

He was born in the ancestral home, Edgewood, Hanover County, in the James River country of Virginia, in 1851. The great cry for enforcement of the Fugitive Slave Law sounded from the North in that year and grew to a rumble of gunfire during his "conditioning years." In the sudden joining of battle at Chancellorsville his older brothers, soldiers in the Confederacy, dug a hole in the ground and sat him in it when he was caught there as a messenger boy of twelve, come to bring them fresh meat. His and his family's hatred of the institution of slavery was equalled only by their devotion to the cause of the States' right to settlement of their own problems.

The Reconstruction, striking desolation upon his people and hopelessness upon his youthful spirit, set him off to the new frontier, Texas, in 1878. He taught a school for boys near San Antonio for several years, then came here as clerk in the Maverick Land Office. The old files of that institution are mines of color in stories of that and earlier periods of Texas history, when the vast domain of the cattleman and sheep rancher was disputed by the first dirt farmers. Strangely intercurrent just here, there came to his attention at this time some reflections by a San Francisco newspaper writer on "Our Land and Land Policy." Little from this Western writer's pen escaped him thereafter.

With a background of courses in Latin and Greek, in Engineering and in Law in the University of Virginia, my father chose the latter and was admitted to the bar in 1886. He became a stout champion of the United Labor Party led by Henry George in far away New York in that year. He never lost this enthusiasm. Ever cautious against fanaticism he would tear at the Georgian preachments ruthlessly, testing, weighing, seeking conflicts with its enemies, always strengthening his convictions—and winning converts.

He was elected City Attorney of San Antonio in the nineties, returned to private practice at the turn of the century, headed the state board that codified the jumbled laws of Texas in 1910, and in 1912 was elected to the judgeship he gave up in death.

San Antonio, Texas.

JOE H. MINOR.

THE CALIFORNIA CAMPAIGN

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

The California campaign is warming up rather rapidly even though the election is nearly a year away. Our enemies are unmasking their batteries. Coming into the open we have against us the State Chamber of Commerce, State Board of Equalization (controlling among other matters the administration of the sales tax), the various Real Estate Boards and some farm organization officials.

On the other hand we find an apparently united body of labor organizations, all leading bodies being unanimously committed to our measure, earnest and intelligent support from the entire number of Labor papers, some twenty or more, scattered newspaper support in addition, as well as the aid of certainly a big percentage of the Epic group.

We have virtually three regular offices in the State, the center of work. In San Francisco Mr. Noah D. Alper is in charge at 83 McAllister Street; in Los Angeles, Franklin Lowney at Philharmonic Building, and in San Diego, E. M. Stangland at 2660 National Avenue. These are the centers of distribution of all our literature.

It seems appropriate that the first wide struggle for the attainment of a large share of the ideas of Henry George should be the State which first saw his great production. For all the prior attempts or successes have been on a small scale or did not involve sufficient revenues to signify all that we would have them mean. Here, however, we have five per cent of the people of the United States and our measure, taking taxation off tangible personal property and improvements, involves a shift of not far from one hundred fifty millions in taxes and a contribution to the State and its subordinate jurisdictions of fifty to sixty per cent of the economic rental value.

This measure will be fought with all the virulence which would have greeted an attempt to make a complete transfer of all other

taxes to land values, and the question arises why should not therefore the fight have been made for the whole rental value. The answer is easy. We can only succeed by the votes of those who are willing to join us. To them we have proof to make. They would not have been willing to go the whole distance. They apparently were and are willing to carry into effect the present undertaking. We are in a war, which must be fought much as would be a military campaign. We can remind ourselves of the words of General N. B. Forrest, who is quoted as saying that the whole art of war was "to get there fustest with the mostest men." If with an appeal to the majority we can get half way today we can leave the future to take care of itself. If our plan of reform is correct it will justify itself so that there will be no fear of a backward step.

Will we succeed in the present campaign? I can assure you the California fight will not be ended till we do win. As for the present, our greatest hopes are founded upon the panicky fears of our opponents, who realize the strength of our call upon the public. The papers of the State fifty times over have disclosed this attitude.

The greatest restriction upon our activity is found in the want of money. While our opponents have a right to make demands upon the longest pocketbooks in the State we work with relatively almost nothing. Our friends in the State supply half of what should be our minimum necessities. We have received of late appreciated and increasing sums from scattered friends throughout the United States, but vastly too little for our real needs.

We cannot say too strongly that the fight we are making is the fight of the whole United States, and that all contributors are helping themselves and even their children's children.

Finally I am glad to note that Mrs. Anna George De Mille is now in Los Angeles, and will shortly aid us in San Francisco. We count greatly upon her assistance especially with the Women's Clubs. May we hope that all friends will consider California for their next vacation ground and help us by their presence and money!

Palo Alto, Calif.

JACKSON H. RALSTON.

SOCIALISTS HELP IN READING, PA.

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

In presuming to make suggestions about Single Tax progress I am somewhat influenced by an unusual experience: The City of Reading, Pa., now systematically assesses real estate with separate land and improvement values, which is essential to the applying of Single Tax. The movement was started by the Reading Chamber of Commerce, in expectation of the so-called Pittsburgh law being extended to third class cities in Pennsylvania. The Chamber bore the expense of making sample appraisements of eight city blocks and employed the Manufacturer's Appraisal Co.; the different foot-frontage values, however, being determined by public meetings. These appraisements were made use of by succeeding Republican and Democratic city administrations, but they were not extended to the whole city as hoped for;—until a Socialist administration came in and immediately employed the same Manufacturer's Appraisal Co. in applying the Somer's system to the entire city. This was done after a friendly conference with our Chamber of Commerce Tax Committee.

How did this happen,—with Socialists notoriously unfriendly to Chambers of Commerce and distrustful of all their doings? Simply because Socialist leaders were convinced, by investigation, that it was a movement in good faith in a direction they wanted to go,—and they carried it through. I was Chairman of the Chamber of Commerce Committee and Single Tax was freely talked at this conference. Reading, Pa.

W. G. STEWART.

WE DO NOT AGREE

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I am delighted to find Frank Chodorov saying in your last issue that such reform as Abolition are based entirely upon sentiment and that their advocates have nothing to teach. This is correct; and it