

to landlordism. No attempt to placate opposition is liable to conciliate those who are fighting for the retention of their privilege to pocket the economic rent which the community creates. Whether they are able to pocket all of it or the larger portion of it, is for the moment immaterial. Let us concede that they do not pocket all of it, but that some of it is distributed as wages, salaries and profits to storekeepers. The contention is that all of it that does not go into the public treasury should go in those ways. What share of it the landlord should get are the wages of his labor or the interest on his capital as owner of buildings, and to these returns he is entitled. As owner of a piece of land he is entitled to receive nothing.

We know this is a hard doctrine. We know society gags at it. But we cannot make a truth like ours easy—and in the long run it will not pay to try to make it easy.

Mr. Fillebrown has done good work in Massachusetts. But it does not appear that in that State any more than in other States landlords are prepared to relinquish their privileges. They will do so only under compulsion. And society will awake to the truth we are contending for only as we challenge loudly and long the iniquity of uncontrolled private ownership of land and its revenue.

Regarding some other points made by Mr. Mackendrick, it should be said: That a tax on land values would relieve congestion must remain as one of our contentions until disposed of by more conclusive arguments than the flimsy ones that have been advanced in opposition. And that the results which may be confidently anticipated from the exemption of improvements from taxation, unless neutralized by influences which may be indicated, must also remain a part of our argument, as irrefutable as the arguments in opposition are confused, mistaken or intentionally misleading. Mr. Mackendrick has presented no facts why any one of these weapons should be discarded from our armory, save that they are the subject of controversy, which is true of

every other proposition that may be advanced in support of the Single Tax. The slight concession made in our favor by Prof. Seligman would hardly induce us to make sacrifice of more dubious principles.—  
EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW.

### FROM THE FIELD

#### REPORT OF LECTURE TOUR OF JAMES F. MORTON, JR.

My first field letter covered a completed trip, while the present lines must be written on the road. The inadequacy of these reports is more patent to the writer than to anybody else. I can state only a few of the bare facts, condensed to fit the requirements of space, but must leave to the imagination all the atmosphere which surrounds the field work, and which arouses fresh enthusiasm at every stage of its progress. The perfunctory account can give no adequate idea of the need of the message, realized anew in every locality, the ever increasing receptivity of men and women in all walks of life, the eager zeal of loyal workers in one place after another, the power of a simple presentation to carry conviction, the new opportunities growing out of the simplest beginnings. We have an immense harvest, ready to be gathered. New York is supposed to be one of the most difficult, hopeless, conservative States; but no Single Taxer could spend a few weeks with me on the road, and fail to become impressed with the conviction that the people are ready as never before for the gospel of economic freedom. The great need is that of cooperation in systematic organized work. With a more vigorous financial backing of the State League, and with the Single Taxers in the various communities thoroughly prepared to cooperate with the field work and to carry out the simple "follow-up" methods necessary to give permanency to its effects, the results will surpass the expectancy of even the most sanguine.

As previously reported, my first trip wound up in Albany, with a fortnight of

active work in the Capital City and its environs. During the days that followed of work at headquarters in preparation for the second tour, I accepted the opportunity of addressing the grange in Millbrook. Here as elsewhere, I found that what opposition to the Single Tax exists among farmers is merely the fruit of ignorance as to the real meaning of our proposition. When it is clearly set before them, they are not slow to recognize that it comes as their best friend.

The tour itself began with a fortnight in Olean, where the indefatigable labors of Mrs. Catherine E. Bradley secured meetings before audiences of the most diverse character; and the local press gave generous publicity. A side trip to Cuba enabled me to address a large gathering of business men brought together by the Chamber of Commerce. This was one of the best and most inspiring meetings of the trip; and the growing responsiveness of business men in the various communities is one of the most significant facts at the present time.

It is a pity to pass Buffalo with the meager mention required in these columns. Tom Work, the ever zealous worker, fairly outdid himself; and one successful meeting after another was the result. Other Single Taxers cooperated valiantly; and new openings were found on every side. Churches, labor unions, business men's associations, clubs, schools, all gave a glad hearing to the Single Tax message. A flying visit was made to Rochester, to address the Labor Lyceum, a body composed mainly of Socialists. Here the lecture was followed by a lively discussion, all to good effect. Lectures in East Aurora under Roycroft auspices, and in Hamburg were also incidental to the Buffalo visit.

An interesting week-end run across the State border brought more work than rest, involving a lecture in Erie, Pa., a debate in Cleveland, Ohio with M. F. Barnard, the Socialist lecturer, and an address at the headquarters of the Cleveland Single Tax Club.

A few days in Jamestown included four speeches in that city, with extremely grati-

fying results, and in Chautauqua. Next followed a lecture in Ellicottville to a small but appreciative audience; and lectures planned for Auburn and Poughkeepsie will close the present trip. After a few days in New York I expect to start on a June tour of the northern counties. As to the summer months, usually considered barren from the standpoint of regular propaganda, a slight effort on the part of readers of these lines could easily secure the making of dates at summer resorts, where a hotel or lawn lecture on a live issue like the Single Tax would be welcomed by management and guests as an interesting change, and where much good seed could be sown. Who will undertake this? Letters on the subject should be sent to me at 68 William St., New York City, as quickly as possible.

—JAMES F. MORTON, JR.

#### WORK OF THE NEW YORK STATE SINGLE TAX LEAGUE

The New York State Single Tax League is doing magnificent work in many ways. In Cattaraugus County it has offered a lady's watch for the best definition of the Single Tax in 300 words sent in by residents of the county and the county editors have been asked to cooperate in the work. This will be followed in other counties.

To serve the purpose of debaters on the Single Tax an excellent exposition has been prepared by Mr. Thomas B. Preston and this will be printed and may be had on application. It is also in contemplation that copies of the admirable article in Jan-Feb. *Single Tax Review* on "The Single Tax and the Farmer" be distributed to the 2,500 officers of the Farmers' Granges in the State.

On this page will be found the report of the Field Lecturer of the League, Mr. James F. Morton, Jr.

A CHICAGO father rendered his six children to the tax assessor as his only personal property. He needn't get gay. The day is coming when the children will be taxed, too.—*Houston Post*.