

HISTORICAL—UNITED STATES

HENRY GEORGE

HIS WORKS; HIS LIFE; CAMPAIGNS OF 1886 AND 1897; HIS DEATH

Henry George is today recognized as one of the greatest Americans. His books, especially *Progress and Poverty*, which is conceded to be his masterpiece, are written in a fascinating style. So fascinating is the style, indeed, that it has been held by hostile critics as the explanation of the ease with which the convictions of the reader are overpowered, he thus being made blind to Mr. George's sophistries. But whether this contention be true or not, no man ever treated political economy in the same delightful way. He made it a live science. But he also opened up its flowery paths; he made its prospects delightful; and he painted radiant pictures to arrest the beholder's attention. No writer, perhaps, so much of a logician was ever so much of a poet.

WORKS OF HENRY GEORGE

Of all the books that came from his pen, *Progress and Poverty, an Inquiry into the Cause of the Increase of Want with the Increase of Wealth; the Remedy*, is the most complete, and in some sense the work shows the most highly perfected literary craftsmanship. *Social Problems* is "light literature" in comparison, but the most interesting to the man who has given scant attention to those problems. Originally contributed to *Leslie's Weekly*, they are really "inspired editorials," dealing with problems which have changed in countenance but not in essence, but their style is so clear and limpid and at times so eloquent that few of these are in matter or manner ephemeral.

Protection or Free Trade is an examination of the tariff question from the standpoint of an enemy of all customs houses. No such treatment as this had the problem ever before received. There

is not a single table of statistics in the entire book. It is pure reason. Mr. George examines every contention of the protectionists; no claim made for a protective tariff escapes him; and he mercilessly exposes the contradictions of many of these claims. He laughs to utter scorn the plea that labor, creator of all wealth, stands in need of any protection, and is especially vigorous in his demand that the workers cease to rely upon government for aid and search more deeply into the causes of low wages and industrial depressions. He has as little patience with the low tariff or tariff reform advocates; the high protectionist is at least more consistent, for if it be admitted that the theory of protection is a good one, that labor needs protective duties, then the application of the remedy is ridiculously inadequate, and those who would lower the tariff or maintain a merely revenue tariff are not the friends of the workingman. For "British free trade" he can find no words of praise, calling it spurious free trade, as we speak of "German silver," which is not silver at all. Free trade meant to Mr. George the abolition of all obstructions to trade and production, the doing away with all taxes now levied upon commerce and industry in all its forms, and the prevention of all speculation in the natural element, land. Governments should derive all their revenues from land values, with no other taxes and no tariffs.

The fourth book of Henry George's which should be mentioned along with these three is the one he left unfinished—*The Science of Political Economy*. This work was designed to appeal to the scholar and the philosophical thinker, and is in some respects the greatest of Mr. George's works even in its incomplete form, for in it he takes political economy to a higher plane, connecting its laws with the larger problems of society and individual life and disclosing its relations to the mightier mysteries that hedge us about. Mr. George had hoped in this work to present the subject in such a way as to compel attention from the great universities and the leaders of thought throughout the world, who would then be compelled to recast much of their philosophy. Though death interrupted him in his task, and though one feels a sense of incompleteness that is to be charged to this interruption, the work

is yet more than a promise. Others of Mr. George's works are *The Perplexed Philosopher*, which is a reply to Herbert Spencer, who announced his disbelief in private property in land in *Social Statics* and afterward recanted, and *The Condition of Labor*, which is a reply to the Pope's Encyclical.

HIS EVENTFUL LIFE

The philosopher of the Single Tax was born in Philadelphia, September 2nd, 1839. His father and mother were born in this country, and were of British extraction. His father was engaged in the book publishing business in a small way, but afterwards entered the custom house, where he remained for a number of years. Henry George was educated in the public schools of Philadelphia; at fourteen he was an errand boy, and in his sixteenth year he went to sea as a cabin boy. On his return to Philadelphia he was placed by his father in a printing office to learn the trade. In 1857 he went to California, attracted there by the gold discoveries. Finding no gold he worked his way as a common seaman to British Columbia, again in search of gold and again without success.

He returned to San Francisco and to type setting. In 1871 he wrote *Our Land and Land Policy*, which contains the germ of his thoughts on social reform, and in 1879 *Progress and Poverty* appeared. In a short time there followed a most phenomenal sale of this work.

In the early eighties Mr. George came to New York; in 1886 he ran for mayor, and polled a vote so surprisingly large that it attracted the attention of the whole country, after one of the most extraordinary campaigns the metropolis had ever witnessed.

THE MAYORALTY CAMPAIGN OF 1886

Of the 68,000 men who voted for Henry George in '86, probably not one thousand had more than a vague conception, at the beginning of the campaign, what was meant by the land question. Not only was it years later that the term "Single Tax" was applied to the free land movement, but there was no organized movement at all until Henry George was nominated in 1886.

When the labor organizations of New York called upon him to lead the labor forces in a campaign for the mayoralty, Henry George hesitated. His inclinations were for the literary life and the lecture platform. 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.

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 today. 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.

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 factions, 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 perfunctorially 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 gauge thrown down in Mr. Hewitt's letter of acceptance and there ensued an interesting correspondence. The verdict on this clash of wits has been summed up in the following words: "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."

In the first of the famous George-Hewitt correspondence, Mr. George challenged Mr. Hewitt to a joint debate on 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 sprang from a "desire to substitute the ideas of Anarchists, Nihilists, Communists, Socialists and mere theorists for the democratic principle 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."

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.

Dr. McGlynn, then the pastor of St. Stephens, 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 in 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, the 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 well-known 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 probably 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 the bribery of the very poor (George's natural supporters) made his vote astonishing; 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 before Greater New York came into being, the city then including only what are now known as the boroughs of Manhattan and the 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 Richard 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 give an air of probability to this story.

THE HENRY GEORGE CAMPAIGN OF 1887

The New York State Convention of the United Labor Party met in Syracuse on August 17, 1887. It was this convention that nominated Henry George for Secretary of State. It was here that the final break with the Socialists took place.

In the campaign that ensued there were enthusiastic meetings all over the State addressed by Judge Maguire, of California, Louis F. Post and the great leader himself. The result was a reverse in city and State. The total vote in the State was 72,000, only a little more than that in the city a year before. Brooklyn added 15,000 votes to the new party, which was not bad, for there was hardly the semblance of organization in Kings County.

Perhaps even this vote, as certainly the vote of '86, was a distinct triumph for the new principles, for it was not easy in those days for a new party to make any kind of a showing. In the 800 districts which then were included in the city, election "workers," varying in number according to the size of the boodle at the disposal of the two dominant parties, "worked" the voters in various ways. This army of mercenaries, whose duty it was to beset the voters whom they could approach and conduct them to the nearest saloon, were usually well supplied with money, and perhaps at no time more than then and in the election of '86. The "respectable" elements of society were fearful of the Henry George spectre, and freely distributed of the contents of the "dough bag" for his defeat. With money and rum and threats the voter was induced or coerced to vote with the abhorrent forces that were his oppressors. In this election there was open buying of votes, so that even the vote that was cast—and the smaller vote that was counted—was indicative of the strength of the appeal that Henry George was able to make for himself and the great doctrine vaguely understood which the name of Henry George typified.

The great leader of the Single Tax movement was an intensely religious man—religious in that rare sense of nearness to what Matthew Arnold called "the spirit not ourselves that makes for righteousness." An incident related by Louis F. Post illustrates this quality of his mind, a quality which it seems to us has been peculiar only to the great ones of the earth, its prophets and its seers:

"He and I went to the Astor House to watch the returns on the *Herald* bulletins across the way. They were frightfully disappointing. It was soon evident to both of us that the United Labor Party movement had that day collapsed. In that frame of mind we went up town, and just as our car was about to start, we standing on the front platform, I said: 'Well, George, do you see the hand of the Lord in this?' He looked at me with an expression of simple confidence which I shall never forget, and answered: 'No, I don't; but it is there.' Then he went on to say that he thought a way of bringing back the people to the land had opened in the labor campaign of the preceding year, but now that way had closed; yet another way would open, and when that closed still another, until the Lord's will on earth would be done."

That way seemed to George, as it did to most of us, to open in the tariff message which a short time after emanated from the pen of President Cleveland, and enlisted the earnest support of Single Taxers everywhere, who now appeared as free trade Democrats, urging tariff abolition as a first step toward the full industrial emancipation which is our goal.

There were many followers of Henry George who clung to the idea of an independent political party national in its scope. This policy Mr. George opposed, and it was the cause of the split between himself and Dr. McGlynn. The nomination by the United Labor Party in 1888 of candidates for president and vice-president resulted in so insignificant a vote—2,668 votes in N. Y. State—that the party ceased to exist.

THE MAYORALTY CAMPAIGN OF 1897

In 1897 Henry George, now in his fifty-eighth year and weakened by illness, was again induced to face the rigors of a campaign for Mayor, this time of Greater New York. He was at the time busily engaged on the *Science of Political Economy*, from which he hoped so much. This work had taxed his every energy, and a premonition of approaching dissolution seems to have haunted him and impelled him to a feverish energy in its composition, which embodied so much of the riper fruit of his profound philosophic thought. But he did not contemplate death with fear or misgiving, but with faith and calm serenity, and eyes fronting the future with placid confidence that death held nothing to fear.

So when the call of the people came to lead them again in a fight for the mayoralty of Greater New York—the first campaign for chief magistrate under the consolidation—though he shrank from the contest it was not with any thought of fatal consequences to himself. Warned by his physician that it meant death he cheerfully accepted the commission, with as high a courage as ever soldier essayed a hopeless assault. Dr. M. R. Leverson, a neighbor of Mr. George and a life-long friend and disciple, has recorded the following notes of a conversation that occurred just before the acceptance by Mr. George of the nomination:¹

¹*Life of Henry George*, by Henry George, Jr. Vol. 2, page 595.

"One afternoon, after talking over the mayoralty subject, we went for a walk on Shore Road, just in front of his house. Mr. George was convalescent merely, indications showing to the physician the still existent condition. Continuing the conversation commenced in the house, Mr. George said to me: 'Tell me if I accept, what is the worst thing that can happen to me?'"

"I answered: 'Since you ask me, you have a right to be told. It will most probably prove fatal.'"

"He said: 'You mean it will kill me?'"

"'Most probably, yes.'"

"Dr. Kelly says the same thing, only more positively. But I have got to die. How can I die better than serving humanity? Besides, so dying will do more for the cause of humanity than anything I am likely to be able to do in the rest of my life.'"

Many of the friends of Mr. George were averse to his facing the dangers of the campaign, and even Mrs. George was appealed to to use her influence to dissuade him. This she refused to do. Her devotion to high ideals was as great as his own, and her reply to these friends, fearful of the consequences to the leader of the campaign that he must face, evinced the innate nobility of her nature which had sustained him through so many trials and dangers:

"When I was a much younger woman I made up my mind to do all in my power to help my husband in his work, and now after many years I may say that I have never once crossed him in what he has seen clearly to be his duty. Should he decide to enter this campaign I shall do nothing to prevent him; but shall, on the contrary, do all I can to strengthen and encourage him. He must live his life in his own way and at whatever sacrifice his sense of duty requires; and I shall give him all I can—devotion."

A conference followed shortly after at the New York office of the Johnson Company, at which about thirty of the friends of Mr. George decided to make the fight. He entered upon the campaign with much of the fire and spirit that had characterized him in 1886.

There were three candidates in this mayoralty contest. Robert Van Wyck was the Tammany nominee and Benjamin F. Tracy stood for the regular Republicans. Seth Low ran as an independent Republican, and around him flocked the opponents

of boss rule as represented by the two regular organizations. Most of the active Single Taxers were for Low before the advent of Mr. George as a candidate. James R. Brown had charge of the Low speakers and Dr. Marion Mills Miller was engaged at the Low headquarters. With the nomination of Henry George, Messrs. Brown and Miller and other Single Taxers who were at the time speakers nightly for Low, showed their loyalty to their old chieftain by immediately resigning their posts and enlisting, most of them without pay, under the standard of their great leader.

The campaign waxed fast and furious; it even showed what seemed to many evidences of coming victory. There was a great ratification meeting at Cooper Union characterized by the old enthusiasm that swept men off their feet; there was waving of handkerchiefs and throwing of hats in the air. The writer of these lines stood at the back of the hall with Father Ducey, both of us perhaps a little curious to ascertain just how the people would welcome this herald of industrial emancipation after years of absence from the political arena. Maybe there lingered in our minds some doubt of the wisdom of the advent of the champion in view of the fact that Seth Low, who had been a clean mayor of Brooklyn, who had an enviable reputation as a student of politics, and who had already thrown the gage of battle to the two spoils-seeking organizations, was already the candidate of the Independents. But to the Single Taxer none of these campaigns represented simply contests for office, or even immediate results. They were regarded as merely instrumental in forcing to the front the great principle of industrial emancipation for which Mr. George stood. So as Father Ducey watched the extraordinary demonstration a flush of pleasure overspread his face, and turning to the writer he said, "It's just like old times, isn't it?" And indeed it was. Physically but a shadow of his former self, the candidate nevertheless surprised his friends by the fire of his winged words. More than once bodily exhaustion compelled him to desist, but he went on, appearing before audiences with the pallor of approaching dissolution on his face, but instinct with the old inspiration that made him the most powerfully appealing figure

that has ever appeared on any political platform in Greater New York.

Willis J. Abbott, a well known newspaper man, was the George campaign manager, and August Lewis was treasurer of the campaign committee. Another, since deceased, who did splendid work as a speaker, was Arthur McEwan, also a veteran newspaper writer, with a trenchant style. H. Martin Williams, now reading clerk of the House of Representatives at Washington, Lawson Purdy, Edward McHugh, and many others raised powerful voices in this campaign. Numbers of meetings at which the candidate appeared told how little he had lost his hold upon the affections of the people of Greater New York. And then came the tragic culmination.

DEATH OF HENRY GEORGE

Henry George, in as dramatic a political battle as New York has ever witnessed, died Friday October 29, 1897, at 4:30 A. M., in the Union Square Hotel. He had addressed several large meetings before retiring. Mrs. George was with him and was awakened by his convulsive movements and faint moanings. He was found dead with a smile on his lips. Around his bedside were grouped Mrs. George, Henry George Jr., Dr. Kelly, Edward McHugh and August Lewis.

He lived for the people and had chosen to die for them. The choice was deliberate. He had entered the campaign against tremendous odds, for opposed to him were the power of Tammany and the "reform" forces behind Seth Low, the independent candidate for the mayoralty. On his own side were growing physical weakness but the power of a great idea; and as the campaign advanced it began to be felt that he stood a nearly even chance with the two other candidates.

It is doubtful if the city had ever been so stirred to its depths by the death of any citizen. The event had all the elements of a tragedy, with the election but three days away and the result in doubt. It was felt for the first time that this man of great genius, of strong personality, to whose standard men flocked as if drawn by some hidden magnet, was a real leader of men. Some per-

ception, too, that the truth for which he stood made him great, seemed to dawn upon the minds of the befuddled editors who were now called upon to comment upon his life and death.

The many eulogies that followed were often tempered with rejection of the Single Tax and the regret that a man so great should entertain an idea of this kind. It seems not to have occurred to them that if the idea for which Mr. George stood were a delusion the subject of these eulogies was not a great man, but a very much misled one, as well as a false and dangerous prophet. Even William J. Bryan, who sent a telegram saying "he was one of the foremost thinkers of the world," has since maintained a discreet silence as to whether the chief thought of all his philosophy was true or false. If false he was not a "foremost thinker," but a very sorry example of self-delusion.—F. C. L. AND EDITOR.