

## The Yankee Prophet "Over There": News from the New World to the Old

### I The Irish Land Question *and* Social Problems

IN THE EARLY 1880's George published two books, *The Irish Land Question* (1881) and *Social Problems* (1883). Both works were related to his journalistic activities, to his first two visits to the British Isles, and to *Progress and Poverty*. *The Irish Land Question* (subsequently reprinted simply as *The Land Question*) grew out of an article for the *Sacramento Bee's* Christmas issue in 1879. When George again took up the question over a year later, the article developed into a book of seventeen short chapters of roughly one hundred pages. Less philosophic than *Progress and Poverty*, the book's full title, *The Irish Land Question, What It Involves and How Alone It can be Settled*, indicates its pragmatic attempt to treat a specific economic condition.

The book is addressed to a typical Georgian rhetorical question: "What would the Irish landlords lose, what would the Irish tenants gain, if, tomorrow, Ireland were made a State in the American Union and American law substituted for English law?" George wrote the "little book, or rather pamphlet" to help introduce his ideas into Ireland in the midst of the unrest there. Michael Davitt, one of the Irish leaders, came to New York in 1880 to gather support for the Irish Land League. After meeting George, Davitt agreed to publicize *Progress and Poverty* when he returned home. Thinking the book too complicated and theoretical for use as propaganda within the Irish Land League, George decided to write a statement of his views suitable for the membership. Appleton immediately agreed to publish the new book.

*The Irish Land Question* became popular almost at once, and George achieved his purpose. The book, basically an introduction to his economic remedy, is only moderately concerned with Ireland in particular; but George is very critical of Parnell's theories and policy. Essentially, George uses the Irish condition as a prime example of the need for reform, and he presents in simple terms his arguments for the confiscation of rent and the return of the land to all the people. The captured rent, he says, should be returned to the whole community in the form of very much needed social services. Emphasizing his usual universal appeal to the workingman and the landless, he calls upon the people of Ireland to join with their English brethren in their fight for independence. The condition of labor, he argues, is just as bad throughout the world as it is in Ireland, if not worse:

What I urge the men of Ireland to do is to proclaim, without limitation or evasion, that the land, of natural right, is the common property of the whole people, and to propose practical measures which will recognize this right in all countries as well as in Ireland.

What I urge the Land Leagues of the United States to do is to announce this great principle as of universal application; to give their movement a reference to America as well as to Ireland; to broaden and deepen and strengthen it by making it a movement for the regeneration of the world—a movement which shall concentrate and give shape to aspirations that are stirring among all nations. (106-7)<sup>1</sup>

George concluded the book with his usual quotation from the Declaration of Independence about self-evident truths and equality, never popular ideas with England's governing classes.

*The Irish Land Question* was of great personal value to George. It advertised *Progress and Poverty*, increased its author's notoriety, and prepared the ground for his visit to Ireland as a special correspondent of the *Irish World*. In fact, after George arrived in the British Isles, he found that the British edition of *The Irish Land Question* was selling even better than *Progress and Poverty* while also increasing the sales of the larger book. He was correct, therefore, in assuming that the smaller work would make its readers want to study *Progress and Poverty*. The "universal question" was the question that counted the most, and *The Irish Land Question*, like *Our Land and Land Policy*, simply

illustrated this point by examining a particular local condition which reflected the universal one.

*The Irish Land Question* was often reviewed with *Progress and Poverty*. In George's support of the Land Nationalization movement in England and in his plans to "start the revolution," the smaller book functioned like a destroyer escort convoying a battleship of the line into a decisive engagement for the control of the economic seas over which the British Empire had ruled unchallenged by wandering Yankees demanding their "inalienable rights." The two books and George in person made their major impact on England, Ireland, and Scotland by arraigning the claims of English, Irish, and Scottish landlords with "the widespread institution of private property in land" which George asserted was "the great social problem of modern civilization" (21-22).

*Social Problems*, coming shortly after, summed up effectively—both in the United States and in the United Kingdom—the collectivistic side of George's social remedy. It sold well on both sides of the Atlantic and reflected his experiences in New York City between his first two trips to the British Isles; but it also indicates how conscious he was of the distress he had witnessed abroad.

*Social Problems* is a compilation of twenty-two chapter-articles, thirteen of which appeared in *Frank Leslie's Illustrated Newspaper*. The articles were written indirectly as a response to the opinions of Professor William Graham Sumner who had just published a series of articles in *Harper's Weekly* and who had so harshly reviewed *Progress and Poverty* in *Scribner's Monthly* about two years before. The *Leslie* essays were published under the general title "Problems of the Times" and appeared throughout the spring and summer of 1883.

*Social Problems* marks an interesting change of emphasis in George's work. In his discussion of collectivistic measures needed for social reform, he stressed the importance of public ownership and government control of monopoly in industry. Though based upon *Progress and Poverty*, *Social Problems* was addressed more directly than George's major work to industrial questions and to public utility problems that beset large cities, especially in the northeastern United States. In a prefatory note, George said that he had tried to "present the momentous social prob-

lems of our time, unencumbered by technicalities and without that abstract reasoning which some of the principles of political economy require for thorough explanation." He referred to *Progress and Poverty*, saying he was discussing points "not touched upon, or but slightly touched upon" in the earlier work; however, he also referred his reader to it for fuller discussion of related ideas.

George's reputation was in the process of change when he was engaged in writing *Social Problems*. He was becoming less the respected author and more the social agitator. His opponents often attempted satire and ridicule in order to lessen the influence he was having on public opinion; even *Leslie's* felt obliged to accompany his series of articles with criticism of the author on its editorial page. Nevertheless, George's influence could not be wished away, and a review of *Social Problems* in the *New York Independent* for May 1, 1884 (just about a year after the "Problems of the Times" began to appear in *Leslie's*), reinforced its continuing presence: "Henry George exercises a strong influence over a vast number of people. We must face the fact squarely, whether we like it or not. His books are sold and read in America and England as no other books are sold and read; the sales are numbered by the hundred thousand, the readers by the million."

*Social Problems* has remained George's most bluntly socialistic book. Coming as it did between his first two visits to the British Isles and reflecting his personal commitment to active reform movements, its socialistic character is everywhere in evidence. His statement on "the truth in socialism" in Chapter XVII expresses sharply his views on the purpose of government:

The primary purpose and end of government being to secure the natural rights and equal liberty of each, all businesses that involve monopoly are within the necessary province of governmental regulation, and businesses that are in their nature complete monopolies become properly functions of the state. As society develops, the state must assume these functions, in their nature cooperative, in order to secure the equal rights and liberty of all. That is to say, in the process of integration, the individual becomes more and more dependent upon and subordinate to the all, it becomes necessary for government, which is properly that social organ by which alone the whole body of individuals can act, to take upon itself, in the interest of all, certain functions

which cannot safely be left to individuals. Thus out of the principle that it is the proper end and purpose of government to secure the natural rights and equal liberty of the individual, grows the principle that it is the business of government to do for the mass of individuals those things which cannot be done, or cannot be so well done, by individual action. As in the development of species, the power of conscious, coordinated action of the whole being must assume greater and greater relative importance to the automatic action of parts, so is it in the development of society. This is the truth in socialism, which, although it is being forced upon us by industrial progress and social development, we are so slow to recognize. (176-77)

He went on to say in the same chapter that "the natural progress of social development is unmistakably toward cooperation, or, if the word be preferred, toward socialism, though I dislike to use a word to which such various and vague meanings are attached" (191). George's meaning was clear no matter what word he chose to use. The "welfare state" was just exactly what George expected the state to be. The public was responsible for the welfare of its members; and when private interests did not contribute to the welfare of individuals, it was the duty of government to intercede on their behalf.

George's comments upon the rights of man and economic slavery in chapters X and XV are powerfully provocative. Besides effectively introducing the principle that those who owned the land owned the people on it, his comments upon *Robinson Crusoe* (his favorite book) at the beginning of Chapter XV also indicate that as a literary critic George was capable of important insights. Defoe's social criticism, implied and explicit, in *Robinson Crusoe* was not lost upon George.

Robinson Crusoe, as we all know, took Friday as his slave. Suppose, however, that instead of taking Friday as his slave, Robinson Crusoe had welcomed him as a man and a brother; had read him a Declaration of Independence, an Emancipation Proclamation and a Fifteenth Amendment, and informed him that he was a free and independent citizen, entitled to vote and hold office; but had at the same time also informed him that that particular island was his (Robinson Crusoe's) private and exclusive property. What would have been the difference? Since Friday could not fly up into the air nor swim off through the

sea, since if he lived at all he must live on the island, he would have been in one case as much a slave as in the other. Crusoe's ownership of the island would be equivalent to his ownership of Friday. (148-49)

It was an especially effective example, particularly for the English, Scottish, and Irish readers. Of course, exempla of this sort are the hallmark of George's style and also the reason why he could be so moving as a writer and a speaker.

Before he had organized his material into book form, a job on which he was still at work just before his second departure for the British Isles in December, 1883, the series of articles in *Leslie's* cost him additional time and effort. In his fifth essay he had provoked a controversy from which he was to triumph personally and which may well have helped to sell copies of the book itself. "The March of Concentration," which is also the fifth chapter of *Social Problems*, is concerned with the concentration of population in cities and of land in fewer hands. In it, George took on another Yale University professor of economics, General Francis A. Walker, a more prominent figure in his day than W. G. Sumner. George had known Walker's work from an earlier date. He had referred approvingly to *The Wages Question in Progress and Poverty* and, in fact, did not seek the quarrel that ensued. Walker had just become president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He was president of the American Statistical Association, was soon to be president of the American Economics Association, and had been a director of the United States Census. In his "Compendium of the Tenth Census," Walker had said that the average size of farms in the United States had decreased "from 153 acres in 1870 to 134 acres in 1880." But George said that it was an "incontestable fact . . . that, like everything else, ownership of land is concentrating, and farming is assuming a larger scale." He also said that the census statement "that the average size of farms is decreasing in the United States" was "inconsistent not only with facts obvious all over the United States, and with the tendencies of agriculture in other countries, such as Great Britain, but it is inconsistent with the returns furnished by the Census Bureau itself" (40-41).

George's corrections were not taken lightly, and a wordy ex-

change resulted because he had called into question the intelligence and integrity of the interpreters who had failed to make sense out of their own census figures. He was proven to be correct in his criticism, however. Walker had misinterpreted the tables for 1870 and 1880 because he had assumed mistakenly that both sets of statistics were tabulated on the same principle. It turned out that the 1870 tables were based on improved land and the 1880 tables on total land. Walker's careless error had led him to compare sets of statistics that could not possibly be compared. The *New York Sun* summed up the long controversy, which amounted to about twenty-five pages and in which Walker had become rather contemptuous of George, by saying: "It is amusing because, while there is no lack of suavity and decorum on the part of Mr. George, his opponent squirms and sputters as one flagrant blunder after another is brought forward and the spike of logic is driven home through his egregious fallacies."<sup>2</sup> Walker's ironic offer to supply "a more elementary statement, illustrated with diagrams, if desired" had backfired.

Walker's criticism of George, like Sumner's, carried over to the *Princeton Review* and finally into a book, *Land and Its Rent*, in which a chapter was entitled, "Henry George's Social Fallacies." Though the academic critics had tried to ignore George, they could not. Much more slowly than their British counterparts, American economists had to come to some terms with him. That he had at least to be refuted was the common reaction, but he could not be ignored. In the years that were to come, hostile recognition and grudging acknowledgment of isolated ideas were as close as he came to academic acceptance. His earlier experiences at Berkeley had been an accurate forecast of his relations with orthodox and university political economists.

In *Social Problems*, George proved himself to be a keen logician, but his effectiveness can be traced in a large part to his skill as a writer, a skill that expressed his own personal zeal and the direction and inclinations of the "popular" American point of view:

"Master"! We don't like the word. It is not American! But what is the use of objecting to the word when we have the thing? The man who gives me employment, which I must have or suffer, that man is my master, let me call him what I will. (48)

*The Yankee Prophet "Over There"*

In turning men into machines we are wasting the highest powers. Already in our society there is a favored class who need take no thought for the morrow—what they shall eat, or what they shall drink, or wherewithal they shall be clothed. And may it be that Christ was more than a dreamer when he told his disciples that in that kingdom of justice for which he taught them to work and pray this might be the condition of all? (80)

And the same inequality of conditions which we see beginning here, is it not due to the same primary cause? American citizenship confers no right to American soil. The first and most essential rights of man—the rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness—are denied here as completely as in England. And the same results must follow. (104)

The viewpoint of *Progress and Poverty* and of George's Christian socialism is once again in evidence:

By making land private property, by permitting individuals to appropriate this fund which nature plainly intended for the use of all, we throw the children's bread to the dogs of Greed and Lust; we produce a primary inequality which gives rise in every direction to other tendencies to inequality; and from this perversion of the good gifts of the Creator, from this ignoring and defying of his social laws, there arise in the very heart of our civilization those horrible and monstrous things that betoken social putrefaction. (218)

In our mad scramble to get on top of one another, how little do we take of the good things that bountiful nature offers us! Consider this fact: To the majority of people in such countries as England, and even largely in the United States, fruit is a luxury. Yet mother earth is not niggard of her fruit. If we chose to have it so, every road might be lined with fruit-trees. (240)

The beginning of 1884 found George back in England preaching that the promised land was promised to all.

## II *Ireland and England (1881-82)*

George left the United States for England in October, 1881, as a special correspondent for the *Irish World*. Just a few days before his departure, Parnell and two other Irish members of Parliament had been jailed, increasing the already large number of political imprisonments. The unrest in Ireland made both

George and his books timely visitors to the British Isles. *Progress and Poverty* and *The Irish Land Question* were selling well throughout England, Scotland, and Ireland; and by early 1882 Kegan Paul had brought out a sixpenny and a threepenny edition of each book. Furthermore, free copies of each work were distributed to every member of Parliament and to various organizations and newspapers having any interest in practical approaches to economic problems.

While George was on his way, Parnell and his fellow prisoners composed their "No Rent Manifesto" which the *Irish World* published with praise and gusto. In one of George's first reports to the paper, he wrote as follows:

It is not merely a despotism; it is a despotism sustained by alien force, and wielded in the interests of a privileged class, who look upon the great masses of the people as intended but to be hewers of their wood and drawers of their water. . . .

I leave out of consideration for the moment the present extraordinary condition of things when constitutional guarantees for personal liberty are utterly suspended, and any man in the country may be hauled off to prison at the nod of an irresponsible dictator. I speak of the normal times and the ordinary workings of government.<sup>3</sup>

In a private letter, dated November 10th, to Patrick Ford, the editor of the *Irish World*, he said that "This is the most damnable government that exists to-day outside of Russia—Miss Taylor says outside of Turkey."<sup>4</sup> He finally was permitted a short visit with Parnell in Kilmainham jail. Speaking in public with great success on one occasion, he made his sympathies with the plight of the Irish unquestionably clear. He spent much of his time traveling about Ireland and witnessing the miserable conditions throughout the country, which he dutifully reported to the *Irish World*. By the first of the year (1882), he had concluded that "The majority of the Irish don't know yet how to get what they want. Like all great movements, it is a blind groping forward. But it is the beginning of the revolution, sure."<sup>5</sup>

Though George felt that the majority of the clergy was not on the side of the struggle for freedom in which the Irish were involved, he met some who greeted him warmly and who encouraged the movement in every way, including the Bishop of Clonfert; another bishop, Dr. Thomas Nulty; and Reverend

*The Yankee Prophet "Over There"*

Thomas Dawson. He also formed a close friendship with the stepdaughter of John Stuart Mill, Helen Taylor, whom he considered to be the most intelligent woman he had ever met. With most of the men in jail, the women of the Irish Land Movement had become very active, and Miss Taylor had been a vital force among them.

In January, George returned to London and with his wife and daughters spent several weeks at Helen Taylor's home. Though Mrs. George and their daughters had come to England with him, he had gone to Ireland by himself. It was at this time that George met in person Henry Hyndman and Herbert Spencer, even spending some weeks in Hyndman's home.

George's meeting with Spencer was the beginning of their mutual antagonism. On the basis of his reading of *Social Statics*, George had expected Spencer to be sympathetic to the Irish cause. However, he was violently opposed to the Irish Land League and its ideas. Rent, Spencer thought, was rightfully due the landlord. George, of course, did not believe in "No Rent"—he wanted to confiscate it. The rift between the two proved to be as permanent as it was fundamental.

George's relations with Hyndman were amicable, but also basically at odds. Hyndman, an associate of William Morris in the Social Democratic Federation and the author of the socialistic *England for All*, was a Marxist. Personal animosity played no part in the ever-widening gulf between George and the true British left. Though their differences were there from the beginning, it was only after 1885-86 that the break became absolute.<sup>6</sup> The Marxists could never accept his defense of interest for one thing, and he could never accept the fundamental anti-individualism of socialist philosophy.

It was also during his winter visit in 1882 to London that George first met Joseph Chamberlain, a member of Gladstone's cabinet, who was in future years to be associated with radical programs for land-taxation legislation before passing from active political life. George was furiously busy into the early spring. And going back and forth between Ireland and London, he even managed a trip to Paris to see the Irish Land League leaders who were in exile.

During his year in England and on the Continent, George found he was always running out of time in which to get things

done. There were, however, three experiences or events of outstanding importance that occurred in 1882. The first was his influence upon Alfred Russel Wallace; the second, his reactions to Parnell and the Phoenix Park murders and his arrests in Ireland as a "suspicious" person; and, third, his effect (unknown to him) upon a young and eventually famous playwright.

In the spring of 1882 George made contact with the active Land Nationalist movement in England, headed by Wallace, the eminent and respected associate of Darwin. Wallace admired *Progress and Poverty* and even tried to interest Darwin in it. He also sought George's help in order to get New York newspapers to review his own book, *Land Nationalization*, a book clearly in debt to *Progress and Poverty*. It not only quoted George frequently, often at length, but it also contained a chapter entitled "Low Wages and Pauperism the Direct Consequences of Unrestricted Private Property in Land," which indicated Wallace's general agreement with George's program and ideas. Wallace's support of George gave the author of *Progress and Poverty* the kind of intellectual respectability he had never received in the United States. The *Fortnightly Review* invited him to write an article on Ireland, and it turned out to be as strong an attack and as deft an analysis of the situation as he was ever to write. Written in his best journalistic style, it appeared just a month after the Phoenix Park murders. Having actually written it before the murders, George's words were all the more effective. With devastating logic George traced the unrest in Ireland to landlordism. Against the background of his analysis, the Phoenix Park violence appeared inevitable.

With his *Fortnightly* article in the press,<sup>7</sup> George went to Portland prison to meet Davitt, upon his release, on the very day of the murders and therefore was not in Dublin. Davitt, whom George had met in New York and who had been in jail from before George's departure for Ireland the previous fall, had always been more sympathetic to George's program than any of the other Irish leaders. In *The Irish Land Question*, he had referred to Davitt's imprisonment and had also censured the Parnellite policy: "Davitt is snatched to prison; a 'Liberal' government carries coercion by a tremendous majority, and the most despotic powers are invoked to make possible the eviction of Irish peasants. . . . It is already beginning to be perceived that

*The Yankee Prophet "Over There"*

the Irish movement, so far as it has yet gone, is merely in the interest of a class; that, so far as it has yet voiced any demand, it promises nothing to the laboring and artisan classes" (98; 59). When Parnell had come to terms with the Gladstone government almost on the eve of the murders, Davitt and a great many of the disappointed Land Leaguers found themselves more than ever sympathetic to George's ideas. Between Parnell's "surrender" and the unfortunate and destructive assassinations, the Irish Land League had reached its unproductive end. In George's report to the *Irish World*, he recorded Davitt's and his own reaction to the disastrous and completely unnecessary violence:

We [George and Davitt] did meet, but earlier than either he or I expected. I was awakened early in the morning by a telegram from a friend in Dublin, telling me that the new Chief Secretary and the Under-Secretary had been stabbed to death in Phoenix Park. But for the terms of the dispatch and the character of my friend I should have thought the story a wild rumor, for Dublin is a good place for rumors. But these left no doubt . . . I went at once to Davitt's room, woke him up, and handed him the dispatch as he lay in bed. "My God!" was his exclamation, "Have I got out of Portland to hear this!" And then he added mournfully: "For the first time in my life I despair. It seems like the curse that had always followed Ireland."<sup>8</sup>

Before returning to Ireland, George helped Parnell, Dillon, and Davitt put together a statement which the three signed, disassociating themselves and the movement from the murders. However, the Land League was dead, and Parnell turned his back upon it. George wrote to Ford on May 17th: "The whole situation is very bad and perplexing. The Land League in its present form on both sides of the water seems to me smashed. But the seed has at least been planted. . . . We who have seen the light must win because much greater forces than ourselves are working with us."<sup>9</sup>

George's usual transcendental confidence and optimism soothed him, but it did not blind him. "Parnell seems to me," he wrote again to Ford several days later (May 20th), "to have thrown away the greatest opportunity any Irishman ever had. It is the birthright for the mess of pottage."<sup>10</sup>

During the summer George set off in the company of James Leigh Joynes, a master of Eton College, in order to make a re-

port to the *Irish World* on the state of affairs in western Ireland. Joynes was to report to the *London Times*. When they arrived in Loughrea, they were arrested almost immediately as "suspicious" strangers. George described the event with great wit: "The whole thing struck me as infinitely ridiculous. There was, after all, a good deal of human nature in Artemus Ward's declaration that he was willing to sacrifice all his wife's relatives to save the Union. And in my satisfaction in seeing an Eton master lugged through the town as too suspicious a stranger to be left at large I lost all sense of annoyance at my own arrest. In fact, my only regret was that it was not Kegan Paul."<sup>11</sup>

After being held for several hours, George and Joynes were released, and they left for Athenry a few miles away. Once there, George was arrested again, just as he and Joynes were boarding the train for Galway. Brought before the same magistrate, he was once again discharged: "The magistrate then summed up with a justification of the police for arresting me, and to my surprise finished by discharging me. Whether what had seemed to me the manifest purpose to require bail had been altered by the telegrams which Mr. Trevelyan stated in the House of Commons he had sent to Ireland on the subject, or whether it was the magistrate's own sense, I cannot tell."<sup>12</sup> The two arrests in three days under the Crimes Act enabled George to see, as he said, "the inside of two 'British Bastiles.'" It also gave him fine material to dispatch to the *Irish World*. Upon his release he handed out copies of *The Irish Land Question* to the magistrate and arresting officials.

Needless to say, the arrest of an American citizen as prominent as George made international news. James Russell Lowell, then United States minister, acted swiftly on his own by writing directly to Ireland to protest the arrest. George, however, made the most of the situation and wrote to President Arthur from Dublin on August 26th, saying in part, "that it is due to their own dignity that the United States should claim for their citizens travelling in countries with which they maintain relations of amity exemption from wanton annoyances, unreasonable inquisitions and imprisonment upon frivolous pretexts."<sup>13</sup> Apologies came in answer to both protests. Lowell was assured by Trevelyan, the secretary for Ireland, that George would not be in danger of the law. Eventually George himself received an

*The Yankee Prophet "Over There"*

apology from the British Foreign Office by way of Washington (October 17, 1882) on behalf of Her Majesty's Government.

George's year in the United Kingdom closed on a high note. After having publicized his books and after having seen to it that they would be widely distributed and influential through Kegan Paul's six- and threepenny editions, he found himself speaking in London in Memorial Hall in September to the Land Nationalist Society (George also spoke later in the month to a meeting of Church of England clergymen.) The meeting was presided over by Alfred Russel Wallace, who had tendered the invitation and who considered *Progress and Poverty* to be "undoubtedly the most remarkable and important work of the nineteenth century." At this time the London *Times* gave him its full attention by first publishing his letter (in which he had defended Joynes' participation in the Irish arrests and Joynes' views on Ireland which the *Times* had taken exception to), by commenting editorially, and finally by reviewing *Progress and Poverty* and *The Irish Land Question*. Also, it was at the Land Nationalist meeting at Memorial Hall that Bernard Shaw was converted to the cause for social reform. Shaw himself relates his experience:

The result of my hearing that speech, and buying from one of the stewards of the meeting a copy of *Progress & Poverty* for sixpence (Heaven only knows where I got that sixpence) was that I plunged into a course of economic study, and at a very early stage of it became a Socialist and spoke from that very platform on the same great subject, and from hundreds of others as well . . . And that all the work was not mere gas, let the feats and pamphlets of the Fabian Society attest!

When I was thus swept into the great Socialist revival of 1883, I found that five-sixths of those who were swept in with me had been converted by Henry George.<sup>14</sup>

George returned home in October to lecture and to involve himself in the series of articles in *Leslie's* that led to the quarrel with General Walker over the statistics and conclusions accompanying the 1880 United States Census and to the composition of *Social Problems*. Fourteen months later, the "apostle of plunder," as the hostile press called George, was back in England to preach self-evident truths with Emersonian eloquence. George had left the British Isles with many cordial invitations to return,

including one from Professor Max Müller, the world famous Oxford scholar of Oriental literature and religion. At the invitation of the new Land Reform Union, he sailed for England for a second time in December of 1883. He had "hitched [his] wagon to a star," as he had suggested the Irish do when he had quoted the sage of Concord in *The Irish Land Question*. He had decided to act upon his own conclusion: "Both England and Scotland are ripe for . . . agitation, and, once fairly begun, it can have but one result—the victory of the popular cause" (63).

### III *Scotland and England (1883-85)*

"In speaking with special reference to the case of Ireland," George had written at the beginning of Chapter XII of *The Irish Land Question*, "I have, so far as general principles are concerned, been using it as a stalking-horse. In discussing the Irish Land Question, we really discuss the most vital of American questions" (73). These questions were apparently Scottish and English questions also. For "a little island or a little world," the remedy was the same—"make land common property."

Henry George's eldest son, who made the second trip to England in his company, says that "next to Gladstone," his father at the time was "the most talked of man in England."<sup>15</sup> There can be no doubt that George was a storm center, and that battle lines were forming. While George was at home, the opposition was consolidating in such movements as the "Property Defense League"; and lectures were being delivered by eminent men, such as Arnold Toynbee, to refute him. Articles of all sorts were written in order to counteract his ever-growing influence. Once the *London Times* had treated George as a serious threat to the established order, little time was lost by those who shared the paper's uneasiness. But George had the support of Helen Taylor, the Anglican clergyman Stewart Headlam, and the Unitarian Philip Wicksteed; and he also had the sympathy of journalists and publishers like William Saunders, James Durant, and William Reeves as well as young men like Sidney Oliver, a future Fabian and Secretary of State for India in Ramsay MacDonald's first Labor government forty or so years later. He even had the support of several prominent men of wealth, such as Thomas Briggs and Thomas Walker, just as he had had the sup-

*The Yankee Prophet "Over There"*

port several years earlier of Francis Shaw—a fact that had surprised Shaw's in-law James Russell Lowell at the time of the Irish arrests. George was, indeed, the chief topic of conversation of anybody interested in economic questions, whether they were for or against him, or merely impartial students of current social problems.

When George arrived in Liverpool on New Year's Eve, he was met by Davitt and Richard McGhee, a Glasgow member of Parliament and one of his most ardent Scottish supporters. The next four months proved to be intensely active. Arrangements had been made for George to speak in the most important towns and cities of England. And George began his lecture schedule in London at a large meeting in St. James' Hall on January 9th, just a few months, interestingly enough, after Karl Marx's death in the same city. John Ruskin, who thought *Progress and Poverty* "an admirable book," had been asked to preside, but his ill health and age forced him to retire regretfully. He wished George "all success in his efforts, and an understanding audience."<sup>16</sup> Introduced as "George the Fifth," a title swiftly adopted by the press, his campaign was off to a roaring start. The next day almost every paper in the United Kingdom reported and commented upon his address and the packed house.

*Social Problems* was available in various editions and was selling well by the time George set forth on his tour. And sales of *Progress and Poverty*, according to one estimate, had reached nearly a hundred thousand copies. His previous visit, the publicity of his Irish arrests, and the reviews in most of the leading periodicals throughout 1883, which followed the review in the *Times* in the fall of 1882, had all contributed to his notoriety. After his London address, George himself realized how famous he had become. The intense and widespread response of the press—as hostile as it generally was—was ample proof. He wrote to his wife, "I can't begin to send you the papers in which I am discussed, attacked, and commented on—for I would have to send all the English, Scotch, and Irish papers. I am getting advertised to my heart's content and I shall have crowds wherever I go. . . ."<sup>17</sup>

Repeating his main ideas over and over again, George spoke effectively and without notes by adapting his speeches to the attitudes he sensed in each crowd that he addressed. After Lon-

don, he went south and west to Plymouth, Cardiff, and Bristol, and from there north to Birmingham and into the Midlands. Organized opposition at speeches began to appear. His confiscationist program was beginning to gall moderates as much as it did conservatives. Even some of the Land Reform groups began to balk. The *Liverpool Post* editorialized on this point the day after his address in that city: "Mr. George's lecture in Liverpool last night had all the sweet and seductive beauty which has stolen away the judgment of many a reader of his famous book. . . . He apparently has convinced a large number of persons that thieving is no theft, for his great audience last night pronounced unanimously in favour of appropriating the land of the country and giving the present owners no compensation."<sup>18</sup> The crowd responded in spite of considerable opposition from local groups.

In February, George moved farther north into Scotland. With great success he repeated the "Moses" address on several occasions. He spoke in small towns, in the Highlands and in the Lowlands, and finally in Edinburgh and Glasgow. Scotland had proved George correct in his contention of two years before: it was riper for reform than either England or Ireland, especially for his nonconformist American variety.

George's effect in Scotland was very great and led to the formation of the Scottish Land Restoration League—Richard McGhee acting as one of the moving spirits and George writing a manifesto. Less than two months later, the English Land Restoration League was also organized. His powerful and permanent influence upon the labor movement in Scotland and the Scottish response to his religio-economic doctrines surpassed his lasting impact upon either the Irish or the English.

At the beginning of March, George returned to England and spoke in Leeds, Hull, Oxford, and Cambridge, finally returning to London. He spoke at Oxford University at Professor Max Müller's invitation; and when he finished his formal address, he asked for questions from his audience, as was often his practice. The meeting was turned into shambles by the eagerness of his listeners to turn the question period into a debate. The evening ended with George telling his audience that it was "the most disorderly meeting he had ever addressed."<sup>19</sup> Both he and Professor Müller were distressed, and apologies were made all around. Needless to say, George went on to Cambridge with

much apprehension. Fortunately, he stayed in command of the situation there, and the meeting was quiet and orderly. George, however, was so exhausted from his three months of lecturing, that he went to see a doctor in London about his sleeplessness and his inability to relax sufficiently between engagements. But George finished his second visit to the British Isles by speaking a few more times in England and finally, at Davitt's invitation, in Dublin—his only Irish speech in the tour. On April 13th, he left from Queenstown for the United States, but by November of the same year he had returned for a third visit. He came alone this time.

George's third visit, at the invitation of the Land Restoration League, lasted a little less than three months, most of which was spent in Scotland. It did not seem that he had been away six months; and though this visit was shorter than the first two, it had been prepared for in the pages of *Nineteenth Century*. In the July number, George had replied to the Duke of Argyll's attack of the previous April. Now he had come to reap the fruit of the debate on the Duke's own ground. George's supporters had reprinted the two articles in cheap editions, and they had been well circulated. Everybody was apparently convinced that George had had the better of the exchange.

Again he began his campaign in St. James' Hall, London. From there his lecture tour took him almost immediately to Scotland where, after his initial address in Glasgow on November 21st, he spoke in about thirty different places, including Edinburgh. He finished the tour in London where he had begun it, but then he agreed to speak in Liverpool and Belfast where he was received by large enthusiastic crowds. The campaign had been generally successful, and "Moses" had again been very popular with Scottish audiences.

Unlike his previous campaign, publicity and newspaper coverage were relatively light. However, the visit did include a kind of double interview in the pages of *Nineteenth Century* in which both George and Hyndman presented their views on "Socialism and Rent Appropriation." Without sharing the moral philosophy of each other, each man praised the other for his war on poverty and for his desire to end the apathy and complacency that confronted social reform; but by then George's third visit was over. Elwood P. Lawrence sums up the character of George's second

and third trips to the British Isles by stressing the major ideas that George himself emphasized:

George's two objectives in his campaigns of 1884 and 1885 had been: first, to describe the evil living conditions of the workers of England and Scotland; and second, to prescribe the remedy. This twofold purpose was stated clearly in February 1884, in a circular addressed to the people of Scotland by the Scottish Land Restoration League. This circular contained the following argument: The Earth was created by God and therefore belonged to no one class or generation but to each generation; God intended the earth to be shared by his children, and every man, woman, and child derived from the Creator an equal right to the earth. (George, like Jefferson, assumed that there was a natural and divine law higher than the civil law.)

Having established a basis for its authority, the circular proceeded to analyze conditions in Scotland. A denial of the equal right of all to the land was the primary cause of the current poverty and misery, and of their consequences: vice, crime, and degradation. The land of Scotland had been made the private property of a few persons; more than two thirds of the population were compelled to live in hovels, to work for starvation wages, and to subsist on insufficient food. George's speeches in 1884 and 1885 were, in part, a detailed elaboration of this theme.

His analysis of British social problems was effective because it was simple, direct, and unprofessional. He described what he had seen—conditions with which his audiences were familiar; he named names and cited cases. His audiences were moved as much by his sincerity as by the facts he disclosed. British workers knew by bitter experience what their own conditions were; what they needed to know—and what George told them—was that poverty was *not* part of the natural order of things, that luxuries as well as necessities were due them by virtue of their labor, and that they must act to secure their just rewards.<sup>20</sup>

After he had returned home in February, 1885, George was asked to return to England to stand for Parliament. He replied: "I am at heart as much a citizen of Old England as of New England, but I think that from the accident of my birth I should be under disadvantage on your side of the water. At any rate, I should not deem it prudent to go over there, unless there was such a considerable call as made it seem clearly my duty."<sup>21</sup>

When the "soldier in the Liberative War of Humanity" had left England after his second visit, many ironic titles had been

*The Yankee Prophet "Over There"*

added to his name: the "apostle of plunder" had become also "George the Fifth," "Saint George," and finally the "Prophet of San Francisco." "M.P." was one title he was never to have. George was truly the prophet that the Duke of Argyll glibly dubbed him, and that is the major reason why he was never to be a professor of political economy or the mayor of New York City any more than he was ever to be a member of Parliament. His effect upon English radicalism and on labor and land movements remained that of a prophet, and both he and his supporters thought it, even then, a very fine and very apt title indeed. The Duke of Argyll was right about one thing at least.

IV The Peer and The Prophet *and* Protection or Free Trade

George's debate with the Duke of Argyll and his book on the tariff question were the highlights of his writing career from 1884 to 1886. "The Prophet of San Francisco" appeared in the same month in which George left England after his second visit, reaching him on the eve of his departure. George, who had known the peer by reputation, had admired his book *The Reign of Law*; but he also knew of Argyll's support of the landlords in Ireland and his opposition to the liberalizing of Irish land laws. When George's supporters in the Scottish Land Restoration League urged him to answer the attack, he agreed because Argyll was a worthy opponent and because he represented all that George had been speaking against in Ireland, England, and Scotland. George began immediately writing "The 'Reduction to Iniquity,'" but he finally decided to take his manuscript with him to New York in order to "polish it like a steel shot."

Even using the fact that he was once a recipient of a complimentary copy of *Progress and Poverty* from the author, the Duke of Argyll was consistently ironic throughout his article. Though witty and condescending, it was an effectively argued article. There could be no mistake about its meaning: George was a Communist, a pessimist, and hopelessly lost in self-contradiction. Including both *Progress and Poverty* and *Social Problems* in his survey of George's ideas, the Duke felt it "not a little remarkable to find one of the most extreme doctrines of Communism advocated by a man who is a citizen of the United States." He said George based much of his argument on surplus population but rejected Malthus. He said George had also contradicted him-

self by speaking about the corruption of democracy on one hand while urging redistribution of wealth and land on the other hand. In his concluding paragraph, the Duke said that in "mathematical reasoning the 'reduction to absurdity' is one of the most familiar methods of disproof. In political reasoning the 'reduction to iniquity' ought to be of equal value." He wrote that George's "erroneous data" had overpowered his "Moral Sense." "The Prophet of San Francisco" was certainly a well-written presentation for landlordism and a hierarchial society. Argyll even used the Bible in a Georgian manner, thus parodying his opponent's style:

In olden times, under violent and rapacious rulers, the Prophets of Israel and of Judah used to raise their voices against all forms of wrong and robbery, and they pronounced a special benediction upon him who sweareth to his own hurt and changeth not. But the new Prophet of San Francisco is of a different opinion. Ahab would have been saved all his trouble, and Jezebel would have been saved all her tortuous intrigues if only they could have had beside them the voice of Mr. Henry George. Elijah was a fool. What right could Naboth have to talk about the "inheritance of his fathers"? His fathers could have no more right to acquire the ownership of those acres on the Hill of Jezreel than he could have to continue in the usurpation of it. No matter what might be his pretended title, no man and no body of men could give it:—not Joshua nor the Judges; not Saul nor David; not Solomon in all his glory—could "make sure" to Naboth's fathers that portion of God's earth against the undying claims of the head of the State, and of the representative of the whole people of Israel. (22-23)

George, he said, had promulgated ideas that would "abolish the Decalogue" and had "forgotten—strangely forgotten—some of the most fundamental facts of Nature."

George chose Argyll's own words for the title of his reply, a reply that was equal to Argyll's in wit, rhetoric, and logic, and which received no rejoinder from the peer—even after the Scottish Land Restoration League and other radical groups had reprinted the two articles in pamphlet form under the titles *The Peer and the Prophet or Property in Land* and had circulated it throughout Scotland as if it were the Declaration of Independence. (The pamphlet appeared in several editions throughout

*The Yankee Prophet "Over There"*

the British Isles.) "The 'Reduction to Iniquity'" contradicted Argyll's contention that the landlords improved the land or the community and increased capital. He described Scotland accurately and boldly. He compared the slavery of the Scot to that of the Negro in the Southern United States and pointed out how the conditions in Scotland were even worse. The most brutal Southern American slaveholder would not have interfered with a Negro slave's religion, which was more than could be said of a Scottish landlord. He used the Isle of Skye to demonstrate the extent of Scottish poverty and to show that overpopulation had nothing to do with it; the curse upon Scotland was landlordism. He made his usual American declaration for equality and human rights, saying that the duke and the peasant were in body and spirit the same and, were they to change places, would be indistinguishable. His comments had the ring of Mark Twain's *The Prince and the Pauper* and anticipated the spirit of *Pudd'n-head Wilson*, for George wrote:

Place, stripped of clothes, a landowner's baby among a dozen workhouse babies, and who that you call in can tell the one from the others? Is the human law which declares the one born to the possession of a hundred thousand acres of land, while the others have no right to a single square inch, conformable to the intent of Nature or not? Is it, judged by this appeal, natural or unnatural, wise or foolish, righteous or iniquitous? Put the bodies of a duke and a peasant on a dissecting-table, and bring, if you can, the surgeon who, by laying bare the brain or examining the viscera, can tell which is duke and which is peasant? (52)

Some of George's paragraphs in "The 'Reduction to Iniquity'" are his fiery best and give the reader a very good idea of why he was so effective in his speeches in the British Isles during his first three tours:

But to return to the "reduction to iniquity." Test the institution of private property in land by its fruits in any country where it exists. Take Scotland. What, there, are its results? That wild beasts have supplanted human beings; that glens which once sent forth their thousand fighting men are now tenanted by a couple of gamekeepers; that there is destitution and degradation that would shame savages; that little children are stunted and starved for want of proper nourishment; that women are compelled to do the work of animals; that young girls who ought to

be fitting themselves for wifehood and motherhood are held to the monotonous toil of factories, while others, whose fate is sadder still, prowl the streets; that while a few Scotsmen have castles and palaces, more than a third of Scottish families live in one room each, and more than two-thirds in not more than two rooms each; that thousands of acres are kept as playgrounds for strangers, while the masses have not enough of their native soil to grow a flower, are shut out even from moor and mountain; dare not take a trout from a loch or a salmon from the sea! (59-60)

George's voice was clearly an American one:

If the Duke thinks all classes have gained by the advance in civilization, let him go into the huts of the Highlands. There he may find countrymen of his, men and women the equals in natural ability and in moral character of any peer or peeress. . . . These human beings are in natural parts and powers just such human beings as may be met at a royal levee, at a gathering of scientists, or inventors, or captains of industry. That they so live and work, is not because of their stupidity, but because of their poverty—the direct and indisputable result of the denial of their natural rights. (60-61)

The Scottish people, George said, were prevented from participating in the general advance of civilization and were, in fact, worse off than their ancestors, "They have been driven from the good land to the poor land." Let the Duke of Argyll "apply the 'reduction of iniquity'" to the facts, George repeated as he catalogued the grievances that he said could be justly held against the landowners of Scotland. "I hold with Thomas Jefferson, that 'the earth belongs in usufruct to the living, and that the dead have no power or right over it'" (48). He even invoked the "American Indian Chief, Black Hawk" for having declared the "first and universal perception of mankind" when he said that "The Great Spirit has told me that land is not to be made property like other property. The earth is our mother!" (50).

George concluded by saying that the manifesto of the Scottish Land Restoration League, which called upon the Scottish people to "bind themselves together" in order to free themselves of landlordism, was "a lark's note in the dawn." Scotland, like Ireland or England, was not an isolated case—"everywhere the same spirit is rising, the same truth is beginning to force its way."

*The Yankee Prophet "Over There"*

George's supporters eagerly proclaimed his ideas and invited him to come to Argyll's own countryside in order to beard the laird in his lair. George reluctantly interrupted his work upon *Protection or Free Trade* and went to the British Isles for his third successful campaign to spread his gospel.

George had been planning *Protection or Free Trade* for several years, for it was to be in some ways the capitalistic companion of the socialistic *Social Problems*. Both books had their genesis in George's opposition to monopoly, whether in industry or in land. He had made an abortive start on the tariff book between his first and second visits to the British Isles (work on it had been interrupted and the manuscript had been lost), and now that he had replied to the Duke of Argyll he was able to give his complete attention to it. However, he was again interrupted; he was not able to complete it until after his return from his third trip to Britain, the speaking tour of Scotland in 1884-85. Having sporadically thus engaged himself in a manner of composition very different from the intense period that saw the creation of *Progress and Poverty*, George was actually fortunate to have finished *Protection or Free Trade* before his first mayoralty campaign which began in the late summer of 1886.

The subtitle of *Protection or Free Trade* says it is *An Examination of the Tariff Question, with especial regard to the Interests of Labor*. In his preface George said that he aimed "to determine whether protection or free trade better accords with the interests of labor, and to bring to a common conclusion on this subject those who really desire to raise wages." He took thirty chapters in which to make his case, some of which had appeared in article form before the book was finished. *Protection or Free Trade* was published in 1886 by Henry George and Company (consisting of George and his second son, Richard), but it had been serialized in newspapers in the last half of the previous year.

*Protection or Free Trade* is an aggressively anti-protectionist book. At one point George imagines a conversation between a protectionist and his favorite character, Robinson Crusoe:

Let us suppose an American protectionist is the first to break his solitude with the long yearned-for music of human speech. Crusoe's delight we can well imagine. . . . Let us suppose that after having heard Crusoe's story, . . . our protectionist prepares

to depart, but before going seeks to offer some kindly warning of the danger Crusoe will be exposed to from the "deluge of cheap goods" that passing ships will seek to exchange for fruit and goats. Imagine him to tell Crusoe just what protectionists tell larger communities, . . . that, unless he takes measures to make it difficult to bring these goods ashore, his industry will be entirely ruined. . . . Are these arguments for protection a whit more absurd when addressed to one man living on an island than when addressed to sixty millions living on a continent? What would be true in the case of Robinson Crusoe is true in the case of Brother Jonathan. If foreigners will bring us goods cheaper than we can make them ourselves, we shall be the gainers. The more we get in imports as compared with what we have to give in exports, the better the trade for us. And since foreigners are not liberal enough to give us their productions, but will only let us have them in return for our own productions, how can they ruin our industry? The only way they could ruin our industry would be by bringing us for nothing all we want, so as to save us the necessity for work. (113-15)

The effectiveness of George's style is readily apparent. It is readable and amusing.

*Protection or Free Trade* is, however, a frankly pro-capitalistic book, and it emphasizes the very things which caused the doctrinaire Socialists and Marxists in Europe to become impatient and finally disenchanted with George. After quoting a protectionist economist, Professor R. E. Thompson, on Charles Fourier, George attacks Fourier's reasoning as harshly as he does Thompson's elsewhere in the book. His comments are a defense of the "middlemen":

This story, quoted approvingly to convey an idea that the trader is a mere toll-gatherer, simply shows what a superficial thinker Fourier was. If he had undertaken to bring with him to Paris a supply of apples and to carry them around with him so that he could have one when he felt like it he would have formed a much truer idea of what he was really paying for in the increased price. That price included not merely the cost of the apple at its place of growth, plus the cost of transporting it to Paris, . . . the loss of damaged apples, and remuneration for the service and capital of the wholesaler, who held the apples in stock until the vender chose to take them, but also payment to the vender, for standing all day in the streets of Paris, in order to supply a few apples to those who wanted an apple *then* and *there*. (64-65)

*The Yankee Prophet "Over There"*

George tries once again, as he did in *Progress and Poverty* and *Social Problems*, to make clear his uneasiness with the word "socialism":

Let us endeavor, as well as can in brief be done, to trace the relations between the conclusion to which we have come and what, with various shades of meaning, is termed "socialism."

The term "socialism" is used so loosely that it is hard to attach to it a definite meaning. I myself am classed as a socialist by those who denounce socialism, while those who profess themselves socialists declare me not to be one. For my own part I neither claim nor repudiate the name, and realizing as I do the correlative truth of both principles can no more call myself an individualist or a socialist than one who considers the forces by which the planets are held to their orbits could call himself a centrifugalist or a centripetalist. The German socialism of the school of Marx (of which the leading representative in England is Mr. H. M. Hyndman, and the best exposition in America has been given by Mr. Laurence Gronlund) seems to me a high-purposed but incoherent mixture of truth and fallacy, the defects of which may be summed up in its want of radicalism—that is to say, of going to the root. (302-3)

Nevertheless, he uses the word and tries to bridge another paradox in two key paragraphs near the end of the book. They reflect that dichotomy on which *Progress and Poverty* and all of George's works are based.

Individualism and socialism are in truth not antagonistic but correlative. Where the domain of the one principle ends that of the other begins. And although the motto *Laissez faire* has been taken as the watchword of an individualism that tends to anarchism, and so-called free traders have made "the law of supply and demand" a stench in the nostrils of men alive to social injustice, there is in free trade nothing that conflicts with a rational socialism. On the contrary, we have but to carry out the free-trade principle to its logical conclusions to see that it brings us to such socialism.

The free-trade principle is, as we have seen, the principle of free production—it requires not merely the abolition of protective tariffs, but the removal of all restrictions upon production. (308)

True, *laissez faire* meant that land values had also to be appropriated because free trade and free production meant the end of all private monopoly of land. "True free trade," he said,

“requires that the active factor of production, Labor, shall have free access to the passive factor of production, Land. To secure this all monopoly of land must be broken up, and the equal right of all to the use of the natural elements must be secured by the treatment of the land as the common property in usufruct of the whole people” (289). It was a point to which even the aged and ill Whitman responded favorably.

George is a socialist in a united world where the many nationalistic states must become like the states in the American Union. In fact, “Common Market” reasoning dominates *Protection or Free Trade*. Individualistic and socialistic motives need no more be at odds than economic progress and social amelioration, or political evolution and moral growth. Protection, he says, is “repugnant to moral perceptions and inconsistent with the simplicity and harmony which we everywhere discover in natural law”—a very Whitmanian, Thoreauvian, and Emersonian contention.

So far as George was concerned, land taxation and free trade went together. It was not necessary to be a protectionist if one was pro-labor, for high tariffs were a false security that only closed down markets, lessened trade, and stultified production by eliminating the need to produce. In the end, labor suffered because jobs became scarce as production decreased; production fell off as need lessened; and need remained unfulfilled because labor was unemployed and therefore without the capital to satisfy its needs. The results were want and poverty amid plenty, or potential plenty. Trading freely, each part of the world would help the other and be helped in return, thereby contributing to the general good of all and to the general advance of civilization. George would not have shared Thoreau’s belief that the curse of trade even effects man’s bargains with heaven, but he might well have understood why Thoreau thought so. After all, George might have said, trade is as different from the love of trade as money is from the love of money. Cooperation means that more than one must operate, which Thoreau well knew.

*Protection or Free Trade* sold about two hundred thousand copies in the five years or so that followed its publication, and it was almost immediately translated into several languages. Its actual popularity and influence in George’s lifetime, however, were uneven. There was no English edition until 1903, six years

*The Yankee Prophet "Over There"*

after the author's death. Nevertheless, George had the unique experience of seeing his book printed in the *Congressional Record* in its entirety in 1892 when six members of the House of Representatives, led by Tom Johnson of Ohio, read it as part of the tariff debate. Needless to say, George was delighted, for more than a million copies were run off and mailed everywhere that year in the United States, including the ten thousand that went to England.

However, the printing in the *Congressional Record* was really a part of the last ten years of George's life, most of which were spent in political activity. In 1886, George was just beginning his decade of campaigning and had yet to experience the pressure of practical politics. *Protection or Free Trade* stood on its own as the work of the author of *Progress and Poverty*, the man who had set the British Isles on fire with the desire for social reform. It was not the work of the candidate for mayor of New York City, but it almost coincided with his agreement to run under the auspices of New York labor unions. However, George's domestic political activity and his association with labor groups from 1885 to his death helped to circulate the book until *Protection or Free Trade*, with the help of the *Congressional Record*, was almost as widely distributed and in as great a number as *Progress and Poverty*.

*Protection or Free Trade* and George's political speeches were based upon fundamental ideas of long standing. He proclaimed them clearly in a speech, "The Crime of Poverty,"<sup>22</sup> which he made in Burlington, Iowa, on April 1, 1885, under the sponsorship of the local chapter of the Knights of Labor. The speech and George's sponsor indicated the direction in which George was headed as much as it betrayed the direction from which he had come:

There is a cause for this poverty; and, if you trace it down, you will find its root in a primary injustice. Look over the world today—poverty everywhere. The cause must be a common one. You cannot attribute it to the tariff, or to the form of government, or to this thing or to that in which nations differ; because, as deep poverty is common to them all, the cause that produces it must be a common cause. What is that common cause? There is one sufficient cause that is common to all nations; and that is, the appropriation as the property of some, of that natural element on which, and from which, all must live.<sup>23</sup>

Free trade alone was not the remedy. The remedy was the same as it had always been: "*We must make land common property.*" The future labor party candidate remained convinced, "This land question is the bottom question. . . . The land question is simply the labor question. . . ." <sup>24</sup> Poverty was, indeed, not an insoluble problem. George ended *Protection or Free Trade* with a characteristic religio-economic statement: he cited the "golden rule."