

which is added to land solely through the activities of society and not by the effort of the individual owner, belongs to society; that it is wrong and unjust to allow the individual owner to appropriate to himself such increment of value, and that it is right and proper for society to appropriate for the purposes of society such social increment of value, or so much thereof as it needs. Just what the practical application of this principle would mean it is impossible to point out in any brief discussion, but a very casual consideration will convince one that its practical application in many of the great questions which are now before the American people for adjustment would be of tremendous consequence.

+ + +

## THE UNITED LABOR PARTY.

*Recollections, Twenty-five Years Afterwards, of the Political Party Out of Which Socialism and the Singletax Came Into American Politics.*

Written by Louis F. Post, for  
The Public.

\*

### First Part.

In the summer of 1886, Henry George consulted me upon his becoming that year the Labor candidate for Mayor of New York. This was not the Greater New York of his second campaign, but that older and smaller one in which at the time of his first there were hardly more than ten thousand voters above the Harlem River. As we had been intimate friends for five years, there was nothing diplomatic in our interview. He asked his question bluntly, and in replying I did not conceal my lack of confidence in his candidacy.

It was with the authority of experience, too, that I spoke. Regular party organization and third party politics were familiar to me in some of their ramifications, and I had a low opinion of both. The former I rejected for its political corruption, the latter for its political weakness. With a quizzical smile, therefore, I asked my friend how many votes he would be content to get. He hesitated until, with my smile still in action, I interrogatively suggested 10,000. "Oh, no", he replied; "while I wouldn't expect to be elected and don't want to be elected, I do want a vote large enough to dignify the cause I should represent, and 10,000 wouldn't do it. I shouldn't care to run unless I can get 30,000."

It seemed to me about as probable that Henry George would wake up a multi-millionaire the next morning as that he could poll 30,000 votes for Mayor of New York at the next election, and I advised against his becoming a candidate. But I had miscalculated his qualities for popular leadership.

### I. The Beginning.

Within a week or two after consulting me, Henry George published a letter which completely changed my view. It was in reply to a communication from James P. Archibald as secretary of a political conference committee of Labor unions.

\*

The conference Mr. Archibald represented resulted from recent high handed legal proceedings against militant Labor organization.

There had been a strike of waiters at a beer and music restaurant on Fourteenth Street. The strike having proved successful, arbitrators agreed upon terms of settlement, one condition being payment by the restaurant owner of \$1,000 toward the expenses of the strike. This sum was paid to a Labor committee which turned over every penny to the waiters' union and got from it no benefit whatever. Yet members of that committee, three honest and simple German workmen, were convicted of extortion—a high grade of robbery under the New York statutes. Judge George C. Barrett, who presided, had encouraged the verdict of guilty by suggestive mannerisms at the trial, mannerisms for which he was noted among lawyers. They made mere stenographic notes almost useless, without the aid for emphasis and gesture of a phonograph and moving pictures synchronized. Not only did Judge Barrett seem to influence the jury in this case—perhaps it wasn't necessary, the jurors being of the employer type—but he disclosed his class animus further by sentencing those innocent-minded working men to three years at penal servitude in the State prison at Sing Sing.

Intended, no doubt, to make an example calculated to cripple labor unionism in strikes, Judge Barrett's severity had an opposite effect. It drove labor unions organically and indignantly into politics. Not with immediate results, to be sure, beyond the scare it gave the "superior classes," but with an effect in favor of unionism which still survives and has ever since strengthened with the years. Outraged and angered at this wanton judicial assault by a typical high grade judge—for Judge Barrett was all of that, beyond cavil—the Labor organizations of New York cast about for a defensive policy. It resulted in definite action by the Central Labor Union.

\*

That body had evolved from a Cooper Union meeting of Labor organizations brought together in January, 1882, by the energy of Robert Blissert, a journeyman tailor, for the purpose of sending encouragement to the Irish on the basis of the "no rent manifesto" which had recently issued from Kilmainham jail. Formed immediately afterward upon recommendation of the "no rent"

mass meeting, the Central Labor Union introduced the now universal Labor Day the following September, entered politics with poor results at the November elections, and by 1886 had become the generally recognized federated body in industrial affairs of all the Labor unions of New York. Its action regarding the judicial outrage upon those striking waiters consisted in the appointment, July 11, 1886, of a committee to prepare plans for political action.

Inasmuch as this federated body had become exclusively industrial after its disappointing experience in politics four years before—when, by the way, I found myself among its defeated candidates for Congress—its committee prudently reported a plan that would leave the constituent unions to decide for themselves, free from all outside or superior influence, whether or not to launch a political movement. Upon receiving this report the Central Labor Union adopted it and issued the call it recommended, but assumed no other responsibility. The call, which was for a political conference of trade and labor organizations six months old or more, brought out a conference on the 5th of August at which 165 labor organizations, with an aggregate membership of 50,000, were represented by 402 accredited delegates.

On the question of independent political action, when it came before that Conference, the affirmative vote was 362, the negative only 40. A provisional political committee of seven was consequently chosen by the Conference, John McMackin of the Painters being the chairman, and James P. Archibald of the Paperhangers, the secretary. It was as secretary of this committee that Mr. Archibald communicated with Henry George regarding the latter's becoming the Labor candidate for Mayor.



What persons or circumstances originally suggested the availability of Henry George, may not be very clearly known; but probably, as in most such cases, the origin of the suggestion was complex.

One possible factor was a meeting of which Tom L. Johnson tells in his autobiography. It had been held at Dr. Henna's (a Porto Rico republican) to consider what might be done to bring Henry George's teachings of "the land for the people" into practical politics. This meeting was followed by another for the same purpose at Dr. McGlynn's parsonage. At the first one those present, besides Tom L. Johnson, were Henry George, Dr. McGlynn, Daniel De Leon, William McCabe, Martin Battle, Dr. Henna, myself and several whose names escape me. No suggestions of George for Mayor were made at either meeting, nor is it probable that the thought was in the mind of any person present; yet those two in-

formal gatherings may have generated ideas that had an influence.

Possibly the suggestion grew out of the circumstances of the Cooper Union mass meeting that had formed the Central Labor Union. The "no rent" spirit which originated and pervaded that meeting was associated with Henry George's name in connection not only with his "land for the people" teachings, but also with his political arrest in Ireland and Michael Davitt's advocacy of his doctrines.

George's reception at Delmonico's soon after in the same year, and elsewhere in New York a year later, in each case upon his return from Ireland, as well as the great circulation of "Progress and Poverty" prior to 1886, must also have had an influence in suggesting his candidacy.

Definite assignment of a controlling influence would probably be of doubtful validity. Credit for the suggestion has, however, been fairly claimed by Thomas W. Jackson,\* the pioneer of newspaper Labor-reporting as a specialty.

Mr. Jackson had as a cub reporter created this specialty on Truth, a penny daily paper which, with the Irish World, had promoted the organization of the Central Labor Union, and in which as its editor while Jackson was there I had exploited Henry George's ideas. In that connection Jackson became a convert and later one of George's newspaper friends. Telling of an occasion when in an informal discussion among Labor unionists and Labor reporters gathered at the co-operative hat store in the Bowery of a hat strikers' factory in Connecticut in the summer of 1886, Mr. Jackson says:

"What you want to do," said the writer, who then represented the Herald, "is to nominate a candidate for Mayor and let it go at that—concentrate all your strength on one candidate." "But who could we nominate?" asked the Labor unionists? After the discussion had gone on some time, the writer said: "I know a man who is both a trade unionist and a Knight of Labor. He belongs to the Typographical Union and a Local Assembly, and has never taken part in any factional quarrels. Besides, he is an educated man, a scholar and a great writer." "Who is he?" several asked. "Henry George," replied the writer. "He'd be a corker!" shouted one of the unionists, "but the trouble is he lives in Brooklyn and that lets him out." (Brooklyn had not become a part of the greater city at that time). The next day the writer called on Mr. George, who had an office in Astor place. He had known the author of "Progress and Poverty" for many years, and after awhile he said: "By the way, Mr. George, where are you living?" "In Harlem, on Pleasant Avenue," he replied. "How long have you been living there?" "Over a year," said Mr. George. "You'll do." "Do for what?" asked Mr. George. "You'll find out later. It's a little secret just now."

\*New York Evening Mail, June 12, 1911.

Whatever the origin of the suggestion, Henry George was waited upon about the 20th of August by Mr. Archibald, who asked him if he would accept if nominated by the Labor unions for Mayor. This request, which lay back of his interview with me and caused Mr. George to consult other friends, evoked from him the letter that altered my views regarding his acceptance. It seemed to me that the condition he imperatively exacted, was prophetic of all the difference between a probable "fluke" and an effective fight.

"The only condition on which it would be wise in a Labor convention to nominate me," he wrote to Mr. Archibald, "or on which I should be justified in accepting such a 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. This would be a guaranty that there should be no ignominious failure, and a mandate that I could not refuse. On this condition I would accept the nomination if tendered to me. Such a condition I know is an unusual one; but something unusual is needed to change the habitual distrust and contempt with which workingmen's nominations have come to be regarded, into the confidence that is necessary to success."\*

Coupled with a clear statement of his own views regarding the relations of Labor to Land and of what is now known as the Singletax method of beginning land restoration, the stirring letter of which the foregoing extract was among the concluding sentences was a master stroke, as Dr. McGlynn called it and as it proved itself to be. It was read with delight at Labor union meetings; and the Labor Day procession early in September, which its writer reviewed from "The Cottage" on Union Square, gave him an ovation throughout its entire length as the unions marched by.

On the 23d of September Henry George was formally nominated by the political Labor Conference. Regular Labor organizations to the number of 175 were represented at that Conference by 409 delegates. The declaration of principles, prepared by George himself, was strictly in harmony with the principles he had elaborated in his letter to Mr. Archibald, to which the enthusiasm for him must be attributed. It would be recognized clearly enough now as a radical Singletax platform.

Frank Ferrell presented it as chairman of the committee on resolutions. Mr. Ferrell was a delegate from the Eccentric Engineers, a trade in which he filled a responsible position. He was a Knight of Labor who had recently been a delegate from his K. of L. district to the national K. of L.

\*Pages 7 to 11 of "An Account of the George-Hewitt Campaign in the New York Municipal Election of 1886. Prepared by Louis F. Post and Fred. C. Leibuscher." Published by John W. Lovell Co., 14 and 16 Vesey Street, New York, 1886. Out of print.

convention at Richmond, where peculiar distinction was thrust upon him, for he was denied hotel accommodations because a Negro, and for that reason his white colleagues went with him to a Negro boarding house, the Knights of Labor tolerating no discriminations of race.

Upon the adoption of the platform as presented by Mr. Ferrell, the nomination was made. James J. Coogan, a large furniture dealer, received 31 votes; William S. Thorne, superintendent of the Second Avenue Railroad Company, received 18; Henry George received 360.

The Labor nomination was supplemented on the 2d of October by a middle class mass meeting's endorsement at Chickering Hall. The Rev. Dr. John W. Kramer (Episcopalian) presided. Other speakers were the Rev. R. Heber Newton (Episcopalian), Thomas Davidson (the philosopher), Daniel De Leon, Ph. D. (then an instructor in Columbia College and now among the leaders of the Socialist Labor Party), Charles F. Wingate (the pioneer sanitary engineer and founder of the Twilight Club), Professor David B. Scott of the College of the City of New York, and the Rev. Dr. Edward McGlynn (Roman Catholic) of St. Stephen's Church.



Compliance with the condition imposed in advance by the candidate, was all that now remained to make his nomination complete.

This was effected at a mass meeting at Cooper Union on the 5th of October. Scores of Labor unionists, Knights of Labor, and other citizens, including women, had in the interval been actively at work soliciting signatures to the George petition. Their work was crowned with success. When that meeting assembled, jammed to the doors and with crowds many times its size packing the streets outside to such a degree as to make access to the platform almost impossible, the required pledges, signed to the number of 34,000, were there.

George then accepted the nomination in a thrilling speech and the campaign opened.

## II. The George-Hewitt Campaign.

Details of that campaign cannot be recounted here. Only some of the larger facts may be recalled.



Significant from the start was the effect of George's nomination on old party politicians. Tammany Hall and the County Democracy—the two bitterly hostile factions of the Democratic party—came together like the rush of iron particles to a magnet. To "save society" and the spoils of politics, they nominated Abram S. Hewitt as their joint candidate; and behind him there gathered as motley a following of respectable parasites

and plug ugly grafters as were ever got together in a political campaign.

The Republicans were strongly inclined to come into the "society saving" alliance, and many of them voted for Hewitt openly; but Republican bosses, thinking they saw a chance to "slip in between," gave the regular Republican nomination to Theodore Roosevelt.

From first to last, however, the contest was between Hewitt and George, and the controversial campaign letters\* they exchanged were read with avidity by all classes. In no sense ephemeral, unless Mr. Hewitt's confused theories of property be regarded as out of date, those letters may be read with as deep an interest today as when they were written. George's would command acceptance far more generally and probably much more readily now than then.

In size and enthusiasm all George's central meetings in hall and street and most of his district meetings were phenomenal. The opposition meetings were notable for slack attendance and the almost complete absence of workingmen.

The George party began the custom in this campaign of taking up penny collections at political meetings. It was not unusual at headquarters of a morning to see great pyramids of pennies on a table, with Henry George, Jr., now a Congressman from New York, busily counting them. They were the street-meeting collections of the night before. But those pennies were not enough for the heavy expense of printing and distributing ballots, and otherwise meeting legitimate campaign expenses; and Thomas G. Shearman and Tom L. Johnson contributed largely to the deficit.



Greatest of all the sensations of the campaign was the silencing of Dr. McGlynn by the Roman Catholic Archbishop of New York.

Dr. McGlynn had publicly declared for the doctrines of Henry George at a large reception to Michael Davitt four years before. He was pastor at that time of the largest parish in the United States, the famous East Side parish of St. Stephen's, and so he remained until "unfrocked" soon after the George campaign for teaching Henry George's doctrines. Upon his restoration under circumstances that removed the Catholic stamp of disapproval from those doctrines, Dr. McGlynn was sent to a parish in Newburg; and there he died, not many months after his eloquent funeral tribute to Henry George—loved to the last and still honored by the common people of both his parishes as their Soggartharoon.

Naturally enough had Dr. McGlynn come into the Labor campaign of 1886 in support of George. He believed in George's "land for the people" doctrines and he claimed the right to propagate them

\*Printed in full in the Post-Leibuscher "Hewitt-George Campaign," at pages 45 to 71.

in a political campaign as an American citizen. But his long struggle within the Church as a champion for the public school system—he would not consent to parochial schools in his great East Side parish—and his advocacy of the doctrine of "the land for the people" in his speeches in behalf of the Irish, had cast over him an ecclesiastical shadow; and when his appearance at the Chicker- ing Hall citizens' meeting to endorse Henry George's Labor nomination was announced, the opportunity seemed favorable to some of his ecclesiastical superiors to humiliate him while pleasing Tammany Hall by embarrassing the independent Labor movement.

It happened, therefore, that Archbishop Corrigan ordered Dr. McGlynn to remain away from that meeting. Equipped with a letter of introduction from Dr. McGlynn, George called upon the Archbishop to reason with him, not fully realizing that the Archbishop was under no misapprehension. George's efforts of course were fruitless. McGlynn's superiors decided to stamp out his independence as an American citizen, and the Archbishop reiterated his order regarding the Chicker- ing Hall meeting.

The dilemma confronting McGlynn was delicate and difficult, and he had to decide it for himself. He decided in favor of his citizenship—not in opposition to his religious obligations but in furtherance of them. It was an eloquent speech he delivered at that meeting, and great was the indignation of the Tammany politicians of his Church,\* and of other churches and of no church. Though he refrained from speaking further in the campaign, from that one speech dated Dr. McGlynn's long but finally triumphant conflict with his ecclesiastical superiors.



On the Saturday night before election, a parade of organized Labor, led by William McCabe† of the Printers as marshal, raised the George campaign to a climax of enthusiasm. It was the most significant trade union parade ever known for any other than a distinct trade-union purpose.

Although the night was wet and the marchers were drenched, the procession with wide-stretched front and in an almost solid mass was hours in passing the reviewing stand at Union Square. Estimates of the number marching varied from 20,000 to 60,000, according to the sympathies of the guesser.

This great procession had cost the campaign managers nothing, an anomaly in political pro-

\*"The Standard," of 1887 for January 8, 22 and 29; February 5, 12 and 26; April 2; May 7 and 14; June 4, 11, 18 and 25; July 9, 16, 23 and 30; and August 6; also January 14, 1888.

†Mr. McCabe was the marshal of the Central Labor Union Labor Day procession on the original Labor Day, that of the first Monday of September, 1882, at New York City.

cessions. Each man had paid his own expenses. There were no gaily decked wagons, no uniforms, only a few torches, and such transparencies as appeared had been made by the very men who carried them. The unions bore aloft their official banners. Some of the marching bodies, without torches or transparencies, moved on in darkness; and without music they moved in silence too, except as they joined in the general marching chorus, a kind common in those long ago days, of "George! George! Hen-ry-George!"

It was indeed an impressive procession, and its very success was believed to have contributed largely to George's defeat. By demonstrating that his following was truly a Labor solidarity, the first the politicians had ever known, it was believed to have startled them into doing what they were reported to have done—sending out "hurry calls" through the tenement house regions and into the slums, with money to buy where votes were for sale and orders to intimidate where intimidation was possible.



At the election on the 2d of November—just twenty-five years ago,—this was the vote as officially reported:

Abram S. Hewitt .....	30,552
Henry George .....	68,110
Theodore Roosevelt .....	60,435

The Labor balloting had been promoted under difficulties, for there was no Australian ballot then, and tickets had to be printed and distributed by the organizations. The count, too, was at the mercy of election officers appointed by the Tammany Hall, the County Democracy and the Republican bosses. Many stories of false counting were reported by "George" watchers, and to this day it is not unreasonably believed that Henry George won the election but was counted out.

### III. Organization of the United Labor Party.

Although the Central Labor Union had set in motion the machinery to organize the Henry George campaign, it had done so with reference only to the municipal election of 1886; and even for that election it had been careful, as a delegate body organized only for industrial purposes, to assume no authority nor any appearance of authority, in politics. The authority had come from a Conference of unions constituted directly by the unions themselves and expressly for political action. But that Conference became obsolete with the creation of political district organizations and a county committee of district delegates. It was out of this situation that the United Labor Party evolved.

At the close of the George campaign, the United Labor Party was completely organized on political lines in New York County, and fairly well in Kings, the Brooklyn county. Elsewhere,

however, it had little or no organization other than an inchoate existence in local Land and Labor clubs from which organizations by political divisions were subsequently effected.



The system of Land and Labor clubs originated at a consolation mass meeting in Cooper Union soon after the close of the George campaign and with reference to it. A declaration in harmony with the platform of that campaign was there adopted, and all who held to its principles were called upon "to form themselves throughout the whole country into associations for the purpose of carrying on the work of propagating truth by means of lectures, discussions, and the dissemination of literature, so that the way may be prepared for political action in their various localities and for the formal organization at the proper time of a national party."

The Cooper Union meeting organized a committee which consisted of John McMackin, Dr. McGlynn, James Redpath and Gaybert Barnes, and this committee set about organizing "Land and Labor" clubs over the country. The executive secretary was Mr. Barnes, he having been chosen by the other three in preference to Daniel De Leon, who was another candidate for the position. Mr. McMackin, the manager of the George campaign and chairman of the New York county committee of the United Labor party upon its organization, was chairman of this general "Land and Labor" committee.\* A considerable degree of organization in different States was accomplished in the course of the year 1887.



In due time steps were taken for extending the organization of the United Labor Party over the State of New York. It was in this connection that the Land and Labor committee promoted organization by local political divisions, but it did so upon invitation of the United Labor party committees of New York and Kings counties.†

Besides New York and Kings counties (the latter being the Brooklyn county), there were only a few that had organized by political divisions and in party form prior to the convention. Among these were Albany and Erie, comprising respectively the cities of Albany and Buffalo.

The convention was formally called by a joint committee of the United Labor party of New York and Kings counties. John McMackin was chairman of this joint committee and Augustus A: Levey, secretary, the chairman of its executive committee being Jeremiah Murphy of Brooklyn, who in 1882 had honorably distinguished himself

\*See "The Standard," of January 8-12; Feb. 12-26; May 14-28; June 4-11; August 13, 1887; also other issues of the same year.

†See "The Standard" of February 1, 1888, page 4.

as leader of the great freight handlers' strike. It was to meet August 17, 1887, at Syracuse.\*

When the Syracuse convention assembled, it elected me as temporary chairman. This was after a sharp contest, which proved to be the first skirmish in a battle that culminated in what Socialists regard as their expulsion from the United Labor Party. The larger outcome of the battle was the continuous political campaigns which, begun in 1887 by the Socialist Labor Party under the name for that one occasion of the Progressive Labor Party, and continued, at first by the Socialist Labor Party alone, but thereafter by that party and the Socialist Party independently of and in hostility to each other, have marked the rise and progress of party Socialism in American politics. This convention battle was fought out during my chairmanship, and I shall tell the story of it in next week's issue of *The Public*.

\*See "The Standard" of July 23 and 30, 1887, and other issues of that year.

## BOOKS

### THE PROFITLESS TASK OF THE LANDLESS MAN.

**Taxation of Land Values in American Cities. The Next Step in Exterminating Poverty.** By Benjamin C. Marsh, author of "An Introduction to City Planning." Formerly special agent of the Philadelphia Society for Organizing Charity; Secretary of the Pennsylvania Society to Protect Children from Cruelty, the New York City Commission on Congestion of Population, and the New York State Commission on Distribution of Population. Published by the Author, 320 Broadway, New York City.

This is one of the many publications that have spontaneously sprung up in support of Henry George's crusade, now that it has crossed the border from the academic and agitational into the practical field. "To the uncounted millions of workers," writes the author in his dedication, "in the only unpaid occupation in American cities—those who toil from birth till death at their profitless task of creating land values for landowners."

It appears to be his principal object to make housing reformers see the relation between the land question and housing reform. In pursuance of this task he explains the moral sanctions for heavier taxation of land values, and, while meeting the objections to their heavier taxation, deals concretely with the evils of taxing buildings and the social benefits of taxing land values heavily. Eight methods for land value taxation in cities are specifically explained. Assessing buildings lower than lands, imposing a lower rate on buildings and personality than on land, exempting buildings entirely, exempting buildings which con-

form to a high standard, assessing all public improvements upon benefited lands, excess condemnation of land, taxation of unearned increment of land value, municipal ownership of land.

It is interesting to note that the tax rate on full land values necessary to meet present budgets would be \$3.52 in the \$100 for New York, \$4.88 for Chicago, \$4.11 for Boston, \$2.56 for Kansas City, \$5.55 for Washington, \$2.56 for Omaha, \$1.07 for Los Angeles, and \$4.87 for Milwaukee. This pamphlet is the richest in detail on the subject as a matter of immediate practical interest, that has come to our attention.

\* \* \*

### HINTS FOR GARDENERS.

**How to Make Home and City Beautiful.** By H. D. Hemenway. Published by the author, Northampton, Mass., 1911.

For young and ignorant gardeners Mr. Hemenway has written a hundred pages of exactly what they wish to know. A plan for a vegetable and a flower garden with tables showing when and how to plant, lists of bushes and vines for the door-yard, plants good for window-boxes, and sprays bad for pests—all are made more attractive by scores of good pictures.

ANGELINE LOESCH GRAVES.

## PAMPHLETS

"The Modern Physiocrats."

"Los Fisiocratas Modernas" (The Modern Physiocrats) is a collection of articles in pamphlet form on economic subjects written by Mr. Antonio Albendin, of Ronda, Spain. These articles have all been published in the Spanish papers, especially in the Madrid Herald. Mr. Albendin possesses the faculty of explaining his subject in a way easily understood, and he is ever alert to make clear the relation of any question of public welfare that is being agitated—such as strikes, the increase of crime, the raising of revenues, the poverty of the masses,—to land value taxation. The "Modern Physiocrats" should be a valuable booklet for propaganda purposes among Spanish-speaking peoples. It is published by the Imprenta Rondena, Ronda, Spain.

C. L. LOGAN.

\* \* \*

"We once had a night clerk who was an Englishman," said a hotel manager. "You know the call lists, the sheets on which are recorded the hours at which guests wish to be awakened in the morning, are made out in rows of 7 a. m., 7:30, 8 and so on. Well, one night a lot of people had left calls for 7:30, when a man came up to the Englishman and said he wanted to be awakened at that hour. The clerk looked down the list and found that all the lines under 7:30 had been filled. He said to the visitor:

"Really, I am very sorry, sir, but we haven't an-