

This is all part of the general forward movement, and we feel that Colorado is in splendid shape to take an aggressive step forward. The editorial in the last REVIEW was read at the meeting at which organization resulted, and was not without its effect, for all recognized the stinging truth it contained.

Since the election last Fall it is very evident that no human intelligence can tell where the best place to concentrate is, I might suggest that it would relieve the Fels Fund Commission of the responsibility of deciding by simply agreeing to match dollar for dollar with every State organization, and leave it to them to spend. This would be democratic, and I believe more satisfactory. It would result in a larger fund, for who can say where we should concentrate?

Aside from our State work, the club here sent a representative to the Fels Fund Conference at Chicago, and also sent one to Missouri last fall.

We are not holding out any great promises regarding the future of Colorado, but we believe we will be on the map in the final windup.—J. R. HERMAN, Denver, Colo.

---

A STRIKING speech for the Single Tax was made by Clarence Darrow in Los Angeles, California, in March. He declared that the root-matter of the labor question was the land question which could only be successfully treated by restoring the earth to the people by the simple method of taking the socially created values in the form of a Single Tax on those values and freeing the earth and, at the same time, giving to all equal opportunity to employ themselves in the natural source of all supply.

---

MR. J. WM. OLIVER, of Weehawken, N. J., has provoked a controversy between himself and the *Hudson Dispatch* on the Single Tax, in which the honors of the debate, whether the test be a knowledge of economics or ability to express thought in excellent English, go to Mr. Oliver by a large margin.

## COMMUNICATIONS.

---

 DIRECT LEGISLATION ANTEDATES  
TAX REFORM IN ILLINOIS.
 

---

## EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

In your interesting "Bi-monthly News Letter" in the March-April issue is one item about the Single Tax situation in Illinois to which I wish to call attention. Your letter says: "The demand for tax reform in Illinois has been insistent and persistent from a time antedating the demand for Direct Legislation in that State."

If you mean by tax reform the demand for home rule in taxation so that the Single Tax may follow, you are, I am very sure, in error as to dates.

Under the Public Policy law of Illinois, passed in 1901, the electors of that State, in November, 1902, declared for State wide direct legislation by a vote of nearly 5 to 1 (yes 390,972; no 83,377). Two years later, in November, 1904, at the request of the Single Taxers of the State, the Referendum League of Illinois (of which I was an officer for about ten years) submitted a home rule in taxation proposition to the voters of the State and it was carried by a vote of over 3 to 1 (yes 476,780; no 140,896).\* At the same election in 1904, a proposition to grant counties optional referendum was carried in the State by a vote of over 5 to 1 (yes 535,501; no 95,420). In November, 1910, a proposition which was the exact reaffirmation of the proposition of 1902, was submitted and passed by a vote of nearly 4 to 1 (yes 447,908; no 128,398). The proposition voted upon by the people in November, 1910, was under the charge of the Committee of Seven, who had been chosen by a State conference of reform workers held the previous June in Peoria, prominent among whose numbers were Louis F. Post and Raymond Robins, leading Single

---

\* See my article "Direct Legislation and Single Tax" in THE REVIEW of January 15, 1906, in which the proposition was quoted "enable the voters of any county, city, village or township of the State of Illinois to adopt such system of assessing and levying taxes as the voters of any such county, city, village or township may determine."

**Taxers.** The Peoria conference, just referred to, instructed the Committee of Seven to pledge candidates for the legislature to three things, viz.: (a) to "work and vote for an amendment to the constitution providing for the Initiative and Referendum"; (b) to "work and vote for the passage of a corrupt practices act"; and (c) to "work and vote for the passage of a bill providing for a comprehensive civil service system."

It was the concensus of the reform workers at that conference, after their long and bitter experiences with previous legislatures that it was almost useless to expect reform measures to be passed without the aid of direct legislation. They had found that while the Initiative and Referendum do not constitute a reform in themselves, they are the *key* to all reforms of any value. It was there shown that many hundreds, and in some cases thousands of dollars and much labor and time had been wasted in vain attempts to secure desired and important legislation. The temperance people of Illinois, for instance, spent in 1904, over \$40,000 in an effort to secure a local option liquor law, and failed through lack of one vote in the legislature.

At all the sessions of the legislature since the Peoria conference, the Initiative and Referendum people of the State have kept paid representatives at Springfield who have given their entire time to the effort to secure the passage through the General Assembly of an amendment to the State constitution establishing direct legislation. After a hard fight the measure passed one house but failed in the other house, lacking nine votes. The opposition to the measure came from the monopoly interests of the State, those interests having learned that "the thing works" when it has a chance. These interests have succeeded in dividing the friends of the measure under various specious pleas—pleas which would not have availed had there been a better understanding of the case, and in some instances, the possession of an altruistic spirit.

It is plain to me that the Initiative and Referendum amendment of Illinois has the right of way over the tax reform amend-

ment even were the latter to favor the Single Tax, which, I understand, it does not. The opinion of Governor E. F. Dunne on political matters is entitled to great weight. I was living in Illinois while he was Mayor of Chicago, and well remember the many important reforms which he advocated and some of which he inaugurated, and believe that he was an able and upright official. If now Governor Dunne, as you say, "condemns the tax reformers as 'hypocritical' and 'pharasaical'" I must believe that he is not too harsh in his judgment.—JAMES P. CADMAN, San Diego, Cal.

---

#### CAN A SINGLE TAXER ENDORSE MALTHUS?

---

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

I have read most of the papers entitled, "On the Good Ship Earth," by Herbert Quick, which are, as you say, "intensely interesting," but I cannot help inquiring: Can the Single Taxer indorse Malthus? We agree on conservation of nitrates, potash, sulphur, phosphorus, etc., but can we agree that

"Just now it is well to remember that increase of population is the greatest evil the world is threatened by." (Paper XVI.)

Does this not conflict with another statement in No. 19:

"There must be no poverty. Some way must be found to eliminate the injustices which make the inequalities that doom so many millions even in our sparsely-peopled land, to lives of simple, stark, dead struggle for existence. Such a state of freedom from poverty is possible in the western world for ages to come."

If so, then the greatest evil must be the thing that causes poverty in a sparsely peopled land, where the evils of overpopulation are not yet a danger. Mr. Quick cites China as showing the evils of population pushing against the capacity of land to produce. There may be in China a struggle for existence; but there is no such struggle in the United States, where statistics show that every adult man produces about \$2,500 annually, and receives but \$500. If I had to hoe corn