

children, not only filled the hall but thronged the street.

Did I make them a speech, or was I intimidated? It was the most radical speech I have made in Missouri. For an hour and a half you could hear a pin drop except for the sound of my voice. When I asked for questions they had forgotten what to ask me, and there were none at first. But pretty soon they woke up. Then came the questions. Wise questions, foolish questions, and questions that were not questions, came in pairs and in bunches. Pretty soon they saw that this wouldn't do, so they agreed among themselves to ask one question at a time; and they sat down on the noisy ones after each question until I had finished my answer.

Such anxiety and interest I have never seen since I started making Singletax speeches, and that is 17 years ago.

Now you want to know what the results were. All I can say is that when they had worn me out I asked to be excused, and then that mob of wild men filed past me, one by one, in silence, each taking a handful of Singletax literature. When I had duly thanked the town authorities, I went to bed; and this morning as I passed up the street, I was greeted everywhere with a "Good morning," "Fine meeting we had last night," and so forth, and I was frequently told, "By gum, there's another side to this story after all."

The conditions here are, I think, fairly typical of the situation in the farming districts throughout the northwestern part of Missouri. I asked them just when this spirit began, and they told me it had begun since that Englishman—meaning Mr. Neilson—and I had come to St. Joseph. They said they didn't "intend to have any consarned outsiders dictating" to them.

The pot is boiling. We can fill any hall in the State if we give proper notice, and merely run the risk of our necks. But that neck business is no joke. I feel safe if I can once get a crowd to listen. They are like a big boy, and can easily be tamed with the right spirit. Until they are tamed, though, it is dangerous. Yet it is great sport, even if it is harder than climbing a 40-foot ladder, and twice as risky.

J. R. HERMANN.



Slater, Saline Co., Mo., Oct. 5.

I came here from Lexington, Lafayette County, today. Arrived at 1 o'clock and arranged for a street corner talk at 3:30. Began on the minute. Was interrupted by all sorts of impertinent questions and was assailed with threats of violence. "Brave men are never eager to take advantage where there are many against one," I said, "and I refuse to believe that old Missouri is truly represented by the kind of men who are trying to break up this meeting." I appealed to their manhood, to their pride, to their patriotism. It was of no avail. The decent men in the crowd were easily distinguished, but they were afraid of the others. Several times I frustrated attempts to knock the box from under me. Responding to their shower of questions, I asked, "Are the men asking these questions willing to answer one? Are they farmers of the soil, or farmers of the farmers?" The shout came back,

"We are anti-Singletaxers, every man, and we don't want you to speak here."

When I had asked for a box early in the afternoon of a merchant, he warned me that the mob would hang me if I advocated the Singletax. "Then let me have a good box to stand on for the last time," I said, jokingly. I hadn't the slightest idea of what was to come. Before I was through, however, I realized that the merchant's warning had been serious and sincere. Upon my announcing to the various groups that I would speak on the Singletax at the bank corner, one man said, "We will run you out of town," and as I went on without having replied to him, he added, "I look upon the man as a thief who advocates the Singletax." At the meeting itself, when I protested against the interruptions, a cry went up, "We have something else waiting for you."

The first man I spoke to in this town—it was in the Y. M. C. A.—told me of the bitter feeling prevailing here. He said a meeting of farmers had been held in Marshall, the county seat, to decide on a course to be pursued for resisting efforts to adopt the Singletax amendments.

Judge Wallace of Kansas City, a Prohibitionist who spoke in Lexington on the 3d, had branded the Singletax as the most damnable, the most infamous, the most diabolical proposition ever made. His whole speech was an appeal to the passions and prejudices of his audience. It turns out that he owns 600 acres of land. He especially denounced those who send speakers into the State as "bad men." Following his speech I spoke at Lexington to a good audience in the court house square, and told them about some of the "bad men" back of this movement—men like Father McGlynn, Henry George, Thomas G. Shearman, Tom L. Johnson.

Without going further into detail, my observations in general are that the landed interests are murderously aroused in this State, and are determined to prevent discussion, as one of the means of defeating the tax amendments. Farmers are consequently not in a frame of mind to be approached or reasoned with. After my meeting here, though, I was told by one gentleman that, notwithstanding the interruptions, I had made votes for the amendment. I was told also of a retired farmer living here who had taken my part in favor of free speech, against a man who said I ought to be run out of town. One of the men in the group told him that if those were his sentiments, he ought to be run out of town himself. The farmer and one other resident of the town who saw me after the meeting, said that two-thirds of the audience wished to hear me, and that one told them that he believed what I had said was true.

Of the bitterness of sentiment among the farmers there is no question, and it is doubtful if it can be overcome during the short period before election. It is all due to misrepresentation by landed monopolists who have made the farmers think that their taxes are to be increased. This misapprehension has driven them wild. But the campaign, no matter how the election comes out, will set a blaze of Singletax education going through the State which nothing can withstand; for when the farmers once know what the truth is, that these amendments are

for their benefit as well as for the benefit of every other man who earns his living, and will hurt nobody but land monopolists, the working farmers will be for the reform to a man.

ROBERT CUMMING.



## SYRACUSE CONVENTION UNBOSSSED.

New York, Oct. 5.

The man who staged the Democratic State Convention at Syracuse, Oct. 1, 1912, was a past master in stage wizardry. There was one poor actor in the company—Alton B. Parker. He could not carry out his part of the program. While the vote for permanent chairman was being taken, Parker sat beside Mr. Murphy, as delegate after delegate stated what he thought of the proceedings. It was an open convention, as far as surface appearances went.

When delegate Mott of Jamestown quoted some of the remarks of William Jennings Bryan, referring to Parker as a reactionary, the applause from the galleries was tremendous. Parker realized at once that while he knew he would be chosen chairman the voters were against him.

The Progressives had no chance to win. The odds were against them, but they made friends by their action on the floor. Osborne led a losing fight, but covered himself with glory. While reading the minority report of the resolutions committee (he being the minority), he made a "bad break," but it worked out in his favor. The spokesman for the Boss rushed to the platform in defense of the machine, and admitted that Mr. Murphy was in full control of the convention. There was one charge that the satellite would not answer, the one made by Sagin of Poughkeepsie, that if the delegates were free to express their own view, Parker would not get 100 votes for chairman. A number of the delegates applauded, but it took the audience by storm. The Baltimore convention was still fresh in their minds.

Parker's address was flat and halting. He was evidently hurt by the lashing of the opposition, and was so tiresome that Murphy yawned several times. "I am a Progressive," was his opening remark. He tried to prove it by the fact that he once invited "the gentleman from Lincoln" to visit him and the invitation was accepted. He did not dare mention the name of Bryan for fear of an expression from the audience.

After the nominations were made and the roll was called, some of the up-State counties voted as a unit; but when New York, with 105 delegates, and Kings with 69, were reached, the county chairman requested that the roll of delegates be called. This action pleased the audience. They were in favor of an open convention. It appealed to them. It was something new. But it did not take long to see that Boss Murphy had his hand on the lever, most of the delegates from Greater New York voting for any name they could think of.

When it was seen that Sulzer on the third ballot had a majority of the up-State delegates, the county chairman of New York and Kings voted the delegation as a unit. The delegates were not consulted; they did as they were told.

The rest of the ticket was made up by the Boss

in "room 216," and put through without a dissenting vote.

Sulzer's nomination had been sanctioned by the State machine, immediately after Straus was nominated on the Bull Moose ticket.

JOSEPH H. FINK.



## TAXATION HOME RULE IN CALIFORNIA.

San Francisco, Sept. 29.

The California League of Municipalities, which at its session in Santa Barbara a year ago adopted resolutions in favor of giving cities power to adopt local systems of taxation, has this year met in Berkeley, at the College of Mines building of the University of California. The following resolution was on the program for discussion on the 25th:

Resolved: That the city officials of California be and they are hereby requested to do all in their power to secure the adoption of the Constitutional amendment providing for Home Rule in Taxation.

The leader for the affirmative was Mayor J. Stitt Wilson of Berkeley.

It is worthy of note that not one of those who opposed the amendment is a member of the League of Municipalities. The opposition came from two University professors and an attorney.

In order that the members might properly consider the subject, the vote was postponed to the 27th. Upon being taken, 73 favored the home rule amendment and only 15 opposed it. This action practically means adoption of the amendment.



Our success is due chiefly to Mayor Wilson and H. A. Mason, secretary of the League. Mr. Mason was chosen to write the argument in favor of the amendment. It is printed along with the amendment in the pamphlet issued by the State and sent by the county clerks to each voter.

Besides that of the League of Municipalities, we have received the following endorsements for the amendment:

City Councils.—Alviso, San Bernardino, Anaheim, Tulare and Dunsmuir.

Organizations.—State Federation of Labor, San Francisco Labor Council, Labor Councils of every city in the State, New Era League of San Francisco (formerly the Women's Suffrage Club), Commonwealth Club, Anaheim Chamber of Commerce.

We have also branch Leagues for Home Rule in Taxation in the following counties: Alameda, Los Angeles, San Diego, Humboldt, Fresno and Butte.



The serious crime of being Singletaxers has been charged against us by agents of the public service corporations who are the only real opponents we have. "It is a veiled attempt to impose the Singletax on the State," is what one public official said in opposing the amendment at the Commonwealth Club. No Singletaxer has denied that he favors it because Home Rule in Taxation will offer opportunity for that system. Yet we have many supporting it who are not Singletaxers. Some do so be-