

Henry George and Henry M. Hyndman, I: The Forging of an Untenable Alliance, 1882-83
Author(s): Bernard Newton

Source: *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, Vol. 35, No. 3 (Jul., 1976), pp. 311-323

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

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3485857>

Accessed: 14-02-2022 23:47 UTC

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>



JSTOR

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

Henry George and Henry M. Hyndman, I:

*The Forging of an Untenable Alliance, 1882–83**

By BERNARD NEWTON

ABSTRACT. Henry George, an individualistic American reformer and economist, and Henry M. Hyndman, an English democratic Marxist, formed a tenuous alliance in 1882. It was based on their mutual advocacy of land nationalization and Irish land tenure reform. During the next few years, the tensions derived from differing *weltanschauungen* and from differing programmatic directions gradually weakened their mutual bond, despite a continual, but grudging, mutual personal regard.

I

INTRODUCTION

HENRY GEORGE, an individualistic American economist and Henry M. Hyndman, an English Marxist, formed a tenuous alliance in 1882. George, author of *Progress and Poverty* (1879), proposed that land be made the common property of the populace by means of the imposition of a single tax upon economic rent. Hyndman, author of *England for All* (1881), presented some of the fundamentals of Marxian theory, along with proposals for democratic reform in the old English Chartist tradition. He formed a political party, the Democratic Federation, which became the first English party to popularize Marx in England. When George visited the British Isles as a reporter and proselytizer of his message, the two men formed a political alliance on the basis of mutual advocacy of land nationalization and Irish land tenure reform. The movements led by both men were new, and both very much needed allies. Each believed in proceeding towards his goal on a step-by-step basis, and positions were as yet unsolidified. Further, each believed so ardently in the validity of his own position, that each was convinced that he could convert the other.

At first, George and Hyndman demonstrated a sense of commonality. George was Hyndman's house guest; George assisted Hyndman in getting articles published in America; both men lectured from the same political platform; and, upon George's return to America, the two men corresponded with one another in a spirit of mutuality. In addition, some people in Britain were converted to Hyndman's movement after initially having been converted to a commitment to social reform by a reading of

* Presented before the Eastern Economic Association on October 30, 1974.

Progress and Poverty. In the face of an attack by Karl Marx, Hyndman maintained that George taught brilliantly by his errors for he led the people part-way towards the truth.

Gradually, during the course of 1883 and 1884, forces were operating to separate these two allies. Hyndman's party converted to socialism in mid-1883. Hyndman's Social Democratic Federation and the followers of George found their alliance subjected to considerable tension within the Land Reform Union, which was dedicated to land nationalization. These two groups split when the Georgians formed the Land Restoration League, which was dedicated both to George's economic analytical diagnosis of the land problem and to his particular solution to this problem. Further, George's private correspondence demonstrated that although the American was sympathetic to the ideals of the Socialists, he was increasingly repelled by their tactics. Finally, in 1885, when these two reformers engaged in a friendly private debate for publication, the intellectual, programmatic, and political differences between them crystallized. There was no violent break, but rather a virtual termination of contact for the next four and one-half years.

When George's political activities in New York State, in 1887, led him to break with the American Socialists and to attack Social Democrats in his newspaper, Hyndman assailed George in his own English newspaper. Subsequently, in London, in 1889, these men had a final contact in a strong, public debate. This debate, unlike the former one, was between two men who had become opponents—Henry George, now known as 'the Single Tax' reformer, and Henry Hyndman, the Marxian Social Democrat. The tension was heightened because the followers of both men, who were in the audience, provided continual outbursts of reaction.

When George died in 1897, Hyndman wrote an obituary article on this American who has "been almost forgotten." He deemed it strange that a man could have achieved such enormous popularity with an erroneous scheme. He spoke with respect of George's personal incorruptibility. Ironically, fifteen years later, Hyndman felt called upon to attack the resurgent Single Tax Scheme that had developed in Britain.

Current scholars remember Hyndman for his pioneering role in British Socialist politics, for it was he who presented Marx to the English masses and formed the first viable Socialist party. Scholars today remember George for the fillip that he gave to British Socialism in the 1880s; for his Single Tax scheme; and as an economist who has affected thought about land utilization and taxation to the present day.

II

THE BASIS OF THE ALLIANCE

THE ISSUE of Irish land reform agitation which arose in 1879 provided the initial basis for the untenable alliance between Henry George and Henry M. Hyndman. The basic positions of both men were reflected in their respective first books, which were published coincidentally in Great Britain in 1881. George's work, *Progress and Poverty* (1), which had originally been published in the United States in 1879, contained a land reform message that was based on an extension of the Ricardian rent theory. Hyndman's book, *England For All* (2), also contained a land reform message, although more significantly it represented an attempt at spreading Marxian doctrines within the constraints of a British imperial purview and of an English Chartist viewpoint. After the two men were introduced to one another by John Stuart Mill's stepdaughter, Helen Taylor, in 1882, they banded together to promote land reform, but ultimately the capitalist-oriented individualism of Henry George and the socialism of Henry M. Hyndman came into conflict. The end of their unsteady relationship was drastically climaxed by two debates: a private debate for publication in January, 1885, and a public debate in London in July, 1889.

III

THE SETTING

WHEN ONE EXAMINES the setting within which George and Hyndman were to be drawn together, one finds both a broad set of long-run elements pertaining to the development of socialist and land reform movements; and an immediate set of political events centering on Irish land problems. Turning first to the former, it should be noted that the period between the last Chartist Conference in 1858 and the formation of the Democratic Federation under Hyndman in 1881 had been a period of quietude for socialist movements in Great Britain (3). In addition, during much of this period, there was only a moderate amount of land reform activity, which was highlighted by the formation of the temperate Land Tenure Reform Association, founded largely under the influence of John Stuart Mill in 1870 (4). However, beginning in 1879—coincidentally, the date of the initial publication of *Progress and Poverty* in the United States—the land reform movement began to develop momentum in the British Isles. In that year, the Irish Land League was founded by Michael Davitt, whose ideas would be personally influenced by George in America in the next year (5). The League was established on the basis of a demand for land nationalization in contrast to the usual demand

for peasant proprietorship (6). Not only were organizations devoted exclusively to land reform established in the succeeding years, but other organizations were launched with broader socialist aims that included land tenure reform in their programs (7).

Henry George (1839–1897) was an American reformer, whose reform message and economic analysis in *Progress and Poverty* helped him to achieve international fame and an ardent following. He became an almost indefatigable lecturer, writer, political activist, and world traveler in order to effectuate his program of land reform. The germinal idea for the principal thesis of his classic flashed within his brain when he saw in California the poverty in the midst of growing wealth and inflated land values. He was still untutored in economics, and from further reflection and the study of economic classics, his influential *Progress and Poverty* emerged (8).

Essentially, *Progress and Poverty* aims at explaining “why, in spite of increase in productive power, do wages tend to a minimum which will give but a bare living” (9). The economic analysis focuses upon distribution theory; that is, the economic laws which determine the shares achieved by the factors of production which are land, labor and capital. Land receives a rent, labor earns wages and capital earns interest. George accepts David Ricardo’s rent theory in which rent is determined by the difference between what is produced by a combination of labor and capital on higher quality (supra-marginal) land and what is produced by an equivalent application of labor and capital on the poorest land that it is economically feasible to utilize at any time. This latter land is called the marginal land and is no-rent land. The income available for both wages and interest combined is the residual after rent is paid out of the total produce. The difficulty arises, according to George, because increase in the productive ability of society leads to a greater utilization of land. There is then no choice but to utilize inferior lands that were formerly sub-marginal. This lowers the margin of cultivation; and thus, increases in production are accompanied by a fall in the separate *relative* shares remaining for labor and capital. Wages and interest remain depressed, and progress is accompanied by poverty. George proposes a solution to the dilemma, which is to abolish private property in land, not by removing land titles, but by imposing a single tax to absorb rents.

Within the framework of these ideas, it is easily understood why Henry George became involved in the Irish struggle for land reform. Actually, George’s primary thrust was directed at reform in both the United States and Great Britain, and he regarded the local problems in

Ireland as merely reflecting the broad problem of exploitation through national land policies (10). A number of specific events conjoined to involve George directly in the Irish land reform movement (11). Principal among these were an article that George wrote on "The Irish Land Question" for the *Sacramento Bee* in California at the end of 1879; his 1880 New York meeting and alliance with the Irish Land reformer, Michael Davitt, who promised him that the Irish Land League would promote *Progress and Poverty*; his expansion of the year-old article of the *Bee* into a small book, *The Irish Land Problem* (1881), which was published almost simultaneously in New York, London, Manchester and Glasgow; and his employment by a leading Irish newspaper in America, the *Irish World*, as correspondent in Ireland at the end of 1881, the groundwork had been set by the land reform agitation that then prevailed (12) for the dramatic impact that he was to produce on the public mind, and even upon the professional economists of that commonwealth (13).

As for Henry Mayers Hyndman (1842–1921), he was a member of the British upper class, whose wealth allowed travel and leisure. Before 1880, Hyndman was an occasional reporter, war correspondent, and writer on economic and political issues. During the 1870s, he became increasingly disturbed by the British exploitation of colonial peoples in different parts of the globe (14). In the late 1870s, Hyndman was becoming increasingly interested in British politics, and his positions on many issues were politically rather conservative (15). During this time he gained some knowledge of the Socialist movement on the Continent through some German acquaintances. Early in 1880 he met Karl Marx, and visited him a number of times. Then in the summer of 1880, he read the French translation of Marx's *Das Kapital* during a trip to the United States. Upon his return to England, he visited Marx, and expressed the idea of reviving the old Chartist movement. Hyndman was not entirely responsive to the Marxian theory at this time because he was imperialistic; because he was unionist in relation to Ireland; because he believed that British workers would not accept the idea of violent revolution if parliamentary means were available to them; and because he himself recoiled at the idea of violence (16). When the Gladstone Liberal government took office that year, and used repressive measures in Ireland, Hyndman's position shifted. He abandoned his unionist stand, denounced tenant evictions, and favored Irish self-government within the empire.

Hyndman's political organizing activity began in 1881 when he helped

form and finance a new political party, the Democratic Federation. In order to promulgate his own views, he wrote a politico-economic book, *England For All: A Text-book of Democracy* (18), which he distributed to each of the delegates at the inaugural conference of the new Party. The book involves a contradictory contrast. First, it is a tract for political and economic reforms in the old Chartist tradition, including such demands as universal manhood suffrage, the eight-hour working day, public financing of elections, etc. (19). These are "stepping stones" in a gradualist approach for the elimination of poverty and inequality. As for Ireland, large proprietors must be compensated and removed; and such reform elements as fixity of tenure, reclamation of land, etc. are proposed. However, in contrast, two chapters in the book appear near the beginning (20), which Hyndman acknowledges are "indebted to the work of a great and original thinker" (21). The reader is not informed that this thinker is Karl Marx—a fact which incidentally greatly angered Marx (22). These chapters present Marx's labor theory of value, his theory of surplus value and his law of capitalist accumulation. Despite the strong revolutionary import of Marx's theory, Hyndman's approach is gradualist and non-violent. In fact, Hyndman concludes his discussion of Marxian economics with a statement that for British workers "to pull down a system, however bad, they must see that something is ready to take its place" (23). In fact, although Hyndman exhorted the workers of Britain and Ireland to unite, he had hopes that the powerful and rich of the British Isles would lead the way in a peaceful reorganization of society (24). As for other parts of the Empire, India must have a direct voice in her own administration (25), and the English-speaking democracies (like Canada and Australia), a permanent union with England brings "the best hope of securing the fullest development in the future" (26). To Chushichi Tsuzuki, who has made the most thorough study of Hyndman, *England For All* "was a textbook of English 'Tory Democracy' rather than of Continental Social Democracy; and Marx's theory of Surplus Value seemed merely an intrusion" (27).

IV

THE TENUOUS ALLIANCE: 1882-1883

HELEN TAYLOR INTRODUCED George and Hyndman to one another in either January or February of 1882. They apparently became friends rather quickly for Hyndman invited George to become his house guest as soon as George left the mantle of Helen Taylor's hospitality. Both men were certainly drawn together by their deep common concern for the

question of land reform in the world at large and by the then current provocative issue of Irish land reform. Both men were embarking on their respective political reformist undertakings, and had a need for associates and allies. Indeed, George's reputation in Britain was beginning to expand (29), and he was therefore a most desirable ally to Hyndman. George was quick to transmit an interview with his new connection to his newspaper in New York. In his introductory paragraph, George refers to Hyndman as a leading writer of the London press who has "extreme radical views on political and social questions," and who attempts to instill "democratic ideas" and "bring about revolutionary movements."

In response to George's many questions Hyndman first averred that the principal immediate reason for the existence of the Democratic Federation was as a base of protest against the English repression of the Irish; he then defamed the other radical and workingmen's groups for showing no sympathy for the Irish cause; he further maintained that the nationalization of land was the only just solution to the Irish land problem; and, in characteristic optimistic fashion, he concluded that the struggle would spread from Ireland to England, as the start of a great European democratic movement (30).

Henry George became Hyndman's guest in London during March, 1882. The host was anxious for George's presence, not only for himself, "but because I hoped quite mistakenly as afterward appeared to convert him to the truth as it is in Socialist economics" (31). Retrospectively Hyndman found the American frustrating, for he believed that his arguments compelled George to retreat from a former position, but at the moment that the pressure was relaxed, George would resume his usual position "of William with his plane and Henry with his axe, sharing the advantage derived from the loan of the individually owned" tools and providing the basis for modern interest and profits. However, Hyndman discovered that it was useless to be angry at George or to press him too hard, for he then went off with his devoted followers, only to return more "single taxy" than ever. Hyndman believed that George lacked "depth of mind," and that he held fast to ideas that seemed to have taken hold of him, rather than he of the ideas (32). Nevertheless, Hyndman found George to be delightful, humorous, good-natured and fond of discussion (33).

Little is known of George's reaction to Hyndman. It appears that George was amused by Hyndman's humorless, formal manners (34). George's son, Henry Jr., believes that his father thought that the socialism in Hyndman was weakening in response to his arguments (35).

Hyndman introduced the American to a different life style. Despite his allegiance to socialism, Hyndman lived in a fashion befitting his wealth. In fact, he was highly formal, so that even when he addressed workers or distributed radical literature, he wore an identifying silk-faced frock coat, and he often wore a tall silk hat and expensive gloves. In contrast, George was an unpretentious and informal person. The contrasting manners of the two men caused Hyndman some irritation. Hyndman relates of the time when George insisted on eating whelks being sold by a costermonger right there on the street. Hyndman expresses his consternation at having to stand there in high hat and frock coat, watching George (36). Consistent with his life style, Hyndman was able to take his guest to an elegant London reception crowded with notables, where the American saw the poets Tennyson and Browning, and where he had a disillusioning discussion with the philosopher Herbert Spencer (37).

In his personal contact with Marx, Hyndman learned of what he termed Marx's "friendly contempt" for *Progress and Poverty*, a view that he shared less strongly. Marx had called it "the capitalist's last ditch." This point Hyndman could not accept. Retrospectively, Hyndman wrote that he saw "the extraordinary gaps in the work and its egregious blunders in economics, but I also recognized, to an extent that Marx could not admit, the seductive attractiveness for the sympathetic, half-educated mob of its brilliant high class journalese" (38). Hyndman believed that George taught through his errors by leading people part way towards the truth, while Marx believed that the propagation of error could not benefit the people (39).

During the month of March, when George was still Hyndman's guest, he appeared on the same platform with Helen Taylor and Hyndman in Glasgow, under the auspices of the Democratic Federation. The meeting unanimously resolved that unjust monopolies, particularly in land, should be destroyed; and that land should be the property of the nation (40). It should be noted that George did not literally believe in land nationalization. Rather, he believed that the taxation of total land rents would have the same basic effect. However, George himself sometimes used the term land nationalization, because his reform fitted into the category in a broad sense of the term (41).

In the following month, Hyndman expressed the difference between his position and George's in an article in the small weekly English newspaper, *The Radical* (a vehicle of the workingmen's clubs in London), which supported George. Hyndman seconded the support that *The*

Radical accorded to land nationalization, but maintained that it alone would benefit the workers very little. He attributed the error in the position of the newspaper to "Mr. Henry George, whose valuable and vigorous book" has misapprehended the crucial problems of our industrial system. The *Englishman* then refers to Karl Marx by name—probably for the first time in print—and asserts the validity of the Marxian analysis, which "shows clearly that the capitalist class rob the working class by means of the surplus value . . . more than the landlord class do by their monopoly of land" (42).

This difference of position in print apparently did not adversely affect the relationship of the two Henrys. While in the British Museum, Hyndman discovered a copy of a 1775 lecture delivered by Thomas Spence, in which common rights in land were acclaimed and land nationalization was proposed. When Hyndman showed his discovery to George, the American was enthusiastic, and encouraged Hyndman to publish the lecture as a tract, for he believed it would help the cause. Hyndman supplied notes and an introduction, and published the tract (43). Meanwhile George sent a copy to Patrick Ford for publication in *The Irish World* (44). George's friendship for Hyndman is expressed in his attempt at helping the *Englishman*, "who has been very kind to me here," to publish an article, "The Coming Revolution in England," in an American magazine (45). In the latter article, Hyndman, with characteristic optimism, forecasts an eventual revolution despite the calm of the time; and he credits this to the new understanding coming from the writings of reformers in many countries. In this group, he included Karl Marx's "great work on capital," as well as George's *Progress and Poverty*, which he nevertheless asserts does not meet the "view of the advanced school on the subject of capital (46).

By the time George sailed for home in October, 1882—after approximately a year in the British Isles—he had become famous. The international publicity occasioned by his arrest in Ireland by an over-zealous official, suspicious of intrusive strangers; the successful sale of *Progress and Poverty*; his association with land reform organizations like the Democratic Federation; and the influential *London Times* review of both *Progress and Poverty* and *The Irish Land Question*, all served to publicize his name and link it with economic reform (47). In the next few months—as indeed in the next few years—Hyndman's Democratic Federation was an indirect beneficiary of George's activities and writings. A number of young professionals, whose names became imprinted in English Socialist history, were attracted to the politics of economic re-

form by George (48), and some became members of the Democratic Federation (49).

In the following year, while George was in the United States, his reputation continued to grow in Great Britain as magazines began to publish critical reviews of his now famous book (50); as academic economists took a public interest in George (51); and with the establishment of the Land Reform Union, which was dedicated to promoting land nationalization and strongly supportive of Henry George (52). Hyndman meanwhile, was steering the Democratic Federation, despite its heterogeneous membership, in the direction of a Socialist program—an action that was successful by the middle of 1883. Despite the widening political gulf between the two men, Hyndman had the Democratic Federation ally itself to the Land Reform Union (53). The reformers each published a new book: Hyndman published *The Historical Basis of Socialism in England* (54), while Henry George published *Social Problems* (55).

Hyndman's work is his most scholarly, containing an extensive study of the development of industrialism and capitalism in Great Britain over the preceding 500 years, as well as an examination of the labor movement and Socialism during the same period. In this work, he explicitly acknowledges Marx and he presents ideas of other socialist theorists. The work has a number of minor references to George on specific economic points, but his main thrust on George is that the American reformer's great success is not due to his theoretical soundness, but to his moral tone and sweeping style. Hyndman further maintains that George writes from a middle class standpoint but nevertheless prepares the way for Socialism by sweeping away middle class prejudices (56). He contends, moreover, that even if rents were confiscated, this would not benefit laborers if farmers still maintained their primacy (57). With his usual optimism, the English reformer sees the spread of "collectivist Socialism" throughout the United States (and in Europe) and he gives much of the credit to *Progress and Poverty* (58). Likewise, he grants George much of the credit for the movement towards land nationalization in Britain (59).

George's *Social Problems* is his most 'socialist' sounding work (60). He proclaims that industrial development is promoting economic concentration and compelling government to undertake an increasing number of functions (61). Natural monopolies like railroads, telegraph, telephone, gas, water and electricity should be owned and managed by the State (62). However, he wished to keep the number of public enter-

prises to a minimum and to increase the general level of competition in the economy. The significance of this work to the study of the relationship between these two reformers is that later in his life the Englishman took some of the credit for George's writing of *Social Problems*, in which the latter presumably was beginning to see that "man cannot live by land alone" (63). Actually, Hyndman did not realize that this degree of "socialism" in George was a position that he had held since the late 1860s (64).

There is strong evidence of a sense of alliance and a mood of agreement about the need to overcome the injustice of the existing system that is very evident in the letters that Hyndman sent to George in the next half year after George's departure from England (65). The English radical admits his disagreement on the matter of the appropriation of competitive rents, which he believes will be of little benefit. However, Hyndman affirms that "for whatever our differences may be economically, I recognize to the fullest extent your noble character" (66). He affirms that since he disapproves "of attacking allies," he had the Democratic Federation turn down an invitation to organize two meetings in which Arnold Toynbee, the radical economic historian and reformer, was going to attack *Progress and Poverty* (67). The Englishman thinks of George as an ally to such an extent that he calls on him to be ready to be involved in an International Labor League which he was planning (68). He asks George to "keep your hands on the Knights of Labour, and give that movement an international twist, if possible" (69). Hyndman had a vision of having key figures operate in different nations (70), but soon he temporarily lost hope of organizing an international organization (71). He had planned this organization at least partly in response to the violence that the anarchists committed, since he was opposed to violent action (72). In conclusion, it should be observed that Hyndman was extremely grateful to the American for the role that he played in securing publication of an article in America (73, 74).

The Brooklyn Center
Long Island University
 Brooklyn, N.Y.

1. Henry George, *Progress and Poverty*, 4th ed. (New York: D. Appleton, 1881).
2. Henry M. Hyndman, *England For All: The Text-Book of Democracy* (London: W. Allen, 1881).
3. See G. D. H. Cole, *A History of Socialist Thought: Volume II, Marxism and Anarchism, 1850-1890* (London: Macmillan, 1954), pp. 379-83.
4. *Ibid.*, pp. 380, 382-83.

5. Charles Albro Barker, *Henry George* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1955), p. 335.
6. Cole, *op. cit.*, p. 383.
7. Among the land reform organizations that were established we note the Land Nationalization Society, founded in 1881 under the leadership of the scientist-reformer Alfred Russel Wallace; and the Land Reform Union established in 1883 to promote George's ideas. Among the socialist organizations we particularly note the Democratic Federation (1881) established under Hyndman's leadership and the Fabian Society (1884), whose membership included such future luminaries as George Bernard Shaw and Sidney Webb.
8. For a thoroughly documented and excellent portrayal of the life and thought of George, read Charles Albro Barker, *op. cit.*
9. Henry George, *op. cit.*, p. 15.
10. Elwood P. Lawrence, *Henry George in the British Isles* (East Lansing: Michigan State Univ. Press, 1957), p. 8.
11. *Ibid.*, pp. 8-11 and Barker, *op. cit.*, pp. 334-37.
12. See Lawrence, *op. cit.*, p. 11 and Max Beer, *A History of British Socialism* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1940; one volume edition), vol. II, pp. 242-43.
13. For a comprehensive discussion of George's effect upon the British economists, see Bernard Newton, "Impact of Henry George on British Economists," *Am. J. Econ. Sociol.*, 30 (April, 1971) and (July, 1971), 31 (January, 1972).
14. Chushichi Tsuzuki, *H. M. Hyndman and British Socialism* (London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1961), pp. 14-18, 21-25.
15. *Ibid.*, pp. 28-30.
16. *Ibid.*, pp. 32-36.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 36.
18. Printed by Gilbert and Rivington, 1881.
19. Henry M. Hyndman, *England for All*, p. 109.
20. These chapters are Chapter II, "Labour" and Chapter III, "Capital."
21. *Ibid.*, "Preface."
22. Henry Mayers Hyndman, *The Record of an Adventurous Life* (New York: Macmillan, 1911), p. 259.
23. Hyndman, *England For All*, p. 86.
24. *Ibid.*, pp. 63-64.
25. *Ibid.*, p. 151.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 168.
27. Tsuzuki, *op. cit.*, p. 42.
28. Barker, *op. cit.*, p. 356.
29. Anna George de Mille, *Henry George* (Chapel Hill: U. of North Carolina Press, 1950), p. 102. George's daughter refers to a letter from George to his friend and benefactor Francis G. Shaw (dated February 11, 1882) that his reputation is out of proportion to the sale of *Progress and Poverty* in Britain (*ibid.*).
30. A dispatch from Henry George with the dateline London, February 22, 1882, *The Irish World*, March 18, 1882.
31. Hyndman, *The Record of an Adventurous Life*, p. 266.
32. *Ibid.*, p. 267.
33. *Ibid.*
34. Barker, *op. cit.*, p. 357. Barker points out that George's attitude towards Hyndman is expressed in a letter that George wrote to Patrick Ford, the editor of the *Irish World*, dated March 9, 1882, and found in the Henry George Collection, New York Public Library (HGC) (*ibid.*, p. 661). The author of this paper carefully searched through the HGC for this letter, and it is apparently missing. George's daughter, Anna George de Mille, was apparently unaware of the letter to Ford, for she wrote that no record was left of George's reaction to Hyndman. See Anna George DeMille, *op. cit.*, p. 103.
35. Henry George, Jr., *Life of Henry George* (New York: Doubleday, Doran & Co.,

1930; original publication date 1900), p. 368. Also, see Barker, *op. cit.*, p. 357 for the same view.

36. Hyndman, *The Record of an Adventurous Life*, p. 265.
37. Henry George, Jr., *op. cit.*, p. 369.
38. Hyndman, *The Record . . .*, pp. 257-58.
39. *Ibid.*, p. 258.
40. Lawrence, *op. cit.*, p. 78.
41. *Ibid.*, pp. 57-58.
42. Henry Hyndman, "Coercion and Revolution," *The Radical* (April 15, 1882), p. 5.
43. *The Nationalization of the Land in 1775 and 1882: Being a Lecture delivered at Newcastle-on-Tyne by Thomas Spence, 1775*. Reprinted and edited, with notes and introduction, by H. M. Hyndman (London: 1882).
44. Henry George Jr., *op. cit.*, pp. 368-69.
45. Henry George to A. J. Steers, August 25, 1882, HGC.
46. Henry M. Hyndman, "The Coming Revolution in England," *North American Review*, 135 (October, 1882), p. 28.
47. Lawrence, *op. cit.*, pp. 27-28.
48. Max Beer, *op. cit.*, II, p. 245; George Bernard Shaw, *The Intelligent Woman's guide to Socialism and Capitalism* (New York: Brentano's, 1928), p. 468; and Sidney Webb, "Socialism in England," *Publications of the American Economic Association*, 4 (April, 1889), p. 88, all show that many of the younger generation of intellectuals and workers were attracted to Socialism via their attraction to Henry George's message.
49. Tsuzuki, *op. cit.*, p. 48.
50. Barker, *op. cit.*, pp. 383-88, 407.
51. Newton, *loc. cit.*, Part II.
52. Barker, *op. cit.*, pp. 379-80; and Lawrence, *op. cit.*, pp. 32-34.
53. *Ibid.*, p. 32.
54. (London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co., 1883).
55. (New York: Belford, Clarke & Co., 1883).
56. Hyndman, *op. cit.*, p. 292n.
57. *Ibid.*, p. 334n.
58. *Ibid.*, p. 431.
59. *Ibid.*, p. 449.
60. Barker, *op. cit.*, p. 379.
61. Henry George, *Social Problems*, pp. 62, 263.
62. *Ibid.*, pp. 257-58.
63. Hyndman, *The Record of an Adventurous Life*, p. 267.
64. Barker, *op. cit.*, pp. 426-27.
65. The Henry George Collection at the New York Public Library has eight letters from Hyndman to George, all of them dated within this period, namely, November, in 1882; and January 4, January 9, March 14, March 16, March 24, April 5, and April 6, all in 1883. The Collection has only one letter (with the last part missing) from George to Hyndman, dated June 22, 1884. Hyndman's letters show that he was generally responding to letters that he had received from the American.
66. Hyndman to George, March 14, 1883, HGC.
67. Hyndman to George, January 4, 1883, HGC.
68. Hyndman to George, March 24, 1883, HGC.
69. *Ibid.*
70. Hyndman to George, April 6, 1883, HGC.
71. Tsuzuki, *op. cit.*, p. 113.
72. Hyndman to George, March 14, 1883; March 24, 1883, HGC.
73. Hyndman to George, November, 1882, January, 9, 1883 and March 24, 1883 (HGC). The HGC sets the year of the January 9th letters as 1882, but the letter has much evidence indicating that 1883 is the correct date—most supportive is the statement that the anarchist, Prince Kropotkin, was arrested in France. For proof, on this arrest see P. Kropotkin, *Memoirs of a Revolutionist* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1899), p. 451.
74. The article is Henry Hyndman, "The Social Reconstruction of England," *International Review* (New York), 14 (February-March, 1883), pp. 110-30.