

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.

The causes of the defeat may be sought for in many directions. Yet after all is said and done, there is but one cause. There remains a vast deal of education yet to be undertaken before a permanent victory for the Single Tax can be secured. The knowledge of the principles for which we contend must be made so general a possession in the minds of the people that the silly arguments of the *Post Intelligencer* will cease to be printed in any newspaper that respects the intelligence of its readers. The Single Taxers of Seattle, if they would win a victory in the next election, must now start out on a campaign of propaganda that will acquaint every voter in Seattle with the arguments in favor of the removal of taxes from improvements.

There are other incidental reasons for the small vote cast for the Single Tax amendments, which may be briefly indicated. It was, first, a decided disadvantage that there were two Single Tax amendments to be voted for, and another serious handicap were the number of amendments on the ballot, 27 in all. This was confusing, and prevented the two amendments from receiving the proper attention of the voter. It is doubtful even with the very aggressive and active campaign waged by the Single Taxers of Seattle that our cause received anything like its proper share of consideration.

There was no newspaper support for the Single Tax amendments, except the *Star*, and the movement was persistently misrepresented. This misrepresentation could not be overcome in time. If the story of Vancouver could have been laid before the people in its true light the result might have been different, for the experience of this Canadian city was not set before the people. If the Vancouver Number of the SINGLE TAX REVIEW, in which the story of Vancouver is told in detail, had been placed in the hands of the voters there would have been a very visible increase in the Single Tax vote.

The idea that the measure was unconstitutional also operated to prevent the full vote in favor of Single Tax and this notion was not confined to the opponents of the measures. Many votes were prob-

ably lost owing to the attack upon the constitutionality of the measures.

The Single Taxers expended in the fight \$2,145.30, and splendid work was done by Miss. Margaret Haley, Thorwald Seigfried, O. T. Erickson, Will Atkinson and many others. Alfred D. Cridge, of Portland, Oregon, the valued Oregon correspondent of the REVIEW, made eighty speeches during the campaign, and there were scores of public debates.

In enumerating the newspaper support received, we have omitted the *Western Woman Voter*, which for the time made itself a Single Tax periodical. Its highly intelligent presentation of our doctrines must have won many votes.

When the result was known Oliver T. Erickson wrote as follows to the *Star*, which will show the spirit animating our friends in the face of defeat, a spirit which will win coming victories:

"If the Single Tax is defeated, we are ready to begin the fight again. It was unfortunate that so many issues were before the people at the same time. We shall go on, and on, unmindful of temporary set-backs, until this thing which we are working for, fighting for, is understood. Then we will win. The *Star* made a remarkable campaign for Cotterill and deserves all the credit."

OREGON.

Oregon is moving along very jauntily to the State election in November confident of being able to survive and thrive even if from thirty to forty measures are on the ballot. Among them will be at least six tax measures, and that the question of the Single Tax cannot be treated with silent contempt is clearly apparent. The official organ of the State Grange of Oregon and Washington, the *Pacific Grange Bulletin*, has articles pro and con in every issue. The editor deplores the fact that the arguments against are such poor dope, and says he is anxious to publish any argument against it, but has not received any yet that amount to much.

W. S. U'Ren has had two or three