

1890-1897

-1-

After Bermuda, during 1891 and 1892, Henry George gave a certain amount of time to the organized single-tax movement. He addressed the Manhattan Single Tax Club twice in 1891, once on the occasion of celebrating the club's fourth birthday; and in mid- 1892 he spoke before the Chicago Single Tax Club. In 1893 he traveled more than he had and made a number of speeches, some of which have been mentioned above. For a writer, and for a man who had suffered aphasia, he did a great deal of speaking during the middle '90s, but of course less than earlier.

The most memorable meeting of the entire period occurred in Chicago, the second National Single Tax Conference. It was placed and timed in that city to take advantage of the Columbian Exposition. George had refused an invitation to speak before the Congress of Political and Social Science, held under the fair's own auspices; and he was reluctant about having a single-tax meeting at all. Since 1890 the accomplishments of the Single Tax League of the United States, the permanent national organization, had not been impressive. But George accepted anyhow and at the meeting created a moment of drama. There he met face-to-face, for the first time since their estrangement and reconciliation, Father Edward McGlynn. At a mass meeting in the Art Institute, while the priest sat on the platform, George discussed the meaning of Archbishop Satolli's decision. Through the nuncio, George reasoned, the old

practice of refusing Catholics freedom to preach the economic rights of man had been condemned by papal authority.

Otherwise the meeting hit the doldrums and even had special reverses for Henry George himself. A resolution favored the political reforms which were then rising in the country: the initiative and referendum, proportional representation, and votes for women. These were not points to disturb

George, for he had favored them all for years, including even woman suffrage. But another resolution changed the economic program of the Single Tax League from formulas he himself had drawn in 1890. The national conference had then called for the public control and management of natural monopolies other than land — of telegraphs, railroads, city water, and gas, as proposed in *Social Problems* and in George's earlier writings. The resolution of 1893 reduced this demand. Louis Post records the change as a shift from the 'socialistic' toward the 'individualistic.'

George himself criticized the move more strongly. Whereas so many times he had had to contend with socialism, he wrote a California friend, 'at this meeting there was an outcropping of what was a strong tendency to anarchism.' It was a bitter pill. There is humor and pathos, both, in Henry George's voting No with the minority at a single-tax conference, the last one of his lifetime.

After Chicago in the exposition year, George withdrew about as completely as in 1891 from anything like organizational effort. Louis Post became the workhorse of the single-tax movement; and Thomas Shearman kept his role as theoretician. Post crossed and recrossed the continent, partly supporting himself by lecture fees, and partly backed by subsidies from Tom Johnson and others. Some of his speeches went into his book, *The Taxation of Land Values*, which was first published in 1894 under another title, and later republished many times. Meanwhile Shearman was continuing his thinking and writing; and in 1895 he produced *Natural Taxation*, a sort of single-tax textbook which would be issued and reissued for years. It completed the effort Shearman had begun, in 1887 or earlier, to concentrate land-value taxation on fiscal needs, and to make it acceptable to the minds of businessmen. The continuing difference, between Shearman's 'single tax limited' and Henry George's 'single tax unlimited,' is clearly indicated by the contrast between *Natural Taxation's* moderateness, and *A Perplexed Philosopher's* demand for abolishing private property in land, without compensation to proprietors.

Besides his work as writer, his obligations as the father of the single tax, and his concern with politics, George acquired during the '90s yet another function to perform. It was a role of inspiration. Though the word *salon* is hardly right for the gatherings at Henry and Annie George's Nineteenth Street home, the place did become a center for kindred spirits to

meet and talk — to ponder, in friendship, the plight and future of mankind. Cocoa was the beverage, and the household surroundings were homely in every detail. The distinction of the place was the grand old man, as he was now, at center. His wife, his beautiful daughter in her twenties, and his lively one in her teens each had capacities to make visitors comfortable and to draw them out.

Lawson Purdy, able young lawyer then and later a civic leader, speaks of having taken Henry Adams there as early as 1889. He himself was a recent convert to *Progress and Poverty*, and he remembers the talk he heard about the need to believe in immortality. One day there called William Sowden Sims, about ten years out of Annapolis and an impressive figure in uniform. The future lifeguard of the British Isles wanted to meet and talk with the man whose book had ‘powerfully influenced’ his mind. ‘I can see no escape from the conclusions arrived at,’ he confessed. Another evening a half-Maori dropped in, for similar reason; and yet another evening is remembered when Robertson James, brother of William and Henry, came as an admirer of Henry George.

For their summers during this period the Georges went to Merriewold, in Sullivan County, where a group of single-taxers had a vacation colony. Departure for there in the spring of 1895, however, involved a wrench, for at that time the family said good-by to the Nineteenth Street house. ‘Afloat again,’ was George’s feeling. But in the fall they moved to Fort Hamilton, a high situation with a view, on the harbor side of New York. They loved the location. For about twenty months they occupied Tom Johnson’s summer home as a regular residence. Meanwhile a legacy from England, about \$14,000, and a gift of a piece of land by Mr. Johnson made possible a new and beautiful home in Fort Hamilton. Done in clapboard in the spacious suburban style then popular, it was the only house the family ever owned.

More handsomely than anything she could have expected, it fulfilled Annie George’s old hope that they would some day have their own home. George himself must have felt deeply happy about the house. Here, as from the bayside houses in San Francisco, he watched the sky and water, and always the boats moving about the harbor. Then there was the reassurance

of friends. August Lewis lived near by. It may be that Mr. Lewis's brother-in-law, Dr. Mendelson, participated in the arrangements that settled Henry George at Fort Hamilton, and that the rich men who made it possible were thinking that his health demanded a change from the city.

Pathetically, the move into a house of the Georges' own almost coincided with Jennie's death, and then with the special anxieties, which came up in early 1897, concerning Henry George's own condition. The handsome upstairs study, where many photographs of George were taken, never became a place of much writing; nor the downstairs living rooms the scene of many at-homes. Yet the new security must have helped account for Henry George's remarkable serenity and confidence in 1897 — as of course it would help his family later.

While George's more personal affairs were thus developing in patterns of old age, his connections were enlarging into literary circles where he had not penetrated earlier. Hamlin Garland in his thirties became the most remarkable personage of a whole group influenced by Henry George. Of course, if Garland's champion, William Dean Howells of the *Atlantic Monthly*, had gone strongly Georgist, he would have ranked first. The older writer did call, very pleasantly, at the Nineteenth Street house. The *Standard* may be judged to have stretched a point, however, when it discovered in a chapter of *A Hazard of New Fortunes* a plain reflection of a chapter of *Progress and Poverty*. Howells was a sympathetic acquaintance of Henry George and apparently not much more.

But there was nothing limited about Hamlin Garland's early interest in George and Georgism. He had been aroused by *Progress and Poverty* before leaving North Dakota and before Howells had become his mentor in any way. In Boston he experienced a real conversion, not unlike Bernard Shaw's. He heard George speak in Faneuil Hall, during 1886, George's great and critical year. In Garland's poignant memory; 'His first words profoundly moved me ... Surprisingly calm, cold, natural, and direct ... he spoke as gifted men write, with style and arrangement ... This selfmastery, this grateful lucidity of utterance combined with a personal presence distinctive and dignified, reduced even his enemies to respectful silence ... His questions were few and constrained, but his voice was resonant, penetrating, and flexible, and did not tire the ear ... He had neither the legal swagger nor clerical cadence; he was vivid, individual, and above all *in*

deadly earnest. He was an orator by the splendor of his aspirations, by his logical sequence and climax, by the purity and heat of his flaming zeal ... I left that hall a disciple.'

The discipleship held. After backtrailing to the Middle West and getting out his first stories, Garland came on to New York, about the time the Georges returned from Australia. In 1890, he published 'Under the Lion's Paw'; and in 1891 this and other stories were gathered into *Main Travelled Roads*, a book which became a classic. As we have seen, the *Standard* reprinted certain of his writings. It discussed others, as they appeared in the magazines. And presently Garland was writing straight, non-fictional expositions of Georgism, and was making Georgist speeches before Farmers Alliances. His *Jason Edwards*, a none-too-successful novel of 1892, was in large degree a single-tax tract.

By this time, if not earlier, Hamlin Garland had entered the George discussion circle, and to those people he read his new stories as he composed them. Recollecting the exchange of affection and ideas, he says: 'The Georges, whom I had come to know very well, interested me greatly ... Of course this home was doctrinaire, but then I liked that flavor, and so did the Hemes. Although Katherine's keen sense of humor sometimes made us all seem like thorough going cranks — which we were.'

Garland's mention of the Hemes refers to a gifted couple, Katherine Corcoran, a beautiful and distinguished actress, and her husband, James A. Herne, actor and playwright. The husband's writings, though little-remembered, occupy about the same position in the history of the realistic drama as Garland's do in the history of the short story and essay. The couple were close to Garland personally, for his brother Franklin played in their company; and James Herne's loyalty to George's ideas was enriched by his having worked his professional way in San Francisco, at the time George was writing *Progress and Poverty*. The earliest letters we have be

tween George and Herne were written during the '90s while Herne was playing on the West coast. He assured George that good seed had been planted out there, and he ventured some cultivating of the soil himself. He discussed the single tax with actors, and read 'Under the Lion's Paw' to labor audiences.

For reasons, natural in his profession, Herne was at first more interested in other varieties of realism than economic for portrayal on the

stage. In 1890 he had just written the play, *Margaret Fleming*, which now occupies a niche in history as one of the early important American dramas to discuss marriage with modern candor. Its failure makes the more notable, for this history, the success Herne scored just afterward with *Shore Acres*, the first Henry George drama on record. It was a down-East, local-color, family-problem play in which events hinge on the disposition of a piece of land. When he saw it, Henry George was too deeply moved even to speak to his friends after the curtain went down. Its realism surpassed *Margaret Fleming*, he wrote the author, yet the moral truth came through. In Mr. Herne's own mind *Shore Acres* captured the language and the spirituality of old Maine; and the intensity of the situation on the stage dissolved theater traditions and made theater history.

In two or three ways the theater people were the ones, among George's literary and artistic champions, who came to mean the most to his family and following. Through these connections they became friends with members of the now famous de Mille family, among them William, who later married Anna Angela. And Francis Neilson, who, as editor of the interesting New York *Freeman* of three decades ago, was the head of the best literary journal ever produced in the tradition of Georgism, gives stage people credit for inspiration in the '90s. American actors, with whom he worked in his youth, says Mr. Neilson in his autobiography, turned him to *Progress and Poverty*.

Though there is no need to examine the more dilute solutions of Georgism that were to be found in American novels during the '90s, the geographic spread of George's influence on literary people and his knowledge of that spread have a real biographical importance. Probably the farthest contact to the east that George had with a literary American was his correspondence with a friend of a dozen years, Poultney Bigelow. The young man in his thirties was

now pursuing a free-lance career, more or less expatriated, in England. He found it possible, he wrote in 1893, to insert Henry George ideas, somewhat surreptitiously, into the pieces he contributed to British and Continental journals. In the West, Henry George's literary frontier seems to have been located in San Luis Obispo, a place just as far away as London. With Mrs. Frances Milne, poet of that city, George had a long but

intermittent correspondence. An oversentimental and pious disciple, Mrs. Milne was one of several who sent George hero-worshipping verse.

Since George often visited Chicago, he may well have known about intellectuals there who loved to talk his ideas. We learn of two circles. One was a group of architects, members of a profession which was lively in that city, among whom Louis Sullivan, the early modernist, was an interested member. For the other, Brand Whitlock, at the time a young journalist, is spokesman. There was a circle of men, he says somewhat vaguely, who had read Henry George, or who, without reading him, 'had looked on life intelligently and gained a concept of it ... But these men were not in politics ... and the only man in politics who understood them at all was Altgeld.'

In the case of literary people like Whitlock and Neilson, or among students like John R. Commons, reading Henry George meant discovering a loyalty that would last. Those young men signified in America an inspirational spread of his ideas, parallel and overlapping, but not confined to, the organized single-tax movement.

-2-

At home, where examination can be more exact, we see that certain more or less literary minds were shifted by Henry George during the '90s toward making an effort for social improvement. Among his followers overseas, on whom our perspective is more distant, the accents of the picture are different. In England and the British antipodes, where George had spoken and where political doctrine had been influenced, the results seem to have been pretty purely political. But elsewhere the story is the opposite. In Russia Georgism achieved surprisingly great ideological results, students of the literature of that country tell us, though political efforts were frustrated.

Henry George received personally the good news from the South

Pacific. Letters from Sir George Grey in New Zealand, and from Max Hirsch and others in Australia, told him of land reforms achieved and of fights against the tariff. And similarly from the mother country, such reports reached him as made it possible for George to continue hoping that Britain would be the first country to make land-value taxation national policy. In 1891 he was informed, at the request of a member of Parliament, on the

occasion when the Commons came within twenty-six votes of resolving that the ground values of London 'ought to contribute directly a substantial share of Local Taxation.' Another report, mentioning the biggest political personalities to speak on his side so far, came to George the next year from James Durant, who himself was then a member of Parliament. Haldane spoke recently for 'our ideas,' wrote the old friend and publisher, and he was brilliantly seconded by Asquith. Besides these men in the Commons, Durant named others who, previously critical, he believed to be now going Georgist — Charles Harrison, the brother of Frederic, and H. W. Massingham, the journalist, among them. Also: 'The better class of socialists — Sidney Webb and that crowd — are now all working with us, but they as well as ourselves are still opposed to the lower shades of socialism.' The Fabians, Durant reported, 'come from being opponents back to being supporters of our views.'

British news of this kind all came in earlier than 1895, when the Salisbury government took over. For the remainder of George's life such optimistic reports would be politically impossible. But he did receive invitations to come again to lecture; and such news as that of work being done by a Henry George Institute in Glasgow kept him informed that his ideas were still growing in Scotland and England. *The Science of Political Economy* was written with Britain very much in mind.

It is hard to speak in a general way about Georgism in western Europe during this decade. The Henry George papers indicate no continuation at all from the practical undertakings of the 1889 conference in Paris. Perhaps George managed to forget that he had been elected president of an international organization of radicals. Letters to him do indicate, however, certain quickenings of interest in his writings. Translations were made into Romance languages — for the southerly lands of low industrialism and high Catholicism, where George's ideas had so far had little reception.

Though, as we have seen, the Italian edition of *The Condition of Labor* came out, as was almost necessary, as early as the American edition, *Progress and Poverty* had been published in Italy only in 1888. A translation of the major book was brought out in Spain in 1893, not long after George had had a request for permission to translate in Havana; and in

1892 a self-styled 'sectary' wrote from Rio de Janeiro, requesting permission to make a Portuguese translation.

Though tardy, the Italian and Spanish translations were gains. But from France and Holland, George learned of discouragement. An admirer and translator at the University of Bordeaux (whose name was Plato) wrote sorrowfully that after ten years only 1670 copies 'of your famous work' had been sold. Jan Stoffels reported in 1892 that neither *The Condition of Labor*, which he had just translated, nor *Progress and Poverty* was selling at all well. Only the Anglo-Saxons are ripe for your principles, wrote the Dutchman, and England and America will have to lead the way.

Yet Stoffels should have mentioned the Scandinavian countries, for they were continuing their early show of interest. Henry George himself was kept somewhat informed, though he never visited there. In 1890 the Copenhagen publisher of *Social Problems* wrote that, though Norway had responded first, there was real 'evidence of the spread of the Gospel and the progress of the Single Tax' in his own 'remote corner of the planet.' This corresponds with an undated memorandum in the George collection, written by Georg Brandes, the distinguished literary critic and historian of Denmark. 'What has made the deepest impression on my mind,' said this student of the French *philosophes* and of romanticism, 'is the profound truth that I should not be compelled to pay a tax on ... my work, but ... from that wealth or value which I have received from no merit or exertion on my own part.'

Unfortunately George never discovered a follower in Germany sufficiently like Walker and others in England to help him bridge the gap between reformism in the republic and reformism in the empire. Probably in 1891 and perhaps earlier, he broke with Flursheim permanently. When Bernhard Eulenstein, a devotee who introduced himself by mail as a 'strict Landliger,' took the initiative, a new connection was established, for a moment. George may have

been pleased at first by this man's criticisms of Flursheim, as at once too socialistic and too conservative, and by his criticism of the publishers for keeping *Fortschritt und Armuth* too costly for mass sale and circulation. But George can only have disliked intensely the bizarre political procedures which Eulenstein recommended. He wanted Henry George, first of all, to visit Germany and have an audience with William II. The young Kaiser had

many ideas on the social question, Eulenstein said, and anyway the interview would be a grand advertisement for *Landligers*. Second, he proposed — to the American lecturer on Moses, now a protege of August Lewis — that in Germany the single tax be identified with the anti-Semitic party. ‘The British relies too much on his political liberty for which I do not give a fig today,’ went on Eulenstein.

For the second time George came to a cul-de-sac in his personal relations with Germans. He seems never to have made contact with Theodor Hertzka, Austrian land reformer and writer of utopian economics; and, unfortunately, he had none with Adolph Damaschke. This younger man entered the land-reform movement the year before George died and became a devoted follower; in the twentieth century he would be an influential worker for improved urban housing, and a leader to infuse in *Bodenreform* a new humanity and power.

In Russia *Social Problems* and *The Condition of Labor* were published almost as soon as in the United States, and an astonishing number of Henry George’s minor writings were translated also. But *Progress and Poverty* was not published there until after the turn of the century; and, though George heard, some years before he died, that Count Leo Tolstoy was saying wonderful things about him, it is doubtful that he had any understanding at all of the following he had already achieved in that dark land.

Curiously enough, it was the German Eulenstein who told him in 1894 that Tolstoy was reading *Progress and Poverty* to his peasants. And it was the same promoter who wrote two years later that, if George would come to Berlin for a land-reform convention, timed for the exposition, Tolstoy would be present. But this was an election year at home, and in any case George would probably have refused another experience that promised to be like the Paris conference. He turned down the invitation before he heard that Tolstoy

had told Jane Addams that, if George would come, he himself would ‘break his habit of never traveling,’ and come in a ‘box,’ as he called a railroad car.

But George did write to Tolstoy. The reply he received is as suggestive as the early acceptances of Henry George in England, say those by Bernard Shaw and Philip Wicksteed. It deserves a full quotation. ‘The reception of

your letter gave me a great joy for it is a long time that I know you and love you. Though the paths we go are far different, I do not think we differ in the foundations of our thoughts.

‘I was very glad to see you mention twice in your letter the life to come.

‘There is nothing that widens as much the horizon, that gives such firm support nor such a clear view of things as the consciousness that although it is but in this life that we have the possibility and the Duty to act, nevertheless this is not the whole of life but that bit of it only which is open to our understanding.

‘I shall wait with great expectation for the appearance of your new book which will contain the so much needed criticism of the orthodox political economy. The reading of every one of your books makes clear to me more and more the truth and practicability of your system. Still more do I rejoice at the thought that I may possibly see you. My summers I invariably spend in the country near Tala. With sincere affection.’

One would like to picture Henry George’s going to Tala, or at least maintaining a long correspondence with Count Tolstoy. He did neither, and one guesses that he missed understanding either the Russian’s sincerity or his greatness. As, a dozen years earlier, *Progress and Poverty* had given faith to certain Englishmen that the power of the state could be used for social reconstruction, so, in this instance, George and his book worked a similar persuasion. Tolstoy became deeply convinced that his philosophical anarchism should yield, and that land-value taxation should be made the one exception to his distrust of all state action. He wished in 1894 that he could persuade the new tsar to assign the rent of the crown estates to the workers; and he actually prevailed on his daughter to do just that on certain family holdings. He wrote the same doctrine to a Siberian peasant, and he made the same appeal to the prime

minister and Duma in 1906 and 1907. He stated his conviction in an eloquent essay of that period, ‘The Great Iniquity,’ and predicted that the Henry George idea would succeed.

Tolstoy was far from being alone with such aspirations in Russia. Long before Karl Marx became a great influence in the land, and before the wars and suppressions of this century destroyed the possibilities of humane methods of social reconstruction, Georgism entered the thought of social

students and reformers. As a recent study of Russian populism of the early twentieth century indicates, George communicated both political hope and economic ideas. More than Bellamy, the American socialist, who was also known in Russia, and more than any other American, George was read and absorbed by thinkers in the Romanov empire.

George's actual influence in Russia recalls the prophecy he made about the destiny of that land, in one of his earliest editorials. One wonders how the future rivalry he contemplated between the United States and Russia, the first political fact of our own day, might have developed or not developed, if Georgism had succeeded better, and Marxism less well, during the second and third decades of the twentieth century.

-3-

While waves of appreciation of Henry George were extending at home and abroad, in the world of thought and letters, a political tornado occurred in America. Though there were Georgists in both the West and the South, few words are necessary to explain that he individually had very little to do with the immediate building up of political discontent and protest. He visited the South only once or twice, and in the West his personal role had never been other than that of occasional lecturer. Deeply as he believed that land-value taxation would be as correct in the country as in the city, since California days his practice of politics, except for 1887, had all been urban. In campaigning for Cleveland in 1888 he had not gone so far out of his own state, even, as to speak for Tom Johnson in Cleveland. The fall of 1890, when Johnson tried again for Congress, and succeeded, was of course the time of George's own greatest preoccupations and pressures. While the new People's party ran candidates, he saw an opportunity for doctrine. 'Politically things

in the United States look splendidly,' he wrote Thomas Walker that October, 'radical free trade is rapidly gaining ground, and our single tax men everywhere are doing good work.'

When the returns came in the Populists had made startling gains: three governors in the South, two senators from the West, about fifty congressmen, and strong delegations in fifteen or sixteen state legislatures. But to George, and the *Standard*, all this seemed, not without reason, ephemeral. To George the great events were that Tom Johnson, as complete

a free-trader as anyone, was elected to Congress, and William McKinley, whose name was attached to the high-tariff act of the spring, had been retired. In New York, though William Croasdale, George's successor on the *Standard*, was defeated, John de Witt Warner, a limited-single-taxer, was elected. Perspective does confirm George's judgment that the election of 1890 brought to Washington a great enlargement of antitariff conviction. But of course this sentiment, like Populist sentiment, would be for the next few years only: different from George's long-run expectation, by the later '90s big business would consolidate, as not before, behind protectionism.

Under the old system of 'lame-duck' sessions, Tom Johnson did not take his seat in the House of Representatives until December 1891. George had recovered from his illness and had written *The Condition of Labor* by that time, and the millionaire pleasantly insisted that he come to Washington, for a bicycle ride and talk, and that he be present at the swearing-in. On this trip George began to have a little influence on federal patronage: his first and successful effort was to get Annie's relative, Will McCloskey, a place in the Government Printing Office.

Meanwhile during the summer, though single-taxers recognized that Populist doctrines and organizations were not for them, efforts were made to have George men lined up for nominations in the Middle West, in the hope that they would be chosen in the coming big election. Thomas Shearman paid Louis Post's expenses to go to Kansas to sound the possibilities of Professor James H. Canfield's running for the Senate. Though the emissary decided that the move could not succeed — and the professor (Dorothy Canfield Fisher's father) became instead the chancellor of the University of Nebraska — the trip was not in vain.

In Kansas, Post established a friendship with 'Sockless' Jerry Simpson. And when that famous personage came east, in 1891, to take his seat in the House of Representatives, he visited Henry George 'to declare his discipleship.' He spoke at a free-trade meeting in Cooper Union and was much publicized for attending a champagne supper with millionaires present — several were single-taxers, one of them Tom Johnson. At about the same time this middle-western connection was established, George began to have letters from young Franklin Lane, future Democratic secretary of the interior. Lane reported that Georgist ideas were

making headway among Scandinavian working men in the state of Washington.

The special stimulation of having Henry George men in Congress, taking an active part in national affairs, appeared first in the spring of 1892. Those members cared intensely — more in a doctrinaire way than any other group in the country — whether Grover Cleveland, if nominated a third time, would, or would not, reassume his role of 1888, as leader against protectionism. Now seemed the time of times to hit hard against that policy.

Tom Johnson, all vigor and nerve, conceived a stroke of propaganda. He arranged with five other representatives — one each from Kentucky, Tennessee, Illinois, Iowa, and Kansas (Jerry Simpson) — to have read into the *Congressional Record*, as an extension of their remarks, a section of George's book of 1886, *Protection or Free Trade*. By proper arrangement the whole text would be reproduced in the *Record*. This did not mean free printing, but very cheap printing; and it did mean free distribution, by means of the members' franking privilege. The trick was quickly turned. The most the Republicans could do, after failing to have the book expunged from the *Record*, was to have a book by George Gunton, Henry George's old critic, distributed (not very widely) in the same way.

Henry George loved the coup. In New York he took charge of the printing. Six weeks after the vote, he was able to report that the book was coming off the press at a rate of 9000 a day. Many contributions pleased him: money from Walker for sending 10,000 copies to Britain; and funds in the United States, from Johnson principally. The thousands of copies sent to Ohio and Pennsylvania, ancient strongholds of protectionism, delighted him especially. Altogether more than a million copies went out before the election;

and according to Henry George, Jr., they were sent to all the newspapers in the country.

Hardly second to the quantity of this operation, George loved the idea that Democratic party action had been the force to put it over. A partisan vote had saved the reading into the *Record*, and by that token *Protection or Free Trade* took the color of Democratic doctrine. The press gallery of the House was stunned, wrote Henry George, Jr. Congressmen were awakening to the fact that the single tax was in politics, according to the same reporter,

and he believed that the Democratic party, allowing exceptions, was ‘galloping towards free trade. Our work is to spur that gallop.’

Of course the national convention in Chicago was not so subject to stampede. As in 1888, the tariff plank caused a prolonged battle in committee; and once more the committee reported a weak and two-minded proposition. Again Tom Johnson, as mighty newcomer in politics, seized the lead. Joining with Henry Watterson, who represented the southern tradition for free trade and who had had his Louisville paper serialize *Protection or Free Trade* when it was first published, Johnson managed to have the tariff plank debated on the floor of the convention. He won something of what he wanted. The Democrats officially declared the McKinley Act to be a ‘culminating atrocity of class legislation.’ But the party made no such clear-cut affirmation as Johnson desired, or as would have been consistent with *Protection or Free Trade*.

A compromise would seem to have been all that the free-traders had a right to hope for, in the convention. But they did permit themselves to expect that ‘Mr. President,’ now nominated, would be persuaded to resume the line of his most historic message to Congress. Watterson wrote Cleveland that in Chicago he had opposed ‘what was represented as your judgment and desire in the adoption of the tariff plank,’ and he added that he did ‘not think that you appreciate the overwhelming force of the revenue reform issue, which has made you its idol.’ He tried pressure. ‘You cannot escape your great message of 1887 if you would ... Emphasize it, amplify it, do not subtract a thought, do not erase a word.’

But Grover Cleveland was not a man to be managed. He and Watterson never spoke after this letter. Tom Johnson and Henry George approached the candidate. Probably they were not as inconsiderate as the Kentuckian, but they felt rebuffed. It can be estimated that the Georgists overstrained, alike in Congress and convention and with Cleveland, asking for more than they could demand. The impression of political opportunities lost at home is heightened by the Liberal victories in England. In that country, during the same summer, was created the Parliamentary situation already reported, which was favorable to Georgist ideas.

Shortly after the convention, Henry George on his own responsibility ordered 200,000 new copies of *Protection or Free Trade* to be printed. The propaganda went on. But after Cleveland’s rebuff there ceased to be heart in

the effort. George retired quietly to Merriewold. For the summer he even stopped trying to keep informed about the campaign. His one remaining hope, he told Shearman during the second week of September, was that a stunning vote for Tom Johnson would strengthen the radical line.

But once again, as in 1888, his faith in Cleveland was renewed. He met the ex-president, and a remark Cleveland dropped convinced him that the candidate was not 'crawfishing' after all. Understanding now that Cleveland truly believed in the revenue-only idea of the tariff, George advised Johnson that 'for the present he has gone far enough,' and that 'the Radical wing is on top,' after all. To his Republican intimate, John Russell Young, George said that there was no need to go to the Populists 'while the Democratic Party can be made to work.'

Late in October, according to this reconciliation, Henry George took a political speaking trip into the Middle West. Though he went as far as Minneapolis, as a Democrat for Cleveland, his main concern was for Ohio. He had become anxious about Johnson, whose district had been gerrymandered. As in George's own case in 1887, possible long-run results seemed more important than immediate ones. Radical hopes reached farther than just re-election; another term in Congress, George thought, might open the way to the governorship; and the governorship in turn might lead to making Ohio the first single-tax state. Then, in 1896 or whenever might be, Tom Loftin Johnson for President.

In this frame of mind, Henry George made no concessions, either to Populist doctrine or to Populist strength. The *Standard* printed the Georgist criticism: that, though the party represented 'widespread and well founded discontent,' its platform was no better than a 'patchwork.' Later, when the vote was in, George attributed no deep importance to the large increase of Populist showing. Though some of his judgments seem sectarian and ungenerous, and though he was far too optimistic about certain victories he cherished, he did, in November, have much cause to celebrate. Cleveland was returned to the White House. Tom Johnson, Jerry Simpson, and John de Witt Warner were re-elected; and his old friend Judge Maguire was chosen a member of Congress from San Francisco. The Republican party is now destroyed, Henry George wrote his lady-poet admirer in San Luis Obispo, and before long the Democratic party, too, will crumble. A true party will

appear. Yet the truth we work for does not reside in parties, 'it is the progress of our idea ... The future believe me is ours.'

A campaign year in which he allowed himself a host of exaggerated hopes was poor preparation for the political realities of 1893 and after. With the worsening depression, national politics shifted from anti-tariff to money problems and to income tax. Henry George as anxious observer and doctrinaire had no quarrel of principle with the President's demand for the repeal of the Sherman Silver Purchase Act. It was doubtless the old editor in him, once sold out by Senator Jones of Nevada, who now resented the silver lobby. And it was the old spokesman for the gold standard, and for limited greenbacks and interconvertible bonds, who opposed new varieties of inflationism. He talked and corresponded with Tom Johnson, in 1893, about bonds and paper money and, in general terms, about working out an 'elastic currency' as national policy. Depression exigencies by no means forced George out of the swim, but the special session of Congress of the summer of 1893 made him heartsick that opportunity for tariff reform was rapidly slipping away.

The situation came to a head in the winter, after the Fifty-third Congress reassembled. The President's message called for a reduction in schedules of duties, and the Wilson Bill was introduced. Hope persisted for reform, and at one dramatic point Henry George had a moment of glory. He was seated in the gallery of the house, and Tom Johnson was speaking — himself a manufacturer — against the tariff on steel rails. But a member pointed to the gallery, and spoke in contempt of the 'master' above, directing his 'pupil on the floor of the house.' In reply a number of Democrats marched up the steps and shook hands with the free-trade thinker.

Later that winter, when the famous and short-lived income tax of 1894 was passed as an amendment to the tariff bill, Henry George's ideas were acknowledged a second time. The measure was enacted, of course, by reason of the agreement of nearly every variety of liberalism: the President favored it; so did the People's party, and farmer and labor groups generally; and Tom Johnson reluctantly agreed. But for Georgists there was very particular reason for regret, and Representative James Maguire moved an

amendment. Place the tax on land values exclusively, he proposed. Make the tax fall on the states in proportion to population, precisely as the constitution requires of any direct taxation by Congress, he argued. Different from George's opinion when once asked by a Senate committee, Judge Maguire believed a constitutional amendment to be entirely unnecessary.³⁹

This was the first time that Henry George's reform had been considered in a legislature as possible policy for an entire nation. George appreciated the event in those terms. The six members who voted for the Maguire amendment were twice the number he expected: Maguire, Johnson, Simpson, Warner, and Charles Tracey of New York and Michael Harter of Ohio. Though he was pleased, he did not think he saw the future coming in Washington. 'The direct line of our advance,' he wrote Richard McGhee of Glasgow, 'is however in State legislation, and the single tax may in that way be brought into political issue at any time.' When the Supreme Court threw out the new income tax, George thought the majority judges to be more right than wrong.⁴⁰

The events that honored Henry George in Congress were the deeds of tiny minorities. To his distress, the fears of the summer of 1893 were more than realized during the winter. Not only did the Mills tariff wither into a 'final defeat of long-deferred hopes,' but the administration took the side of capital in a shocking labor

affair. At campaign time 1892, Cleveland had said, for the ears of labor sympathizers, the right things about the recent Homestead strike. But when, in the more famous crisis of two years later, the President not only broke a strike but used such a mighty exercise of federal power to do so as no earlier administration ever had, and none has since, liberals and pro-labor people were alarmed in the extreme.

The Pullman strike and Cleveland's ordering troops to Chicago, requires no retelling. To Henry George the issues were the gravest the country had to confront, and they were utterly plain. The President's famous dictum, that if it took 'the entire army of the United States to deliver a postal card in Chicago, that postal card will be delivered,' seemed to him irrelevant and needless. His admiration went to Governor Altgeld, who protested that Cleveland was being too precipitate, and that federal troops were not necessary.

In New York George assumed the role of a kind of tribune of the people. He returned to Cooper Union, where during labor campaigns he had spoken so frequently. Perhaps 10,000 tried to hear him. Under the title, 'Peace by Standing Army,' he spoke for the freedom of working men. 'There is something more important, even, than law and order, and that is liberty. I yield to nobody in my respect for the rights of property; yet I would rather see every locomotive in this land ditched, every car and every depot burned and every rail torn up, than to have them preserved by means of a Federal standing army. That is the order that reigned in Warsaw [long applause]. That is the order in the keeping of which every democratic republic before ours has fallen. I love the American Republic better than I love such order.' Of a handful of letters preserved from those that came to George after the address, the best were from writers who were old abolitionists and wrote in that vein.

The reformer never changed his mind again, to be favorable to Grover Cleveland. He quarreled with him once more, in 1896. In an event famous in diplomatic relations, the President said some very sharp things against Britain, in the matter of the Guiana- Venezuela boundary dispute. As the question before the public was how to apply the Monroe Doctrine, we may wonder whether George remembered his own plan to intervene in Latin America,

from the Pacific side, thirty years earlier. But he was a sober man now, a leader with followers in England whom he had indoctrinated in natural rights. He made an eloquent anti-imperialist speech, once again in Cooper Union. It won praise from directions not usual. 'You have rendered your country a noble service,' wrote Horace White, 'your speech last night was very effective.'

Meanwhile, over a period of two years, George's dissents and his associations with other radicals had ripened in him the most bitter feeling about the administration and the conservative branch of the Democratic party. The sympathy with Governor Altgeld in 1894 had led to a correspondence, though they had never met. George assured the governor that the issues he had fought over would surely rise again. In the summer of 1894, as the congressional elections approached, the only hope he had was the old one, that conservative blunders would lead to radical gains. 'Does

political history show any parallel to the Democratic stultification?' he demanded of Lloyd Garrison.

Once again he rejected the third-party possibility. He would not change his mind about the People's party, or encourage a new party of his own. When single-taxers in New York and Brooklyn made a motion toward organizing, he said publicly that he would accept no nomination if offered. 'The Single Tax is not a party or an organization,' he told a *Tribune* reporter. 'It is a perception of a great truth.'

In Chicago his attitude made difficulties. Eugene Debs, the recent leader of the Pullman strike, Henry Demarest Lloyd, whose *Wealth versus Commonwealth* had just appeared, Clarence Darrow, and others had fabricated a united front of Populist and labor forces. Even single-taxers and socialists were pulling weight together in that city. But when Henry George visited, a month before the elections, he talked single-tax ideas unadulterated. According to Professor Destler's close study, his opposition so weakened the labor and Populist alliance as to assist the coming Republican victory in Illinois.

Neither united-front, nor third-party, nor George's own type of intra-Democratic insurgency succeeded at the polls that year. In New York, John de Witt Warner was not even nominated for Congress. Jerry Simpson and Tom Johnson, who had judged it best that George not make campaign speeches in the West, were both defeated. Of the Georgist group in Congress, only Judge Maguire survived. Champ Clark — with whom George was acquainted — called 1894 the greatest slaughter of the innocents since Herod.

The way ahead darkened suddenly, after brightness. George had no function, any longer, as adviser to congressmen. The next election seemed crucial. Professor Nevins has given us President Cleveland's haunting fear: should the Democratic party go wrong on the money issue now, as it had once gone wrong on slavery, it might wander in the wilderness another thirty years. From his own point of view, almost as opposed as Cleveland's to monetary inflation but governed by a different sense of history, George shared the sense of fatality.

Yet when 1896 came he could do what the retiring President could not. He could stay with the party when it named an inflationist candidate. William Jennings Bryan 'certainly did not represent my views,' he told Dr.

Taylor. 'But I had to take the best offered, and he came nearest it.' He had little to say at first.

George's situation is represented perfectly by the fact that for the campaign he resumed the role of correspondent. He was outside history, rather than in it, this time. The New York *Journal* hired him. He had had some slight acquaintance with William Randolph Hearst earlier, but there seems to have been no personal connection this time. His real associations were much less with the proprietor of the new paper than with Arthur McEwen, old friend and ace reporter, and with the editor-in-chief, Willis J. Abbot. Abbot was a believer in George's doctrines and had been active in Chicago labor politics until recently.

The job took George to both the Republican and the Democratic conventions, and it allowed him freedom to write as he pleased. While in Chicago he saw much of Tom Johnson, and he heard Bryan give the 'Cross of Gold' address. Perhaps a letter to his employer was the first estimate he made of the 1896 leftward movement of the Democratic party — the first such movement for decades. He congratulated Hearst on committing the *Journal* to Bryan. The platform stops short, he said, and in certain respects he disagreed with it: he was not a silver man, and he did not like the income tax. Yet Bryan had the better cause, and he was glad to serve.

In September he spoke much more warmly. He endorsed Bryan in a letter to the *Arena*, and many times he said publicly how he would vote. In his belief, monopoly not gold was the cross that must be removed — and would be, if Bryan won.

Besides his writing, George did a little platform work for the candidate. He prevailed on Governor Altgeld to come east and make a speech against government by injunction, and against federal domination in any sphere of power. This proved to be a major campaign event, and thousands stood outside the hall. So far as George as a public man was concerned, moreover, it indicated a real change of style. By arranging the meeting, by sitting on the platform with Mary Ellen Lease and others, he demonstrated that he had rejoined the general forces of insurgency and change.

This was a little hard for some of the businessmen and lawyers of the single-tax movement. Not Tom Johnson, who was for Bryan, but Thomas Shearman and August Lewis of New York, George's generous patrons, and

Louis Prang and Lloyd Garrison, both of Boston, disagreed. To Garrison George explained that he believed it ‘quite as well, if not somewhat better, that some of us single-taxers should be on different sides, though I wish you and I at least were together ... You and I can talk, after this madness is over.’ As if to act on this advice, a group of single-taxers, who differed from George, published a kind of manifesto of their views.

Despite his tolerance, the conservatism of his followers led to George’s climactic piece of campaign journalism. Under the title, ‘Shall the Republic Live,’ it was printed in the *Journal* on the day before the vote. It shows that he had caught the passion, and shared the exaltation, of one of America’s four or five most crucial presidential campaigns. He demanded to know of those few single-taxers, who, ‘deluded, as I think, by the confusion, propose to separate from the majority of us on the vote,’ how they expected to recognize ‘the great struggle to which we have all looked forward as inevitable,’ if not by present indications? ‘For all the great struggles of history have begun on subsidiary and sometimes on what seemed at the moment irrelevant issues ... Would [the single-taxers] not expect to hear predictions of the most dire calamity overwhelming the country, if the power to rob the masses was lessened ever so little? ... The larger business interests have frightened each other, as children do when one says “Ghost!” Let them frighten no thinking man.’

George’s more leftward and literary followers were thrilled. Post stood right beside him, as always. John Swinton, with whom there had been a recent reconciliation, was delighted. Hamlin Garland sent his compliments; and James Herne said that no one but the author of *The Condition of Labor* could have written that final article.

For George and those like him, perhaps even more than for those Bryan men who had no anxieties about silver, the campaign of 1896 achieved a special glory. Twentieth-century progressivism would draw from its dedications and gathering of forces. So, too, did Henry George, personally, just one year later. The Bryan campaign in some degree canceled for him the retirement of 1887. It returned him to politics. It prepared him to make a second campaign, a most tragic fight to be mayor of New York.

After the battle was over the *Journal* offered Henry George more writing at very good pay. Because there had been no central single-tax journal since the *Standard* died in 1892, the proposition must have been tempting. George could have \$50 for a weekly column — or could contribute an occasional column at convenience — in which he would have the opportunity to address single-taxers and sympathizers with ‘absolute freedom of expression’ guaranteed.

But George refused the offer, in favor of working on *The Science of Political Economy*. His decision conforms also with the quiet role he retained, with respect to the single-tax movement. In recent years his organized followers had been developing the techniques of propaganda: they were starting chain letters, using single-tax stickers, establishing new organizations, and so on. But George himself made only one notable exception to his general habit of keeping apart. In 1895 and 1896, he joined Post and Shearman and Lawson Purdy and others, who were trying by concentration of forces to capture Delaware — one small state to be made a pilot for the single tax. The campaign effort meant simply traveling to Philadelphia, crossing the state line, and making speeches. But George seems to have had no heart for the work. When an issue of free speech arose, he refused to dare arrest and become a member of the ‘Dover Jail Single Tax Club.’ The veteran of Loughrea and

Athenry decided that his friends had drummed up a none-too- valid case.

George held back too, in January 1897, when he began to hear rumors that he would be nominated a second time for mayor of New York. ‘Are your congratulations as to the mayoralty sarcastic?’ he demanded after a letter from Post; ‘I am a little uneasy about being pulled off my course.’ Five months later — after illness and his daughter’s death had intervened — he wrote Thomas Walker that he was giving no countenance to the proposed candidacy; and he told another correspondent that he wished his friends would abandon the idea.

The inner question, as we saw in the last chapter, was whether George should give all to the book he intended to be final, or dramatize his cause once more in a city election that would be reported round the world. The

considerations in favor of politics were enlarged now because of the reorganization which had just been enacted for New York. On 1 January 1898, the old city would become the borough of Manhattan; and by combination with Brooklyn and other boroughs, Greater New York would be organized under one government, the second city in population, the most cosmopolitan city on earth. In other respects different from 1886, the mayor would hold office for four years; his patronage would be second only to the President's; and both practically and symbolically his authority would be unique. The new blueprint of city government corresponded well with Henry George's early ideas about city reform, as he had put them in editorials in the San Francisco Post. James Bryce saluted the coming election as of international significance; and, just after the campaign closed, an American expert called it 'a stupendous experiment in city government, such as the world had never seen before.'

So far as Henry George's medical advisers were concerned, to run or not to run was a black-and-white decision: either keep on writing and live, or run for mayor and die. Dr. Kelly and Dr. Levenson said the same thing. With the latter, a friend of twenty-five years standing, George discussed the decision as they walked the Shore Road at Fort Hamilton. The physician remembered the reformer's words: 'But I have got to die. How can I die better than serving humanity? Besides so dying will do more for the cause than any

thing I am likely to be able to do for the rest of my life.' George omitted asking the advice of the physician who had attended him in 1890. When Dr. Mendelson, agitated by what he saw in the newspapers, implored his friend not to run — there have been thousands of mayors but only one Progress and Poverty, he begged — George answered that he would take that advice, 'unless as I see it duty calls.' But he wrote those words on 30 September, and by that time the answer must have been crystal clear in his own mind.

As in 1886, he discussed — this time hardly shared — the decision with his friends. Tom Johnson took charge, at a meeting of about thirty, in his office in New York. George allowed no one to discuss his health; and, when the book was mentioned, he said that the essentials were now complete — an exaggeration which indicates his state of mind. After the

meeting he asked his wife whether she remembered his saying at the time of the Phoenix Park murders that Michael Davitt should go straight to Dublin, even though it cost his life? I ask you now, the husband went on, 'will you fail to tell me to go into this campaign? The people want me; they say they have no one else on whom they can unite. It is more than a question of good government. If I enter the field it will be a question of natural rights, even though as mayor I might not directly be able to do a great deal for natural rights. New York will become the theatre of the world, and my success will plunge our cause into world politics.'

Annie George hesitated less than her husband had done, and the decision brought no remorse. The family noticed that the candidate's old optimism came back, that his eye lit again and spring returned to his step. His pictures show an emaciated man, but those who knew him best recall a rekindled one.

The first obvious result of the reorganization of New York was that, contrary to what was usual, the campaigning began early in the city. Those who were first to move were reformist independents in politics, the members of the recently established Citizens Union. The union wished to be bi-partisan, but the impulse had come from liberal Republicans, and the nominee was of just that kind. President Seth Low of Columbia University was blessed with about all the advantages, and burdened with the disadvantages, that a man of wealth and education has in American mass politics. He was the heir of a clipper-ship fortune and had served in the family business; he had been reform mayor of Brooklyn and a leader in the public-charities movement. Though he gave every sign of really wanting to run, President Low took a leaf from Henry George's book. He did not commit himself entirely until 125,000 signatures indicated that there was popular interest in his cause. Had a momentum developed from this careful preparation, there can be no question but what Greater New York would have had as first mayor — President Low was actually elected in 1901—an executive with capacities and merits in proportion to the office.

But, to the crucial question, whether Republican party regulars would vote for Low, and so perhaps smash Tammany, Boss Thomas Platt gave the answer which denied 100,000 votes. Under his orders, at the end of September, the party nominated General Benjamin F. Tracy, who had been President Harrison's secretary of navy, and since then law partner of Mr.

Platt's son. Simultaneously, when Richard Croker returned after three years at his home in England, he dictated the Tammany ticket. Judge Robert A. van Wyck, a party hack, became the regular Democratic nominee. This left the Bryan Democrats of 1896, the groups known as the Democratic Alliance and the United Democracy, as discontented as were the Republican liberals. They were the ones who had sounded Henry George.

The situation differed from 1886, and yet was capable of being built into likeness. Devotion to Bryan and the Chicago free-silver platform had hardly the compulsion and self-consciousness that labor had had, in Henry George's first campaign. Yet last year's emotion did have political effect. At the meeting at which George accepted the nomination of the Democratic Alliance, Mary Ellen Lease of Kansas sat on the platform, and the candidate addressed himself to 'Fellow Democrats, who last year voted for William Jennings Bryan.' Though he had nearly fainted before the meeting, George put eloquence into saying that 'into the common people would come a power that would revivify not merely this imperial city . . . but the world.' The meeting sent greetings to Bryan. We learn as a campaign secret, which leaked to the Republicans, that Bryan approved the nomination as though George, and not Tammany's van Wyck, were the regular Democratic candidate. A majority of the national committee are said to have felt the same way.

As in 1886 Henry George wrote his own platform, and he made it virtually the same. He stressed municipal ownership and municipal home rule, and called for tax reform and the end of government by injunction. Striving more than ever to universalize his message, he named his party 'The Democracy of Thomas Jefferson.' It was not a labor party, this time, though it sought the votes of labor; and it was not a single-tax party, though many but by no means all the single-taxers of New York went with their leader. George believed that this effort had the same goals as the one of 1886 — purification in politics and democratization in economics, to begin in New York, and to be spread gradually elsewhere, as politics might make possible.

The immediate enemy, now as before, was Croker's Tammany Hall. For George this was the determining point of strategy in a campaign where little else was clear. As candidate he was concerned, though as radical Democrat not governed in his tactics, by the vast enigma, how Low and

Tracy would divide the Republican vote. Memory of his last campaign must have helped him believe that neither of these two would win. His Republican opponent of 1886, who had had the support of both wings of that party, regular and liberal, was greatly concerned this time. Viewing the city election from the perspective of Washington, Roosevelt conceded 'what the populists say,' that his party in New York did represent 'corrupt wealth.' He favored Low. But he criticized the academic man sharply for not having consolidated with Platt and accused him of being 'hand in glove with Henry George.' The total situation, from George's point of view, was that Tracy was a candidate to neglect, Low was one to respect but not to concede to, and Judge van Wyck was the one to defeat — for the good of city and party alike.

As was entirely natural, George's own thoughts reached back eleven years. 'I won the race,' he said publicly and definitely, as he had not spoken in 1886. 'I know, as you know, that the votes cast for me were counted out by the system that prevailed then.' Making this early effort to establish continuity between the present campaign and his last one, George was taking long chances. What he said brought reply not from Croker but from Hewitt and Ivins. The ex-mayor was quoted from abroad as saying again that Henry George was leading forces of anarchy and destruction. The name-calling seemed to be striking once more.

This prompted George to review publicly for the first time the whole history of his relations with Hewitt, from employee to rival, and to tell the story of the Democrats' effort to divert him from the first mayoralty campaign with an offer to elect him to Congress. George's accusations of bribery evoked the reply of Ivins, which was discussed in Chapter xv. Whatever the exact fact about 1886 may have been, it seems unlikely that recriminations in 1897 made very effective campaigning. Certainly Mr. Hewitt's fear words did not have their earlier power. When George demanded retractions, Hewitt returned a soft answer. He had been misquoted from overseas, he said, and had not meant what had been printed. Hewitt, whom Tammany had elected in 1886 and dropped in 1888, announced for Low this time.

Though his energies were limited, George fought an aggressive campaign and loved the fight. As in all recent years, financial support came from Tom Johnson and August Lewis. Father McGlynn wrote in a friendly way but counseled George against taking the stump too vigorously. If there was no labor support to compare with that of 1886, the shortage was somewhat filled by Jerome O'Neill, the Central Labor Union man who ran for president of the council, on the Democracy of Thomas Jefferson ticket. Apparently the strongest lieutenant George had from the Democratic party was Charles N. Dayton. A former postmaster of New York, he was expected to make a real subtraction from Tammany strength.

From single-tax ranks, besides the senior allies already mentioned, Lawson Purdy and Charles Frederic Adams were the most prominent men. Hamlin Garland, who got into the thick of the fight, tried to mobilize literary manpower. He asked Henry Demarest Lloyd for an endorsement 'to be used in a very literary meeting we are organizing,' at which Herne and he were going to make speeches. He hoped that Howells would return from Europe in time to take part in the campaign.

Though there appeared no special campaign paper, like the *Leader*, in 1897, there was less need for one. Willis J. Abbot of the *New York Journal* took hold as chairman of the campaign committee. Hearst gave him leave with pay. And, though the *Journal* supported the Tammany candidate, star writers such as Arthur Brisbane and Arthur McEwen, who contributed a splendid character study of George to the then current November *Review of Reviews*, spoke favorably of George in Hearst's own paper. In general the metropolitan press behaved in a much friendlier way than in 1886. The best papers of both parties went for Low: the *Times*, the *Tribune*, the *World*, and the *Brooklyn Eagle*. Naturally the *Tribune* was especially eager to have George take as many Tammany votes as he could.

In his own role as speaker and leader, George tried desperately to perform as he had once performed. He was persuaded to conserve his strength by going daily, from campaign headquarters at the Union Square Hotel, to August Lewis's downtown house for lunch and an afternoon rest. People noticed his reduced vigor, and his wife says that he became spiritually withdrawn. Despite everything, he outdid as fighter every one of his adversaries; and for a dozen days, from 16 to 28 October, his record was

truly heroic. He made thirty speeches. And on five of those days, one of them the day he died, he spoke four times.

As of 8 October, professional betting odds were ten to seven in favor of van Wyck, three to one against Tracy, four to one against Low, and eight to one against George. How realistic this was at the time and whether or not George's fortnight of hard campaigning developed any sizable current his way are of course questions not subject to present-day estimate.

For civic reformers like Heber Newton, George's candidacy, as it was launched later than Low's, presented a terrible contradiction. This was of course the thought, which has been shared by students since, that the two reform elements, one derived from each party, would cancel each other out. But the fear seems to have been unrealistic. There is evidence to support as fact what Theodore Roosevelt charged — a considerable mutuality between the two. The Democracy of Thomas Jefferson supported the county candidates of the Citizens Union, and the two nominees behaved with extraordinary respect toward one another. Low retracted a comment made in error about George; and George said many things which after his death the Citizens Union was able to use to indicate that if Henry George could speak again he would advise his people to vote the ticket led by President Low.

Though there is much to justify the Citizens Union claim, Henry George's last statement about Low was perhaps the most explicit.

He was far from a merger at that time. He spoke the following words at Flushing, five days before the election, and about twelve hours before he died. 'Let me say a word about Mr. Low. On election day as between Mr. Low and myself, if you are yet undecided you must vote for whom you please. I shall not attempt to dictate to you. I do entertain the hope, however, that you will rebuke the one-man power by not voting for the candidate of the bosses. I am not with Low. He is a Republican and he is fighting the machine, which is all very good as far as it goes. But he is an aristocratic reformer; I am a democratic reformer. He would help the people; I would help the people to help themselves.'

This valedictory echoes much of the life intention of Henry George. It is barely possible that Greater New York would have had a more creditable

administrative history for the coming four years, if, on the last Friday of the campaign, the Democracy of Thomas Jefferson had shifted to President Low. But Henry George, Jr., was nominated on that day of anguish, and any other choice would seem to have been humanly impossible. Political momentums were too great, personal loyalties too emotional for any other choice to have been right.

On election day, the next Tuesday, President Low received 151,000 votes. Henry George, Jr., received 22,000. Justice Tracy had 101,000; and Judge van Wyck won, with a 234,000 plurality vote. The regular parties had almost twice as many votes as the reform parties combined.

Poignant letters by grieving George men tell us that some strength did shift from the Democracy of Thomas Jefferson to the Citizens Union vote. An informed contemporary believed that about 60,000 made the change. If as few as half that number did so, Low received a smaller number of votes of his own than the number who had signed the pre-campaign petitions which requested him to run.

In their own retrospect, the Citizens Union leaders believed that the death of Henry George had destroyed the Columbia president's last hope of victory in that campaign. If George had lived, for Low to have won, the Democracy of Thomas Jefferson would have had to take about 85,000 votes that went to the Tammany candidate. And this calculation subtracts nothing from Low's actual vote, as strength that would have belonged to George.

Altogether it seems improbable that George's continued candidacy could have meant victory for Low and the Citizens Union in 1897.

As for the most optimistic tabulation of Henry George's own chances, if we allow him 85,000 Tammany votes (as Low's advisers imply they did), we may allow him 50,000 Citizen's Union votes as well (less than our contemporary's estimate). Such a poll, combined with what Henry George, Jr., did receive, would have made him the mayor of New York.

The only cautious estimate is that reform, by schism in the parties, could in no circumstances have won in 1897. Henry George's belief that the fight would be a battle of symbols, one last venture in education in democratic theory and practice, seems entirely right.

On Thursday, the day before he died, George spoke three times on Long Island. Considerable traveling was required. He appeared first at Whitestone, then at College Point, and then at Flushing, where Dan Beard, of Boy Scout fame, was in the chair. At that place he made the statement about Low, which is quoted above. At College Point he had seemed dazed and exhausted; and his final remarks, made at the Manhattan Opera House, where he arrived after most of the crowd had departed, were so rambling as to distress the audience that remained.

He died in his hotel, early the next morning, after brief suffering. Mrs. George found him in their sitting room, a hard stroke of apoplexy upon him. Dr. Kelly came and could do nothing; his Irish grief was the most uncontrolled of all. The women stood firm. The oldest son, who was to have been married within a few days, had to give first attention to the campaign. The family behaved, and the martyrdom had occurred, just as Henry George had invited, in the dignity of duty and great love.

There followed on Sunday the amazing salute, obsequies which the New York *Herald* called 'unique,' and the *Times* compared with Abraham Lincoln's. 'Call it what you will, hero worship,' that paper said, 'but its object was truly a hero.' In the early morning the body was taken to lie in state at Grand Central Palace. Richard George accompanied it; and Anna Angela, now nearly twenty, insisted that she go too. Beginning at seven the mourners

started the procession that lengthened with the day. Estimates of those who passed the bier vary from 30,000 to 100,000.

From three to five-thirty the public services were held. Heber Newton read the Episcopal service, his and his friend's legacy from old St. Paul's. Lyman Abbot spoke, and the choir from Plymouth Church sang the hymns. The later speakers were Rabbi Gottheil, John S. Crosby, and Father McGlynn. Mayor Strong and Seth Low had seats on the platform. The break of tension came when Father McGlynn declared his belief in Henry George's ideas. The cheers of thousands rang, shocking and yet appropriate too, across the body of Henry George.

In the late-fall evening the funeral procession moved south. The open hearse was drawn by sixteen horses draped in black. The bronze bust by Richard George was carried Roman style, just as Henry George had wanted. A white rose, dropped from a Madison Avenue window, clung to the casket

in the waning light. A military band had volunteered; it led the way with 'Chopin's Funeral March' and 'The Marseillaise.' The procession passed City Hall, then crossed Brooklyn Bridge; and at the Borough Hall in Brooklyn the body was returned to the family.

The next day, privately, the interment service was read at Greenwood Cemetery. Two Episcopalian clergymen, John Kramer and George Latimer, the cousin who helped him get passage to India when he was fifteen, took charge. Father McGlynn spoke, about immortality.

Almost required, one thinks, were the words the family chose to have set in bronze on the stone that marks the grave. They come from the conclusion of *Progress and Poverty*. 'The truth that I have tried to make clear will not find easy acceptance ... It will find friends ... This is the power of truth.'