

o'clock, at the Twelfth street Turner hall, on Twelfth street near Halsted, to consider our view of the removal of the King of Italy.

There was nothing in that call to excite fears of a disorderly purpose or a dangerous act. There is no pretense to the contrary except that the words "our view" were emphasized, and that the call was issued by an avowed anarchist. The first point is childish. The second is an exposure of ignorance. Many men avow themselves anarchists who are personally as harmless as Quakers. Although some anarchists believe that the existing order will be overthrown by irresistible revolt, and some propose by criminal methods to help on the revolt, others are emphatically men of peace. The fact, then, that the call was issued by an avowed anarchist is wholly void of significance. But even if the meeting had been called by criminal anarchists, even if its purpose had unmistakably been to approve the assassination of the King of Italy, even if it had been to encourage that kind of folly and crime against other potentates, nevertheless it had not done so. It had violated no law. To go a step further: even if the meeting had been held, and had done all this, yet so long as it remained a peaceable meeting the police would have had no right to interfere. Their function in such matters is to preserve the peace, not to censor public speakers. It does not follow that meetings which advocate assassination may proceed with impunity. If speakers do advocate assassination, and there is any law against such incendiarism, they may be dealt with by the law. But if we are to have law and order, if that public dignity which comports with public safety is to be observed, if the people are to be assured that the law guaranteeing freedom of speech with responsibility for utterances made is to be upheld, speakers who transgress must be held to account by orderly legal proceedings, based upon actual utterances, in which judgment shall be pronounced by juries. Their meetings must not be disturbed by policemen acting upon their own irrespon-

sible volition and without, even the shadow of a pretense of legal warrant. Yet in the case under consideration the Chicago police, without legal complaint, without a warrant, without other authority than a self assumed censorship, suppressed the meeting mentioned and summarily arrested the leading participants in the call quoted above. They did so, moreover, before a word had been uttered or a purpose had been indicated by any speaker. In doing this they themselves became "anarchists," overriding guaranteed rights of free speech, defying the law, disturbing the peace and making a mockery of public order. Their unwarranted act was more subversive of law and order, more inimical to the public peace, and more dangerous to good government than anything that could possibly have been said at the suppressed meeting.

The single tax men of New York have done a sensible thing in organizing a "Bryan and Stevenson single tax campaign committee." Henry George, Jr., is the president, with Montague R. Levenson as secretary. The treasurer is Jerome O'Neill, one of the oldest and most active of Henry George's disciples. Not only is this a sensible proceeding, but it is an appropriate tribute at this time to the memory of Henry George. For Mr. George realized, no one better, that a vital issue was pending in this country, which even before he died had begun to take shape. On the eve of the presidential election of 1896 he wrote:

What is really in issue in the election that takes place to-morrow is the very life of the republic. It may not be a final conflict, but it must be a conflict that will make the side that wins stronger and the side that loses weaker for conflicts yet to come. And it is drawing near to the close of the century when, as I have long thought, the great struggle must in fact though not in form, be determined.

It was part of Henry George's greatness that he could distinguish essence from form. He knew that the elementary rights of men to the use

of the earth might very likely, most probably would, be determined in struggles in which that particular question would not be formally at stake. He saw it as an unnamed issue in the campaign of 1896; he foresaw it as the unnamed issue of 1900. And so it proves to be. The paramount issue of imperialism essentially involves all that Henry George contended for. With a popular awakening upon that issue there cannot fail to be a popular awakening upon the issue that is inseparably associated with George's name. A tide is rising which George's followers can, if they will, take at its flood. Or they may let the flood pass while they amuse themselves with imitation politics. The New York single tax men, with George's eldest son, his confidant and biographer, as president, have seized the opportunity. Describing themselves in their call as "dedicated to the principle of equal rights, by which all forms of privilege shall be abolished and every man shall be free to enjoy the full fruits of his labor," they declare their alliance "with the democratic party of the country in this presidential contest, with a deep and fervid conviction that such action is required by the sacred cause of human rights;" and solemnly pledging themselves for this struggle, they call upon their "single tax brethren throughout the nation" to join them "heart and soul in an earnest effort to carry to a triumphant issue the candidacy of Bryan and Stevenson."

Those who are not already informed will no doubt be interested to learn what vouchers there are for the authenticity of the appeal of the central Filipino committee "To the American People," which appeared in *The Public* of July 28—Page 252. The author of this appeal, Dr. Galicano Apacible, a Filipino scholar and patriot, is the president of the central Filipino committee at Hong-Kong. Some of our readers may remember Dr. Apacible's remarkable and thrilling letter which appeared in *The Public* June 10, 1899 (No. 62,

page 13), addressed to the Cincinnati Single Tax club in acknowledgment of a remonstrance against the war upon the Filipinos, which that club had adopted and had sent by its secretary, Mr. S. Danziger, to the Filipino junta at Hong-Kong. Dr. Apacible has lately come to this continent on the special mission of issuing the appeal of the central committee to the American people. His companion in this mission is Mr. R. D. Fontela, a native of Manila, and, like Dr. Apacible, a gentleman of high culture. These gentlemen have shown to their sympathizers in Cincinnati credentials that fully entitle them to confidence as representatives of the cause of Philippine independence and as authorized by the central committee to speak for the rights of the Filipino people in an official manner. This address "To the American People," printed in parallel columns of Spanish and English, is published in pamphlet form. It is worthy of careful preservation for its historic value. But a document so noble in its patriotism and so pathetic in its appeal to the world's brotherhood will be treasured for other reasons besides its historic value; it will command the heartfelt sympathy of every friend of liberty, justice and peace. The name of any applicant for the pamphlet will, if sent to Walter H. Beecher, box 111, Cincinnati, be forwarded as promptly as possible to Mr. Fontela, who is now distributing it free to all parts of the United States. The Filipino representatives themselves are stopping in Toronto. For obvious reasons, however, their exact address is not made public.

THE MEAN LEVEL OF ECONOMIC PHENOMENA.

The mean level of the ocean is what its level would be if there were no tides or waves. It is the level at which the tides equilibrate, and toward which wave crests fall and wave hollows rise. This common level, to which all undulations tend, is a stable basis for calculation. No one would think of objecting to it because the waves throw up higher crests and hol-

low out lower depressions. Nor would anyone for that reason discredit generalizations that depend upon it. No one, for instance, would set up the fact that some ocean waves rise higher than the Hudson river, to discredit the conclusion that the Hudson river must empty into the ocean because its mean level is higher than the ocean's. Yet in political economy, where the mean level of the ocean has its perfect analogue, just such absurd objections are gravely raised.

Political economy is a science of tendencies. So understood, it is an exact science. Just as the mean level of the ocean may be exactly ascertained, though the waves rise and fall in a way to defy calculation, so the mean level of economic undulations may be exactly determined, notwithstanding the number, variety, uncertainty and complexity of individual transactions. But some students and not a few professors of economic science, ignoring this, frequently dispute sound economic generalizations, even such as would appear to the untutored to be axiomatic, for no better reason than that they are contradicted by some transitory economic phenomenon. It is as if the greater height of a particular wave, or the deeper depression between two waves, were cited to show that the mean level of the ocean is a mere assumption which facts disprove.

A familiar example of this species of perversity is the denial by some economists that cost of production determines the value of products.

Particular products are instanced, the value of which is conceded or shown to be very much above or below the cost of their production, and also of their reproduction. This seems to invalidate the generalization and is often accepted as conclusive. But it does nothing of the sort.

Instances of this kind, like the waves of the ocean, are only undulations. At the mean level of economic phenomena, the axiomatic truth still holds good, that cost of production determines the value of products. Trade being unobstructed, no kind of production can be carried on long with the value of products either above or below their cost. If their value remains below cost, their pro-

duction must cease for lack of remuneration; if it stays above cost, competition will draw off purchasers. Whatever the undulations in value may at any time happen to be, the cost of products does determine their value.

Another example of the disposition to discredit sound general principles in political economy by reference to particular economic undulations is connected with the incidence of taxes. When levied upon a product of current labor, taxes are found to enhance the price of the product, thus shifting the burden of the taxation from the maker or seller of the taxed product to its last buyer or consumer. The principle consequently inferred is that taxes on labor products are borne by consumers.

This generalization is often denied, because there are instances in conflict with it. For example, stamp taxes on proprietary medicines are not always added to the price. But although that be true, it is only another instance of disputing the mean level by measuring the altitude of a wave crest. A one-cent stamp tax upon a dollar bottle of medicine might not be added to the price. This proves nothing, however, except that in that instance the tax is too small to produce its natural effect. A dollar stamp tax upon a dollar bottle of medicine would certainly express itself in the price. So would a tax very much less than a dollar. And if the proprietary medicine happened to be subject to keen competition, even so small a tax as one cent would be shifted to the final buyer.

Any tax upon products, however light it may be, has a tendency to increase their price, just as any pressure upon a wall has a tendency to topple it over. Whether the tendency produces its natural effect must depend in the one case, as in the other, upon such circumstances as its own persistence and the resistance it meets. When a tax is high enough on products to leave the producers no remuneration for the work, the price must go up or production must cease. Men will not produce for nothing. Though some taxes on some products may not for some time be shifted to consumers through higher prices, it