

SINGLE TAX REVIEW

An Illustrated Bi-Monthly Magazine
of Single Tax Progress

Edited and Published by
JOSEPH DANA MILLER, at 150 Nassau St.
New York

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE:— In the United States, Canada and Mexico, \$1.00 per year. Payable in advance.

Entered at the Post-office, New York, as Second Class Matter.

JANUARY-FEBRUARY, 1917

SHALL THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW BE DISCONTINUED?

The continuance of the REVIEW now hangs in the balance. It is up to the Single Taxers of the country to decide whether the REVIEW be continued or be forced to suspend.

The decision rests for the moment with Daniel Kiefer, Chairman of the Provisional National Single Tax Committee. But it should rest primarily with the Single Taxers of the whole country who believe in the need of a Single Tax organ, and who believe that the REVIEW, as adequately as its present support permits, fills that need.

It should be remembered that the publisher of the SINGLE TAX REVIEW financed it for ten years with the help of a few contributors. Its subscription list was inadequate to pay the cost of publication, and the deficit was met by men who thought the REVIEW worth maintaining. This is the history of all Single Tax organs in the past and of ninety-nine per cent of all publications having a reform purpose.

When the Fels Fund Commission was organized it drew to itself the funds of Single Taxers of the country for Single Tax work, on the assurance to such con-

tributors that all Single Tax activities, in which it included the REVIEW, would thereafter be provided for out of this general fund. This prevented us from appealing to Single Taxers generally for support, as well as relieving us of the necessity for so doing. From that date till now the REVIEW has been chiefly maintained by the contribution of the Commission, a contribution wholly disproportionate, it seemed to us and to many others, compared with its expenditures for other and more questionable activities.

At the recent meeting in New York (elsewhere referred to) both the Fels Fund Commission and the Provisional Committee for national organization authorized by the Niagara Falls Conference, passed out of existence. In their place Mr. Kiefer was selected as chairman of the National Single Tax League, with authority to continue Single Tax work pending the election of a National Committee, and to select an advisory committee, who have, however, no authority whatsoever. Subsequently, at this meeting the question was raised as to the support of the SINGLE TAX REVIEW and other publications while organization of the National Single Tax League was being perfected under the terms of the proposed constitution. Mr. Kiefer assured those present that the REVIEW would be provided for and that to take up time discussing the matter would be superfluous.

Relying upon this statement, and with this issue of the REVIEW under way, the publisher of the REVIEW wrote to Mr. Kiefer in order to have a definite understanding in regard to this financial support. In reply Mr. Kiefer sends a check for \$125 on behalf of the Provisional Organization for the current issue of the REVIEW, adding, however, that he doubts that the Single Taxers of the country want to see the REVIEW continued, and suggesting that the

next issue of the REVIEW should be delayed until a definite expression of opinion may be had from the new organization "through its duly elected representatives under the planned proxy board system," which, Mr. Kiefer says, "it is unlikely can be done for at least ninety days."

We have written Mr. Kiefer that the method which he suggests is an admirable one for chloroforming the REVIEW without acquainting Single Taxers of the cause of its demise. Mr. Kiefer under existing arrangements, is the practical dictator of the new National Organization, having sole responsibility for the disbursements of any funds collected, (the amount now pledged being \$33,000). In view of his attitude it becomes necessary to appeal directly to the Single Taxers who wish to see the SINGLE TAX REVIEW continue publication.

Not only would it be in our judgment a vital mistake to suspend even temporarily the publication of the REVIEW pending the perfection of a National Single Tax Organization, but we feel that to await the decision of a committee chosen by the proposed proxy system would be far less satisfactory than to have the fate of the REVIEW settled now by the direct action of those who know the publication.

The time which must elapse before a decision would be had is too remote, and the result of the decision under the peculiarities of the plan suggested too problematical to justify any further delay in bringing the situation to the attention of the Single Taxers of the country.

This passing reflection occurs to us. As a curious example of unconscious paternalistic attitude of mind, it was urged by Mr. Kiefer at the recent Conference that something should be done to "discourage promiscuous solicitation of funds for Single Tax work," and some of those present seemed to be in

accord with this sentiment. The freest solicitation of funds for Single Tax work is expressive of a state of democracy; anything done designedly to discourage such solicitation, to make it difficult to finance any work that its promotor may deem useful, is autocratic, and dangerous as all autocracy is, whether it be benevolent or otherwise.

And here is just where the trouble lies. If the "Beggar Knight," as Mr. Lolus F. Post has dubbed Mr. Daniel Kiefer, will refrain from being the chief solicitor of all funds, men doing useful work for the Single Tax will not be in the position of beggars of a lesser rank to the "Beggar Knight." They will finance their labors by solicitation of contributions from individuals, which method, however "promiscuous" it may be, is at least democratic. In such instances, too, men who work for the cause will be better able to maintain their self-respect, and will do better work in consequence. To discourage the solicitation of funds may be characteristic of the peculiar attitude of some members of the Provisional Committee, though we doubt if the sentiment is general among them. Single Taxers with money to contribute to Single Tax work are neither children nor idiots who need to be guarded against the consequences of foolish giving.

What the movement needs is more democracy. What it needs, too, is that the SINGLE TAX REVIEW, if it is to live, or whatever is to take its place, shall be in a position to review, uninfluenced by the pressure of any group, committee or body of individuals, all questions of policy affecting the triumph of our principles. The columns of such an organ must be fearlessly open to any Single Taxer (as the REVIEW has always been) who has anything to say, subject only to the editorial veto on what may be adjudged personal or scandalous in its nature.

This it must be, as well as being a chronicle of our progress and a medium

for those who have something notable to say in the form of essay or exposition. If the Single Taxers of the country believe there is need of such an organ, and that the REVIEW, which alone of all our publications approximates to such a need, should be continued, they will express themselves in no uncertain tone.

JOSEPH DANA MILLER

UNSOLICITED PRAISE FOR THE
SINGLE TAX REVIEW

Here are a few unsolicited commendations among the many received in the mail for the month.

"The REVIEW is an indispensable publication."—J. B. CARROLL, Chicago, Ill.

"Your publication is fine."—FRED S. WALLACE, Editor Coshocton (Ohio) *Morning Tribune*.

"Your REVIEW is a great publication."—ANDREW FYFE, Grand Rapids, Mich.

"The fact that I renew my subscription year after year will show you more than words what I think of the REVIEW."—KENNETH B. ELLIMAN, Sec. Free Trade League, Boston, Mass.

"Some time ago I had occasion while in Philadelphia to look up back volumes of the Single Tax REVIEW and was surprised at the amount of excellent reading in them. I regard the REVIEW as much ahead of the ordinary economic publication."—W. A. DOUGLAS, Toronto, Canada.

"I appreciate the REVIEW because it keeps me in touch with everything a Single Taxer ought to know."—JOHN B. BOTT, Greensburg, Pa.

"Hope that the REVIEW, and the *Public* now going to New York will be able to strengthen and hearten each other."—W. K. SMITH, Chicago, Ill.

"There is no better Single Tax paper being printed anywhere."—J. H. BROTHERS, Eugene, Oregon.

"The REVIEW is doing a great service for the cause."—JANET L. BROWNLEE, Pittsburg College for Women, Pittsburg, Pa.

"The best of Single Tax organs."—The *Rebel*, Hallettsville, Texas.

"A splendid REVIEW."—EMANUEL JULIUS, of the *Appeal to Reason*.

"I consider the REVIEW excellent in every respect."—W. R. LESTER, London, England.

"The REVIEW for Nov-Dec. is a superb number, brim full from cover to cover of instructive and logical matter."—J. G. WRIGHT, Berkeley, Calif.

"I wish you continued success with your worthy publication"—LONA I. ROBINSON, Glendale, Calif.

"I have long been hoping for the time when I could do something to show my appreciation of the REVIEW."—A. C. CAMPBELL, House of Commons, Ottawa, Canada.

LET US PULL TOGETHER FOR
A NATIONAL MONTHLY

A letter of appeal to determine just what Single Taxers want to do with the REVIEW will soon be sent broadcast over the whole country. Let an effort be made now to establish the REVIEW as a monthly magazine. With a strong pull and a pull altogether this is now possible.

Our readers should know what we believe a Single Tax organ should be, if the REVIEW can now be established as a monthly.

(1) An organ for militant Single Tax, as expounded by Henry George, but at the same time a faithful chronicle of our progress, such as will impress by its general typographical makeup and the dignity of its outward dress and inward sanity. The REVIEW is believed to approximate more nearly than most of the smaller Single Tax publications to such a standard.

(2) A Free and Independent Forum for all Single Taxers whether they be contributors to a fund or have no dollars to contribute. To maintain such a forum it is essential that the editor himself be free, and absolutely indifferent to any influence that can be exerted by groups, committees or organizations, but amenable only to the great body of Single Taxers. The REVIEW is the only publication that approximates to such a standard.

(3) A repository for essay and exposition, of greater length than can be accommodated in any of the existing Single Tax periodicals