

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.

MARCH - APRIL, 1917

NOTICE

Mr. Daniel Kiefer, Chairman of the Provisional Organization of the National Single Tax League, has agreed to continue the maintenance of the REVIEW from the Provisional Fund until the National Conference meets some time during the Summer, when the matter of the REVIEW's support may be taken up and the degree of help accorded to it decided finally.

Mr. Kiefer says that he is in favor of the continuance of the REVIEW.

The REVIEW has offered Mr. Kiefer the use of its columns to state his own position in reply to editorial in January-February number, which offer he declines.

To those who have protested in letters to him against the suspension of the REVIEW he has written that he has turned over such letters to us for reply. As it is a physical impossibility for the editor of the REVIEW to answer even the letters addressed to this office, the writers will accept this and the REVIEW's thanks in lieu of other acknowledgment.

FRIENDS RALLY TO THE REVIEW

With the news that the SINGLE TAX REVIEW was in danger of suspension came scores of protests and letters urging that on no account must we consider the giving up of

the periodical. A Single Taxer of this city, known for his princely liberality, made an immediate offer to underwrite every cent it costs, urging that for no reason the work be suspended a single minute.

We find it a physical impossibility to acknowledge all the letters received, so our friends are asked to accept herewith our appreciation of their good wishes and helpful suggestions. We have received abundant testimony to our belief that American Single Taxers will not willingly see the REVIEW discontinued.

Hon. James W. Bucklin writes: "I do not see how the Single Tax movement can get along without your journal except at a real loss of power."

Henry S. Ford, of Camden, adds this to a long letter: "I am willing to give to the extent of my means to keep the REVIEW going. Most of what I have learned about the Single Tax, outside of Henry George's works, I have learned from the REVIEW. To propagate Single Tax by suspending the REVIEW is like promoting a chicken's growth by cutting off its head."

Henry J. O'Neill, of Allentown, Pa., thus strongly endorses the REVIEW: "From the time you started the REVIEW down to this day nothing has caused me more surprise than the persistency and excellence of your work in conducting that periodical. There is no publication in our movement that I would more unhesitatingly refer outsiders to than the SINGLE TAX REVIEW; it has always been dignified, reasonable and attractive. I hope none of us will ever forget or fail to appreciate the work you are doing and have done for our cause or shall fail to be truly thankful for it."

This is the opinion of J. S. Codman, of Boston: "The SINGLE TAX REVIEW should be continued. It is the only paper which today acts as a forum for Single Taxers themselves. There are a great many questions far too abstruse to appear in the *Public*, and, even more so, in the *Ground Hog*."

Robert C. Macauley, whose splendid work for the Single Tax party of Philadelphia, and the ability with which he conducts the *Single Tax Herald* have won the admiration even of

those who differ as to the question of political policy, in a lengthy letter to Mr. Kiefer says, and we have room for this citation only: "It is regrettable to say the least that there should be any difference of opinion concerning the imperative need for continuing support of so capable and useful a publication, that has taken near a score of years on the part of Miller to build up."

Mr. Chas. H. Ingersoll says: "I do not endorse any attempt to snuff out the REVIEW," though it is but fair to say that Mr. Ingersoll does not believe that we should have printed the editorial in last issue entitled "Shall the REVIEW be Discontinued?"

We have not the space to make further citations from letters received in unqualified endorsement of the REVIEW and expressive of a desire to see it continued. Many of these contain offers of help. We acknowledge with sincere appreciation the receipt of such letters from Messrs. G. Hughes, of Topeka, Kas.; B. F. Lindas, of Washington, D. C.; K. P. Alexander, of Little Rock, Ark.; A. J. Melville, of Fairhope; Hon. Chas. O'Connor Hennessy, of New York; Geo. H. Atkinson, of this city; B. L. Yarnall, of Philadelphia; Frederick F. Ingram, of Detroit; Geo. L. Rusby, of this city; B. H. Nadal of New York; Otto David, of Detroit; Lawson Purdy, of New York; William Lustgarten, of New York; W. I. Swanton, of New York; J. Weiler, of Chicago; Bolton Smith, of Memphis, Tenn.; Ralph Rogers, of Vernonia, Oregon, and many others.

One letter that has pleased us greatly comes from Chas. Le B. Goeller, of Union, N. Y. Mr. Goeller is the publisher of the *Single Tax News*, a weekly Single Tax paper known to some of our readers as an uncompromising exponent of the full Henry George philosophy. Mr. Goeller writes: The suspension of the REVIEW would be the biggest calamity that could strike the movement. It is the last remnant, really, of the times of Henry George."

The following resolutions were passed by the Rochester Single Tax Club: "Resolved, that it is the sense of the Rochester Single Tax Club that the SINGLE TAX REVIEW ought to be made the organ of the National Single

Tax League, supported as such, and published monthly."

One letter only shall be printed in full. It is from the pen of a man of wide newspaper experience, whose name for certain reasons is withheld.

"I have been taking the REVIEW as you know for a number of years, and have always liked it. From a distance I have kept track of your Single Tax affairs. From the account of recent meetings and discussions I have got a distinct impression of a certain tendency which in other connections I have been fighting all my life. And now I note it has struck you and in your appeal to your subscribers there are all the problems of centralized control, oligarchy, the taking away from men their freedom to write and to edit, which in a much more drastic form are present everywhere in the newspaper and magazine world.

"I do not know Mr. Kiefer nor any of the men who are organizing the National Single Tax Society. I have never worked with them and am not a contributor to their funds, but I have always intended to be when I got my own affairs into shape. They are doing a good work and are moving in the right direction, but I can see exactly how they are at the same time preparing a handicap which may menace and strangle the movement to a greater or less extent.

"I can see that they feel that all other solicitations ought to retire from the field and let all the money the Single Taxers have flow into one treasury. Then the one treasury will have a little group of custodians. And since you have to call upon them for support they will assume the right to take charge of the REVIEW or whatever other medium is decided upon, and so by degrees, all free individual effort and ambition is harnessed if not suppressed.

"I am glad you made an appeal direct to your subscribers and I sincerely hope they will respond. I will give you such help as I can from time to time myself.

"As a matter of principle, I think it would be a mistake for the National Society to take over or in any wise to control your paper. In view of your long dedication to the cause the National Society ought to afford you

some regular sufficient backing: in return you would agree to be the Society's official organ but that function ought to fall within the larger lines of the freedom of the paper and an uncontrolled editorship."

It is in no spirit of self-conceit that we print these extracts. We would greatly prefer not being obliged to print some of them. But we do in justice to ourself and that our readers who are not acquainted with the state of public sentiment regarding the REVIEW may know it. We hope that in the future there will be no need of printing such letters save in circulars which may be sent out as endorsements. They are of no interest to casual readers of the REVIEW, but they do vitally concern the workers who look upon the REVIEW as an instrument of the cause. We therefore offer no apology for presenting them.

INTRODUCING A FEW FRIENDS OF THE MOVEMENT

Perhaps one of the useful offices filled by the SINGLE TAX REVIEW is the introduction to one another of men who have done or are doing useful work for the cause.

This number will give our readers some idea of the splendid work being done by Dr. Marion Mills Miller, in ways very different from most of the activities of others. Yet what an important way it is. Can there be a more useful work than putting the Single Tax into standard literature? This Dr. Miller is doing, as witness his "American Debate," reviewed in this number; the introduction to "The Poet's Lincoln," also reviewed in this issue, and much other work. We think we are justified in asking recognition for this sort of literary activity in the interest of our cause from an accomplished scholar.

While we are engaged in introducing men whose work entitles them to wider recognition, let us not neglect a few others. William Lustgarten, gentlemen, known well and favorably to local men, and to his many devoted friends in this city. How many elsewhere know of his work, his whole-hearted devotion

to the cause, his generous help to activities needing help? It is probably too late to elect him national committeeman, but in the association reorganized, as it will be, the name of William Lustgarten presents strong claims for consideration for some post of national responsibility in the movement.

Byron W. Holt, gentlemen of the press and all statisticians of wide repute! Here is one of you, and not a whit behind any of you in fame and real accomplishment. Gentlemen of the West and more distant East, do you know him as a Single Taxer? Then get acquainted. We know him in New York, but we have sometimes thought because we never saw his name on any Advisory Committee or any literature sent out, that you might not know him so well. Might it not be profitable to the cause to place men prominently in the front of the movement who have won prominence in other fields of endeavor, whose names lend weight to their pronouncements, whose connection with a cause adds the presumption of a reasonably intelligent character to the cause itself?

Charles Frederick Adams, gentlemen! Really is it necessary to introduce him? It seems yesterday that we sat in the parlor of Henry George's home, we a young man, timid in that great presence. There sat another who loomed in our imagination as a figure almost as imposing. For was he not the close friend of this prophet of a new dispensation, the beloved disciple? Well, Mr. Adams—it seems now like a sacrilege, and now like a blessed privilege to call him "Charlie Adams"—lives in New York, works here, and is as much interested in the great question as ever, carrying his weight of years and his acute intellect unimpaired. Orator, counsellor, authority on Constitutional history, rarely proficient in economic problems and with the enthusiasm of youth still with him—why do we not see his name oftener, why is he not recognized as one of the Elder Statesmen of the movement? Are we indeed forgetting the men who won our early triumphs, who were the pioneers of a cause when it was despised and of little consequence in the world?

And there are others.