

appeared in Harper's Magazine in the '90's, and which will be long remembered by those who appreciate spiritual analysis.

—That both Russia and Great Britain are crowding Persia and persist in denying her the simplest sovereign rights, is the complaint of W. Morgan Shuster, the American Treasurer-General of Persia. In replying to Mr. Shuster the London Times denies that Persia is independent, asserting that Great Britain and Russia exercise a control over that ancient nationality akin to that exercised by guardians over a minor. At the present moment though the ex-Shah and his hastily collected tribesmen have been overcome, the Persian government is struggling with a change of cabinet, Russia threatens to occupy two provinces of the North, and two regiments of Indian troops have been landed by the British at a southern port, nominally to guard British consulates in the south. [See current volume, page 1004.]

PRESS OPINIONS

The World-Movement for Democracy.

The Chicago Tribune (Rep.), Nov. 2.—In the future, when the political phenomena of this generation can be seen clearly, it is probable that the age will be conspicuous for its wonderful democratic movement. It will be remarkable not only because of the progress made by popular government but because of the general and sudden breakdown of autocracy. It is apparent even now that the old order has no stability and no strength. It has crumbled almost at the first attack, as if nothing but the shell were there; as if invisible or hidden forces had been at work on its vitals. Only in Russia has an autocracy maintained itself against a popular movement, and even there a policy of concession and compromise has been needed to preserve it. It has been almost as if the nations were responding with sudden enthusiasm to a fiery evangel of freedom. . . . The dust hardly settles on the ruins of one autocracy before the crack of another is heard. They have fallen like the walls of Jericho at the sound of the horn. The old order has not had the power to resist. Revolutionists have not been compelled to carry on long, uncertain, and desperate war to accomplish their ends. Absolutism, tyranny, and autocracy have been discovered to be without substance—to be mere shells with no body. . . . That so many nations in so few years have found liberalism and democracy so strong and successful and the old order so ineffective and weak indicates the progress of a world movement as remarkable as any of recorded history. Its effects can be observed even in the most democratic of countries. The revolutionizing of political methods in the United States and of governmental methods in Great Britain illustrates it—the demand for Direct Primaries, for the direct election of United States Senators, for the Referendum and the Initiative here, and the elimination of the House of Lords as an irresponsible and unresponsive legislative body there. To the historian who will survey this world movement for political freedom in the perspective

of time it may seem as remarkable a phenomenon as the crusades, as remarkable as the Renaissance, as remarkable as the great Fifteenth and Sixteenth century movement of exploration and conquest, and as the liberal movement of the latter part of the Eighteenth century.

RELATED THINGS

CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

OUR HEROES.

For The Public.

I wish I could write a great poem
That would set all hearts aglow
For the grandest cause and the greatest work
That mortals here can know:
The wiping out of Injustice,
That fiend that throttles and gags,
Making millionaires of some people
While others walk in rags—
Aye! flaunting their wealth ill-gotten
In the face of the starving throng
Till Justice cries out in anguish,
"How long, oh Lord, how long?"
How long shall the wicked triumph,
And the seats of the mighty stand?
Till Greed the hideous monster,
Despoiling our glorious land,
And the Special Privilege vampire
And all that go in its train
Shall be met, and fought, and vanquished
Till each and all are slain.
When thinking of heroes of battles
Think of our heroes dead;
They stand as great examples—
Our leader and those he led;
Not dead but only sleeping,
And when their Judge they see—
"What ye did for the least of my children,
Ye did it as unto Me."
O, Brothers, lift up your banners,
And in golden letters forge,
"We fight in the name of Justice,
In the name of Henry George."

ANNE W. RUST.

* * *

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.

Third Part.

1. The Socialist Labor Party Within the United Labor Party.

As I explained in the Second Part of these recollections,* all thought about the Socialist element in the George campaign of 1886, and for a

*See The Public, current volume, page 1151.

considerable time thereafter, had probably been of Socialism as a Labor philosophy and of Socialists as its unorganized adherents. But in the process of permanent organization disquieting signs pointed to an effort by a small minority, Socialists of the strictest sect, acting deliberately and as an organized unit to control the organization of the United Labor Party from within.

Not to convert its members to Socialism; there had been no objection to efforts of that kind. Not to avail themselves of its public platforms for converting either its members or outsiders; the public platforms of the United Labor Party had been absolutely free to Socialist speakers and Socialist teaching. The manifest object was political control of the larger organization by a smaller one. It was as distinctly a projected "capture" as that of which the Socialist historian tells when he describes the same Socialist Labor Party as having originated eleven years before in a convention of the National Labor Union, composed of 106 delegates, which "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."* There was only one substantial difference. In the United Labor Party others than Socialists had well-defined views, knew how to express them, and, when they discovered sectarian Socialists acting as a unit to "capture" the common organization, brought the majority into action as a unit to prevent the "capture."

They did prevent it, though at the cost of a "split." But at this distant day that outcome cannot be looked upon as an exorbitant price. To the greater movement it was a profit, doubtless, rather than a price. Like the rise and decline of the Greenback Party, of the Anti-monopoly movement, of the Grangers, of the Populist Party, of the Knights of Labor, of the Socialist Labor Party itself, and like the present development of the Socialist Party and of the Progressivism that flourishes in both the Democratic and the Republican parties, and like the increasing popularity of Singletax methods and ideals in all connections, the split at Syracuse was incidental to the growth toward what both factions were at heart eager to accomplish. It was one of the "growing pains" of democracy.

It must not be supposed that the Socialist group in the United Labor Party monopolized the tactics and the speech that embitter. As the controversy gained ground they became targets for many a verbal missile and were baffled by many a tactical expedient that must have seemed to them more Godforsaken in their wickedness than if used by themselves. Such speech and such tactics came, however, from more than one source. "George

men" were by no means alone in bitterness toward Socialists, as Socialist tradition has it; nor did they take the lead in fighting Socialists, as Socialist tradition also has it. Indeed they were the last to join vigorously in the fight that brought on the "split" at Syracuse—those of them that were unaffected by Labor union quarrels and who accepted Henry George's doctrines. Along with Henry George himself,* they recognized in his doctrines the root principle of genuine Socialism and its primary political necessity; and like him they were averse to unnecessary conflicts with Socialists or over Socialism.† As to the miscellaneous "bourgeoisie" elements of the United Labor Party, these were in part indifferent and in part divided in their sympathies with reference to the Socialist controversy. It was Labor unionists of the type afterwards dubbed "pure-and-simplers" by Socialist Labor Party leaders, who were first to resent the "capture" policy and most bitter as the faction fight waxed warm.

But the fact that there were recrimination in speech and retaliation in tactics is not very important in accounting for the subsequent "split." The vitally important consideration on that point, so far as the subject may be any longer of importance at all, is not what either side did after hostilities began but who provoked the hostilities. And this question turns upon one's view of the legitimacy of "capture" by a party within a party, and the counter-legitimacy of resistance.

II. The Socialist Labor Party's Policy of "Capture."

Early among the signs of intended "capture" which culminated in the "split" at Syracuse was the episode of the daily paper of the George campaign—The Leader.

This campaign paper had reached a circulation of 35,000 daily, and efforts were made to establish it as the organ of the United Labor Party. Among the financial contributors were Labor unions, Socialist organizations, Greenbackers, individual Socialists, individuals who now would be called Singletaxers, and many unlabeled and unaffiliated sympathizers.

During the campaign the Volkszeitung (German and Socialist) had furnished shop-room and editorial-room free, and contributed the free use of its presses. Compositors, pressmen and other mechanical employes were paid union wages; but editors and reporters, all but myself being regularly employed on other papers, worked without pay. Among the best from the Sun, the Herald, the Tribune, The Times, The Star, the World and the Staatszeitung as well as the Volkszeitung, those newspaper men were, by the way, as fine a staff as any editor could have desired.

*See "Progress and Poverty," book vi, ch. 1, Part v; book ix, chs. i, ii, iii and iv. "Protection or Free Trade," ch. xxviii; and "Social Problems," chs. xiii, xiv, xviii, xix.

†The files of The Standard throughout the controversy show this spirit on the part of Henry George.

*Hillquit's "History of Socialism in the United States," page 209.

The persons who worked without pay, and those who contributed money and mechanical equipment, held altogether a variety of social opinions, ranging from pretty extreme individualism to extreme socialism. But they were agreed upon the principle of land socialization. This furnished them, as it furnished the United Labor Party, with a common ground for co-operative political action. Socialists were impatient, of course, to make their own special propaganda; so were Greenbackers to make theirs; different types of individualists, and also the "George men" (who would be better recognized now as Singletaxers), had similar moods. But there was no controversy whatever over the common ground, except that some thought "it didn't go far enough."

As to the financial support for *The Leader*, no one doubted that it came very largely from individuals and organizations that were not in sympathy with the Socialist Labor Party. Yet the Socialist Labor Party "captured" *The Leader*. It did so easily, because its members acted as an organized unit for their own inside party, while the other contributors acted confidingly and individually for the common cause.

I can write of this episode with freedom, for I was unaffected by it personally. Having already refused to abandon my law practice in order to continue as editor-in-chief of *The Leader* after the George campaign, its fate did not affect me in any selfish way. But I was concerned in other ways, and I found the process of "capture" interesting.

By the New York law under which *The Leader* had been incorporated, votes were counted by shareholders and not by shareholdings—one vote for each holder whether his shares were few or many. This is probably a good plan, if every investor understands it; but no one gave any attention to its possibilities for controlling *The Leader* except the Socialist Labor Party. Subscribers who thought only of the common cause, took all their stock carelessly in their own names; members and organizations of the Socialist Labor Party foresightedly distributed theirs among friends. Such, at any rate, were the reports of the time, which I regarded as worthy of credence. When, therefore, the question of control came up at the stockholders' meeting after the Henry George campaign, the Socialist Labor Party stockholders "won out" by a large majority. They would have been greatly in the minority had the voting been by shares, or had all the shares been distributed as it was reported that theirs were.

I am not condemning those tactics. While shrewd, they were nevertheless entirely regular. But such tactics could not have contributed much, I should suppose, to foster the friendly relations that had lasted throughout the George campaign and which had continued except in a few localities

where Socialist Labor Party members and non-Socialist Labor unionists had got to quarreling.

The policy of "capture" with reference to *The Leader* did not end at the stockholders' meeting. Although *The Leader* remained the organ nominally of the United Labor Party, and John McMackin, chairman of the county committee, was president of the company, the paper came under the editorial control of Socialist Labor Party leaders, and they conducted it—much less discreetly for their purpose than they might have done—in the interest of that organization.

Its "general course" was indeed endorsed by the county committee as late as May, 1887,* but this was one of those perfunctory endorsements that are easy at a time of suppressed internal strife, when every one shrinks from seeming to cause a rupture. It was less in the nature of genuine endorsement than of "capture" by a shrewd minority from a tolerant majority. As often happens in such matters, the tolerance was misplaced. In three months Mr. McMackin resigned as president of *The Leader* company, on the ground principally that it was disloyal to the party of which it was the organ and he the county chairman.†

Before *The Leader* episode, which doubtless was one of the larger facts that finally caused the New York County committee of the United Labor Party, and the Syracuse convention, to consider the Socialist Labor Party as an organization to be dealt with more prudently, some of the district organizations of the United Labor Party in New York City were irritated by local indications of a "capture" movement.

Prominent among these were the associations of the Eighth, Tenth and Fourteenth legislative districts, from all of which there came contests to the Syracuse convention, and in all of which the controversy was between the Socialist Labor Party on one side and Labor unionists not of that party on the other. As the time approached for choosing convention delegates, the friction in those districts had become intense, and lines had been so sharply drawn that separate associations were formed, each claiming to be regular and denouncing the others as "bolters."

Similar friction appeared in other districts, but the Eighth, Tenth and Fourteenth were the only ones involving the Socialist Labor Party question upon which the Syracuse convention acted.

In my own district, the Twenty-fourth of New York City, Socialist Labor Party members of the United Labor Party association had drawn a rigid line against the rest of us; but as we didn't know

*The Standard, May 14, 1887, page 8.

†See The Standard of August 13, 1887, page 1, and of August 20, 1887, page 3.

it at the time, there was no friction. This is the appropriate place, however, for explaining, as I have promised,* what I feared might be my special weakness in the contest for temporary chairman at Syracuse.

I had gone to the Syracuse convention as a delegate, not from my residential district but from an Albany district, and here are the circumstances.

The United Labor Party association in my district was small. Most of its members were Socialists, as the rest of us knew; but we did not know that they were obedient members of an independent party within the common party. The association had been "captured" easily and without our knowing it. Even when I was nominated in the association for a delegate to Syracuse and defeated, I attributed the result to my lack of candidatorial qualities. It neither surprised nor irritated me, for I had done but little work in my own district and made but few friends there, having quit my home and law office to put in all my time and energy night and day during the George campaign as the unnamed editor-in-chief of *The Leader*. Nor had I any cause for chagrin. Lucian Sanial, the well known Socialist writer and statistician, was in all respects a man one could be defeated by without reasonable sense of humiliation. I did not suspect then, nor think it probable until later, that Mr. Sanial had been elected a delegate to the United Labor Party convention by the Socialist Labor Party as such, and as a part of its tactics of "capture." Neither did this fact cut any figure subsequently; for, although Mr. Sanial failed to attend the convention, his seat was not contested and the name of a Socialist as alternate took his place on the approved roll of delegates.

Considering my defeat final, I abandoned all thought of attending the Syracuse convention. But during a week-end visit at Hackettstown, N. J., I received a telegram from the New York Sun asking whether I intended going to the convention from Albany. The inquiry was mysterious and remained so until I returned to New York. Then I learned that upon hearing of my defeat in my own district—which the newspapers had exploited as a Labor rebuke to Henry George,—the Second Assembly District Club of Albany elected me as one of the delegates from that county.

While this was in fact a compliment, I realized nevertheless that the Cooper Union "Land and Labor" committee† was accused of utilizing "Land and Labor" clubs for making "paper" delegates, and that my own credentials might be regarded as in that category. Though they were so regarded by some, the fact proved ineffective. It served only as an opportunity for one or two stinging insinuations, which didn't sting much and wouldn't

have stung at all had I known at the time what afterwards proved to be true. The Socialist Labor Party had more supporters in the Syracuse convention from "Land-and-Labor" club delegates than from the regularly organized United Labor Party districts of New York and Brooklyn.*

+

Until a purpose to "capture" was suspected, no attempt was made to invoke against the Socialist Labor Party that clause in the constitution of the New York County committee of the United Labor Party which made members of all other political parties ineligible. But as a result of *The Leader* episode, and of irritating experiences in some of the district associations, a ruling on the eligibility of members of the Socialist Labor Party to membership in the United Labor Party was demanded of the county chairman. His decision, sustained by the county committee, was against the Socialist Labor Party.† In delivering this decision, Chairman McMackin explained that the Socialist Labor Party was a political party like any other, because "it had regularly nominated candidates and polled votes for them," and "was still in existence as a party." On the point raised in protest that Greenbackers were admitted to the United Labor Party, he said: "They first severed their party affiliations and came in as individuals." and "the Socialists must do likewise."‡

In that decision, though it was overwhelmingly supported, the Socialist Labor Party members of the United Labor Party refused to acquiesce, and this was still the situation when the committee on credentials of the Syracuse convention reported.

III. Decision of the Socialist Contest at Syracuse.

First disposing of unrelated and minor questions, the majority report of the committee on credentials at Syracuse declared as follows on the contests from the Eighth, Tenth and Fourteenth legislative districts of New York County, the only

*See *The Standard* of February 18, 1888, at page 4.

†In a speech at the Syracuse convention, August W. Mayer, a prominent and trusted labor leader of New York, said, as reported in the *New York World* of August 19, 1887: "It is not true that the Socialists started the idea of independent political action. When the suggestion was first made in the Central Labor Union, Block and the other Socialists opposed taking independent political action. They have been trying ever since to get control of the movement. As to Mr. Shevitsch's assertion that there were twelve organizations in New York, representing 17,000 men, who voted to condemn the New York County convention for ostracizing the Socialist Labor Party, I know something about it, and I know there is nothing like 17,000 men in them. But even if there were, there are the building trades unions, representing over 40,000 men, which voted to sustain the county committee's ruling, and the vote by which they sustained it was 50 to 1."

‡*The Standard*, August 13, 1887. See also issues of January 22, 1887, page 6; May 14, 1887, page 8; June 4, 1887, page 3; and August 20, 1887, page 3.

*See *The Public* of November 10, 1911, "Second Part" of these Recollections, at page 1151.

†See "First Part" of these Recollections in *The Public* of November 3, 1911, at pages 1126, 1130.

contests involving the Socialist Labor Party question:

From the Eighth Assembly district of New York County two sets of credentials were received. One signed by P. J. McMahon, chairman, and Charles Barnet, secretary, certified to the election of J. N. Bogert, William H. Autenrieth and J. F. Clancy as delegates. The other, signed by Hugo Vogt, chairman, and Charles J. Rayersky, secretary, certified to the election of Hugo Vogt, John G. Stein and Frederick Bergman as delegates. The committee heard the contestants on both sides, and, after a prolonged debate, decided to report in favor of seating J. N. Bogert, William H. Autenrieth and J. F. Clancy on the ground that the contestants having acknowledged that they have been and still are members of the Socialist Labor Party were ineligible under the constitution of the United Labor Party of New York, as officially declared by its highest executive authority, the county general committee.

From the Tenth Assembly district of New York two sets of certificates appeared, one signed by August W. Mayer, chairman, and William Gerner, secretary, certifying to the election of August W. Mayer, John Breunig and Edward Zimmerman as delegates. The other, signed by A. Goldsmith, chairman, and Dan S. Jacobs, secretary, certified to the election of S. E. Shevitsch, Max Boehm and Laurence Gronlund. All of the contestants were heard except Mr. Gronlund, who did not appear. Messrs. Shevitsch and Boehm acknowledged that they are members of the Socialist Labor Party. Much conflicting testimony as to the regularity of the respective electors was submitted, after which the committee decided to report in favor of seating August W. Mayer, John Breunig and Edward Zimmerman.

From the Fourteenth Assembly district of New York two sets of credentials were received. One signed by Michael J. Murray, chairman, and William McCabe, secretary, declaring the election of William McCabe, Francis Schaidler and Dennis J. Quirk as delegates, and the other signed by Francis Schaidler, vice-president, and Francis H. Koenig, corresponding secretary, certified to the election of George Block, Walter Vrooman and Francis Schaidler, as delegates. The committee found that Francis Schaidler was certified to be a delegate by both sets of credentials and declared him elected. The committee heard George Block, William McCabe and Dennis Quirk. The claim of the men whose election was certified to by the chairman of the district was that the election first held was void by reason of the participation therein of members of the Socialist Labor Party. Mr. Vrooman did not appear before the committee. After listening to the evidence the committee decided to report in favor of seating William McCabe and Dennis Quirk as the remaining delegates.

The minority report declared that the decision of the county committee of New York to regard members of the Socialist Labor Party as ineligible to membership in the United Labor Party was retroactive, having been made after the election as delegates of the Socialists whose seats were in contest; that even if this clause of the constitution of the county committee were not retroactive, the

committee had not properly ascertained which of the rejected delegates were members of the Socialist Labor Party; that the Socialist Labor Party was not and had never been a political party "in the accepted sense of this word" and had not been so considered until recently by the county committee; and that as to one of the rejected delegates, Mr. Block, he had never been a member of the Socialist Labor Party and his seat was contested simply on the ground that members of the Socialist Labor Party (also members of the United Labor Party) voted for him.

+

A five minute rule having been adopted, an orderly though tense debate ensued in the convention.

Among the speakers for the Socialist Labor Party were George Block, Hugo Vogt, Walter Vrooman (one of the brilliant Vrooman family of Kansas, at that time a lad whose eloquence had won him the title among Socialists of "the boy orator"), and Sergius E. Shevitsch. Mr. Shevitsch spoke for fifteen minutes, two of his associates having with the consent of the convention, given him their "time." A Russian of noble birth, he had become a follower of Lassalle; and his force, elegance, pithiness and polish of speech, with its keen but humorless wit, make the event prominent in my memory after all these years, though I could not recall a word he said. It was such a speech as few could have made except men trained in diplomatic service, as he had been in that of his native Russia, to which he has since returned. Another speaker for the Socialist Labor Party was Laurence Gronlund, the distinguished Socialist writer, regarded then as the American interpreter of Karl Marx. Being recognized by neither report from the committee on credentials, and having no place on the rolls as a delegate, he was given the platform by invitation of the convention on motion of Henry George.

On the other side the principal debaters were William McCabe, John F. Clancy, and August W. Mayer. Mr. Mayer's speech, also fifteen minutes from gifts of "time," was the one on this side to compare with Mr. Shevitsch's on the other. Mayer's lacked the polish and elegance of Shevitsch's—as was to have been expected, for Mr. Mayer was a German workingman untrained in the gentle art of debate,—but it was equal to Shevitsch's in force, and if inferior in the wit that burns, it excelled in the humor that melts and the qualities that tend to convince. Mr. Mayer, who had been walking delegate for the American Fresco-Painters' Union, made the issue clear when he advised prudence and patience in Labor politics. "First organize your men," he said, "and then educate them; and when educated, if they want a more radical platform they will make it them-

selves.* That the temper of the convention was wholly favorable to Socialistic agitation and education within the United Labor Party, while irreconcilably hostile to "capture," was evident from the enthusiasm with which this advice from Mr. Mayer was received.

+

When the delegates directly involved in the contests had spoken, the question was debated from the floor, both McGlynn and George taking part; and as the floor discussion proceeded, points of order and subsidiary motions in considerable variety were made and disposed of.

One of the subsidiary motions, extremely fair upon its face, was offered by Thaddeus B. Wakeman (a Socialist sympathizer), doubtless in good faith to secure harmony. It might have carried if the tolerance and co-operative disposition of Socialist Labor Party managers had not come by this time to be so thoroughly distrusted that no harmony resolution could possibly restore confidence. Mr. Wakeman moved that—

in consideration of the fact that the organization known as the Socialist Labor Party was not, at the formation of our party, regarded as a political party in the common acceptance of that term, and that the members of that organization avow and declare that they do not consider their organization a political party, we admit both of the delegations from the contested districts and give a half vote to each delegate; that we do not thereby commit this convention as deciding that the Socialist Labor Party is not a political party, but, on the contrary, that unless the congress of that body next September [a month later] distinctly disavow the name and all claims of being a political party, then we recommend that all members of that party be ineligible in our party.†

A motion to lay this amendment on the table having been withdrawn when the chair ruled that an affirmative vote would "table" the whole subject matter, Mr. Wakeman's belated harmony proposal came to a direct vote and was defeated by 94 to 54.‡ This vote was regarded as the test, and so it probably was; for although William McCabe was afterwards seated by 91 to 86 to the exclusion of George Block, local and personal animosities and labor union controversies entered strongly into the latter vote. At any rate the minority report of the credentials committee was soon afterward rejected and the majority report adopted.

+

In adopting the majority report of the committee on credentials, the Syracuse convention decided, in harmony with the decision of the New

*New York World's report of Syracuse convention, in issue of August 19, 1887.

†New York World, August 19, 1887.

‡The large minority vote represented the spirit of toleration and not Socialist Labor Party sentiment. The number of Socialists in the convention was nowhere near so large.

York County committee, that members of the Socialist Labor Party were ineligible to membership in the United Labor Party. But it did not decide that Socialists were ineligible. On the contrary, by seating several individual Socialists and at least two Socialist delegations, it decided that propagation of Socialism within or through the United Labor Party was not incompatible with membership.

The unseating of Socialists other than those named above as active in a hostile political organization, was by the Socialist delegates themselves. They were not expelled, but voluntarily withdrew. Their withdrawal took place in connection with the report of the committee on permanent organization.

James Redpath as chairman of that committee presented its report. One part of the report named John McMackin for permanent chairman and John McCabe of Albany and R. H. Ferguson of Buffalo for vice-chairmen. A minority report proposing to expunge these nominations was defeated; but a motion by Mr. McMackin to the same effect was adopted. Mr. McMackin and John R. O'Donnell (formerly president of Typographical Union No. 6) were then named from the floor as opposing candidates. The contest was vigorous, but Mr. McMackin won by 111 to 58. Thereupon yielding the gavel to him, I relinquished all further responsibility in the convention except as a "carpet bag" delegate from Albany.

Meanwhile, however, the withdrawal of the enrolled Socialist delegates had occurred. When the Twelfth legislative district was called on the contest between McMackin and O'Donnell for permanent chairman, the two delegates—W. B. David and Max Alteran—announced that they had been instructed by their district association to withdraw from the convention "because of its throwing out of the Socialists." They therefore refused to vote. A similar announcement was made by the delegates from my own home district, the Twenty-fourth of New York County. Bernard Berlyn (now of Chicago, a man noted in both New York and Chicago for standing by his guns) and Mr. Sanial's alternate, a Mr. Hieley, refused to vote because Socialist Labor Party members from the Eighth, Tenth and Fourteenth districts had been excluded.

+

It is always difficult to distinguish action from its causes and motives sufficiently well to fix blame upon either side in such a controversy, if there be blame. But it seems to me, as I contended on a point of order during subsequent proceedings in the convention, and as I have indicated above, that the Syracuse convention did no more technically than to decide three contests upon their individual merits, and no more substantially than to make a precedent for excluding members of the Socialist

Labor Party from membership in the United Labor Party. It did not condemn Socialists nor Socialism.

However, this question is no longer of any more than curious interest. The fact of broadest interest is the historical effect of the Syracuse decision. It resulted in a Socialist party which has persisted in American politics, and out of which, from a subsequent "split," another and larger and more promising Socialist party has come. The rest of my story is not very long, but the limitations of space necessitate its postponement until next week's issue of *The Public*.

BOOKS

AN INSIDE VIEW.

Through the Mill: The Life of a Mill Boy. By Al Priddy. The Pilgrim Press, Boston, New York, Chicago. Price \$1.35. Postage 15c.

As a record of actual experience under industrial conditions for the young, this volume is a helpful contribution to the work that is being done by the large-hearted men and women who are seeking to reform those conditions.

Al Priddy, entering into the details of his early life, gives a fairly suggestive picture of thousands who are forced in early youth into the same crushing servitude of mind and body. The debasing influence of the home environment with its atmosphere of discouragement, disorder and ill-temper induced by intoxicating drink; the evil associations of the mill which literally and savagely compel the vicious habits generally practiced where the conditions of labor are depressing and exhausting—all these things are shown in their deteriorating effects on the boy whose story is told in the simple, straightforward, unaffected manner which testifies to the truth of his narrative.

But in this instance there was an inborn aspiration toward a higher habit of living, and though repeated failure pursued his efforts to obtain an education and a change of employment he came at last to the desperate conclusion to "leave the mill at any cost." The first break made he found opportunities waiting around him. The wages that had gone to pay the beer bills of his guardian uncle and aunt were swiftly invested in a railway ticket that took him to a middle west college, where he had assurance that he might work out the expenses of the preparatory school which would fit him for the college course that had been his ambition, and which the way (with a will) would open for him to attain. The simply but forcibly related story holds a lesson for all youthful workers.

A. L. M.



Four hostile newspapers are more to be feared than a thousand bayonets.—Napoleon I.

PERIODICALS

American Magazine.

The second installment of Senator La Follette's autobiography, the first of Ray Stannard Baker's study of Hawaii, and the beginning of H. G. Wells' new novel "Marriage," are the American's November contributions to the periodical literature one can enjoy in the reading, and be glad for having read.



A Greek Journal on Singletax.

Ereuna (*The Examiner*), a Greek Socialist weekly from Athens, in its issue of July 24 contains an article on The Singletax by the editor, P. E. Drakoules. After an explanation of the meaning and the need of land values taxation, the history and experience of Vaacouver is cited at some length, and mention is made of the "millionaire Joseph Fels, one of the devoted heralds of Henry George's doctrine of the Singletax, who has colossal sums to spend for preaching this liberating plan for taxation." A subsequent number of Ereuna prints a long quotation from Henry George's lecture on "The Problem of Poverty."

A. L. G.



The Pacific Monthly.

"How I Learned to Farm," by C. H. Chapman, Ph. D.—a Doctor-of-Philosophy's story of how he got out of scholastic thralldom and into independent usefulness, is a charming narrative-essay, one of the kind of contributions to *The Pacific* (Portland, November issue) which give it character of its own as a high grade magazine. Especially timely now in Oregon, is Charles Erskine Scott Wood's running conversation, heard on a street car, about the Singletax. Nothing on any controversial subject could be thrown into more interesting form nor better express at once the truth in it and the familiar objections to it.



Everybody's.

"A Peach of a Story" is not likely to strike the reader at first as quite appropriate for so trebly serious a narrative as that of a triple execution, but the appropriateness is there. The story is by John Palmer Gavitt. No one can regret reading it, gruesome as it is, unless he believes in capital punishment and wants to keep on believing in it after he cannot. Morbidity is not fostered by this story; yet there isn't a dull line in it. It is a thoroughly human story humanly told. Whoever reads it through will know more of the life he already knows than he ever dreamed of, and not improbably be thereafter a wiser reader of criminal news and a better citizen. In this issue of *Everybody's* a brilliant controversy appears between the editors and Lincoln Steffens on the question of censorship of speech, print and drama.



The Twentieth Century.

With its November issue the *Twentieth Century Magazine* (Boston) appears in a new cover, rich and sedate, and under the editorship of Charles Zueblin.