

To stand and laugh in the sunlight, not choke in the
squalid gloom;
To weave the purple and linen, and hold the work
of my loom;
To take what a man has coming, and cherish it next
to my heart—
To give what I ask in fullness, hold true to my or-
dained part;
Me—a shiftless, blunted dreamer; ho, scoff all ye
who can;
Aye, though sweated and grimed and bestial, yet
God made me for a Man.

CHARLES JOHNSON POST.

* * *

"LITTLE BROTHER."

From Arden Leaves (Arden, Del.) for October, 1911.

Among those who having seen little of our vil-
lage have yet loved it much was one whom some of
our people will remember as being a child in years,
but with the fine courtesy of a gentleman, the son
of Bolton and Susie Scott Hall, "the only son of
his mother." He stayed in Arden twice, loving
the open fields and wandering, blanketed in In-
dian fashion, among the woodland trees, and it
was planned that he should return and spend the
winter here.

A letter from his father written October 8th
says, "Little Brother passed away this Sunday
afternoon, after a few hours illness—I know it
is all right."

"I held it truth, with him who sings
To one clear harp in divers tones,
That men may rise on stepping stones
Of their dead selves to higher things—

"But who shall so forecast the years
And find in loss a gain to match?
Or reach a hand through time to catch
The far-off interest of tears?"

* * *

THE UNITED LABOR PARTY.

Recollections, Twenty-five Years Afterward, of the
Political Party Out of Which Socialism and
the Singletax Came Into American Politics.
Written by Louis F. Post, for The Public.

+

Second Part.

Ascribing the origin of the United Labor Party
of twenty-five years ago to the Henry George cam-
paign for Mayor of "little old New York," the
First Part* of my narrative dealt with that cam-
paign and continued the story of the Party down
to the time, less than a year afterward, when at
its State convention at Syracuse a split occurred.
With this split, between the United Labor Party
and its Socialist Labor Party membership, began
the present party Socialism in American politics.
The first skirmish was over my own candidacy for

temporary chairman of the Syracuse convention.*
and the entire battle culminating in the split was
fought out while I was in the Chair. This is the
story I have now to tell.

I. State Organization of the United Labor Party.

Not so much as a thought of contesting for the
temporary chairmanship of the Syracuse conven-
tion of the United Labor Party came to me until
the time set for calling the convention to order
was almost upon us. Quite out of harmony with
any expectations of such a contest, I had advised
the nomination of Dr. W. C. Wood, son of a for-
mer Secretary of State of New York and a young
physician of good standing at Gloversville, who
was devoted to what would now be called the
Singletax.

Dr. Wood's nomination had been agreed upon,
as I understood, but at a late hour Gaybert Barnes
notified me of the necessity for a change of plan
in that respect. Saying that a fight was at hand
which made it inadvisable to elect for temporary
chairman a man without chairmanship experience,
and that Dr. Wood was personally averse to risk-
ing the ordeal, Mr. Barnes urged me to make the
contest. What the anticipated fight was to be
about I did not know (although I did know that
there was a good deal of adullamitic opposition
to the leadership of George and McGlynn), but
from experience I was sure I had some faculty
for chairmanship on "roughhouse" occasions. So,
assuring myself of Dr. Wood's desires, I consent-
ed, half eagerly and half reluctantly, the reluc-
tance being due to circumstances to be told farther
on and which I feared might unduly weaken me
as a candidate. Dr. Wood made the nomination,
Dr. McGlynn seconded it, and Henry George spoke
for it.

The opposing candidate was Frank J. Ferrell,
the Knight of Labor whom I have described as the
principal figure in a race complication at Rich-
mond, and as having presented the platform at
the Labor conference preliminary to the George
campaign for Mayor the year before the Syracuse
convention. A man well worthy of respect any-
where, Mr. Ferrell was especially popular in Labor
circles and consequently strong in the convention
at Syracuse. There was nothing on the surface to
show that the Socialist Labor Party had put him
forward. He was not a member of that party, nor
was he nominated by any of its known members.
To leaders of the Socialist Labor Party in the
United Labor Party convention Mr. Ferrell was
merely their most available candidate for tempo-
rary chairman. Not himself hostile to Henry
George's leadership or doctrines, but holding es-
pecially friendly relations with a K. of L. group
that were hostile, his nomination was tactically
wise for concentrating against the "George nomi-
nee" for temporary chairman all the delegates who

*See last week's Public, page 1126.

*Opened at Syracuse, N. Y., August 17, 1887.

had either a positive disposition to oppose George or the "George nominee" or an amiable tendency to co-operate with the complex opposition. He was distinctly the "opposition" candidate.

And Mr. Ferrell nearly won. The vote went our way by 91 to 61—a majority of only 30 in a total of 152.

No bones were broken, however, nor much feeling engendered. With undiminished friendliness my defeated opponent conducted me to the chair; and, so the New York World reported, "there was cheering as the tall colored man and the short white man walked up the aisle." In the ensuing campaign Mr. Ferrell worked heartily with the United Labor Party.

*

Some of the pride of victory stirred me I suppose as I took the chair, but all consciousness of any was fairly drowned in my eagerness to bring parliamentary order out of the prevailing chaos. That I succeeded I needed no one to tell me; the order spoke for itself. Yet the generous personal and newspaper compliments on my method were by no means disagreeable. The result was accomplished not by domineering but by decisiveness coupled with fairness.

Even my Socialist critics said nothing more harsh about the chairmanship, so far as I know, than that in my acceptance speech I had implied that Socialists were not good Americans. I attributed this criticism, however—reasonably enough I think—to super-sensitiveness, most of the Socialists of that time being Germans. The only excuse for the criticism was this bit of patriotic rhetoric in which I had indulged: "We have gathered here today as Americans—as Americans not in a narrow national sense, but in respect of the free spirit of American institutions."*

*

No sooner had I asked "the pleasure of the convention," than fifty men sprang up at once, pawing the air wildly and making the Alhambra Rink echo from rafter to rafter with a discordant chorus of "Mr. Chairman!" "Mr. Chairman!"

Some chairmen have a bad habit of intensifying such disorder with meaningless trip-hammer accompaniments of the gavel; and when weariness of the shouters or hope among them of recognition from the Chair brings comparative quiet, these chairmen are apt to revive all the confusion by asking "the pleasure" of the meeting and thereupon to add to the renewed clamor the further disorder of their own gavel play. From observing such chairmen I had learned my lesson.

When in response to my first request for "the pleasure of the convention" those fifty voices or

*See "The Standard" of August 27, 1887, for verbatim report of this speech and a running account in full of the convention proceedings.

more filled the whole place with disorderly noise, I struck one blow with the gavel and then waited, without words or further action, for general silence. Silence began to come, and as soon as I could be heard I gave the floor to one of the clamorous crowd whom I had already seen with a chairman's eye. Which one made no difference in point of fairness, for a stop-watch couldn't have distinguished any rights of priority. There was order and attention while the "recognized" delegate spoke, but when he resumed his seat bedlam broke loose again.

Once more striking a single blow with the gavel, which could be seen though it could hardly be heard, again I waited for silence. It came more quickly than before, and this time I took the convention into my confidence. "Gentlemen," I explained, "whenever more than one delegate addresses the Chair at the same time, one blow of the gavel will indicate that the Chair has come to a decision and will announce it as soon as he can be heard. It will be useless to shout for recognition after the gavel falls." Instantly upon finishing that explanation, without allowing the slightest opportunity for renewed demands for the floor, I named the delegate I had already decided to recognize.

Having said his say in order and to an attentive convention, he took his seat, and the clamor began again. It yielded, however, to the method I had adopted and which I maintained to the end. When two or more delegates of different views rose at the same time, I tried to promote order still further by announcing, upon "recognizing" one of them, that I would "recognize" another of them next. Sometimes I would name others still, to be recognized in turn, thereby postponing renewed clamors for "recognition" until three or four delegates had been heard.

From sheer force of habit the impulse to keep on shouting "Mr. Chairman!" after the gavel fell, survived somewhat. But as every delegate shouting for "recognition" knew that when the gavel fell a decision had been made, and thought it might be in his own favor, the order would almost immediately become perfect and so remain until the floor was vacant again. Of course confusion would have reigned had I been unfair. But once the factions saw that everybody got recognition sooner or later, and that true "time" was called regardless of faction friend or faction foe and of little delegate or big leader, the struggle with disorder was over.

No Bible class or prayer meeting could have behaved better than that United Labor Party convention after fears of unfairness, whether from tricky decisions or weak ones, had been dissipated. "Thirty-five points of order were taken in thirteen minutes," said the Syracuse Standard, "and at times there was a regular babel of sound," but "the chairman continued cool and decided and

carried the convention safely through a tide of motions, substitutes, amendments and points of order." All this may sound like boasting, and maybe it is; but if boasting it be, isn't the boast pardonable for the lesson it carries?

True universally, as I believe, is the lesson of that chairmanship experience. Disorder will not persist in any meeting if the chairman is decent enough to be fair and decisive enough to make his fairness felt. Equally universal, equally true, is its further lesson, and vastly more important: the principle applies to all crowds, however unreasonable they may seem and however turbulent they actually are. As the fault for persistent parliamentary disorder is almost certainly the chairman's, likewise does persistent social disorder—rioting among "the lower classes," for instance—almost certainly lie at the door of executives who are either indecisive in trying to be fair or unfair in trying to be decisive.

II. Socialist Labor Party Contests.

The chairmanship experience described above was almost altogether in connection with formal contests over the right to seats in the United Labor Party convention of delegates belonging also to the Socialist Labor Party—not of all such, but of particular ones against whose claims contests had been formally made from their own districts. It was the same kind of controversy that may arise in any political convention in consequence of local quarrels.

The contests and all they involved were finally decided by the Syracuse convention in its temporary-organization stage and upon reports from its committee on credentials.



Soon after my election as temporary chairman and immediately after the election of Thomas Sanford, Alvin T. Walsh and Thomas Devine as temporary secretaries, William T. Croasdale* moved the appointment (not naming by whom, as I remember) of a committee on credentials. Thereupon a tumult began which finally gave place to fair and orderly discussion.

Mr. Croasdale's motion was adopted, but with an amendment allowing the respective Congressional District delegations to select their own representatives for the credentials committee. The members thus selected were William E. Simkins, E. D. Murray, Gaybert Barnes, James D. Webb, Adolph Pattenkofer, J. J. Sweeney, William T. Croasdale, James J. Crosson, Edward Finkelstone, Wm. Penn Rogers, Edward Conkling, Hugh Whoriskey, W. O. Eastlake, A. C. Sutherland, C. L. Dedrich, John J. Bealin, F. S. Hammond, A. J. Barker, P. H. Cummins, John H. Quinlan, G. E. Bedell, J. H. Steinmetz, E. W. Benedict,

*See The Public of September 1, 1911, pages 893 and 903.

F. S. VanHouten, George H. Van Winkle, John H. Ronayne, and E. D. Northrup.

Some of the Congressional Districts were without delegates.



Three formal contests and some protests came before that committee. The contests were from the Eighth, Tenth and Fourteenth legislative districts of New York County, and over these the fight raged in committee until far in the morning of the second day of the convention.

The other delegates amused themselves meanwhile as best they could. Part of the interval was devoted to a mass meeting at which the audience, overflowing the Alhambra Rink, was addressed by J. C. F. Grumbine (a local clergyman), who presided, and by Dr. McGlynn, Hugh O. Pentecost, John McMackin, and Henry George.

Delay in formulating reports on credentials held back the business of the second day's session until nearly noon, when two reports were submitted. The minority report was signed by E. Finkelstone, William Penn Rogers, Alex. G. Sutherland, E. W. Benedict, H. A. Barker, G. H. VanWinkle, E. D. Murray, and J. A. Ronayne. William T. Croasdale signed the majority report as chairman of the committee, and John H. Bealin attested it as secretary.

These reports defined the issue. To understand it, and the animus and purport of the decision of the convention, the earlier history of the Socialist Labor Party must be considered.

III. Antecedents of the Socialist Labor Party.

The traditional notion that Socialists were expelled from the Syracuse convention for being Socialists is a mistake. A few were excluded; the rest withdrew.

Those that were excluded were excluded upon specific district contests.

Their exclusion was because they were members, or had been elected by members, of the Socialist Labor Party. Membership in the Socialist Labor Party, like membership in the Democratic or the Republican party, was held by the Syracuse convention, as it had already been held by the county committee of the county from which the excluded Socialists came, to disqualify for membership in the United Labor Party.

No one was excluded for holding or advocating Socialist opinions.

Nor was the decision merely technical. Both the county committee of New York County and the Syracuse convention had substantial reasons in fairness for their action. The decision rested upon the fact that the Socialist Labor Party was being used to control the United Labor Party by a minority of its membership. This is said without disrespect, and in no spirit of condemnation. It is simply a statement of the primary fact—to be

approved or condemned, as may be—which caused the decision.

Instead of excluding Socialists for believing in or advocating Socialism, the Syracuse convention merely excluded certain delegates for belonging to a party within the party. There was no question of *conversion* to Socialism; the question was solely one of *capture* by a particular Socialist group organized as an independent political party.

The one point which might distinguish the case of the Socialist Labor Party within the United Labor Party from that of the Democratic or the Republican party if either had held similar relations to the United Labor Party, is the fact, if it was a fact, that the Socialist Labor Party was not a political party in the same sense in which the Republican and the Democratic parties were political. On that point there may be room for disagreement, but hardly room for considering the Socialist Labor Party as so manifestly right that the rest of us were indisputably wrong.

+

The Socialist Labor Party of the United States originated in an attempt at capture not unlike that in which it was foiled at Syracuse. This original capture occurred at Pittsburgh in 1876. As the excellent historian of American Socialism tells it, "the convention of the National Labor Union was composed of 106 delegates of the most heterogeneous political complexion, and was easily captured by the Socialists among them, some 20 in number, who spoke and acted as a unit, had well-defined views, and knew how to express them."* That event appears to have put an end to the National Labor Union. But the Socialists who captured the organization arranged while in Pittsburgh for a convention at Philadelphia later in the same year.

When the Philadelphia convention met, several organizations were consolidated into a Socialist party under the name of the "Workingmen's Party of the United States;" and at the second convention, held about eighteen months later, the name was changed to "Socialist Labor Party of North America."

This is the organization with which the Syracuse convention of the United Labor Party had to deal as a party within the party.†

+

Long before the George campaign for Mayor of New York, the Socialist Labor Party, although primarily organized for propaganda only, as the Socialist historian explains, had gone into local politics at several places, sometimes as a Labor party within another Labor party and sometimes independently.

As an independent party it polled 7,000 votes

in Chicago in 1877. In 1878, with the popular Ernst Schmidt as its candidate for Mayor, a distinguished physician and a scholar of high rank, it ran the Chicago vote up to 12,000. At Cincinnati and Cleveland it polled respectively 9,000 and 7,000 in 1877, and at St. Louis 7,000. Its State ticket in New York in 1879 got 10,000 votes.

In national politics, the Socialist Labor Party fused with the Greenback Labor Party at the latter's convention of 1880, but only long enough for its managers to learn the impossibility of effecting a capture. Its delegates to the Greenback convention, about ninety, had decided in caucus to apply for admission as a body and to vote as a unit on all questions; but they drifted away when frustrated by a ruling that all votes must be taken by States.

After 1880 the Socialist Labor Party abstained almost altogether from political activities until the George campaign of 1886. There appears, however, to have been an exception in legislative contests. In the Tenth legislative district of New York City, a typical East-Side neighborhood and one of the three districts from which the seats of Socialist Labor Party delegates were contested at the Syracuse convention of the United Labor Party and awarded to the contestants, the party had polled habitually from 700 to 1,000 votes for its legislative candidate.*

It is probable that at the organization of the United Labor Party in New York City on the heels of the Henry George campaign of 1886, the Socialist Labor Party was regarded by its own members not as a political party but as a sort of Labor organization; and it is quite true that the non-Socialist members of the United Labor Party did not at first treat membership in the Socialist Labor Party as a disqualification for United Labor Party membership. It must be recalled, however, that there were at that time few members of the United Labor Party who knew even of the existence of the Socialist Labor Party except vaguely. They knew of Socialism and they knew Socialists. Against the former they had no prejudice; with the latter they worked in harmony. And if there was any intolerance at all it was not from so-called "George men" toward Socialists, but from Socialists toward "George men" and others.

Whoever was familiar with the circumstances must know that Henry George was fair when, on the eve of the Syracuse convention, he wrote: "The Socialists have not only *not* observed the toleration with which the majority have treated their peculiar views—a toleration of the sort by which alone conflicting views can be harmonized within party lines,—but have been persistent in the attempt to undermine the platform of the party in which they so indignantly claim the right of membership.†"

*"History of Socialism in the United States," by Morris Hillquit, page 209.

†Hillquit, pages 209 to 217.

*See Hillquit, pages 259, 261, 262, 264, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271.

†"The Standard" of August 13, 1887, editorial on page 1

The intolerance thus gently charged by Henry George to the New York Socialists of 1887 did not break out until permanent organization of the United Labor Party had begun. Co-operation was cordial throughout the George campaign for Mayor, but soon thereafter signs of an intent to capture appeared. My account of this and of what followed, must be deferred, however, until next week's issue of *The Public*.

PAMPHLETS

Manifesto of the Spanish League for the Single Tax.

Mr. Antonio Albendin (Calle Mendez Nunez 21, Ronda, Andalucia, Spain) sends a copy of a Manifesto issued by the Spanish Single Tax League (*Liga Espanola para el Impuesto Unico*). The Manifesto explains the object of the organization, and the methods by which the propaganda can best be advanced, stating that nothing can be gained by forming an independent party, nor by revolution. By persistent effort the people can be educated, and by popular demand required legislation can be obtained. In explanation of the purpose and principles of the Singletax, quotations are taken from Henry George's "Condition of Labor." The document also sets forth the by-laws of the League.

C. L. L.

PERIODICALS

Bodenreform.

Germany is marching on. Its people in their own minutely thorough, acutely academic way keep right on toward the Singletax. The German concession of Kiauchou in China is the imperial laboratory and 900 towns in Germany are testing out the experiment. Bodenreform—Land Reform—for September 20 (Berlin, N. W., Lessingstr. 11. Price, \$2.00 per year), reports progress and advises on method. Now that the fight over the Imperial Increment Tax is stilled, the question of land value taxation steps once more into the front line of battle. Its aspect is varied. Vacant lot gardening in a number of cities is carried on as a municipal enterprise for the poor. Some of the industrial interests regard with favor land value taxation and cite to its advantage their actual experience. School-teachers, too, are being led to look upon it as a valuable means toward their coveted school reforms. For when the Saxon teachers named among their fundamental demands for the pending school law, the reduction of the number of pupils in classes and of hours of teaching, and the authorities were petitioned to reject these demands because they would cost 70,000,000 marks (\$17,500,000), the *School Journal of Saxony* answered: Reforms would of course cost money, but that need frighten no true friend of the people, for "millions and millions have flowed into the pockets of those individuals who were the lucky owners of land on the Teltow and Nordostsee Canal. Land reform

records bear ever new testimony that money is to be had to carry through a stupendous school reform in Germany." And the editor of *Bodenreform* adds: "If the people do earnestly wish to reform the schools, they must lend much more aid than heretofore to the spreading of land reform ideas." Not only can the land value tax be education's financial servant. Its philosophy, writes Herr Oberlehrer Rosenfeld, can be used by the teacher to answer some old riddles of geography, history and religion. The land-returning laws of the old Hebrew "Jubilee Year" seem fair only on the theory that the land belongs forever to all the people. Plato's connection with this new-old doctrine is analyzed at length in the second of a series of studies on "Land Reform and Greek Philosophy," published in this very energetic organ of the League of Land Reformers of Germany.

A. L. G.

+ +

La Revue de L'Impot Unique.

The lucid thought and power of expression which are characteristic of the French mind are again evident in the October issue of the *Single Tax Review*, published in Paris by Georges Darien.* In the human mind and in the earth he sees the spiritual and material wealth which hold the potentiality of happiness for all mankind. Only he who grasps the significance of this thought can realize the vision of the poet:

. "a sense sublime
Of something far more deeply interfused,
Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,
And the round ocean and the living air,
And the blue sky, and in the mind of men."

Man owes his very being to the earth and remains dependent upon it for the life of the body and for that of the soul itself. The atheistic conception of land as private property has not only made a mockery of religion, but has proved the greatest obstacle to the discovery of natural laws which make possible the advance of civilization. Let France return to the road indicated by the Physiocrats and, by establishing the equality of all before the laws of the land, achieve the liberty and fraternity which have been the noble dream of her people. Henry George has demonstrated the feasibility of supplanting by a single tax on land values the old monarchical expedients of loans and taxes on labor which lead to increasing deficits and deepen the misery of the poor. "A people who are unhappy have no country," said Saint Just, "they love nothing; and if you wish to found a republic, you should take care to lift them out of the state of uncertainty and misery by which they are corrupted." Single taxers have no quarrel with their critics over the sanctity of property rights. Quesnay declared that the security of property is essential to social stability, and the modern movement is an effort to restore to every living person his rights in the common inheritance to which no individual can justly establish an exclusive claim. In an article entitled "The Foundation of Justice," the editor reviews the subject from the standpoint of the magistrate, and expresses the belief that the corruption of men and women is

*3, Rue de Furstenberg, Paris. Price of annual subscriptions outside of France, 70 cents.