

is very often in these days writing the opposite of all he really believes.

A very thoughtful editorial criticism of the report of the congressional industrial commission's tax expert may be found in the issue of the 12th of the Chicago Post. This expert, "curiously enough," as the Post says, "is led to advocate the imposition of an income tax," to remove inequalities and approximate to uniform and equitable taxation, notwithstanding that income taxes are condemned by experience. "The movement for home rule, or local option in taxation," pursues the Post, "seems to have escaped his notice, though it holds out much more promise of substantial improvement than any other plan yet devised;" and it concludes:

If there is a tendency to income taxation by states, the naked eye of the layman fails to discern it. The commission's expert must have drawn upon his imagination for his facts. The result of the gratifying movement for local option in taxation will probably be quite different from that predicted by the industrial commission. The idea of exempting all personal property is growing in favor, and in some communities (Hawaii, among others) there is even talk about placing taxes on land values alone. Reform lies in the direction of simplicity, certainty and equity.

Philadelphia has been undergoing an experience with anarchy of the vicious sort, the director of public safety—Heaven save the mark!—being the anarchist in chief. It is over Emma Goldman, who does not believe in government and who makes very excellent speeches in support of her faith. The Philadelphia director of public safety does not agree with Miss Goldman. Neither do we. But he adopts a method of answering her arguments which is not only not recognized in books on logic, even as a fallacy, but which is in our judgment one of the worst of crimes. He abuses his power as a policeman, charged with the execution of the law, to violate the law of free speech by forcibly preventing Miss Goldman from addressing her

fellow citizens upon the subject of her opinions. He makes no pretense of street obstruction, but forbids her holding meetings anywhere, even in her own halls. This is worse than stealing. It is worse than murder. For it undermines the whole body of the law. There can be no government where free speech is suppressed. Legalized violence there may be, but no government. Government derives all its just powers from the consent of the governed, and the consent of the governed cannot be ascertained if their opinions regarding government are suppressed. The North American, of Philadelphia, calls the director of public safety a fool. He is worse than a fool. He is a criminal, guilty of one of the worst crimes that a public officer can commit against a self-governing people.

The story of what this man has done seems almost incredible. It suggests that possibly he is neither fool nor criminal, but insane. His interference with free speech began, it appears, on the 7th, when a squad of police prevented an advertised meeting of the Social Science club of Philadelphia, at which Miss Goldman had been announced to speak. Both she and the members of the club were stopped from entering their hall. On the 8th the police announced that Miss Goldman would not be allowed to speak in Philadelphia at all. On the 9th they prevented her speaking to the shirtmakers' union, where her topic was to have been "Trades Unionism;" and a little later, having followed her to the Labor Lyceum, they ordered the labor organizations there in session not to listen her. It was on this day, also, that the police department issued orders to all labor organizations forbidding their having Miss Goldman speak at their meetings, and notified all owners of halls not to rent them for meetings of "anarchistic tendencies." When an application was made to rent Odd Fellows' Temple hall for a meeting to protest against these arbitrary orders, the

police authorities forbade the trustees to rent it. As an indication of the insanity of the department the answer of the director of public safety to a request of the Single Tax club for information was very significant. The club explained to him on the 11th that it had been its custom to allow the fullest discussion of all social and economic questions, and asked the intended effect of the police orders upon its meetings; to which the director replied that no discussion of the subject of anarchism would be allowed, and if it were discussed the meetings would be suppressed. It was then explained to him that at the meeting that night there would be a protest against the action of the police, and that while the club did not advocate anarchism it would discuss the principles of that school of thought. "Attempt it and I'll close your meeting," was the reply of the director. Not only in this case, but generally, the director announced that he would not allow the subject of anarchy to be discussed even adversely. It is inconceivable that the people of Philadelphia, sluggish as so many of them undoubtedly are, will allow this reckless interference with public meetings and free speech to go on without rebuke. It is not a question of whether Miss Goldman's doctrines are right; it is a question of whether a Russian censorship is tolerable.

The post office department is again trying to economize without touching the exorbitant charges for railway service. This time, however, the plan proposed, though it diverts attention from the swindling railroad contracts, is not in itself illegitimate. The idea is to cut off from second-class privileges those publications which depend upon merchandize premiums for getting circulation. The exclusion would deprive of these privileges all papers which offer a bonus or premium other than another publication having second-class rights. A little protection weakness is exposed by the depart-