

CLEVELAND.

Our cause has had free but gilt-edged advertising in Ohio for several months, thanks largely to the Rev. Herbert S. Bigelow, of Cincinnati and to our short-sighted enemies.

Bad as is the constitution of this State as regards taxation, and in many other respects, it did require the legislature to provide for a constitutional convention at this time, a little piece of thoughtfulness which goes far to atone for the mistakes of our forefathers who drafted the old charter.

Backed morally, if not financially, by the late Tom L. Johnson, Mr. Bigelow started in many years ago to win the voters over to the Initiative and Referendum. How well he succeeded is now a matter of history. Thousands of his friends and supporters did not realize, until after the election of delegates to the convention last November, how thoroughly he had done his work.

United with vast patience, winning manners, and singularly tactful and persuasive speech, Mr. Bigelow possesses abilities that rank him as an astute politician of a high order. He was the motive force in the State-wide campaign for the I. & R. He succeeded in uniting the granges and the trade unions in a harmonious campaign of his own devising.

Result: 61 delegates out of 119 pledged in writing to the I. & R. with fixed percentages.

As president of Ohio's constitutional convention, Mr. Bigelow is now looming up as a very big man in the old Buckeye State. Had he used his talents for political management on the other side, it is not too much to believe that wealth and high office would have been his reward.

Organized opposition to the I. & R. was conducted by the Ohio Chamber of Commerce, over which Allan Ripley Foote presides, and whose membership includes the heads of many of our public service corporations. Mr. Foote and his lobbyists always won whenever Mr. Bigelow asked the legislature to submit to the people an amendment to the constitution providing for the I. & R., but when the

question was brought to the people, even our enemies, astonished beyond measure, acknowledged that the principle had won.

Can there be better evidence that our legislators often do not correctly represent their constituents?

But as to the advertising of the Single Tax, Mr. Bigelow was, of course, well known as one of our number. He had never concealed the fact. The opponents of the I. & R., however, made him and his Single Tax belief the center of attack. Their appeal has been principally to the farmers, who have been told that Mr. Bigelow's motive was to use the I. & R. to rob them of their land.

If there is any one in Ohio who hasn't heard of the Single Tax during the past few months, it is because he doesn't read the organs of Special Privilege or couldn't otherwise be reached by the Ohio Chamber of Commerce.

The latest move is to picture Mr. Bigelow as a socialist. The *Cleveland Press*, one of the Scripps-McRae newspapers which have done valiant service in our democratic movement, says that postcards are being sent all over the State ridiculing the I. & R. and calling Mr. Bigelow a disciple of Marx. Despatches were sent out from Cincinnati gravely stating that in a sermon he declared that socialism was to him a religion.

In the convention itself the opposition is along two lines: First, to get as high percentages as possible; and second, to have inserted a provision that the I. & R. shall never be used to obtain the Single Tax.

We have had good advertising, too, from the president of the Western Reserve University of Cleveland, who publicly referred to the Single Tax as quackery. J. B. Vining, president of our local club, politely requested President Thwing to come before the club and make good, but he hasn't accepted the invitation.

We haven't much of a Single Tax organization in Cleveland. A few of the faithful whose work hours will permit, meet every Thursday at a restaurant opposite the city hall and have a room to themselves from 12 to 2. The city hall is said to be full of Single Taxers, just as it was during Tom L. Johnson's long tenure of office.

The Single Taxers take their friends to luncheon here, and a speaker is usually on hand. On March 7, Prof. C. A. Bowgher spoke on "Is the Single Tax fundamental?" The only event of this kind that has attracted any attention from the newspapers was an address by Walter W. Pollock on "City Wide Congress for Cleveland," for the discussion of public questions. The *Cleveland Press* had a long editorial commending the idea, and suggested that the \$12,000 which has been raised for a Tom L. Johnson memorial be used to endow such a congress.

Our good old Single Tax enemy, ex-Governor Herrick, now ambassador to France, has been making some admissions to the effect that there is something wrong in the farming communities, and that, in truth, the farmer isn't getting his share of the tariff plunder. His remedy is to have the farmers form co-operative trusts and borrow money at a low rate of interest. Colonel Herrick is a money lender as well as a tariff beneficiary.

I have asked the colonel and the college professor who promptly applauded him, if cheaper capital and improved methods wouldn't tend to raise land values rather than wages, and therefore make it harder for the poor man to engage in farming. They have not honored me by their notice.

Thoughtful people are beginning to be worried over the farming situation in Ohio. What has taken place in New England is going on in this fine old agricultural State. When the farms of New England were abandoned, it was explained that the soil was poor anyway. That explanation will not suffice in the case of Ohio, and so our apologists for the existing order are talking of high interest rates, unscientific farming methods, and the superior attractions of city life. They shut their eyes to the great fact that farming land is held at practically prohibitive prices. They never mention it, and can't even be drawn into a discussion of that grave feature. But they are willing to do almost anything else, even to having agriculture taught in our country schools.

I don't decry education and better farming methods. I am a graduate of an agricultural college, and love the old place,

and believe that it might do good under a just industrial system. But of the hundreds of grim and awkward though capable and hardy boys who passed through that school at the same time, I can recall only two who took up agriculture as an occupation, and they inherited good farms.

Now, agriculture is to be taught in our district schools! I have often thought that if a new Gilbert and Sullivan combination could get hold of that idea, and of our agricultural colleges, and of that ridiculous and huge bunch of scandals at Washington known as the department of agriculture, a hit could be made on the stage. There are elements of comic opera in an agricultural school that turns out lawyers, bankers, doctors and commercial travelers, as I have known one to do; and some of the documents sent out by our \$20,000,000 extravaganga at the Nation's capital would make the stage comedian wriggle with delight.—HOWARD M. HOLMES, Cleveland, Ohio.

THE FIGHT IN SEATTLE.

The good fight has been fought in Seattle, and has been lost. The opposition has won the battle but we shall win the war. Out of the first engagement we have won something, and that is a Single Tax mayor in the person of George F. Cotterill, who has defeated Hiram Gill. The latter attributes his defeat to the Single Taxers, and elsewhere in this number our correspondent, Mr. Atkinson, returns the compliment by attributing the defeat of the Single Tax measures to Mr. Gill. These are the graceful amenities of the conflict that has just closed.

Here is the vote on the two amendments, the first providing for a gradual adoption of the Single Tax principle, the other for its immediate adoption.

The Griffith's Amendment:

7,932 affirmative.
31,390 negative.

The Erickson Amendment:

12,323 affirmative.
35,470 negative.