



[Daniel De Leon](#)

AN ADDRESS.

TO THE PEOPLE OF NEW YORK  
OF ALL POLITICAL PARTIES.

A Report From

**THE STANDARD.**

**HENRY GEORGE, Editor and Proprietor.**

Vol. II • New York, Saturday, November 5, 1887 • No. 18

**R**ELYING on your honor and sense of justice, the united labor party asks you to record your verdict at the polls upon the partisan iniquity and perversion of law by which it has been swindled out of its inspectors of election. The case may easily be understood from the following plain statement of facts:

A little more than a year ago the labor organizations of New York city were requested by the Central labor union to call a political convention. In response to that request delegates were elected, and under the auspices of the Central labor union the convention was called to order, and John McMackin elected chairman. This convention of the new party, to which no name had yet been given, adopted a platform of fundamental principles at Clarendon hall on the 23d of September, 1886. The leading feature of that platform was a declaration in favor of securing the land for the people by an exclusive tax on land values. When the platform had been adopted, Henry George nominated for mayor, and an executive committee appointed, a call was issued to the people generally to join in the movement. A public meeting was then held at Chickering hall, and from the body of that meeting a committee was appointed to co-operate with the committee already appointed by the labor convention. Then a ratification meeting was held at Cooper union at which the candidate for mayor formally accepted, the campaign was opened, and local organizations of the party were formed in every assembly district.

At the election of Nov. 8, 1886, more than 68,000 votes were counted for the labor candidate by inspectors selected by political adversaries. In the course of time it became

evident that by no means all the votes cast for him had been counted, there being no labor party watchers at many of the polling places, and attempts at a fraudulent count being detected where there were watchers.

A few days after that election this new party called a mass meeting at Cooper union, at which an address to the country was adopted and a temporary committee for the national organization of the party appointed; and in the month of December primary elections of delegates to a county general committee were held by the local organizations of the party in the various assembly districts. When the delegates to the county committee met they perfected a permanent organization with John McMackin as chairman, and adopted a constitution and by laws, in which the name of the new party that had made a record of 68,000 votes, and which that committee represented, was declared to be “the united labor party.”

At a later meeting a sub-committee of the county committee was elected to endeavor to procure the passage of a law giving to the new party inspectors of election who might protect the party in the future from the frauds by which it had suffered at the previous election. Members of the sub-committee, Frederick C. Leubuscher and Abner C. Thomas (both now candidates on the united labor county ticket), drafted the bill now known as the fifth inspector of elections law. Mr. Leubuscher appeared before the judiciary committee of the assembly, and, stating that he was secretary of the legislative committee of the united labor party, advocated the passage of the bill. After its passage by the legislature, Mr. Leubuscher, Mr. Thomas and Augustus A. Levey called on Governor Hill and urged him to sign the bill. By the legislature, the governor and the state press in general, it was admitted that the purpose of the bill was to afford protection at the polls to the united labor party. The act, as passed, required the police board, in case it held that a third party polling 50,000 votes was not entitled to one of the four inspectors of election already provided for, to appoint a fifth inspector on the nomination of that member of the police board who should be selected by the chairman and secretary of the party polling the 50,000 votes.

In the following summer, long after the adjournment of the legislature, the *New York Sun*, in one of its fantastic editorials, suggested that Irving hall, an insignificant local faction of the democratic party which had indorsed the labor party’s nominee for

mayor at the previous election, was entitled to the extra inspector. But, confident that the intent of the law was plain to every citizen of New York who knew the circumstances of its passage, the various assembly districts of the united labor party selected members to act as inspectors.

On Aug. 19, 1887, at a state convention held at Syracuse, Henry George was again selected as the standard bearer of the united labor party, supporting a platform precisely the same as that adopted at Clarendon hall the year before. This convention excluded members of the socialistic labor party from membership in the united labor party, and declared against what is commonly known as state socialism.

Later, nearly one year after the mayoralty vote on which all claims for the extra inspector are based, the socialists formed a new party, calling it “the progressive labor party,” and pretending that their insignificant faction really comprised the 68,000 voters who cast their ballots for Henry George, claimed that the law had been enacted for their benefit, and selected one of the democratic police commissioners to name their inspectors. Meantime the Irving hall faction had selected another democratic police commissioner to make its appointments. John McMackin, as chairman, and John N. Bogert, as secretary, of the county committee of the united labor party, in accordance with the law, selected a police commissioner to nominate the fifth inspector.

This being the situation, the two republican police commissioners voted to appoint the united labor party inspectors, and the two democratic commissioners voted in opposition on the ground that the adverse claims were well founded. The question was then taken into the courts, they being asked to command the board of police commissioners to perform their obvious duty.

As the courts concede, Mr. McMackin made a *prima facie* case in favor of the claims of the united labor party; but, on the other hand, affidavits were filed by the newly organized progressive labor party that it was that party, and not the united labor party, that cast 68,000 votes for Henry George last November. The supreme court and the court of appeals have finally decided that the question of fact thus raised must be determined before the courts can apply the law. The final action of these courts was only reached on Tuesday, Oct. 25, and it is now too late to have a trial of the issues of fact and an approval of the fifth inspectors before election day. It will be observed that the

decision of the courts is, not that the united labor party shall not have the fifth inspector, but merely that the question as to what party polled the 50,000 votes must be settled before the inspectors can be approved.

Meanwhile the case has been on trial before the court of public opinion. There has been but one decision arrived at wherever fair consideration has been given the matter. The following quotations from the press indicate the general feeling; From the *Real Estate Record and Guide* (ind.): "The legislature clearly intended that those who voted for Henry George for mayor should have an inspector." *Brooklyn Times* (rep.): "Every sane man knows that the party referred to was the united labor party." *Albany Journal* (rep.): "The conspiracy to rob the workingmen of New York of their inspectors of election seems to have succeeded." *New York World* (dem.): "It is notorious from the debates in the legislature that it was the intention of the law that the additional inspectors should be accorded to that (the united labor) party."

Moreover, E. Ellery Anderson, one of the counsel opposing the united labor party, admitted in private to counsel for the latter that it was the party to which the legislature meant to give the inspectors. The attitude of the democratic police commissioners has been that of men fully aware that they were playing with the law. Among politicians the question as raised has been regarded simply as a means, fair or foul, of flooring an opponent. No honest man has believed but that the slow machinery of the law has been invoked by a trick.

With these facts before them, the citizens of New York are asked whether or not the united labor party is entitled to the inspectors of election by the plain letter of the law and by the clearly expressed purpose of the law-making body. Should not the conduct of the democratic police commissioners, Fitz-John Porter and John R. Voorhis, meet with a scathing rebuke at the hands of the voters of the city? Ought not that rebuke extend to the shameless trading politicians who are at their back?

A party that polled more than one-third of the votes cast last year, and that confidently expects an increased vote at the coming election, must send its voters before the 812 election boards of the city on election day to deposit their votes in the hands of 3,248 inspectors, not one of whom is placed there to guard its interests. Is not this a violation of fair play? Is not the way paved for fraud in the count? Other facts go far to

show that this is the case. Already, from police headquarters the Associated press has been notified that the police will not, for the first time in fifteen years, supply that agency of news with the returns from the polling places simultaneously with the handing in of the inspectors' official reports to the police department. Is there not design in thus arranging for certain delay in making the election returns public? Is it not a plan to perpetrate fraud beyond precedent or parallel? A false count is to be a fitting climax to the disgraceful course followed by the tricksters who have cheated the people out of their constitutional convention, resorted to petty persecution so as to prevent money being raised to carry on their campaign, and deprived them of their inspectors.

The dishonest and high-handed course pursued by its opponents has but roused the united labor party to greater caution and more active exertion. The party believes it will poll at the coming election more than a plurality of the votes cast. The people of New York are asked to make that plurality so large that it will prevail over trickery and fraud. The united labor party offers to them an opportunity to promote the common good, to declare that the purity of the ballot must be preserved, to ruin the conspirators who have nullified the law, and to restore to the people the powers usurped by bargaining politicians.

By order of the county general committee, united labor party.

FREDERICK C. LEUBUSCHER,  
H.O. COLE,  
R.K. HAMILTON,  
JOSEPH HARRIS,  
DANIEL DE LEON,  
W.B. CLARKE,  
J.W. SULLIVAN.

Transcribed and edited by Robert Bills for the official Web site of the Socialist Labor Party of America.  
Uploaded October 2006