

city where there are so many separate parcels of land to be assessed, the success in New York of the system suggested, since its introduction in 1906, and the local support given it by practically all the important real estate men in New York, is very significant.

HENRY GEORGE'S MAYORALTY CAMPAIGN OF 1886.

(For the Review).

By **FREDERIC CYRUS LEUBUSCHER.**

Of the 68,000 men who voted for Henry George for Mayor in 1886, probably not one hundred had more than a vague conception, at the beginning of the campaign, of what was meant by the land question. Not only was it years later that the words "Single Tax" were applied to the free land movement, but there had been no organized movement at all until Henry George was nominated in 1886. Indeed, the labor unions made the nomination not because any but a few of their members realized that there was a land question, but mainly because some had been sent to prison. It is now legal for strikers to picket and to induce other workingmen to quit their jobs. Then, however, it was illegal; and in 1885 and 1886 a large number of union men had been sentenced to three and four years imprisonment for merely soliciting other workingmen to aid the strikers. The unions demanded that the law be changed. As the old parties paid no attention to the demands, the Central Labor Union (a body of delegates from the various unions) set about forming a new party.

In the winter of 1881-2, a mass-meeting had been held in Cooper Union, New York City, for the purpose of expressing the sympathy of New York workingmen with the poor of Ireland in their revolt against landlordism. On the recommendation of the committee that arranged the meeting a permanent central body was organized which still flourishes, though now under the name of the Central Labor Federation. Thus the evils of landlordism in a foreign country indirectly led to the nomination of Henry George for mayor of New York.

The campaign of 1886 was not the first political effort of the organized workingmen of New York. In 1882, the Central Labor Union nominated candidates for the national, State and local legislatures; but the vote was so trifling as to excite derision. For the next four years the Central Labor Union confined its work to industrial affairs. Goaded to desperation by the persecution of the boycotters, a committee was appointed on July 11, 1886, to prepare a plan for political action. The report of the committee was

adopted, and is here given in full, for it shows that questions of government and not of economics came to the fore:

"Being appointed by your honorable body to devise a plan whereby the workmen of the City and County of New York may take independent political action in the coming election, and believing that in order to bring about the desired results a plan of action must be agreed upon whereby the wage workers, of whatever calling, whether connected with the Central Labor Union or not, shall be united in one grand political organization whose objects shall be the redemption of our city government from the hands of plunderers whose acts of spoliation have brought disgrace upon our city, and through whom the administration of justice has become a farce; and believing that by united action on the part of the workers honest men can be elected to administer the affairs of government and the laws can be enforced for rich and poor alike—your committee, after carefully considering the various propositions laid before them, respectfully submit the following for your consideration: That every trade and labor organization six months in existence prior to the call of the conference or connected with some central body, send a delegate for every hundred members to a conference with credentials and instructions from their body and power to call a convention. All delegates must be bona fide workingmen."

On August 5th the conference met with 402 delegates from 165 labor organizations representing a membership of about fifty thousand. Mindful of the fiasco of 1882, there was a long debate, culminating in a vote of 362 in favor of independent political action, and only 40 opposed. On the adjourned date, August 19th, the following committee of seven on permanent organization was selected: Frank Farrell, Henry Emrich, John J. Bealin, Patrick A. Doody, Thomas Ford, Ernest Bogue, and Reuben Silverbrandt. These chose John McMackin, of the Painters, for chairman, and James P. Archibald, of the Paper Hangers, for Secretary. George G. Block, of the Bakers, was subsequently selected in the place of Archibald, resigned. Does any Single Taxer recognize more than one or two of these names as those of persons who really ever understood the land question?

Twenty-seven years ago men of Irish birth or Irish descent dominated organized labor of the United States and, most markedly, of New York City. Henry George had championed the cause of Irish home rule and had denounced the alien landlordism of Ireland. He had even suffered imprisonment on the soil of Ireland. When he returned to the United States he appeared frequently before the unions, where his eloquent and witty tongue and convincing logic had endeared him to the lovers of the Emerald Isle. Small wonder, therefore, that in these preliminary conferences of the summer of 1886 his name was on every workingman's lips as the ideal candidate for Mayor. Assured of this, Secretary Archibald asked Mr. George whether, if nominated, he would accept.

Henry George hesitated. His inclinations were for the literary life and the lecture platform. He was also mindful of the woful failure of the 1882 campaign, for he was not sure whether a convention would be representative of the working masses. A brilliant thought came to him: Why not be nominated by the masses themselves? He therefore wrote Mr. Archibald that the only condition on which he would accept the nomination "would be that at

least 30,000 citizens should, over their signatures, express the wish that I should become a candidate, and pledge themselves in such case to go to the polls and vote for me." Never before had a candidate insisted on such a nomination. This was indeed the beginning of the movement for direct nominations, which now, almost thirty years later, seems destined to sweep the country.

In the letter to Mr. Archibald, which was dated August 26, 1886, is the first mention of the land question, for it contains the following passage:

"With unsurpassed natural advantages—the gateway of a continental commerce—New York is behind in all else that the citizen might justly be proud of. In spite of the immense sums constantly expended, her highways, her docks, her sanitary arrangements, are far inferior to those of first-class European cities; the great mass of her people must live in tenement houses, and human beings are here packed together more closely than anywhere else in the world; and though the immense values created by the growth of population might, without imposing any burden upon production, be drawn upon to make New York the most beautiful and healthful of cities, she is dependent upon individual benevolence for such institutions as the Astor Library and the Cooper Institute, and private charity must be called upon for "fresh air funds" to somewhat lessen the horrible infant mortality of the tenement districts. Such parks as we have are beyond the reach of the great mass of the population who, living in contracted rooms, have no other place than the drinking-saloon for the gratification of social instincts, while hundreds of thousands of children find their only playground in crowded streets."

The Labor Day parade on September 6th was an ovation to Henry George. So much enthusiasm was evoked by his letter that the proposed nomination lost all local significance. Mr. George spoke in Newark, N. J. on Labor Day, and he was gravely nominated "by the workingmen of Newark for Mayor of New York."

On September 23rd the convention met at Clarendon Hall, 13th Street between Third and Fourth Avenues. One hundred and seventy-five labor organizations were represented by 409 delegates. A negro named Frank Farrel, who represented the Eccentric Engineers, was the chairman of the platform committee. He read the platform which had evidently been written by Mr. George himself. It was a new declaration of independence, and would be useful as a Single Tax tract to-day. Although the boycotting cases were the causes of the uprising, the only allusions to workingmen's inequality before the law were the following: "that the practice of drawing grand jurors from one class should cease, and the requirements of a property qualification for trial jurors should be abolished; that the procedure of our courts should be so simplified and reformed that the rich should have no advantage over the poor; that the officious intermeddling of the police with peaceful assemblages should be stopped." Equal pay for equal work in public employment, without distinction of sex, was for the first time demanded in a political platform. Twenty-five years later fifteen thousand women teachers in the New York City public schools won their fight for equal pay. The platform is here given in full:

THE FAMOUS CLARENDON HALL PLATFORM.

"The delegates of the trade and labor organizations of New York, in conference assembled, make this declaration:

1. Holding that the corruptions of government and the impoverishment of labor result from neglect of the self-evident truths proclaimed by the founders of this Republic that all men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with unalienable rights, we aim at the abolition of the system which compels men to pay their fellow-creatures for the use of God's gifts to all, and permits monopolizers to deprive labor of natural opportunities for employment, thus filling the land with tramps and paupers, and bringing about an unnatural competition which tends to reduce wages to starvation rates and to make the wealth producer the industrial slave of those who grow rich by his toil.

2. Holding, moreover, that the advantages arising from social growth and improvement belong to society at large, we aim at the abolition of the system which makes such beneficent inventions as the railroad and telegraph a means for the oppression of the people, and the aggrandizement of an aristocracy of wealth and power. We declare the true purpose of government to be the maintenance of that sacred right of property which gives to everyone opportunity to employ his labor and security that he shall enjoy its fruits; to prevent the strong from oppressing the weak, and the unscrupulous from robbing the honest; and to do for the equal benefit of all such things as can be better done by organized society than by individuals; and we aim at the abolition of all laws which give to any class of citizens advantages, either judicial, financial, industrial, or political, that are not equally shared by all others.

3. We further declare that the people of New York City should have full control of their own local affairs; that the practice of drawing grand jurors from one class should cease, and the requirements of a property qualification for trial jurors should be abolished; that the procedure of our courts should be so simplified and reformed that the rich shall have no advantage over the poor; that the officious intermeddling of the police with peaceful assemblages should be stopped; that the laws for the safety and sanitary inspection of buildings should be enforced; that in public work the direct employment of labor should be preferred to the system which gives contractors opportunity to defraud the city while grinding their workmen, and that in public employment equal pay should be accorded to equal work without distinction of sex.

4. We declare the crowding of so many of our people into narrow tenements at enormous rents, while half the area of the city is yet unbuilt upon to be a scandalous evil, and that to remedy this state of things all taxes on buildings and improvements should be abolished, so that no fine shall be put upon the employment of labor in increasing living accommodations, and that taxes should be levied on land irrespective of improvements, so that those who are now holding land vacant shall be compelled either to build on it themselves, or give up the land to those who will.

5. We declare, furthermore, that the enormous value which the presence of a million and a half of people gives to the land of this city belongs properly to the whole community; that it should not go to the enrichment of individuals and corporations, but should be taken in taxation and applied to the improvement and beautifying of the city, to the promotion of the health, comfort, education, and recreation of its people, and to the providing of means of transit commensurate with the needs of a great metropolis. We also declare that existing means of transit should not be left in the hands of corporations which, while gaining enormous profits from the growth of population, oppress their employes and provoke strikes that interrupt travel and imperil the public peace, but should by lawful process be assumed by the city and operated for public benefit.

6. To clear the way for such reforms as are impossible without it, we favor a Constitutional Convention, and since the ballot is the only method by which in our Republic the redress of political and social grievances is to be sought, we especially call for such changes in our elective methods as shall lessen the need of money in elections, discourage bribery and prevent intimidation.

7. And since in the coming most important municipal election independent political action affords the only hope of exposing and breaking up the extortion and speculation by which a standing army of professional politicians corrupt the public whom they plunder, we call on all citizens who desire honest government to join us in an effort to secure it, and to show for once that the will of the people may prevail even against the money and organization of banded spoilsmen."

Mr. George was nominated by 360 votes to 31 cast for James J. Coogan and 18 for William S. Thorn, the smaller votes being complimentary.

Henry George was now the nominee of the hand workers; and the newspapers were filled with denunciations of a "class movement." There were thousands of head workers, however, who expressed a sympathetic interest—physicians, clergymen, lawyers, teachers, etc. To organize these, a meeting was held on October 2nd in Chickering Hall, Fifth Avenue and 18th Street. The meeting was called for eight o'clock, but by 7.30 the large hall was packed, necessitating overflow meetings in the street. Rev. Dr. John W. Kramer presided and the speakers were Prof. Thomas Davidson, Rev. R. Heber Newton, Prof. De Leon, of Columbia University, Charles F. Wingate, a well known sanitary engineer, Prof. David B. Scott of the College of the City of New York, and Rev. Dr. Edward McGlynn.

The speech of acceptance was delivered at Cooper Union on the night of October 5th. New York had never before witnessed such an outpouring at a political gathering. Huge rolls, tied with blue ribbon, were stacked in a pyramid on the platform. These contained the 34,640 petitions asking Mr. George to run for Mayor. The nomination was tendered by John McMackin in a well-worded speech. The speech of acceptance was typical,—eloquent and witty, but occupied mainly with fundamentals, the land question to the fore. The only allusion to the provoking cause of the workers' uprising was contained in the sentence: "The Theiss boycotters are still in prison." His closing words were a prophecy that is even now being fulfilled: "We are beginning a movement for the abolition of industrial slavery, and what we are doing on this side of the water will send its impulse across the land and over the sea and give courage to all men to think and to act."

The campaign committee was composed of John McMackin, chairman; George G. Block, secretary; B. J. Hawkes, treasurer; and the following workmen: Henry Emrich, Joseph Wilkinson, Hugh Whoriskey, John Devitt, James H. Casserly, Thomas Moran, Ludwig Joblinowski, Joseph Geis, Matthew Barr, James P. Archibald, and Thomas J. Ford. To this committee was added the committee named by the Chickering Hall meeting, viz: James Redpath, editor; Charles F. Wingate, sanitary engineer; Edward Johnston, dry goods; and Gideon J. Tucker, lawyer.

Of course not a single newspaper supported Henry George. Most of them became almost hysterical in their denunciations of a "class" movement, and some demanded that all political parties combine on one candidate to avert the threatened election of a new Danton. The local Democratic party had, ever since the exposure of the Tweed Ring, been divided into three fac-

tions: Tammany Hall, the County Democracy and Irving Hall. The County Democracy was in the saddle, having captured the mayoralty at the previous election, Irving Hall was almost a negligible quantity and endorsed Henry George, though without receiving any pledges from him. Many of the rank and file of Tammany favored the nomination of Mr. George; but the rank and file then, as now, had no say in the naming of candidates. When the convention met on October 11th not a dozen men knew who was to be chosen. Then Abram S. Hewitt was suggested and perfunctorily nominated, though the delegates stared at each other in amazement as they did so; for Mr. Hewitt was one of the leaders of their arch-enemy, the County Democracy. The latter organization had not intended nominating Mr. Hewitt, but Tammany's action, and the danger of Mr. George's election forced it to say "me too."

Mr. Hewitt was a man of culture, ability and wealth, and had made a creditable record as a member of Congress for several terms. The fact that he was a son-in-law of the venerated philanthropist, Peter Cooper, the founder of Cooper Union, helped to make his nomination a shrewd one. The keynote of his letter of acceptance was denunciation of the "class" movement that had nominated his opponent. He claimed that that movement was an attempt "to substitute the ideas of anarchists, nihilists, socialists and mere theorists for the democratic principle of individual liberty which involves the right to private property, and that "the horrors of the French Revolution and the atrocities of the Commune offer conclusive proof of the dreadful consequence of doctrines which can only be enforced by revolution and bloodshed even when reduced to practice by men of good intentions and men of blameless private lives."

About a year ago the writer of this article met a man who was one of Mr. Hewitt's supporters in 1886. He told me that while he was listening to the reading of his letter of acceptance he could hardly forbear laughing outright, for he had read the platform on which Henry George was running, and had also heard his speech of acceptance. Besides that, he said, Mr. Hewitt, only a few years before, had spoken in praise of Mr. George's theory of taxing "the unearned increment" as Mr. Hewitt had called it; but that he was taking advantage of the hysterical fears of Fifth Avenue and of Wall Street.

By such appeals Abram S. Hewitt made a strong bid for Republican support. That party, at that time in a great minority in New York City, thought that at least half the Democratic vote would go to George, and that it could slip in between. Had the election taken place within a week of the nominations, it is probable that at least a quarter of the Republican vote would have been cast for Hewitt. As the campaign progressed, the bulk of the Republican voters returned to their allegiance and cast their ballots for their nominee, Theodore Roosevelt. Their vote for him fell only about 25,000 below the normal Republican vote, and many of these voted for George. Mr. Roosevelt who at that time was barely 28 years of age, did not make an active campaign and carefully refrained from attacking Mr. George for fear of alienating the Republican workingmen.

Mr. George promptly picked up the gage that had been thrown by Mr. Hewitt's letter of acceptance; and there ensued a correspondence between the two that is given in full in "An Account of the George-Hewitt Campaign" published in 1886 by John W. Lovell Co. It consists of two letters from Hewitt and three from George, Mr. Hewitt failing to reply to Mr. George's third letter. The limits of this article will not permit of an analytical review of this correspondence. Suffice it to say, as was said after the election when the public mind was calm and a dispassionate perusal of the correspondence possible: "It is difficult to see how any other popular verdict can be given than that Mr. Hewitt misjudged his own powers when he ventured to initiate a discussion of social, moral and political questions with Henry George."

William Sulzer, the impeached ex-Governor, and John Hennessy his investigator, gave spectacular proofs in the 1913 campaign for Mayor of New York of the corruption of Tammany's leaders. Their work was coarse compared with the keen thrusts of Henry George in 1886. In his first letter to Mr. Hewitt he gave a list of the names (50 in number) of the committees representing the two factions of the Democratic party that had listened to their candidate reading his letter of acceptance; and he said: "With a single exception—the respectable figurehead at the top of the list—every one of these names is that of a professional politician. These committees are made up of men who have lived and expect to live on the spoils of office. You will not find among them a single 'mere theorist,' but you will find among them notorious corruptionists, keepers of gambling houses, officials smirched with the mire of Tweed, contractors who have grown rich by fat jobs, leaders of 'Dead Rabbits,' and even, in more than one case, men who have been tried for their lives on the charge of murder. I call your attention to the composition of this committee because it is not accidental. On the contrary, it fairly represents the class of men who, under Republican forms and in the name of Democracy, have hitherto ruled in this city, and against whom the common working people have risen in their might."

In the first letter of the famous George-Hewitt correspondence, Mr. George challenged Mr. Hewitt to a joint debate of the issues of the campaign. Mr. George was especially anxious that Mr. Hewitt should publicly defend his assertion that the movement which Mr. George represented springs from a "desire to substitute the ideas of anarchists, nihilists, communists, socialists and mere theorists for the Democratic principle of individual liberty which involves the right to private property." Mr. Hewitt declined to "accommodate in debate a gentleman for whose remarkable acuteness, fertility and literary power I have the highest respect." Mr. George continued to urge Mr. Hewitt to meet him in debate, and finally notified him that Chickering Hall had been rented for the evening of October 22nd, and offered to share the time with him. As the invitation was not accepted, Mr. George spoke for several hours after the introductory speech of the chairman, Rev. Dr. Kramer. He considered what is now called the Single Tax from two standpoints,—the practical or inductive, and the moral; but while preferring the latter, he, "in

deference to the common way of looking at these matters," laid stress on the former. This address has become a storehouse of material for countless Single-Tax speeches and articles. Like all of Mr. George's platform utterances it is so replete with homely illustrations and amusing anecdotes, with pathos and eloquence, skilfully interwoven in the argument, that even a political audience sat enthralled. At the conclusion, the speaker, as he did in most of his speeches, invited questions from the audience, especially from friends of Mr. Hewitt. This was a novelty in American politics. Heckling a candidate had for years been common in England but was practically unknown in this country. In the 1886 campaign Mr. George introduced a number of innovations which have since been quite generally adopted. In response to the invitation, fourteen questions were asked by as many persons. They were such as Single Taxers are used to hearing, among them being our venerable friend: Would you tax the poor man's lot on which there is a cottage as much as the rich man's lot next door on which there is a palace? The answers were cogent and witty, and kept the vast audience interested. When the people left there was a well-nigh universal verdict that the candidate's "anarchy" had been thoroughly dissected.

Although Mr. Hewitt had declined to meet his opponent on the same platform and had "decided to make no personal canvass," he changed his mind so far as to make several speeches. To have done otherwise would have been fatal, in view of the extraordinarily active canvass being conducted by his opponent, and by the latter's supporters. The burden of his speeches consisted of a comparison of his long public record with Mr. George's short one, denunciation of his opponent's land theory, and an explanation of his relations with corrupt politicians for which Mr. George had criticized him. Garbled newspaper accounts of Mr. George's speeches furnished Mr. Hewitt with many texts; and when their obvious falsity was pointed out, Mr. Hewitt did not retract. The newspapers were unanimously against Henry George, and at that time they seemed to think it paid to deliberately misquote and misrepresent an opponent. Even the *Evening Post*, which prided itself on its journalistic fairness, made it appear that Mr. George had told a large audience that the horrors of the French Revolution would be repeated in New York if he was not elected. The writer of this article had taken a verbatim shorthand report of the speech referred to, which showed that the *Evening Post's* statement was made out of whole cloth. To make up for the lack of journalistic support, Louis F. Post and others started a daily newspaper called *The Leader*. This continued to support the Henry George movement until 1888, when it was captured by the Socialists, and soon thereafter discontinued publication.

The Single Tax philosophy has now so thoroughly permeated the consciousness of the people that even its opponents state its incidence fairly well. In 1886, however, there were comparatively few who had ever read *Progress and Poverty*, and still fewer who had become intellectually and spiritually convinced of the truths it taught. It seems almost inconceivable that at a mass meeting of business men at Steinway Hall addressed by Mr. Hewitt, and

presided over by the president of a national bank, the following resolution was adopted:

"That to exempt personal property and buildings, and cast the burden of taxation on unimproved land, according to Mr. George's theory, would enable the owners of the land and buildings upon it to reassess the whole amount of the taxes upon the tenants in the form of excessive rents, and so work oppression upon the laboring classes by absorbing their wages to meet their rents."

Of course Mr. Hewitt knew better, for only a few years before he had written highly laudatory words of Mr. George's elucidation of his land theory in *Progress and Poverty*, and had stated that it was unjust that the unearned increment of land should go to the individuals who happened to hold possession of it. Still, at this same meeting he "out-Heroded Herod" by stating:

"And yet there comes one apostle who, preaching to one class of the community the doctrine of hate, tells them that his gospel will override the laws of Divine Providence. Is there no danger in such doctrine as this? Remember that here in New York is a large population of people who necessarily live from day to day. By that labor of each day must their bread be got. Now when a man of extraordinary ability comes to these people and points to the houses of the wealthy and says, 'All this is yours; you produced it. Follow me and I will make an equitable distribution of property by which you shall have your share of these good things,' this is a most attractive doctrine, and I don't wonder that thousands of men have followed the lead of this new apostle. But on the other hand we have the experience of mankind from the beginning, showing that by the establishment of the right of private property the world has grown in wealth, in comfort, in civilization, and in all the blessings that go with progress under the broad shield of law."

At another meeting, he said that he regarded "the election of Henry George as Mayor of New York as the greatest possible calamity that could menace its prosperity and its future hopes; but I have no fear that the doctrine of confiscation which he preaches will ever be put in practice in this city *where a large majority of the people are living under their own vine and fig tree and where men own their own homes.*" The number of the owners of New York today is unknown but it is estimated not to exceed 150,000 or 3 per cent. of the population. The number in 1886 could not have been more than one person in twenty-five. If Mr. Hewitt's statement were even measurably true, Mr. George has been vindicated; for in 27 years "the large majority who owned their own homes" has been reduced to three in about one hundred of the population.

The campaign for the election of Mr. Hewitt consisted of a few meetings in large halls, the support of the newspapers, and, above all, the combined activities of two political machines well oiled with the contributions of what have since been called "the interests." In striking contrast was the Henry George campaign. With little or no funds with which to hire halls, there was inaugurated the cart-tail campaign now so popular. Hundreds of volunteer speakers addressed nightly meetings during the month of October. Nor were the speakers entirely recruited from the ranks of labor; for among them were physicians, lawyers, artists, stenographers, merchants, manufacturers, and teach-

ers. The pulpit supplied its quota. Father Huntington, the "Protestant monk," went the rounds with the other speakers, night after night, and pleaded the cause of the poor among whom he lived and worked. Men who worked for daily wages were there too. When their work for an employer was done, mechanics, clerks, and "common" laborers took their turn upon the trucks. These men who are supposed to know nothing but the technique of their trades, exhibited a knowledge of political economy—its literature, history and principles—of social science, the science of government, the progress and scope of democracy, and the nature of abstract justice, that would put to shame the newspaper proprietors and politicians who stigmatized them as ignorant agitators.

It was at such meetings that Mr. George delivered most of his speeches. Going from one point in the city to another, usually five times in a night, often more, and once eleven times, he addressed the multitudes that came to hear him.

As we have seen, extremes met in this campaign. Henry George's candidacy was supported by Father McGlynn, the beloved Catholic priest, and by Col. Robert G. Ingersoll, the brilliant agnostic. At one of the meetings a letter was read from Col. Ingersoll, in which he said:

"There was a great ship disabled at sea, and there were on board a thousand steerage passengers and one hundred in the cabin. The food began to grow scarce in the steerage, for they only had enough to last during an ordinary voyage. There was plenty in the cabin—plenty not only for the hundred there, but for the thousand below. For a few days the steerage passengers depended on charity, and a few generous souls gave them a little meat and bread. Some gave them crumbs, others advice. Some talked about "vested rights," and a few clergymen, travelling for their health, gave them prayers. The demand grew greater than charity supplied. Advice was not food. Prayer did not satisfy hunger, and at last a cry was raised: 'We will help ourselves!'

"After all, this world is only a great ship, making its annual voyage through the ocean of ether around the sun; and if the steerage passengers grow hungry, and if they can truthfully say that they by their labor, by their toil, produced all the food in the cabin, shall they be allowed to die for lack of bread? In my judgment the cabin will become intelligent enough to divide, and the steerage would become intelligent enough to be satisfied with its honest share.

"There are in most communities at least three classes of people; first, those who do not care because they do not know; second, those who do not know because they do not care; and third, those who know and care. Upon this, the third class, we must in this campaign rely. The very rich, who do not know, because they do not care, will never vote for Henry George. Neither can we rely upon those who do not care because they do not know. The people who labor and the people who think—those who suffer and those who sympathize—should vote together.

"Whenever a new idea is advanced, the people who do not even understand the old ones will begin to talk of revolution and the horrors of 1789. You cannot prevent a revolution by attacking new ideas as though they were wild beasts. Such a course produces revolution. When the people speak and the rich refuse to hear—when facts are denounced and prejudices sainted—a revolution is at hand.

"My sympathies are with the laboring man. The industrious should wear the robes and crowns and sit at the banquets of the world."

Dr. McGlynn was one of the principal factors in the large vote cast for

Mr. George in 1886; but his support in 1887, after he had been excommunicated, also partly accounted for the decreased vote cast for Mr. George that year. Dr. McGlynn was the most beloved priest and also the most intellectual in the New York diocese. He refused to obey the Archbishop's command to withdraw from the campaign. This fact was not made public until after the election of 1886; but on the Sunday preceding election day hundreds of thousands of copies of a pamphlet were distributed at the doors of all catholic churches. This pamphlet consisted of the correspondence between Joseph J. O'Donohue, chairman of Tammany Hall's committee on resolutions, and Monsignor Preston, to the effect that the Catholic clergy were opposed to Mr. George's candidacy. This came too late to do much damage to Mr. George's cause; for whatever effect it had was probably offset by the resentment aroused by the hierarchy's interference in a political contest.

Political parades have been customary in exciting campaigns in New York; but in this campaign there was only one. It is doubtful if either the Republicans or the "united" Democrats could have mustered a procession respectable in point of numbers. At any rate, neither dared to take the risk of failure. The labor organizations, however, had no such fears.

About a week before election, William McCabe, the wellknown journeyman printer, who organized the labor day parades of 1882 and 1883, was appointed marshal and invested with the necessary authority to call out the labor associations that were pledged to the support of Henry George.

The parade took place on October 30th—the Saturday preceding election day—November 2nd. About 30,000 men marched for hours, drenched by a cold rain, shouting: "Hi! Ho! the leeches—must—go" "George—George—Henry George."

The parade was probable the first tangible proof to the politicians that they were in danger. They did not fear the effect of George's crowded meetings, nor worry over the slim attendance at their own. Their confidence in the power of the "machine" was unbounded. But when 30,000 men—most of them mechanics—marched in a cold and drenching storm through two miles of streets, behind their union banners, on the eve of election, and at their own expense, the politicians awoke to the fact that the "machine" was in danger of being smashed.

It is possible that this parade defeated Henry George. The alarm it created in the breasts of "the interests" caused their pocket-books to open and provided an enormous corruption fund for use on election day. Mr. George was the first in the United States to suggest the use of the Australian secret ballot, since adopted in every State. But in 1886 each party printed and furnished its own ballots, which were distributed on the streets in front of the polling places. When a poor devil received a \$2 bill for voting for Hewitt, he knew he was being watched until he had deposited the "right" ballot in the box. It was common, in some districts of New York City, to see men lining up before the ballot box, each holding aloft in his right hand the ballot that had been given him, so as to make it convenient for the heeler to see that

he stayed bought. All this machinery required many "workers" under pay. The Henry George supporters were necessarily handicapped by their inability to pay men to act as distributors of ballots, etc., and in some districts ballots for Henry George were not obtainable. These obstacles, combined with bribery of the very poor (George's natural supporters) made his vote remarkable; for, out of a total of 218,000 he polled about one-third, or 68,000, Mr. Hewitt receiving 90,000, and Mr. Roosevelt 60,000. This was twelve years before Greater New York came into being, the city then including only what are now known as the boroughs of Manhattan and Bronx. Of the 24 Assembly Districts Hewitt carried 15, George 5 and Roosevelt 4.

Many years later a prominent Tammany politician told the writer of this article that Mr. Croker, the boss of Tammany Hall, had informed him that if the vote actually cast had been correctly counted George would have been declared elected. The well-known confidential relations of the Democratic and Republican machines in New York City give an air of probability to this story.

If Mr. George had indeed been elected or allowed to take his seat, he could not have done anything directly to advance the cause that was nearest to his heart. The mere fact, however, that the author of *Progress and Poverty* had been elected to the mayoralty of the then fourth greatest city in the world, would have given an enormous impetus to the propaganda of the Single Tax. So his campaign and the great vote he polled, have made Single Taxers of hundreds of thousands who might otherwise have lived and died without ever having learned that the "earth belongs in usufruct to the living." In his speech of acceptance Henry George said, "What we do on this side of the water will send its impulse across the land, and over the sea, and give courage to all men to think and to act." Would the fight to free the land of England now be on if there had been no campaign of eighty-six? The imprisonment of the humble Theiss boycotters set the ball rolling. Blessed be their memory!

THE HENRY GEORGE CAMPAIGN FOR SECRETARY OF STATE IN 1887.

The New York State Convention of the United Labor Party met on August 17 at Syracuse. In the *Standard* of July 30 preceding the Convention Mr. George wrote as follows:

"Over the platform there is not likely to be any dispute. The principles on which the new party is consolidating are well stated in the Clarendon Hall platform on which the municipal campaign was made in this city last year, and in the call for the Convention. They are that land values shall be appropriated for the benefit of the community and that taxes on production and its results be abolished; that businesses in their nature monopolies (such as railroads, telegraphs, etc.) and functions that can be performed better by the