

with others form a party in good time. But will they? Will they not follow our example, and wait for others whom they in turn convert to do the same thing? And at this rate how long will it take to accomplish anything permanent?

What has already been accomplished has been done through organization. Witness our earnest Toronto friends and the \$700 exemption act; the good work done by the Tax Reform Association; the educational work of the Massachusetts League. Everywhere some power of organization was behind the work.

Look back to the old days. Pick up a copy of the old *National Single Taxer* and see the list of organizations in nearly every important city of the United States. Then reflect that that paper, issued weekly, had a paid-up subscription list sufficient to keep it going and pay the self-sacrificing editor and publisher, and his no less devoted wife, some compensation for their labors. No other reform paper, certainly no other Single Tax publication, was ever brought so near financial success. That long list of clubs printed in the back pages helps to tell the story. It was the power of organization, no less than the indefatigable labors of George P. Hampton and his wife that was making the organ of the movement a force to be reckoned with.

With organization much could be done that is now neglected. With organization Congressman Baker might have been saved to us. Such work among Single Taxers as was necessary had to be done through his own committee from Brooklyn. How much the work of Frederick H. Monroe and his lecture bureau could be simplified with the forces of organization ready at his hand. How these forces could be bent toward localities where legislative opportunities opened, or where the forces that oppose us were seeming to yield. How much in many ways could be done.

To elect Single Taxers to office will effect as little in the future as in the past. They are not elected as Single Taxers, but as Democrats or Populists. There are but few Robert Bakers, and the opportunities of electing Congressmen are fewer still. There are even now—and we speak advisedly upon this matter—many Single Taxers in Congress. But they will keep silent as long as the Single Taxers remain unorganized, and therefore without influence or potentiality. Not the election of Single Taxers to office, but the persuading of those now in office that there is a power they must reckon with, is the important thing to do. This can be done through organization.

What can be done without organization we are doing. But politically this is but little, and educationally it is far less than it would be with the influence of massed forces everywhere adding a potentiality and numerical influence to an economic teaching by lecture bureau, forum, or public prints.

AFFAIRS AT FAIRHOPE.

We offer no apology for printing articles in criticism of Fairhope, coming as they do from writers who are good Single Taxers. The *REVIEW* is a Single Taxers' publication and not the organ of Fairhope or any other isolated or special experiment on professedly Single Tax lines. Both sides shall be heard until this unhappy controversy is disposed of.

The charges of unfairness, of alleged defects in the very plan of organization, even of maladministration, coming as they do from different quarters, are not, we regret to say, met and disposed of in the report of the committee appointed at the conference and which appears on another page.

There is nothing in the report that leads one to believe that any real investigation was made, or that the protest of objecting renters was considered, or that the testimony of any one representing the other side was taken.

It is conceivable that the membership plan as Fairhope grows in numbers and importance will be found impracticable. That the only alternative, the admission of all the renters to a voice in determining the appraisal of land values and their manner of disbursement in public improvements, would result in the perversion of the original aims and objects of the colony—though insisted upon and apparently sincerely believed in by Mr. Gaston and others—seems by no means conclusive under certain legal forms of trusteeship which the laws of some States, and no doubt those of Alabama, provide for.

But these are matters for future consideration. If it be urged that a full participation of all renters of Fairhope in the appraisal and distribution of rentals may result in perverting the original purpose of the colony, which is to provide a working example in miniature of the practical operation of Single Tax principles, it can very well be retorted that a self-perpetuating membership (and accusations grow that good Single Taxes are and have been rejected on no other ground than they oppose certain features of the administration) may result in the same perversion of the primary objects of the colony. Is or is not the membership plan fatal to the continued success of the colony?

We make no allusion to the regrettable personalities which have characterized much of this controversy. Mr. Brokaw's article printed on another page would have been stronger without them. We believe in the sincerity of both sides, and we no more believe that any large numbers of the renters desire to wreck the colony (for this certainly would not profit them) than that the forty-five governing members (who if report be true are by no means all Single Taxers) desire to arbitrarily govern the remainder of the population.

We print on another page the protest of

the renters. There is but one statement, to which if we understand it correctly, exception may be filed. That is the following statement:

"The grand principle of the Single Tax does not depend upon the collection of the full rental value of the land, etc." It may be that this is an unconscious slip. The principle of the Single Tax, however, is the collection of the full rental value of the land. But in practice it may be found expedient to leave to landowners a small percentage of such value to facilitate its collection by providing a basis of assessment, determined by the small selling price that land would then have. Mr. George contended that it would not be possible to take more than ninety per cent. of land value. It is however true, as this paragraph from the renters protest goes on to state, that the Single Tax does "depend upon the judicious use of the rentals collected." If the rentals taken in Fairhope are something more than the land value, as is alleged, because of the reductions of assessed rentals in sixty cases, then improvement values are indirectly taxed. But if taxes take considerably less than the rental value then improvements in Fairhope must remain inadequate to the demands of a growing town.

It is clear that these are questions that only those on the ground can determine. In accordance with a recent concession of the voting members renters now have a voice in the disbursement of rentals. This is really an important concession, but it is a curious fact that few of the renters seem to regard the concession seriously, holding that this cannot really be done without a change of the constitution. But we are at this writing without data enabling us to say whether this is so or not.

Fairhope's troubles are of interest far beyond Fairhope. Therefore an investigation by an important committee whose findings will have weight with the Single Tax world, and whose decision must be accepted as a solution of the problem, seems to us imperative. We know now that all is not as it should be at Fairhope, and although it is quite true that success or failure of the colony means but little to the world-wide Single Tax movement, yet for its own sake and for such colony imitators as may come after, and perhaps, too, because it has been exploited in the public press as a Single Tax experiment, a strong effort should be made to set at rest the problem of its government, to satisfy the claimants of both sides of the controversy, if that be possible, and to determine how the Single Tax features of the colony may be preserved under a more democratic administration than seems to prevail.

To this end we suggest the organization of a committee to sift Fairhope's affairs to the bottom, and to be composed of members drawn from such men as Judge Samuel Seabury, Lawson Purdy, Hon. James G. Maguire, Hon. Robert Baker. We suggest

these men because of their legal, or judicial or legislative training. In the findings of such a committee absolute confidence could be reposed.

ROOSEVELT ON CAPTAIN "BUCKY" O'NEIL.

The following is a brief account from the pen of Theodore Roosevelt, of Captain O'Neill, once Sheriff, then Mayor of Prescott, Arizona, and later Captain of the Rough Riders, killed at San Juan Hill, but whose name will be held by Single Taxers in grateful remembrance because of his efforts to establish the Single Tax in Prescott. Captain O'Neill understood our principles, recognized their far-reaching import, and revered the name of Henry George. The editor of the REVIEW had the pleasure of meeting him in New York City before the Spanish-American War, when O'Neill, at that time Mayor of Prescott, was on his way to the Klondyke. It was the era of the Klondyke gold fever, and O'Neill, to whom the lure of adventure was forever beckoning, had turned his footsteps in the direction of the Alaskan gold fields. We recall him as a man at least six feet in height, with a face singularly handsome because of its combined strength and gentleness.

The President's account of his Captain of the Rough Riders is interesting as well as sympathetic. In passing, it is worth mentioning that Nicholas Vyne, of Emporia, Kansas, from whose pen a short article appears in this number, was a Sergeant of the Rough Riders, and knew O'Neill—though not of O'Neill's company—but did not know him as a Single Taxer:

"Most of the men had simple souls. They could relate facts, but they said very little about what they dimly felt. Bucky O'Neill, however, the iron-nerved, iron-willed fighter from Arizona, the Sheriff whose name was a by-word of terror to every wrongdoer, white or red; the gambler who with unmoved face would stake and lose every dollar he had in the world—he, alone among his comrades, was a visionary, an articulate emotionalist.

"He was very quiet about it, never talking unless he was sure of his listener; but at night, when we leaned on the railing to look at the Southern Cross, he was less apt to tell tales of his hard and stormy past than he was to speak of the mysteries which lie behind courage, and fear, and love, behind animal hatred and animal lust for the pleasures that have tangible shape.

"He had keenly enjoyed life, and he could breast its turbulent torrent as few men could; he was a practical man who knew how to wrest personal success from adverse forces, among money-makers, politicians and desperadoes alike; yet, down at bottom, what seemed to interest him most was the philosophy of life itself, of our un-