

would obviously be bad form and a suicidal policy to reject any proffered help that was cheerfully given. In the handling of that matter Fairhope's interests have never been financially involved, while she has been benefited much more than the cost of the boat even if she never again earned a cent. The truth is that until quite recently business has not been sufficient to meet the expenses of such an enterprise. Her losses however, have not fallen upon Fairhope, but upon those who so generously gave us the benefit of the enterprise. They have nobly stood behind it without quibbling or hair splitting as to whether or not it was *socialistic* and proving unequivocally that no spirit of *monopoly* governed their action.

Fairhope is not "apart from the great stream of human progress," but in the midst of it, manfully buffeting the waves with which the adverse winds of criticism and selfishness would overwhelm her, and she will outlive the storm.

J. BELLANGER.

Fairhope, Ala.

THE QUESTION OF ISOLATION.

Editor Single Tax Review :

In your issue of July 15th you say: " * * * Is it indeed written that nothing shall succeed apart from the great stream of human progress? That no man or collection of men can withdraw from their fellows and by themselves demonstrate any great theory of human life and conduct? Fourierite communities failed alike with Thoreau and his colony of one. These have passed with the early Christian communisms, the monastic communities, individualistic and socialistic alike." Farther on you say that Fairhope is different, but you leave the impression that the Fairhope people are all Single Taxers, and isolated from others. This is erroneous.

There are people living here (and some of them are lessees) who were here when Fairhope was founded, who had never heard of the Single Tax before that time. Some of them are not Single Taxers now, and some are avowedly antagonistic. A second class are those who have come here from Mobile, from places in our vicinity and from all parts of the country; attracted here because there is more business here than in any other town in our county, which is larger than the State of Rhode Island; and because Fairhope has public improvements which are not yet dreamed of by any other towns in this county, not even by the City of Mobile. Of this second class many do not pretend to be Single Taxers. Others do, but there sincerity is perhaps to be questioned, because it is to their pecuniary advantage to gain our good will, as they depend upon us to be supplied with labor. There is a third class here who are a sort of floating population such as reporters, both summer

and winter, etc. Some are lessees, but many are not, and they are probably mostly not Single Taxers. A fourth class of people living here are those who live among us but own their own land, and do not profess to be Single Taxers. There is furthermore a fifth class of people here who thought they were Single Taxers when they joined the colony, and perhaps were, but short-sighted self interest caused them to backslide. Some of them want the colony to sell out, as they figure that they can then realize \$800 from a share of stock for which they have only paid \$100. One of them demanded \$50 for the improvements on a 65 foot lot, said improvements consisting only of clearing and partial fencing worth at the most \$5. The remaining \$45 represented unearned increment, which this quasi Single Taxer wished to pocket. This class is now demanding deeds to the lands they have leased.

These five or more different classes of people mingle with us in our churches, lodges, schools, etc. They come into contact with us in our business and social life at every point, and they influence us in many ways. We are, therefore, no more isolated from other people than the members of lodges and churches are isolated from the rest of mankind. The sweeping assertion which you make concerning the failure of all isolated institutions does not, therefore, apply to Fairhope, even if the assertion were true. But the assertion is not true, as you will find if you will take a little pains to investigate the matter.

J. W. BRAAM.

Fairhope, Ala.

SOME SUGGESTED CHANGES.

Editor Single Tax Review :

There seems to be a great deal to be said on both sides of the Fairhope controversy, and both sets of disputants have some truth on their side. But it seems to us it should not be difficult for all parties to get together, if they will only hold fast to fundamental principles.

In the matter of voting in Fairhope, as elsewhere, the question would be very much simplified if it could be clearly kept in mind what things should be matters of majority rule and what should not. In all cases voting should be limited to subjects which are properly affairs of government, leaving all other matters to individual decision. In Fairhope the corporation has the undoubted right to say each year what the total rental value of the land of the colony is, but the decision, as to what part of this whole each individual should pay, should be left to an assessor, or board of assessors, elected by a vote of all the residents of the colony, with an appeal to the whole population in case any one thinks he is unjustly assessed. The use to which the funds should be applied should also be decided by

popular vote, always provided that they must be used for the common good.

I have not been to Fairhope, but so far as I can learn, it is so much of an improvement over all other Southern towns that the portion of the Single Tax which they are able to apply, hampered as they are by state and national laws, is more than justified. It seems to be worth all it has cost.

As to the assessment of individuals in relation to the tax, in personal property and improvements, refunded to them by the colony, it should be borne in mind that what each individual is called upon in justice to pay is the annual rental value of the land he holds, and no more. If the State takes more of this than its just share (it should take some) that is no fault of Fairhope, or of the Single Tax. It is the fault of present unjust laws. If one individual, holding a small piece of land highly improved, receives from the colony more in return for State taxes than the amount of his share of the rental value of the land, it does not affect him individually at all, he has paid his fair and just Land Value Tax, just what he would have paid if the State had taken no more than it would have taken under the Single Tax. It is the colony, as a whole, that has been wronged, not some other individuals who may have had smaller State taxes to pay, and the wrong is that the State has taken from the total rent collected, more than it is justly intitled to, and therefore left less for local expenses and improvements.

Phila., Pa.

EDW. D. BURLEIGH.

REPLY BY THE EDITOR.

The foregoing letters are replies to the communication of Mr. E. Q. Norton printed in the summer number of the REVIEW. We give them the same prominence that was accorded to Mr. Norton's letter in criticism of the "Fairhope Plan." THE REVIEW would fail in its purpose as the medium for the free and full discussion of all matters affecting the welfare of the movement if it should neglect to accord to both sides of the controversy the opportunity to be heard. The REVIEW, however, has been careful to provide that none of the bitterness of feeling that has been engendered should find place in its pages. Enough has been said concerning the limitations of Fairhope as a Single Tax experiment. With the reply to the letter of Mr. Call, which Mr. E. Q. Norton will furnish, and which cannot be printed in this number, the discussion will close.

The REVIEW's own judgment in the matter has been expressed, and it is not necessary to repeat it. The plan of Fairhope, the difficulties that surround the problems there to be met, are now matters of general knowledge, and Single Taxers are in a position to form their own opinions. The truth is clearly midway between positions occu-

pied by the more uncompromising partisans of both sides, as it usually is in a controversy of this kind.

It will be clear, owing to its plan of refunding all State and county taxes on land, improvements thereon, and personal property, moneys and credits excepted (as set forth in the third clause of the Lease), that, as Fairhope increases in population and wealth its real difficulties will begin.

At these it is useless to blink. They must be bravely and boldly faced. It is true, also, that if Fairhope cannot be democratically governed any working illustration of the Single Tax principle that the colony can furnish will always be open to attack.

Our inquiry in the last number of the REVIEW, "Is it written that nothing shall succeed apart from the great stream of human progress," is amusingly misunderstood by several of our correspondents. A colony that is attempting what Fairhope is doing must of necessity be "removed from the great stream of human progress." Mr. Braam asserts that many classes are represented at Fairhope. By "classes" we understand Mr. Braam to mean differentiated individualities. Possibly. But the question of isolation remains.

Of those who object to the REVIEW for its policy of fair play and free speech, and would suppress any editorial discussion of a matter so important as a Single Tax colony, nothing further need be said. The good that such men can do for any cause, however sincere their intentions, is strictly limited by their unfortunate temperaments. But think of it in a disciple of Henry George!

Editor SINGLE TAX REVIEW.

FOR ANOTHER FAIRHOPE.

Editor Single Tax Review:

We are establishing a town here on Single Tax principles. We have almost entirely adopted the Fairhope plan. This place, as far as I know, is the only one besides Fairhope, established on Single Tax principles within the United States. At some other time I will write you more particularly as to the movement here and the success of the Town Organization, which we call the Nucla Town Improvement Company.

This is a separate organization from the Colorado Co-operative Co. Most of the people here are Socialists, but many also believe in the S. T.

GUNNAR NAUMANN.

Nucla, Montrose Co., Colo.

Samuel Seabury was prominently mentioned for the New York mayoralty nomination by the fusionists, and when fusion failed, by the Municipal Ownership League. But Judge Seabury was happily reserved for a more opportune occasion.