On Picket Duty.

London "Freedom" brings the report that "Jus" is likely to be revived as an Individualist Anarchist paper. If the movement to the end proves successful, it will be the most interesting event to Anarchists chronicled in these columns for a long time. "Jus," freed from the restrictions by which it was always hampered, could be a power in England. There is no better soil for Anarchist seed.

At the end of a protest against the addition of the higher branches of education to the curriculum of the public schools, the Winsent "Press" says: "The common district school thoroughly well conducted is good enough for common folks. Let the uncommon folks have uncommon schools and pay for them. True enough; but, if common folks should not be made to pay for uncommon schools why should uncommon folks be made to pay for common schools?"

Judging from indications, "Honesty" will not much longer enjoy the distinction of being the only Anarchist journal in Australia. The "Australasian Radical," published in Hamilton and edited by W. R. Winspear, which, if I mistake not, has heretofore leaned strongly toward State Socialism, gives unequivocal signs of a reversal of its attitude. In its first number of the enlarged and improved form recently adopted it squarely favors the Anarchist solution of the land question, antagonizing both the State Socialists and Henry George, and would seem that the editor must soon follow the logic of liberty to the end.

In the "Standard" of April 11 Henry George says: "The real reason why I got sixty-eight thousand votes for mayor of New York in 1886 and only thirty-seven thousand votes in the same city in 1887 was that in the one case, owing to the pledge of votes with which I entered the contest, it was believed that I might be elected, and that in the other case not even the most saugne could pretend that I had the slightest chance."

[I will elaborate:] Then you lied, did you, Henry George, when all through your last campaign you persistently told the voters that you stood a good fighting chance of election, and at any rate would pull a vote dangerously near a plurality.

From San Francisco comes the first number of a paper called the "Commonwealth." Published in the interest of the Kaweah Cooperative Colony. The moving spirit in this colonial enterprise and the editor of the paper seems to be Barrette G. Haskell. Knowledge of this fact is all that is necessary to keep persons who know Haskell, and who value their lives, possessions, and reputations, aloof from the colony. Other persons should be informed that Haskell is a consummate scoundrel, with whom it is highly dangerous to have any dealings, as he will stop at the commission of no crime, provided he can reap the advantages and make others: take the risk.

The "American Idea" is surprised that I describe it as Anarchistic, but does not reject the name. It simply restates its political view, and says this, if these views are Anarchistic then it stands on an Anarchistic platform. These views, briefly summarized, are that there should be no government save those who either cannot or will not govern themselves; in other words, that the only function of government is to restrain insane persons and criminals. Not discussing here whether government is the proper name for this function, I will ask the "American Idea" a single question: should the cost of such restraint be met by compulsory taxation or voluntary contribution? The answer to this question will decide whether I was justified in claiming my Missouri contemporary as a new "American anarchy." Observe.

"Newspapers" of "Auflandicate for the last few months have not failed to draw that E. C. Walker, though nominally connected with the paper, has practically disappeared from its columns as a writer. Those who have also noticed the championship of reactionary and superstitious measures to which the senior editor, Mr. Harman, has given himself have not been in a position to say much for his conduct. His conduct has also necessitated its necessity, for Mr. Walker's writings have always been the paper's chief attraction. Now they will be surprised and glad to learn that he is about to publish a paper of his own. On May 12 will appear the first number of "Fair Play," which he will issue fortnightly from Valley Falls, Kansas. It will have eight pages, something more than half the size of Liberty, and the subscription price will be fifteen cents per year. Let it have a generous send-off.

Those who criticize the Anarchists' Club for appointing a chairman from whose decisions there shall be no appeal or on the ground that such a course is inconsistent with the teachings of Josiah Warren show thereby that they understand as little as a babe unborn what that philosopher really taught. No point was insisted on more strenuously by Warren and by StepanPearl Andrews (whom one of these critics describes as Warren's 'formulator') than that, in all undertakings requiring the cooperation of two or more individuals, an essential of efficient work is an individual leader from whose decisions no appeal can be taken save by resignation. The so-called "Anarchist" and its editor, who deride the constitution of the Anarchists' Club. Far from acting in violation of Warren's teachings, those who formed the Club acted directly in obedience thereto. The editors who charge them with inconsistency on this score are for the most part men whose determination to criticize puts them under the necessity of finding something upon which to exercise that determination.

When it first became necessary to distinguish between Communist Anarchists and Individualistic Anarchists, somebody or other gave the latter the same, philosophic Anarchists. It stuck, and on the lips of the Communists even became an abbreviation of derision; so that now, when a Communist desires to be particularly severe on an Individualist, he calls him a philistin Anarchist. How the Communists must have regretted, when, as the months went on, the labor lecturer, expounding the doctrines of Kropotkin, and summarizing his "Paroles d'Révolution," on the platform, under the title "Philosophic Anarchism," and to "This is really misleading. And it is hard on the Individualists. Not only have they been forced to share with others the name which, as the first to assert a new form, Anarchism, but now they must share also with others the distinguishing adjective, philistine. People who have squeamish fancies about the enslaving influence of party names need be in no hurry on that account to bolt our party, for at this rate it will soon be nameless.

I expected to share with the readers of this number of Liberty the joy of an announcement that E. C. Walker and the Harmans were out of the clutches of the Comstock gang, for such a time seemed to be the case. On motion of their counsel, the indictments against them were quashed by the court on the ground that the objectionable passages were not set out in them. But the report of this action was speedily counteracted by the further news that the district attorney, being obstinately determined on the defendants' downfall, had secured their indictment a second time, in face of the fact that nearly one hundred and fifty citizens of Valley Falls petitioned for an abandonment of the prosecution. My latest information is that the defendants were summoned to Topoka last Monday to give bail, but hoped to secure a postponement of the trial until next week. These additional legal proceedings will no doubt entail new and large expenses, and all who value free discussion should rally promptly to the protection of our persecuted comrades. Contributions may be sent to E. C. Walker, Valley Falls, Kansas.

Lucien V. Pinney issued the final number of the Winsent "Press" on April 12. It is a unique journalistic document, and I shall preserve a copy as a memento. Every line upon its editorial page bears the imprint of a man. Discarding the editorial "we" for the individual I, he reviews the career of the paper, the causes it has stood for, the opinions it has championed, renders the opinions somewhat, dunes the public as it deserves, pays tribute of thanks to his helpers and friends, extends some decided left-handed compliments to his successors, refuses to offer any regrets, promises to be heard from again in "some quarter with more or less emphasis," and, instead of saying Good-bye, says "Good Night, to one who is coming on the morrow with the rising sun to say Good Morning." Of this revelation of himself to the public the most significant feature to the readers of Liberty is his confession that he is uncertain whether to classify himself as an Anarchist, and so remaining unclassified and expectant, awaiting further developments. No one is more anxious than I to see him again, a "little influence; still, if he will not seem a word of advice, I will recommend him to pass his season of retirement in finding out exactly where he stands so that his influence may not be impaired by inconsistencies. But, whether his paper has been consistent or not, I can truthfully say of it as he himself says of it: "I don't believe there was ever such another paper as this one published in Winsent, or in Connecticut either, and I doubt if there ever will be. And all the puns, and purists, and cautious moralists, and scandal mongers, and chronic hypocrites,—all the tomfooleries and toads in the community will rise up and say: 'No, I hope not.'"
LOVE, MARRIAGE, AND DIVORCE,
AND THE CONDITION OF THE INDIVIDUAL
A DISCUSSION

by

Henry James, Horace Greeley, and Stephen Pearl Andrews

Mr. James's Reply to the New Yorker Observer.

Continued from No. 277.

For example, I have always been strongly against the idea that marriage should be a mere matter of convenience or pecuniary advantage. I have always believed that it was essential to the happiness of both parties. I have always held that the institution of marriage is one of the most sacred and important of all the institutions of society. I have always believed that the only legitimate object of marriage was to ensure the perpetuation of the species, and that it was the duty of all persons to enter into it, provided they were both of sound mind and of age.

The doctrine of divorce has been very much controverted in recent years, and I should like to say a few words on the subject. I have always been opposed to the idea that divorce should be resorted to as a matter of course. I have always believed that it was a most unfortunate thing to have a married couple separated, and that it was a great mistake to allow the parties to be divorced without due consideration. I have always held that the institution of marriage is one of the most sacred and important of all the institutions of society. I have always believed that the only legitimate object of marriage was to ensure the perpetuation of the species, and that it was the duty of all persons to enter into it, provided they were both of sound mind and of age.

The doctrine of divorce has been very much controverted in recent years, and I should like to say a few words on the subject. I have always been opposed to the idea that divorce should be resorted to as a matter of course. I have always believed that it was a most unfortunate thing to have a married couple separated, and that it was a great mistake to allow the parties to be divorced without due consideration. I have always held that the institution of marriage is one of the most sacred and important of all the institutions of society. I have always believed that the only legitimate object of marriage was to ensure the perpetuation of the species, and that it was the duty of all persons to enter into it, provided they were both of sound mind and of age.

The doctrine of divorce has been very much controverted in recent years, and I should like to say a few words on the subject. I have always been opposed to the idea that divorce should be resorted to as a matter of course. I have always believed that it was a most unfortunate thing to have a married couple separated, and that it was a great mistake to allow the parties to be divorced without due consideration. I have always held that the institution of marriage is one of the most sacred and important of all the institutions of society. I have always believed that the only legitimate object of marriage was to ensure the perpetuation of the species, and that it was the duty of all persons to enter into it, provided they were both of sound mind and of age.

The doctrine of divorce has been very much controverted in recent years, and I should like to say a few words on the subject. I have always been opposed to the idea that divorce should be resorted to as a matter of course. I have always believed that it was a most unfortunate thing to have a married couple separated, and that it was a great mistake to allow the parties to be divorced without due consideration. I have always held that the institution of marriage is one of the most sacred and important of all the institutions of society. I have always believed that the only legitimate object of marriage was to ensure the perpetuation of the species, and that it was the duty of all persons to enter into it, provided they were both of sound mind and of age.

The doctrine of divorce has been very much controverted in recent years, and I should like to say a few words on the subject. I have always been opposed to the idea that divorce should be resorted to as a matter of course. I have always believed that it was a most unfortunate thing to have a married couple separated, and that it was a great mistake to allow the parties to be divorced without due consideration. I have always held that the institution of marriage is one of the most sacred and important of all the institutions of society. I have always believed that the only legitimate object of marriage was to ensure the perpetuation of the species, and that it was the duty of all persons to enter into it, provided they were both of sound mind and of age.
from police regulation without instantly rushing into adulterty? It would really be a monstrous course of ten years. But he, in his pitiless and unrelenting fury, looks steadily upon the one object of remorse than of shame.

A young man must feel at seeing an eminent public station, like that of the editor of a religious newspaper, perverted to the wanton degradation of private character and the prostituted obstruction of human enterprise. I am yours, etc.

HENRY JAMES.

Then followed several communications between the "Observer" and Mr. James, which are omitted. Anything in this pertinent to this discussion is contained in the excepts indicated by quotations marks.

To be continued.

THE RAG-PICKER OF PARIS.

By FELIX PYAT.

Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker.

PART FIRST.

THE BASKET.

Continued from p. 122.

"Shut up before the hour! I protest," he exclaimed; "I'll enter a complaint."

Garouze threw him aside, and in a furious voice shouted:

"Hold! You really worry me. Stand off, or this time I strike."

Jean drew back into the axis of the parapet, and, stretching out his arms, still barred the avenue.

"Ah! Monseur 'sh angry," said he, in a tone of irony. "'Excuse me! Monseur then prefers water 't wine, like the Grand Turk! "Ah you, fishman, and so much 't worse you don't know it. You 'll be put in the Morgue... and in the newspapers, with all the honors due your rank."

The doke shivered as if the cold marble had just touched him. Exposed on the slab, in black and white and in the "Official. Precisely that!" replied the ragpicker.

"In the "Official?" It isn't possible," exclaimed Garouze, sitting down again.

"Let us ask at it: can you read?"

"A little, my nervy," answered Jean, candidly.

He handed his hardcover to Garouze and dropped his sack a bit of newspaper.

"Yes," said he, "I read this while I was drinking over there at the inn: I should have got tipsey, as you say, if they hadn't made me lick the drunkard's glass 'bout rousing it; that why I preach 't you so well. Listen.

"ANOTHER SUICIDE."

He interrupted himself to attend to the charred wick of his candle.

"You yourself," said he, "I can't see a thing."

And he continued slowly, reading without stuttering his words, stammering:

"A man in the prime of life has just been taken from the bench and carried to the Morgue. His case has been taken up by the newspapers. He was sort of a man's of sort of a man's.

"Ah! that's my affair. Well, never mind, I haven't my dictionary. 'A letter found on him provided him with a plausible way to endure the trials of life.

"That's fine, sure. 'Deader than poor, said this crazy coward. 'Hear that."

"That's fine, sure. 'Deader than poor, said this crazy coward. 'Hear that."

"Real,' said Garouze, shrugging his shoulders, "morality from below followed by morality from above.

"Good morning, sir." Jean, reading about in his seat and his eyes fixed on the piece of paper, resumed his reading.

"There is no greater crime against religion and society than suicide, that son of idleness and pride! Suicide is the brother of murder. Worse, perhaps, it is murder without the risk. The man who commits it is a guilty coward, a deserter, a merchant, a wine. —No, there's no wine there,—a merchant who goes into bankruptcy, everything that is cowardly and vile. And so forth and so on. Yes, as much as to say the confreres who does not empty his glass, a pretender, a good-for-nothing, a sinner, but the paper's too. To be continued in our next. What an oration, hey? What an epitaph! How it strikes home! How? The purest of wisdom. What have you to answer, coward, hey?"

And brutally, as if branding the duke, the ragpicker clapped the tip of newspaper on his shoulder, saying in his rough drawling voice:

"There's your mark. Keep it!"

Then he started off, staggering and grumbling:

"Hm! Hm! The reading has made me hoarse. I'm off to get a drink."

Farewell!"

Garouze took the newspaper and read the passage again.

"Yes," said he, bitterly, "fear morality to be read at the table at the Maison-de-Dieu. —It seems to me, those who wish to rid of his presence, who, like myself, prefer death to ignoble poverty."

Jean, who had made a pretense of going away, returned to the charge.

"I axe!" he cried, stung with object sort of it, 'a man's of sort of a man's.

"Sh th' only thing I need to bury Rothchild."

With this conclusion he started off again, singing at the top of his voice his favorite refrain:

Forever wine!
Forever juice divine!

CHAPTER IV.

THE BANK COLLECTOR.

Garouze walked back and forth with long strides, twisting and turning on the quai like a tiger in its cage. He seemed to be revolving in his overexcited brain an idea even more frightful than suicide.

"Everything that is cowardly and vile," said he, repeating the last phrase of the newspaper article.

"Well, no! Neither cowardice nor villainy, neither water nor wine, neither the mud of the street nor the hurdle of the press. If I do this, I shall lose my soul, and I am no object of terror than of shame."

He asked with the thought of another suicide: crime the thing! Yes, a curse, a curse not on myself alone, but also a curse on others.

And he did not stir, crouching behind a part of the wall which screened him from the street lamp.

Two bank collectors, dressed in blue uniforms with brass buttons and wearing on their heads the three-cornered hats looked upon as an essential of their profession, and with their honesty, were rapidly approaching completing their rounds and falling.

One of them carried on his back a heavy money-bag, and an enormous trunk backpacked him, so strong that small half-way out of his right pocket.

"What a day!" said he to his companion. "I have been delayed by the weight of the receipts. Let us double our pace. Do you know that we carry on our persons half the wealth of the house?"

"Yes," said the other, "it is heavy and tempting. But here we are in Paris. Suppose I leave you and go home? There is no more danger now your back?"

The two men, and his infamous tail coat, he was about to rise, ready to get rid of this load as fast as possible in order to go home myself. My wife must be anxious."

"Think of mine, then! She is in confinement, you know. One month more to feed."

"I know that," said the collector with the big bank-book; "but bah! when one has health, what matters it?"

His honest face beamed. He continued:

"I have a little girl, Marie, a love of a child. She is as big as a cent's worth of copper and gives me a hundred cent's worth of joy. Oh! I am happy. You see, Louis, a child is the joy of a house."

"Or its sorrow," said the other, shaking his head.

"Yes, but when one has heart enough to work and work..."

"He has all, you are right, Jacques. That's what I meant."

"I hate, then; let me detain you no longer. Good evening, Dupont."

"Good night, Didier."

Thus they separated, each going in his own direction.

He whom his comrades had just called Jacques Didier continued on his way, acting toward the other, and directing his steps downward the street. Born in the relatives of the wine-shop.

He walked briskly, thinking of his day's work, his duty fulfilled, his family waked, and his name written with his young wife and his little Marie.

Suddenly, as he reached the wine-shop, at the corner of the quai, a threatening force emerged from the shadow of the wall, and a terrible voice hurled these words into the silence of the night:

"It is over! Blood... gold!"

Jacques Didier stopped short with a cry of distress.

"Help! Help!"

He had received a stunning blow. Blood spurted from a small but deep hole in his temple.

Fatale wounded, he staggered a moment; his outstretched hands seemed to grasp at some means of salvation and clench in the empty air; then, uprooted, losing his footing, he fell at full length, like a tree.

Garouze, frightened but determined, threw down his bloody book and leaped upon his victim with a valiant face.

Didier then made a last resistance. With his falling arms he surrounded the precious money-bag, and like a faithful dog defending to the last his master's pro perty, he struggled, in spite of his danger, in his brother, in his master.

The assassin had to use all his strength in plundering the unfortunate Didier. Death came to the aid of crime against the duty that still defended the coveted reward. The man of duty at last takes the reward, like a statuesque grace.

With his foot on the money-bag, Garouze took hold of the bank-book, fastened by its chain to a button-hole of the uniform, and tried to tear it away.

"And that moment a sound of a run was heard. Frightened, he dropped the chains, which had held firm, and quickly, to make an end, he rummaged the bank-book lined with bills and stuffed the bundles into his pockets by his hand. But, no, his infatuate still held him, he was about to rise, when Jean, recalled by the cries, came running up with an uncertain gait, calling out:

"Well, what's the matter there?"

And throwing down his sack in order to run faster, he fell upon Garouze just as he was picking up the money-bag.

"Assassin! robber! false brother! To dishonor the profession! Help! Help! Wait!" said Garouze, trying to release himself from the grasp of the man."

"Will you be silent, you rascal?" he said, in a hollow voice, while Jean screamed like a dog at a wolf. A short struggle ensued between them, near the inert body of the bank collector.

The guilty man saw that he was lost if the combat lasted. He made a desperate effort; his iron hand seized the ragpicker's throat; and, with an irresistible atv, he threw him down by the miss and dropped one and a half dozen gold pieces upon his ear. "Ah! brigand!" exclaimed Jean, with a choking voice. "What a wretch! What a thief! I shall not soon forget it."

Garouze freely picked up the money-bag. For a moment he looked at the two men stretched at his feet; then, slapping his pockets stuffed with bank-notes, he bowed his head, like a poor Didier.

"Neither cowardly nor vile," he cried. "Blood and gold. Now I have the wherewithal to live respectable and rich, and so I will live."

In a storm had redoubled in fury, drowning in its continuous roar the echoes of this double struggle. Nature seemed no longer indifferent to this human tragedy: the night made itself the murderer's accomplice, an English night: Paris disguised as London for its accomplishment. One could not see two steps before him. The assass in disappeared as if he had plunged into the earth. No one but the rag picker had seen or heard him.

Jean got up painfully."

"Good God!" he repeated. "What a throw! What a wretch! It has sobered me."

In fact, a new expression had replaced his bewildered look. He was transfigured. He seemed awakened from the deepest sleep of Circe, turning by the way of Damascus, converted by a revelation, possessed by a vision and an inner voice

Continued on page 6.
Liberty.

The Effect of Force in Finance.

The course of Senator Reagan of Texas on the question of prohibition has shown him to be anything but a reliable champion of liberty, but nevertheless, when, in a recent Senate debate, he opposed the idea of legal tender paper money and said that, if any more treasury notes were to be issued, they should not be legal tender, he was extremely popular for all these reasons and was most especially favored for all taxes and public dues, he showed due regard for liberty and a marked degree of financial insight. The Fort Worth “South West,” however, which believes in a complete legal tender money, calls Senator Reagan by such names for this, and likens what it describes as his partial legal tender scheme — that is, a scheme of legal tender to the government, but not to individuals — to other partial legal tender schemes according to which the original treasury notes were issued — that is, a scheme of legal tender to individuals — and gives the government for its part duties.

That the treasury notes suffered depreciation under the latter scheme no one now doubts, and the “South West” argues that, both schemes being partial legal tender schemes, notes issued under the former would be more depreciated. What makes this argument so dangerous is it to accept an analogy without first analyzing it. In comparing two things it is important to ascertain, not only in what respects they are alike, but in what respects they are different. These two schemes are undoubtedly alike in the respect that each furnishes a partial legal tender money, but a little closer inspection will reveal a vital difference between them, no less a difference, in fact, than that between a note-issuer who is willing to receive his own notes and one who is unwilling to do so but is determined to force others to accept them.

In order not to overtax the “South West”’s power of abstraction, I will make the illustration that I have to offer a little more concrete by substituting John Smith for the government. Suppose that John Smith issues paper money, and then, holding a pistol at the head of John Brown, his neighbor, says to him: “If any of my notes are offered you in payment of a debt due you, you must receive them; if you decline, your life shall pay the penalty; but, as for me, I give you the rest of the world notes in payment of any debts due me.” The “South West” will have no difficulty in seeing that John Smith’s notes, issued under such circumstances, would rapidly depreciate. In fact, it sees that such was actually the case in a certain responding instance, where John Brown, the citizen, was forced by John Smith, the government, to take notes which the latter issued but was unwilling to accept in payment of import duties.

But suppose John Smith had taken a different course

Should Labor be Paid or Not?

In No. 121 of Liberty, criticizing an attempt of Kropotkine to identify Communism and Individualism, I charged him with ignoring: “the real question whether Communism will permit the individual to labor independently, own tools, sell his labor or his products to others.” In Herr Most’s eyes this is too outrageous that, in re-printing it, he puts the words “the labor of others” in large black type. Most being a Communist, he must, to be consistent, object to the purchase and sale of anything whatever, but why this should particularly affect the labor of others rather than that I can understand. Really, in the last analysis, labor is the only thing that has any title to be bought or sold. Is there any just basis of price except cost? And is there anything that costs except labor or suffering (another name for labor)? If a thing should be paid for, Horrible, isn’t it? Why, I thought that the fact that it is not paid was the whole grievance. “Unpaid labor” has been the chief complaint of all Socialists, and that labor should get its reward has been their chief contention. If the man who oppose wages — that is, the purchase and sale of labor— were capable of analyzing their thoughts and feelings, they would see that what really excites their anger is not the fact that labor is bought and sold, but the fact that one class of men are denied the use of their labor, while another class of men are relieved of the necessity of labor by being legally privileged to sell something that is not labor and that, for the privilege, would be enjoyed all gratuitously. And to such a state of things I am as much opposed as any one. But the minute you remove privilege, the class that now enjoy it will be forced to sell their labor, and then, when there will be nothing but labor with which to buy labor, the distinction between wage-payers and wage- receivers will be wiped out, and every man will be a laborer exchanging with fellow-laborers. Not to abolish wages, but to make every man dependent upon wages and to secure to every man his whole wages is the aim of Anarchistic Socialism. What Anarchistic Socialism aims to abolish is usury. It does not want the whole labor of a man, but its capital of reward. It does not hold that labor should not be sold; it holds that capital should not be hired at usury.

But, says Herr Most, this idea of a free labor market from which all privileges are to be removed is nothing but “consistent Manchesterism.” Well, what better can a man who professes Anarchism want than that? For the principle of Manchester is liberty, and consistent Manchesterism is consistent adherence to liberty. The only inconsistency of the Manchester men lies in the fact that they did not apply their principles. But this infidelity to liberty in some of its phases is precisely the fatal inconsistency of the “Freieheit” school, the only difference between its adherents and the Manchester men being that in many of the phases in which the latter are infidel the former are faithful, while in many of those in which the latter are faithful the former are infidel. Yes, genuine Anarchism is consistent Manchesterism, and Communist or pseudo-Anarchism is inconsistent Manchesterism. “I think thee, Jew, for teaching me that word.”

The nearest approach to a tangible criticism that I can find is the statement that I attribute to Marx a conception of the State entirely foreign to the sense in which he used the term; that he did not believe in the old patriarchal and absolute State, but looked upon State and society as one. Yes, he regarded them as one in the same sense that one lion after the lion has eaten the lamb. Marx’s unity of State and society resembles the unity of husband and wife in the eyes of the law. Husband and wife are one, and that one is the husband; so, in Marx’s view, State and society are one, and that one is the State. If Marx had made the State and society one and that one society, the Anarchists would have little or no quarrel with him. For to the Anarchists society simply means the sum total of those relations between individuals which grow up through natural processes undisturbed by external, constituted, authoritative power. That this is not what Marx meant by the State is evident from the fact that his plan involved the establishment and maintenance of Socialism—that is, the division of capital and its public administration—by authoritative power, no less authoritative because democratic instead of patriarchal. It is this dependence of Marx’s system upon authority that I insist upon in my paper, and, if I misrepresent him in this, I do so in common with all the State Socialists journals and all the State Socialists themselves. It is to the deference to misrepresentation; otherwise, what is the significance of the sneers at individual sovereignty which J. G. Fol-lower of Marx, indulges in near the end of his article? Has individual sovereignty any alternative but authority? If it has, let us know it, and if J. G. Marx and his followers are opposed to it, then they are necessarily champions of authority.

But we will glance at one more of J. G. ’s “answers.” This individual sovereignty that you claim, he says, is what we already have, and is the cause of all our troubles. It is a mistake to assume that the State Procrustinez, the crushing-knife of the department, is a thing of necessity, which young Liberty grinds beneath her heel.” —Procokinez.

The appearance in the editorial column of articles over other names would, of course, appear to the writer whose work it is, or in the regular writers’ column, the shipping articles, or the editor aware of it, one of the new features of Liberty. The appearance in the regular columns of articles over other names would, of course, seem to the writer whose work it is, or in the regular writers’ column, the shipping articles, or the editor aware of it, one of the new features of Liberty.
with his neighbor Brown. After putting his notes in circulation, suppose he had said to Brown: 'If any of my notes are offered in payment of a debt due you, you are at liberty to receive or refuse them, as you may see fit; but for you and the rest of the world, I notice that I will promptly receive these notes at their face value in payment of any debts due me.' Does the "South West" think that such an attitude on John Smith's part would have caused his notes to depreciate? On the contrary, would it not have increased their worth? And if so, what is the difference, in its essential nature, on his part to trust the fate of his notes to their merits, and to have inspired in Brown and others a higher feeling of confidence than they ever would have entertained if Smith, even though willing (as he was not) to accept the notes himself, had attempted to force them on others? It seems to me that in reason it must answer in the affirmative.

But this answer would be equivalent to an admission that Senator Reagan's partial legal tender not only is widely different from, and far superior to the judicial legal tender of the original greenback legislation, but must also be given the preference over the complete legal tender which the "South West" has advocated.

How easily my Texas contemporary might have avoided this dilemma by the exercise of a little discrimination

Mr. Blodgett's Final Question.

To the Editor of Liberty:

I have one more question, and it does not occur to me now that I shall ever ask again: You say: "I do not believe in any inherent right of property. Property is a social convention." Now, does not this involve the propriety of compelling individuals to regard social conventions?

Grahamville, Florida.

S. Blodgett.

Grahamville, Florida.

Readers who desire to refresh their minds regarding the series or questions which the above concludes should consult Nos. 115 and 117. The answer to the first question in No. 115 is really an answer to the question now put. There I said that the only conception of individuality, or propriety of Anarchism is to be found in the idea that individuals are to be considered as individuals to refrain from overstepping the principle of equal liberty. Now, equal liberty itself being a social convention (for there are no natural rights), it is obvious that Anarchism recognizes the propriety of compelling individuals to regard social conventions. But it does not follow from this that it recognizes the propriety of compelling individuals to regard any and all social conventions. Anarchism protects equal liberty (of which property based on labor is simply an expression) or, more properly speaking, it is a social convention, but because it is equal liberty,—that is, because it is Anarchism itself. Anarchism may properly protect itself, but there is no mission ending. This self-protection it must effect through voluntary association. Anarchism, not through governmental force to protect equal liberty, through government to invade equal liberty.

Not a Decree, But a Prophecy.

Have I made a mistake in my Anarchism, or has the editor of Liberty himself tripped? At any rate, I must challenge the Anarchist in his other political paper upon "State Socialism and Anarchism." If I am wrong, I stand open to conviction. It is this. "They [A.-archists] believe in the unrestricted liberty of all these relations shall belong exclusively to the mothers untill old enough to belong to themselves."

Now, this is an unanswerable statement that is in opposition to theoretical Anar- and also to nature. What is the matter with leaving the question of the control of the two parents, to be settled between them,—allowing them to decide whether both, or only one, and which one, shall have control? I may be wrong, but it seems to me extremely un-Anar- chistic to think that instead of leaving the control of these relations shall belong exclusively to the mothers untill old enough to belong to themselves.

If I should ask whether the editor of Liberty momentar- ily forgot his creed that we must follow our natural de- sire, or if I have misunderstood his statement, or misapplying my own Anarchism.

Paternal love of offspring is, with a few exceptions, a comparatively late development in the evolution of the animal world, so late that there are tribes of the hor of teas, and individuals even among civilized nations, in whom it is not

found." But the fact that it is a late development shows that it is going to develop still more. And under the cursed ecolo- gical conditions under which we hope to keep Man, it would burst forth with still greater power. Is it wise to at- tempt to stifle that feeling,—as it would be stifled,—by the proposition that the child shall be the slave of the parents?

Maternal love of offspring beautifies the woman's char- acter, broadens and enriches her intellect. And as far as I have observed, paternal feeling, if it is listened to, indulged, sustained, has never been the worse for it. It even has an effect upon the man's mind. Should he be deprived of all this good by having swept out of his hands all care for his offspring, he would not say that the child he was so fond of was being made to feel that "they belong exclusively to the mother." It seems to me much more reasonable, much better common sense than to say that the child of Anarchist parents belongs to both of them, if they both wish to have united control of it, and, if they don't wish this united control, then each of them is to have control.

The question is one, I think, that could usually be settled amicably. But if some unusual occasion were to arise when all efforts to settle it amicably were to fail, or where the child would be equally competent to rear it, then, possibly, the fact that the mother has suffered the pain of childbirth might give her little the advantage. I do not feel perfectly sure that that principle is right and just.

I would like to know if Mr. Tucker, upon further consi- deration, does not agree with me.

F. F. K.

I accept F. F. K.'s challenge, and, in defence of the Anarchist of the sentence objected to, I offer to sub- mit the language in which it is phrased to any gene- rally recognized authority in English, for the discovery of any authoritarian meaning possibly therein con- tained. I maintain that the sentence means no more than the word "shall." Now, it may be ascertained from any decent dictionary or grammar that this auxiliary is employed, not alone in the language of command, but also in the language of prophecy. Suppose I had said that the Anarchists look forward to a time when all men shall be honest. Would F. F. K. have sus- pected me of desiring or precipitating a decree to that ef- fect? I hardly think so. The conclusion would simply have been that I regarded honesty as destined to be accorded by mankind, at some future period, in the absence of contract, of the mother's superior claim, and a refusal on the part of defensive associations to protect any other claim than hers in cases of dispute not guarded against by specific contract. That is all that I meant, and that is all that my language implies. The language of prophecy doubt- less has its source in authority, but today the idea of the future is so far departed from the prophetic form that philosophers and scientists who, proceeding from accepted data, use this form in mapping out for a sure course the evolution arcu:—not therefore accused of designs to impose:—their sovereign wills upon the human race. The editor of Liberty respectfully sub- mits that he may properly present respect to the oracular style which the best English writers not unfrequently employ in speaking of futurity, without having it im- puted to him on that account that he professes to speak either from a throne or from a tripod.

As to the charge that comes from the Anarchist principle, it may be preferred, I think, against F. F. K. with much more reason than against me. To vest the control of anything indivisible in more than one per- son seems to me unduly communistic. I perfectly understand the method in which the fathers substitute the marriage for the marriage, but, either one, and which one, shall have control. But if they are foolish enough to decide that both shall control, the affair is sure to end in government. Con- tract as they may in advance that both shall control, real control, it will be found impossible for both to control. And then it is a logical impossibility for both to control.

One of the two will then control; or else there will be a compromise, in which case each will be controlled, just as the king who makes concessions gov- erns, and is governed, and as the members of a democracy who are inclined to simply tax, or divide, or take the money. In other words, it is to levy an unjust tax for the State in lieu of allowing an unjust tax for private benefit. A reform, some may say. Well, a partial reform, but with not much difference to the persons imposed upon.

To Tax Monopoly Not to Abolish It.

(Tulare News.)

Wherever there is a monopoly taking tribute from the people, such tribute is taken from individuals in specific sums, and an equal distribution of such monopoly, and continuance a monopoly is to convert the use of the gov- ernment the tribute unjustly paid by some people, and not to permit them to use the monopoly. In other words, it is to levy an unjust tax for the State in lieu of allowing an unjust tax for private benefit. A reform, some may say. Well, a partial reform, but with not much difference to the persons imposed upon.

"Fraternal" Coercion.

The "Commonwale" is one of those few Socialist papers that I always have the patience to read, its brightness and thoughtfulness being a rather remarkable exception to the insufferable dullew and com- monplace of the average Socialist Journal. In its last issue I find the following clipping, credited to the "People": Not a Fraternal, but a Fraternal, State is what Socialists want. You growlers for individualism, can't you see the difference? This is a very good illustration of the Socialist method of avoiding a difficulty and of the enviable ease with which they satisfy their desire for security. Attack them where you will, they are perfectly safe and invulnerable. Destroy their position, and they will change its name and then claim that your fire did not disturb them. You object to the compulsory ele- ment of their reformatory utopias, and show them the inconsistency, the absurdity, the self-anhilating ten- dency of the mode of treatment which they prescribe for society, and they will invent another label for the unhomely medicine.

Names are of no consequence, gentlemen. Show us that State Socialism does not violate our liberty, does not seek to deprive us of our rightful possessions, and does not force upon us our ignorance of the method of making us subservient to the State. Some men, when under the influence of intoxicating beverages, delight in going around and forcing fraud- ulent and dishonest practices, and those that happen to be near at hand, even strangers not excepted. Doubtless such a drunkard individual would be astonished and angered at seeing one offended and repelled by his overflowing cordiality. But the liberty to choose one's friends and associates is very important. We insist upon not being even kissed against our will.

V. YAROS.

"The Montagnards intend that taxation shall lose its op- positive character and be only an act of fraternity." — Politicians. Good Heavens! It is the fashion to trust fraternity in everywhere nowadays, but I did not imag- ine it would even be put into the hands of the tax-gatherers.

Some men, when under the influence of intoxicating beverages, delight in going around and forcing fraud- ulent and dishonest practices, and those that happen to be near at hand, even strangers not excepted. Doubtless such a drunkard individual would be astonished and angered at seeing one offended and repelled by his overflowing cordiality. But the liberty to choose one's friends and associates is very important. We insist upon not being even kissed against our will.
Why Not Commit Adultery?

In Liberty No. 119 Mr. A. H. Simpson cautiously criticizes Mr. W. S. Lilly's reason for not recommitting to the regimen of a "pure breed." The main reason that he states is that "Mr. Lilly never for the moment thinks of the woman in the matter except as an object." Let us for a moment try to set aside all considerations likely to arise in our thought of his wife's reaction, his children's, his own, and others, and ask ourselves, why not? It is by the right of the freeborn man and the name of the base collector, Jacques Didier. Troubled and agitated as if he were the author of the crimes, he examined the book-bank to see if it was really there, and putting his hand on the box...

And he has killed him, the second son, he exclaimed, shaking his head.

"A poor devil of a man of the species like ourselves. God! is it possible that we should ever think of such a thing? Worse than the wolves? Ah! the Cain! It was worth while, indeed, to stop him from killing himself that he might kill another.

The bad saved at the expense of the good! It is my fault.

To be continued.

Dear Comrade Tucker:

I have received from Dr. E. E. Foose, Jr., the article above for Liberty, accompanied by a no note of explanation from which I quote: "Friend Lloyd: I was much interested in your last letter to Liberty. I have his book, and am of saying much that I would like to say better than I could say it. What I have written above does not suit me, but it may be in part because I have not evolved clear ideas on the subject, and in part because I am not in agreement with all that he says. If I were to write a letter to you, I would probably say more than I did to Dr. Foose. I think you are right to insist on the right to decide whether one's own sex life is right or wrong, and that the only basis for such a decision is to seek what is right for one's own self."

E. E. FOOTE, JR.

Liberty, Adultery, and Mental Sex.

Pessimism and Rose-Water.

London (Commonwealth) - A report from three middle-class persons who have had the good luck and the worst of all persons, will not cause any particular sorrows among them two with their two or more persons are good will to the popular cause: first, persons of very strong and marked advanced opinions who are so far from thinking that the holding of such opinions involves any sort of social guilt, and second, persons of very weak and marked advanced opinions who are so far from thinking that the holding of such opinions involves any sort of social guilt, and who are therefore inclined to be under the influence of such people. The latter kind are persons whose opinions are not very advanced, and who are therefore inclined to be under the influence of such people. The latter kind are persons whose opinions are not very advanced, and who are therefore inclined to be under the influence of such people. They are therefore inclined to be under the influence of such people. They are therefore inclined to be under the influence of such people.
The Case Against Dives.

[With Paul Campbell in the Christian Socialist.]

As the great case of Lazarus vs. Dives is every day arousing an increasing importance in the minds of thinking people, and is in accordance with public discussion, that is, the necessary trial should be done; for many persons, whose sympathies are entirely with the plaintiff and against the defendant, have yet been convinced that the latter is to be condemned for, whilst many others, whose sympathies are quite the other way in many instances, consider that, in deference to a growing public opinion and in his own interests, Dives should be brought to trial, otherwise than the more numberous one of which he is really guilty.

The offensive to which these opportunist friends of Dives consider it advisable for him to plead guilty, and of which many, either with a view of affected indignation, or timidity and half-heartedness on their part, are actually in grave danger, is that of a steward who has been at times unfaithful to his trust. His great riches, it would appear, have been given to him by God, as the latter has been infinitely good and merciful, has been given, we are to suppose, to Lazarus.

The object of God in giving the riches to Dives is that he may help Lazarus. The riches, in fact, are a trust to Dives, to which, by the way, he is allowed to help himself for his own private purposes in a way not usually permitted to trustees. He has spent too much of his riches, than divinely entrusted him, upon himself, and to the injury of others. He has made a profit of them, and to the injury of others. Lazarus, the poor fellow, has been treated with great injustice and shame, and, too little upon Lazarus, in the way of alms and charitable doles. Now, those who look at matters in this light, were at once raised against him to a speedy termination, which will really be in his favour, by deciding to be a more faithful steward in the future, and also to give a smaller per cent on his profits and loans to the shabbier sort of trade, and have everything, generally speaking, his own wicked way.

The friends of Dives, however, who object to his lord and patron being spoken to in this way. They will not have him lectured and bullied and worried. Granted that his main faults are two, as one of these apostles of his in the presbieri said: "the fact that his ancestors practised (i.) theft to such an extent that he possesses a superabundance, and (ii.) that he spends this superabundance chiefly upon his own enjoyment." Here is Lazarus, however, who has not practised theft either personally or by proxy in the person of his ancestors,—as a most scandalous statement of Mr. John Stuart Mill shows. He has taken a glass of beer in tobacco and beer. Why do you not lecture him as much as Dives? Is not his wages a trust as much as the "saving" of fortune or superabundance? If he has too much is expected of the latter, because he has bad much given him; well, does he not give much? Does he not pay nearly all taxes, support all charitable institutions, and give to charities and hospitals? And in case of distress? Lazarus we might do without; in fact, Lazarus we will do without, and ship him off to British Columbia or Manitoba, if he get too important and troublesome; but do without Dives? Never!

As these uncompromising friends of Dives, here referred to, seem to have in a very strong case, the rich man really appearing to spend a good deal on Lazarus and make himself generally useful, yet, as the condition of Lazarus seems to be getting every day more miserable, his kindness, as one might say pleasant and agreeable as before, the many excellent people who think there is something wrong and that somehow Dives is not acting fairly are extremely puzzled, as we have said, to find out how all this can be.

It is not strange that everyone should not have fully realized by this time that Dives is a case of the rich man and Lazarus— the question upon which people are asked to adjudicate— is not so much how Dives spends his money, as how he saves it? not so much as to the latter's distribution of the former. To save, as he has obtained it and is obtaining it unjustly. Yet this is so. Dives is imposed upon, not paying for a wrong use made of the money. He has not been true to himself, and, markedly so, by provision for certain purposes, or which, as others equally absurdly say, he or his ancestors have "saved" out of his lawful earnings, but for accumulating that money by despoiling another's earnings, to wit, Lazarus. Dives, in fact, is accused of being a robber, and his property, it is claimed, is as simply so much plunder as another's, and that money is his, as he is not deemed culpable, therefore, to the extent of deserving punishment. But a robber all the same he must be declared, and all the property of another, and the desire to defend one's own, are thus brought in. One might suppose that the latter would overcome the for-
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