

Henry George and Europe: As Dissident Economist and Path-Breaking Philosopher, He Was a Catalyst for British Social Reform

Author(s): Michael Silagi and Susan N. Faulkner

Source: *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, Vol. 48, No. 1 (Jan., 1989), pp. 113-122

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

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3486994>

Accessed: 14-02-2022 19:29 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](mailto: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 Europe:

## *As Dissident Economist and Path-breaking Philosopher, He was a Catalyst for British Social Reform*

By MICHAEL SILAGI\*

Translated by SUSAN N. FAULKNER

ABSTRACT. *Henry George's* influence was greater in the *United Kingdom* than in the *United States*. The 80s and 90s there were particularly favorable for the reception of his revolutionary ideas. Though, thanks to such thinkers as *Alfred Russell Wallace* and *James* and *John Stuart Mill*, a *land reform* movement already existed, its sudden rise to national significance was due to George. George's writing and speaking skills and his dedication moved many serious citizens into the political *Left* and heavily influenced men and women who became leaders of *British non-Marxian socialism*, at the formation and consolidation of their movement. While George's followers broke with both the Wallace and socialist movements, George's rhetorical talents awakened the broad circles of thinking people to a *consciousness* of the full range of the *social question*.

### I

#### George, Hyndman and Marx

THE INFLUENCE of Henry George in Great Britain, as a result of his writings and appearances there, was more profound than in the United States. Despite his fine showing in the New York mayoral elections in 1886, despite the honors paid him at his funeral by hundreds of thousands of fellow citizens, his effect in his native country remained marginal during his lifetime.<sup>1</sup>

A first British edition of *Progress and Poverty* appeared as early as 1880 and was soon out of print; it was followed shortly thereafter by a cheap "sixpenny edition." Four years later, about 100,000 copies of the work had been sold.<sup>2</sup>

A contemporary of George, the Liberal jurist, Clement M. Bailhache explains the success of the author by the extraordinary vividness and forcefulness of his exposition<sup>3</sup> and this is surely correct. Yet the factor responsible for the enormous response and the fruitfulness of his efforts was, in actuality, the particular period which was especially favorable for the reception of George's ideas.<sup>4</sup>

\* [Michael Silagi, J.S.D., Ph.D. is a Senior Research Fellow at the Institute of International Law, University of Göttingen, Nikolausberger Weg 9c, 3400 Göttingen, West Germany.]

American Journal of Economics and Sociology, Vol. 48, No. 1 (January, 1989).

© 1989 American Journal of Economics and Sociology, Inc.

Toward the end of the seventies, England's industry was plagued by a severe depression.<sup>5</sup> But these industrial difficulties were far surpassed by the great crisis in agriculture. Since England held fast to its policy of free trade and refused to shield agriculture by protective tariffs, the British market was flooded by agricultural products from overseas, so that the farmers lost their livelihood.

This led to a rural exodus and to an overpopulation of the slum quarters in the cities. While the rural population in the decade of 1871–1881 rose by 7.42 percent, the urban population in the same period increased by 19.63%.<sup>6</sup> The economic distress in the countryside brought on tensions between the imperiled tenant farmers and the large landowners. The farmers soon began to place the blame for all their misery on the landlords. In the cities, too, the contrasts sharpened between the various social classes. The growing needs of the cities, particularly in regard to road construction, public transportation, and sanitation conflicted with the profit-seeking interests of the urban real estate owners.<sup>7</sup>

In the face of all this, Henry George's words found a resounding echo. He did not lack precursors, of course (one might mention again Thomas Spence and Patrick Edward Dove, and two others, James and John Stuart Mill), but the land reform ideas of these men had remained largely unknown. The sudden rise of the land reform movement after 1880 was due to Henry George, who—through his *Progress and Poverty* and through his personal dedication—succeeded in awakening in many thousands a deep interest in his theses regarding a just distribution of land. The British Liberal John A. Hobson is right, therefore, when he not only points to the fact that *Progress and Poverty* “struck the thinking people with convincing and dramatic force,” but also emphasizes that this work by George was in effect the “first book of serious economic import which ever reached the outer circle of the English reading public.”<sup>8</sup>

The immense influence of George on the political Left in Great Britain is the more remarkable because Karl Marx, by then already the guiding authority for the Socialists of Continental Europe outside the Romanic countries, had lived and worked in London since 1849. Nevertheless, British Socialism, in contrast to the movement on the Continent, was at this time still far from being ideologically stabilized and did not represent a potent force. D. C. Summervell found that “British Socialism was an affair of very small sects in the first 40 years of the [19th] century, and may be said to have been extinct during the 40 years that followed.”<sup>9</sup> Hence, the revolutionary effectiveness of George's teachings was further aided by the fact that *Progress and Poverty* reached England precisely at the onset of the process of formation and consolidation of British Socialism.

*Das Kapital*, the first volume of which had appeared twelve years prior to *Progress and Poverty*, first became available in an English translation not before 1886. Those among the British Socialists who knew it had previously been able

to read it only in the French version. George's work, on the other hand, found—as has already been pointed out—a ready market, not only among the groups familiar with French, but among the broad public. (As late as 1909, a small inquiry among 34 workers about their readings of economic and historical writings revealed that seven of those questioned had read *Progress and Poverty*, second only to Blatchford's *Merrie England* (nine readers). Only one reader had taken up Marx's writings.<sup>10</sup>)

To be sure, the easier readability of George and his clarity of expression, comprehensible even to the untrained, further contributed to this difference in dissemination. J. A. W. Marriot, who, incidentally, was opposed to the ideas of both Marx and George, wrote about their major works as follows: "Even more persuasive than Marx's *Capital* was Henry George's *Progress and Poverty*, which was published in 1879. George wrote arrestingly with no little rhetorical power. Anyone could follow his argument, even if they refused to assent to his conclusions."<sup>11</sup>

Marx himself assessed George's significance highly, albeit negatively, as is reported in the memoirs of H. M. Hyndman, a doctrinaire Socialist and great admirer of Marx.<sup>12</sup> Hyndman was personally close to Henry George as well, perhaps closest of all English Socialists.<sup>13</sup> (In 1882, the author of *Progress and Poverty*, together with his family, had for some time been house guests in Hyndman's London home.<sup>14</sup>) Hyndman reports that Marx called *Progress and Poverty* "the Capitalists' last ditch."<sup>15</sup> While a Marxist would regard this as a scathing judgment, it would not be seen at all in a negative light when regarded from the standpoint of the non-Marxist Henry George. For he firmly believed that his reform proposal would serve to perpetuate the capitalistic system, though in a more refined form.

According to Hyndman, Marx feared the extraordinary persuasiveness of the American. Furthermore, he did not believe that a study of *Progress and Poverty* would lead the reader toward Socialism. On the contrary, he was afraid that for every ten readers who, enlightened by George about the evils of the prevailing system, became Socialists, there would be a hundred others who would stop at the position taken by Henry George.<sup>16</sup> Marx further commented on George in a letter written in 1881.<sup>17</sup> There he described the American as "totally backwards,"<sup>18</sup> although a "writer of talent,"<sup>19</sup> whose work, nevertheless, was important because it is "a first, albeit a failed, effort, to free himself of orthodox political economy."<sup>20</sup>

Hyndman rejected *Progress and Poverty* as much as did Marx. But Marx contradicted Hyndman's notion that the literary success of George contributed greatly to the dissemination of Marx's theories. In effect, the "easily read" book, as Marx called it, had, he thought, made public opinion aware of the social

question and, indeed, of the entire problem of the economic situation. But that is all Marx would concede.

## II

**George and British Land Reformers**

UNDER THE INFLUENCE of Henry George, an organization developed in England which was committed to the cause of justice regarding landownership. But its program differed significantly from the basic points of *Progress and Poverty*. This was the Land Nationalization Society, formed between 1882 and 1883, whose spiritual father was the famed naturalist Alfred Russel Wallace, co-author of the theory of evolution. Wallace advocated the nationalization of land, while George wanted to leave the land itself in private hands and merely transfer the land rent to community property through taxation. Wallace intended to compensate the expropriated landowners, a measure which George fought as a sanction, contrary to natural rights, of robbery.<sup>22</sup>

Wallace's outline of his plan regarding the land question appeared in 1882—three years after *Progress and Poverty*. It was titled *Land Nationalization/Its Necessity and Its Aims/Being a Comparison of the System of Landlord and Tenant With That of Occupying Ownership in Their Influence on the Well-Being of the People*.<sup>23</sup> The author remarked in a footnote<sup>24</sup> that Henry George's work (which he enthusiastically praised, by the way,<sup>25</sup> and cited in detail<sup>26</sup>) had come to his attention only after he had already completed most of his manuscript. Wallace called *Progress and Poverty* the most noteworthy and important work of the century; indeed, there can be no doubt that, although he had nearly finished his own book when he came upon George's writing, he adopted some essential thoughts from the American.<sup>27</sup> The title of one chapter, "Low Wages and Pauperism, the Direct Consequences of Unrestricted Private Property in Land," is obviously a formulation inspired by George.<sup>28</sup>

But Wallace had developed some fundamental concepts independently from George in his book. Here, however, something similar happened to him, unintentionally, as had occurred also unintentionally, in 1858 in connection with evolution. Wallace, in fact, had anticipated with his essay on the theory of human descent Charles Darwin's ground-breaking work, *On the Origin of Species*.<sup>29</sup> But his name is linked with Darwin's in crediting the theory only by historians.

Wallace's organization was a catch-all for those who, each in his own way, wanted to fight for the reform of landownership. Henry George's first public lecture in London was organized, under Wallace's chairmanship, by the Land Nationalization Society. In 1883 the followers of the American's ideas joined together to form a Land Reform Union as part of Wallace's Society. Initially, the

activities of the Land Reform Union consisted predominantly of joint readings and discussions of *Progress and Poverty*,<sup>30</sup> in which not only Georgists took part, but also advocates of land nationalization, among them the Social-Democrats.

Subsequently, the Union worked out its own program which, while it was based on *Progress and Poverty*, was so formulated as to seem acceptable as well to Wallace's adherents and to Social-Democrats. Yet, the differing views could not be bridged permanently in this fashion.<sup>31</sup> After only one year, the Georgists took over the leadership of the Union, reorganized it strictly along the ideological lines of *Progress and Poverty*, and changed its name to "Land Restoration League." The organization is still in existence under the name, adopted in 1907, of the "United Committee for the Taxation of Land Values."<sup>32</sup>

The founding of the Land Restoration League brought about a sharp demarcation from those groups wishing to achieve the abolition of private monopoly of land through nationalization; it signified, at the same time, a repudiation of socialism. This complete separation from the advocates of nationalism as much as from the Socialists was to make it easier for the Georgists—after 1889—to join with the Liberals.<sup>33</sup>

The creation of an organization entirely dedicated to Henry George did not, however, lead to an immediate break with the followers of Wallace and with the Socialists. This circumstance was partly responsible for the fact that Henry George's program was identified in the British press until 1888 with the "land nationalization" movement and, as a result, rejected as Socialist.<sup>34</sup> During his first trips to England, George often spoke at public gatherings of these groups, while failing simultaneously to point out the incompatibility of many of their principles with his own. In addition, he himself described his remedy—the confiscation of land rent through taxation—as "virtual nationalization,"<sup>35</sup> although in actuality this means would leave the property relations entirely unchanged. George, furthermore, assured his listeners again and again of his sympathy for Socialism,<sup>36</sup> but not, to be sure, because of doctrinal agreement. E. J. Rose remarks in this connection: "Long right of Morris, George was ideologically not even so far left as Tolstoy, much less . . . the Fabians in England; but George found great satisfaction in their influence upon socioeconomic ideas."<sup>37</sup>

When English Socialists, for their part, assessed George's influence positively, they did so for the same reason: they saw his effects on the social and economic attitudes of his contemporaries as highly beneficial.

There can be no doubt that George Macaulay Trevelyan's statement is correct: "The revival of British Socialism was preceded and in some way prepared by the vogue of a different doctrine, that of the American Henry George in his *Progress and Poverty*."<sup>38</sup>

But George was by no means only forerunner and pioneer; he was in an extremely direct way activator and spur as well for those men who later were to play leading roles in the English non-Marxist Socialist movement.

### III

#### **Georgism as Catalyst**

BETWEEN 1870 AND 1890, many organizations for social reform developed in Great Britain. Yet of all these groups, Max Beer says, "none exerted as deep an influence, relatively, upon public opinion as the Fabian Society."<sup>39</sup> In turn, Edward R. Pease,<sup>40</sup> a co-founder of the Fabian Society, writes as follows about George and his significance:

*Progress and Poverty* gave an extraordinary impetus to the political thought of the time. It proposed to redress the wrongs suffered by the working class as a whole: the poverty it considered was the poverty of the wage workers as a class, not the destitution of the unfortunate and downtrodden individuals. . . . It suggested a method by which the reward of labour would go to those that laboured; the idleness alike of rich and poor would cease; the abundant wealth created by modern industry would be distributed with something like fairness and even equality, amongst those who contributed to its production. Above all, this tremendous revolution was to be accomplished by a political method, applicable by a majority of the voters, and capable of being drafted as an Act of Parliament by any competent lawyer. To George belongs the extraordinary merit of recognising the right way of social salvation.<sup>41</sup>

Sidney Webb, who was considered by many to have been the best mind among the Fabians, and who later held several ministerial posts in Labour governments,<sup>42</sup> expressed similar thoughts about Henry George:

Little as Mr. Henry George intended it, there can be no doubt that it was the enormous circulation of his *Progress and Poverty* which gave the touch which caused all the seething influences to crystallize into a popular Socialist movement. The optimistic and confident tone of the book, and the irresistible force of its popularization of Ricardo's Law of Rent, sounded the dominant "note" of the English Socialist party of to-day.<sup>43</sup>

In March of 1889, at a time when George was encountering evergrowing opposition among Socialists, Webb wrote in a letter to the American:

I want to implore your forbearance. When you are denounced as a traitor and what not, by Socialist newspapers; and 'heckled' by Socialist questioners, or abused by Socialist orators, it will be difficult not to denounce Socialism in return. But do not do so. They will be only the noisy fringe of the Socialist Party who will do this, and it will be better for the cause which we both serve, if you can avoid accentuating your difference with Socialists.<sup>44</sup>

Leading figures of the English Left have given interesting reports about their truly having been awakened to the social question by George. The noted novelist and popular historian H. G. Wells writes in his autobiography as follows:

It seems improbable that I did not then [c. 1883] encounter the opposition of Socialism and individualism, but oddly enough I cannot recall having thought at all about Socialism until I read Henry George at Midhurst.<sup>45</sup>

Even more impressive is the testimony given in a letter of 1904 by probably the most famous Fabian, George Bernard Shaw, regarding the contribution made by George to his own "conversion" to Socialism. He describes his conversion through George in his reply to an invitation to a "Progress and Poverty Dinner" in New York, and his description lends support to Anne Freemantle's opinion that George's influence on him was attributable more to his personality than to his book.<sup>46</sup> Shaw writes:

One evening in the early eighties I found myself . . . in the Memorial Hall, Farrington St., London, listening to an American finishing a speech on the Land Question. . . . He spoke on Liberty, Justice, Truth, Natural Law, and other strange 18th century superstitions and . . . explained with great simplicity and sincerity the views of the Creator. . . . I noticed also that he was a born orator. . . . Now at that time I was a young man not much past 25, of a very revolutionary and contradictory temperament, full of Darwin and Tyndall, of Shelley and DeQuincey, of Michael Angelo and Beethoven, and never having in my life studied social questions from the economic point of view, except that I had once, in my boyhood, read a pamphlet by John Stuart Mill on the Irish Land Question. The result of my hearing that speech and buying from one of the stewards a copy of *Progress and Poverty* for sixpence . . . was that I plunged into a course of economic study, and at a very early stage of it became a Socialist. . . . When I 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. This fact would have been far more widely acknowledged had it not been that it was not possible for us to stop where Henry George stopped. . . . But I am glad to say that I never denied or belittled our debt to Henry George.<sup>47</sup>

Even twenty-four years later, Shaw expressed similar views in the preface to the American edition of his book *The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism*:

I wonder this book of mine was not written in America by an American fifty years ago. Henry George had a shot at it; indeed it was his oratory (to which I was exposed for forty-five minutes forty-five years ago by pure chance) that called my attention to it. . . . Still, America can claim that in this book I am doing no more than finishing Henry George's job.<sup>48</sup>

The surpassing importance of the, as it were, catalytic effect of George's influence, which Shaw credits with the Socialist revival of 1883, is extended by Max Beer to the eighties in general: "Four-fifths of the Socialists [in Great Britain] who came to Socialism in the eighties had gone through the Henry George school."<sup>49</sup> In Hobson's words, *Progress and Poverty* was for these people "a stepping-stone to a more or less formal Socialism,"<sup>50</sup> and Henry Pelling thinks that it was only due to the influx of former Georgists that the previously tiny Social-Democratic Federation became a permanent organization.<sup>51</sup>

Indeed not only the Fabians, but also British Socialists of other orientations, confirmed the tremendous impact of the American and his works, even while rejecting his views. William Morris<sup>52</sup> wrote in 1883 that it was certain that Henry George's book was being received in England, as in America, like a "new Gos-



pel.”<sup>53</sup> Tom Mann<sup>54</sup> shows his great appreciation for the illumination he had found in George’s ideas when he conveys to us this vivid impression of the spiritual state of young Socialists after 1880:

In 1881 I read Henry George’s *Progress and Poverty*. This was a big event for me; it impressed me as far the most valuable book I had so far read, and, to my agreeable surprise at the time, it seemed to give an effective answer to Malthus. I was greatly interested in the book. It enabled me to see more clearly the vastness of the social problem, to realize that every country was confronted with it, and the capable and comprehensive analyses of the population question supplied me with what I had not then found in any book in this country before. . . . His book was a fine stimulus to me, full of incentive to noble endeavour, imparting much valuable information, throwing light on many questions of real importance and giving me what I wanted—a glorious hope for the future of humanity, a firm conviction that the social problem could and would be solved.<sup>55</sup>

In summary, the historical development confirms Hyndman’s views, not those of Marx: The great rhetorical talents of George were needed to awaken the broad circles in England to a consciousness of the full range of the social question. Yet the majority of those stirred up by George did not remain Georgists, but became Socialists; Anne Fremantle’s remark, meant for Shaw, is as valid for many others: George had won them *with* his teachings, but not *for* his teachings, rather for Socialism.<sup>56</sup> To this point, Geiger writes:

It is true that the majority of George’s English converts soon turned from the land question to the growing socialist movement, but the impetus for the consideration of social reform had been supplied by the stocky red-bearded American orator with the religious vision and almost fanatical confidence of some chosen prophet.<sup>57</sup>

George, to be sure, had proposed only an unsentimental, matter-of-fact solution though he described and scourged passionately the prevailing injustices. As passionately as he called for their elimination, as wholly devoid was his remedy of pathos, filled only with sparse simplicity and cool rationality. This could neither satisfy, nor maintain a hold on, the aroused masses. What remained, ultimately, was the enduring effect of George’s writings and personality on the entire British Left and his decisive contribution to the formation of the Fabian Society and the Social Democratic Federation, and thereby as well, though indirectly, to the later founding of the Labour Party.

### Notes

1. The American historian Sidney Fine reports, citing substantial evidence from the beginnings of Progressivism through the period of the New Deal: “. . . Henry George had not fought his battle in vain. Not only did he establish himself as an important figure in the realm of American economic thought and as an influence on the movement for tax reform, but as the era of Progressivism was to demonstrate, his ideas served as a stimulant to the reform movement as a whole.” *Laissez Faire and the General-Welfare State: A Study of Conflict in American Thought, 1865–1901* (Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press, 1956), p. 295.

2. Elwood P. Lawrence, *Henry George in the British Isles* (East Lansing: Michigan State Univ. Press, 1957), p. 34.
3. Clement M. Bailhache describes the effect in *Practical Land Reform* (London: 1904), p. 85: "Henry George, with a clearness and force which no other possesses, with illustration on illustration and argument on argument, demonstrated to us what it now seems extraordinary we could not see for ourselves."
4. On this, John A. Hobson comments, "A certain dramatic opportuneness attending the advent of *Progress and Poverty* gave to Henry George the public ear." See Hobson, "The Influence of Henry George in England," *Fortnightly Review*, 62 (New Series), 1897, p. 838.
5. R. C. K. Ensor, *England, 1879-1914* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1936, 1952), p. 111.
6. *Op. cit.*, p. 103.
7. *Cf.* Hobson, *op. cit.*, p. 839: "The rising standard of sanitation and of other civic needs was driving home to municipal reformers a sense of conflict between the public interest of the town and the private interest of the owners of town land."
8. *Op. cit.*, p. 837.
9. In his *English Thought in the Nineteenth Century* (London: 1929, 1964), p. 202. Also see Julius Braunthal, *Geschichte der Internationale*, Vol. 1 (Hanover: 1961), pp. 209ff.
10. Derek Hudson, "Reading," *Edwardian England, 1901-1914*, Simon Nowell-Smith, ed. (London: 1964), p. 312.
11. J. A. R. Marriot, *Modern England* (London: 4th ed., 1948), pp. 230ff.
12. H. M. Hyndman, *The Record of an Adventurous Life* (London: 1911), p. 282.
13. George Raymond Geiger, *The Philosophy of Henry George* (New York: Macmillan, 1933), p. 236.
14. Hyndman, *op. cit.*, p. 290.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 281.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 282.
17. Quoted in F. A. Sorge, *Briefe und Auszüge aus Briefen von Job. Phil. Becker, Jos. Dietzgen, Friedrich Engels, Karl Marx u. A. und F. A. Sorge und Andere* (Stuttgart: 1906), pp. 174ff. (The relevant parts of the letter are also reprinted in F. A. Sorge, "Die Arbeiterbewegung in den Vereinigten Staaten 1877-1885," *Die Neue Zeit*, 10th year, 1891-92, Vol. 2, pp. 201ff.)
18. *Ibid.*, *Briefe*, p. 76; *Neue Zeit*, p. 201.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 77 or p. 203.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 77 or p. 202.
21. Hyndman writes: "Nevertheless, I still hold that George's temporary success with his agitatory fallacies greatly facilitated the promulgation of Marx's own theories in Great Britain, owing to the fact that the public mind had been stirred up to consider the social question, and political economy generally, by George's easily read book." *Op. cit.*, p. 282.
22. *Progress and Poverty* (New York: Robert Schalkenbach Foundation, 1979), p. 365. George devoted a whole chapter to the question: Book VII, Ch. 3, pp. 358-67. *Cf.* Heinrich Niehuus, *Geschichte der englischen Bodenreform theorien* (Leipzig: 1910), pp. 141ff.
23. Quoted from the 3rd edition (London: c. 1890).
24. *Op. cit.*, p. 9.
25. George Jr. quotes a letter from his father: "I see, too, by the English papers that Alfred Russel Wallace has been indorsing *Progress and Poverty* which he says 'is undoubtedly the most remarkable and important work of the present century.'" (*The Life of Henry George*, New York: Robert Schalkenbach Foundation, 1960, p. 353).
26. See especially Wallace, *op. cit.*, pp. 165ff.
27. Rose calls *Land Nationalisation* by Wallace "a book clearly in debt to *Progress and Poverty*," (Edward J. Rose, *Henry George*, New York: Twayne Publishers, 1968), p. 100.

28. Chapter VII.
29. Cf. also Karl Schewe, *Bodenreform und Bodenreformpartei in England* (Jena: 1925), p. 10.
30. Lawrence, *op. cit.*, p. 32.
31. *Ibid.*, p. 34.
32. *Loc. cit.*
33. On this, Lawrence points out: "By separating themselves from socialism, George's followers laid the foundation for their eventual cooperation, beginning in 1889, with the Liberal Party" (*op. cit.*, p. 37).
34. *Ibid.*, pp. 52ff.
35. In Henry George and H. M. Hyndman, "Socialism and Rent Appropriation: A Dialogue," *Nineteenth Century*, February, 1885, p. 378.
36. *Ibid.*, pp. 377ff.
38. George Macaulay Trevelyan, *British History in the 19th Century and After, 1782-1919* (London: 1937, 2nd ed., 1956), p. 402.
39. Max Beer, *Geschichte des Sozialismus in England* (Stuttgart: 1913, p. 461); on the significance of the Fabians see also Trevelyan, *op. cit.*, p. 403.
40. (1857-1955). See Margaret Cole, "Edward Reynolds Pease," *Dictionary of National Biography, 1951-1960* (London: 1971), pp. 799ff.
41. Edward R. Pease, *The History of the Fabian Society* (London: 3rd ed., 1963), p. 20.
42. (1859-1947). See Mary Agnes Hamilton, "Sidney James Webb," *Dictionary of National Biography, 1941-1950* (London: 1953), pp. 935-940.
43. Sidney Webb, *Socialism in England* (London: 1890), p. 21.
44. Quoted in Charles Albro Barker, *Henry George* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1955), p. 526.
45. H. G. Wells, *Experiment in Autobiography* (London: 1934), Vol. 1, p. 168.
46. Anne Fremantle, *This Little Band of Prophets* (London: 1960), p. 157; J. Morris Davidson, a contemporary of George, assessed author and work as follows: "In most cases of brilliant authorship the writer is markedly inferior to his literary offspring; but this could not be said of Henry George." In *Concerning Four Precursors of Henry George and the Single Tax* (London: 1899), p. 2.
47. Quoted in Archibald Henderson, *Bernard Shaw* (London: 1932), pp. 149ff.
48. George Bernard Shaw, *The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism* (New York: 1928), p. xi; see also a letter by Shaw in the same year to the American Georgist, J. Rupert Mason, published in *Land & Liberty*, 55 (London: 1948), p. 198. Before expressing his reservations about George's theories, Shaw emphasized here: "I have never repudiated Henry George, nor denied my indebtedness to him for making an economist of me."
49. Beer, *op. cit.*, p. 439.
50. Hobson, *op. cit.*, p. 842.
51. Henry Pelling, *America and the British Left* (New York: 1957), p. 56.
52. (1834-1896). See J. W. Mackail, "William Morris," *Dictionary of National Biography*, 1st Suppl. VI, III (London: 1901), pp. 197-203.
53. "It is certain that Henry George's Book has been received in this country as a new Gospel." Quoted in J. W. Mackail, *The Life of William Morris*, Vol. II (London: 1912), p. 110.
54. (1856-1941). See J. S. Middleton, "Thomas Mann," *Dictionary of National Biography, 1941-1950* (London: 1959), pp. 568-570.
55. *Tom Mann's Memoirs* (London: 1967), pp. 16ff.
56. "Shaw's conversion by Henry George—though not to him," Fremantle, *op. cit.*, p. 34.
57. Geiger, *op. cit.*, p. 232.