

SINGLE TAX REVIEW

An Illustrated Quarterly Magazine of
Single Tax Progress

Edited and Published by

JOSEPH DANA MILLER, at 11 Frankfort St.
New York.

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

Entered at the Postoffice, New York, as Second
Class Matter.

SPRING NUMBER, 1905.

PUBLISHER'S NOTES.

To all those whose subscriptions have expired—and the bulk of them expire with this issue—postal card notices are mailed. We have made this special offer. With every renewal of subscription, accompanied by remittance of \$1.00 for a new subscriber, we will send a cloth bound copy of *Progress and Poverty*, *Social Problems*, or *Protection or Free Trade*. These are Doubleday Page Editions, and are published for \$1.00. It ought to be within the power of every one of our good friends to get at least *one* subscriber to accompany his own remittance.

We have adopted this means to increase the circulation of the REVIEW, and to overcome, if possible, the general apathy. The REVIEW should be loyally supported by every friend of the movement.

The old offer of ten subscriptions for \$5 still holds good. Help to place a few more public libraries on our subscription list.

Will friends of the REVIEW bear in mind that if they need any books they can help by ordering of us. Do not place your orders with booksellers—we will supply as cheaply any book you want.

We also wish to call attention to the announcement of the publication of the new and recently enlarged edition of Webster's International Dictionary, published by G. & C. Merriam, Springfield, Mass. In writing kindly mention the REVIEW.

Part 2nd of Miss Colbron's essay, "Radicalism in Literature," announced for this issue, is unavoidably crowded out.

Our next number will contain more of the

inside news of Fairhope from E. Q. Norton and others. Extra copies of the Summer number in quantities may be had for ten cents each, and our friends are requested to send in their orders so that we may provide for an increased edition. This issue should be widely circulated, for both sides will be given a hearing. Single Taxers everywhere who know anything of Fairhope are requested to send in their communications, for the REVIEW has set itself to the work of putting to rest this most unfortunate controversy. The danger to the colony, and incidentally to the greater world wide movement, of which the colony has been widely advertised as a practical if miniature illustration, is not in publicity, but in concealment. Let all the facts be known.

PRESENT STATUS OF THE MOVEMENT.

There is much that is unsatisfactory in the present status of the movement. Centres once active as fields of agitation have lapsed into quietude. Names once familiar are no longer seen in public prints, and some who were active as propagandists or letter writers, or who were often seen at various resorts where Single Taxers frequent, are no longer to be observed.

No doubt there are more Single Taxers than there ever were. But this is not to be disguised—there are fewer *active* Single Taxers than ever before. Nor is there anything like the old enthusiasm.

Why disguise these facts? Why hug to ourselves the delusion that if the cause is not moving here it is yet making progress elsewhere?—"all fields look green at a distance." Why not confess, even if we are obliged to let the public overhear us, that we are at present almost absolutely at a halt on the march; that we are encamped in the face of the enemy, without leaders and without a plan of campaign.

It is little wonder that earnest workers like Edward T. Weeks and others urge the formation of an independent political party to arouse the hosts from their lethargy. To this there are objections that seem to us almost insurmountable. Yet, even this might be welcomed in exchange for the "do nothing" policy. But it strikes us that there is a middle road, a way in which those who differ as to the wisdom of political action and those who approve of it might be brought together.

Clearly, our weakness is lack of organization. What are the Single Taxers of philosophic anarchistic tendencies thinking of? How do they imagine the Single Tax is to be brought about? By merely saying, even if said repeatedly and continuously, that it is a good thing? What politicians fear is not theories, but votes. What is the good of convincing an individual if we leave him helpless with his convictions, powerless to enforce them or to influence the law making powers? Oh, but he will go away and

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