

The New York Campaign

THE campaign of the Single Tax Party in this city closed at 12.30 midnight preceding Election Day at the corner of 125th street and Seventh avenue, when the candidate bade "good night" to a little group which had listened not unresponsively to a speech of nearly an hour's duration from Oscar Geiger on the issues of the campaign. This is an historic corner, for Single Taxers have held forth here for many years. On this spot the thrilling voice of John S. Crosby was heard in days gone by. Earlier in the history of the movement the Prophet himself delivered his message on more than one occasion from this very spot. It was the message of glad tidings, of industrial emancipation, of the destruction of economic privilege, with taxation only the means whereby this great reform could be brought about. After him followed a long line of able exponents, many of whom rest now from their labors—some in the grave and some in public office.

NOW that the campaign is over it may be well to take account of the net results achieved. We do not speak of the vote merely, though that will interest our readers. I have received 1,017 votes in Manhattan, 1,207 in Brooklyn, 299 in the Bronx, 442 in Queens, and 51 in Richmond, a total vote of 3,016. Following is the vote for three of our Assembly candidates: John Hansen, 257, James Dangerfield, 80, and Mrs. Alma Ford, 60. The vote for Messrs. Burger, Macey and Donovan, our three remaining Assembly candidates, is lacking when we go to press.

The vote, therefore, is not "negligible." It may be considered "respectable" even within the meaning of those who use it as a synonym for "size," though a vote for a principle is always eminently respectable.

But I started out to speak of the results. At the cost of about one thousand dollars we induced the government to print the words "Single Tax" one million times in a very conspicuous place, namely, on the ballot. In addition we secured the appearance of the same magic words an equal number of times in the metropolitan newspapers that printed the sample ballot. The parties distributed to every voter a sample ballot, printing the words "Single Tax" another two million times. Advertisers know the value of iteration, and when a year from now and two years from that date again, the government does the same thing for us, we have secured an amount of advertising the value of which can hardly be overestimated. Joseph Fels paid hundreds of thousands of dollars for a less general and less public iteration of the words "Fels Naphtha." He had something to sell and knew how to advertise it. For years we Single Taxers had something to sell and didn't know enough to take it into the market. We neglected to advertise it in the most effective way a political or governmental proposal can be advertised.

THINK of addressing an audience of one million people every election! It is true that the address that we could deliver was short—just two words. But coming often

how soon will it pique the curiosity? Only one man in one hundred can tell what the Single Tax is, and half of that number will not tell it correctly. Let us not delude ourselves. Twenty years of the work of education have not educated. My vote is an accurate measure of the value of this method of education if it is nothing else. Granted that there were Single Taxers who did not vote for me, for one reason or another. Their judgment was abominable but they meant well. That the Single Tax is something to be talked about and not to be voted for, is, of course, a delusion curious in its nature and sterile in its results. But the average man who is not a Single Taxer, in his primitive unsophistication somehow jumps intuitively to the notion that the Single Tax being a governmental question should express itself at the polls. To convince him otherwise would take years of ingenious argumentation. He would have to be caught young and grow very old before you could subject his mind to the atrophying process that would induce such a conviction.

The little group of workers which numbered about thirty in all, including ten of the wonderful boy pupils of Mr. Oscar Geiger, did splendid work. That we got on the ballot at all was due largely to the unremitting, unselfish work of James A. Robinson, of Philadelphia. To this work Mr. Geo. T. Watts and Mr. Arthur H. Morino added their efficient aid. Our debt to Philadelphia was increased by the successful appeal of Robert C. Macauley for funds for printing the literature of the campaign made at the dinner given to the candidate at the Cafe Chevalier, in 45th street, in October. This dinner was presided over by Oscar Geiger as toastmaster. Addresses were made by Messrs. Geiger, Macauley, Miller, Macey, Goldzier and others.

There followed on the heels of this dinner over one hundred out-door meetings, at which George Lloyd, Frank Chodorov, John Goldsmith, Mrs. Alma Ford, Walter J. Triner, Oscar Geiger and his ten boy pupils, spoke. Over 200,000 pieces of literature were distributed among the voters at meetings and at subway and elevated stations. In this work Mrs. Haxo, daughter of our old friend, A. M. Molina, did heroic service. Then on the last day of the campaign a "show" was arranged for. An auto was driven through the city stopping just long enough at various corners to enable Mr. Chas. Ryan to deliver a Single Tax message through the megaphone and Mrs. Haxo to render selections, among them being the Land Song, in her fine soprano voice—also through the megaphone. At many places the response was gratifying. Only in one portion of the city was the reception such as to occasion some inconvenience to the entertainers. This was in the Wall street section, and was due to the young savages of the "curb," who tore down the banners and seized and scattered the literature on the sidewalks, not with any malicious intent, but with the attitude of mind peculiar to savages and parochials who greet with amusement or mild resentment what is new and strange to them.

We also have the satisfaction of having won a legal fight in the courts that has far-reaching importance. The Board

of Elections ruled that Johnan Hansen, of the 3rd Assembly in Queens, and James Dangerfield, candidate in the 12th Assembly of Kings, could not appear on the ballot owing to the similarity of signatures on the petitions. The lawyers of the party, Messrs. Loew and Burger, immediately got busy, and secured a writ of peremptory mandamus compelling the Board of Elections to replace these two names on the ballot. The decision was rendered by Judge Benedict, of Brooklyn, who ruled that the Board had no authority to pronounce on the genuineness of signatures to nominating petitions, since a corrupt Board of Elections might thus render invalid any petition on the ground of faulty signatures. Their only power is to pass upon the regularity of the procedure as conforming to the law. The extent of this victory and its importance can hardly be overestimated.

Among the net results achieved are about one hundred new members of the Single Tax Party organization in this city, which we will hazard is greater than that of any single year's membership of any local Single Tax club in the Union, hundreds of requests for literature, and some newspaper publicity. The latter was small outside of three articles in the *New York Sun* of some length, a smaller notice in the *Globe* and an article in the *Brooklyn Eagle* dealing favorably with the issue raised by the new party and containing friendly reference to the candidate. This was from that veteran newspaper correspondent, Julius Chambers.

The lack of newspaper publicity was one reason for the smallness of the vote. Unless we can succeed in "making news" the metropolitan press will scrupulously refrain from all reference to the Single Tax. The "old guard" were not alive to the opportunity offered them in this campaign. We must therefore travel without them. The Single Tax movement, as we have long suspected, and as a rapidly increasing number are coming to see, is now in its formative stage. It must be "begun all over again," not as a taxation proposal, or as a reform in taxation (important as these are), but as a great measure of industrial emancipation. There must be a free earth for the generations that are to come, and it is idle to minimize our demands, or to imitate the silly tactics of the past in endeavoring to sneak this issue over on the people. These cowardly and evasive methods have met with the answer they deserved. However well meaning these leaders have been they have eliminated themselves from the new movement that voices the aspirations of the Prophet of San Francisco, and that slowly but irresistibly is now gathering momentum.

We must not be discouraged. The growth of a new party is of necessity slow. It will be instructive to note the history of the Free Soil Party, with its inspiring cry of "A Free Soil for a Free People." Even after several years of agitation beginning in 1844, though it secured a dozen or more representatives in Congress, its presidential candidates, VanBuren and Adams, received no electoral votes. In 1852, with John P. Hale as its candidate for President, the party again received no electoral votes, and cast a popular vote in all the States only a little in excess of the Single Tax

vote cast in the one State of California in 1916 for the measure known as the Great Adventure. The issue of land reform would not have been obscured had it not been for the question of slavery and the impending shadow of the civil conflict. Swallowed up by the Republican Party the Free Soil Party nevertheless impregnated the new party with its teachings and traditions, which found fruit in the Homestead Bill and the wonderful utterances of that splendid champion of the land rights of men, Galusha Grow, not to speak of other eminent advocates of land reform.* The Free Soil Party and the Republican Party that succeeded it would have gone further in the direction so clearly indicated by many of the speakers in Congress had it not been for the more startlingly obvious wrong of the institution of chattel slavery. The land rights of men could not make the progress they deserved to make in the presence of this more palpable institution of human injustice. The question of slavery barred the way.

But the history of the Free Soil Party should teach us a lesson. "A Free Soil for a Free People," contained the seeds of revolt against the system of landed property. The Free Soil Party ceased to exist, but passed along its principles to the organization that succeeded it, which started to crystalize into more or less effective legislation the principles it had inherited.

AMONG those to whom we are indebted for contributions and offers of material assistance are Mrs. August Lewis, Louis Mann, ex-Senator Duhamel, Hon. John J. Murphy, John J. Egan, Bishop Mason, Hon. Fred. Hinrichs, Frederick C. Leubuscher, Dr. Walter Mendelsohn, Joseph Fink, Morris VanVeen, Edward Crown, Fred W. Moore, B. H. Nadal, Fred J. Riley, Joseph Silbernig, Miss Willey, Mr. Sneiderman, Herman G. Loew, Miss Corrine Carpenter, Mrs. Donaldson, Miss Currie, Mrs. Dangerfield, Charles H. Ingersoll, Louis Kempner, Miss Jennie Rogers, Dr. M. M. Brill, Edmund Conger Brown, Mary E. Tuttle, Thos. B. Preston, Joseph McGuinness, W. A. Hayward, E. J. Foord, Bernard M. Allen, Mrs. Julia Goldzier, Miss Hildreth, E. Yancey Cohen, Edward Summick, E. Dundon, Miss Roswell, Joseph Jackson, Miss Charlotte Schetter, Mrs. Alexander Black, and many others.

JOSEPH DANA MILLER.

"In the United States, under the name of the Single Tax Party, a national political organization has been formed, which, as its name indicates, will (like the Reform Party in our country), enter the political field on behalf of the doctrine of the Single Tax.

"The most prominent Georgists of the great republic have lent their enthusiastic support to the new party. By means of its branches scattered over the whole country, it will inaugurate a great national campaign on behalf of the Georgian cause." (Extract from *El Georgisimo*," by Dr. Maspero Castro, Buenos Aires.)

*See SINGLE TAX FIVE YEAR BOOK, page 281, for an admirable discussion of Land Legislation in the United States by Dr. Marion Miller.