

radical. If we tried, we could always have true tickets in the field presenting in clear-cut honesty those three mental attitudes towards every problem in municipality, State or nation. We could also vote on single issues or problems. But we cannot live as a republic and have many more Presidential conventions.



A "Zero" Function.

Our notion of "zero in occupations," to borrow the phrase of the Chicago Tribune's ingenious "Line-o'-Type" man, is the casting by the New York delegation of its ninety votes for Wilson on that last ballot.



CONFIDENTIAL EDITORIAL.

For Singletaxers Only.

Disclaiming all pretensions to inerrancy, The Public welcomes criticism from its readers; and its silence under criticism by no means implies inattention or indifference. To be governed, however, by every criticism, good though the criticism be as an observation unrelated to seeming reasons for other criticisms, is impossible. Had The Public yielded to all criticisms of its policy, its issues would long ago have been of white paper only, without a spot of printer's ink to soil it. Possibly that would have improved The Public in the estimation of some of its critics, but it wouldn't have left it much reason for continued publication.

Such a policy with reference to criticisms would have necessitated not merely a reversal of The Public's position on every question which has for fifteen years gone into the making of history, but absolute silence. We could have said nothing about the Cuban war, nothing about the Philippine usurpation, nothing about the Boer war, nothing about race questions, nothing about organized labor, nothing about McKinley, Bryan, Roosevelt, or Tom L. Johnson, nothing about woman suffrage, nothing about the money question, nothing about municipal ownership, nothing about religion, nothing about politics, nothing about Socialism, nothing about police interference with free speech, nothing about commission government, nothing about direct legislation, nothing about anything at all but the Singletax. The files of The Public, had there been any under those circumstances, would have been at best a collection of Singletax tracts instead of the weekly history of the world which they are from the beginning of the present period of democratic revival.

Indeed they wouldn't have been even a collection

of Singletax tracts, for criticisms on wasting space upon Singletax subjects have been as abundant and as strenuous as those on wasting it upon every other vital subject of this vital democratic period.

The criticisms most in evidence just now are those that object to seeing "so much about Socialism" in The Public's columns. This is as it has been with every other question, for Socialism happens to be now, along with the Singletax and related questions, a subject matter of general discussion and therefore one to which The Public devotes much attention. For the purpose of acknowledging all these criticisms in lump, and of explaining some things which their writers may possibly not have considered, we select the best of them in point of form. It comes from Worcester, Massachusetts, and besides covering the ground concisely and with clear thought, is evidently written in good feeling and with good faith. It is as follows:

Do you not think you give too much space to Socialism and news of that movement? Singletaxers are not interested in Socialism. I would like to use The Public in propaganda work, but there is so much Socialism in it. People whom I give it to get the impression—from your paper—we are Socialists. Personally I do not feel like subscribing to a paper with so much Socialistic bias. If you want to run a Socialist paper, well and good; but don't expect support from Singletax men.



As The Public is published for the sake of those who want it as it is and for what it is—inclusive, of course, of the possibility of improvement—and will be cheerfully discontinued when it lacks adequate support from those sources—our critic's objection to subscribing for it is in the nature of a vote against its further publication. We prefer such frank declarations to grudging support, and thank him for making his. His specific criticisms, however, being typical of a class, call for specific consideration.



Socialists would probably receive assurances of The Public's "socialism" with some of the surprise, and perhaps not a little of the disgust, with which they received like assurances about Henry George during his life time. No one who really knew Socialism, and also the Singletax, would have called Henry George a Socialist. Nor would any such person call The Public a Socialist paper.

That The Public is socialistic is true, and so was Henry George; but this is explained by the fact that a Singletaxer (if Henry George's

doctrines are the test) is bound to be socialistic—a socialist in some respects, an individualist in others. To quote from Henry George himself, a Singletaxer can no more be either “an individualist or a socialist than one who considers the forces by which the planets are held to their orbits could call himself a centrifugalist or a centripetalist.”

Singletaxers who indiscriminately denounce Socialism, not only get their Singletaxism from other sources than the teachings of Henry George, but they are in antagonism to the essentials of what he taught. To tag Henry George as a Singletaxer in the narrow sense of pure or nearly pure individualism (whether the anarchistic individualism of which Emma Goldman is the best American representative, or the capitalistic individualism of which J. Pierpont Morgan is the American heavyweight champion), is to belittle Henry George's teachings.

Primarily Henry George was a democrat. The Singletax was to him only the accidental name of the fiscal gateway which, when once unlocked, will, as he taught, open up the highway that leads on to industrial as well as political democracy.

And so of The Public. It is not now, never has been, and never expects to be a Singletax paper in the narrow or narrowing cult-sense of that term. It is a democratic paper, democratic in the generic and irrespective of the political party sense. As such, it advocates the Singletax. Not for the sake, however, of the Singletax as a fetich, but for the sake of democracy as a social principle and purpose. And this is the general attitude, as The Public is glad to believe, of the Singletaxers of this and every other country.

Consequently, The Public has no aspiration to be a weekly bundle of Singletax tracts for distribution among people whose prejudices need quarantine protection from Socialism. Probably an output of tracts on the Singletax, exquisitely expurgated, would be useful with such people, and we trust their needs may be attended to; but this is not the function of The Public, nor is it one which The Public can undertake without revolutionizing its whole reason for being or of trying to be.

We should be sorry to believe, we doubt if it is really true of our critic himself, that Singletaxers are not interested in Socialism, at least as part of the social yeast of the historic period in which we are living. The citizen who is not at this time enough interested in Socialism to learn what it is and what it is doing, or having done to it, is a civic ignoramus. Singletaxers who wish to live in such ignorance may fare well enough in academic propaganda; but they are utterly unfit to represent their cause, either publicly or privately,

in the practical struggles in which it is now everywhere in some degree involved. Singletaxers more than any other social sect need to realize—for their cause is invincible if intelligently represented with reference to time, place and circumstances—that “he knows not his own cause who knows his own cause alone.”



It has been the aim of The Public, from its inception, to win favorable consideration for Singletax methods of democracy from non-Singletax democrats by treating their own special methods fully and truthfully in its news reports and considerately and fairly in its editorials. While it may often have missed this aim, inexcusably so perhaps, it has never yet seen good reason for giving it up. Another of its objects has been to widen the vision and strengthen both the purpose and the energies of Singletaxers in promoting Singletax methods of democracy, by keeping them intelligibly informed week by week of all the activities and thought that are influencing that mass of men and women whom *they* must influence favorably if they expect to make their cause anything more than an intellectual plaything.

Singletaxers who don't see what we lay before them of the clashing thought and complex activities of the world in which they live, cannot of course be affected by it. This may be to their advantage, or otherwise; as to that, we are individualistic enough in our Singletax philosophy to insist that they judge for themselves. As for The Public, however, we still hold to the opinion that its policy is worth pursuing so long as enough persons agree with us to make the pursuit possible. We think that Singletaxers are all the better Singletaxers for a broad intelligence. With persons who won't taste the Singletax unless it is sterilized and fed them with a spoon, other agencies for Singletax propaganda had better be used in place of The Public.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE

SINGLETAX INFLUENCE ON LAND MONOPOLY.

Winnipeg, Man.

When, in 1869, the Hudson's Bay Company relinquished its vast monopoly rule in Northwest Canada to the Canadian government, it retained, under the terms of the Deed of Surrender, the ownership of some 7,000,000 acres of land. It secured the right of selection of blocks of land adjoining its trading posts, and of certain sections (640 acres) and parts of sections in every township within certain boundaries described as the fertile belt.