On Picket Duty.

The immigration problem has received some attention from Know-Nothing Powderly, and he recommends a law that no one shall be allowed to land who cannot show that he has the means to support himself one year without employment. Nothing else is expected from Powderly, but that the Union Labor party should contain so much stupidity, ignorance, and humanness as to find such a policy suitable for its platform is indeed a matter for surprise. And this is the party of progress and industrial emancipation!

Two new publications are advertised in this issue—the one on the land question, the other on the money question. The former is the fifth number of Charles T. Fowler's "Sun," entitled "Land Tenure." It needs no recommendation to those who have read the previous numbers of this admirable series. The latter is entitled "The Laws of Wage, and is written by Hugo Bilgram, a new name to the readers of Liberty.

Dr. Bilgram has analyzed the money problem with remarkable keenness and by a method peculiarly his own, arriving nevertheless at conclusions substantially the same as those of Proudhon, Greene, and Spooner.

Readers of Liberty probably remember various paragraphs which have appeared in recent numbers exposing the ignorant misrepresentations of Anarchists that have persisted from time to time from the pulpits of Rev. Hugh O. Pontoost of Newark. They will now be glad to learn that this preacher has had his eyes opened, at least partly. On Sunday evening, June 20, he preached a sermon in his church on "Christ and the Common People," in the course of which he referred to the Anarchism. The Newark "Evening News" reports him as follows: "I ha' herefore believe that an Anarchist is an individual who went around armed to the teeth, and who would just as soon as not commit some desperate act. I suppose the very mention of the name turns your blood cold. I have, however, talked to a number of intelligent revolutionists recently, and I must confess that, if what they state is true, I have been deceived." And the "News" adds: "The speaker said that he had been surprised to learn that the Anarchists taught many things that were, in his mind, true Christianity. The clergyman who could say this in his pulpit, not only eating his own words, but flying directly in the face of what is perhaps the greatest prejudice now prevalent in the public mind, is certainly a brave man, and, despite his present adherence to Henry George's doctrine, I begin to have hopes of him.

I have often noticed that the best things that I write are the things that please nobody at all. I have not adopted this test, however, not as an absolute criterion of excellence; otherwise I should take all criticism as a rejection. The exception in the paragraph that appeared some time ago in these columns regarding the English individuals a woman, "Jesu." I cannot help suspecting, nevertheless, that there was something very good about it, in view of the reaction of which it has been condemned. The principal contention is over my comparison of "Jesu" with "Commonweal," "Justice," "Freedom," and the "Ararat." A writer in the "Commonweal" was the "I sae complain," his grievance being that I had mentioned the "Anarchist" in this category, while "Liberty" was devoted upon the other two Socialists. Then the editor of the "Anarchist" waived because I had instituted this classification for the express purpose of bringing his journal into disrepute. And now, just as I was finding someone in the thought that "Jesu," at least, appreciated "our" accomplishiments, I discover a nervous eye on part lest individualities may get confused with "Anarchist" pure and simple. Alas! poor Liberty! As always, obfuscated and displaced, she must go her way alone for a long time yet to come. Luckily she is used to it. Though rejected by the builders, she is sure to become the head of the corner.

E. C. Walker declares that my description that he set up legal marriage as a realization of the Anarchist principle is a reflection upon either my intelligence or my honesty. Mr. Walker will not deny, I think, that he has claimed that his marriage was Autonomistic—his word for Anarchist—and that his defence in no company. He has, accordingly to his claim, was a realization of the Anarchist principle, and to test the truth of my assertion it remains only to inquire whether this course was a stepping up to the marriage or a substitute answer to the inquiry. "Our sole plea in the courts," he says, "was that mutual consent constituted marriage, and that this had been acknowledged by the highest legal authorities." Now, when a man is charged by the State with living with a woman without being married to her, and he makes answer that he is married to her, he is either dodging—that is, compromising, and Mr. Walker denies that he did compromise,—or else he means to declare himself legally married. I am ready to stake my intelligence and honesty against Mr. Walker's (though it is offering him large odds) on the result of any attempt that he may make to escape this alternative. And before taunting him on not daring to accept the wager, I will give him more time than he allowed me in which to answer his analogy to the conduct of that of Reclus's daughters. For, on finding no answer in the very next issue of Liberty, he immediately popped out the charge that I had "taken refuge in ignorance when confronted with an indisputable fact," whereas the truth is that my answer was already in type. By the way, does Mr. Walker recall the profound silence in which he took refuge, and from which he never emerged, after the appearance of an article which I wrote in reply to him, entitled "A Fable for Malcontents?" He should remember that his in a house built of very thin glass, and that the Massachusetts stone crop beats that of the most hollow.

The Reward of Authors.

To the Editor of Liberty:

I received from you a few copies of the "Sun." I presume that Mr. C. T. Powel is the editor and publisher at the same time. On the envelope you wrote: "Copyright reserved by the author and publisher." I fell to thinking before I opened the book. What does this reservation of right mean? Surely it does not mean that you would not degrade me to send a copy to the Library of Congress in order to protect your right. I cannot think of what. What does it signify? Moral right is at an end. Mrs. O. will read it, and I will reprint all his book. Good! Now you think, Mr. Tucker, if any other paper would regularly reprint your articles and pamphlets? May the gods inspire them with such a desire! I think that would be the greatest boon to your cause. It is just what we want. I will remember that, when the first numbers of "Land and Liberty" (Zemlia i Volia) appeared in Russia, some of the "legal" newspaper quoted and reprinted many articles with the imminent intention of refuting them. What a delicious thing was in our camp! What a stir it made! Thousands who had never heard of the paper and were even ignorant as to the existence of the Socialistic party began to think and feel an interest in the movement. You did not fail to realize that the boys were "living with fire," and of course [sic].

I believe that the publication of the "Protest" [sic] ... of being remunerative. Would you complain that your rights are violated, should Lippencott or any other American periodical reprint a thing with which you would do it with good luck, knowing that you will not lose, but gain, by their enterprise.

Let's reason. You publish a book. I buy it, read it myself, I sold it others, copy it for my friend, and, if I like it, and want to give it a greater circulation for reasons of my own, I set it up and publish it. Must I go to the publisher and author and ask their permission? It is no more their property than the Bible is Moses's.

I beg to say that an author would work all his life over a book and publish it, and that then another would reprint and sell it at cost, thus depriving the author of his reward. I don't care a straw for the author; I want to buy my books as cheap as possible, and have no wish to pay more for what I can get for less. I shall not be restricted, and his life-long work will be in vain: he will be left destitute.

I will drop a coin for the poor, and make a collection for the destitute laborer. It was for him to form to himself emergencies and publish his work as cheap as the other.

Then there will be no incentive, no stimulus, for authors to write books; progress will be hampered; there will be no literature.

I am not obliged to furnish incentives and stimulate with my money to any one. I will read my Bible until it is torn and then put my classics until they become rotten.

Then?

Why, this will be the best incentive and most efficient stimulus for authors to write and for publishers to publish.

It is because the author or inventor is unable to control such means as to reap the whole fruits of his labor that one is justified in depriving wholly of his due reward.

I become confused, and hasten to ask you to enlighten me on this point.

[Mr. Fowler has taken advantage of the copyright law, I do not propose to discuss his conduct or motives. That is his own matter entirely. He may be governed by controlling reasons of which I know nothing. When he shall announce that he acted thus in order to exemplify Anarchist principles, he will then be in the same boat with E. C. Walker. Upon the question of copyright itself I agree with my correspondent, though I cannot endorse the whole of his argument. Unless he means to announce himself an outlaw, he does not wish to buy the author's books any cheaper than liberty and equity will let him; else he might better steal them outright without talk or ceremony. Nor is the matter of charity to the author pertinent to the discussion. The question is one of justice to the author and whether he can get it under liberty. The answer is that, when labor is left in possession of the capital which it produces unburdened by usury or taxations, the author and the investor will not have to appeal to the rich in order to put their product on the market, but will be able to do so directly, and the start which they will naturally have of advantage will be great. Competitors will secure the reward of their labor. Exact justice might not always be done, but a true conception of justice and such approximate realisation thereof as is possible is all that can be hoped for.—Boston Liberty.]
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PART SECOND.

COST THE LIMIT OF PRICE:

A Scientific Measure of Industry in Trade as One of the Fundamental Principles in the Solution of the Social Problem.

Continued from No. 102.

115. It is the same, as already observed, even with reference to natural results, in which there is no positive Cost, and so there is no question of price, for our own use. (Sl.) Thus, for example, although land in its wild state is not right for human use, the growing of a piece of land of itself is simply a natural result of Cost is the labor of enclosing it, yet, if I have selected a pleasant situation for my own habitation and culture, and am induced to part with it for the accommodation of others, it is a natural result also now, and is estimated by whatever amount of remuneration I may feel to make the surrender.

117. It is a question whether the party making the surrender can know the real extent of the sacrifices, or can judge with accuracy of the price, of the sacrifice, with reference to the things of which the sacrifice properly in commerce, a common average of estimate cannot be attained as in the ordinary case of capitals. (165.) But even here the operation of the principle is quite distinct from that of value as a quality of things, or the price of the party making the surrender will satisfy his own consciousness by estimating the degree of sacrifice to him, and not as under the value standard by estimating the degree of the want of the sacrifice as it appears to him. He fixes the price of the sacrifice as he would prefer to take rather than not sell, he is restrained from going farther without inquiring what is the highest point to which he would go. This distinction between the active Cost of the labor of production and the passive Cost of surrender is important in various ways, and especially, as we shall see, in connection with the standard of values.

118. It is as the positive Cost of the labor of production, alone, which relates to things properly in commerce, it is that which usually amounts by Cost, unless the regulations of the existing commerce and things taken out of commerce by special appropriation. In the latter case the labor contained in or bestowed upon the property is the whole of its equitable price. In the former it is augmented by the amount of sacrifice experienced in parting with it, occasioned by the present need.

119. In case of positive or negative Cost, the value is repugnance to the surrender, in which case the value, differing from the price, the party making the surrender can know the real extent of the sacrifices, or can judge with accuracy of the price, of the sacrifice, which is not the case with other sacrifices. The party making the surrender will satisfy his own consciousness by estimating the degree of sacrifice to him, and not as under the value standard by estimating the degree of the want of the sacrifice as it appears to him. He conceives of the sacrifice as a sacrifice for, and by some persons erroneously supposed to be found, in money. The question may still be asked: Why not employ money as the standard with which to measure this sacrifice? The answer is found in the uncertain and fluctuating nature of money, the fact that it represents nothing definite.

120. Money has profoundly two uses: (i) as a standard of value, and (2) as a circulating medium. As a standard of value, it is a measure of the value of, or a measure with which to compare the value of, different kinds of property. It does not even profess to be a standard of cost. It has no relation whatever to the cost, or, in other words, to the labor which is in the different cases already spoken of as indicating the price of the property. The value of a property in existing commerce, the value alone being taken into account. But value is incapable of a scientific estimate, as will be more specifically shown in the next chapter. It is not the value which money has in itself as a standard of value. In its nature it is a third term which connects the property and the labor. Hence the paper money is assumed as a representative of specie. So far very well. There was a time when bank-papers were an exact representation of specie, if it required no paper money at all. But the banking system, issued only dollar for dollar. Her bills were merely certificates of deposit for so much. So far. Then, the bank-did not stretch nor contract, while the price remained constant as a medium of circulations. But with the development of the banking system two, three, four, or more dollars of paper money are issued for one dollar of specie on deposit. The amount is then expanded and contracted, according to the fluctuations of trade and the judgments or speculative interests of perhaps five hundred different banks of directors. It is a medium of exchange, not a standard of exchange. A year one foot long and the next year five feet long. The problem of existing money, then, is to measure values which are in their nature positively incapable of measurement by money, which is a standard of measure, but of the nature of any thing. It is therefore uncertainty x fluctuation = price.

121. To make gold the standard of cost, instead of value, would be to take as much gold as is ordinarily dug in an hour in those countries where it is procured commercially—as the price of the value of labor while it is in the act of producing it. It may be equally troublesome and repugnant. This may perhaps be one dollar, which would make the price of labor a dollar an hour, and the difference between that price in this article and the usual price of labor in the same article—which is understood necessary, as the measure of acquiring all other commodities—is some indication of the labor cost of the article. But it is not a standard of cost. But the fact is that no average of the product of gold-digging can be made. It is powerfully uncertain. The product of gold, therefore, is only a standard of cost, a product of a standard of measure. The product of any article can be this. The demand for it in the arts is also exceptional and uncertain, and is not a fixed value. If it is not a fixed value, it is a fixed price, and the producer might not be able to measure it by gold. The result of all this investigation is therefore this: that the product of gold, and, for the same reason, that of silver, is quite unfit for the standard of cost. The idea is that in this case, if the product of the industry is to compare other labor, while corn or what does sufficiently those conditions; and (2) that it is just such a circulating medium, provided it can be made to rest upon a proper basis, and represent what may be called a circulating medium.

122. It results from what has been said that the basis of valuable property is human labor, and that the measure of such property is the amount of labor which there is, so to speak, laid up in the article owned. The article is the product of labor, and is therefore an indication that is given to us. It is the measure of the output of labor that is given to us. It is given to us by the manufacturer, who authorizes his labor to be paid for labor, and who authorizes his labor to be paid for labor in the same way as if, then, so many hours of labor at brick-making, so many hours of carpenter's labor, so many hours of laborers, etc., were in the time it takes to make it a house, and entitles it to a price as property, is the human labor that the house represents. The way it is, then, so many hours of labor at brick-making, so many hours of carpenter's labor, so many hours of laborers, etc., are the price of what was received. The equable limit of price is, we have seen, a constant fluctuation in the price of commoditie is a constant fluctuation in the price of commoditie, not a constant fluctuation in the price of commoditie.
IRELAND!

By GEORGES SAINT-OUTON.

Translated from the French by Liberty by Sarah E. Holmes.

From page 191.

Oh! for an end of the toil which he endured, his intense desire for her gorged still more the irresistible evocation of her luminous face! He would die, but at least holding between his shriveled fingers that soft and precious band which he almost crushed and tore from his flesh, and remembred her, "Marian!"

The name constantly rose to his lips in a stammer, and left his throat in spite of himself; and, to know how great was the matter which he held in his hands, I observed in his prayer holds before his eyes the divine crucifix, and with arder contemplated the weapon, glittering in the expiring light of the firelace, and its tapering blade insensibly magnetizing him into the mysterious ecstasy of a dream.

And suddenly he who had not seen recess from his torpor by the thousand noises outside, or the hoary commands of Newington whose echoes reverberated through the vast halls, or the battle of the soldiery still filling the courts, or the shots of the sanitation amusing themselves by firing at some inoffensive passer-by, trembled nervously at the sound of a silken train brushing imperceptibly over the thick carpet.

And then he stood in a loose wrapper of white satin, somewhat open at the neck, Lady Newington, with her long golden tresses and her undulating and charming step, advanced slowly and silently, looking, in the reddening brightness of a falling bough, with the marvelous apparition of a young Mandarin. Immersible to the fantastic grace of this entrance, Richard, with knotted brows, in an outbreak of malignant wrath, tried to rise and conceal from Ellen's look, as from a profession, the daggers which he had wrested from the hands of the_respent to the passions with which he was_addressable; and as, with a seeming somnolence she leaned on Bradwell's chair, with a quiet gesture she seized his arm, and the possession of his.

Bradwell gave an instinctive cry of terror.

"Ellen! do not touch it."

"Why?"

"It is poisoned."

"And why?"

"The Duchess made a hush, incredible laugh, whose fleeting banter doubled the fascination of her being by parting her voluptuously moist lips over the white whiteness of her teeth: and lowering over her sparkling eyes her linking lashes.

"My lady! You frighten me, you are playing with death.... I swear it to you."

Ellen's laugh ceased, not under the influence of fear, but because of a sudden idea which imposed itself upon her, again transforming her mobile face and changing the expression of her deep, black eyes, proceeding gaily into an expression of diabolical cunning of cold cruelty; and with her clear voice, impermeable, enigmatic, cutting, and menacing she said, again, more slowly, and more softly, more expressly:

"Poisoned! We will see!"

Very quickly she turned towards the window, with one push opened it wide, and gave the odd call with which she usually summoned Bradwell, Bradwell recoiled with horror.

A frightful odor of blood reached them, borne by the wind from the high window which borders the garden, and, not yet decreasing, was rapidly decomposing, and also the more pungent and stifling smell of fire which had been lighted.

"There!" said Ellen, lifting her black lace past the screen, and revealing the Promised Land, the endless treasures, the most delicious eden, where the air was eternally light, where the fire was eternally burning, where the fire was eternally glimmering.

And Ellen, suddenly and almost with a leap, dashed into the room, and took place in front of the Duchess, who, motionless, immobile, came towards her, without haste, without movement, without saying a word.

The Duchess called the nearest of the turtle-doves, behind which the others held delicately back. Also, the favorite, whiter than the others, with a suspicion of a tinge of blue, was the one chosen for the impalement of the queen, and about the neck a loop of gold from which hung an enormous diamond, glittering in the night like a clear star when amid the darkness, she left her nest to come and knock at Lady Ellen's window.

Instantly Assel sallit, lighted as a flame, placing her pink feet on the shoulder of the Duchess, and immediately she divined the Duchess's will, and, feeling in himself a disposition to violence if Lady Ellen did not cease her attacks against the young girl.

She perceived, under Richard's outward calm, the thought which was evolving in his mind and saw in his twitching hands the itching for violence; so she proceeded to satisfice his imprisoned ire by an inscription, which sharpened his desire to violence.

"Your Marian, you would not touch her! On account of her virginity, perhaps. Ah! ah! ah! do not trouble yourself; many a fine day, doubtless, has she remained thus!"

She purposely used this coarse expression, which she had heard in the conversatory attentions of a certain society of beautiful, young, among the countries people about her father's parsonage. A more discreet circumlocution would not have so deeply wounded Richard, who in his distress was seeking revenge, and this broad language would irritate the wound caused by calumnious assertions.

The infamy of the proceeding did not escape him; she knew perfectly well, from having informed herself, as a false detective, the irreproachable reputation of the Duchess, and, in her thought besides savoring her hatred, the outrage, for dulled with this indecency of idea and by such revolting images, would pollute Marian, would sully her horrifying halo of saintly purity, would ruin his young, his inhabitants, the power that he esteemed so much, so highly, as she exercised over Sir Bradwell.

The immediate effect of this enormous intoxication might be dangerous to her, might complete the exasperation of him whose privacy she so monstrously violated, and she shivered with fear as she felt the young man's hand grasp her.

To startle the provoking, hateful face, his hand had suddenly swerved away, and the Duchess, who meekly and gracefully grabbed the hil of the dagger, to answer the blow, round and round, she lashed, she struck, looking at Richard's face.

But there was no longer on her look as piercing and cutting as the steel in the hands of the executioner; restless, shaded with a sudden and darkened them, his eyes traced in space an imaginary outline, and fixed themselves beyond the borders of the apartment where the apartment of the village, in the distance, in search of Marian.

Lady Ellen's low and vulgar invective hands in Sir Bradwell's mind the thought of the young girl who meant the young girl, who meant the young girl at this very hour on the roads swarming with victorious soldiers in the terrible country where they were going through their evolutions, with blood on fire, greedy for the joys which crown triumphs.

Alone, without a defender, without defense; Paddy Nell, obliging hung, cut-day; Toner a prisoner in the castle without the weapon Continuad on page 6.
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Why Wages Should Absorb Profits.

Van Buren Denslow, discussing in the “Truth Seeker” the con-parative rewards of labor and capital, points out that the present wage system divides profits almost evenly between the two parties, the railroads of Illinois, which pay annually in salaries and wages $815,000,760, and to capital, which Mr. Denslow defines as the owners of the resources, in constructing and equipping the roads, $81,790,203. Then he remarks: “No system of intentional profit-sharing is more equal than this, provided we admit to the principle that a day’s work already done and embodied in the form of capital is as well entitled to compensation for its use as a day’s work not yet done, which we call labor.” Exactly. But the principle referred to is the very thing which we Socialists deny, and, until Mr. Denslow can meet and vanquish us on that point, he will in vain attempt to defend the existing or any other form of profit-sharing. True Socialists assert that “a day’s work embodied in the form of capital” has already been fully rewarded by the ownership of that capital; that, if the owner lends it to another to use and the user damages it, destroys it, or consumes any part of it, the owner is entitled to have this damage, destruction, or consumption made good; and that, if the owner receives from the user a surplus beyond the return of his capital intact, his day’s work is paid for a second time.

Perhaps Mr. Denslow will tell us, as we have so often been told, that this day’s work should be paid for a second and a third and a hundredth and a millionth time because the capital which it produced and in which it is embodied increased the productivity of future labor. He that does can such an increase we grant, but that labor, where there is freedom, or is should be paid in proportion to its usefulness we deny. All useful qualities exist in nature, either actively or potentially, and their benefits, under freedom, are enjoyed by the nation and none of them are monopolized among mankind. The laborer who brings any particular useful quality into action is paid according to the labor he has expended, but gets only his share, in common

No Method in the “Sun’s” Madness.

The New York “Sun’s” governmentalism is above suspicion, and so was its sanity—until recently. But some of its latest utterances would seem to indicate that it is not simply and maintaining the present condition of things that made it so reckless and uncompromising an upholder of the thousand and one government-created and law-sustained monopolies which are rapidly destroying every distinctive feature of American life. Such logic was only admissible to be State-crazy and verging upon a state of dangerous lunacy. Not long ago it startled its sensible readers by the wild declaration that there is but one step from boycotting to assassination, which is tantamount to saying that no man has a right to choose and decide for himself with whom he shall associate, what he shall read, where he shall get his daily supplies, and on whom he shall bestow his favors. It virtually said: once having become a reader of the “Sun,” you are bound to support it as long as you live, or as long as the owners find it profitable to continue its publication; it may offend and insult you; it may libel you about outrageously and defamably; it may fill its columns with rackety, calumny and abuse of everything that you respect and approve,—still you must send in your regular subscription, or else be denounced as an assassin. Can the love for government reduce men to still more pitiful idiocy? The “Sun’s” latest utterance was the admission that it can.

Some troubles occurred in a certain minor labor organization in consequence of the appropriation by the financial secretary of the funds entrusted to him, and he laid himself on the state of arrest, owing himself the greatest honor of the greatest annoyance and loss by lodging a legal complaint against the defaulter, simply resolved to expel him and expose his villainous conduct to his fellow-laborers in order that he might be treated according to his deserts. This is what is in that act any person of ordinary sense could object to as criminal and illegitimate? A number of people have agreed to sever their connection with an individual who misused and squandered the funds of the organization, unwilling to have anything to do with him. This, nevertheless, was a text for a bitter and violent attack upon the labor body in question by the “Sun,” which charged them with having assumed the function of a criminal tribunal. It claimed that the robber in effect not only save himself, but that his fellow-laborers in the strength of the Anarchist protest against the existence of the State, but, coming from the “Sun,” which professed to labor for freedom and favor a government which governs least, it teases us to beware of such friends of liberty. All believers in government of man by man inevitably fall a prey to this terrible malady and become raving maniacs.

V. Yarros.

Mr. Perrine’s Difficulties.

To the Editor of Liberty:

I suppose I should feel completely swamped by the great waves of satire which have rolled over my head from all directions. Still I feel able to lift my head, and make the motion of scissors.

I have had the fallacy of a part of my argument so clearly pointed out to me by another than Liberty that I did not think it would be necessary for its editor to go so far around me as to deny the sanction of cost in order to refute me;

Indeed, my only hope of Liberty now is that it will define some of its own positions.

I have heard a great deal of “spookists” and “plumb-blues,” but I cannot clearly see the reason that contract has ceased to be a “buck-fine” when we have to allow that most liberty for an argument.

Will you please explain what safety there may be in it?
individualistic community where it becomes each man's duty to get and keep himself. This has been the best, as certain science has come to be its outspoken reality of the Republic for to break contracts made with the Crow Indians, unless the idea基地 is a conflict of interest to be discussed.

The true authority of the State rests, as Hume shows in his "Aryan Household," not on contract, but on its development, or on the State, but on the State, and on the State, and on the State, and on the State.

However, I do not feel warranted in entering into any discussion from that standpoint till I am able to find out more clearly what Liberty means by development. In your reply to me, you seem to think of it as a sort of cut-and-dried process; this may be a host idea absorbed from the "Mon- day Lectures," but I think that it is hardly warranted by either Darwin or Spencer.

I tried in both of my letters to insist on the existence of a general law of development which is almost completely the power of individuals and which is, by its bearing on "optimism." I mean that, on the principle of the survival of the fittest, the best that has to be said is that the ability to have a man do not deny man's divinity, "neither do you deny his degradation"; from what has man become "man" or has he become "nothing," and then what do you mean by "man's degradation"?

The idea of development which admits of a degradation and which expects Liberty's followers to arrest the "waste process" which has already made trial of everything else and is in despair about to make the experiment of An- drerdau, but I think that it is necessary for me to ask for a more complete exposition of the system.

FREDERICK A. C. PERRINE

Mr. Perrine should read more carefully. I have never said that it is "man's duty to break all contracts as soon as he has come to a yearning that they were made foolishly." What I said was, if a man should sign a contract to part with his liberty forever, he will violate it; but, we now see, that the horror of his folly. Because I believe that some promises are better broken than kept, it does not follow that I think it wise to break a foolish promise. On the contrary, I deem the keeping of promises such an important matter that in the extreme cases would I approve their violation. It is of such vital consequence that associates should be able to rely upon each other that it is never better to do the most important and prudent. The greatest possible care can be taken only at the expense of some consider- sion of even greater importance. I mean by evolution just what Darwin means by it, namely, the change of species as the result of variations that occur from any cause whatever, those are preserved which are best adapted to the environment. Inasmuch as the variations that perish vastly outnumber those that survive, this process is extremely wasteful, but human intelligence can greatly lessen the waste. I am perfectly willing to admit its optimism, if by optimism is meant the doctrine that everything is for the best in the end of optimists otherwise.

As to the word "degradation," evidently Mr. Perrine is unaware of all its meanings. By its derivation it implies descent from something higher, but it is used by the best English writers to mean a condition to which something has been reduced. As in: the waste products and the process of elimination. The great difference is that I used it.—Editor Liberty.

Theoretical Methods.

From the raw recruit in the Salvation Army up to the The- oretician of the "Sun," the idea of a "waste process" to be preserved, but human intelligence can greatly lessen the waste. I am perfectly willing to admit its optimism, if by optimism is meant the doctrine that everything is for the best in the end of optimists otherwise.

As to the word "degradation," evidently Mr. Perrine is unaware of all its meanings. By its derivation it implies descent from something higher, but it is used by the best English writers to mean a condition to which something has been reduced. As in: the waste products and the process of elimination. The great difference is that I used it.—Editor Liberty.

Theoretical Methods.

From the raw recruit in the Salvation Army up to the Theo- retician of the "Sun," the idea of a "waste process" to be preserved, but human intelligence can greatly lessen the waste. I am perfectly willing to admit its optimism, if by optimism is meant the doctrine that everything is for the best in the end of optimists otherwise.

As to the word "degradation," evidently Mr. Perrine is unaware of all its meanings. By its derivation it implies descent from something higher, but it is used by the best English writers to mean a condition to which something has been reduced. As in: the waste products and the process of elimination. The great difference is that I used it.—Editor Liberty.
Sociological Letters.

[Letter Refd]

I have already told you, my dear friend, that the socialism of the means of production is a dogma; that a dogma is proclaimed, taught, imposed; that it has its faithful, its apostles, its sectarian, its priests, its martyrs, and its visionaries; but that it is not open, justified, demonstrated. It is a dogma.

The dogma is by nature mysterious and obscure, and you ask me to throw some light on it, on the ground that I have taken as my motto: "Whatever is not clear is not true." It is precisely that which throws light on the dogma of transubstantiation, the apotheosis of Christ, and the trinity. And yet millions and millions of men have believed in them. For these men have disputed with each other, beaten each other, tortured each other; for these generations, entire, have been annihilated, and they have cost the waves of the seas, and the blood of the sacred of the sixteenth century, Saint Bartholomew, the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and the Inquisition.

The socialism of the means of production is the religion of the day: it has its adorers from the North to the South, from the Orient to the Occident; it is confessed in journals, magazines, meetings, congresses; it commands armies; and you, profane man, ask it to bring you proof!

Have its adherents asked for proofs? And they are almost as numerous as the stars of heaven — visible to the naked eye. Have its apostles, its leaders themselves asked for proofs? They have been believed, beloved; they have followed: follow! They have given the word of command; obey! You make objection, you being a libertarian, are obedient; that to follow such a leader is in itself and in its place among the practicing of Parisian's form; and you send me the triumphalist argument that you cannot believe without knowing.

Alas! no more can I]

Let us learn, then, and since one is never so well informed as by himself, let me inform ourselves and run for a little while, over mountains and through valleys, to lay hold of the said dogma and find out for ourselves whether it is so refractionary as to analysis.

It forms a part of the Christian baggage. Christianity is a championship of the exploited, the wretched, the poor, the exploiters, the powerful, the rich.

Against the iniquity of distribution it has protested by the insatiable and well-known social revolution in its day: Communism.

Listen to the fathers of the Church.

Saint Basili: "The rich man is a thief!"

Saint John Chrysostom: "The rich man is a brigand."

Saint Jerome: "Opulence is always the result of robbery."

Saint Clement: "It was iniquity that gave rise to private property."

Communism:

No more private property, everything in common, and then no more thieves, no more brigands, no more opulence, and no more iniquity. We unite, the working classes, direct, common, and easily dispense with knowledge and with even with thought. It may be subject to some illusions and disappointments.

Application (Acts 4: 14 and following):

Neither was there among them that lacked: for as many as were possessors of lands or houses sold them, and brought the prices of the things that were sold, and put them into the apostles' feet, and distribution was made every man according as he had need. That is the pure Communist doctrine, as simple as the child born, and not yet adulterated in view of the resistance of those people who, under the pretext of liberty, are disposed to go to lay a matter what at the feet of no matter whom, and to beg to be of the hands of no matter whom, no matter what.

Pensivity:

"But a certain man named Ananias, with Sapphira his wife, sold a possession; and kept back part of the price, his wife also being privy to it, and brought a certain part, and laid it at the apostles' feet." But Peter said: "Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost?" But the husband of the time, and to keep back part of the price of the land! And Ananias hearing these words fell down, and gave up the ghost: and great fear came upon all them that heard these words. Christian Communism has anticipated the tradition of all Communists, past and future, which have been included in their methods of action a satirical terrorism.

But the young men arose, wound him up, and carried him out, and buried him.

Addition to the address:

And it was about the space of three hours after, when his wife, not knowing what was done, came in. And Peter answered her: "Tell me whether ye sold the land for so much?" And she said: "Yea, for so much." They Peter said unto her: "How is it that ye have agreed together to tempt the Spirit of the Lord, and to keep back part of the price of the land? And Ananias hearing these words fell down, and gave up the ghost: and great fear came upon all them that heard these words.

Christian Communism has anticipated the tradition of all Communists, past and future, which have been included in their methods of action a satirical terrorism.

And the young men arose, wound him up, and carried him out, and buried him.

But for dear the great price of the priests,Humbled by our Apostles' name. Then the trumpets of all who have seen The city's run to expanse. Oh, Liberty, then glories heaven bright! Profess of blue and preface with delight, Eternal barrow in thy presence is sung, Amidst the shelter of thy glowing reign.

[Michael Hickey]

BRONX COUNTY COURTHOUSE, New York, April 21, 1877.

Those who do not remember Mr. Hickey's letter and my comments in No. 93 should read them in connection with the above communication. The fact of the week's notice given by the priest makes the matter clear. I thank my earnest Irish comrade for his kind explanation and for the excellent work which he and his neighbors are doing in a country where it is most needed.—EDITOR LIBERTY.
A Criticism That Does Not Apply.

It paints me to see your frequent attacks on Henry George, as if the defenders of monopolistic secure in the hands of the Government the rights of individuals. To me, this appears to be true, but I may be mistaken and will gladly accept arguments and refutations that will shed light on the question. The capital point of the money question does not seem to be clear to the editor of "The Standard." It is not a question of what is to be done with a bank, but rather whether the system of Government is not already a sort of bank, a national bank, and that bank has its monopoly just as the Bank of England. The capital point of the money question does not seem to be clear to the editor of "The Standard." It is not a question of what is to be done with a bank, but rather whether the system of Government is not already a sort of bank, a national bank, and that bank has its monopoly just as the Bank of England.

Dr. Anthony Thinks It Heart Disease.

The following from the London "Jub" is printed here with great satisfaction, not only because of its intrinsic excellence, but because, being an editorial utterance, its clanging sentences place that paper squarely in opposition to compulsory taxation.

A certain Quaker was so enamored of peace that he was ready to fight for it. Professor Hazley loves liberty so dearly that he would use coercion to bring it about. A little judicious despotism, he thinks, might well be reëxamined today with a view to forcing men's minds into a proper frame of such sort that they will then tomorrow clamor for liberty. We are not misrepresenting him. "Some years ago," he said, "the doctrine of voluntarism so far as I am concerned, even if I thought the state that taxation should be voluntary. It is not worth paying for with love, life, or liberty, nor any other way or abstraction to any employer of the community for the purpose of compelling the tax payment of any person for the purpose of the state's welfare, and the public welfare of the state, the world, we are not at the present time advanced enough to leave to private enterprise general measures for the public welfare."

But now comes the grand argument for coercion. Correction is the road to liberty. Thus, speaking of free libraries, "if there were no other excuse for State authority in this matter, the very excellent one is sufficient that the existence of these libraries will more than anything tend to bring about that state of mind in which competition will become of more importance. The opportunities will be given for voluntary effort." To coerce men for their own good is an old cry, but to coerce men in order to prepare them for their own good is a new cry. Professor Hazley. But, alas! in the very next sentence he lets the cat out of the bag. He only wants to catch the individuals. "We want to get support from all sides, and do not mind for what reasons it is given." Has it never occurred to so clear-headed a thinker as Professor Hazley that to compel men by force to pay for something for which they desire, and that those who advocate it are neither better nor worse than pickpockets, baggers, highwaymen, brigands, and thieves?
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Consistency.

Let no man be led astray at me because I am consistent. As blind revolt is the ultimate right of a nation, so blind inconsistency is the ultimate right of the individual. I believe in consistency, but that the pieces of the puzzle are too many. Nevertheless at two—may, if I can get them, I cut three pieces a week, for the confectionery. Shall any man charge that consistency is inconsistent. This was insidious, merely, because my conviction was not strong enough to counteract your idiozy? Or, if I admit this reluctance to the Archangel, theoretically, am I a dog because the old Archangel clings to me in my practice! Advocating violence, am I vitally inconsistent? If I cannot, must be Advocating non-inconsistency, shall there be no forgiveness for me if I forget my principles and break somebody’s head?

Away with inconsistency! It is a delusion. What I really think and what I really do is of no importance, even though my thoughts be contradictory among themselves and be negatived again by my acts. But why do I think I ought to think as I do? If I think I ought to think, I ought to act, according to my consistency, as v,- value, no consideration.

Wonderful will be the results when physiology shall have succeeded in deciphering the play of the atoms of the brain; when the first dawn of a new idea shall be discerned in the depths of its corresponding nerve cells; when its advance and coordination with other times-registered ideas shall be noted; when in time it predominate so far as to influence action; when it becomes a moving force, a religion, permeating every fibre, infiltrating every breath. Until then the virtues of inconsistency will be unpopular.

Finally, as I recognize that almost all the evil of the past and present is done by men in deference to some outworn principles, and that their nature, for the sake of an alleged consistency, I deem it for myself the highest duty to be inconsistent. I should be inconsistent with my principles were I not inconsistent with them.

John Beverley Robinson.

[As I know no way of answering Mr. Robinson except by showing the inconsistency of his argument either with itself or with some truth which I suppose him to admit in common with the rest of mankind, and as I see no way of showing that I am consistent, by Mr. Robinson’s own statement, only make him more enameled of his position, I shall not make the attempt. He will not complain of this neglect, inanimate. If his system be true, and it is quite consistent and that what he does because he thinks he is to be of no importance, he admits that his attitude is not worth consideration. For me, himself, I wish that always judge deliberate inconsistency by the end in view and the advantage of such a method of attaining it. From this stand-point inconsistency between belief and conduct may sometimes be defensible. Inconsistency between beliefs held by one person may not be inconsistent with the end, the advantage of such a method of attaining it. From this stand-point inconsistency between belief and conduct may sometimes be defensible. Inconsistency between beliefs held by one person may not be inconsistent with the end, the advantage of such a method of attaining it.

—EDITOR LIBERT.]