Feb 1929 Correspondence, FSTC

WM. CALL, PRESIDENT E. B. GASTON, SECRETARY MINNIE H. BROWN, TREASURER

FAIRHOPE SINGLE TAX CORPORATION

ADMINISTERING

Fairhope Single Tax Colony

ESTABLISHED 1895

FAIRHOPE, ALABAMA

REPORT OF TREASURER for Moth of Jan. 1929

Peceipts

Rent	$ 3132.18
Penalty	94.17
Wharf	236.39
Daphe Turp.Co.	350.00
M.F.Northrup Turp.Lease	180.00

Expenses

Taxes		2229.01
Highway		23.15
Wharf		189.85
Refund		162.74
Re.Courier Ad.		12.50
Printing 1000 Reprints Sec'y Address		11.00
Library		75.00
Salaries		125.00
Rent & Light		15.19
Sec'y Postage		3.75
Wharf Tel.		3.00
St. Imp. Notes		156.25
W. Ruffles on Bath House		2.25
	$3992.74	3008.79
Cash on Hand Dec. 31	429.96	
" " " Jan. 31		1413.91
	$4422.70	4422.70

R. L. Connolly
Treas

Thorsby, Ala.
Feb 1 - 1929.

Mr B. E. Gaston.
Fairhope, Ala.

Dear Mr Gaston

Will it be satisfactory for me to pay my rent on the Ring farm in March. This is just as soon as I can send the money without having to borrow + pay a big fee to get it.

I'm sure of this money & I'll not ask for any longer time than this & will pay in full. I'll also send tax receipt with rent check if this will be alright. Please write me at your earliest convenience. also please let me know the subscription price on your Fairhope paper & send me a sample copy please

if you have one.-
Thanking you
I am
Yours truly,
Ida J. Bradford
Box 136-

Feb. 12, 1929.

Mrs. H.M.Finkbine,
Atlantic, Iowa.

My Dear Mrs. Finkbine:-

I am sorry to have failed to reply earlier to your favor of Jan. 5, in regard to loan.

I gave some attention to the matter at once and found that one of our ~~citizens~~ winter citizens, who might have been favorably inclined, had just sent a considerable sum back to New York his permanent home, for investment. And have no one else here in view. Here, as elsewhere, the securing of loans, is becoming increasingly difficult.

In regard to the reported rule of the Building and Loan Association, not to make any loans on leaseholds, I think that is more an excuse for not making loans, because they do not have the money available, than anything else. I inquired of their field man, who has been investigating and closing up loans, and he said he had heard of no such rule; that they simply did not have the money to loan. The Company is now endeavoring to increase its capital stock and sell additional stock to get more money.

I am sorry not to be able to give a more favorable report. If I find a likely subject I will broach the subject of your loand to him.

Very sincerely yours,

_____
Secretary.

Feb. 2, 1929

Mike H. Jansen,
Newkirk, Okla.

Dear Mr. Jansen:-

Was glad to receive yours of 29th and enclose receipt for your remittance for lots 7,8 & 9, Blk. 32, div. 2, which you looked at while here. The application will come before the council when it meets next Monday night, and will, no doubt, be granted, effective after a week's notice, which was posted yesterday. That would make it the latter part of next week before I would be able to send you a lease.

Was interested in your report of your trip and the kind of weather you are having there.

Hope you get back before long to build you a nice place on your lots.

With very best regards,

Most sincerely yours,

Secretary.

A.E. Schalkenbach
Fairhope, Alabama.

February 5th 1929

Mr. E. B. Gaston
Secretary of the Fairhope Corporation.
My dear Mr. Gaston.

After carefull consideration of the deliberations had last night by the Executive Council, the method of procedure by the Trustees, I believe it is the intention to hold a an illegal election on Thursday the 7th inst.

I so expressed myself but without any support, regardless of the expressed mandate of the Corporations Constitution

In the month of December the President called my attention to a proposed loan of monies from the bank in order to carry on the regular business of the Corporation. Stating that although there had been many precedents established he proposed to live up to the provisions of the Constitution and refuse to carry out any proposition to incur an interest bearing debt.

In the discussions had last night the mandate of the Constitution was of no weight what-so-ever but precedent alone should prevail. Beleiving that a glaring violation of the expressed terms of the Constitution will afford the disgruntled members not a sound basis for legal action, regardless of precedent, I desire to be relieved from all official connection with the proposed election. I therefor submitt my resignation as Trustee of the Fairhope Corporation to take effect immeadiately.

I cannot reconsile myself to deny the right of petition on Constitutional grounds to fourteen members and then openly and glaringly violate the Constitution myself.

Sincerely Yours

A. E. Schalkenbach

Feb. 6, 1939

J.S.Haughey
President Central
Labor Council,
Portland, Oregon.

Dear Mr. Haughey:-

Yours of 31st Jan. received and I take pleasure in replying. As the best evidence regarding the conditions under which land is leased by our Corporation, I am enclosing a copy of our lease as in use today. This does not however cover your question regarding the right of a lessee to remove his improvements during his lease. To this I would say that yes, a lessee may remove anything added by him to the land (which is physically removable) so long as his rent is paid up; the corporation having a prior lien for rent on all improvements he woul not be allowed to remove same if in arrears on rent.

As to schools, peace officers, etc., these are handled by the civil authorities and the Colony has nothing to do with same, further than to take care of the taxes out of its ground rents.

I am taking pleasure in sending you a few copies of an attractive illustrated folder regarding the Colony, which we would be glad to have you hand to any one interested.

Yours very sincerely

FAIRHOPE SINGLE TAX CORPORATION,

By _____
Secretary.

P.S. Am also a copy of last issue of the Fairhope Courier, published by the writer.

Fairhope Ala., Feb. 7. 1929.

We, the undersigned, acting as the Board of Trustees of the Fairhope Single Tax Corporation of Fairhope Alabama sitting at the annual election for officers of the said corporation certify that thirty-nine (39) ballots were cast for the following candidates.

President	William Call	39
Vice President	E. C. Wolcott	39
Secretary	E. B. Gaston	39
Treasurer	R. E. L. Connolly	39
Supt. Lands & Highways	Marion Smith	39
Sup. Public Service	J. A. Patterson	39
Trustee	Delia K. Bancroft	38
	C. A. Gaston	1

Trustee A B Leal

Acting Trustee D. K Bancroft

Acting Trustee M H Brown.

Feb. 7, 1929

Mrs. Ida J. Bradford,
Thorsby, Ala.

Dear Mrs. Bradford:

In reply to yours of 1st, it will be all right for you to pay the rent in March; and you understand the tax receipt applies on rent the same as cash, except for any penalties fees or interest, which are not allowed. I will have our treasurer, who is not in today, send you a bill unless you have one.

According to our records Mr. Crawford has a claim against this property, and no doubt, you are in touch with him in regard to the matter.

The subscription price of the Courier is $1.50 a year. I am sending you a couple of late copies and would be very glad to receive your subscription.

Yours very truly

Subretary.

Ans.

John T. McRoy
Northumberland Apartments
2039 New Hampshire Avenue
Washington, D.C.

February 7, 1929

Mr. E. B. Gaston,
The Fairhope Courier,
Fairhope, Alabama.

Dear Sir:

I called on Congressman, the Hon. Lister Hill, the other day, to get an agriculture booklet of ~~Mobile~~ BALDWIN County and he referred me to you. I would like to know if pecan nuts, peaches, and figs are successfully grown in your neighborhood? Is rice one of your principal crops?

Many years ago I visited the City of Mobile; the back country of which, particularly towards New Orleans, I found swampy with stagnant bodies of water, malarial and with mosquitoes a great pest. What are the conditions on your side of the Bay?

If you have a brocure on the Fairhope Singletax Colony, I will greatly appreciate a copy.

Should there be any charge for literature I am calling for, please advise me amount.

Cordially,

John T. McRoy

Feb. 11, 1929

John T. McRoy,
Northumberland Apts.
2039 New Hampshire Ave.,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir:-

We are pleased to receive your favor of 7th and learn that our fine young Congressman Hon. Lister Hill had referred you to me for information about this section and told you something of our Single Tax Colony.

I am taking pleasure in sending you a folder regarding our Single Tax Colony, which I hope you will find of interest. I am also asking the Mobile Chamber of Commerce to send you some of their literature dealing with agricultural and horticultural advantages of this section, which will be equally true of the Fairhope neighborhood.

An entirely different condition prevails on the east side of Mobile Bay, from that on the west side of the bay, which you noted beyond Mobile; for we have at Fairhope a bluff 30 or 40 feet high a few roads back from the water line, while a half mile back an altitude of 130ft above sea level is reached, which is maintained through a large part of the back country. Instead of the sluggish, muddy streams of the country west we have clear, spring fed streams. We have comparatively few mosquitoes, the water is exceptionally pure and the country very healthful.

I shall hope to hear from you further.

Yours very truly,

P.S. I am sending you a copy of the last issue of the Courier.

My dear Mr Gaston,

Mr D. M. Bedekian, whose address is 18 The Crescent, Montclair, N.J. wants to know more in particular than I can tell him. Please send him some literature. I told him I knew you'd be glad to do so, therefore he is expecting it. Thank you.

With choicest wishes to all the family and to any inquiring friends, I am

Very Cordially yours,

Annabel D. Swackhamer,

Free Acres

Scotch Plains,

N.J.

P.S. My place is cozy and comfortable here and I'm enjoying it immensely. I drive 12 miles each way every day to my place of teaching. Am teaching Geography in Jr. High now, hence go to far away continents every day (in imagination) That is even better. [illegible] isn't it?

Feb. 12, 1929

Mr. D.M.Bedekian,
18 The Crescent,
Montclair, N.J.

Dear Sir:-

Our mutual friend, Mrs. Annabel D. Swackhamer, of Free Acres, N.J., requests me to send you particulars in regard to our Single Tax Colony, with which I take pleasure in complying.

I am sending you an illustrated folder; a copy of our form of lease, with application for land, which is a part of the lease contract; a copy of "Quarter Centennial History"; a copy of a reprint from the Congressional Record embracing a short statement from Henry George on "The Single Tax, What It is and Why We Urge It," forcibly presenting the fundamentals of the Single Tax idea. I am also sending a late copy of the Fairhope Courier. I hope this matter will reach you promptly and be found of interest.

Yours very sincerely,

_____
Secretary.

Feb. 12, 1929.

A.E.Schalkenbach,
City.

Dear Mr . Schalkenbach:-

Your resignation as trustee and reasons therefor was duly received and given careful consideration. Of course to resign is your privilege and if insisted on must be accepted, but I sincerely trust on further consideration you will decide to withdraw the resignation.

I wish very respectfully to present my viewpoint on the points raised, in the hope that you will find therein reason for continuing to serve the Corporation in the important position to which you were elected and to exercise the full privileges and duties of membership.

As one of the framers of the constitution I fail to find in the constitutional provisions for the preparation of an "Official Ballot" the plain mandate which you seem to find against allowing any one to be voted for except those whose names are printed on the ballot.

Sec. 3, of Art. VII, provides for the printing of an official ballot, covering any measure to be voted upon and the names of persons placed in nomination in the manner hereinafter provided, and the following two sections provide for nominations to be made by 5% of the members filed 10 days before the election and the names of any officers to appear on the ballot unless becoming disqualified or presenting his resignation 10 days before the election. But nowhere is there prohibition against writing in the name of any one else for whom a member may wish to vote. It is only by inference that any such prohibition is found.

And away back in 1906, 23 years ago and with a number of the framers of the constitution present and participating--and not opposing--a resolution was adopted by the members at a special election, that "The instructions of the constitution relative to the preparation of offical ballots shall not be held to prevent the members from nominating and voting for any candidates they desire at any election."

And then as now, the Code of Alabama provided for the printing and supplying to various polling places of official ballots, but in a section following provided as follows:

"Sec. 380. The elector may write in the column below under the title of the office the name of any person whose name is not printed upon the ballot for whom he may wish to vote."

It is true this gives express permission for such writing in, but this gives powerful support it seems to me that to the inference, that without direct prohibition of so doing, there would be no violation of the constitution in permitting such writing in our ballots; nor do I see anything seriously objectionable where particularly, as in our constition, the necessity of a majority of those voting to elect in any case, is provided. (See sections 8 and 9, of Art. VII) which would make it impossible in case of a much divided vote to run in a "surprise" candidate and elect him by a minority.

I greatly regretted to have you decline to serve as a trustee because of this difference of opinion, but I was truly distressed to have you go to the extent of refusing even to vote at an election, which might have been crucial as to the election of officers in sympathy with the fundamental purpose of the Colony to carry out the Single Tax principle as far as possible under existing laws, but happily proved not to be so, though no one knows when the united support of those who cherish the Single Tax will be vitally necessary to checkmate those among our membership whom you know to be "with us but not of us."

I sincerely hope, my Dear Friend Schalkenbach, that these considerations may lead you to reconsider your action, and go along with the majority in such interpretations of the constitution as do not violate our fundamental principles and are not definitely contrary to the provisions of the constitution.

Sincerely and fraternally yours,

Feb. 15, 1929

R.C.Albrecht,
2306 Kenton St., W.H.
Cinsinnati, Ohio.

Dear Mr. Albrecht:-

Yourr registered letter just at hand, and will have to admit that the earlier ones werer received. When I received the second, I was positive I had already written you in reply to the first. Am certainly glad you persevered and greatly regret that you did not promptly get the information desired.

As the first letter is not now available, I do not know just what particular information was desired, but am sending you a number of copies of the paper, an illustrated folder descriptive of our Colony, a copy of our form of lease, showing just exactly the terms on which we lease land, in our application of the Single Tax idea.

If there is other specific information which you want, I will try to give you extra prompt attention.

Yours very truly

_____
Secretary.

Feb. 15, 1929

Percy R. Creed,
Union Club of Boston,
Boston, Mass.

Dear Mr. Creed:

I am pained to find that your favor of Sept. 6th last appears to have been laid aside without answer being made to the questions asked. As you spoke of seeing Mr. Fiske Warren soon, you have probably got the information desired from him. However, I am, if tardily, answering same herewith.

1. As to "balancing our budget." Theoretically we are chiefly concerned with taking the rental value of the land, Should that not be sufficient to do all that we wished to do, we would have to "cut our coatsaccording to our cloth" but in fact, we consider both the rental value and what we think we ought to have to meet our needs. We would ~~xxxx~~ be satisfied with collecting enough to meet the taxes on the land and on the property of lessees thereon and cover our cost of administration--provided there was not additional land value remaining to be collected by individuals.

2. I have never heard of people anywhere wbeing satisfied with what they were getting from their public agencies. We do not ~~xxx~~ supply ordinary public services, these being in the hands of the Town--water and light--and paid for in specific charges therefor.

3. No, we do not find our refusal to give outright title any serious handicap. Of course it keeps some away, but if they insist on title we prefer they would go where they can get it. We have been told that we "should give people the option of leasing or buying" to which we reply: "we do. We give them the option of leasing ours or buying the other fellows. If other land considered is near ours, they find our proposition is better for them. They are generally satisfied with the leasing system--reserving always the privilege of complaining about rents, as they elsewhere complain about taxes.

4. As to the cooperative store. We did not find it to pay, while greatly increasing opportunities for friction. Another Cooperative Store venture--not directly connected with the Colony but on our land-- seems about to go under.

5. We do not make an annual budget--that is in advance--but I send you a copy of our treasurers last annual

report, which will advise you of our receipts, from what sources and what spent for.

6. People often ask me: "What has been your most serious difficulty?" And I tell them "human nature." It hinders us from two chief standpoints, greed and desire to run things. We put the Singletaxer to "the acid test" of being willing to put up the rent on land which he helped to buy--if a member of our corporation-- and of which he is in possession, to the figure which the man not in possession would be willing to pay. Many fail to meet the test. Then Singletaxers are independent souls, full of confidence in their own wisdom and, just like other folks they sometimes will not want to play, unless others play their way. These characteristics in other folks who come to us are not modified by their belief in the Single Tax and they often rebel against not being allowed to speculate in our land, as well as refuse to credit us with unselfish motives.

7. We combine Singletaxers from everywhere, with other people, who care little or nothing about it, but find our proposition the "line of least resistance." The latter probaly in larger numbers.

8. We have no serious difficulty in dealing with the town or county authorities. Our legal relation to them is simply that of land-owning corporation, entitled to the same treatment as other such corporations; which our individual citizens have the same political rights as any other citizens.

9. The Colony preceded the muncipality and called the first public meeting to consider the matter of incorporating as a municipality. Reason, the police and sanitary powers which could only be thus secured and because it was the only way by which neighbors on their own land who were getting the benefit of all improvements of a public nature made by us, could be made to contribute to such purposes. Also because it gave them and others within the Colony whom we did not deem itssafe to take into membership opportunity to help run the town, and thus be to some extent a safety-valve.

10. Coming from Iowa we were incorporated under the laws of that state, but early decided that it would be desirable to be incorporated under the laws of the state of our domicils. There being no law suitable, we secured the passage of one to suit. I am taking pleasure in sending you a pamphlet giving a condendes statement regarding a ~~kraiak~~ suit which we once had to face, going to the Supreme Court of the state, where we won handsomely and in which the law is cited and essential documents briefed.

All of which I hope you will find of interest and value, and that I may hear further from you.

Yours very sincerely

_____

Secretary.

February 18, 1929

We, the undersigned members of the Fairhope Single Tax Corporation, hereby petition the Executive Council thereof to call a referendum election, to be held within fifteen days after the date hereof, upon the following question.

"Shall the present form of application for lease be discontinued and the form in use previous to it be adopted?"

E. H. Roberts	W. G. Carr Council
Mildred W. Roberts	C. A. McCauley
F. H. Mallory	A. F. Merahon
Mary E. Mallory	Nettie F. Johnson
Thos H. Brown	J. R. Cross
Wallie M. Bausen	E. A. Whittier
Axel Johnson	A. N. Whittier

Petition Re
Ref. on Return
to prem Form 7
application for
lease
Filed 2/18/29.
Election called
for 3/2/29.

Feb. 19, 1929

Walter Mask,
City.

Dear Mr. Mask:-

By action of the Executive Council of Fairhope Single Tax Corporation, Monday evening, Feb. 18, 1929, I was instructed to write you and ask by what authority you are burying persons in Fairhope Cemetery without consulting the persons in charge of the same; reference being particularly to the burial of Mr. Lufkin. Your explanation is awaited.

Yours truly

_____
Secretary.

Dec. 3, 1924

Reg. meeting
Present, Mrs. Dyer Mr. Connolly. Mr. Smith,
Rockwell,
Minutes read and approved

Bills
N. K. P. Nelson — Son 4.15
Gaston Motor Co. 38.80
Marion Smith 2.90
J. A. Patterson 2.15

Cr. Orders appd. 630 1 3.50

Appr. Steve Redivo accepted
Surrender Jessica Sherman
of lots 9 & 10 Blk 3. & W 3 accepted.

Supt L & N. reported proposition of Shup-
Ons Sms 7.50 for saw timber & 60 for
wood on east 1/2 of se 1/4 of N.W.
Moved that appr be accepted
ed unless prospective buyer will pay a higher
amount, ~~plus 25 an acre for 2 acres~~
Carried

WM. CALL, PRESIDENT E. B. GASTON, SECRETARY MINNIE H. BROWN, TREASURER

FAIRHOPE SINGLE TAX CORPORATION

ADMINISTERING

Fairhope Single Tax Colony

ESTABLISHED 1895

FAIRHOPE, ALABAMA

Feb. 19, 1929

Members of Fairhope
Single Tax Corporation:

You are hereby notified that obedient to a petition filed with the Executive Council, dated Feb. 18, 1928, praying for the submission at a referendum election to be held within 15 days from date thereof of the following proposition:

"Shall the present form of application for lease, be discontinued and the form in use previous to it be adopted."

The Council ordered the election prayed for to be held on Saturday, March 2, 1929.

You are further notified that at the same meeting the Council voted to call a meeting of members for discussion of the proposed referendum, to be held on Tuesday evening, preceding the election, Feb. 26, in the Council Chamber in the Courier building. The attendance of all members is urged at such meeting that the question to be voted on may be fully understood by all.

Very respectfully yours,
E. B. GASTON, Secretary.

This question not involving a change in the constitution only members "in person on the Corporation grounds on the day of election" will be entitled to vote.

Statement to Members of Fairhope Single Tax Corporation

Approved by Unanimous Vote of Members Attending Meeting February 26, 1929, of Which All Members Were Notified and Urged to Attend.

FELLOW MEMBERS OF
FAIRHOPE SINGLE TAX CORPORATION:

You have been called to express yourselves by a referendum vote, on the following proposition:

> "Shall the present form of application for lease be discontinued and the form in use previous to it be adopted?"

Submitted because of a petition therefor, signed by the following:

E. J. and Mildred Roberts, W. G. and Carrie A. McConnel, F. H. and Mary E. Mallory, Thos. H. and Dollie M. Bowen, Axil and Nettie F. Johnson, C. O. and A. N. Whittier, J. R. Cross and A. H. Mershon.

The following reasons are presented why you should vote against this proposition:

While the applications in force prior to Dec. 21, 1925, embodied IN PRINCIPLE everything included in the form now in use, experience has fully demonstrated that there are unfortunately, plenty of people, who will without hesitation take the pledge always required, that having read the constitution "while I hold lease of Fairhope land I will not oppose the full application of the principles therein set forth and contracted in your leases," neither having read the constitution nor having any serious idea of conforming to what all must know is the central principle set forth in constitution and lease contract, that there shall be no profiting from land otherwise than FROM ITS USE.

On one occasion at a meeting of the directors of the Chamber of Commerce when the revision of the application form was under discussion, several presumably honorable gentlemen, lessees, even denied having signed the former application, though they had done so from one to several times, as evidenced by their signatures then in the Corporation's files.

Even some members having not only made the pledge required in the application for land, but the higher pledge of membership in the Corporation, have been known to violate the same, by collecting or trying to collect "bonuses" for transfer of unimproved lots, or prices notoriously out of any fair relation to the value of improvements, for transfer of improved holdings.

These cases were comparatively few—though always hurt-

ful to the Corporation and casting doubt upon the sincerity of purpose of its members—when the Corporation had an abundance of land of approximately the same desirability, but as the more desirable lots appeared about to be taken up (and to some extent, as could be shown from a PURPOSE to take lots to hold them for exaction of bonuses) such instances became more numerous; while, with the apparent approach of the Florida boom, which some of our own people were hailing with delight and even trying to get in line to profit from by joining in speculative land ventures in the immediate vicinity, our principles seemed about to be lost sight of by a large part of our lessees and to a distressing extent by members. The asking of bonuses for unimproved lots began to be the rule and asking prices for improved leaseholds soared to unreasonable heights.

Land speculation is bad enough, according to the claims of all who profess belief in the Single Tax principle by whatever method applied; but when land of an organization conceived for the purpose of fighting land speculation, and making a demonstration of the benefits of administration of land FOR USE ONLY as against trafficking in it for profit, is seized for purposes of speculation against a signed pledge not to do so, that organization is certainly outraged and its loyal members, who cherish its purposes have not only the right but it is THEIR DUTY to take such steps as will prevent further such breaches of faith and assure the carrying out of its purposes unimpaired.

To this end the form of application now in use, was, after full discussion in the executive council and by members of the Corporation, adopted on Dec. 21 ,1925. It embraces nothing not implied in earlier applications, but makes the applicant definitely pledge not to DO THE ACTS which would violate his pledge, and gives the Corporation effective remedy in case of violation. Much has been made of the matter of the Council appointing committees for valuation of properties, but examination will show that there is no provision for this in the present form (copy of which is attached) but provision, only in cases which it is believed would be rare, when the council refused approval of transfers because of evidence of wholly unreasonable charge for improvements,for participation by the lessee on equal footing with the Council, in choice of appraisers, whose finding would be binding on the Council but not on the transferrer.

Under the present form transfers of improved properties and new applications for land have been made continuously, and there is no reason to believe that any person wanting our land for use in harmony with our purpose and with disposition to honor the pledge always required and which would still be required if the former application were reverted to, has been deterred from applying because of the present form, or would be so prevented. Though there is plenty of reason to believe that some who, with the secretary given opportunity to explain the application to them would have readily signed it and taken unused land for improvement or bought improved leaseholds,

have been discouraged from doing so, by certain parties with unlimited time at their disposal, because not engaged in any useful occupation, who have from their "sidewalk offices" misrepresented the Colony policy in this and other respects and cast aspersions on the integrity and sincerity of its officers.

We regret to state, though we feel called upon to do so by the importance of the situation, that while we do not question the good intentions of all who have signed the petition for the pending proposal, we believe it can be shown that some who are actively promoting it, are not and never have been convinced Singletaxers; that they have at various time denied belief in important Colony policies and benefits arising from the same and that in this effort they are advising with, consulting and in close cooperation with others outside the membership who are openly opposed to our principles and policies.

There may be among the membership some who really cherish our principles (of course no one has honorable place among us who does not) who think this matter is not of great importance; that we got along for years fairly well under the old form of application and that to return to the same might be yielded to objecting members in the interest of harmony. We are aware that in circulating recent petitions studied efforts have been made to present the same as moves which would bring about a better feeling among dissatisfied members and probably prevent some terrible but not well-defined danger to the Colony—which is in fact non-existent. Yielding in this respect—and it means nothing if not that it will weaken the safeguards aganst misuse of Colony land—will only whet the appetite for further attack on our fundamentals. Your attention is called to the fact that only a few weeks ago largely the same group presented a petition for a referendum on a proposition which was in violation of two provisions of the constitution, evincing either such ignorance of the constitution, or willingness to attempt to secure action which would be in violation of it, as to dsclose them as unsafe leaders.

We wish particularly to call your attention to the fact which is visibly proven all about us—though constantly denied —as all facts except mathematical demonstrations are denied by some—that Fairhope has far outgrown any community along the Eastern Shore and that the most of the growth and development here is on the land of our corporation; that in contrast not one of the speculative ventures nearby, though some of them have been promoted by modern methods of ballyhoo designed to sweep people off their feet by hope of quick riches from increa ing land prices, including auctions with gambling devices and the building of sidewalks through land which ought to be left for years to come for farms and orchards, can be said to have succeeded and the net results in way of building and increased population are infinitesimal in proportion to money invested and effort put forth, with present tendency of values downward instead of upward; so that you should give small consideration to claims which we know are being made, that a reversal of policies pursued hitherto would result in new activity here.

Conditions are not good throughout the country, worst where land speculators have been the most active. Do not be deceived by the idea that better times can be brought to Fairhope by encouraging land speculators in any degree.

Real Singletaxers will not want to prosper by such means if such prosperity were possible.

Those who do not believe in our policy have abundant opportunity to demonstrate what they can accomplish by the contrary policy, all around us.

By holding our land sacred to the purpose for which it was acquired and dedicated—which means keeping it open to users, without "bonuses" for transfer of unimproved lots, or exhorbitant prices for transfer of improved property and leaving those who do not like our policy to operate outside, Fairhope may get the benefit of BOTH POLICIES—if there is benefit in the other policy, while other towns can benefit only from the everywhere else prevailing policy.

We have nothing to gain in way of prosperity and everything to lose from the standpoint of principle by listening to the pleas of those who at heart are eager to reap "unearned increment" or who cannot work in harmony in any effort unless they are permitted to lead.

This argument has been directed chiefly to the necessity of providing means for the Colony to protect itself against violations of the pledge of lessees to "not oppose the full application of the principles set forth (in our constitution) and contracted in our leases," embodied in all forms of application in use since Nov. 1905. Probably most of the signers of the petition under consideration have in mind that it is the intention to go back to the form in use from Nov. 1905, to December 7, 1925.

However, this would not be the effect of carrying the proposition to be submitted on March 2nd, because its language is that the "form in use previous to it (the present form) be adopted" and there was in use from Dec. 7, to Dec. 21, 1925, another form, which was printed and in use, which contained the following clause:

> "And I agree that my lease may be declared forfeited if it be shown that I have violated this agreement with regard to an unimproved leasehold, and if to an improved leasehold that the Corporation may refuse approval of the proposed transfer, or if a transfer shall have been effected for an excessive consideration without the knowledge of the Corporation, the Corporation, may, on ascertainment of the fact have a right of action against me within six months of approval of the transfer by its Executive Council, for the recovery of the excess above a fair valuation as above provided and apply any sum recovered to its 'Land Fund.' "

Even those who are strong for the present form of application do not want to go back to so drastic a proposition as this.