

vacant by the passing of Matthew Arnold; Jerome K. Jerome, author of that admirable if novel experiment in dramatic art, "The Passing of the Third Floor Back"; John Morley, of course, and Bryce; Jno. A. Hobson, Gilbert Chesterton, Maurice Hewlett, G. F. G. Masterman, Quiller Couch, better known as "Q," and J. M. Barrie, the Shakespeare of modern playwrights. Altogether it seems that the coming fight for the abolition of landed privilege will enlist in the war the men whose literary attainments are the glory of contemporary English letters.

#### THE ANTWERP FREE TRADE CONFERENCE.

The Second International Free Trade Congress will meet at Antwerp on the 9th, 10th, 11th and 12th of August. This is held under the auspices of the Cobden Club, which has of late years pursued a wholly innocuous policy. It is to be hoped that there will be in attendance delegates who will give the advocates of mere commercial free trade some needed lessons. Free-traders who want to stop half way on the journey are at this stage of the world's progress not friends but foes of freedom. Nor is there anything in their programme particularly inspiring to the workers of the world. Free traders of the Cobden Club kind are out of date. The Henry George free traders have the field.

#### A DEFINITION.

The words Single Tax stands for an *exclusive* ground rent tax system (a natural tax system) and the word is also the slogan for the "humanized" political economy of to-morrow.

The term Single Tax stands for the fact that *all* public revenues can successfully, exclusively and permanently be drawn from the economic earning power of Land while the drawing of revenue from the economic earning power of Man all cease entirely in true Democracy.

Since wealth is produced by Labor from Land Single Taxers propose shifting all

taxes to Land entirely, thus setting Labor free in wealth production.—A. Wangeman.

#### DANIEL KIEFER.

(See portrait.)

Daniel Kiefer was born in Cincinnati on Jan. 29th, 1856. He attended the public schools of that city until the age of 16. He then entered the employ of a firm engaged in the manufacture and jobbing of clothing and woollens. He became a member of this firm in 1880 and remained so until he finally retired from active business in 1901. Since then his time and energy have been almost wholly devoted to the cause of the Single Tax and progressive democracy.

To those who knew him during the greater part of his business career nothing seemed less probable than that he should ever profess any sympathy for any radical movement. He was then a staunch republican and protectionist and a most extreme type of reactionary conservative. He took little active part in politics until the year 1896 when like nearly every business man he became afflicted with "Bryanphobia." Mark Hanna's terrible warnings of the evils that would certainly follow Bryan's election impressed him so strongly that he felt it his duty to devote all the characteristic energy which has since been used for the benefit of the Single Tax movement to securing votes for McKinley.

The awakening came soon after this election. The Dingley Law did something to show the fallacy of protectionism, but he remained a republican until the Philippine war capped the climax of that party's iniquity.

He did not become a Single Taxer overnight. The transition from plutocrat to democrat was so gradual that it is not easy to state just when he ceased to be one and became the other. The date was somewhere between 1898 to 1900.

While the Philippine War was at its height he received and entertained at his residence two members of the Hongkong Filipino Junta engaged in making a private tour of the country with the object of learning the true state of American public opinion and ascertaining the possibility

of a successful appeal to the conscience of the people. One of these gentlemen was Dr. G. Apacible, President of the Junta. The other was its legal adviser, Mr. R. D. Fontela. He assisted them in preparing a powerful appeal to the American people, which however fell on deaf ears.

As soon as he had firmly landed in the Single Tax camp he began to lay plans to work for it. Tom Johnson's first election as Mayor of Cleveland seemed to indicate that the democratic party was a hopeful subject. The Cincinnati end of that party had then been for years the personal property of John R. McLean, a plutocratic resident of Washington who ruled through his lieutenant, Lew Bernard. McLean and Bernard had with little difficulty resisted all previous attempts to oust them from control, since they could at all times rely upon the aid and support of the Republican boss, Geo. B. Cox. In spite of this discouraging state of affairs he succeeded in interesting enough radical democrats to form a fighting organization. Then followed a series of contests with the gangsters in control of the party which finally culminated in 1905 in the nomination and election of a ticket free from the taint of bossism. But the victory turned into Dead Sea fruit. Although the new mayor owed both his nomination and election to the friends and admirers of Tom L. Johnson he soon made it evident that he was shy of having his administration looked upon as a "Tom Johnson" one and in his efforts to avoid that calamity paved the way for a gang restoration at the next election.

But in the meantime Mr. Kiefer had been busy with other than political work. Cincinnati had the unique good fortune of possessing in the Vine St. Congregational Church, of which Herbert S. Bigelow was pastor, a centre for Single Tax and other radical reform propaganda. The church was leading a precarious existence, being in continual danger through insufficiency of financial support. He succeeded in removing this danger by interesting a number of liberal minded persons in the work done by this institution. He then organized the Bigelow Press Bureau through which extracts from Mr. Bigelow's sermons were furnished for publication to more

than two hundred newspapers and periodicals in different parts of the country. This proved to be a most effective means of propaganda.

One day in 1907 there appeared in the *Public* an announcement to the effect that on account of the extremely favorable balance of trade which the business office of that paper was enjoying it would probably be compelled to suspend. This would undoubtedly have been a serious calamity to the movement. Mr. Kiefer so recognized it, and asked Mr. Post for permission to try to raise a fund to save his publication. The permission was granted, although none of the older men in the movement who had had experience in soliciting contributions from Single Taxers thought that there was any possibility of success, and many of these assured him that the attempt would surely result in failure. But he went ahead in spite of these warnings and the *Public* was saved. His success in this matter made him the logical selection for the chairmanship of the Fels Fund Commission.

His latest bit of activity has been in connection with the testimonial to the public services of Tom L. Johnson. The idea was original with him and on him fell the task of raising the funds for the affair.

Since accepting the chairmanship of the Fels Commission Mr. Kiefer has done a tremendous amount of labor. Perhaps the most important work he has done has been such as has been imposed on him, not by the duties of his position but by the desire to make clear to inquirers the real object of the Fels movement. Since this Commission was formed the flood of fool suggestions that have poured in on the committee would have taxed the patience of a Job and the labors of a Hercules. With considerable tact and unabated zeal chairman Kiefer has let no opportunity slip by to inculcate the true doctrines to men of influence and misdirected energy who, engaged in the pseudo-reforms of the day, have written soliciting the aid or encouragement of the Fels Commission. His reply to such a letter from the Philadelphia Jewish Sanatorium for Consumptives is a model of its kind. To the managers of this institution Mr. Kiefer wrote:

"Mr. Fels contributes no money to charity. He knows that neither your charity, nor any other, can do more than temporarily relieve a few individual cases of distress. He knows that what the poor need most, is not alms, but a change in social conditions that will make alms-giving unnecessary. It is to help in bringing about such a change, that he is giving whatever he can spare to the Single Tax movement.

"In the case of your own special charity, you are trying to keep up an institution for the care of indigent consumptives. You certainly must know that the conditions under which the poor must live and work, inevitably breed both consumption and poverty.

"You must know that a social system, which so restricts opportunities for employment that thousands gladly accept a chance to work amidst the most unhealthful surroundings, under the most harmful conditions, inevitably produces consumptives by the thousands. You must know that a system which places a premium on the withholding of valuable land from use, must encourage the over-crowding of millions into disease breeding tenements. You know this and perhaps imagine that when you announce your readiness to care for fifty victims of this outrageous system that your duty has been done.

"It does not seem to occur to you that the cause of this evil should be removed, so that the further wholesale production of consumptives may be stopped, and existing consumptives and their near relatives enabled to become self-supporting so as not to need the aid of institutions like yours.

"While such an idea has not occurred to you, it has occurred to others, Mr. Fels included, who have seen the truth which Henry George has made clear, and are doing what they can to bring about its adoption.

"Conditions that make such an institution as yours appear to be necessary, would long ago have ceased to exist, were it not that such influential men as those whose names appear on your letter-head are indifferent or hostile to the adoption of the reforms advocated by Henry George. It

is not asking too much, that requests for contributions to charitable institutions be confined to these, who, through acts of omission and commission, are upholding the poverty-breeding conditions that make charity seem necessary. It is not asking too much, that those who are doing what they can to abolish these conditions be spared such requests.

"In the first mentioned case, the request is merely asking the persons responsible for poverty, misery and disease, to do something to relieve their victims. In the latter case, it is practically asking those who are trying to prevent further mischief along that line, to relax their efforts, or to take on the additional burden of helping the first mentioned class to partially evade their duty of caring for the unfortunates, for whose condition they are responsible."

His reply to a letter from Samuel Gompers also leaves little to be desired in point of incisiveness. The contents of Mr. Gompers letter are indicated in what follows from Mr. Kiefer's answer:

"You say you are working for such palliatives as will make for better homes, better working conditions, safety conditions of employment, that shall protect the life and limb and health of the workers, that shall admit of the children being taken out of the factories and workshops and mills and mines and placed in the homes, the schools and the play grounds. I am very glad to learn that. I see thereby that your efforts at obtaining legislation must be devoted, at least partly, to entirely different legislative measures than anything proposed by your "American Association for Labor Legislation." The enactment by the legislature of any or all of the things proposed by that body, cannot bring about any of the results you say you are working for.

"You say you were among the earliest readers and students of Progress and Poverty, and a personal friend of Henry George up to the time of his death. I regret to note that the exceptional opportunities thus given you were wasted, for you do not seem to have benefitted by them sufficiently to even grasp the elementary economic truth that until the land question is settled, no other reform, no matter how

good in itself, can bring any permanent relief to the working classes.

"You say that the palliatives you are working for are of more pressing importance than 'the hope of everlasting happiness in the sweet bye and bye.'" Unless the latter remark was meant to be a reference to the Single Tax it is irrelevant. I presume that it is such a reference. Allow me to tell you that what you so sneeringly refer to is only in the "sweet bye and bye," and not in the present because you and others in influential positions have deliberately neglected your opportunities to help bring it sooner."

These are but a few of the many kinds of activities with which Mr. Kiefer fills a busy life. Few have done as much to bring home to men of standing in the community the gospel of our movement. Perhaps his judgement of men has not been at all times faultless. It may be, too, that his impatience and zeal have at times led him to hasty and impetuous language and action. Men of his tremendous activity, constantly doing as well as conceiving, are not usually of the reflective turn of mind that brings to what they do the tactfulness and diplomacy so useful in allaying opposition. It would be strange, indeed, if mistakes had not been committed in the responsible position in which Mr. Kiefer finds himself. But though we have differed with him in the past, and are quite likely to differ with him again, our tribute to the splendid, energetic, self sacrificing work he is doing and has done must remain without a shadow of depreciation.

Mr. Kiefer was married in 1888 to Miss Rosa Danziger. His family consists of three sons and a daughter. If he can leave them the Single Tax in operation he will feel that his duty to them has been faithfully discharged.

J. D. M

Mayor Gaynor recently announced his conviction that churches should pay a share of the cost of government.

A Single Taxer standing as democratic candidate for Congress in the 8th Minnesota district which includes Duluth is Judge Alfred Jaques.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

LAND OWNER AND MORTGAGE HOLDER.

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

It is doubtful whether Single Taxers can improve on Georgian economics. By an omission (in the last REVIEW) I gave a wrong idea of George's statement that to buy up the individual claims of land owners would give them a power of the same kind and amount that they possessed before. What I had written and omitted in copying was:

"Moreover, all wealth combined would be insufficient to pay for land values, and the increase of capital (concrete labor) would be small. The bulk of the payment would be in evidences of debt; present and speculative land value would be capitalized and bonded."

Such a debt, of course, would only be perpetuated monopoly, and not capital. If a portion of such debt be exchanged for actual capital, this would have no more power to exploit than any other capital. But I am not the only blunderer. Recently I heard Single Taxers soberly discussing this problem: A farm worth \$30,000. is mortgaged for \$20,000., and the Single Tax is applied; should the mortgage holder, on ethical grounds, pay his proportion of the rent tax? They forgot that he could not possibly pay the tax, nor would the owner pay the mortgage, for the capitalized land value would be destroyed, and the owner could buy in his improvements on foreclosure. — C. F. HUNT, Chicago, Ill.

FROM CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS.

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

Mr. George's teachings contain in my judgment, a large element of truth. Meanwhile, on the other hand, like most reformers, he carried his contentions altogether too far. I have long believed that all local taxes, whether state or municipal, should be levied directly on real estate. I would, could I have my own way, derive municipal revenues wholly from a tax on unimproved real estate; that is, upon real