

~~of Columbia by the sub-committee of which he is~~
any contemplated attack upon Serbia; those in Italy should prevent the sacrifice of Albania to Italian ambitions; and those in England, France, and Germany should force their governments to refuse any help to Austria-Hungary and Russia, and should guard absolute neutrality. The manifesto concludes:

The time has passed when the working classes of the world should shoot down one another for the profit of capitalists, and the pride of dynasties, or the exigencies of secret treaties. If the Governments suppress the possibility of evolution and force the proletariat to desperate measures, the responsibility for what happens will rest on the shoulders of the Governments.

The Congress adopted a resolution to hold anti-war meetings in the big cities of Europe on Dec. 16. Because of its publication of this manifesto in its issue of the 26th, the Arbeiter Zeitung of Vienna suffered confiscation of that issue.



National Singletax Conference at Boston.

In connection with the fourth annual meeting of the Joseph Fels Fund Commission of America, the third annual unofficial Conference of Singletaxers of the United States was held at Boston, Mass., on the 29th and 30th of November and the 1st of December. [See vol. xiv, pp. 1194, 1209, 1215, 1261; current volume, page 1117.]



Assembled at the Twentieth Century Club on the 28th, the Conference elected Charles S. Millett, M. D., of Brockton, Mass., as chairman; Carroll W. Doten, professor of economics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, as vice-chairman, and Reginald Mott Hull of Cambridge as secretary. Frank H. Thomas, president of F. H. Thomas & Co., Boston, acted as chairman part of the time. Early in the proceedings, the Conference was welcomed by Mayor Fitzgerald in an address in the course of which he made concrete applications of Singletax principles so pointedly and forcibly that the Conference adopted with unanimous enthusiasm a unique resolution offered by ex-Congressman Baker of New York. Mr. Baker's resolution stated that as the Mayor's speech was not perfunctory, the Conference wished to acknowledge it in no perfunctory way.



This day's business consisted in the presentation of reports. Daniel Kiefer reported fully for the Fels Fund Commission. For Oregon, reports were made by Wm. S. U'Ren, W. G. Eggleston and J. W. Bengough. The reports for Missouri were by S. L. Moser, Dr. Wm. P. Hill, John Z. White and W. A. Black. For Ohio Herbert S. Bigelow reported. Messages from Canada and

France were brought by Robert L. Scott from the former and by S. Richard Fuller from the latter. Resolutions were submitted by Prof. Lewis J. Johnson embodying advisory proposals by the Conference with reference to the activities of the Commission and the desirability of taking advantage of the opportunity afforded by the large affirmative votes directly on the Singletax in Missouri, California, Oregon and Washington. Action was deferred until the 29th.



Following is the report of the Joseph Fels Fund Commission, presented by its chairman, Daniel Kiefer, as stated above:

At the Conference of last year the principal work laid out was to give what help we could to the Singletaxers of Oregon and of Missouri in the fight they had in contemplation for the adoption of Singletax measures.

In Missouri, a State-wide measure providing for gradual adoption of the Singletax was submitted. In Oregon the workers submitted a graduated tax measure providing in addition to regular taxes a sur-tax on all lands exceeding \$10,000 in value owned by one individual or corporation. It also provided that the straight Singletax for local purposes should prevail in every county in the State except where the voters should order otherwise. While the graduated tax feature could not be correctly called Singletax and was only called so by our enemies, yet its adoption would have disarmed much of the opposition to our principles. In three of the counties local Singletax measures were submitted under the home-rule Amendment.

We were furthermore interested in trying to defeat a repealer of the Oregon home-rule Amendment adopted two years ago, and also an Amendment submitted by plutocratic interests to render further use of the Initiative and Referendum useless.

The Commission was also called upon to aid campaigns in California and Washington. In California a home-rule in taxation Amendment was submitted through the Initiative. In two cities of Washington, Seattle and Everett, there were local contests for the Singletax.

In Ohio a successful fight was made for a new progressive Constitution, providing for the Initiative and Referendum and abolishing the requirement of a clear majority of all voters for future Amendments. The opposition to these changes was declared to be based on fear lest these measures should bring about the Singletax. Although the Initiative and Referendum Amendment had been loaded with what was intended to be an inhibition of its use for any change in taxation, it has failed of its purpose. It does not prevent use of the Initiative and Referendum for submission of Constitutional amendments providing for the Singletax or any other tax system. The State was flooded with literature denouncing the work of the Constitutional Convention as in the interest of the Singletax movement. Some quotations from this literature may be interesting. One document stated: "Allen Ripley Foote of the Ohio State Board of Commerce is distributing a limited number of discus-

sions of the amendments. One who goes with Mr. Foote in his reasonings may not follow him to all his conclusions, but at whatever point he may alight he will find his mind torn with doubt. Some of the Amendments Mr. Foote warmly commends; others he only touches in passing as inconsequential; some he flays to a nudeness, terrifying no doubt to Rev. Bigelow and his fellow Singletaxers. The trail of the Singletax serpent is found throughout the work of the Convention." In another place the same document, speaking on the proposed method of submitting Constitutional amendments, says: "The whole intent and purpose of this proposal is to make easy work of foisting the Singletax on Ohio. Mr. Bigelow gave as much time and thought to this as he did to the Initiative and Referendum. If all else is defeated and this one proposal is adopted the work of the Joseph Fels organization of Singletaxers in Ohio will not have been in vain." Another document issued by a so-called "Citizens and Taxpayers' Information League" comments thus on the Initiative and Referendum amendment: "Intended to secure a Constitutional amendment authorizing a Singletax on land."

Of course all the falsehoods and misrepresentations concerning the Singletax, with which we have become familiar, were widely circulated throughout the State. We have consequently our enemies to thank for the fact that the overwhelming majority for the Initiative and Referendum and other progressive amendments in Ohio were more distinctly Singletax victories than they otherwise would have been.

In Missouri the Singletax amendment was voted down by a tremendous majority. But the election enables us to note how many Singletax voters there are in the State. Thus we learn that in St. Louis there are 47,000 Singletaxers, about 40 per cent of the voters. In Kansas City there are 10,000. The votes cast against the measure can not fairly be considered solidly antagonistic. Many were cast by voters who were in doubt and took what they believed to be the safe course. Others were deceived by the false statements circulated by the Missouri Land Owners' Protective Association, which, in addition to its policy of deception, encouraged the breaking up of meetings in behalf of the Amendment and openly urged acts of violence against our speakers.

In Oregon the graduated tax and the three local Singletax measures were defeated by a two to one vote. The campaign has consequently ended with the result that one-third of the voters of the State are openly with us. Of those who opposed, many did so only because of doubt which further campaigning should clear away. The home rule measure was repealed, but the proposition to destroy the effectiveness of the Initiative and Referendum was fortunately defeated.

The California measure was voted down, although the majority against it was not large enough to be considered overwhelming. Its reversal at a future election would appear to be an easy matter. The Amendment received large majorities in San Francisco and Los Angeles. As the opposition had fought against it on the ground that it was a Singletax measure, the majority in these two large cities and the big vote for it throughout the State indicate that California is nearly ripe for the Singletax.

The advantage of the Initiative and Referendum

may be noted in these three States. There could have been no campaign in either but for the power of direct legislation. There would now be no chance to secure resubmission in any of these States if we had to depend on the legislature. The Initiative and Referendum enables us to start new campaigns whenever we see fit. By means of the Initiative and Referendum the woman suffragists of Oregon were able to submit their proposition four times. Three times it was defeated, but this year it was finally adopted. A righteous cause need but persevere to finally achieve success.

The fight in Seattle also ended in defeat, but the test in that city was hardly a fair one. There were two measures before the people, both known as Singletax measures, and the vote was consequently divided. The more radical of the two measures received the larger vote, about 13,000.

In Everett an actual victory has been achieved. By a vote of 4,200 in round numbers to 2,300 against, that city of 25,000 people, the fourth in size in the State, has fairly won the honor of being the first important city in the United States to adopt the Singletax.

Thus the apparent fruits of Singletax effort for this year have been a direct victory in Everett, an indirect victory in Ohio, and defeat in California, Missouri and Oregon. But even where public sentiment is still against us, there must come a change in our favor. The Singletax is spreading throughout western Canada, and its influence must be felt more and more on this side of the line. If for no better reason than the need of meeting the competition of tax-free labor, and to stay the flood of emigration to Canada, the adoption of the Singletax must soon be seen to be an urgent necessity even where it is now bitterly opposed.

The task before this Conference is to consider what plans are best to deal with the existing situation. The methods pursued in the past three years and a half may perhaps not be the best for the work we have in prospect. Then there is the vitally important question of funds to be considered. The best plans require large expenditures. If this gathering should devise ways and means to secure an ample fund it will furnish the key to certain victory within a short time.



The second day's meeting was in Tremont Temple on the 30th. Professor Carroll W. Doten (of the economics department of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology) presiding as vice-chairman of the Conference. The day began with further reports. E. W. Doty described the work of J. J. Pastoriza in Houston. In response to questions, he explained in general outline the Somers system of land valuation under which Houston and several other cities, including Cleveland, are operating. Ex-Governor Garvin told of Rhode Island, laying stress upon the value of the tax statistics, especially for Woonsocket, which John Z. White had obtained and arranged. A. B. Farmer of Toronto reported upon Ontario and Nova Scotia. When Congressman Henry George, Jr., had reported upon the tax investigation in the District

of Columbia by the sub-committee of which he is
 chairman, the Conference began consideration of the resolution of advice to the Commission which had been proposed by Professor Johnson and was the special order of the day.



As originally proposed, the Johnson resolution embodied the Singletax platform of 1890, drafted by Henry George and adopted by the Conference of that year at Cooper Union, New York. An explanatory clause, designed to show that the declaration of that platform that non-competitive business "should be controlled and managed by and for the whole people concerned," means "public ownership and operation" of non-competitive businesses, was struck out by general consent after a discussion indicating that "controlled and managed" could not be misunderstood to mean the present day notion of "regulation." Otherwise the Johnson resolution was adopted without alteration. A motion to strike out the second paragraph of section I as printed below, was defeated by 58 to 35. A motion to strike out the whole of section III, including the Singletax platform of 1890, was defeated by 52 to 48. A motion to strike out the final clause of the platform of 1890 was once carried, but upon reconsideration was defeated. In the course of the discussion of the Johnson resolution, and late in the afternoon, it was laid upon the table for the purpose of permitting other business to be considered; but a subsequent motion to take it from the table was carried by 55 to 38 in time for final action. It was adopted as a whole with only three or four dissenting votes. The resolution as adopted is as follows:

Resolved, By the National Advisory Conference of Singletaxers (unofficial), in session at Boston, Mass., on the 29th and 30th of November and the 1st of December, 1912, pursuant to invitation of the Joseph Fels Fund Commission of America, that the following be submitted to Singletaxers and other believers in tax reform and social justice throughout the United States, regardless of party or class, for their favorable consideration and action:

I.

It is the opinion of this Conference that the work of the Commission has been gratifying in very high degree, and successful beyond reasonable expectations. Its expenditure of funds deserves the hearty approval of the more than 3,000 contributors and of all other Singletaxers.

When this Commission was organized, in 1909, there was no general discussion of the Singletax in the United States. Apart from the sporadic work of a few public speakers and clubs, a limited distribution of literature, and occasional indirect and obscure efforts at securing favorable consideration from legislative bodies, the movement appeared to have but little life in this country. To those within it the future seemed dark; by those without, the subject was generally regarded as one of mere academic

interest, in so far as it was generally considered at all. This condition changed with the advent of the Commission.

The Commission promoted the Singletax movement in Oregon, where the popular Initiative existed, by aiding tax reformers there to secure the adoption of county home rule in taxation in 1910. Although this advantage was lost in 1912, its adoption and the struggle to retain it have greatly forwarded agitation for and education regarding the Singletax in that State. The Commission also promoted the activities of Singletaxers in Oregon on behalf of local county Singletax bills in three counties, and of the graduated Singletax amendment throughout the State, the latter being an application of the Singletax to all land values (including water power rights and public franchises) with a graduated tax in addition upon holdings above \$10,000 in value.

In Missouri, where also the popular Initiative already existed, the Commission, co-operating with local Singletaxers, aided in securing a pronounced vote for the Singletax in the face of a powerful and prejudiced opposition.

That these measures failed of adoption at the first effort is not so much a matter for disappointment as the large vote in their favor is cause for rejoicing. The result offers advanced positions for renewed activities, an opportunity which should be promptly and aggressively utilized.

The Commission made possible a highly educational campaign in both States, which brought the enemies of the Singletax out into the open. What is needed for the adoption of Singletax principles and policies is that vital general discussion which is compelled by the proposal of definite measures to the people. This is now secured in Oregon and Missouri, in which States the Singletax is now the paramount political issue.

In Seattle, Wash., a third of the city vote has been cast directly for the Singletax for municipal purposes. In Everett, the fourth city of the same State, the Singletax won at the recent election by a vote of 4,858 in its favor, to 2,637 against it. The majority for Singletax was 2,221. This is the third vote in Everett on this question.

In California the Commission assisted in promoting an amendment for home rule in taxation. This was denounced as a Singletax measure, and the opposition turned the campaign into a Singletax contest. Although the amendment was defeated, it polled a very large vote, and the large proportion of the votes in favor must have been cast by men who approved of the Singletax.

In Ohio the Commission assisted the campaign for the constitutional Initiative under which the Singletax can be voted upon by the people upon the filing of an Initiative petition, and wholly independent of the action of any legislative body.

We heartily commend all these activities of the Commission. If any of the details of its administration may be reasonably criticised, we are of opinion that such details fall within the category of mistakes incidental to the efficient management of any large enterprise. On the whole, we regard the administration of the Commission as having been intelligent, conscientious and effective.

I.

This Conference therefore advises:

(1) That the Joseph Fels Fund Commission of America as at present constituted be continued for two years, such vacancies as may occur to be filled by the remaining members of such Commission in consultation with Joseph Fels as its founder.

(2) That at the end of two years, or sooner in its discretion, the Commission call another unofficial national advisory conference.

(3) That the Commission continue to encourage and assist efforts to apply the Singletax through direct political action upon measures whether before legislative bodies or before the people by popular initiative or referendum petitions, whenever and wherever in their judgment such encouragement and assistance are needed and the opportunities afforded appear to justify them. In the opinion of this Conference educational work on behalf of Singletax principles and policies is advantageously promoted in very high degree by political action, especially by submitting specific measures directly to the people.

(4) That the Commission continue to expend, in their discretion, portions of their fund in promoting measures for increase of people's power in government, especially the Initiative and Referendum, and for protecting such measures where they exist or may be secured.

(5) That especial attention be paid to effective distribution of the taxation data already secured by the aid of the Commission in Oregon, Missouri and Rhode Island; that similar data for other localities be obtained to the fullest extent that the same may seem to the Commission likely to be useful for educational purposes, either locally or generally, in support of Singletax principles and policies. In the opinion of this Conference, specific data of this kind is of the utmost value for purposes of Singletax propaganda. Supplementary to this data, the Conference advises that the Commission obtain, for purposes of comparison, similar data from Alberta and from the Singletax municipalities, both urban and rural, of British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Manitoba.

(6) The Conference further recommends that the work of the Commission, with reference to distributing Singletax literature of a general and abstract character be continued.

(7) That the thousands of votes cast within the past five years directly for Singletax principles and policies in Missouri, California, Oregon and Washington be utilized by the Commission in organizing those States for further activities of like character, and with a view to the extension of organization throughout those States and into other States of the Union. For the purposes of this campaign of organization, the Conference recommends that the Commission encourage and assist in the establishment of headquarters and the employment of competent organizers in the States named, in the discretion of the Commission, and elsewhere as in its judgment favorable organizing opportunities are afforded; that all such organizations be upon a basis calculated to develop them into self-supporting bodies; and that, as far as possible, the organizations be so developed as to extend into the school districts

and election precincts of the States and cities voting on any measure for any degree of application of Singletax principles, or for the extension or protection of any of the people's power provisions that may be effectively utilized for the advantage of all the people.

(8) This Conference welcomes the adoption of woman suffrage in the various States in which that reform has been achieved, and we look forward with satisfaction to its universal adoption throughout the United States. We are proud of the fact that in every State Singletaxers have been among the leading advocates of equal rights for women. In this connection, the Conference advises that the Commission encourage and assist, in its discretion, efforts promoting civic education, among both men and women, with reference to land tenure and taxation, and with especial reference to Singletax principles.

III.

The Conference further recommends that the basis in principle and general policy of all such organizations be the platform of the National Singletax Conference in New York in 1890, which was drafted by Henry George and unanimously recommended by the committee on platform, consisting of Henry George of New York (chairman), James G. Maguire of California, L. A. Russell of Ohio, Warren Worth Bailey of Illinois (now of Pennsylvania), H. Martin Williams of Missouri, Bolton Smith of Tennessee, Carl J. Buell of Minnesota, and Edward Osgood Brown of Illinois. This platform is as follows:

[Here follows the Singletax platform of 1890 as published in *The Public* of last week. See also volume xiv, page 912.]

IV.

In closing this address, the Conference fraternally urges other Singletaxers throughout the country to join the three thousand or more who have loyally supported the work of the Commission. Such co-operation need not interfere with individual or group work of an independent character. Its tendency will be to broaden and strengthen the Singletax movement as a whole, and to make every special activity within its scope progressively more effective. Nor need it interfere with organizing the movement broadly on a democratic basis. The Commission does not assume to control Singletax activities; it aims to encourage and assist them. The Commission does not aspire to be an authoritative Singletax organization; its purpose is to regard its reason for being as at an end when the Singletaxers of the country shall have developed a representative organization. The Commission's function meanwhile is to provide the best possible means at its command for enabling American Singletaxers to avail themselves of the generous offer of Joseph Fels to duplicate contributions and to administer responsibly the fund thus obtained in the best interest of the Singletax in the United States. Every dollar contributed by any Singletaxer means two dollars for his cause. The work of the Commission for the future has the guarantee of excellent past performance and the assurance of better opportunities now at hand. The cause itself appeals to the highest sense of social justice and the best understanding of civic order. We, therefore, confidently

commend the cause to every right-minded citizen of the United States, and solicit for the Joseph Fels Fund Commission of America, as the most effective present agent of that cause in this country, the cordial support of all to whom its principles and policies appeal.



After the adoption of the platform, Joseph Fels laid his proposition for the future before the Conference. His original obligation was to contribute an amount equal to the amount raised from other sources, up to \$25,000 a year; but he had in fact contributed much more than came from other sources, and more than \$25,000 a year. Referring to this he said that he would hereafter adhere closely to the plan of duplication, giving dollar for dollar, and no more, up to \$2,000 a month, and as much further as his means will allow.



The evening proceedings of the 30th were of a general and social type at dinner in the large auditorium of Ford Hall. John J. Murphy of New York presided as toastmaster, in the absence of Wm. Marion Reedy of Missouri. The speakers included William S. U'Ren of Oregon, Hon. Henry George, Jr., and Grace Isabel Colbron of New York, S. Richard Fuller of Boston, Joseph Fels, Hon. Herbert S. Bigelow and John W. Bengough. Mr. Bengough exemplified parts of the clever chalk-talks he had used in the Oregon campaign. At a goodbye session at the Twentieth Century Club on the 1st, Dr. Millet presiding as chairman of the Conference, speeches were made by Messrs. Scott of Winnipeg, King of Ohio, White and Post of Illinois, Black of Missouri, Hall of New York, and Kiefer of Ohio; and by Councilman Ernest E. Smith of Boston, and Miss Mary L. Birtwell of Cambridge.



The Joseph Fels Fund Commission.

Several attendants at the Boston Singletax Conference were asked to advise upon the name of the Joseph Fels Fund of America, originally suggested by Tom L. Johnson and by his advice adopted. They had met at Hotel Bellevue the night before the Conference and numbered twenty-five or thirty well known Singletaxers from different parts of the United States. Their meeting was held for other purposes, but took the matter of the name of the Commission into consideration upon the urgent request of both Mr. and Mrs. Fels, who were present, and who explained that they felt that the use of Mr. Fels's name gave too personal a character to the work, and discouraged other contributions. After an extended discussion, they were unanimously asked to allow the name to remain as it is.

At intervals during the Conference the Commission sat in executive session for the transaction of its business. There were present during these sessions the following members of the Commission: Daniel Kiefer of Ohio (chairman); George A. Briggs of Indiana; Charles H. Ingersoll of New Jersey; Frederic C. Howe of New York; Lincoln Steffens of Connecticut, and Jackson H. Ralston of Maryland.

NEWS NOTES

—John Percival Jones, who once represented Nevada in the United States Senate, died at Los Angeles on the 27th after a long illness.

—Albert K. Smiley, host to the annual Lake Mohonk (N. Y.) humanitarian conferences, died at his winter home at Redlands, Cal., on the 2nd, in his 85th year.

—An active little crowd of men at Pretty Prairie, Kans., who believe in the doctrines of Georgism, have formed an association for the discussion of progressive subjects and the distribution of literature. J. C. Seyb is secretary.

—The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America is holding its second quadrennial meeting in Chicago this week, opening at the La Salle Hotel on the 3d. Thirty-two denominations will probably be represented. [See vol. xi, pp. 879, 901.]

—A staunch democratic Democrat, Mrs. William Carmichael, formerly of Illinois and now of Fall City, Wash., though in her 75th year, drove six miles in the rain to cast her maiden ballot at the recent election. She voted the Democratic ticket straight.

—The fifth annual conference of the Governors of the United States is in session this week, from the 3d to the 7th, at Richmond, Va. The especial object of this meeting is the enactment of uniform State laws. President Taft has invited the Governors to confer with him at the White House on the 7th. [See vol. xiv, p. 977.]

—The Court of Cassation at Rome, which has had under consideration the reasons for annulment of the sentences upon the Camorrista convicted in July, at Viterbo, after a two years' trial for the murder of Genaro Cuocolo and his wife, has rejected all of them. The judgments of the trial court are therefore confirmed. [See current volume, page 660.]

—Dr. Alice B. Stockham of Chicago died on the 2d at her Los Angeles residence at the age of 79. She had been a physician of the eclectic school since 1854 and of the homeopathic since 1880. Dr. Stockham, whose writings in favor of eugenics were designed to promote social purity, was in 1905, like Dr. E. B. Foote, Sr., 40 years before, victimized by a prosecution in the Federal courts for "misusing" the mails.

—The fourth Russian Douma met for the first time on the 28th at St. Petersburg. The elections have been taking place since September. Mr. Rodzianko, the Octoberist deputy of Yekaterinoslav, who was President of the third Douma, was re-elected by a vote of 251 against 150, the vote of the Constitutional