

are after coal land or corner lots for the rent, I am the only one who writes Single Tax articles for our county papers. Two papers have published my articles for ten years quite regularly. But one died two years ago. It had a Single Tax column for six years in nearly every number. I don't know whether that column killed it or not. But the *Genius of Liberty*, the oldest in the county, and one of the leading papers, publishes articles from me in both daily and weekly editions. The Editor assures me that in a short time he will be able to handle more of my matter than he has in the past. He is not afraid of its killing his paper.

My work has been to present our cause boldly to all men and women, regardless of creed, parties, wealth or poverty. The only wealthy man besides Tom L. Johnson, who has written me is the famous coke baron, Henry Clay Frick. He wrote me: "I was much interested in your letter, but don't believe in your conclusions." This was more than I expected.

To the second question: "Moral principle should govern."

Suppose I am opposed to the rum traffic, and the only ship going to my destination is well loaded with rum. My going in that ship will not violate a moral principle. But as an aggressive reformer, I would try to make the rum dealers feel like dumping the stuff overboard.

Then whichever political party we can steer furthest our way let us get aboard and try to induce them to throw overboard all their frauds and follow us.

If I vote that party ticket I vote my principles though they may have planks that I do not approve. Sometimes by not voting we help the party to which we are opposed. A legislator was approached by a briber and he spurned him, he was approached by a briber on the other side and he spurned him and he was approached by an offer of \$500 if he would not vote and he did not know what to do.

Let our plan be to hammer away and the rocks of prejudice and ignorance will fall into a dozen pieces, useful to fill a mud hole where the "red van" can cross in comfort.

Let us get a Single Tax plank into the Democratic platforms where we can, and use them to steer to port.

C. B. POWER.

Amarillo, Texas.

Editor *Single Tax Review*:

Replying to Mr. Weeks' first question, I would say that Single Taxers could vote for the party nearest to their way of thinking, until the time is ripe for some other political action, without incurring moral guilt. And indeed they would incur moral guilt not to do so.

Regarding his second question, it is quite obvious that they should be governed by both "moral principle" and "expediency,"

and that it would be unwise to the extent of immorality to ignore expediency.

This, I think fully answers (omitting argument), his queries; but possibly, for Mr. Weeks' purpose, he has not put his questions well. They savor too much of the frazzled catch-question. "Shouldn't we vote as we pray? A question that could be answered either "yes" or "no" without involving morals—or even without locating in the least the "where we are at."

It is but fair to Mr. Weeks to presume that he simply wants to know if there will ever be a time when the Single Taxers should organize a separate party, and if so, how near to hand is that time?

As for myself, my answer to the first question is, "I don't know." The latter can be answered only when "I do know." It all depends.

One thing certain, I am not looking for the middle of any pig trail road in the woods to stand up in, like the Populists and the Prohibitionists, and at the present like the Socialists.

Henry George, at the Syracuse convention, upon the organization of the United Labor Party by the Single Taxers and Socialists—dominated by the Socialists—strongly opposed a third party movement, but he was overruled, and the organization affected. He yielded under protest, and accepted the nomination for Secretary of State—the highest elective office that year. "But," said he, and I remember almost his very words—"but, my friends, we make a mistake by cutting ourselves off into a third party. We once were listened to, we will not be listened to now. In this campaign of the whole State I will not nearly receive the vote I got in the one City of New York for Mayor." His words were prophetic. He didn't receive half so many votes. Afterward, through his *Standard* he fired his "I told you so!" and slid gracefully back into the Democratic party. His editorials against third party building were the most philosophical and conclusive I have ever read, before or since. Some of them ought to be reproduced.

Times change, it is true, and human conduct must keep up with the procession. But I was too glad to get back home into the Democratic party from my prodigal ninety days with the United Labor Party to be in a hurry again to go astray. As luck had it, no election was held while I was riotously living, and so I have ever since been able to boast of never having voted other than the Democratic ticket.

But we are making history rapidly and few can tell what a year may bring forth. Watch, pray, and read the *Commoner*—and the *Public*—and THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW, and work for and vote with the better of the two old parties—and wait for developments of the Single Tax that are sure to be seen and felt by the persistent and intelligent propaganda efforts.

Mr. Weeks deserves much credit for his earnest endeavor to do something—so many seeming to have “lain down.” We may be able to better know how to do later on, as the campaign approaches. Never were there brighter prospects for re-alignments; never less interest shown, under the Jack o’ lantern prosperity in politics. The financial crisis is due this year, and it will surely culminate this year or early in the next. They have come every ten years since 1833. Many of us remember 1873, ’83, ’93, and 1903 is here. The prime cause is land speculation—fostering stock and bond and credit crazes.

These ten year visitations are as regular as birthdays—and the hard times last seven years. At the end of seven years normal conditions have returned, the people have accumulated some money, then lands begin to rise, and the skinning operations begin again. It takes about three years to go through this skinning process, then seven years for the hide to grow back again—completing the decade—and the beginning of the skinning again—and so on.

The country is now naked—from the most complete skinning known in our history. Hard times are already on, and the crash of the crisis is expected at any time. Wall Street is too shaky to withstand much longer. There has been more extravagance, more wars, more administrative cussedness in this government—and in others—than for many decades past.

Now the point I am after is, the consolation we may get out of a panic. *It is the time for a change of administration, and the revival of interest in reforms.*

Let Bro. Weeks, and all reformers, keep now everlastingly at it—for a closer organization of the democratic Democrats—for aggressive action at the first blast of our Roderick’s bugle horn.

We need, by no means, to be despondent over the outlook. Never did so big a thing as the Single Tax grow so fast. The recent news from the English Parliament—coming within 13 votes of carrying—why it alone is enough to recompense us all for all the hard licks and kicks we have received.

So far as my neighborhood is concerned I am not at all uneasy—when a show down is called for. And, I am sure that the growth of single tax sentiment is much more wide spread than some people know of.

J. L. CALDWELL.

Denver, Colo.

Editor *Single Tax Review*:

Single Taxers in Colorado seem very much unconcerned regarding future political organization and action along the lines suggested by Mr. Weeks. Copies of his article and requests for letters for publication have been mailed direct to eighteen of the prominent Single Taxers of Colorado,

with the result that replies have come from but two.

Personally, I am in full accord with the propositions so ably presented by Mr. Weeks in the January issue of the *REVIEW*. It submits the alternative of a future political freedom, for a past political slavery—of a contest in which the heart can go with the ballot—for one from which our principles continually plead for divorce.

As respects Single Taxers, what argument can be advanced to induce us to remain with the Democratic party, unless we write the platform? Of what avail would be its success otherwise, with its puny reforms and a Republican Congress.

As respects the “making” of Single Taxers can indirect education, hedged about with the confused issues of the present democracy, be equal, in any respect, to direct education, such as the contemplated action would insure?

Do we not rather annul what would otherwise be of permanent benefit, by casting our lot with a party that gains victories or suffers defeat upon indefinite issues? It was so in this State last fall, although Mr. Herman* does us wrong to imply that “We left the track of simple and pure propaganda for the cesspool of place hunting politics.” We were not after office at any time during the movement and our only offense against principles was the support we gave the Democratic party, which, after fathering the amendment in the regular assembly, secretly and openly opposed it throughout the campaign.

It is not the object of this movement to obtain office. Our principles put into practice by Republican, Democratic or Socialist office holders would be entirely acceptable, but as long as we subordinate our principles in the service of any unprincipled party, we will have an empty sack to hold. It is only by education that we can force the issue of Land Value Taxation upon some dominant party and this is to be quickest accomplished when we demonstrate our strength and define our issue.

E. O. BAILEY.

Denver, Colo.

Editor *Single Tax Review*:

In replying to your question concerning an independent Single Tax political organization, I will say; that the plan suggested, namely, that an organization be formed to go to the national Democratic convention and ask for admission, would be unprecedented so far as I know, and I do not see how admission could possibly be obtained and if admission could not be had then the only effect the movement you speak of could possibly have would be that

NOTE.—See letter of Mr. J. R. Herman that follows.