
Henry George and Europe: George and His Followers Awakened the British Conscience and Started a New, Freer Society

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

Source: *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, Apr., 1991, Vol. 50, No. 2 (Apr., 1991), pp. 243-255

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

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3487705>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



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

JSTOR

Henry George and Europe:

George and His Followers Awakened the British Conscience and Started a New, Freer Society

By MICHAEL SILAGI*

Translated by SUSAN N. FAULKNER

ABSTRACT. Henry George played a tremendous role in the development and growth of the British Liberal party and of British Liberalism, one no less significant than his role in that of British non-Marxian socialism. One of the Liberal leaders who gained a place in history, Joseph Chamberlain, had already been a land reformer before he learned about Georgism. Chamberlain used the Georgist analysis, but he and the other 19th century Radical Liberals worked up a program for a broader distribution of landed property, not for the abolition of the private land monopoly. The same tactic in Ireland entrenched private land monopoly thereby making many renters small holders. But George also supplied the analysis and the context of the Liberal campaign. And later Liberal leaders—notably David Lloyd George, Winston Churchill (as well as Liberals in the Labour Party, Philip Snowden, Herbert Morrison, Ramsay MacDonald and Josiah Wedgwood)—came close to making the taxation of land values the law of the kingdom.

I

Joseph Chamberlain, Land Reformer

HISTORICALLY, Henry George played a significant role in the development of the characteristically British, non-Marxian variety of individualist and collectivist socialism. But no less significant was the role he played in the development and growth of the British Liberal party and of British Liberalism. In the Liberals' program, the demand for land taxation, based on George's analysis of the causes of poverty, was to play a tremendous role. And that politician who, more than anyone else, fought to place the land question foremost among the later policies of the Liberals was Joseph Chamberlain (1836–1914).

Chamberlain's interest in the land problem was arrived at independently and stemmed from years before his acquaintance with Henry George's theories. Since the publication of *Progress and Poverty*, however, he had come to be

* [Michael Silagi, Dr. jur. et phil., is senior research fellow at the Institut für Völkerrecht der Georg-August Universität, Platz der Göttingen Sieben 5, Blauer Turm, D-3400 Göttingen, Germany.]

American Journal of Economics and Sociology, Vol. 50, No. 2 (April, 1991).

© 1991 American Journal of Economics and Sociology, Inc.

dependent in two contrasting ways upon the American social philosopher. On one hand, he was utterly fascinated by George's description and analysis of the prevailing conditions, especially in regard to landownership; but he was repelled, on the other hand, by George's proposed solution. While in his speeches he relied heavily on the arguments contained in *Progress and Poverty* and came increasingly under the spell of George's thought processes, he nevertheless developed his own practical land reform program out of an ever sharpening sense of contradiction to George. Yet in reality, Chamberlain's impact on the Liberal Party was to come about as a result, not of his anti-Georgist suggestions, but of his Georgist arguments.

Chamberlain's interest in the law of landed property, particularly in regard to the lot of the farmworkers, awakened in the time of his communal-political activities in Birmingham, where, from 1873 to 1876, he held the post of mayor. In the early 70s, Chamberlain began his collaboration with the reformers who, under the leadership of John Stuart Mill, had joined together to form the Land Tenure Reform Association.¹

At a meeting of this Association in 1872, he supported a motion demanding a change of the laws concerning tenure. As he explained, to begin with, city dwellers and agricultural laborers had to be given, by means of electoral reforms, proportionate parliamentary representation, so that they could influence legislation. Then he continued: "If I were to write the heading of the next chapter of the Liberal programme I would write 'Free Schools,' 'Free Land,' and 'Free Church.' . . . In this country and this alone the agricultural labourer is entirely divorced from all interest in the soil he tills."²

But when soon thereafter, under the leadership of Joseph Arch, the "National Agricultural Labourers' Union," a unionized farmworker organization was formed, small farmers were denied the right to associate. It was Chamberlain who took their side and protested sharply against a union which locked out co-workers.³ His espousal of the cause of the agricultural labourers became known far beyond the borders of Birmingham through his contributions to the *Fortnightly Review*, the periodical, founded in 1865, of the progressive forces within British Liberalism.⁴

In 1874, Chamberlain summarized his views in the *Review*. He noted the most urgent of all reforms was a change of the electoral system. But after that, an alteration of the existing agrarian order was the one measure which would be of the greatest direct use to the community at large. In this connection, he said:

Sooner or later, laws which have no parallel in any other part of the world, which were elaborated in the interest of a small minority of the nation, and which failed to secure even their advantage, will certainly be remodelled. An absolute tenant-right will have to be conceded

to the English farmer; the Game Laws must be abolished or reformed; the rights of entail and settlement will have to be restricted within the narrowest limits; and some provision made for securing to small cultivators more frequent opportunities of proprietorship.⁵

II

Chamberlain's Position vs. George's

AS A RADICAL LIBERAL POLITICIAN, who, already half a decade prior to the publication of *Progress and Poverty*, had emphatically rejected the existing agrarian order, Chamberlain of course had to take George's theses into account after 1879. After all, these had found a substantial echo among just those whose lot the British Liberal wanted to ameliorate. The Georgist remedy of confiscation, through taxation, of the land rent was, however, fundamentally different from the proposals which Chamberlain and the co-authors of a "Radical Programme" began to spread at about that time. Among the most important points of this Radical Programme of the eighties belongs the assurance of "commensurate living space" for the urban proletariat,⁶ as well as the improvement of the conditions of the agricultural laborers,⁷ and the creation of a new class of independent, small farmers ("a new race of yeomen").⁸

As far as urban reorganization was concerned, this was to take place exclusively at the expense of the real estate owners: "The expense of making towns habitable for the toilers who dwell in them must be thrown on the land which their toil makes valuable, and without any effort on the part of the owners."⁹ These owners, for their part, were to be prohibited from wringing disproportionately high increases in value from their land through a utilization both excessive and contrary to the interests of the community. Failing this, the land would have to be expropriated, in which case the owners could be compensated only for the actual, present value ("with no allowance for prospective value").¹⁰

The second objective, the creation of a healthy agricultural class, was to be attained through expropriation of the landlords against appropriate compensation and through support of the new yeomen by means of favorable government credit.¹¹

In the final analysis, then, Chamberlain's plans called for a broader distribution of landed property, not the abolition of private land monopoly. George's effect on the "Radical Programme" is, nevertheless, unmistakable; the influence of *Progress and Poverty* was, in fact, evident in just those comments with which Chamberlain warned against the American and his writings: The Radical Liberals regarded the urban and rural land reforms as "the two greatest and most pressing needs of [their] time,"¹² not least because they thus hoped to counter successfully the Georgism which they saw as 'dangerous.'

Pointing to the wide dissemination of *Progress and Poverty* and its radiating effects on the workingclass, Chamberlain called on the owners to recognize their responsibility for the lot of the poor. Otherwise these, stirred up by George's teachings, would demand measures just as cutting and unjust as the American's proposals. As antidote, he therefore urgently suggested the distribution of real property among those farmers who were working the fields. Chamberlain's views are illustrated here by two excerpts, one from an article in the *Fortnightly Review*, the other from a letter, both written in 1883. In the periodical, he writes as follows:

The needs of the poor are gradually finding expression; the measures proposed for their relief are coming under discussion. The wide circulation of such books as *Progress and Poverty*, of Mr. Henry George, and the acceptance which his proposals have found among the working classes, are facts full of significance and warning. If something be not done quickly to meet the growing necessities of the case we may live to see theories as wild and methods as unjust as those suggested by the American economist adopted as the creed of no inconsiderable portion of the electorate.¹³

And in the letter, Chamberlain writes:

Have you read two books lately published—*Progress and Poverty*, by Henry George, and *Land Nationalisation*, by A. Walton [sic—*i.e.* Wallace]? They come to the same conclusion, "L'ennemi, c'est le propriétaire," and they advocate the same remedy, namely, the confiscation of property in land. I am told that these books are being eagerly read by the working classes in London, and that the feeling in favour of drastic measures is growing. In all seriousness, if I were a large landowner I should be uneasy. They are so few, and the landless are so many. *There is only one way of giving security to this kind of property, and that is to multiply the owners of it.* Peasant proprietorship in one form or other, and on a large scale, is the antidote to the doctrines of confiscation which are now making converts.¹⁴ (Emphasis supplied.)

In short, George wanted to eliminate land monopoly. But Chamberlain wanted to perpetuate it by creating additional small land monopolists: getting more allies for the hitherto limited number of landed proprietors, he hoped to secure them from expropriation. On the other hand Chamberlain did learn and adopt a great many ideas from George, and he was (according to his biographer J. L. Garvin) a thorough admirer and student of the American. Chamberlain also met George personally at a dinner of the Reform Club in April 1882,¹⁵ and he was as profoundly shaken by George's description of the contrasts between the rich and the poor in *Progress and Poverty* as he previously had been through his contacts with Joseph Arch. Garvin reported:

Chamberlain read it [*Progress and Poverty*] electrified. . . . A decade had passed since he had been moved by Joseph Arch, as now more potently by Henry George's eloquent pictures of the contemporary contrasts, and they were glaring, between the wealth of the few and the distress of the many.¹⁶

In fact, although Chamberlain recommended the plan of dividing up the large estates as a counter to Henry George's proposals, he followed *Progress and Poverty* extensively in his presentation of the social ills and their causes, most especially at public meetings where he was appealing directly to potential voters.

Thus, in a speech he gave in 1885 in Inverness, he said the following: "I have sometimes speculated upon what would have happened in this country if it had been possible to establish private property in air,"¹⁷ and: "I read the other day that within recent years many valuable public rights had been lost beyond recovery. Lost! Gentlemen, do you not think that it is a very mild way of putting it? But why beyond recovery? I hope that the people will never admit that doctrine so dear to pilferers of every class that a theft is to be condoned because it escapes detection at the time."¹⁸ In this speech, too, Chamberlain described "the sacred right of the landowners" as a fetish. All this sounds like *Progress and Poverty*, whether the talk is about the hypothetical consequences of establishing private property in air, or whether it is about the perception that the theft contained in the private acquisition of land is still robbery, because the statute of limitation does not apply to it.¹⁹

Equally reminiscent of George is Chamberlain's famous "Ransom" speech, in which he commented, that in the early years of the English social system every man had been born with natural rights, one of these being a claim to a part of his native soil; and that it was only later that communal ownership of this native earth was replaced by private landownership. And, Chamberlain continues, this arrangement, now that it had become institutionalized, might perhaps not be retractable. But then he asks what "ransom" the owners are willing to pay for the security they enjoy.²⁰

Garvin describes Chamberlain's dilemma by saying that he was stirred by George's spirit; although he rejected George's dogmatic campaign, his crusade was against the system of the ownership of large landed properties. In vain, however, the English politician repeated that his ideal ("a new race of yeomen") represented the opposite of the nationalization of land.²¹ The Radical Liberals and the Georgists were thrown into one pot by the speakers of the right wing of the Liberal Party and, even more so by the Conservatives. The Radicals were accused of making common cause with George, and were told that they were basically undistinguishable from the avowed followers of the American. Thus warned Lord Salisbury in 1884: "We are on an inclined plane leading from the position of Lord Hartington to that of Mr. Chamberlain and so on to the depths over which Mr. Henry George rules supreme,"²² In the same vein, Lord Stanley of Alderley declared in the following year that a brochure about the land question from the pen of the radical candidate for the House of Commons, A. C. Fyffe,

was “of the same nature though less in degree than the publications of Mr. Henry George.”²³

III

The Report of the Royal Commission

THE FACTORS which caused public opinion to classify the Radicals as moderate (or masked) Georgists were not any common elements as to the contents of their practical proposals, but the parallels in their presentation of the existing land order. Here Chamberlain’s opponents forgot that he wanted to eliminate the miseries so forcefully described in *Progress and Poverty*, not by the introduction of the Single Tax, but by the creation of a broadly-based peasant proprietorship. The Radicals of the 19th century shared only George’s view that the appropriation of the land (*i.e.*, of the land rent) by private persons was against natural law. But they did not draw the inference from this—despite Chamberlain’s comment that a theft not immediately discovered was not therefore to be condoned—that a community could freely take back that of which, in contravention of natural law, they had been deprived: “In the largest number of cases the wrongful possession has been sanctified by time.”²⁴ George, on the other hand, insisted that no custom contrary to natural law, however long in existence, could establish a new prerogative, and that private appropriation of rent by landowners was nothing more than indefinitely repeated theft. In George’s view, as has already been discussed in detail, only confiscation of the land rent through taxation could abolish poverty and need, as well as reinstate social conditions in accord with natural law.²⁵

The Radical Liberals regarded the latter view of the American as “visionary,”²⁶ while at the same time seeing the opposing viewpoint, that landownership should not be changed at all, as misguided. The same Fyffe (who was reproached by Stanley of Alderley for differing from George only in degree) objected to the reform suggested in *Progress and Poverty* on the grounds that it was “beyond practical politics.”²⁷ On the other hand, Fyffe characterized his own project of creating a broadly-based peasant proprietorship as “the middle ground of the practicable.”²⁸

But despite this supposed incompatibility, repeatedly stressed by the Radicals, of their intention of dividing up large estates with George’s Single Tax plan, all Radical Liberal reform proposals are, in fact, permeated by the spirit of *Progress and Poverty*. With good reason, therefore, R. H. Gretton says, “his [George’s] theories coloured the whole of the Radical Programme.”²⁹ Chamberlain’s opponents were really not mistaken in believing that the author of *Progress and Poverty* had supplied more than merely the impetus for the development of the

Radical points concerning the land question. He had done so by persuading the Liberals of the injustice of the existing social arrangements and of the need for changing the applicable land law.

For the reformation of land law, the Radical Liberals demanded, in addition to the peasant proprietorship, a tax reform which had undeniable Georgist features: The "Radical Programme" speaks of "vexatious and restrictive taxes which press heavily upon industry,"³⁰ of the complexities and high cost of the collection of indirect taxes, taxes which the Radicals did not wish to abolish entirely, but to lower by increasing, simultaneously, taxes on real property.³¹ In order to prevent, however, valuable land (*i.e.*, land urgently needed by the community) from being withheld from proper use, the radicals proposed to tax uncultivated land not according to its actual yield, but according to its market value.³²

The latter principle—an unheard-of, yes, revolutionary, new, purely Georgist principle—was first mentioned in 1885, a short time after George's third trip to England. This was in the House of Commons. It found acceptance in the same year, in the concluding report issued by the "Commission on the Housing of the Working Classes" appointed in 1884. (One member of this Commission was Cardinal Henry Edward Manning who was to play a significant role favorable to Henry George at the intra-church discussion of *Progress and Poverty*.³³) With the consent of Cardinal Manning; and at the instigation of another member of the Commission, Jesse Collings, a co-author of the "Radical Programme," a resolution was adopted which recommended the taxation of uncultivated, urban real property at a level of 4% of its value, for the following reason reminiscent of *Progress and Poverty*:

At present, land available for building in the neighbourhood of our populous centres, though its capital value is very great, is probably producing a small yearly return until it is let for building. The owners of this land are rated, not in relation to the real value, but to the actual income. They can thus afford to keep their land out of market, and to part with only small quantities, so as to raise the price beyond the natural monopoly price which the land would command by its advantages of position. Meantime, the general expenditure of the town on improvements is increasing the value of their property. If this land were rated at, say, 4 per cent, on its selling value, the owners would have a more direct incentive to part with it to those who are desirous of building. . . . Their competition with one another would bring down the price paid for land which is now levied on urban enterprise by the adjacent landowners—a tax, be it remembered, which is no recompense for any industry and activity of the townspeople themselves.³⁴

This paragraph from the report of the Royal Commission on Housing could have been taken straight out of a Georgist tract. It shows the extent to which Henry George's ideas had become accepted by 1885 in English politics, through the intercession of Liberal members of the House of Commons. Not without admiration, a George biographer, Charles A. Barker, remarks in this connection:

“Henry George’s ideas had reached farther into the policy-making of Parliament than they ever had into the policy of the legislative [sic] of California.”³⁵

IV

The Consequences of the Commission’s Report

THE CITED 1885 REPORT of the Commission became the point of departure for a systematic examination of the land problem in Great Britain’s political circles. The propelling force behind the land reform efforts was the Liberal Party. Even after Joseph Chamberlain had parted from the Liberals, the demands for the reform of land law, which he had brought into the “Unauthorized Programme” of 1885, continued to exert an influence on the Liberal Party. Indeed, in 1889, the Liberal Party Congress passed a resolution calling for the taxation of land value.³⁶ The influence of Georgist ideas was still in the ascendancy.

The previously mentioned, noted Liberal publicist John A. Hobson (incidentally himself an opponent of the Single Tax, which he designated as “obvious injustice”³⁷) thus assessed Henry George’s effect in 1897, the year of the American’s death: “Henry George may be considered to have exercised a more directly powerful formative and educative influence over English Radicalism of the last fifteen years than any other man.”³⁸

Following this campaign of enlightenment regarding land reform, there were numerous attempts during the final five years of the 19th century to shift the tax burden on real property to land alone. The beginning was made in Glasgow in 1895 when the corporate bodies of 518 communities demanded the power to impose taxes on land value only, apart from buildings and improvements.³⁹

A Royal Commission was appointed in 1896 to examine the then existing system of community taxation and to make proposals for a fairer distribution of personal and property taxes. In 1901, a minority within the Commission proposed leaving the communities free to impose local land taxes.⁴⁰ From then on, a series of legislative proposals to this end were laid before the Lower House, but these were turned down consistently by the Conservative majority until 1906.⁴¹

In 1906, however, the Liberal Party won the majority in the House of Commons, and it appeared that things would be different. Among the Liberal M.P.’s, a “Land Value Parliamentary Committee” was formed (called, for short, the “Land Values Group”), which at Easter of 1906 had no less than 280 members.⁴² Even then, however no bill instituting land tax became law. Despite the majority in the Lower House, all attempts at a Georgist-inspired tax reform were foiled by the vetoes in the House of Lords.⁴³ The far-reaching effects of these failures were to be seen later.

In 1909, the Liberals tried to evade the intervention of the House of Lords by means of a trick. David Lloyd George, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, tied the proposals for tax reform to the Budget estimate, and placed both together within the Budget bill before the Lower House. Now, the Budget had traditionally been the sole domain of the House of Commons for a quarter of a millennium. For 250 years, no Upper House had denied its approval to any Budget estimate. Confident of this custom hallowed by time, the Liberals sought to put through land value taxation.⁴⁴

With his "People's Budget," as the proposal has gone down in British parliamentary history, Lloyd George had to close a budgetary gap of 15 million pounds, which had developed primarily because of the costs of a rapid buildup of the navy and of an old-age pension law passed the previous year. The needed funds were to be obtained through an increase in existing taxes and the imposition of new ones. Among the taxes to be introduced were those to be based on land assessments, particularly an "undeveloped land duty," a duty of $\frac{1}{2}$ penny per pound of the value of unenclosed or fallow land, as well as an "increment value duty," a value increment tax, which was to be imposed at the time of property exchange and which was to amount to 20 percent of the difference between the value of the estate at the target-date, April 30, 1909, and the date of the exchange of property.⁴⁵

The explanation offered by Lloyd George for the introduction of these new taxes is, actually, non-Georgist,⁴⁶ yet does utilize Georgist argumentation: "The country is in need of money and we are looking out for somebody to tax. . . . We don't want to tax industry. We don't want to tax enterprise. We don't want to tax commerce. What shall we tax? We will tax the man who is getting something that he never earned, that he never produced, and that by no law of justice and fairness ought ever to belong to him."⁴⁷

The fiscal significance of these taxes would have been minimal to begin with, since the Liberal government shrank from a consistent application of their land reform ideas. (The Georgist A. W. Madsen wrote, not without bitterness, about the "undeveloped land duty": "That tax is made almost a dead letter by numerous restrictions and exemptions."⁴⁸) All new land taxes would have brought in, during 1909, if actually collected, 500,000 pounds. Their great significance lay in the fact that their actual imposition would have necessitated a reassessment of all land values throughout Great Britain, something which Geiger has perceptively labeled "a tremendous undertaking, comparable to the Domesday Book of William the Conqueror."⁴⁹ The ensuing, dogged opposition of the landlords, in fact, was not aimed so much at the planned taxes as at this general land value appraisal. They saw in it, perhaps not unjustifiably, the first step toward an all-embracing land reform; such reassessment would, after all, have

ascertained the actual land value—without the value of the installations, buildings, and improvements—of each parcel of land.

This, in turn, would have created the basis for a separate tax on the bare land, as well as the possible basis for the introduction of a more or less Georgist-oriented system of taxation.

In 1911, Lloyd George openly expressed himself about this problem: “When it [*i.e.*, the valuation] is accomplished it will be very great piece of work. It will be of enormous value, not merely for the taxation we imposed under the Budget of 1909, but the reconsideration of the problem of local as well as Imperial taxation.”⁵⁰

In 1909, then, the great question was whether the Lords would again reject the plan for new land taxes, in spite of its being part, this time, of the Budget. They did so. In 1909, they broke the tradition of 250 years because they wanted to thwart the government’s intention of land reform. The Upper House turned down the “People’s Budget.”

V

Greater Democracy Through a Constitutional Crisis

THE CONSEQUENCE was a constitutional crisis. The attention of the stirred-up public, however, was turned only secondarily to the problem of whether the Commons should have introduced a land value tax through the back door of budgetary legislation. Now, it was fundamentally the prerogatives and authority of the Upper House that became the central question. In the Lower House, in answer to the veto in the House of Lords which basically had been directed at the land reform section, a bill was introduced and passed which demanded a drastic curb of the power of the Upper House.

In consequence, two elections for members of the House of Commons were held in 1910. Both times, the majority of the electorate voted against the Lords. The outcome of these elections was, in effect, a popular referendum in favor of the Commons and against the Lords. After the first ballot in early 1910, the Budget was passed. Furthermore, in December after the second election a Parliament Act became law which conceded to the House of Lords only a deferred veto—but not for fiscal proposals, for “money bills”. According to this Act, money bills could be enacted immediately, if necessary without the assent of the Lords.⁵¹

Clearly, then, the decision of Lloyd George to tax real property more heavily and in a manner based on land reform principles led to a severe conflict, at the end of which stood a democratic constitutional revolution in favor of the Commons. Haldvan Koht said: “Thus a whole revolution was brought about. . . .

The ideas of Henry George proved capable of stimulating far-reaching practical measures."⁵²

Yet in fact no practical measures resulted along the lines of the Georgist program. Already in 1920, even before the end of the land reassessment, which had been delayed by the war, the regulations for land taxation were annulled.⁵³ A further attempt by the Labour Chancellor of the Exchequer Philip Snowden, to push through the land value assessment and land tax together with the Finance Act of 1931, was unsuccessful,⁵⁴ even though it was thoroughly supported by liberals in the Labour party, including Herbert Morrison, Ramsay MacDonald and Josiah Wedgwood.

It is evident that just as much as Georgism proved to be a catalyst within the political Left of the process leading to the development of the Labour Party, it acted, within the area of Liberal Party politics, as ferment for the constitutional crisis culminating in the weakening of the House of Lords.

It should be mentioned at this point that Georgism was more successful in the overseas territories of the British Empire than in Europe, in the mother country. In particular, in some provinces of Australia and New Zealand, laws were enacted, for the most part in the closing years of the 19th century, which provided for a land tax on net value. This thereby created as well the foundation for the prerequisite general land value assessment. It is true that George's guidelines were altered, mostly by supposed improvements, and nowhere did the new tax laws bring with them the abolition of other taxes as George had sought. In each case, rather, it was simply a matter of the introduction of an additional kind of tax which appeared especially just—in conformity with natural law—but which was intended to replace at most one or two other—unjust—types of land tax.⁵⁵ But it would be a mistake to conclude that because the Georgist movement in Great Britain has yet to achieve the taxation of land values it has been a failure. The movement can be charged with underestimating the political power of the land monopolists and the resources they command; indeed, this is true of its assessment of all monopolists.

But besides the greater democratization of the British oligarchy, George and his followers also achieved the recognition of the social question in a country dominated by an aristocracy, a nobility and a plutocracy. This domination was responsible for the decline in the British economy and British culture. "The true measure of George," said a perceptive historian,⁵⁶ "is found in the effect of his crusade against suffering in the minds and hearts of the British people."

"George had helped start a new society," he added, "though neither he nor his followers were able to lead it." At least not then.

Notes

1. Elsie E. Gulley, *Joseph Chamberlain and English Social Politics* (New York, 1926), pp. 197, 200.
2. Quoted in J. L. Garvin, *The Life of Joseph Chamberlain*, (London, 1932), Vol. I, pp. 149 ff.
3. Gulley, *op. cit.*, pp. 201 ff.
4. See "Fortnightly Review" in the *Oxford Companion to English Literature*, 4th ed. (London: 1967), p. 309.
5. Joseph Chamberlain, "The Next Page of the Liberal Programme," *Fortnightly Review*, 16 (N.S.), 1874, p. 419.
6. [Frank Harris]. (The authors of the anonymously published "Radical Programme" are named in Joseph Chamberlain, *A Political Memoir* [London, 1953, p. 109]). See also "The Radical Programme, III.-The Housing of the Poor in Town," *Fortnightly Review*, 34 (N.S.), 1883, pp. 587 ff.
7. Jesse Collings, "The Radical Programme, IV.-The Agricultural Labourer," *Fortnightly Review*, 34 (N.S.), 1883, pp. 609 ff.
8. Garvin, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 79.
9. Joseph Chamberlain, "Labourers' and Artisans' Dwellings," *Fortnightly Review*, 34 (N.S.), 1883, p. 775.
10. *Loc. cit.*
11. (Francis Adams), "The Radical Programme, VII. Taxation and Finance," *Fortnightly Review*, 38 (N.S.), 1885, pp. 133 ff.
12. Garvin, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 552.
13. *Loc. cit.*, *Fortnightly Review*, 34 (N.S.) 1883, pp. 761 ff.
14. Dorothy Nevill, *Under Five Reigns*, 5th ed. (London, 1911), pp. 206 ff.
15. Henry George Jr., *The Life of Henry George*, New York, 1960, p. 371.
16. Garvin, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, pp. 305 ff.
17. *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 385 ff.
18. *Loc. cit.*
19. *Cf. Progress and Poverty*, (New York, 1979), pp. 333 ff., 363.
20. "What ransom will property pay for the security it now enjoys?" Quoted in Garvin, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 548. On the historical discussion in the 'Ransom' speech, compare the parallel passages in *Progress and Poverty*, Book VII, Ch. 4, "Private Property in Land Historically Considered," pp. 366 ff.
21. Garvin writes, "Stirred up by the spirit, rejecting the dogma of Henry George's *jebad* against landlordism, (Chamberlain) often pointed out that his ideal, a new race of yeoman, was the opposite of land nationalization." *Op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 79.
22. Quoted by Garvin, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 462.
23. Stanley of Alderley, "Radical Theorists on Land," *Fortnightly Review*, 37 (N.S.), 1885, p. 297.
24. Adams, *op. cit.*, p. 133.
25. *Progress and Poverty*, p. 363.
26. C. A. Fyffe, "The Coming Land Bill," *Fortnightly Review*, 37 (N.S.), 1885, p. 284.
27. *Loc. cit.*
28. *Loc. cit.*
29. R. H. Goetton, *A Modern History of the English People*, 2nd ed. (London, 1913), Vol. I, p. 143.
30. Adams, *op. cit.*, p. 135.
31. *Op. cit.*, pp. 134 ff.

32. Gulley, *op. cit.*, p. 218.
33. Charles Albro Barker, *Henry George* (New York, 1955), pp. 487–88.
34. Quoted from P. Wilson Raffan, *The Policy of the Land Values Group in the House of Commons* (London, 1912), pp. 3 ff.
35. Barker, *op. cit.*, p. 414.
36. Raffan, *op. cit.*, p. 3.
37. John A. Hobson, *The Taxation of Unearned Incomes* (London, 1908), p. 8 and *passim*.
38. Hobson, "The Influence of Henry George in England," *Fortnightly Review*, 62 (N.S.) 1897, p. 844.
39. Raffan, *op. cit.*, p. 6.
40. George Raymond Geiger, *The Philosophy of Henry George* (New York, 1933), p. 409.
41. Raffan, *op. cit.*, p. 6.
42. A. W. Madsen, "Great Britain," *Single Tax Yearbook* (New York, 1917), pp. 103 ff.
43. See Lawrence, *op. cit.*, p. 129.
44. *Ibid.*, pp. 140 ff.
45. H. Köppe gives a detailed description of the new taxes in the "People's Budget" in "Die englische Bodensteuerreform," *Jahrbuch der Bodenreform*, VI (1910), pp. 1 ff., 34 ff.
46. The English Labour party politician Lord Douglas of Barloch (*Who's Who*, London, 1972, p. 894) says about Lloyd George: "He never showed any understanding of the principle of the taxation of land values." ("Is No Bread Better Than Half a Loaf?" *Land & Liberty*, 79 (1972), p. 39.
47. David Lloyd George, *The Lords, the Land and the People* (London, 1909), p. 50.
48. Madsen, *op. cit.*, p. 96.
49. Geiger, *op. cit.*, p. 413; the Domesday Book was put together in 1086 on orders of William the Conqueror. It contains statements about property conditions, size, and value of the entire English land and real estate.
50. Quoted in Raffan, *op. cit.*, p. 16.
51. R. C. K. Ensor, *England 1870–1914* (Oxford, 1936, 1952), pp. 424 ff.
52. Haldvan Koht, *The American Spirit in Europe* (Philadelphia, 1949), p. 203.
53. Geiger, *op. cit.*, p. 414.
54. Lawrence, *op. cit.*, p. 180.
55. On this, see *The Operation of Land-Value Rating in Various Countries* (Memorandum of Evidence submitted by the United Committee for the Taxation of Land Values, Ltd., to the Enquiry Committee appointed by the British Government), (London, 1949), *passim*, and E. J. Craigie, "Australia" in *Land-Value Taxation Around the World*, eds. H. G. Brown *et al.* (New York, 1955), pp. 3–24, as well as Roland O'Regan, "New Zealand," *op. cit.*, pp. 27–36. (One is strongly tempted to present a more detailed discussion of the Georgist successes in the British overseas territories but they fall outside the scope of this work.)
56. Lawrence, *op. cit.*, p. 191.

Cross Cultural Currents in the Near East

PHOENICIANS, ASSYRIANS, PERSIANS, AND EGYPTIANS carved out empires in the Near East. With the conquests of Alexander the Great in 333 B.C. it fell under the West's sway. Under the *Pax Romana*, agriculture, industry, and trade flourished as never before or since. Arabs conquered much of the area by 636 A.D. and