CHAPTER 6

THE LAST DECADE

After his defeat of 1887 George did not personally re-enter politics until ten years later. Although writing and lecturing on the land question both here and abroad formed the backbone of his work during this decade, he also took part in Democratic campaigns, supported free trade, and in matters affecting working men was, as always, on the side known as progressive.

Nevertheless, his books and speeches now at times displayed an anti-socialistic, "anti-government" trend. There were two major reasons for this: the fact that he had lost the mayoralty campaign partly through being erroneously branded a socialist; and the influence of his associate Thomas Shearman.

George was keenly aware both of his own philosophic differences with formal socialism, and of the part that being confounded with it had played in his political defeat. Shortly afterwards he started his own weekly, *The Standard.*[1] The first few issues contained censures of the Catholic Church, which had excommunicated Father McGlynn for supporting George's allegedly anti-private-property stance. Thereafter George was at pains to emphasize the difference of his position from that of Socialism, which really didn't respect private property —whereas he was against only private property in Land profits. This distinction he made in a somewhat intransigeant form in two books of the early 1890s.

The first of these was *The Condition of Labor,* subtitled "An Open Letter to Pope Leo XIII." In 1891 the Pope had just published a famous encyclical expressing sympathy with workers, but denouncing radical reform in land ownership in a way that George felt was aimed at himself. In his literary reply, the economist upheld the ethics of the land tax theory, saying that competition (except in land acquisition) was "necessary to the health of the industrial and social organism," and that one should "leave sacredly to the individual all that belongs to the individual"—by which he meant untaxed earnings, as well as wages undiminished by land-profits.[2]

Independent but fairly respectful in tone, this book was a restrained, creditable piece of writing. The same cannot be said of his next work, *A Perplexed Philosopher:* a diatribe against the social philosopher Herbert Spencer, who in his 1850 *Social Statics* had championed land nationalization and then omitted all advocacy of it in a later edition of the book. In bellicose mood George condemned Spencer as an arrogant sycophant to British landlords, and there is a passage where he emphasizes his own free-enterprise leanings by writing in an extreme vein against taxes:

"Take anything which denies or impairs the right of property—robbery, brigandage, piracy, war, customs duties, excises or taxes on wealth in any of its forms—do they not all violate personal liberty, directly or indirectly?"[3]

Yet even in these two somewhat polemic, tendentious works as well as in certain speeches he made at the time, the downright anti-tax attitude was only secondarily expressed,—the goal of eliminating private profit from land always being the main issue.

While his essential tolerance, as shown here and there in *Progress and Poverty,* for some taxes other than the land tax was being scanted in favor of clarifying his anti-Socialist position, George was including in his circle Thomas Shearman, the man who was to name the movement "single tax."

In 1881 Shearman, a corporation lawyer, had written George,

then a stranger to him, asserting great interest though not entire agreement with his theory, using the letterhead of a "Tax Reform League" and asking George to address a Revenue Reform Club.[4] In other words, he had a prior concern with tax reform before ever encountering the author of *Progress and Poverty*.

Shearman was a rather complex man. His professional activities appear to have been inclusive of tendencies not usually found together. He defended without compensation hundreds of Indians, Negroes, Armenians, coal miners, factory hands and tenement-dwellers, simply because of his sympathy with the downtrodden, and his philanthropies were correspondingly generous.

On the other hand, he was a partner in a law firm representing the Erie Railroad, and successfully defended the notoriously unscrupulous railroad tycoon, Jay Gould, in almost a hundred damage suits arising out of the "Black Friday" gold panic. Since lawyers are supposed to defend their clients this is no reflection on Shearman's integrity, but it does suggest the climate of vested interests in which much of his professional life was rooted. Other clients included the National City Bank, James Hill of the Canadian Pacific, and several other important railroad and industrial companies.[5]

Since he was for land taxation, George welcomed his support; it was his habit confidently to accept the backing of anyone who seemed in fairly strong agreement with him, even if such a man's basic outlook was not the same as his. By 1887 Shearman had become one of the movement's most active members. But its anti-tax, free-enterprise aspect received an emphasis from him disproportionate to that found in *Progress and Poverty*.

Shearman first called the movement "single tax" in an address he gave in 1887.[6] It was a phrase which had appeared in George's book only twice, the first mention being in Book VIII, three-quarters of the way through the volume. And when the term did occur, it was "a" single tax, not "the" single tax that was spoken of. Yet Shearman lifted this phrase from George's great work on land reform, and called the whole movement "the single tax."

Thereafter the designation was accepted and often used by George, who saw certain advantages in it:

"The term single tax does not really express all that a perfect name would convey," he wrote. "It only suggests the fiscal side of our aim. And in reality the single tax is not a tax at all. (He meant it was the collection of "land-rent"). But it is a tax in form, and the term is useful in suggesting method. Before we adopted this name, people . . . insisted on believing we proposed to divide land up . . . equally. Since we have used the term single tax, this sort of misrepresentation seems to have almost entirely disappeared."[7]

In his relief that the word "tax," denoting a charge on private property, dispelled the fear of land nationalization (which he had supported in Ireland) and eased the way for the appropriation of land profits, he didn't worry that the name might lend his cause a different emphasis from what he intended. The appellation fitted in so well with his current efforts, begun in his state campaign of 1887, to make clear he was not a Socialist.

"Not by accident, we may be sure," wrote his biographer, Professor Charles Barker, "the phrase appears contemporaneously with his separating from socialism, and from land nationalization as a practical reform movement."[8]

In 1887 *The Standard,* which George was to publish for six years, now became the prime means of his focusing attention on his proposal. As in all his journalistic enterprises, he pressed for a number of public issues. Yet *The Standard* more than any of his previous editorial ventures was predominantly a land-reform sheet, and prominent Georgist followers were among its supporters.

Containing articles, reports, letters, jokes and parables, it served as a rallying point for land-tax bestirment, and as a house-organ in which members of the movement, which was beginning to include partisans of dubious mental caliber, could communicate with each other. "Agitate, agitate, agitate, and all things will come right of themselves," a contributor's letter was captioned.

The lead editorials by George were frequently six or seven thousand words long. Sometimes he illustrated his land thesis with statistics, such as those of overcrowded tenements contrasted with high-priced vacant lots in different parts of New York City. At other times he supported his position in an exalted, over-simplified way:

"If there be any Christian man who fails to see in the simple reform that we propose a cause sufficient to abolish all poverty save such as may result from individual misconduct, then it can only be that he has failed to understand it, or does not in reality believe in the sort of God his religion proclaims."

The current of personal religious feeling which had always underlain George's economic philosophy became partly diverted in this post-election period to preoccupation with the attitudes of the Catholic Church. To his ethical convictions the McGlynn case now added the element of religious polemics.[9]

"The great question which Dr. McGlynn's case ought to bring home to all citizens. . . ." he wrote, "is whether the American republic can afford to have in its midst a secret power, wielding a tremendous political influence, deriving its authorizing impulse from a foreign kingdom and utterly irresponsible to the American people or any part of them, whether they are Protestant or Catholic. . . ."

How far George may have influenced people to question the power of the Catholic Church is an interesting and unexplored point. More certain is it that his distaste for Catholicism's worldly workings gave new drive to his longtime belief that churches should be aware of human economic misery—and aware in the right way.

As a result of this attitude he helped to found, in 1887, the sect-like Anti-Poverty Society headed by McGlynn. Its aim was to promote "social justice" which meant to champion George's gospel about land. Protestants and Jews as well as numbers of Catholics composed the meetings which took place in New York every Sunday evening—rousing with evangelic color, complete with hymn-singing, organ music and the distribution of tracts.[10]

A militant, salvation-army spirit prevailed, with George and

McGlynn, both striking orators, the two chief speakers. Many times there must have been an inspiriting fusion of religion and a call to social action.

But religious cranks and sect-following types trooped to the meetings, along with good Catholics, other religionists, and plain single taxers—as George's sympathizers were now mostly called. The written and spoken material was sprinkled with references to the bounty of the Almighty and the fact that every baby born into the world should have the earth as his birthright. "Not the Lord but the landlord" was a sally cheered by the worshippers, and during a speech by the Reverend Hugh Pentecost (a Protestant) the following were hissed: *The New York Tribune,* Standard Oil, Chauncey M. Depew, an economist named Edward Atkinson, the mayor of New York and Archbishop Corrigan who had ousted McGlynn. The peroration—"The bar before which these thieves are to be brought is right reason . . . the judge is Almighty God! The prosecuting attorney is the Anti-Poverty Society"— was received with "wild applause and waving of handkerchiefs."

After a year George withdrew from the Society. One wonders if he had had enough of its proselytizing zealots. The only reason given, however, was a split in political affiliation: McGlynn, who was a leader of the United Labor Party, wished to support one of its men for President, which to George seemed entirely futile.

His city and statewide campaigns of 1886 and 1887 had convinced George that Labor could not hope to win the national contest of 1888. He once said that choosing a political party was like boarding a street-car: you took the one that was going in your general direction, even if not exactly to your destination. Ever since the election of 1872 when he realized the party of Lincoln no longer represented the spirit of Lincoln, that street-car for him had been the Democratic party. The conductor this time was President Cleveland, running for a second term.

The desirable direction in which Cleveland was apparently headed was towards support of free trade: at least, he was for "tariff reduction." This was an issue which, though close to his

heart, George had naturally not found suitable for local campaigns. Now he worked actively for Cleveland, stumping upstate New York and Pennsylvania with speeches in his behalf.

He also wrote a series of *Standard* editorials supporting free trade and explaining, as he had in the *Free Trade* book, how this issue and the land issue were interwoven. The two anti-privilege subjects had an intrinsic relationship, he averred, in that free trade would ultimately benefit only landowners unless land reform took place first.[11]

He evinced the confident belief that discussion of the first topic would entail consideration of the second. His own brilliant, abstract turn of mind, along with the all-encompassing primacy he gave to the land question, kept him from realizing that most people would see no connection at all. As in the case of expecting Laborites to care about the land issue, or hoping that socially concerned churchmen would cherish it, he was counting on a mutuality of interest between certain other groups and himself which did not actually prevail.

The President lost to Benjamin Harrison; yet during the next four years sentiments against the protective tariff were strongly voiced in Congress. But by the time Cleveland ran again, this time successfully, in 1892, his anti-protection attitude was much qualified, and George called on him, vainly trying to stiffen it.

Journalism, authorship and lecture-tours were the main ingredients of George's life. His role strictly as an economist was secondary to him. Yet he was a well-known, and to some people notorious one, and he was by no means indifferent to all the things that were being said for and against his thesis.

In *The Standard,* for instance, he reprinted a defense of his ideas which Shearman had published elsewhere. The paper also printed many outside comments on George's work, especially those which afforded favorable nuggets for quotation. In the *Century* he wrote a reply to Edward Atkinson, a Boston business economist, who in the same magazine had criticized the land tax theory.

The high mark of his involvement with economists occurred

in September 1890 when the American Association for Social Science held its annual meeting, in Saratoga, New York, and he was invited to participate. A whole day was programmed to debating The Single Tax.[12]

Against it were John Bates Clark of Smith College, the young Professor Edwin Seligman of Columbia University, William Harris, Commissioner of Education, Edward Atkinson, the business economist, and a fifth man. George defended the proposition, supported by his friend Louis Post, a Labor journalist, and William Lloyd Garrison, son of the abolitionist; by a Boston lawyer, Samuel Clarke, and by a land conveyancer. President E. Benjamin Andrews of Brown University and Professor Edward James, soon also to be a university president, endorsed George with qualifications.

The verbatim report of the meeting makes fascinating reading for anyone wanting to know how the economists of that day felt about the land tax proposal and its author. One gets a sense of lively interest, of respect and cordiality for George mingled with some disdain, and of an overriding net distrust of the plan. The criticisms of the opposing economists present an assortment of approaches. It is not so much the arguments themselves which differ—though there were quite a few contradictory ones—as the emphasis which varies.

Professor Seligman, asserting there was much unearned profit besides that from land, said the scheme was "either recklessly dishonest or irretrievably unequal," and sought "to put the burdens of the many on the shoulders of the few." Professor Clark highlighted the propriety of State's rights as against individual "natural rights," and claimed that existent modes of land-ownership were satisfactory. Harris and Atkinson brought out this latter point too, and implied that under the land tax, the landlords could pass on the burden to the tenants. This was specifically denied by Seligman, who conceded to the single taxers that such a tax could not be "shifted." One speaker protested that land should not be "nationalized"; the rest appeared to avoid this misunderstanding. Almost all agreed that non-compensation to owners was very unjust.

President Andrews of Brown made an unusual speech in

which he said the reform was "extraordinarily desirable", with the evils of the existent system operating much as George described. But he objected to land as the sole source of taxation, warning that it would make money flow noiselessly into the coffers of a potentially despotic state. He thought it would produce too much revenue—the opposite of the usual opinion.

When George took the floor, he pointed to this plethora of arguments, saying that if the gentlemen would but fight it out among themselves, there would be no objections left for the single tax men to meet. Unlike Louis Post and William Lloyd Garrison, whose idealistic, wooden speeches sound like paraphrases of *Progress and Poverty,* he answered his opponents flexibly and directly, if not to their satisfaction.

To the argument that the tax wouldn't bring in enough revenue, he simply said that if not, some supplementary method should be found. His rejoinder to the claim that there were other important sources of unearned income besides land was that he couldn't think of any, except franchises. (Here he did less than justice to his own breadth of view, for elsewhere he had cited tariffs, patents, and deliberate monopolistic arrangements as sources of profiteering.) The ordinary ups and downs of business profits, he felt, didn't come under the heading of unearned increment.

He pinpointed the question of compensation to landowners as the chief stumbling-block to the acceptance of his idea. Here he reiterated his belief that justice demanded the change, and that other factors would mitigate the present landowners' disadvantage. He implied, incorrectly, that current land-values consisted mostly of profits and expectations that had accrued since the time of purchase, and hence had not really been paid for by the owners at all. Professor Seligman was quick to point out that this was not so.

The sharpest, most significant opposition of the debate took place between these two men.

"There are today economists worthy of the name who are protectionists," said Professor Seligman, "there are economists, justly so called, who are socialists; but throughout the wide world today there is not a single man with a thorough training

in the history of economics, or an acquaintance with the science of finance who is an advocate of the Single Tax system. In biology, in astronomy, in metaphysics, we bow down before the specialist; but every man whose knowledge of economics or the science of finance is derived from the daily papers or one or two books with lopsided ideas, thinks he is a full-fledged scientist, able to instruct the closest students of the markets or of the political and social organism."

To which Henry George, in part, rejoined:

"Professor Seligman said that the advocates of the single tax do not understand the science of finance. Well, if some of the reasoning we have heard here be the result of understanding the science of finance, we single tax men are glad that we don't understand it. He has also said that the professors of political economy as a class are against us. Unfortunately, that is true. But is it astonishing? Given a great social wrong that affects the distribution of wealth, and it is in the nature of things that professors of political economy should either belong to, or consciously or unconsciously be influenced by the very class who profit by the wrong, and who oppose, therefore, all means for the remedy.

"Professor Seligman intimates that we who are not of the colleges ought to accept what professors of political economy tell us of social science, as we accept what professors of the physical sciences tell us of their domain. The difference, which he ignores, is that researches into the physical laws of nature do not affect the 'pocket-nerve': political economy does . . . There is a reason why the great majority of us must, in such matters as astronomy or chemistry, accept what the professors of such sciences tell us. But if we cannot all study political economy, the science whose phenomena lie about us is in our daily lives and enter into our most important relations, and whose laws lie at the bottom of questions we are called on to settle with our votes - then democratic republican government is doomed to failure, and the quicker we surrender ourselves to the government of the rich and learned, the better.

"Let me say a direct word to you professors of political economy, you men of light and learning, who are fighting the single

tax with evasions and quibbles and hair-splitting. We single tax men propose something that we believe will make the life of the masses easier, that will end the strife between capital and labor, and solve the darkening social problems of our time. If our remedy will not do, what is your remedy? . . .

"There must be some deep wrong underlying our organization today. If it is not the wrong we point to, the wrong that disinherits men of their birthright, what is it? . . . Modern society cannot stand still. All over the civilized world social conditions are becoming intolerable. If you reject the single tax, look to it, from what you turn and toward what you are going. . . .

"What is proposed on the other side? More restrictions, more interferences, more extensions of government into the individual field, more organization of class against class, more bars to the liberty of the citizen. In turning from us, even though it be to milk-and-water socialism, you are turning to the road that leads to revolution and chaos, you are using your influence to intensify the fight in the dark that, as it goes on, must evolve the forces that destroy civilization."

Seligman was moved by this to a long rebuttal:

"It is grossly unjust to ascribe to professors of political economy a truckling or even an unconscious subservience to the powers that be. All history disprove this . . . (here he cited the support given by professors to labor unions, free trade, etc.) Let me tell Mr. George that the reason why college professors are not counted among his followers is not that they are afraid of consequences, but that they utterly repudiate the adequacy of his solution. Show us that your remedy is a true remedy; convince us that your methods are just and that your results will be efficacious; bring home to us, in short, the proof that you have really solved the social question—and I can assure you that you will find no more devoted or enthusiastic adherents than the college professors. . . .

"Mr. George, you ask us, if the single tax is not the remedy, what is the remedy? Ay, that is the question. The science of political economy I consider the deepest, the most difficult, the most complex of all sciences. It is still in its infancy. The laws

of social well-being do exist, but we are only finite mortals, and have only begun to acquire the first inkling of these laws. . . ."

Along with secondary arguments, the debate with Seligman reflected major conflicts between George and the economists in regard to both substance and approach. As far as substance went, they felt he overdid the emphasis on private land ownership as an economic evil, whereas he, holding this correctible injustice to be the cause of maldistribution, thought they trusted too much to unnecessary governmental measures of relief.

The variance in approach, however, was also very significant: the academicians assumed they were the highly-trained exponents of a complex cerebral science, while George, as much a moral philosopher as an economist, was convinced of the self-evident rightness as well as the economic accuracy of his own simpler views. Although he did offer Seligman a half-apology for having implied the professors were subservient to material interests, he never lost the feeling that he and they were for the most part in different camps.

No account of George's life would be complete without some mention of Tom Johnson, his closest associate, and later, as "the reform mayor of Cleveland," to be the most influential carrier of George's liberal philosophy.[13]

As a young man Johnson was already a magnate who had cheerfully made a fortune in profiteering from steel, and from street railways. One day in 1885 a train-vendor prevailed on him to buy a copy of *Social Problems:* he was astounded to read that George held monopolistic privileges such as his own to be the root of economic evil. He next read *Progress and Poverty,* and was struck with doubts. "I want you to answer that book for me," he told his lawyer, "for if it is right, I am all wrong." The lawyer thought the book *was* right in principle. Tom gave up money-making as an ideal, and went to call on George, who was fifteen years his senior.[14]

They became tutor and pupil, as well as friends. The younger

man felt the other's greatness as soon as he entered his presence, yet there was nothing of hero worship in his behavior, and his brief written appreciations of George are the more effective for their reserve.

George advised Johnson to go into politics, replying to the latter's assertion that he couldn't speak in public, that he didn't know since he hadn't tried. Johnson's maiden speech was simply terrible. Before his career was over he was a first-class orator, whose clear, sensible mind and moral charm kept him in constant contact with masses of people.

With George's encouragement Johnson ran for Congress as a Democrat from Ohio, winning in 1890 and 1892. He was a forceful supporter of free trade. With five other congressmen each taking a piece of it, he read George's entire *Protection or Free Trade* into the Congressional Record. Paid for primarily by Johnson, this was reprinted in a booklet banteringly know as St. George, of which almost a million and a half copies were distributed.[15]

It was not as a congressman, however, but as a mayor that Tom became a force in American political life. This was to occur several years after George's death, when in 1901 he began his eight years' shining service as mayor of Cleveland. His success in ridding the government of graft and monopolistic depredations made Cleveland "a city set on a hill"—an example to which mayors all over America turned to learn how it was done. The reformer Lincoln Steffens called him the best mayor in the best governed city in the United States.

He fought hardest against the street-railway monopoly, for he personally understood the interplay between its huge profits and the corrupt influences which its owners could bring to bear on newspapers, courts and legislators. Although the Georgist public ownership he advocated was not adopted, he did cut down on the profits of franchise-holders, and the spotlight he turned on the injustice of such privileges was seen far beyond his city and state.

From the state he wrested tax and other home-rule privileges, and he managed to secure a small amount of "land value taxation", shifting the real estate tax slightly from buildings to land.

Perhaps his most distinctive contribution as mayor was his idea of a city for which its own citizens were responsible. Nonchalantly he pitched a large tent here and there all over town, encouraging the people to assemble and discuss civic matters until they should become a fully informed electorate. It was in the cities, he said, that the abolition of privilege should begin.[16]

In all this George's influence was marked. Both men shared the vision of a city as a unit not too small and not too large for significant personal understanding of public affairs. "The foundation of our system is in our local government," George had written.

The casual, courageous, well-beloved mayor of Cleveland had much the same effect on others that George had exerted on him. Each had the enkindling quality of a great leader, opening up for younger people a side of life they didn't even know existed. Around Cleveland and Chicago a group of liberals gathered whose interest in Georgist anti-monopoly ideals stemmed largely from Johnson; and he gave impetus to the careers of two Georgist disciples, Louis Post and Newton Baker, later both members of President Wilson's progressive-minded cabinet.[17]

The autumn of 1890 had held other striking events for George besides the economists' debate. Just prior to it he had completed a triumphal Australian lecture tour, and on his return he addressed the First National Single Tax Conference at Cooper Union in New York. It was symbolic of the slightly detached attitude he was always to maintain regarding the organized movement that his featured address—on Sept. 2,his 51st birthday—was on free trade, not the single tax.

The "crank element" had now departed from his following, he said at this point—a statement only relatively true, for this element was to persist, though not as markedly as in the days of the Anti-Poverty Society, for a long time.

In December the year's various pressures caused him to cede control of *The Standard* to Louis Post and another editor. Three days later he suffered a stroke. A stay in Bermuda—(where to

his great satisfaction he learned to master a bicycle)—apparently restored his health, at least for a while.

But death thereafter was more often in his thoughts, though not in a sorrowful way.

"None of that when I am dead," he once said to his children as they passed a doorway draped in funereal black crepe. "Death is as natural as life; it means a passage into another life. If a man has lived well—if he has kept the faith—it should be a time for rejoicing, not for repining, that the struggle here is over."[18]

1892 was an election year which saw his political energies revive. He worked not only for Tom Johnson's re-election to Congress, but also for Cleveland's second term—likewise a successful campaign. He refused to support the Populist party though he shared some of their beliefs, being uninterested in doctrines that didn't highlight the land problem as he saw it.

The next year he again addressed a National Single Tax Conference—the second, held in Chicago. This time his point of view in one respect was definitely opposed to that of his followers: he voted, unsuccessfully, in favor of government management of public utilities.[19]

In 1894 he moved closer to the political limelight as he took the part of Governor Altgeld of Illinois in the Pullman strike. George condemned Cleveland for sending Federal troops to Chicago in behalf of the capitalist owners versus the railroad workers. That same year there was talk of offering him some nomination on a Single Tax ticket, but he rejected the idea:

"The Single Tax is not a party or an organization," he declared, "it is the perception of a great truth."

The presidential election year of 1896 gave him the opportunity, as correspondent for the *New York Journal,* to attend both the Republican and Democratic conventions. At the latter he heard William Jennings Bryan's famous "Cross of Gold" speech. Though George was not particularly in favor of free silver, he subsequently supported Bryan for being against those strains of monopoly in the social fabric which he himself considered the greatest "cross" of all.[20]

His campaign work for the Democrat set him at variance

with many single taxers, whom he chided in a *Journal* article as being "deluded" and intimidated by business interests.

Now he had once more, without trying to, attained political visibility, and in 1897 he was tendered for the second time the nomination for the mayoralty of New York. The boroughs of the city were about to be welded into greater New York; and the new plans for city government consorted well with some of George's previous ideas on municipal reform.

Yet there were two personal obstacles to his candidacy. He had been engaged on a manuscript, *The Science of Political Economy,* which he meant to be the ultimate comprehensive expression of his views. Already in 1896 his constitution was weakening, and he sensed he wouldn't be able to finish the book unless he gave it precedence over other work. Then in March 1897, he suffered a heart attack, and to the conflict of priorities was added the warning of doctors.

"There have been thousands of mayors of cities," wrote a physician friend, "but so far but one *Progress and Poverty.*" And three other doctors told him the fight would probably cost him his life. George's answer was: "Wouldn't it be glorious to die that way!"[21] As usual he had no real desire for office, but he saw in the campaign a great chance to dramatize land reform demands—and this was more important to him than anything else.

He held a meeting of thirty friends to advise him whether to run, but his mind was virtually made up. When his consultants admitted that the land tax cause would be helped, that spur to his sense of duty settled it. His wife concurred that he should follow his conscience. No one was allowed to mention his health.

The name he chose for his party of independents and Democrats was "The Democracy of Thomas Jefferson." The Founding Father had always been his favorite political philosopher, and the choice symbolized George's faith in the capabilities of the common man. His opponents were the Tammany Democratic and two Republicans: one conservative, one liberal.

As he had eleven years earlier, George wrote the platform, which emphasized land-tax reform, municipal home rule, and

the battle against political corruption. This time his party was not a Labor party, though it sought labor votes. At first he seemed keen and cheerful in the fight. Willis Abbot, later to edit the *Christian Science Monitor,* was chairman of the campaign committee, and Tom Johnson its manager.[22]

George died of a stroke four days before the election, to the stunned grief of thousands who had never believed in his doctrine.

The night before he had spoken four times. When someone hailed him as a friend "of the laboring man" he was still strong enough to correct him: "I am for *men*!" But for the most part he was mild, strange. "Time and tide wait for no man," he said once, as if to himself.

"The figure of Mr. George on his last night on earth was one of remarkable pathos," the *New York Journal* reported. "The crowd at Whitestone noticed it and did not know what to make of it. . . . His manner can best be conveyed by imagining a martyr, racked with wounds for conscience's sake speaking to the people, while his soul was far away looking on other scenes."

This same visionary abstractness attended him when he died in his hotel. "His face was white," his son wrote, "his body rigid like a statue, his shoulders thrown back, his head up, his eyes wide open and penetrating, as if they saw something and one word came—'Yes'—many times repeated, at first with quiet emphasis, then with the vigor of his heart's force. . . ."

A hundred thousand people filed past his bier in Grand Central Palace, and an equal multitude, unable to get in, waited or prayed outside while the funeral was going on.[23]

Eulogies were pronounced by Episcopalian, Jewish and Catholic clergymen. When George's oldtime friend, Father McGlynn, came to the point where he said, "There was a man sent from God, and his name was Henry George," applause broke out, first tentative, then tumultuous, as mourners who at first had been shocked felt impelled to join in. Throughout the services there were periodic waves of applause. In the words of one who was there, it was not like a funeral but a resurrection.

The catafalque drawn by sixteen black-draped horses passed in the dusk along Madison Avenue, where a rose dropped from one of the great houses clung to the coffin, down to City Hall and over Brooklyn Bridge. It was escorted by hundreds through the canyons of the lower city. The dark streets were lined with people feeling that curious intimacy of grief for a stranger that surrounds a great man when he dies.

In those days when there were no mass communications save newspapers, it was extraordinary for a private citizen who had never held office to evoke such a demonstration. The *New York Times* compared it to that held for Lincoln.[24] American and foreign papers united in extolling his character.

He was buried in Greenwood Cemetery in Brooklyn, New York City, where Tom Johnson later was to lie nearby. On his stone was carved a passage from *Progress and Poverty:*

"The truth that I have tried to make clear will not find easy acceptance. If that could be, it would have been accepted long ago. If that could be, it would never have been obscured. But it will find friends—those who will toil for it, suffer for it, if need be, die for it. This is the power of Truth."