

hands of those who do. After much of what is sometimes described as "backing and filling," Mr. Kingsley agreed that the "fishing ground" owner held command of the situation. A very energetic attempt, however, was made to hide the admission in rhetoric. Also an attempt was made to change the illustration from fish to bread, but he was strongly advised to confine himself to fish. If it is merely a matter of capitalists employing laborers and taking the larger part of the product, why do they let so many laborers remain idle? Dr. Ernest Hall, a leading surgeon, was chairman, and displayed a lively interest in the whole series of meetings in Victoria.

A meeting was held by the Y. M. C. A. at which a lecture on Thomas Carlyle was given. Carlyle's economics were shown to be similar to Henry George's doctrines. The difference being that Carlyle had no faith in democratic society, while George had none in aristocratic society. Meanwhile Carlyle did not dodge the issue, as do most modern Tories.

Still another meeting was held in Victoria, at which the doctrines of Henry George were presented. On the following evening a company of gentlemen gathered at the home of Dr. Hall for the purpose of more fully developing the exact points of difference between the Single Tax and Socialism. Dr. Hall was in earnest to know the exact truth.

Returning to the State of Washington, a lecture was delivered before the Board of Trade at Puyallup, on Public Ownership of Public Utilities and the Single Tax. A very good audience assembled and paid close attention to each argument and illustration. With a few exceptions members of the audience were friendly. Newspaper reports were very fair, much more so than at many points.

Another debate was held at Everett, Wash. Mr. Lewis appeared for the Socialists. He insisted that when the improvements are removed from land, whether railroad or other land, the value disappears. He was referred to land on which no improvements had been made, also to Baltimore after the great fire. But facts have no effect on Mr. Lewis. It is easier to deny them. Asked as to how Socialists would distribute products, he said he would leave that matter to Socialist societies—it is a mere detail. The distribution of wealth is the matter under discussion, but is merely a detail. If one man should claim more than an equal share on the ground that he produced more than others, Mr. Lewis would call him a hog—and he would be uncomfortable. And yet in another minute he was loudly asserting that "a man should have all he produced." Socialists are queer.

## IN DEFENCE OF FAIRHOPE.

LETTER FROM WILLIAM CALL.

### *Editor Single Tax Review.*

Permit me to reply through your columns to the criticisms of Fairhope by Mr. E. Q. Norton contained in your last issue. As resident, lessee and member for nearly seven years, treasurer for two years, deputy treasurer for two more and at present one of the trustees and never absent from the colony more than three consecutive days, I believe I can speak with as much authority of Fairhope's plan and its application as can the Committeeman for Alabama on the National Single Tax League, and I am sure that I can state it and the facts that substantiate it, more accurately than can he. The "misunderstandings" he deplores he immediately proceeds to extend and amplify by offering a "scrap of history."

This "scrap" is too long to quote here in full, but is contained in the first, second, third and fourth paragraphs of this article and, briefly, state that he opposed the colony from the start and so wrote the founder and former secretary, that he has voiced this opposition consistently and bases his claim to authority on the ground that he is "the oldest Single Taxer, in point of service, in the State if not in the South, and is the Committeeman for Alabama in a defunct organization."

As to his assertion that he has always been opposed to the colony, even before it had located here, I offer in rebuttal his first letter to Mr. E. B. Gaston, dated Feb. 12, 1894, in which he says:

"The plan outlined by you for a cooperative community has more good points than any I have seen heretofore, and is well worth trying. Of course, you fully realize that even if all your own local affairs were carried out as you propose, and every one in your community were to prove in every way all that you could wish as cooperators, still you would be greatly burdened by the ill effects of our present forms of taxation and ill adjusted laws, besides being to a great extent crippled by the effects of private monopolization of the source of all those things from which alone you can draw.

"Locally your own laws may be equitably adjusted, but you will be burdened by the coal and iron monopolists, the timber land owners, the oil kings, the R. R. kings, etc., and so long as general conditions remain as they are, you can get only partial benefits from your cooperation; perhaps whatever benefits may come to you through your plan may ultimately be absorbed by the ever concentrating power that is being monopolized by a few persons. For my part, I would prefer to remain in the field and fight for a change in general conditions that should embrace all the people and all parts of the country and ultimately the whole world."

Not a word here that the Single Tax could not be at least partially applied because of State laws. No statement that the plan would "work injury to the Single Tax movement" or that "the Single Tax did not require any colony plan." No mention in fact of the Single Tax or of any opposition to it, but merely an expression of personal preference as to cooperative propaganda. That he misconceived the purpose of the colony cannot be claimed, as other letters disprove that.

The statement contained in the first two lines of the third paragraph I can only ascribe to the carelessness or ignorance of the compositor and proof reader. Surely no Single Taxer of any standing would declare that "in any application of the Single Tax at large, the State or Government would have to first buy out all the land owners and then divide up this land among the people."

His statement that the Fairhope plan "would work an injustice to some by refunding to its members State and County Taxes which they had paid on their personal property and improvements, which Taxes might exceed in amount the rent they were called on to pay for the use of colony land; that some would pay for the privilege of living on colony land and on the less desirable locations, while others would be paid for occupying colony land on some of the more desirable locations," shows lamentable ignorance or deliberate perversion of facts. Later, in his illustrations, he endeavors to give proof of his assertions by quoting "net rents" which are in every case erroneous.

These objections he says he has stated to some sixteen individuals in particular and to outsiders in general. Why not specify these sixteen? Some of them are true blue Single Taxers, some are Socialists, but none of them are or can be individual arbiters of Fairhope's policy.

His assertion that he has aided the colony and the colonists while at the same time opposing the colony plan, falls of its own weight. I do not believe he can point to one act of service that he has rendered to the colony, except his efforts to locate it here, nor can he point to any case where his friendliness to the colonists has worked to the mutual advantage of the interested parties.

It is hardly worth while to point out the fallacy of his claim to the right to judge Fairhope because of his record as a Single Taxer and a committeeman. In this connection he says that his record "made it widely known throughout this section that I was a Single Taxer, and to have allied myself with the colony would have been a practical admission that I commended the colony plan, when such was really not the case."

I quote from his letter to Mr. E. B. Gaston, under date of Aug. 5, 1894, while the colonists were still in Iowa.

"If the colony decides to locate here, we will have Mr. George come down again, and also our next President, Tom L. Johnson; but of this nothing should now be said or written. \* \* \* There is not a day that I do not get letters of inquiry as to the advantages of this shore, and if you decide to locate here I could no doubt turn in to you names of those who would like to join the colony." About this time his letters are full of the advantages of location, climate, products of the soil, etc. Letters that would do credit to the most enthusiastic land agent.

The next day, August 6, 1894, he writes: "Now as to taking stock; if the colony comes here, I can do so, because it will be possible for me to join, having my home where the colony is; but if the colony goes elsewhere, I could not join it, as I cannot leave my home to do so, and nothing would induce me to give up my place here; not even to join such a good colony as I think yours can be made to become. If I knew that my vote would decide you to come here I should hesitate to cast it, for I would not want to assume the responsibility. I will aid you all I can to arrive at the facts, and while I want you to come here, I have not overstated, but rather understated what can be done and is being done here now." Where does the opposition to the colony appear in this? Further comment seems hardly necessary.

I have before me a paper headed "Application for Membership," which reads in part as follows:

"To the Executive Council, Fairhope Industrial Association:

"I hereby make formal application for membership in Fairhope Industrial Association.

"I have carefully read your constitution, approve of the principles therein set forth, and will abide by it and such regulations as may be made in accord therewith.

"I hereby subscribe for one share of stock in your association, etc., etc."

This is the regular form of application in use at that time, and goes on to state that the signer has made a first payment of \$5.00 upon his stock, answers questions as to place of birth, age, nationality, knowledge of economics, etc., and is signed "Edward Quincy Norton, Daphne, Ala.," and is dated Oct. 25, 1894. On the back is the endorsement, "No. 40, Edward Quincy Norton, Daphne, Ala. Filed Oct. 27, 1894." Is this consistent?

This brings us to what are presumably the "inside facts" promised in your Spring issue. His first "fact" presented is "that the Fairhope plan is not the plan of the people there; if it were left to them, they would change it in some important respects." It is true that it is not the plan of all the people here. Certain persons would gladly change it in some important respects, the most important being the total

elimination of every Single Tax feature. Nevertheless, the present plan is the plan of the great majority of the people here who have of their own free will and accord signed a lease which provides:

(1) The said lessee, his heirs or successors shall pay to the Fairhope Single Tax Corporation, its successors or assigns in equal payments, on the first days of January and July of each year, or at such other time or times as may be fixed by the said corporation, an annual rent based on the value of said land, exclusive of improvements, to be determined by the said corporation through its executive council or board of directors, as provided in its constitution and by-laws, under its avowed principle of so fixing the rentals of its lands as to "equalize the varying advantages of location and natural qualities of its different tracts and convert into the treasury of the corporation for the common benefit of its lessees, all values attaching to such lands not due to the efforts and expenditures of the lessees," and the said lessee for himself and his heirs, hereby expressly agrees that the said annual rent shall be determined by the said corporation upon the principle just stated and in manner now or hereafter provided by its constitution and by-laws, and shall be expended by said corporation, under the provisions of the constitution and by-laws.

(3) In consideration of the payment of rents herein provided for, the Fairhope Single Tax Corporation agrees with the said lessee to pay all taxes levied by State and county upon the land herein described and his improvements thereon; and on receipt of the county treasurer's receipt for taxes paid by him upon the personal property held upon such lands—moneys and credits excepted—to give him a certificate of equivalent amount, receivable from bearer at its face value on future rent charges, or in discharge of any indebtedness to the corporation.

If it is not their plan, why did they subscribe to it?

His next statement, "that if left to a popular vote \* \* \* they would be willing to assess all taxes on the rental value of their lands alone, provided they could fix the rentals," is on a par with his assertion that Mobile, if left to a popular vote, would be Single Tax by a large majority. Mobilians are still smiling over that statement. I would like to have Mr. Norton explain how he would assess all taxes on land values alone, without refunding to the lessees the State and county taxes on personal property and improvements?

He says the rentals are fixed by a council of five and not in accordance with the law of supply and demand. He knows better than that. As a former member of the council, having served through two appraisements, I know that the actions of the council are not only subservient to the will of the membership, but that all lessees, members and non-members,

are requested to sit with the council and give it the benefit of their views, and the appraisement is of no effect until approved by the resident membership.

After such reiteration, Mr. Norton says that the Fairhope plan does not "equalize the varying advantages of location and natural qualities of all tracts of land" because it undertakes to repay to renters the tax they pay to the State and county on their personal property and improvements, and to prove this and his "net rent" theory, referred to before, he offers fifteen "illustrations" which only prove in fact that his ability to give "inside facts" accurately is very much impaired, and that he is losing his grip on fundamental principles of the Single Tax. These illustrations are so full of inaccuracies as to be absolutely worthless as arguments.

#### ILLUSTRATIONS FROM FAIRHOPE RENT LIST.

Mrs. M. E. Mead: Rent \$25.00, taxes refunded \$5.60, leaving a net rent of \$19.40 as her price for occupying two lots. Here are the facts: Mrs. Mead rents two valuable lots on the bay front, appraised by the colony at \$25.00. She pays this to the treasurer and also \$5.60 to the county tax collector, making her total payment \$30.60. The colony then pays to Mrs. Mead, on presentation of tax receipt, \$5.60 as refunded taxes, leaving her net payment \$25.00; her land rental. Is Mr. Norton so weak in mathematics that he cannot do this simple little problem in addition and subtraction? If not, is he qualified to judge of the merits or demerits of so important a matter as Fairhope?

The second illustration, that of William Call is in the same category except that he joins the e. 50 feet of Lot 4, Blk. 6, Div. 1, which is less than a half lot and assessed at \$13.90 because the law of supply and demand and its superior location and natural qualities make it more valuable, to Lot 3, Blk. 1, Div. 1, a full lot, half a mile away from the aforeside Lot 4, and assessed at \$16.00, to make them appear as adjoining lots and by that means hide the contrast in their values. The net rent fallacy appears again.

C. K. Brown: Rent on 7 lots \$110.00 less \$21.19. This is an attempt to show that Mr. Brown "pays for the privilege of living on a less desirable location" I presume. These lots are on the main street and one block from the business center. They contain 4 1-10 acres, each lot being 104½ x 228 ft. and on the tract are five houses, all but one (Mr. Brown's residence) closely fenced; crowding the outhouses near the dwellings and preventing the use by the sub-tenants, of the ground intended by the colony to appertain to the buildings. The balance of the land, fully ¾, is planted to forage crops by Mr. Brown. From a Single Taxer's view point, the rent is so low that it is still profitable to raise horse feed rather than let the land be used for building sites.



Mrs. A. B. Call: Rent on 3 lots \$37.50 less \$8.40 taxes refunded, leaving \$29.10 for the use of 3 lots in business center of town. This is absolutely erroneous in every particular except perhaps the tax refunded, and as I have not the receipt before me, I am not prepared to declare that even that is correct. These lots are 18-19-20, Blk. 3, Div. 1. The rental on them is \$47.50 instead of \$37.50, and they are not in the center of the town but a half mile away on Magnolia Ave. Bear these in mind. They figure in two other illustrations, and furnish an exhibition in juggling that would make a Japanese montebank green with envy.

Miss A. A. Chapman: Rent, \$20.00, taxes, \$2.94, leaving \$17.06 for her to pay for two lots on a back street. Originally one lot when taken, but replatted without her knowledge or consent, making two lots and doubling her rents. Still the net rent error! Miss Chapman's net payment is the \$20.00 charged to her by the colony and would be \$20.00 whether her improvements were nil or worth \$10,000.00. Magnolia is not by any means a back street. Six new houses have been erected there within the past year and Mrs. Howland's, J. J. Mogg's, E. B. Gaston's, A. H. Mershon's, W. Stimpson's, Mrs. A. B. Call's and Mr. Blank's houses have been there for several years. Every good lot on the street has been taken for some time at the same rental or better, as witness J. J. Mogg, Lot 1, \$17.50, Anne B. Call, Lot 18, \$10.00, Lot 19, \$15.00, Lot 20, \$22.50, W. Stimpson, Lots 3 and 4 \$10.00 each. As another evidence of habitual inaccuracy, witness the imaginary line which divides the land into equal parts, each the regular lot size of one half acre, and by some occult means doubling the rent without doubling the area. Does any sane man, at all familiar with land and land values or with the Single Tax, believe that imaginary lines between two stakes fix the value, rather than the demand for the land? Certainly Mr. Norton does not, and he should not so insult the intelligence of your readers as to suppose they would. In his desire to make out a case of utter foolishness or rascality on the part of the membership of Fairhope, he has in this instance certainly overshot the mark.

Mershon Bros: Rents \$214.15. In 1904 their rent was \$130.80 of which \$87.49 was refunded in taxes. "I am assured that for a number of years their taxes refunded was greater in amount than their rents, so that they were paid for occupying colony ground." Another case for net rent. As even under his manipulation of figures it appears that Mershon Bros. paid to the colony \$43.84 more than their state and county taxes came to, he is compelled to state that he is assured, etc. In presenting "inside facts," assurance stand for nothing especially when no one is quoted. Absolute knowledge is demanded of a critic. From

my own knowledge as treasurer and deputy, and Mershon Bros.' own statement to me, their taxes have never been in excess of their land rent. Mr. Norton's inability to state facts, "inside" or out, is shown by his statement that their rents this year are \$214.15 when they are \$188.40.

L. S. Massey: Rent \$6.75 on 5 acres. Taxes \$8.64, leaving him \$1.89 ahead. Here we have a good Single Tax argument. The statement of rent and taxes is correct, but the deductions are wrong as usual. Mr. Massey is still out \$6.75 cash regardless of Mr. Norton's unique methods of computation. Mr. Massey pays a higher rent for his location than any one else in the same tract, which consists of 40 acres, he being nearest town. He has the best improvements in the tract however, made by his own industry, and by virtue of the single tax he is not fined for possessing them.

W. S. Baldwin: Rents \$17.50 less \$3.12 taxes, leaving \$14.38, the same old net rent fallacy. As this occurs in every illustration I will not refer to it again except in one instance. His rents have not been raised to \$23.00 but doubtless will be if the law of supply and demand and the advantages of location and natural qualities of the land warrant it. Any comparison of this illustration with taxes or valuations in Green, Clay Co., Kan, are as valuable to this discussion as the relative prices of ice in Mobile and Greenland.

F. L. Brown: Rents, \$34.00, taxes \$24.89, net rent? \$9.11. Mr. Brown has on this tract a good dwelling, barn, saw mill, rice mill, brick mill and kiln, blacksmith shop, at least 20 acres under cultivation, and gives more employment to labor than any other man in the colony. As he is paying the full rental value of the land, should he be taxed in addition on his industry? Does Mr. Norton advocate the present system of taxation in connection with the Single Tax? I confess that his argument and illustrations leave one entirely in the dark as to what he does advocate. Perhaps the land is not taxed high enough; some of us think it is not, but later Mr. Norton says that under the Single Tax Fairhope farm land would most likely pay no tax. What would be done with Mr. Brown then?

W. E. Baldwin: Rent \$23.50, taxes refunded \$33.18 leaving him \$10.68 ahead. A sudden qualm of conscience causes Mr. Norton to add, "if to the above is added the rent of the lot on which is the store building of C. K. Brown, rented by him, it would bring his rents up to \$45.50." Certainly it would and it should be added, for the \$33.18 taxes refunded is mainly the taxes on this stock of goods on C. K. Brown's lot and as he rents the store he naturally pays the ground rent. But, whether added or deducted, it proves nothing, as the point he tries to make, that the net rent is what it isn't, has become very much blunted.

Mrs. M. A. Robinson; Rent \$25.00 for lot

on bay front. Taxes refunded \$18.20, net rent ? \$6.80. \$10.00 is however charged for bath house privilege. Why not say that the privilege is rent? It is so considered and appears in the rent list. This lot is given to compare with those of Mrs. S. E. Greeno in another illustration and will be referred to later.

Mrs. F. W. Call: Rent Lot 3 \$22.00, Lot 4 \$13.10, total \$35.10. Taxes refunded \$4.30, leaving her rents to average \$15.45 per lot. These lots adjoin the lots of Mrs. Annie B. Call next east (18-19-20, Div. 1 Blk. 3) and while the rent of the last mentioned lots average \$9.70 those of Mrs. F. W. Call average a rent of \$15.45, though farther away from what is admitted to be the central point of the town, i.e., the town pump and Mershon's store. It will be plainly seen here that it is not the application of any plan to "equalize the varying advantages, etc." I wish to brand this statement as misleading in every particular, except the taxes refunded and the rent of Lot 3. These lots of Mrs. F. W. Call are Lot 3, Blk. 6, Div. 1 and the west 54½ feet of Lot 4, Blk. 6, Div. 1. The rent on the former is \$22.00 and on the latter \$27.00, of which Mrs. Call pays \$13.10 for 54½ feet and I pay \$13.90 for 50 feet. This because lot 4 is nearer the center of town than lot 3 and because my 50 feet is nearer the center than Mrs. Call's 54½ feet. This disposes of his contention that "varying advantages of location and natural qualities" are not considered in assessing rental values. His statement that these lots adjoin the lots of Mrs. Annie B. Call next east (18-19-20, Blk. 3) is another error. He claims that he received these facts and figures from the present secretary of the corporation. The secretary did give him a printed rent list and that shows distinctly

## DIVISION ONE.

(Block Six.)

Lot 1—J. W. Thompson . . . .	\$16.00
" 2— " " " " . . . .	20.00
" 3—Mrs. F. W. Call . . . .	22.00
" 4—w, 54½ ft. Mrs. F. W. Call .	13.10
" "—e. 50 ft. Wm. Call . . . .	13.90
" 5—Mershon Bros. . . . .	49.00

E. B. Gaston: Rents e. 4½ ft. Lot 3, Blk. 7, \$1.00; Lot 4, 80½ ft. less 32x100 ft. \$16.63, total \$17.63, less taxes refunded \$16.57, leaving \$1.06 rent? for land on main street opposite Call's. These figures, too, are erroneous, for while he gives the rentals on the business lots only, he figures in the taxes on Mr. Gaston's residence and personal property and does not give the rental of the land on which it is situated. This lot would bring his rents up to \$38.63. Quite a change!

Mrs. S. E. Greeno: Rents \$30.00, taxes refunded \$11.90, leaving \$18.10 rent for two lots and compared with the lot of Mrs. M. A. Robinson nearby. "The facts amount to

simply this. Mrs. Greeno pays \$30.00 for two large lots and Mrs. Robinson pays \$35.00 for one small one because the latter's has "advantages of location" that the former's does not possess. Mrs. Robinson is ahead in location and Mrs. Greeno in cash. I make this explanation to Mr. Norton and not to the Single Taxers of the country who, I am sure, have detected his error from the beginning.

"J. Bellangee: Rents \$6.50 on 4 acres of land. No taxes refunded, but the improvements are valued at not less than \$500.00 and at present tax rate, \$1.40 per \$100.00, would make the tax exceed the rent." This tract has the following improvements. 1 1-8 acres of cleared land, partnership and other fences. There are no buildings of any kind on the land and the improvements are valued at \$50.00 and therefore exempt from taxation. The printed rent list shows this tract to be in Div. 4, between the J. Smit tract and that of W. C. Wolcott. Mr. Norton has seen this place hundreds of times. He knew Mr. Smit and where he lived. It was a simple matter for him to ascertain the facts in the case, but his overwhelming desire to advertise the iniquities of the Fairhope plan to Single Taxers throughout the world caused him to "shut his eyes to a painful truth" and locate the house of Mrs. Anne B. Call, on Lots 18-19-20, Blk. 3, Div. 1. in which Mr. Bellangee lives, on a tract of farm land a mile away. This was as simple a matter for him to do with his pen as the task of crowding these three lots with their 318½ feet frontage, into my little 50 feet of space between the lots of Mrs. F. W. Call and Mershon Bros.

I am willing to concede mistakes to writers who write of Fairhope at long range but I maintain that no critic, and especially one with the national reputation of Mr. Norton, should dip his pen in ink, for the purpose of stating "facts," until he has taken the utmost pains to ascertain the truth of his statements.

"Colony farm lands," says Mr. Norton, are rented at from 85c. to 85c. per acre, while under the Single Tax they would most likely pay no tax because such land, so situated, would have no rental value." Wrong again! Colony farmlands rent as high as \$2.70 and under the Single Tax would certainly pay a rental. Any land within three miles of a wharf doing \$2,-120.53 worth of business in 1904 on a rate of 5c. per package, would have a rental value. The lands he refers to, held by the "Stapleton boys," prove a boomerang when viewed in the proper light. These lands are, of course, raw and unimproved. Such lands throughout the country have been assessed at similar values and the State Examiner, in his report to the Governor of Alabama, has stated that the valuation was much too low. But we all know, none better than Mr. Norton, that all lands have an assessing value and a selling value, and that in the majority of cases the two

are widely divergent. Mr. W. D. Stapleton, one of the "boys" referred to, was asked to put a price on the land adjoining Fairhope and he refused to make any offer.

Mr. Norton "cheerfully admits that the Fairhope plan is as well applied as our present State laws will allow, but the facts and figures given above show that this plan does not equalize, etc." I submit that thus far he has failed to give any facts worthy of the name and that his testimony is, as a lawyer would say, "incompetent, irrelevant and no foundation laid." In not one illustration has he proven anything except his lack of knowledge and his inability to state a fact.

In conclusion I wish to say that Mr. Norton's attention has been called to some of the more glaring inaccuracies of his article and he has been asked to remedy them. His answer has been that if something was written to which he could reply he would consider it, but that a few mistakes could make no difference in his argument. As he has restricted free press and free speech in his paper by saying that he would publish no communications containing personalities or sarcasm, and his article in the REVIEW cannot be answered in an abstract way, but only by showing how utterly reckless are his statements, I have written this reply.

I very much regret that I have been compelled to make this article as long as it is, but in no other way could it cover all his errors without continued argument and correspondence.

Mr. Norton's suggested changes are like his "facts," incompetent. Fairhope is a corporation founded with the avowed intention of administering the land so as to equalize the varying advantages, etc., and the events of the past few months have proven conclusively the folly of allowing any others than Single Taxers to direct its policy. We are a small community, working to demonstrate our theories, and have never made the slightest effort to take advantage of any one's ignorance to rent them land. Those who are objecting the hardest, came here of their own volition and leased the land, as they would of any corporation, and if the affairs of the corporation had been administered on strictly modern business principles, if J. D. Rockefeller had been at the head and all the rental value had gone into the pocket of the corporation landlord, no protests would ever have appeared. The protestants would be too busy trying to pay their rents and keep on the right side of the landlord. The opposition is not to Fairhope, but to the Single Tax, and one of the leaders of the opposition has declared his intention to "bust the d— colony," and his application for membership has been on file for months with that end in view. That the talk of reform is insincere is evidenced by the fact that the first opposition was to high rents; afterwards the slogan was "Taxa-

tion without representation," and to-day they are squabbling among themselves as to whether the land should be deeded to the members. This last is the pet theory of the individual who is to "bust the d— colony" and its object is apparent.

Fairhope does not pretend to govern its people. That is not the province of the Single Tax or of a corporation. It is simply renting its lands at the full rental value and expending the money for public benefits. The members and lessees are amenable to the same laws, and have the same rights, as citizens, as the rest of the people of Alabama.

WILLIAM CALL.

Fairhope, Ala.

FROM J. BELLANGEE.

Editor *Single Tax Review* :

In your editorial upon Fairhope in the summer number of the REVIEW you say "that the semblance of personality is unavoidable in this discussion." This is very true. Indeed there is seldom any trouble among men where personal considerations do not enter more largely into the case than principle.

It is because we cannot adjust our personal feelings and antipathies to the requirements of principle that our differences become so acute. But however desirable it may be to "remember that both sides have the real good of the cause at heart," it may not be the exact truth. Usually it is not unqualifiedly so.

There are generally some on both sides who are sincere and quite as frequently some of the most active on both sides are prompted by very unworthy motives.

The true story of Fairhope's troubles cannot be told without full recognition of a degree of human weakness and folly that will show conclusively that no plan, no matter how ideally perfect, can hope to escape their evil effects. Personal interests, personal pride and ambition, and above all personal antipathies founded on social, political and business relations are sure to be a large factor in every human enterprise. No system can eliminate them. It will be fortunate if it may survive in spite of them.

Because our troubles partake so largely of these elements the public at large cannot see them in their true perspective and will therefore very likely attribute them to wrong causes.

Those who are bent on making mischief, whether on the inside or outside of the colony, appreciate this, and naturally appeal for sympathy to the outside public that they can hope to influence by their representations. They know that only by an appearance and profession of candor can they secure attention.

It seems to me the part of wisdom for the outside world to recognize these facts, and before giving ear to complaints to enquire if it is not possible that the enemies of the