

came. They were always informative, acute, lucid, interesting and genuine; and more than once, entirely apart from his contributions that it published, *The Public* has been indebted to Mr. Larimer for facts, hints and suggestions which have entered satisfactorily into its decisions on questions of editorial policy. Though a mere boy in years, for he died at 36, and a friend whose face we have never seen, David K. Larimer is one whose death touches us more than most deaths have, with a tenderly affectionate realization of his fidelity to the truths that came within his vision and the readiness and ability with which he sprang to their service.



THE DAMNING CLAUSE IN ANY THIRD-TERM CREED.

An English writer has commented with surprise and admiration on the capability which the typical American has shown of rising to the occasion when placed in a position of political importance. This writer cited McKinley as an illustration. There are instances of lesser note in the nation, in each State, and in each community. I recall at this moment the case of a mayor in one of our larger cities. There was nothing in his previous career to warrant a prediction of successful administration. He was a man without much education, just a commonplace semi-political citizen, nominated by the organization, it would seem quite by accident, and elected in a spiritless campaign. And yet this man made, even by the confession of opponents, a splendid official. He was more than faithful to the prescribed duties of his position. He was an aggressive leader in all matters of civic improvement.

The point is that we have plenty of citizens in this Republic capable of filling any political position, from President down. George Washington thought so in his day. He did not think that George Washington was necessary to keep the country from collapsing. All the Presidents of the United States have been capable men, and some of the least celebrated have been the most useful. Let us remember that we are not seeking for rulers but for intelligent public servants. If our democracy cannot find and supply these in amply sufficient numbers, then we had better confess failure and go back a couple of centuries. It is all right in a monarchy for the king or his minister to say, I alone can save the state. But such an utterance is an insult or a joke in a democracy, if it is a democracy.

So, coming to the present situation in our po-

litical affairs, we object to the solemn-sounding words of certain men in high position that Mr. Roosevelt is the one man who can fill at this time for the good of the nation the position of President. We have no objection to Governor this or Senator that saying that Mr. Roosevelt is the one man who can save the Republican party from defeat. That is all right. That is a party matter. But to say openly, or even to suggest or imply, that Mr. Roosevelt, or any other man, is necessary to save this nation is a slanderous utterance against the nation. This is the damning clause in any third-term creed. The very advocacy of a third-term candidacy in the face of a splendid tradition is the confession of weakness, incapacity and failure, unworthy of American citizenship, and the mere suggestion of the necessity of such action is utterly and pitifully destructive to the ideals of democracy. The men who are advocating a third, and maybe a fourth, and so forth, term for Mr. Roosevelt are blind to the fact that, in trying to cure certain grievances which they see, they are flying to the chiefest of evils in a popular form of government. This chiefest of evils, which Washington foresaw and others since have foreseen, is the insidious idea of some emergency in which resort must be had to what has been known in history as "the strong man," or "the man on horseback," or to what the American people themselves have called Mr. Roosevelt, "the man with the big stick." It seems strange that those who are now supporting Mr. Roosevelt do not see this danger of weakening the ideals, and the still young tradition, of our republican government. It seems strange that the very men who are professing themselves champions of the people should be rushing into a course which is the negation of democracy. These men would pay too high a price for what they want. We cannot give up the tradition against the third term. This tradition is worth more to us than any reform that can be conceived in the brain of any of the seven Governors.

J. H. DILLARD.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

SINGLETAX CAMPAIGNING IN SEATTLE.

Seattle, March 7.

It was a great battle, that of day before yesterday in Seattle. Not for the Singletax, for this it was only a preliminary skirmish; but for civic decency and manhood and womanhood. And in the election of George F. Cotterill for Mayor, manhood and womanhood won.

95 PER CENT

of Seattle Homes

Will Pay

LESS

TAXES

UNDER AMENDMENT

NO. 2

**Landgrabbers Drove the Milwaukee Terminals and
Berlin Machine Works from Seattle
IDLE LAND MAKES IDLE MEN**



"HOW DO YOU LIKE IT?"

We lost the Singletax skirmish; but we had a magnificent campaign of education, the best I have ever been in.

You may get some notion of it from the specimen campaign document on our side which I send you.

Such documents were abundant and in great variety; and many of those on the other side, of which also there were plenty, were educative for us. One that the opposition made much of, represented a poor man sitting disconsolately on a stone in a vacant lot he was holding down, mourning over the prize of exemption from taxes on improvements that the Singletax would give to his next neighbor, a purse-heavy citizen leaning against a fine four-story house on his improved lot. What do you think of that for an educational cartoon when the smoke of battle clears away?

The actual vote for and against the Singletax amendment is no indication of the real sentiment in Seattle on the Singletax.

Thousands of votes were cast against it by people who did not yet understand it and whose fears were aroused by the newspapers. An incident will illustrate: A young man who was distributing advisory ballots for the Singletax, met a woman who asked him for one. She said she did not understand it. He explained it, and she said that on account of what the newspapers published she had already voted against it. She was sorry, but she would go home and ask her daughter, who had not yet voted, to vote for it; and she thought she could get one or two other women who had not voted, to whom she would explain it, to vote for it also.

One woman who heard my talk Monday night at

the public market place dropped into Singletax headquarters election day and said she wanted to vote right on that question and couldn't find out what was right. That woman's statement is a key to the mind of thousands of people in Seattle. She complained that those against the Singletax say one thing, those for it a different thing, and asked, "How can I tell which is true?"



During the last ten days of the campaign, we went down to the water front between eleven o'clock and two, and then again in the evenings, and talked on the streets to the working men. We explained to those men the question of unemployment, and pointed out the possibilities of the Erickson amendment in that direction, and I could see myself how we changed the current of those men's thoughts from the election of Gill, as a hope for changed conditions, to the adoption of the Singletax.

We not only distributed circulars, but we called attention to the fact that the Milwaukee Railway, which wanted to build its terminals in Seattle, was forced to go to Tacoma because the little handful of men owning terminal sites demanded twenty times as much for a site as the Milwaukee Road had to pay for the same in Tacoma; and the same thing in the case of the Berlin Iron Works which wanted to come here, but went to Portland instead. There was no question about the facts in these cases, as the Port Commission had made an official statement to the people of Seattle during the campaign.

We had other strong illustrations, of which this is a sample. A man named Huntley said at one of our meetings: "The people of Seattle don't want business. I know it. My father and I had enough money to build a nut-bolt-and-screw factory, and we thought we had enough money to buy a site. We went to the little handful of men in Seattle who own all the factory sites, and tried to buy one. They charged more for the site than we had expected to pay altogether for site, factory and machinery. Of course we did not build. Seattle is still without the factory, though there is a demand for those goods. Instead, we did with our money what everybody else in Seattle is doing. We put it into cold storage—invested it in a vacant lot." As he and I walked along to the car that evening, he pointed out that lot, which he had bought for \$360 and sold shortly afterwards for \$4,500. "I know that I held that man up and made him give me \$4,500 for the privilege of putting a house on that site," he said, "but that is the kind of business that Seattle calls investment and enterprise." I think I told that story fifty times during the campaign, and I know my hearers understood me when I followed it up with the explanation that under the Erickson amendment people who are holding up building sites would have to pay taxes on that privilege.

There was another strong point—the fact that 47 landlords own the 85 business lots on Second avenue, where practically all the retail business of Seattle is done, and that these 47 landlords received last year \$1,600,000 in ground rents for those 85 lots. When we pointed out to the people that that \$1,600,000, which was paid by the community of Seattle for the privilege of doing business on Second ave-

nue, would have paid the whole electric light bill (public and private), the water bill (public and private), and the garbage collection bill of Seattle, and that under Singletax it would have been available for those purposes, instead of going into the pockets of 47 landlords as now, the people having to tax themselves over again to pay for those services, it made a profound impression on all who heard; and I never failed to call their attention to the fact that that \$1,600,000 would have gone far to relieve unemployment in Seattle if it could have been used to build public buildings and improve streets and to raise wages by giving employment to men who are now underbidding for jobs.

We found out that one of those 47 landlords paid for the printing of the 30,000 circulars that were distributed against the Singletax.

Seattle offers much other material for concrete illustrations. We had a set of large wall charts in color which contained illustrations from Miss Parker's "Western Woman Voter," and found them very effective. They not only caught and held attention, but they answered the falsehoods which were circulated in the newspapers and printed on circulars to the effect that the Erickson amendment would increase taxes on the homes and lower them on Second avenue property.

There are seven vacant lots in Seattle out of every nine lots. It is unfortunate that so many people in Seattle have money invested in these vacant lots, because the cry went up from the "antis" at the beginning of the campaign that Singletax would confiscate vacant lots. It frightened the people. It would be better for Seattle if all her vacant property were held by absentee landlords, instead of so much of it being held by her own good citizens.



The line-up between the Gill open-town interests and Singletax hostiles was marked. After one of my meetings a high school teacher went home with me and spent the evening telling her experiences in her house-to-house canvass of the women for Cotterill. This teacher is a young woman who was never in any campaign before. Her brief canvassing has opened her eyes to the connection between the economic condition of the people and Gilliam. She was astounded to hear both men and women who appear to be average good self-respecting people declare that they were going to vote for Gill because they believed it meant better times. They were evidently suffering sorely from the hard times in Seattle consequent on the collapse of the real estate boom here.

The strength of the Gill campaign did not lie in the fact that it stood for viciousness. To the unthinking, it held out a hope for better times; and so desperate have the people here become, that they turn to anything that offers such a hope. That is why I believe it is not claiming too much to say that the Singletax campaign diverted enough Gill votes of that kind toward Cotterill to elect him.

Two Knights of Columbus tell me that good church people of my own persuasion went almost solidly against Cotterill and with Gill. One of them told me that the ushers in the cathedral had a luncheon a few days before the primary, at which there were two

reverend gentlemen of the cathedral and twenty-three ushers. They took a straw vote, and there was 1 vote for Cotterill, 3 for Parish and 21 for Gill.

If we could have had our campaign apart from the mayoralty campaign, and have had time and resources, we could have won. But scores of our Singletax people had to go into the Cotterill campaign and work like nailers, for the Cotterill campaign was the important one and Cotterill is a Singletaxer and a good one. The cause of the Recall and Woman Suffrage would have received a terrible blow if Gill had been elected. Women who felt the stigma that would attach to woman suffrage, worked like beavers to defeat him. You can see how it took our best workers and how we had to keep the Singletax and the Cotterill campaigns separate. And to cap all, Oliver T. Erickson was in the hospital through most of the campaign.



The well-meaning churchmen of whom my Knights of Columbus friends told me, objected as strenuously to the Singletax as they favored Gill. Their objection was that it was Socialism. Alas the irony of fate! The official Socialists, on their advisory ballot recommending measures to be voted for and against, classified the Singletax amendments as "immaterial!"

Doctrinaire Socialists here bitterly opposed them. It frequently happened during the campaign that after we had talked at a street meeting, a Socialist would bound up as soon as we had left, and make the most reckless attack on the whole Singletax theory.

I received a letter from Mayor Stitt Wilson of Berkeley during the campaign, in which he said he was glad I was in this land-value tax campaign—that it was the next great step in the social revolution, and he shortly expected to take up the question of taxing land values in California. When I read that letter to a meeting of Socialists to which I had been invited to speak, some of them jeered at Mr. Wilson, and said he was not a Socialist at all; and Bruce Rogers, editor of the Socialist paper, said that the sooner Wilson was thrown out of the Socialist party and put where he belonged, with the capitalists, the better it would be for Socialism. At the Quiz Congress held before the primaries, the Socialist candidate for Mayor, Mr. Wells, when asked if he was in favor of the Erickson amendment, said he didn't know what it was, he hadn't read it at all.

However, there were Socialists who seemed better disposed, and we believe that a great many of them voted for the Erickson amendment. But on the whole the influence of socialistic officialdom was against it.



There were a great many meetings held by the women. It may be said that practically every Woman's Club in Seattle discussed this amendment. Besides the women who did not yet understand the question, there were women against us who did understand it. The wife of one of the most prominent of those 47 owners of Second avenue had her automobile out election day for Gill. And Mrs.

George A. Smith, who held meetings against the Singletax, was in charge of the women's campaign for Gill. It was she, by the way, who asked in the newspapers who was financing me, and got her answer through the same channels, that I was financing myself and receiving no compensation for my work from anyone.



All this is very ragged writing, but I haven't time to fix it up. Let me go on with what occurs to me about the value of the campaign regardless of immediate results. It was well worth while. Its educational value cannot be estimated. I have never seen people more aroused and interested. It caused Singletax to be discussed everywhere. The public library sent to Singletax headquarters for material; said they couldn't meet the demand for reading matter on the Singletax. The book stores all ran out of "Progress and Poverty" and other works of Henry George. Everywhere one went, on street cars, or in stores, or on street corners, Singletax was being discussed, and always earnestly. The campaign here has only begun.

We are all tired. I spoke six times some days, three times at noon and three at night, and sometimes at an afternoon meeting in between, and passed literature besides while others were speaking. Monday and Tuesday I passed out thousands of sample ballots besides making eight speeches in those two days. My feet were so swollen and sore and tired and my hands and arms and throat, that I went home and fell into bed Tuesday night at 8 o'clock when the polls closed, and I have not got rested yet.

But the Cotterill election is such a magnificent victory, we do not care for anything else.

MARGARET A. HALEY.



SEATTLE AND OVER THE BORDER.

Victoria, B. C., March 7.

The Singletax fight in Seattle was made on fundamental lines and with great earnestness. Many of the best workers, however, had their energies absorbed in the Cotterill fight, and the election of Cotterill is itself a victory. Not only is he a Singletaxer, but a militant one; and his election was in spite of the combined opposition of Big Vice and Big Business. Over and over again Big Business organs urged his defeat on the ground of his being a Singletaxer.

In this connection I wish to put in a word about Margaret Haley. This little woman's energy, ability, pertinacity and eloquence were remarkable, encouraging, delightful. Had the Singletaxers been able to secure half a dozen Margaret Haleys there would have been a victory that would have made the country sit up and take notice.

I believe that the women and small home owners were scared by the talk of confiscation. The women had not had time to look in economics much, and their fears were great because of a virtual confiscation perpetrated upon small property owners several years ago in a great re-grading and levying scheme.