

3. The Struggle for Reform.

‘...rooting from this new land’s heart
the poison growth of Old World weeds,
Bashing in with Reason’s fists,
The mummy face of Christless creeds.’
- John Farrell, 1883.

When John Farrell was running the *Lithgow Enterprise*, the name “Single Tax” had not been invented, and all those associated with the early movement, which operated in several countries, called themselves “Land Nationalists.” In New York city, Father Edward McGlynn (1837-1900) called the movement the “Anti-Poverty, Land, and Labour Party,” while in 1882, Henry George revived the old anti-slavery “Free Soil Society” name, since besides its historical associations, it was very descriptive of his purposes. But whatever title was adopted the diverse sections of the movement, including those in Ireland and Scotland with which George was strongly associated, all aimed at the same thing.

The part to which Farrell belonged, the Land Nationalisation Association of New South Wales, had an inauspicious beginning at Forbes, a small town in the Central West, 80 miles from the nearest connection to the railway, and about 250 miles from the sea-board at Sydney. In the early years the fortunes of the

organization were centred on Ignatius Bell, a self-employed boot-maker, and William Dickinson, who made his living driving a delivery cart. Two more unlikely leaders of a political movement could scarcely be found but, as the first presidents of the oldest branch, formed on 26 January 1887, to coincide that year with “Anniversary Day,” as “Australia Day” was then called, Bell and Dickinson were seen as the ‘fathers’ of the movement.

Like legions of ordinary men and women in this period, these two had read widely but were mainly self-educated; their interest being originally kindled by a series of unsigned articles in the *Bulletin*.¹ Shortly thereafter they bought and studied their own copy of *Progress and Poverty*, and convinced of the correctness of George’s argument, moved to induce others to convert. But their attempts to arouse the citizenry were less than vigorous, being mainly limited to cutting-out relevant articles from *Reynold’s News* and the *Bulletin*, and displaying them in Bell’s workshop window.² This glacial-like seed planting went on for four years before the first branch was finally opened – with a membership of seven persons. The group, besides Bell and Dickinson, included Charles Wait, William Hutchinson and John Cotton, and Frank Cotton, who with John Farrell, would soon become the movement’s most influential advocates.

In the meantime, in the United States, the home of the movement, 1887 marked the beginning of a period of six agonizing years of excommunication for

Father McGlynn who had been found guilty of preaching a doctrine, Single Tax theory, which his superiors deemed contrary to the Faith. Perhaps no clergyman in modern times had been brought more prominently to public attention than McGlynn, a native of New York who once described himself as an Irishman born out of his country! Through falling in with Henry George he became very popular with radicals, but soon found himself at odds with his bishop.

Perhaps this was to be expected from a priest who, in the 1860s, campaigned against establishing parochial schools on the grounds that ‘the Church had been sent to preach the gospel and had no divine commission to teach reading, writing, arithmetic, etc.,’³ and, that ‘the demands for charity elsewhere were more pressing.’

It seems to this writer at least that McGlynn’s strength lay in his willingness to defend his beliefs when it was clear that the cost of doing so would be high. As was the case when Archbishop Taschereau of Quebec forbade Catholics to join or retain membership in the KoL on the grounds that they were ‘hostile’ to religion, or, when that same bishop called for *Progress and Poverty* to be placed on the Index [of banned books].⁴

In 1882 McGlynn made a speech with Michael Davitt on behalf of the Land League, and it was not very long before this matter came to the attention of Cardinal Simeoni, the Prefect of Propaganda in Rome whose function it was to

see that priests preached only true Catholic doctrine. As far as Simeoni was concerned, McGlynn's land-for-the-people doctrines were simply an attack on the rights of property, and as such were seen as supporting socialism. Consequently he ordered Cardinal McCloskey, Archbishop of New York, to silence and if necessary suspend McGlynn. Subsequent attempts by Simeoni to secure retractions from McGlynn regarding his views on landed property – and a promise to steer clear of Irish affairs – ended in failure.

Dr. Michael Augustine Corrigan was McCloskey's coadjutor bishop throughout these exchanges, and all correspondence went through him. On the death of Archbishop McCloskey in 1885, he succeeded to that office and ultimately, it was between Corrigan and McGlynn that the controversy over land as private property was played out. It should also be pointed out that McGlynn's friendship with George was often strained. The priest allowed few distinctions or reservations. As attitudes became more entrenched, he exceeded the limits set by George in the debate and began to argue that the very possession of land was immoral.

In what seemed to be the conclusion, after a pastoral career of thirty-six years and an intimate connection with the Church's charitable mission of helping poor immigrants adjust to their new circumstances, McGlynn was excommunicated on 4 July 1887. But this did not end the matter.

Scarcely had McGlynn been out of the Church when new crises in Ireland loomed, and since he was well-known in Ireland, his supporters asked the question: was it British diplomacy that had secured the excommunication? Others wondered if the action had been taken in the hope of enlisting British aid in restoring the Vatican's temporal powers? Such questions remained unresolved, but McGlynn's departure was soon followed by one more edict; the gist of which was that Catholics everywhere risked sharing the American priest's fate should they remain with the Land Leagues, withhold their rent, or participate in Davitt and John Dillon's "Plan of Campaign."⁵ This decision was firmly based upon information given to Pope Leo XIII by Archbishop Persico⁶ who had been a bishop in British India and in the United States, and whom the Pope sent to Ireland to investigate the land question on the spot.

Needless to say freethinkers and socialists in Australia were angry with Persico's findings, regardless of the fact that they had long ago rejected Catholicism in their own lives. Nevertheless, the findings gave them a rare opportunity for feigning indignation while continuing to embarrass the Church by turning McGlynn into a *cause celebre*. William Windspear was a leading player in this motley charade, and it seems his sense of proportion deserted him completely when he claimed the Pope's actions revealed the 'secret power' of world landlordism.⁷

Rather, what it showed was the extent of a new understanding that had been building between London and Rome that went back to the Congress of Vienna. At the Congress, Lord Castlereagh had been the foremost advocate of the restoration of the temporal powers and, *quid pro quo*, Pius VII granted the king of England the right of veto over all appointments to Catholic Bishoprics in England. This accommodation continued through Gladstone's early reign, most notably in March 1869 when he brought in his Bill for the Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Irish Protestant Church.⁸ Windspear's analysis might also have failed to recognize that Dr. Troy, Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, along with the entire body of the Catholic Episcopate in Ireland, supported the Act of Union in 1800.

En passant, like players in a Greek tragedy, within months of McGlynn's excommunication Parnell's power, too, 'had run into the sand,' following his affair with Kitty O'Shea,⁹ the wife of a party colleague.

It was not the first time that affairs half a world away dominated the news in Australia, after all the country had been colonised by Anglo-Saxons and Celts, many of whom harboured longings for any news of 'home.' This market was particularly well catered for by the *Freeman's Journal*, the oldest and largest 'Irish Catholic paper in the colonies,' and the booksellers Hannigan and Mitchell. The bookshop, in Sydney's Royal Arcade, sold 'splendid' oleographs of Parnell

and Davitt and stocked a wide range of Irish National and American publications that included Father Burke's *Refutation of Froude*, Mitchel's *Jail Journal*, Mitchel's *History of Ireland*, the *Speeches and Addresses of A. M. Sullivan*, and the "*Land League*," a *Narrative of Four Years of Irish Agitation* by Hugh Mahon.

Traditionally the so-called "Irish Question," which was a sort of shorthand for "Irish Land Question," had been treated by the Australian press in isolation, as an uncomfortable fact of British Colonial life. Such was not the case. According to the Georgists, the land question was as much a problem in the Dominions and the United States as in Ireland, but it seems Henry George was about the first to argue the question this way. He even went as far as to argue 'that the land laws of Ireland were more favourable to the tenant than those of Great Britain, Belgium, or the United States.'¹⁰ Spelling out the parallels between the Irish system and other like it elsewhere, he writes: 'The Irish land system, which is so much talked of as if it were something peculiarly atrocious is essentially the same land system which prevails in all civilized countries...the same system which all over the civilized world men are accustomed to consider natural and right.'¹¹

Nonetheless, the fact remained that land 'was as indispensable to human life as air and water,' and to give it into the possession of certain people, be they

few or many, was to give them an advantage over all other persons.¹² And, according to Timothy Coghlan the Government statistician whom single taxers were very fond of quoting, in New South Wales the situation was such that fewer than 700 individuals owned more than one-half of the alienated lands in the colony.¹³

While it does not come within the purview of this work to open another inquiry into the machinery of government *a propos* the land laws, it is sufficient to notice key moments that single taxers saw as crucial to understanding the land question and what they were hoping to change.

A History of the Land Laws

In the 1850s it was becoming increasingly difficult for those of limited means to get land to buy or use.¹⁴ Squatters had the right to cultivate any part of their runs, but beyond very limited parameters others could not. Shepherds often had permission from 'their masters' to grow vegetables for themselves, but as to growing wheat, it was understood between squatters that this was a privilege that they alone should enjoy.¹⁵ Population was sparse, but all the land was claimed, and the growth of cereals was kept within such narrow limits that wheat was at times as dear as three pounds per bushel.¹⁶

Towards the end of the 1850s the character of the land problem changed entirely. Large increases in population had accompanied the gold rushes, and

many who had done well on the gold fields, along with other immigrants, wished to settle on the land. Many such people, however, had little capital and were unable to pay in full for the land they selected. Some means to help them needed to be devised.

The leading scheme to foster settlement was the John Robertson Act of 1861. This Act contained two important provisions. First, the pastoral leases were granted for only one year if within the settled area, and for five years if outside it; but the whole area, surveyed or not, was opened to selection and sale at any time. Secondly, selectors could pick a limited area – 40 acres to 320 acres – in any place, at one pound per acre, and pay as deposit one quarter of the purchase money. They had to reside on the land for three years, making during residence improvements worth one pound an acre. The balance of the purchase money they were allowed to pay off virtually at will, with five per cent per annum interest added.¹⁷ Robertson's scheme, conditional purchase by residence, improvements, and installments, played a large part in the subsequent history of land settlement in Australia. Its underlying principle was copied by nearly every colony – for example, in Duffy's legislation in Victoria (1862) and in Strangways's Act (1869) of South Australia.

As some saw the matter, the immediate effect of the legislation was a great, if temporary, relief; and it appeared that for once in the history of the

colony the land hunger was fully satisfied. Large numbers of people rushed for the land, in many instances without sufficient means to keep them going, and the consequence was that many could not make their second payment and the land was forfeited; wheat that had been ruling from 10s. to one pound per bushel dropped to 3s., and the selectors became 'the poorest class in the country.'¹⁸ Another effect was to precipitate an ugly struggle between the established squatters and the 'invading' selectors. The Act left a loophole through which squatters obtained "dummies" to select land on their behalf, even going so far as to take paupers out of asylums and place them all on allotments. This device, called "dummying," prevented ordinary folk from owning their own blocks and, according to Farrell, necessitated squatters and their families committing 'perjury' i. e., telling lies before the District Courts as to who were the real owners of their properties.¹⁹ He also lamented the fact that there were Boards of Directors and Pastoral Interests that occasionally 'offered rewards for cattle stealing, for the destruction of fences, or the scalps of vermin,' but had never 'offered a reward for the suppression of perjury in land matters or the detection of dummies.'

Squatters also purchased heavily at auction sales and, because they could – with the help of their credits at the banks – pay cash and buy in large tracts, they beat the small financial men in the auction-rooms. In consequence they

emerged from the struggle as large landowners. The legislation that had been intended to benefit the colony by establishing closer settlement succeeded only in creating much larger estates.

Between 1861 and 1884 various amendments to the Land Act were attempted, and in some cases became law, the most important of which was Garrett's Act of 1875. This Act, like all the amendments, according to the Georgists, only remedied one wrong to create another.²⁰ Nevertheless, in the early 1880s the people were beginning to clamour against the sale of the public estate and, as a consequence, Sir Alexander Stuart won government on the promise of stopping auction sales in land; it was from these promises that the Act of 1884 eventuated. As a result of the land laws up to that date, more than 32,000,000 acres were sold, besides the 7,338,539 acres²¹ alienated previously to 1861.

And what was the outcome? Were the people settled in happy independence? Was the great land monopoly broken up, or was it greater than ever? Thomas Halloran, a single taxer who had travelled extensively through the Central West in the early 1880s, claimed the monopoly was 'greater than ever.' He wrote:

Runs that I knew twenty years previously that had not a selector on them, were still in the same hands, or in the hands of some

financial company. They had gone through the operation of the various phases of Sir John's Act. I had seen them dotted with homesteads; later on I saw the public schools arrive. I, who found it so hard to get schooling of any sort in the old days, was delighted to see our paternal Government have a care of the young [²²]. Still later churches were built, and peace and plenty seemed to reign for a season at least. But where are those signs of civilization now? Where are the schools? Where are the churches? If I had been absent from the land and on my return found this transformation it would not seem strange; but I was not absent, I was not blind, I saw it all, I saw the schools close one by one; and lastly I saw the little churches close for longer and longer periods, and finally altogether. The farce [dummying] was played out, all was consummated; the lion had laid down with the lamb, but the lamb was inside. So ended the first lesson. ²³

But Who Owned New South Wales?

At the Census in 1889, there were almost 60,000,000 acres held under pastoral lease made up of 1,035 holdings. Before the crises of the 1890s – not after – the number of holdings held in pawn by the various banks and other financial institutions numbered 618. Assuming the pawned stations to be of average acreage, it would seem that of the 65,000,000 acres, about 35,000, 000 acres were in the hands of the money lenders ²⁴

This fact may go some way in explaining several matters: Aboriginal dispossession; the Colony's poor record on de-forestation; the problems of soil

degradation through over-stocking; and the bitterness with which the Shearers' Union was hounded year after year.²⁵

The Bank of New South Wales with 127 properties aggregating more than 5,000,000 acres held the highest number of properties; but it did not own the most land. That distinction belonged to the Australian Mortgage, Land and Finance Company, AML&F, with 51 holdings totaling over 8.5 million acres. Dalgety's, with 35 properties comprising nearly 7 million acres was the next largest landowner.²⁶

The amount of land encompassed in the pastoral leases was enormous, but government charges were low. The AML&F's Lake Victoria station for example, situated in the Far West near Wentworth, was comprised of more than 1,400,000 acres, and was leased for less than 1d per acre. Similarly, Connupie Downs near Wilcannia was the largest property leased by the Bank of New South Wales, and was leased for two-thirds of a penny per acre.²⁷

Of the 317 pastoral holdings making up the Western Division in 1885, 152 properties were owned by the money lenders. These included the one million acres property, Salisbury Downs, owned by the Trust and Agency Company of Australasia. Still, the largest property in the colony was owned by an independent, this was Sir Thomas Elder, whose property Moomba covered more than two million acres.

In 1891, the number of sheep in Australia exceeded 1,000,000 for the first time. And in 1895 there were about 40 stations shearing more than 100,000 sheep annually. Elder's Moomba was amongst the largest, and they processed 285,000 beasts every year. Other large sheds were Dunlop and Toorale, where 276,000 sheep and 261,000 sheep respectively, were shorn every year.²⁸

Sir Samuel Wilson (1832-1895) who came to Australia from Ballycloughan in 1852, owned Dunlop, a sprawling, 885,000 acre, river-fronted property on the Darling near Wentworth. He also leased Toorale – a half-million acres larger – for 1d. an acre.²⁹

Wilson, like the members of other large landholding families, the Abbotts, Tysons, Allisons, Hays, Vickerys, Elders and McCaugheys, or the more famous but less wealthy Kellys of Glenrowan, arranged their affairs to keep the wealth within the family. Wilson arranged for Samuel McCaughey (1835-1919), his nephew, to buy Dunlop and Toorale; McCaughey was also born in Ireland, at Tulleyneuy in County Antrim. At the age of twenty he was brought to Australia by Charles Wilson, another uncle who had been travelling overseas, and in order to teach the young man the family business, placed McCaughey on Kewell, one of his stations in the Wimmera district of Victoria.³⁰

After only four years McCaughey had interests in at least three stations, Coonong, Singorimba and Goolgumba; his partner was David Wilson, another

family member. But over time his best known station was probably Yanco, on the Murrumbidgee near Deniliquin, where his efforts in irrigation on behalf of thousands of sheep put him at odds with Cotton who believed that irrigation water and the rich alluvial soils of the Riverina would have been better used for closer settlement than on improving merinos.³¹

Undeterred, McCaughey continued to direct his energy and wealth towards sheep breeding, and to meeting the special needs of wool-growers. And in 1894, despite the depression, he had the wherewithal to purchase Warrabee Park, near Narrandera, for 142,000 pounds, an enormous sum in those times. Yet according to Cotton, McCaughey was 'one of the poor men who was always kicking up about the Single Tax.'³²

In a system where it often seemed that the rich not only made the laws and enjoyed an unequal share of the honours, McCaughey was appointed to the Legislative Council in 1899 and created a Knight Bachelor in 1905. In going into parliament, he followed Alexander Wilson, another uncle who, as well as owning the largest stock and station agency in Sydney, owned Corree in the Riverina and sat as the member for Murray, 1880-1882, and for Bourke in 1887.³³

Farrell's Reply

It was Farrell's hope that he could educate people up to a better understanding of the land laws, and in spite of the strength of the monopoly it

seems that at no stage did he come to the point of accepting that his goals could not be achieved. Thus, buoyed by a somewhat cavalier spirit, the first issue of the *Australian Standard* was a victory issue, since it coincided with the defeat of the Dibbs' Protectionist Ministry and the inauguration of the fifth Freetrade Ministry of Parkes on 8 March 1889.

The poet's feeling on the defeat might be best gleaned from the following words he addressed to Dibbs:

It was close; other people have hearkened
To words such as yours 'ere today,
Till the lives of the workers were darkened,
And their liberties given away;
In reply to such words they have yielded
Strong limbs and dumb minds to the yoke
Of the power which their tyrants have wielded –
But your project has ended in smoke!
We have learned of the only decision
In which certain advances can be made –
It is not through what you call Protection
Or what some, but less blind, call Freetrade.
It is not by increasing taxation
But by striking a death-dealing blow
At all taxes, we'll bring to the Nation
A plentiful peace. You can go! ³⁴

It should also be noted that it was Farrell and his colleague on the *Daily Telegraph*, Tom Courtney, who almost single handedly swept Dibbs 'into the gloom.' Of Farrell's political role Mary Cameron wrote: 'Suffice to say at this point that analogous to the flurry of literary and humanist activity that followed the execution of Charles 1 was the minor but nonetheless real humanist renaissance that followed on agitation for land reform in Australia under the aegis of genial, big-hearted John Farrell.' ³⁵ .

Frank Cotton also stood in the 1889 elections, at Forbes, and was defeated by the Protectionist Alfred Stokes. Farrell thanked Cotton for making the attempt, and took the opportunity to sketch a pen-picture of the reasons for his friend's defeat. He told his readers that the loss was entirely due to the vagaries of the electorate itself - in that its two distinct centres of population, Forbes and Parkes, both wanted a railway line, (to the exclusion of the other), and Cotton lacked the duplicity to convince both sides he was for them:

The great railway question has to be dealt with diplomatically, and hardly anyone but a politician with a soul baked over out of recognition by the coagulated villainy of years party shuffling could lie about his intentions regarding the railway with sufficient directness and candour to win the full confidence of both places...

the dominant landowners in each place sigh for the load of unearned increment which is the first freight a new railway carries, and the trembling shop-keeper, whatever he may think, blandly votes with them, and retains a portion of their valuable custom. To refuse to have anything to do with the railway question and say that the Commissioners were the men to deal with, as Cotton did, was honest but sadly unworldly, and must have filled the breasts of the other candidates with silent joy.³⁶

Farrell's reaction to his friend's defeat was to predict he would be successful in the next election, as he was, but not in Forbes, he was returned for the inner suburban Sydney seat of Newtown in 1891. But in assessing the loss, some regard needs be taken of the time Cotton spent away from the electorate campaigning on behalf of Charles Garland, who was in New Zealand for medical reasons. Garland's presidency was, however, a test question at the election wherein the *Cowra Free Press*, the local protectionist journal, according to the *Australian Standard*, published articles attacking Cotton, Farrell, Garland and Foxall for their advocacy of Henry George's principles. The *Press* tried to show that any victory for the land nationalists would be followed by socialism and republicanism and the annihilation of 'the strongest bulwark of monarchial government – the landed aristocracy.'³⁷

In such a vein of rhetoric the *Press*' attack was sustained for many thousands of words. Fortunately at no stage did Cotton lose heart, even after his

own defeat he simply ‘wiped the dust from his shoes’ (to use a phrase he liked) and set out on another lecturing tour. The more mundane part of his brief was to canvass for the disposal of shares in the *Australian Standard*, and for subscriptions and advertisements.³⁸

Not all of what the *Cowra Free Press* published however was incorrect. The Socialist Club at that time at 533 George Street, Sydney, was supported by Farrell (and calling itself the International Reading Room, it occasionally took advertisements in the *Standard*). They had over 350 newspapers and magazines on file from all over the world, including the *London Democrat*, *Christian Commonwealth*, and *Church Reformer*, as well as the New York and Australian *Standards*. And Farrell openly admitted that while he differed from the socialists regarding the methods by which justice for all people was to be obtained, ‘we recognize that they are working towards the same ends as the Single Tax Party.’ He encouraged his readers to visit the Club and take part in debate. There ‘they will find some “foemen” worthier of their steel than the combined variety troupes of the *Australian Star* office, the Political and Protectionist Reform League, and the Burwood National Party could produce.’³⁹

One important aspect of the 1889 election was the question of the State’s burgeoning deficit. According to Farrell, Dibbs had run

...the country into debt
Never was debt as stiff as it,
It makes creation shiver yet,
To think of Dibbs' deficit.⁴⁰

But the Freetraders' relations with the rival political party were closer than to Farrell's ideals, and the single taxers were alarmed after the elections to discover that William McMillan, the treasurer, was planning to sell off suburban land in order to pay off the deficit. But Georgists argued that the selling off of public lands could not continue indefinitely as a means of revenue raising, and in their view led to the patronage, corruption, and wasteful extravagance that created the deficit in the first place. Writing in the *Australian Standard*, Farrell pointed out that single taxers could expect little comfort from an alliance of Freetrade-cum-Liberal Political Association, of which McMillan was chairman, for the cause of democracy. In this period before the Labor Party emerged, a proposal to form a third party on purely democratic lines, to be called the Advanced Liberal Party, if taxing the unimproved value of land were not included in the platform of the Freetrade and Liberal Association, was seriously considered by Farrell and his supporters.

And of the proposed alliance of Freetrade and Liberal Political Association, Farrell expressed serious doubts: 'The Freetraders have not in the

past established any special claim to be regarded as a body of reformers whose interests go beyond their personal interests...no wonder that a party reasonably suspected of selfishness should find itself gradually supplanted by the open and vigorous selfishness of Protection.’⁴¹

The editor of the *Standard*, laid down the conditions of respectability to the new Alliance confronting Protection: ‘If (their) platform includes Land Value Taxation, Payment of Members of Parliament, Single Voting, a Local Government Bill, and any possible plan to reform the Legislative Council, it will be believed that its intentions are honourable.’⁴²

The First Conference of the Land Nationalisation Leagues.

The first conference of delegates from the Land Nationalisation Leagues of New South Wales, and representatives from the other colonies, was opened at St. James’ Hall in Philip Street, Sydney, on Wednesday evening at 8 o’clock on 24 April 1889. The delegates represented leagues at Sydney, Adelaide, Brisbane, Condoblin, Crookwell, Forbes, Goulburn, Granville, Lithgow, Nymagee, Wagga, Echuca, Bathurst, Grafton and Wellington.

As Charles Garland was en route to America and Great Britain, Foxall was elected Chairman, and he adjourned immediately to allow members of the Freetrade Association to attend a meeting called for the same hour to discuss

amalgamation with the Liberal Association. The Amalgamation was voted in by a majority of members.

The Conference duly met the following evening with the same cast of players. The first business was the formation of an Executive Council, to which the following delegates (who were all men), were elected: Messrs., H.J. Akerman, John Farrell, Frank Cotton, T.J. Hebblewhite, Fred Walsh, E.W. Foxall, W.E. Johnson, W.J. McCloskie, A. Card, J.A. Dobbie, J.E. Woodthorpe, H.J. Fletcher, F.O. Furner, F.M. Michelmore, D. Hogarth, T.H. Martyn, A.B. Wood, W.H. Waldon, J.S. Ramsay and Percy Wakefield.

One of the most important decisions taken was undoubtedly the changing of the name from the 'Land Nationalisation League' to the 'Single Tax' party. In a speech that was typical, the Grafton delegate opposed changing the name, suggesting that many Protectionists who were as opposed to monopolies as Freetraders, would turn away from a new name. One other delegate, J. A. Dobbie (Sydney), claimed the present name was unwieldy and failed to express the method by which land nationalisation would be achieved. Fred Flowers, who would run unsuccessfully for the Labor Party in South Sydney in 1891, was one of the few whose names were recorded as having voted against the change. Nonetheless, the motion was carried by a large majority.

The debate around the name was, however, in the opinion of this writer, a blemish on all of those involved, since at no time was the real reason for the change admitted or acknowledged for pragmatic reasons. The reason for changing was simply that the odium attached to the Land Leagues made it impossible for any group with political aspirations calling themselves land nationalists to garner support from the mainstream. And, if this was not immediately obvious, careful readers of the *Standard* might have at least sensed that Cotton and Farrell understood the popular enmity against the Leagues, since beyond a few occasional innocuous words from Davitt, references were rarely ever made to the troubles in Ireland.

One other important matter discussed was the proposal put forward by delegate Knibbs (Bathurst), to form a third party. The motion to form a new party was put to a vote, and lost, on the Chairman's deciding vote.

However, it should be admitted that this decision was taken in haste, without a tenth of the serious consideration which so important a step demanded. Nor it might seem was a conference of delegates, mostly in country districts very far from the city, summoned at short notice, the best way to decide the matter.

On less important matters, during proceeding Farrell received a letter from Henry Parkes expressing his pleasure at seeing 'so many intelligent minds working at bettering the conditions of humanity.'⁴³ There was also a telegram

from the Queenslanders Murray Frazer and H. Hardacre wishing the delegates 'God speed.' There was also a cablegram from Henry George in New York, announcing his intention to visit Australia in October and, mistakenly as it turned out, that Morrison Davidson, who later wrote books on Henry George and Jerrard Winstanley,⁴⁴ would accompany him. And while some might call Davidson a reredos-smashing Puritan,⁴⁵ the fact that George wanted him with him amply shows the leavening influence of Evangelicals and 'Low' Church Protestants in George's movement.

That said, before turning from the Conference it should be noted that under the influence of Huxley, Darwin, Bradlaugh, Symes and Marx, and others, to say nothing of lodges, secret societies, 'penny dreadfuls,' and mass entertainment generally, the way people thought about things in the late 1880s was changing. Or, as Beatrice Webb put it: 'Political conviction was supplanting religious faith.'⁴⁶ George's preoccupation, too, with the land question had immediately attracted large numbers of radicals to his cause, because his notion of the unearned increment re-enforced their critique of the prevailing distribution of wealth. Such forces also accompanied the rise of anarchy and freethought, and some freethinkers like Bradlaugh, who was also a Freemason⁴⁷ (see Appendices), took pride in believing their brand of morality was actually superior to Christianity's.⁴⁸ In what was then a fairly sceptical intellectual *milieu*, it was

scarcely surprising that a number of well known freethinkers were Conference delegates; W. W. Collins, L. H. Berens, Ignatius Singer, L. E. Marcus and Peter McNaught, being five of whom we know.⁴⁹

Nevertheless, on the subject the platform, it was suggested that the League should have a comprehensive platform beyond that of taxation, 'one which the true Liberalism of the colony could rally to.' Suggestions, in addition to the Single Tax plank (and the call for a national system of irrigation), included 'the transfer of the interest on the money borrowed for building railways from producers' freights to the land values created by the making of such railways; the improvement of the public estate by a system of light railways; the limitation of usury to a maximum of 10 per cent per annum; Parliamentary reform; compulsory and free elementary education; free medicine and free medical advice; and simplification of the legal codes.'

At the conclusion of the proceedings of the Single Tax Conference, the thanks of the delegates were conveyed by special resolution to Foxall, Cotton, and Farrell, for the services they had rendered to Land Nationalisation in New South Wales. Several of the country delegates then left to be entertained by Foxall at Adams' Hotel.

As these things go, it was fair to say that the conference had been most successful – far more than the most sanguine single taxer had any right to expect.

Owing to the fact that the branches of the League were mostly in the country districts, it was not thought that the attendance of delegates would be large. The fact that only very short notice of the date was given, and the difficulty of calling together all the country leagues for discussion and decision at a time when 'depression' was widespread and the members, who were mostly working men, were scattered far and wide in an effort to earn a living, militated against the success of the undertaking. But it was a success, nevertheless, measured by the fact that 'it had a very considerable effect upon public opinion in the city.'⁵⁰

Perhaps more reliably, a good deal of information was exchanged between the 'fifty' persons present, largely concerning the growth of the movement in various districts, and the causes of its local advances or otherwise, was gained, and 'several ardent disciples of the movement became known to each other for the first time.'⁵¹ In such a mood it was scarcely suprising that it was confidently predicted that as soon as a lecturer could be sent to each little town dozens of new leagues could be formed, especially under the stimulus which the approaching visit by Henry George would bring to the whole discussion.

With the conference over it was back to work, and to claims by William McMillan that working men in New South Wales were more prosperous than wage-earners elsewhere, on information supplied by W.B. Rutland, the delegate from Nymagee at the recent conference, Farrell wrote: 'At the Nymagee Copper

Smelting works, men slave 70 to 98 hours a week, without a Sabbath's rest. They live for no other purpose than to pile heavy logs into the furnaces, and stir up the molten metal with long iron rods. They get from 9 pounds to 11 pounds per month, equal in purchasing power to from 30s, to 40s. in Sydney.' ⁵² In the same article Farrell noted a recent advertisement from a merchant looking for a watchman to work 10 hours per night and whose work included cleaning up the premises, for 2 pounds per week. There were over three hundred applicants for the job, many of whom 'begged for the position at half the wages.' ⁵³ 'And,' he wrote, 'this goes on in a new land with limitless resources, and where nature has been especially prodigal of wealth.' ⁵⁴

While such articles were undoubtedly useful for educative purposes, their worth in a practical political sense is more difficult to gauge. Witness the election at Central Cumberland ⁵⁵ about a month after the Conference when, because they had no party of their own to support, single taxers supported W. A. Brodie instead of David Dale, the nominated candidate of the revenue tariff party which had consistently failed to remove duties on food. Nonetheless Brodie lost, and only the fact that another Freetrade candidate, T. W. Taylor, withdrew, prevented the Protection candidate Alban Gee from taking the seat, because of the split vote. ⁵⁶ Following Brodie's defeat, Farrell warned the revenue tariff party that single taxers in future would only vote for candidates who opposed taxes on

commodities. And, even though the Single Tax Executive had supported Brodie's candidature, without a party structure, it was difficult to see how they could ensure that future candidates fitted the criteria.

The Central Cumberland election was a turning point for the STL. It had previously accepted an alliance with the tariff revenue party simply because the latter went some distance with them along the same road. Moreover, with the house evenly divided, any struggle between 'true' freetraders ⁵⁷ and Parkes' tariff revenue party might have brought the government down.

The problems of contending without their own party was mentioned, but not exaggerated and, looking ahead slightly, single taxers were to claim responsibility for the election (in October 1889) of the new Freetrade member for Newcastle, James Curley, at that time secretary of the Miners' Union.⁵⁸ And in the July 1890 by-elections held for Hartley, Balmain and Namoi, the Single Taxers again claimed that the Freetrade candidates whom they supported, John Hurley, John Hawthorne and Charles Collins respectively, won mainly through their help. Knowing that such vigorous and able debaters as Lesina, Ryan and Caulfield had stumped through Hartley on Hurley's behalf, this was no empty boast.⁵⁹

Farrell believed that single taxers were the real freetraders, and the revenue tariff party, usurpers, who 'had long taken the liberty of using our name.'

⁶⁰ In this connection Farrell reported an interview he had in early August with J. B. Sargent, from New Haven, Connecticut, one of the largest hardware manufacturer in the world, employing nearly 2,000 hands. A convinced freetrader, Sargent told Farrell that despite claims to the contrary, he thought workmen in Protectionist America, in proportion to the work they did, were not well paid, owing to tariffs on raw materials. He also argued that Protection was mainly based on fear and ignorance. Four months after the Sargent interview, Farrell assured *Telegraph* readers that Protection did not protect labour: 'And never in the world was there a more brazen and impudent sham than the pretence on the part of certain of its advocates that it does. How can it protect labour when labour is the only thing that is allowed to come from abroad without any restriction and compete with local labour?' ⁶¹ To emphasise the point he cited the United States where conditions had been vitiated by pauper labour coming in. However, in Victoria: 'The wide expanse of sea which lies between Australia and the low-wage countries of Europe has effectively prohibited the influx of impoverished immigrants from such sources.' ⁶²

Farrell, the son of an emigrant gold-digger, speaking without apparent irony, claimed European pauper emigrants were not to be confused with those who came to Australia in the 1850s looking for gold: 'From all quarters [of the earth] poured the most adventurous and ardent spirits to compete with each other for

fortune and these, and their descendants, are the Victorians of today.' He suggested that the 1850s bestowed riches on Victoria, the 'best manhood the world could send, and gave her a very marked advantage over the more sluggish populations of the other colonies.'⁶³ According to Farrell, fiscal policies in Victoria were moulded more by memories of the 1850s than by any perception of economic truth. As for America, during the previous election (here he quotes Sargent) 'unlimited promises of higher wages... were held out as an inducement to ensure [President] Harrison's return, and when it was secured, down went wages in many cases, and a wholesale weeding out of men took place.'⁶⁴

In the evening of Monday, 2 December 1889, the third of a series of meetings to pave the way for the coming visit of Henry George was held in the Temperance-hall. Foxall presided and reported, among other things, that the fund for meeting the expenses that would be incurred by George's visit had reached 800 pounds.

Henry Willis, an ordinary member of the League, then delivered an address on 'Why Working Men Should Be Single Taxers.' He pointed out the enormous increases in the power of labour in regards to production, that had taken place with the development of modern machinery and the improvement in tools over recent decades.⁶⁵ He also pointed out that wage earners were not paid

from capital (as A. G. Yewen, the socialist, argued ⁶⁶), but from the product of labour, and what they needed was a proper share of the wealth they had created.

Alex Riddell, a mining engineer, spoke on, 'How the Single Tax Encourages Industry.' They had all heard in recent times of the benefits that would flow from placing more taxes on the products of industry, but single taxers taught that labour would only be benefited by removing all of those burdens, and placing them on land values alone. ⁶⁷ And while everyone could see 'the depression that existed amongst labourers,' and 'the low wages and poverty,' he lamented the fact that not all were agreed to either the cause or the remedy: 'Protectionists gave people one remedy for the present state of industrial slavery, and freetraders gave them another.' ⁶⁸

He then proffered a Single Tax solution, promising that if the burdens were removed from industry and economic rent paid to the State instead of to private landowners, and wealth diffused among those who created it, employers would compete for labourers, instead of as now labourers competing against each other for employment, while involuntary poverty would be banished. ⁶⁹

In conclusion, James Williamson, president of the Granville branch of the STL, emphasized some important claims of the League; that the effects of the tax would be to end the destructive monopoly in land and throw it open to would-be occupiers and enable the people to employ themselves on their own farms.

But while the Wilsons and McCaugheys and so on made fortunes from great estates under the existing system, others made fortunes from their suburban holdings; as was the case with James Squire Farnell (1825-1888) ex-Secretary for Lands; Vice-Chairman of the Commercial Bank and third Grand Master of the Grand Lodge in 1877, and who became Premier fifteen days after his installation.

⁷⁰ Following his death the family inherited 30 acres of land at Ryde, Sydney, land which had cost their father one pound an acre, and shortly thereafter, local authorities had sought to resume the land but the asking price was 30,000 pounds. Despite the 'exorbitant' figure, the land was 'unimproved,' plainly the difference between the original price and the price in 1888 arose through no effort of the family. According to Cotton, the increase in value of Farnell's land came from increases in population, and from building roads and providing lighting and water to meet their needs. He suggested a tax of 1d. in the pound on the 30,000 pounds should apply to meet public expenses, and to do all the things that an advancing civilisation made necessary for society to do on behalf of its members.

Despite arguing rationally what they saw as the 'natural law,' Cotton and Farrell were continually described by the *Bulletin* and *Sydney Morning Herald*, as cranks and as 'fanatical disciples of Henry George who loudly proclaim Land Nationalisation as the panacea for every human ill.' ⁷¹ Curiously, as Paul Stenhouse points out: 'Modern historians have taken up these charges and made

them their own.’⁷² Levelling them without opportunity of reply, at the Single Taxers, they seem unaware that the charges were rebutted long ago by Farrell who wrote: “We only regard Henry George’s scheme as the first practicable step towards further reforms... just so far as what he teaches accords with reason and deduction, we follow.”⁷³

In this context, it is important to understand that some of those who bought land in earlier times for a song were determined to keep it regardless of the social cost. As in the case of Daniel Cooper, a wealthy, mainly suburban, landowner, and James Hyne an unemployed itinerant who, according to Frank Cotton, had been charged with taking soil to the value of one shilling from Cooper’s estate. Unable to pay the fine and costs, 8 shillings and 10 pence, Hyne was given 21 days jail. And, it should also be pointed out that Cooper was the first Provincial Grand Master of the Grand Lodge.⁷⁴ But since he was also a speculator, Cotton said:

Daniel Cooper, aided by the law, received hundreds of stolen acres of the public estate, and now gloats in luxurious absenteeism upon the unearned increment. Yet nobody attempts to bring him to justice...It would be a healthy object-lesson for democracy if 1,000 unemployed Sydney men would proceed to the Daniel Cooper estate and “steal” a shilling’s-worth of sand and take out 21 days apiece. It would be healthier

still if some means could be found by which the absentee Cooper could be made to pay...for the maintenance of the 1,000 men while they were in jail.⁷⁵

Cotton also explains:

at almost every Christmastide poor devils – respectable heads of working families as a rule – are dragged before magistrates...for stealing a few useless weeds...for Xmas [sic] decorations. [yet the empty heath] awaits only the syndicate-mongers who... will rig a land-boom, and offer the greedy absentee, thousands of pounds for every farthing which the Daniel Cooper estate has cost him. Gigantic robbery! And how the mammoth robber pulverises the petty thief! How his mymidons guard his shilling's worth of sand! ⁷⁶

Meanwhile the *Standard* was losing money (due mainly to the theft of letters by Anderton containing monies for subscription ⁷⁷), and in the August issue Farrell announced a meeting of shareholders in the Australian Land Nationaliser and Lithgow Enterprise Newspaper Co. Ltd., scheduled for 9 August. The issue for 6 July, the last to come out weekly, had promised that the new monthly edition would be enlarged, but remain at the old price, 3d. The August issue announced that new shareholders had come forward, and it seemed likely that it could revert to its weekly format; the September issue announced (mistakenly) the imminent resolution of the financial problems of the paper, and

the adoption by the Freetrade and Liberal Political Association of a tax on the unimproved value of land, in their platform. Farrell rightly considered the decision, taken at the Association's Conference, to be a victory over the tariff revenueites among the freetraders, especially as a further resolution by the Cowra tariff revenue party that income and property tax be imposed, was withdrawn on the advice of the Chairman.⁷⁸

Unfortunately the September issue of the *Standard* proved to be the final issue for 1889, owing to financial losses, and to a recurrence of Farrell's neurasthenia and the distressing rheumatic pains that went with it. To convalesce he chose to go to New Zealand, not only for his health's sake, but because there he could assist with the preparations for Henry George's visit.

In Dunedin Farrell interviewed Sir Robert Stout (ex-Freethought Party despite his knighthood), whom he considered a true democrat, and someone who could be counted on to make George's visit a success.

In Wellington he met J. H. Shine, secretary of the local Single Tax League, and James Grove, a landowner from Blackbridge Lower Hutt, with whom he had corresponded. In Auckland he visited the Anti-Poverty Society and the Knights of Labor, both of whom 'were working to promote the Single Tax.'⁷⁹ He also had 'several lengthy meetings' with Sir George Grey, third Governor of

South Australia, who had, during the writing of *Progress and Poverty*, maintained a regular correspondence with Henry George.

From the *Auckland Evening Star*, Farrell clipped an article on the sale of Crown Lands, and how much of that land was available for settlement. The *Star* showed that fewer than 750,000 acres were available; a fact that seemed curious since the colony comprised seventy-seven million acres and the whole population was only a little over half a million persons. From these figures the reason for the 'imbalance' was plain enough; nearly eighteen million acres of the best agricultural, and most accessible land had already been monopolized in large blocks by just sixteen hundred people.⁸⁰

The September issue of the *Australian Standard*⁸¹ also reported a meeting, under the auspices of the ASL, wherein the single taxers Vincent Lesina, Frank Cotton, and L. H. Berens, shared a platform in the Sydney Domain with the socialists William McNamara and A. G. Yewen, and George Black, the Republican, to express solidarity with the London waterside workers who were on strike.

The 'Great' London Dock Strike, as it was called, was a good example of the sort of thing Farrell had railed against in Lithgow, wherein advocates for labour, in this case, Eleanor Marx, Ben Tillett, John Burns, Harry Orbell, Henry Champion and the semi-literate Will Thorne,⁸² encouraged dockers into

believing that by marching with banners and bands and surviving on handouts of pigs' trotters and powdered milk, they were doing something extraordinary. In the grim reality, however, dockers were asking, meekly, for a rise of a penny an hour, from 5d., to 6d! And while it might be argued this represented a rise of 20 per cent, starting from such a low base, what they were after was a pittance.

Ship owners who'd made fortunes out of taking millions of immigrants across the Atlantic during the past few decades, were scarcely affected by the dockers 'withdrawing their labour' and used the time to bring their ships back into top condition. For most of them the demands were at worst an inconvenience, easily righted by increasing the carrying costs on items such as tea, for which wage-earners, rather than do without, would gladly pay the extra.

Nonetheless the strike continued and Farrell's report of the Domain meeting noted that McNamara, by way of a finale, recited a poem that in its time said exactly what many were thinking:

The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof
saith God's most holy Word;
The water hath fish and the land has flesh, and
the air hath many a bird,
And the lands are teeming o'er all the earth,
and the earth hath numberless lands,

Yet millions of hands want acres, and millions
of acres want hands.

Sun and breeze and gladsome shadows are over
the earth spread wide,
And the good God gave these gifts to men who
on earth abide;
Yet thousands are toiling in poisonous gloom and
shackled with iron bands,
While millions of hands want acres, and millions
of acres want hands.

‘Tis writ “You shall not muzzle the ox that
treadeth the corn:”
Then why do ye shackle the poor man’s limbs
that have all earth’s burdens borne?
The earth is a gift of a bounteous God, and to
labour his word commands,
Yet millions of hands want acres, and millions
of acres want hands.

Never a foot hath the poor men here to plant
with a grain of corn,
And never a plot where his child may cull fresh
flowers in the dewy morn;
The field lies fallow, the weeds grow rank, while

idle the poor man stands;
Oh! Millions of hands want acres, and millions
of acres want hands.

Who hath ordained that the few should hoard
their millions of useless gold,
And rob the earth of its fruits and flowers, while
profitless soil they hold;
Who hath ordained that a parchment scroll
should fence round miles of land,
While millions of hands want acres, and millions
of acres want hands.

'Tis a glaring blight on the face of day, this
robbery of men's rights,
'Tis a lie that the word of God disowns: 'tis a
curse that burns and blights,
And will burn and blight till the people rise
and swear as they break their bonds
That the hands shall henceforth have acres, and
the acres henceforth have hands.⁸³

The meeting continued with Lewis Berens apportioning blame for the
'enslavement' of workers, on the workers themselves. He pointed out that once
they realised their position and their 'overwhelming numbers,' they could

through the ballot-box, 'quietly and without bloodshed change whatever they wished.' ⁸⁴

George Black, another very good public speaker, unfortunately got only halfway through his speech when the chairman ordered him to stop. It seems that the time difference between London and Sydney had been miscalculated and it had become a matter of urgency to end in time for a cable to be sent conveying a message of sympathy to be read at the mass meeting that day in Hyde Park, London.

It was later claimed that 2,000 persons attended the meeting; and if this was so then the 5 pounds 7s. collected ⁸⁵ might be seen as an indictment of those present for their lack of generosity, or, that the paltry sum was a barometer of the true feelings of some Australians who were themselves 'doing it tough,' towards discontented workers half a world away?

Farrell on the other hand wrote a tribute to the dockers which came as a poem published in the *Bulletin*, 16 November, commemorating the marching men carrying the white and violet Union Jack of Australia as a way of thanking Australians for their support:

In beseeching
Had been stretched to all the world, you've walked in
triumph, ours and yours;
Never will that flag be honoured with a crown of honour
reaching
To a glory passing this, while it or any flag endures.

The Visit of John Dillon, John Deasy and Sir Thomas Esmonde.

Another story with international implication that was played out in 1889 was the visit to Australia of the MPs Dillon, Deasy and Esmonde, the Parnellite delegates who came to raise money for the salaries of members of the Irish Party in the House of Commons, and to promote Home Rule and defend the Land Leagues.

Unlike certain other places, political differences in Australia did not usually engender lasting bitterness and while many of the locals may have been keen observers of distant troubled lands, generally they were content to remain outsiders who did not allow contentions back home to disturb their own social relations. All might have been well had this situation continued. However, for the visitors, in the United States the usual source of funds, public opinion had turned against terror groups like the Clan-na-Gael and it had become necessary to seek a

new constituency from which to canvass funds. Australia, with its large number of prosperous Irish farmers and businessmen ⁸⁶ seemed the most promising.

Towards the end of May, Dillon held a meeting at the New Masonic Hall in Sydney to a capacity house of 1,300 persons. But only one member of the Government was present; Daniel O'Connor, Parkes' Post-Master General who felt compelled to attend since he had been accused of hiding behind the curtain when the Redmond brothers were in Australia in 1883 on a similar begging mission. ⁸⁷

The men were in Australia for about ten months and in that time Dillon made over 80 speeches. They visited Adelaide (where the tour began), Hobart, Melbourne, Sydney, Brisbane and Townsville, and dozens of towns in between. At large meetings all three of the visitors spoke; but at many of the smaller towns Deasy or Esmonde often spoke alone. ⁸⁸

In Tasmania Esmonde met the man who helped John Mitchel to escape; his name was Quinn. And whilst he was in Hobart, the young baronet stayed with the Governor Sir Robert Hamilton, a Home Ruler when Under-Secretary for Ireland.

Their principal theme was the Irish question in its broadest aspect; and they made the same sort of speeches they would have made had they been back in the House of Commons discussing evictions or the Land Purchase Bill and so on.

That said, they nonetheless raised about 33,000 pounds,⁸⁹ an achievement without which the Plan of Campaign could not have been carried on.

Dillon and his party left Europe for Australia on 6 March 1889, and were away for more than a year. And although they were in Australia for several months from May onwards, for reasons previously discussed having to do with single taxers distancing themselves from the Land Leagues, despite the fact that Home Rule was a worldwide issue of immense interest, one may, significantly, seek in vain for any more than the merest mention of the mission in the *Australian Standard*.

REFERENCES

¹ *Forbes Times*, 19 April 1890.

² *Ibidem*.

³ Stephen Bell, *Rebel, Priest and Prophet: A Biography of Dr. Edward McGlynn*, New York, Robert Schalkenbach Foundation, 1968 edition, hereafter referred to as *Rebel Priest*, p. 217.

⁴ *Ibidem*.

⁵ The "Plan of Campaign" began in 1886 in response to the defeat of Parnell's Tenant Relief Bill. Its contrivers were well aware that their enterprise 'would turn many farms to wilderness.' A. M. Sullivan, *Old Ireland*, 1927. pp. 38-39. See also John Biggs-Davidson and George Chowdharay-Best, *The Cross of St. Patrick the Catholic Unionist Tradition in Ireland*, London, Kensall Press, 1984, hereafter referred to as *Cross of St. Patrick*, p. 225.

⁶ Biggs-Davidson and Chowdharay-Best, *Cross of St. Patrick*, p.229.

⁷ William Windspear, *Radical*, 5 May 1888.

⁸ See 'Gladstone, Ireland and Rome,' *Protestant Standard*, 24 May 1890.

⁹ See Mary Rose Callaghan, *Kitty O'Shea; A Life Of Katherine Parnell*, London, Pandora, 1990.

¹⁰ Henry George, *The Land Question*, New York, Robert Schalkenbach Foundation, 1982 edition, p. 7.

¹¹ *Ibidem*, p. 8

¹² John Farrell 'Introductory,' *Australian Standard*, 9 March 1889.

-
- ¹³ John Farrell, 'Facts Worth Knowing,' *Single Tax*, 25 August 1893.
- ¹⁴ Thomas Halloran, 'Our Land Laws,' *Australian Standard*, 27 April 1889, hereafter referred to as '*Land Laws*.'
- ¹⁵ *Ibidem*.
- ¹⁶ *Ibidem*.
- ¹⁷ Aidan De Brune (editor), *Fifty Years of Progress in Australia*, Sydney, Halstead Press, 1929, p. 117.
- ¹⁸ Thomas Halloran, '*Land Laws*,' 27 April 1889.
- ¹⁹ John Farrell, 'Perjury in High Places,' *Single Tax*, 25 July 1895.
- ²⁰ Halloran '*Land Laws*,' 27 April 1889.
- ²¹ *Ibidem*.
- ²² Halloran gave exclusive credit to Robertson and Parkes for the public School Act, which he considered was amongst the most advanced legislation ever passed in New South Wales.
- ²³ Halloran, '*Land Laws*,' 27 April 1889.
- ²⁴ These figures, reproduced in Harry Holland's, *Socialist*, 10 September 1895, were taken by Holland from William Hanson, *Pastoral Possession in New South Wales*, Sydney, Gipps, Shellard and Co., hereafter referred to as *Pastoral*, Hanson was the Government printer (retired).
- ²⁵ *The Socialist*, 10 September 1895.
- ²⁶ Extracted from *Pastoral*.
- ²⁷ *Ibidem*.
- ²⁸ Rolf Boldrewood, *Shearing in the Riverina 1865*, Sydney, Halstead Press, 1983 edition, p. 2.
- ²⁹ For leasing charges see *Pastoral*, p. 489.
- ³⁰ See E. J. Brady, *Australia Unlimited*, Melbourne, George Robertson, n. d., p p. 844-877.
- ³¹ *Ibidem*.
- ³² *Single Tax*, 6 October 1897.
- ³³ A. W. Martin and P. Wardle, *Members of the Legislative Assembly of New South Wales 1856-1901*, Canberra University Press, 1959, p. 229.
- ³⁴ *Australian Standard*, 9 March 1889.
- ³⁵ Mary Cameron, *The Bulletin*, 'The Inky Way,' 28 January 1904.
- ³⁶ John Farrell, *Australian Standard*, 9 March 1889.
- ³⁷ *Ibidem*.
- ³⁸ *Ibidem*.
- ³⁹ *Australian Standard*, 11 May 1889.
- ⁴⁰ *Australian Standard*, 9 March 1889.
- ⁴¹ *Australian Standard*, 27 April 1889.
- ⁴² *Ibidem*.
- ⁴³ *Australian Standard*, 11 May 1889.
- ⁴⁴ J. Morrison Davidson, *The Wisdom of Windstanley the 'Digger'*, London, Francis Riddell Henderson, 1904.
- ⁴⁵ See Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down*, London, Penguin, 1980 edition.
- ⁴⁶ Colin Ford and Brian Harrison, 'Church and Chapel,' *Years*, p p. 89-110.
- ⁴⁷ Leon De Poncin, *Freemasonry and the Vatican*, Paris, n p., 1968, according to this writer one Professor Aulard a teacher of Revolutionary History at the Sorbonne, put the relationship between Freemasonry and Religion in its true colours: "It is absurd to continue to say: we are not aiming to destroy religion, since we are at once obliged to make the opposite assertion, that this destruction

is indispensable for the rational foundation of the new political and social State. Let us, therefore, no longer proclaim that we do not want to destroy religion, but, on the contrary, that we do want to destroy religion, in order to set up the new State in its place.” P. 168.

⁴⁸ See Walter L. Arnstein, *The Bradlaugh Case, Aethism, Sex and Politics Among the Late Victorians*, University of Missouri Press, 1983.

⁴⁹ These five men were all occasional contributors to the *Australian Standard*.

⁵⁰ John Farrell, *Australian Standard*, 4 May 1889.

⁵¹ *Ibidem*.

⁵² *Australian Standard*, 11 May 1889.

⁵³ *Ibidem*.

⁵⁴ *Ibidem*.

⁵⁵ Caused by the death of the newly-elected member of Parliament, J. R. Linsley.

⁵⁶ *Australian Standard*, 29 June 1889.

⁵⁷ John Farrel, ‘Of Course We are the Free traders,’ *Australian Standard*, 3 August 1889.

⁵⁸ *Australian Standard*, 28 January 1890.

⁵⁹ *Australian Standard*, 3 August 1890, p p. 3 and 15.

⁶⁰ *Ibidem*.

⁶¹ John Farrell, ‘The Humbug of Protection,’ *Daily Telegraph*, 28 December, 1889.

⁶² *Ibidem*.

⁶³ *Ibidem*.

⁶⁴ *Australian Standard*, 3 August 1890.

⁶⁵ ‘The Single Tax Movement’ *Daily Telegraph*, 3 December 1889, hereafter referred to as *Movement*.

⁶⁶ See A. G. Yewen, ‘Single Taxism v. Trades Unionism and Socialism,’ *Daily Telegraph*, 7 January 1890.

⁶⁷ *Movement*, 3 December 1889.

⁶⁸ *Ibidem*.

⁶⁹ *Ibidem*.

⁷⁰ Grahame H. Cummings, *The Foundations of Freemasonry in Australia*, Sydney, 1992, hereafter referred to as *Foundations*, p. 21.

⁷¹ *The Bulletin*, quoted in the *Australian Standard*, 27 April 1889.

⁷² See Bede Nairn, *Civilizing Capitalism*, p.32; Bruce Scates, ‘Wobblers’ Single Taxers in the Labour Movement, Melbourne 1889-1899,’ *Historical Studies*, 21(1981/83), hereafter referred to as ‘Wobblers,’ passim; Picard, *George*, passim.

⁷³ *Australian Standard*, 15 June 1889.

⁷⁴ Grahame H. Cummings, *Foundations*, p. 13.

⁷⁵ From the *Bulletin*, n.d., quoted by Cotton in the *Single Tax*, 20 April 1894.

⁷⁶ *Ibidem*.

⁷⁷ See for example, ‘Robbing the Single Tax League,’ *Newcastle Morning Herald*, 7 June 1890.

⁷⁸ Paul Stenhouse, ‘Pegasus,’ p. 250.

⁷⁹ *Australian Standard*, 28 January 1890.

⁸⁰ *Ibidem*.

⁸¹ *Australian Standard*, 1 September 1889.

⁸² For a judgement on Thorne see Colin Ford and Brian Harrison, *Years*, p p. 89-110.

⁸³ *Australian Standard*, 7 September 1889.

⁸⁴ *Ibidem*.

⁸⁵ *Ibidem*.

⁸⁶ This is a theme worthy of much closer study, e. g., Loneragans, at Mudgee; Dalton brothers at Orange and Sydney; Wilson family et al. For one reliable but older source see F. S. Cleary, *Australia's Debt to Irish Nation-Builders*, Sydney, Angus and Robertson, 1933.

⁸⁷ *Protestant Standard*, 18 May 1889.

⁸⁸ *Daily Telegraph*, 'The Return of Mr. Dillon and Sir Thomas Esmonde,' 2 June 1890.

⁸⁹ This was Dillon's own estimate. See F. S. L. Lyons, *John Dillon A Biography*, London, Rutledge and Kegan Paul, 1968, p. 106.

4. Henry George in Australia.

I have in this inquiry followed the course of my own thought. When ...I set out on it, I had no theory to support, no conclusions to prove. Only when I first realised the squalid misery of a great city, it appalled... me, and would not let me rest, for thinking of what caused it and how it could be cured. - Henry George, *Progress and Poverty*.

Introduction.

In his book *Protection or Freetrade* (1886) George attempted to show how true freedom of international, national, and local trade and commerce, the free movement of people, their products and their ideas across all boundries would promote peace. He also tried to show how the end of all monopolies and privileges, especially those of land, all advantages, special statutes, all restrictions upon free and fair competition in domestic and world markets are prerequisites to the achievement of a rational society in which both sexes can enjoy equality of opportunity for themselves, and in so doing, reap the full reward of their contribution to the economy and society.

Considering the tremendous number of his books that were sold; his five speaking tours of Great Britain and Ireland; his trip to Australasia, and the promotional work he did throughout his own country, one might rightfully claim that George was the foremost protagonist in the worldwide movement for the

emancipation of labour in the second half of the 19th century. As one historian puts it, the thinking of the English labour movement was based more on George and his catch-phrase ‘the unearned increment,’ than it ever was on Marx’s ‘surplus value,’¹ a view wholly endorsed by the Webbs.²

Similarly, Alfred Russell Wallace the British naturalist, writing to his friend Charles Darwin in 1881 about one of George’s books, said:

There is... a discussion of Malthus’s *Principles of Population*, to which both you and I [are] indebted. The present writer, Mr. George, while admitting the main principle...in the case of animals and plants, denies that it has ever operated in the case of man, still less that it has any bearing whatever on the rest of social and political questions which have been supported by a reference to it. He illustrates and supports his views with a wealth of illustrative facts and cogency of argument which I have rarely seen equalled, while his style is equal to Buckle, and thus his book is delightful reading. The title of the book is *Progress and Poverty*. It is the most startling, novel, and original book of the last twenty years, and if I mistake not will in the future rank as making an advance in political and social science equal to that made by Adam Smith a century ago.³

George’s ideas, however, were, as he always admitted, not wholly his own. Thomas Spence (1750-1814), the author of the delightfully titled

Constitution of Spensonia, A Country in Fairyland situated between Utopia and Oceana (1801) and other works, was one important influence. One that might have been was *Die Erlesung der Darbenden Menschheit* (The Salvation of Starving Mankind) (1871) by the German writer A. Th. Stamm.

In 1889, one J. W. Sullivan attacked George as a plagiarist, asserting the central core of *Progress and Poverty* came from a book by Patrick Dove entitled *The Theory of Human Progression*. George replied that he had not heard of Dove's book until 1881. Moreover, the book was published anonymously, only a few copies were printed, and it was of such a character that it never acquired any popularity and had been practically forgotten. Except the two books agreed in the recognition of certain fundamental truths, which George had always contended were self-evident, there was little resemblance between them.⁴ It was also very likely that Dove's book would have languished in obscurity had not the extraordinary effect of *Progress and Poverty* on the public's mind stimulated an interest in earlier writings on the question. This was the same interest that caused Herbert Spencer's *Social Statics* to be republished in 1892.

George referred to Dove's work in lectures in Great Britain in the mid-1880s and claimed that they had independently discovered the same truths. He also pointed out that there were others before Dove. Bishop Nulty of Ireland, Herbert Spencer, as well as Quesnay and the other *physiocrats* had also seen it

clearly. And William Ogilvie, professor at Aberdeen (whose essay on the *Right of Property in Land* (1782) George did not see until years after *Progress and Poverty* was published) saw that the value of land belonged to the community and constituted the natural revenue fund. 'Adam Smith was on the verge of discovering it,' George wrote, 'while John Locke and some of the Fathers of the Church saw it dimly or in part.' ⁵

Annie Fox or Mrs. Henry George.

Much has been made of these various influences on George, but there seems to be no record of any input from his wife. Yet it is scarcely believable that Annie did not have a special knowledge of the land question, or strong opinions on the matter. After all, her's was an emigrant family, one small part of the human flood of mainly innocent, softly spoken Gaels who had been forced to leave Ireland through seven centuries of misrule when, long before the 'Black' famine of the 1840s, it was possible to see small circles of families standing about the cobbled quayside of Queenstown (now Cobh from whence the *Titanic* departed), or the small harbours of Baltimore, Ballina, Westport, or Tralee, receiving the blessing before they departed, with a chill wind flicking icy droplets of grey-green spray into their faces – as only the wind coming off the Atlantic can. And with every face fresh with worry and poverty writ large.

Annie's fortunes as a girl were centred in Sydney, in the period just before the end of Transportation and the discovery of gold; at a time when flogging and other punishments (especially on Norfolk Island) were still used to instill discipline into day-dreaming Hibernians unused to the rhythms of modern life.⁶ Annie's uncle, Matthew McCluskey, who was her guardian when she married Henry George, had earlier emigrated from Ireland to the United States where he, like so many of his countrymen, also flourished. Elizabeth Fox nee McCluskey, Annie's mother, was the daughter of Henry McCluskey, a blacksmith from Limerick, and it was he who first brought the family to New South Wales and later, to California. Annie's father was John Fox, a major serving in the British Army in Sydney. They were married in Saint Mary's Church (now the Cathedral) on 31 August 1839, by the Vicar-General Father Francis Murphy, a friend of McCluskey who, ever mindful of the machination of dissenters, was soon to be cast in the unhappy role of the first Catholic Archbishop of Adelaide.⁷ Fox was thirty-six years of age and Elizabeth was sixteen.

Some Tour Preliminaries.

Charles Launcelot Garland M P, president of the STL, claimed that it was due to the influence of Annie George, who was Australian by birth, and who was

naturally anxious to visit the country where she was born, that finally persuaded Henry George to do a lecture tour of Australia.⁸

For years numerous attempts had been made to induce George to come, but his time was so occupied with public speaking, writing, and in publishing the New York *Standard*, that such a long trip seemed impossible. In the early part of 1889, however, the League's executive took advantage of the approaching departure for the United States of Garland, to commission him to invite George to lecture in Australia (Garland was going for business reasons, he owned the Australian patent rights of the 'improved' Edison Phonograph⁹). Garland took with him the necessary letters of introduction, but on arrival, found George was not in the country, having just left to conduct a campaign in Great Britain and Ireland.

While waiting to take ship for England, Garland was entertained by Henry George junior. He then followed George to London, and was present at the debate between Samuel Smith and George at the National Liberal Club. He was also present at the famous debate between George and Henry Mayers Hyndman, the leader of the Socialist party in England. Wishing to spend as much time as he could with George, he accompanied him through Ireland. The first meeting addressed by the American was in Belfast, where Garland, too, said a few words.

¹⁰ Next, George went to Toonbridge, a village in the North, then it was on to

Dublin where he spoke to a large crowd in the Rotunda. Michael Davitt, who acted as chairman in Dublin, was then an enthusiastic single taxer ¹¹ which set him apart from Parnell.

In every speech George made the point that every year 17,000,000 pounds went out of Ireland to pay rents to absentee landlords who did nothing for it. He also defended Home Rule and argued that so long as Ireland was ruled by an English Parliament, she would not get justice. The gist of his case was easily put; the owners of Ireland belonged to the House of Lords, and to ask English parliamentarians to deal justly with Ireland 'was simply to ask the landowners of Ireland to give up their rents.' ¹²

Since George's early boyhood, Australia had been a place of peculiar interest. His first voyage to sea in 1855, as a boy aboard the ship *Hindoo*, put him in Melbourne in the early days of the gold discoveries in Victoria. Later, he became interested in the legislation of Australia. The introduction of the secret ballot, which he had strongly put forward in America, and other enactments, made him think of Australians as progressives, and Australia as a place where his ideas might be implemented. There was also the sentimental inducement that Mrs. George was born in Sydney, and she accompanied him.

Their route lay across the continent of America, to San Francisco; and all along the line of travel supporters came trooping to the stations to greet them. On

the way George spoke at Bradford, Pennsylvania; Denver, Colorado; and Los Angeles, California; and in each city he spoke to large appreciative audiences. They also stopped for a few hours at St. Louis, Missouri, to see Annie George's elder sister, Teresa (also born in Sydney), who was a member of the Order of the Daughters of St. Vincent de Paul, better known as the Sisters of Charity.¹³

From the time that George arrived in California until his departure the newspapers gave him a good press, and praised him for being so well known. But he was busy from the time he arrived in San Francisco on Tuesday, 4 February 1890, to the moment of sailing on the following Saturday. He spoke twice at the Metropolitan Hall – on Tuesday and Friday night – and once in Oakland and, since Christianity was his motivation, he also gave an address to an audience of clergymen. Tuesday night's address was to a paid, general audience, Friday night was free, and intended for working men. Both were successful, the hall being filled on each occasion.

Of his reception, one local paper claimed: "For fully five minutes after stepping to the front of the stage, Mr. George looked upon a scene of wild applause." When silence had come, the "Prophet of San Francisco," the prophet who was being honoured by his former fellow-townsmen, commenced to speak in a voice that almost broke from emotion.

The address then delivered was preserved and published under the title:
Justice the Object – Taxation the Means. ¹⁴

It is quite distinct from other of George's lectures. All the circumstances gave it an intimate touch, seen in the many personal references he made. Of the Friday night meeting, the *San Francisco Examiner* reported: "Hundreds unable to find seats stood in the aisles and along the walls woollen shirted men sat side by side with elegantly dressed women. The audience was thoroughly cosmopolitan, and all the different elements that went to make up the crowd were equally enthusiastic, and frequent applause shook the building." ¹⁵

The Tour of Australia.

On the following day, Saturday, 8 February 1890, Henry and Annie George sailed on the steamship *Mariposa* for Sydney, where they were expected to arrive about a month later.

George was due in Sydney from New Zealand on Thursday, 6 March 1890, so the Second Annual Single Tax Conference was conveniently scheduled for the 4th to allow delegates to meet him. Farrell attended as the delegate for the New Zealand Leagues since he had only recently arrived back in Sydney after preparing the way for George in New Zealand, and spending time with Sir Robert Stout and Sir George Grey. Twenty-seven country Leagues sent delegates from New South Wales in addition to those from Sydney, Brisbane, Adelaide and

Melbourne. Delegates were cheered at successfully obtaining one of the planks in their platform, namely payment to Parliamentarians, which had just been approved. MPs were to get 300 pounds per year (Farrell earned 1,000 pounds a year as editor of the *Telegraph* ¹⁶), with free railway and tramway travel. ¹⁷ E. W. Foxall moved that a Federation of Australian States be promoted, and after long discussion this resolution was adopted by the Conference, as was a resolution to oppose any candidate who did not declare in favour of taxation on land values. ¹⁸

At the close, on Tuesday, 4 March, word came that the steamer, having left Auckland earlier than scheduled, would arrive before morning and, as George wrote later, ¹⁹ the *Mariposa* could have arrived earlier ‘had our captain allowed her to put forth her speed.’ Numbers of delegates and their friends secured all the available beds in waterside hotels and awaited the arrival of the vessel. Some indication of the mood of heightened anticipation that prevailed among Single Taxers at this time (due mainly to the meetings in the Temperance Hall arranged by the Campaign Committee to arouse public interest) might be gauged from Farrell’s description of what happened next. Hardly had the delegates assembled for the Wednesday conference, at 2 p. m., when they were told that a flag announcing the arrival of the *Mariposa* was flying from the Post Office Tower. There was an immediate stampede for the steam launch *Invincible* that Garland had chartered. It was very soon over- crowded with excited Single Tax delegates.

As the launch was setting out news came that the flag had nothing to do with the San Francisco mail, but the delegates decided to make for the Heads just the same. When in Watson's Bay, the steamer hove to, and awaited the appearance of the vessel. While they were waiting, the delegates made the best of their situation by hiring the band of the *Liguria*, a cruise ship moored nearby, and by taking aboard large quantities of refreshments. The *Mariposa* not being signalled at half-past 6, a return was made to the city, and all hope of the moonlight trip to meet George was given up for the day.²⁰

In Australia at Last.

The *Mariposa* arrived at dawn the next morning and the delegates scrambled aboard 'in a manner that almost involved several fights with the crew.'

²¹ While Garland and Farrell, and other members of the executive, were welcoming the Georges, the conference, such as it was, went on under Frank Cotton.

The *Mariposa* came to her moorings at Cowper Street wharf in Woolloomooloo Bay at 6 a. m., and the visitors were taken in pouring rain to their apartments at the Hotel Metropole, one of Sydney's finest, where numerous well-wishers greeted them for the rest of the day. George had proposed to go to the Single Tax Conference in the afternoon, but a constant stream of interviews with reporters kept him away.

At 6 p. m. George returned to the ship, which he left again, accompanied by some of the delegates at 7 o'clock. At Circular Quay the party were put into carriages and, headed by a brass band playing American tunes, set out for the Town Hall ²² to be received by Sydney Burdekin the Lord Mayor and a crowd estimated at 2,000 persons. "Just a few words!" demanded the crowd as George raised his hat in response to the welcome, and the request being shouted again, he 'complied.' With the speech made, more cheering broke out when the Georges entered the hall where the mayor, surrounded by representatives of politics, the arts and commerce, met them and introduced the visitors to other guests of note..

Shortly thereafter George spoke in response to Burdekin's welcome, making the kind of speech one might expect of an able and experienced orator. He chose his targets carefully and in one part said: 'I congratulate you on your streets. I saw lines of street tramways owned, they tell me, by the people. You can teach us [Americans] a lesson there. We made the mistake of handing our tramways over to private individuals and we built up great monopolies. We created colossal fortunes, but we have not been well served, and in the United States railways have been a corrupt power.' These remarks were greeted with applause, which was renewed when George reminded the crowd that Tom L. Johnson, 'America's greatest freetrader,' advocated the tramways not only being owned by the municipalities but being run free by them, just as the owner of a

large hotel runs a lift free for his customers. The lift increased the value of the room and a higher rental resulted. The free trams would increase the value of property in its vicinity, and the municipalities could recoup their costs by a tax on the value of the land.²³

George concluded with the words: 'If you can teach us more, for God's sake teach it – advance Australia!' A thunder of applause followed his call, and continued well after he had resumed his seat. George was followed by Daniel O'Connor M.P and D'Arcy Reeve, the grandson of William Charles Wentworth. Reeve, in Britain in 1889, devoted 2,000 pounds to the diffusion of Georgist ideas. However, with these speeches over, the reception concluded with cheers for the visitor and the Mayor.

The Tough Schedule Begins

In January 1890, single taxers learnt that the Rev. A. J. Griffith, of the Congregational Church, Balmain, had started a *Progress and Poverty* class, and the Rev. Isaac Sargenson, of Rookwood, had offered to speak at a public meeting of the Single Tax League. The Rev. J. Hastings, Adelaide, offered his pulpit to George during his South Australian trip, and the Rev. Keith Mackay, of Sandhurst (Victoria) made the same offer.²⁴ On Friday 7 March, in the afternoon, George was the guest at the daily luncheon of the members of the Presbyterian Assembly at Baumann's Café, and on being introduced by Foxall, a vice-

president of the STL, was warmly welcomed by the ministers and laymen present. At the end of the luncheon, T.K. Clouston, the Moderator of the Assembly, expressed the pleasure he felt in welcoming George on behalf of the Presbyterians. 'Most of them had read his writings,' he said, 'and were greatly impressed with the religious tone which pervaded them.' ²⁵

That evening, George returned to the Town Hall to be banquetted by the Single Tax League. Thus the banquet was attended by Georgists, all of whom claimed to be staunch democrats. Consequently evening dress – an emblem of social status – was nowhere to be seen, the league having made it clear that the banquet was not 'a dress function.' There were about 200 persons present and Charles Garland presided.

In a speech to 'the honoured guest,' John Plumb, the League's only other M P, said he 'thought Henry George was as inspired as Jesus Christ was 1800 years ago when He came to liberate the toilers.' In response, George identified those present as men 'who would carry out the principles of Richard Cobden (1804-1865) "the Apostle of Free Trade" to their fullest extent.' ²⁶ Frank Cotton then responded to George, and after a closing toast to the 'Trades and Labour Council and the Maritime Council,' the proceeding terminated with 'three cheers for the visitors.' ²⁷

On the following night, Saturday, 9 March, George was scheduled to deliver his first lecture in the Protestant Hall (Sydney's largest venue), and on Sunday evening it was arranged for him to preach at the Pitt-Street Congregational Church. On Monday morning at 11 o'clock he was to meet representatives of the trades and labor bodies to discuss various questions relating to work and wages in the colony, and in the evening he would speak in the Exhibition Building in Prince Alfred Park.

A great crowd gathered at the Protestant Hall, Castlereagh-Street, on Saturday evening, to hear George deliver the first of his series of anti-poverty lectures, entitled 'The Land for the People.' There was a considerable degree of struggling for admission, and some little time before the 8 o'clock start the galleries were packed and the lower portion of the hall was filled.²⁸ And the American did not disappoint them. According to a report in the *Echo* (part of the Fairfax stable) and an opponent of the Single Tax, George was a lecturer of considerable ability:

Imagine, then, for two hours this man walking to and fro in his narrow strip of platform - 12 ft. say by 3 - and speaking entirely without M S., notes...speaking, too, in a slow, almost solemn, voice and dealing with phases of what Carlyle named "the dismal science." For a man under these circumstances to keep the eager,

strained attention of a packed hall, including men of every shade of politics, is an intellectual feat. I said at the commencement of this article that not one man in our community, in my opinion, could even draw such a house; I add, that not a man here, even if he could pack the Protestant Hall as it was filled on Saturday night, and with a similar class, could hold them so absolutely on the same ground for a fraction of two hours. Much of it is in his mental affinity to his audience, much in his personal magnetism.²⁹

In closing the reporter from the *Echo* wrote: ‘He appealed to the pity of men for other men, for women, for children, victimized and crushed by the very conditions of their hard existence, and in his protest against these evils he appealed to the true sentiments in his audience. It was an address that came, the best of it, from the heart as well as the head.’ ‘Trivial at times, in its best parts it rose into semi-religious fervour and height’ he wrote. ‘No one who was present can deny that a very deep impression was made.’³⁰

Meanwhile J. J. Foster, a representative of the ‘Henry George Campaign Committee’ (conducted by W. E. Johnson), had returned to Sydney that morning after completing the arrangements for George’s Western Tour. With little time off, Foster left the following day to organize meetings in Melbourne and at towns along the way.

At this point, it is necessary to recall that Annie George's parents, John Fox and Elizabeth McCluskey, in 1839, lived in a small property near Hyde Park in Market-Street East which had grounds enough for keeping a cow.³¹ Meanwhile, Elizabeth's parents, Henry and Mary McCluskey, lived close by at 169 Phillip-Street, where Henry ran his own iron-mongery and blacksmithing business.³² However, despite the depression in the early 1840s, McCluskey's very practical skills were in demand, and in 1843 he moved to premises on, or very near the site of what is now the Pitt Street Congregational Church. But before the church was built, it was there, while Elizabeth and her first child, Teresa, were apart from John Fox, that Annie was born.³³ No mention of this fact was made publicly by Annie at the time nor later by the family biographers. But since Annie left New South Wales as a child, it may be that she was unaware of the significance to her of George's visit to the Church. Moreover, since her mother was deceased, and she only returned to Sydney as a mature woman, who was there to tell her?

Henry George preached at the Pitt Street Congregational Church in the evening of Sunday, 10 March, taking for his text the words, "Thy Kingdom Come." The Rev. D. Jackson, having conducted the first part of the service, gave his pulpit over to George, who then addressed the congregation. He pointed out that Christianity was a creed which, starting among an 'obscure people,' was

preached by fishermen and tentmakers and made its way against persecution, tyranny, ridicule, against the opposition and derision of the learned, until eventually it 'conquered the world.' ³⁴

George told the gathering he believed that Christianity was about to move to a higher stage. He believed the conviction was growing that the gulf which separated the rich from the poor was unnecessary, he believed that the social dangers that everywhere seemed to be rising, and which charity had shown its impotency to relieve, could be relieved by justice. ³⁵ 'Christianity,' he said, 'was responsible for ending negro slavery, and now it was rising to fulfil the promise of God's kingdom on earth. There could be but one result 'The triumph of right all over the civilized world.' ³⁶

Monday evening saw George in the Exhibition Building in Prince Alfred Park, Redfern. Rain had been falling almost non-stop since his arrival; suburbs were flooded, many families unhoused, and despite the conditions over 6,000 people turned up, a large percentage of them women.

The following night, in the same building, George spoke to a crowd of between 3,000 and 4,000, the relative fewness of numbers being due to the cyclonic wind and rain that continued to batter Sydney. The chairman of the second lecture in the Exhibition Building was George Herbert, president of the Maritime Council. George's lecture was entitled: "Labour and the Tariff." ³⁷

On the Tuesday of that week, George found that the committee that had charge of the arrangements had made engagements for him to speak right from the day he landed in Sydney. He pleaded that this was excessive and asked to be excused from a lecture they had proposed for Wednesday night. Later in the day, however, he received a letter from the Committee of the Unemployed asking his assistance. After considering the matter he decided to forego any time off and give a lecture for their benefit on Wednesday evening. Frank Cotton duly booked the Protestant Hall for the meeting and, since George refused to accept any payment, admission to the lecture was free.

At the end of the first week or so, there was little doubt that George's mission had been a success in important respects, as measured in creating a great force of public opinion in favour of land value taxation. There was every probability he would be similarly successful in the country districts.

The evening of Saint Patrick's day found George in the Elite Skating Rink at Newcastle speaking to a crowd of over 2,000 persons.³⁸ On the platform were, among others, the Rev. Canon Selwyn, Alderman Christie (Mayor of Newcastle), James Curley, M P, W.S. Thompson and John L. Fegan, a well-known Methodist lay preacher, and future Labor MP. Besides an interest in Henry George, all the men were members of the Freetrade and Liberal Association.³⁹

During the course of the evening George repeated his arguments in favour of the Single Tax, and denounced protection in the strongest terms. 'Wage-earners,' he declared, 'did not want protection but only freedom and justice.' And because Richard Cobden's theory had never been fully implemented there, he did not call New South Wales a 'really freetrade colony.' At the end of the lecture George took several questions from the floor, and the proceedings, which had been orderly throughout, concluded at 10.30 p. m. The following day, still in the Hunter District, George spoke to a meeting at Maitland.

On Thursday, 20 March, a crowd accompanied George to Lithgow where they were met by a torchlight procession and a band, as Farrell wrote to the readers of the *New York Standard*:

The rain and the wretched poverty-stricken place it is. The whole town suffers under the direct blight of landlordism more than any other I know out here, and the coal miners live in miserable huts, which they are allowed to build on the mine owners' lands, by paying a small ground rental, and which ultimately becomes the mine owners' property. The look of the place is enough to make a white man sick, so wretched is it, so unprogressive and shabby.⁴⁰

Farrell had always seen landlordism as a cruel and unjust imposition.⁴¹ Some time previous to George's visit, cutting close to the bone for his country readers, Farrell noted that in towns like Queanbeyan, Lithgow, Mudgee and Yass

there are many shops the tenants of which pay about one pound (per) week rent, and contrive to get a living. In Sydney, tenants of precisely similar shops pay 3 pounds to 6 pounds per week, and contrive to get a living. The building of each of these differently located shops cost about the same, and the difference in rent represents advantage of location, which all goes to the land owner who has never... added to the wealth of the community. Whether in the up-country or in the metropolis, labor and capital can only get about the same returns. But what enormously different returns landlordism can get!⁴²

At the Lithgow meeting some important questions were put to George, when asked the difference between admitting Chinese goods and the Chinese themselves? He answered: 'The difference is that Chinese goods don't eat rice, drink rum, wear pigtails, and smoke opium.'⁴³

After Lithgow George went on Mudgee, Orange and Bathurst; and was 'quietly received' at Cootamundra, the afternoon of Friday 21 March. In the evening he addressed a large crowd, and when the question of immigration was raised again, he replied that he thought people were justified in excluding races

which they thought could not be assimilated. In this instance he avoided mentioning the Chinese and instead pointed to the danger in Canada 'of the French elements wanting to maintain the French language.' ⁴⁴

Saturday, 22 March, saw George in Wagga Wagga, arriving at the station over an hour late at 10 o'clock in the morning. The members of the Reception Committee, with their chairman, J. R. Garland, waited with a four-horse dray to convey the Georges to town. When the train put in an appearance, George was greeted by his Wagga disciples George Kebblewhite and Walter William Head (who changed his name to William Ashe Woods). The party then drove to the Town Hall where arrangements had been made for an official welcome by the Mayor, C. H. Croaker. Immediately after the reception, George was driven to the Commercial Hotel, where an address written by W. C. Hunter, President of the Murrumbidgee Single Tax Association, was read out by Walter Head:

Sir, - We your disciples of Wagga Wagga, in the Colony of New South Wales, welcome you to our town, and tender you our homage. We are believers in your doctrines, distributors of your literature, and untiring advocates of the principles you inculcate. The civilized world at the present moment is agitated by the unrest of labor, and we feel that unrest will be disastrous to the nations, unless the reforms you propose are quickly initiated...In this young country, land monopoly has already attained gigantic proportions. Six-tenths of the alienated land of the

'Landlords, 'Wobblers,' and the Labour Movement.'

colony are owned by five hundred and eighty persons, and we look with confidence to your advent to our shores, and to the dissemination of your works, to stop and eventually to destroy this crying wrong. Our best endeavours will be devoted to assist you in your great crusade, and our admiration, respect, and esteem for you will end only with our lives.⁴⁵

The address was very handsomely got up, being printed on white satin and addressed to Henry George, author of *Progress and Poverty*.⁴⁶

At the meeting held that same evening, Saturday, 22 March, the Wagga Oddfellows' Hall was filled by a large audience that included 'a number of ladies.'⁴⁷ Mayor Croacker presided, and amongst those on the platform were the Venerable Archdeacon Pownall and the single taxers Hunter, Halloran, Heydon, Kebblewhite and Head.

The enthusiasm displayed and the interest shown in the doctrines expounded by George at his lecture, according to Head at least, caused 'a number of people' to think it was a good time to promulgate George's ideas more widely, and he publicly suggested that steps be taken to establish a *Progress and Poverty* class, or an Economic Debating Society. The objects would be to discuss George's arguments, with a view to increasing knowledge in a question 'which is one of the most important the world has had to deal with.'⁴⁸

The following day, Sunday, George arrived in Albury and was met by G. A. Thompson, the mayor, and by a committee of the local branch of the Single Tax League ⁴⁹ that included alderman Luke Gulson, ⁵⁰ Farrell's old friend from his days at the Turk's Head Hotel.

George was sometimes accompanied by W. E. Johnson and Frank Cotton, as their duties in Sydney permitted. And Cotton, who was also well-known, was described by the local press as a 'prominent *doctrinaire*'. ⁵¹ A dray was provided to take the visitors into town, and after the formal introductions, the party, including the mayor, drove to the Albury Hotel for speeches and light refreshments. Sunday afternoon was then spent visiting points of interest about this rather splendid country town which, in the quiet solitude of the place, was appreciated, and remarked upon by George.

His mission to the city of Albury was straightforward enough; to expose the fallacy of protection and to explain the benefits of Federation. Albury was of special interest to the single taxers, as was the river Murray that flowed past its doors. The peculiarity of the interest in the river arose from the fact that it divided two colonies of substantially the one people – subjects of one sovereign. On either side were Custom-stations with Customs-house officers, a ridiculous situation in the eyes of the Americans, as George told the large crowd that came to hear him lecture the following night at the Mechanics' Institute. ⁵²

At the end of his talk George took questions from the floor including one from George Plummer, a writer well known to readers of the *Liberator* and *Radical* on the contention recently put by E. W. O'Sullivan, that poverty arose through drunkenness and laziness.⁵³ George replied at length. He explained that drunkenness was the outcome of poverty, and that poverty caused feelings of despair that drove people to drink. As proof (and playing down the land and race divide) he suggested: 'It was not unusual to charge the woes of Ireland to the laziness of the Irish,⁵⁴ but remove the Irish to another place where the conditions were more favourable, and they become the most industrious of men.'

On the platform with George that night were Rev. J. Wilson (Congregational) who chaired the meeting and, keeping company with Cotton, Johnson and Gulson, were the 'lesser' lights A. Brittlebank, T. H. Wilkinson, W. J. Jones, and William Affleck, in 1894 the Labor member for Yass Plains. The following night George would lecture in the Town Hall, Melbourne.

The lectures George gave in Melbourne during the first week were well attended, and provoked considerable criticism, hostile and otherwise. Generally speaking critics, while acknowledging his ability, thought no government would ever give practical effect to his ideas. In the meantime, a conference was held at the Trades Hall between representatives of the Trades Hall Council and members of George's party to consider the proposal for a debate between Henry George

and W.A. Trenwith, M.L.A., a champion of Protection policy. J. Hancock, president of the THC, chaired the meeting. The 7th of April was put forward by the land nationalists as a probable date for the encounter. The manner in which the debate should be conducted was also considered, and it was resolved that George should open in a 10 minutes' speech; that Trenwith should reply in 15 minutes; then George 10 minutes; Trenwith 10 minutes; George 5 minutes; Trenwith 5 minutes; and George 5 minutes in conclusion;⁵⁵ the 'standard' procedure at that time. But this meeting was arranged without George's knowledge or consent⁵⁶ and for a time it seemed there would be no debate. A good deal of ego-soothing later, George, writing from the Grand Hotel explained to the THC: 'Although the challenge issued on my behalf...[was done] without my authorization or knowledge, and without fault on your part, [it] placed me in a position of seeming antagonism to the Trades Council, which I would not willingly assume, yet, since Mr. Trenwith has expressed disappointment at not having the opportunity to meet me, and this feeling is seemingly shared by others, I will go as far as I can to gratify him and them.'⁵⁷ The debate finally took place on Easter Monday night, 10th April, in the concert-room of the Exhibition Building.

There was really nothing to be gained from George debating with Trenwith, he could scarcely display Trenwith's scalp on his belt in London or

New York, as the man was virtually unknown outside of Melbourne.

Nevertheless, as the *Argus* reported the following day; 'The debate cannot be considered seriously, Trenwith never rose to George's height. In plain English the local man was utterly lost.' ⁵⁸

Leaving Melbourne, George's caravan swung north to Echuca.

The effect of Henry George's lecture in the town was very encouraging.

Most of the 'leading' identities were present, and a good many farmers from the country round. Some who had hitherto opposed Georgism openly declared that they had never understood the single tax before and that they now saw it 'in another light.' Unfortunately, it was impossible for George to do more than touch upon the principals of the Single Tax theory, and because of the disinformation spread mainly by the *Star*, it was necessary to return again and again to old misconceptions and put them right.

Nonetheless the visit excited some lively discussion, even before George arrived. On the 9th of April the 'Single Tax' was the subject for debate at the Mutual Improvement Society in connection with the Presbyterian Church. Moreover, after the visit, on the 19th April, F.M. Higgs read an essay on 'The Justice of the Single Tax' for the Echuca Young Men's Christian Association.

Henry George's Visit to Forbes.

Forbes, the 'Mecca' of the single tax movement in New South Wales, was an unscheduled stop for George. His visit was outside his original engagement, and was made hurriedly as a compliment to the local Branch because it was in Forbes that the first Land Nationalisation meeting took place in 1887. The secretary and president of the local league, C.F. Price and Charles Wait, met George, who was accompanied by Frank Cotton and F.O. Furner, at Grenfell, having driven out for that purpose.

Seven miles from Forbes a large number of vehicles and horsemen were assembled to meet the American. An open carriage, with two freshly-groomed greys, was provided for the Georges, and the procession then formed, gathering additional recruits along the way, until on reaching Forbes the cavalcade was over half-a-mile in length, with squads of horsemen on either side as outriders.⁵⁹

The public meeting at the Osborne Hall was crowded. Enthusiasts having ridden and driven in fifty or sixty miles in order to be present. After the lecture George and his travelling companions were entertained at the Albion Hotel, and speeches were delivered, and toasts drunk far into the night.

George gave one lecture in Forbes, on Monday 14 April,⁶⁰ although neither he nor his committee received one penny for his effort.⁶¹

The visitors left for Cowra on the Tuesday morning, and from there it was on to South Australia, which, since they already had a tax on land values,

impressed George as the most advanced of the colonies.⁶² He spoke in Adelaide on 21 April.⁶³ And in a bitter attack, the *Sydney Bulletin* suggested 'that in his progress through Australia he has learnt such facts and been informed with such principles, that he has seen fit to modify the Single Tax doctrine as formulated by him in *Progress and Poverty*.'

In his biography of his father, Henry George Jr. writes 'George made the acquaintance of Chief Justice Way.' And notes that 'Way... attended every lecture and speech that George delivered in Adelaide.'⁶⁴ George Jr. also said that his father was 'strongly impressed' by the Rev. Hugh Gilmore, whom he dubbed 'the Dr. McGlynn of South Australia.' If the dates given for George's movements in Australia by the newspapers are correct, then we must accept that George did not meet Gilmore at this time, although George Jr. leaves the impression that he did. Such a meeting was then not possible. Gilmore, 'the red parson,'⁶⁵ was in New South Wales as a guest of the Primitive Methodist Church at Newcastle; where he gave 'at least three lectures' that made clear his support of Henry George.'⁶⁶ It is likely though that George met him in some other place, or that he knew Gilmore from earlier visits to Great Britain; Gilmore arrived in South Australia in 1889.⁶⁷

George arrived in Albury on Saturday, 3 May, from Melbourne on his way to Sydney, and on Sunday morning preached in the Congregational Church.

⁶⁸ Taking the words “Thy Kingdom Come,” he reminded people that the world had been praying for the coming of the Kingdom for centuries. And although he was not there to say how it could be done, it was certain that wrong existed and that a way must exist by which justice could be done and wrong righted. ⁶⁹ He concluded by emphasizing the need for people to exercise their ‘privilege’ of helping to bring forward ‘that time in which prophets had told them Justice shall be triumphant and the will of God on earth be as it was in Heaven.’ ⁷⁰

A day or two later found George back in Sydney before heading north to Brisbane and Rockhampton. On one of his rare days off, he and Farrell were sitting on the balcony of Peter McNaught’s home overlooking the Parramatta River at Hunters Hill. With them were E. W. Foxall, Walter Elliot Johnson, Charles Garland and J. S. Ramsay. Suddenly from behind Pulpit Point a flotilla of sailing ships ‘shot out.’

‘Beautiful,’ cried George, ‘but isn’t this just a bit like breaking the Sabbath?’

‘Oh, no,’ said Farrell, ‘our Sabbath was broken when we got it.’ ⁷¹

George returned to Sydney on the last day of May after his Queensland trip in which he met Sir Samuel Griffith, the ex- Premier. ⁷²

During his hectic New South Wales tour Farrell had accompanied the Single Tax leader everywhere. The latter’s ‘lecture tour marathon was equalled only by

‘Landlords, ‘Wobblers,’ and the Labour Movement.’

Farrell's massive journalistic *tour de force*.' ⁷³ That George's visit placed his theories before the colonies' wage-earners in a way that *Progress and Poverty* never could have, was evident from the newspaper coverage, most of which was sympathetic. ⁷⁴

While the *Daily Telegraph* published the fullest reports on the tour, other dailies, in Farrell's estimation (with the exception of the *Australian Star*) reported him 'less fully, but with reasonable fairness.' ⁷⁵ Farrell's presentation to the American public of the New South Wales press is remarkable for its evenhandedness:

The *Sydney Morning Herald*, the oldest and most conservative...proceeds with caution and walks circumspectly before vested interests and all things by law established, but is fair and honourable in its reports, and in the admission of reply and adverse criticism. The *Daily Telegraph*, its morning rival, has climbed in a few years to a very large circulation, and speaks the true voice of New South Wales. It is liberal and progressive and keeps well up to the march of thought...The *Bulletin*, a smart illustrated weekly, which albeit advocating protection by tariff, has had a large influence on public thought...there are two other free trade dailies, the *Evening News*, supposed to have the top circulation of all, and the *Echo*...there is also the *Australian Star*, the official mouthpiece of monopoly and the protectionist party. Of all these the *Telegraph* has done far and away the greatest service to the cause of human freedom. ⁷⁶

After touring through four colonies for nearly three months, George rested for a brief while, and on Saturday, 30 May, he and his wife were taken on a harbour picnic, arranged by George Reid M P, in which a number of prominent single taxers and their wives took part: 'The steam yacht *Ena* was placed at Reid's disposal by a T. A. Dibbs and the route chosen was the prettiest in the Harbour, skirting Elizabeth Bay, Double Bay, Rose Bay, and up Middle Harbour where, in a secluded reach, the party took refreshments before returning to Princes' Stairs at half-past 12.⁷⁷ That same night George gave his final address in Sydney, at the Protestant Hall, his subject 'The Fallacies of Protection.' George Reid chaired the meeting.⁷⁸ The lecture was (in the *Bulletin's* estimation) 'the single tax apostle's most practical and carefully-thought-out speech.'⁷⁹ George said that protection seemed to be dominant all over the world. It had risen up in America, Victoria, in Queensland and South Australia, 'and had taken possession of these places by the surrender of the freetraders.' He went on to say 'they [his supporters] would fight a losing battle unless they made it an aggressive one.'⁸⁰ The next day George left by train to join the R. M. S. *Valetta* in Melbourne; and the following Saturday night George gave his farewell lecture in Victoria, at the Town Hall, on taxation, protection, and confiscation. There was a large audience and the visitor answered some

objections that had been raised against the Single Tax, but he mainly covered ground dealt with in his previous addresses.⁸¹

On the Monday of the second week of June, George was the guest of honour at a banquet in Adelaide. C. A. Murphy, Consul for the United States, presided over a party numbering about 60. The chairman spoke of the lecturer 'as one of the wonders of the nineteenth century.' The following night George delivered a farewell lecture entitled: 'The World-wide Struggle.'⁸² He spoke in an appreciative way of the 'advanced opinions on the land question' in South Australia, and considered that the cause was 'rapidly gaining strength in New South Wales.' In what were almost his final words on the tour, he advised colonists to give up protection and adopt freetrade. The next morning Wednesday, 12 June, George left for London by the *Valetta*.

Some Final Thoughts

To undertake a gruelling three months' tour of the colonies, visiting numerous towns in the country districts and making over 100 speeches, George asked only a modest 800 pounds, an amount the STL willingly paid, noting that George received the money 'for visiting Australia not only New South Wales.'⁸³ The strength and eloquence of George's appeals generally sufficed to overcome any resistance occasioned by the newness or novelty of what he was saying. And in spreading his message, George usually found the clergy with him. As one

report noted: 'There was no mistaking the Christian-like ameliorating influences and tendencies of his teachings.' ⁸⁴

Harry S. Taylor, a single taxpayer from Adelaide commemorated the tour by writing a poem entitled *A Sonnet to Henry George*:

I groped half blind in darkness and in gloom,
And sought in pain the first faint streaks of
Light.
Waiting the breaking of a morn more bright
To guide my soul unshackled from its tomb.
I waited for the dawn, that from the womb
Of Time should lead betrothed; Justice, linked
With Might
Should burst all fetters and his sway resume.
I waited, and had waited still in vain,
When, like a meteor, athwart my path
Thy spirit – mighty prophet – fell! Again
My soul found strength, and Freedom, she
Who hath
Flashed like a beacon-star in ages past
Gleamed full in view, coy maiden, wooed at
last. ⁸⁵

Reading Taylor's poem, one thinks of Farrell's *My Sundowner*, which he sub-titled *A Tale of the Unearned Increment*.⁸⁶

In contrast to Farrell and the single taxers, George had his critics, from the mean-spirited⁸⁷ Dr. Barry⁸⁸ to William 'Paddy' Crick M P, who asked the House whether a free railway pass had been granted to 'an American visitor named Henry George.'⁸⁹

To apply the term 'critic' to some other persons, however, would be to pay them an undeserved compliment. 'Cavillers' would be more appropriate. Joseph Palmer was one who fitted this category. He was 'especially indignant' that the 'liberal' pastors and deacons of the Pitt Street Congregational Church had let George use their pulpit. In response, Frank Cotton quickly pointed out that although Palmer was Chairman of the Baptist Union, he was also a very successful share-broker. And 'in the face of such an unusual connection between God and Mammon' he politely declined to accept Palmer as any 'authority on the nicer points of ethics.'⁹⁰ Another was John Tebbutt, a landholder and astronomer from the Windsor district (in the 1980s Tebbutt's image was on the \$100 bill). Of Tebbutt Cotton caustically wrote: 'Among his tenants is a Chinaman [sic], and while he is in his cosy study peering through a telescope...that Chinaman is growing cabbages in the damp trenches, a certain number of which Tebbutt demands for the privilege of allowing him to grow any at all. And as the planets

continue their interesting whirl through space, and the land around Windsor becomes more valuable, Mr. Tebbutt will be able to demand still more cabbages from the Chinaman. No wonder Mr. Tebbutt is angry with that spoiler Henry George.’⁹¹

Cotton then turned his attack to Julian Salomons; ‘the Jew... who once came very near to being Chief Justice.’ Cotton described him as ‘almost hysterical in his anger’ against Henry George.⁹² And became angry when Salomons, speaking to the press, did not scruple to make George ‘say words which he never uttered.’ Salomons, the quintessential reactionary, was quite satisfied that social conditions could not be remedied, and to prove that there were worse calamities than hunger and pauperism, he asked: ‘What is the misery of a starving pauper compared with the physical agony that the late German Emperor had to suffer?’⁹³

In an angry response Cotton wrote: ‘What were even the sufferings of the German Emperor, tended by the most skilled surgeons of Europe, lying in a palace, surrounded by every physical comfort, in comparison with those of the poor costermonger dying by inches of the same disease [cancer] in a stinking London alley, tended only by a starving wife, no food in the house, and his little children pleading for bread?’ Cotton, not unreasonably, suggested that Salomons knew that no parallel could be drawn between a disease that attacks king and

peasant alike, and a social evil which afflicts only the poor; but, using his 'lawyer-like trickiness' made the comparison for the sake the gallery. He reminded the lawyer there were men still living who remembered the time when his [Salomons'] ancestors were regarded as 'unfit to exercise even the commonest rights of man'... And if it had not been for the Henry Georges of that day, instead of being an eminent barrister, he might now [like many poor Jewish refugees in Europe], be 'selling pickled cucumber and fried fish.'

While the greater part of the material written by the editor of the *Australian Standard* was usually of a more positive nature, Cotton's strong defence of Henry George arose from his reaction to a paper written by T. H. Huxley the well-known evolutionary materialist. The paper, published in the *Nineteenth Century*, was then enlarged by Julian Salomons and republished in the *Telegraph*.⁹⁴ In it they argued that there were no 'natural rights' upon which an ideal social system could be based. Rather tartly a supportive and unrepentant Farrell added:

Single Taxers are but mortal, and when an opponent like Mr. Salomons descends to misrepresentation and petty quibbling in the place of argument, it can hardly be wondered at if an angular fragment from the bed rock of historic truth crashes through the fragile defence of transparent humbug behind which he takes shelter.⁹⁵

And of the scientist 'who was never noted as a well-wisher of the toiling masses' Farrell pointed out that Huxley 'had always endorsed the full Malthusian doctrine.' 'He has spoken before' Farrell wrote: 'And we know his voice.

Nothing but songs of death!' ⁹⁶

In the coming days, Cotton and Farrell would be forced, in the face of increasingly difficult times, to forget such men as other more formidable critics gathered to discredit the Single Tax.

REFERENCES

- ¹ Elwood P. Lawrence, *Henry George in the British Isles*, Michigan State University, 1957. P.3.
- ² Sidney and Beatrice Webb, *The History of Trade Unionism*, London, Longmans Green, 1950 ed. p p. 374-76.
- ³ Cited in Anna George De Mille, *Henry George Citizen of the World*, University of North Carolina Press, 1950, hereafter referred to as *Citizen*, p. 1.
- ⁴ 'Henry George and His Predecessors,' *Single Tax*, 6 December 1897.
- ⁵ *Ibidem*.
- ⁶ See H. N. Birt, *Benedictine Pioneers in Australia*, 2 vols., London, Herbert and Daniel, 1911.
- ⁷ For information on Murphy see James Waldersee, *A Grain of Mustard Seed*, Sydney, Chevalier Press, 1983. In a brief sketch of Adelaide Murphy wrote: 'You can judge what is the situation of this poor mission when I tell you that there is no church there is no chapel nor school house, and we are reduced to celebrating the Holy Mysteries in a poor shop.' P. 100.
- ⁸ *Australian Standard*, 28 January 1890.
- ⁹ *The Bulletin*, 5 April 1890.
- ¹⁰ 'Banquet to Mr. C. L. Garland, M. L. A.' *Australian Standard*, 28 January 1890.
- ¹¹ *Ibidem*.
- ¹² *Ibidem*.
- ¹³ Henry George Jr., *The Life*, p. 107.
- ¹⁴ Re-published by the Victorian Single Tax League, May, 1932.
- ¹⁵ Cited by 'P. J. M.,' in *Justice the Object: Taxation the Means*, An Address by Henry George, Melbourne, Victorian Single Tax League, Reprinted October, 1947.
- ¹⁶ 1,000 per year for Farrell.
- ¹⁷ *The Standard*, 23 April 1890.

-
- ¹⁸ *Australian Standard*, 28 March 1890.
- ¹⁹ *The Standard*, 23 April 1890.
- ²⁰ *The Echo*, Sydney, 6 March 1890.
- ²¹ *The Standard*, 23 April 1890.
- ²² John Farrell, 'Henry George: Arrival and Reception in Sydney, *Daily Telegraph*, 7 March 1890.
- ²³ *Daily Telegraph*, 7 March 1890.
- ²⁴ *Australian Standard*, 28 January 1890.
- ²⁵ 'A Religious Utterance,' *Daily Telegraph*, 8 March 1890.
- ²⁶ A name given to him by his supporters, see *Chalmers's Biographical Dictionary*, p. 227.
- ²⁷ 'Henry George,' *Daily Telegraph*, 8 March 1890.
- ²⁸ *Daily Telegraph*, 10 March 1890.
- ²⁹ *The Echo*, Sydney, 10 March 1890.
- ³⁰ *Ibidem*.
- ³¹ Address supplied in an advertisement for a lost cow, *SMH*, 21 May 1844, p. 3.
- ³² Henry McCluskey, 'Black smith and General Dealer,' later at 223 Pitt-street. See *Sydney Commercial Directory*, 1851 in ML.
- ³³ 'Henry George and Australia,' *Single Tax*, 20 January 1896.
- ³⁴ *Daily Telegraph*, 10 March 1890.
- ³⁵ *Ibidem*.
- ³⁶ *Ibidem*.
- ³⁷ *Daily Telegraph*, 12 March 1890.
- ³⁸ *The Echo*, 19 March 1890.
- ³⁹ 'Henry George's Proposed Visit,' *Newcastle Morning Herald*, 26 February 1890.
- ⁴⁰ *The Standard*, 23 April 1890.
- ⁴¹ Stenhouse, 'Pegasus,' p. 207.
- ⁴² *Australian Standard*, 9 March 1889.
- ⁴³ 'Henry George at Lithgow, *Albury Border Post*, 28 March 1890.
- ⁴⁴ 'Henry George in the Country,' *The Echo*, 24 March 1890.
- ⁴⁵ *Wagga Wagga Advertiser*, 25 March 1890.
- ⁴⁶ *Ibidem*.
- ⁴⁷ *Ibidem*.
- ⁴⁸ *Ibidem*.
- ⁴⁹ *The Echo*, 24 March 1890.
- ⁵⁰ *Albury Border Post*, 25 March 1890.
- ⁵¹ *Ibidem*.
- ⁵² *Ibidem*.
- ⁵³ *Ibidem*.
- ⁵⁴ See Liz Curtis, *The Same Old Story the Roots of Anti-Irish Racism*, London, Information on Ireland, 1985 edition. See also Lewis P. Curtis Jr., *Apes and Angels: The Irishman in Victorian Caricature*, London, Newton Abbott, 1971.
- ⁵⁵ *Albury Border Post*, 4 April 1890.
- ⁵⁶ 'Our Melbourne Letter,' *Albury Banner*, 4 April 1890.
- ⁵⁷ 'Henry George,' *Forbes and Parkes Gazette*, 14 April 1890.
- ⁵⁸ *Argus*, 11 April 1890.

-
- ⁵⁹ 'Henry George's Visit to Forbes,' *Forbes and Parkes Gazette*, 18 April 1890.
- ⁶⁰ *The Forbes Times*, 19 April 1890.
- ⁶¹ George Hart, 'Henry George,' *Forbes and Parkes Gazette*, 9 May 1890.
- ⁶² Henry George Jr., *The Life*, p. 533.
- ⁶³ 'The Descent of George,' *Bulletin*, 26 April 1890.
- ⁶⁴ Henry George Jr. *The Life*, p. 533.
- ⁶⁵ Tony Laffin, 'Aspects of Christian Socialism – Newcastle 1890 to 1916,' *Hummer*, Sydney, n.d., c. 1990.
- ⁶⁶ *Ibidem*. One lecture entitled 'Home Rule For Ireland,' was given in the Lyceum-hall, Newcomen-street by Rev. Hugh Gilmore, on 21 April. See *Newcastle Morning Herald*, 22 April 1890.
- ⁶⁷ Verity Burgmann, 'In Our Time,' *Socialism and the Rise of Labor, 1885-1905*, Sydney, Allen and Unwin, 1985, p.147.
- ⁶⁸ 'Henry George in the Pulpit,' *Albury Border Post*, 6 May 1890.
- ⁶⁹ *Ibidem*.
- ⁷⁰ *Ibidem*.
- ⁷¹ Quoted in Stenhouse, 'Pegasus,' p.p. 359-360, from ML MSS 1522/2 item 7.
- ⁷² Henry George Jr. *The Life*, p. 533.
- ⁷³ Stenhouse, 'Pegasus,' p. 228.
- ⁷⁴ Hebblewhite, *Penny Post*, iii, 8 March 1913; *Australian Standard*, 1 August 1890.
- ⁷⁵ *The Standard*, 23 April 1890.
- ⁷⁶ *Ibidem*.
- ⁷⁷ *The Echo*, 2 June 1890.
- ⁷⁸ *Daily Telegraph*, 2 June 1890.
- ⁷⁹ *The Bulletin*, 7 June 1890.
- ⁸⁰ *The Border Post*, 3 June 1890.
- ⁸¹ *The Echo*, 11 June 1890.
- ⁸² *Ibidem*.
- ⁸³ George Hart, 'Letters to the Editor,' *Forbes and Parkes Gazette*, 9 May 1890.
- ⁸⁴ *Albury Banner*, 28 March 1890.
- ⁸⁵ Harry S. Taylor, *Australian Standard*, 1 July 1890.
- ⁸⁶ John Farrell, *Australian Standard*, 25 May 1889.
- ⁸⁷ See numerous anti-Catholic tracts by Dr. Barry in the *Protestant Standard*.
- ⁸⁸ Stephen Judd and Kenneth Cable, *Sydney Anglicans*, Sydney, Anglican Information Office, 1987. See plates therein especially 'The Will of The Lord' by Phil May, reproduced from *The Bulletin*, 8 May 1886.
- ⁸⁹ 'Sir Henry Parkes and Henry George,' *Daily Telegraph*, 1 May 1890.
- ⁹⁰ Frank Cotton, 'Henry George and His Critics,' *Australian Standard*, 30 April 1890.
- ⁹¹ *Ibidem*.
- ⁹² *Ibidem*.
- ⁹³ *Ibidem*.
- ⁹⁴ See 'Professor Huxley and Henry George,' *Daily Telegraph*, 4 April 1890.
- ⁹⁵ John Farrell, "'Jayar" and Mr. Salomons,' *Australian Standard*, 28 May 1890.
- ⁹⁶ John Farrell, 'Professor Huxley and Henry George,' *Daily Telegraph*, 4 April 1890.