On Picket Duty.

A very lively quarrel is in progress among Australian radicals. Joseph Symes, the high priest of Free-thought at Melbourne, finding himself unable to "be" the Anarchist element so rapidly growing under the fostering care of David A. Andrade, is trying to expel it from the organization of the Secularists. His task is proving not altogether an easy one. Excluded from the columns of Syme's paper, the "Liberator," the Anarchists are driving the fight through the "Australian Radical," which is itself becoming more and more Anarchistic with each issue.

It is not often that Liberty's interpretation of the principle of equal liberty receives legal sanction. But its application of that principle to the matter of boycotting now has the clear endorsement of the California courts. The following decision has recently been rendered by Judge Maguire of the supreme court, who therein shows a knowledge of the doctrine of individual sovereignty which would make Eastern judges envious if they were not so dishonest: "If each and all have the right to believe their patronage or employment, or sell their labor to whomsoever they will, to commence and discontinue at will, then it would be absurd to say that, while each and all have the individual right, they cannot exercise it collectively, for that would be to assert that the exercise of one lawful right is illegal, but that the exercise of two lawful rights is illegal; that while one right will not constitute a wrong, two rights, or ten rights, or one hundred rights will constitute a wrong, i.e., using in illegality with the number of rights collectively exercised, which is the "reductio ad absurdum" of the position that a combination among workmen to do collectively what each has the individual and unquestioned right to do separately; constitutes an unlawful act or an unlawful conspiracy."

The London "Freedom" says that the American Mutualist papers, with the exception of the "Alarm," "zealously repudiate all but passive resistance to oppression, and cling to the peace-at-all-costs doctrine of George Fox, Godwin, Shelley, Proudhon, and Leo Tolstoi." The truth of this assertion cannot be tested unless "Freedom" will be good enough to define the doctrine concerning peace which it imagines these five men to hold in common. I am not sufficiently familiar with Godwin's writings to speak positively of that author's views, but I am certain that no American Mutualist paper accepts the non-resistant teachings of Fox and Tolstoi. And what Shelley is this that is sandwiched thus between these men? And what Proudhon? Surely not the Shelley who said to the Men of England: "Forge arms, in your defense to bear," surely not the Proudhon who wrote two large volumes on "War and Peace," which, while a prophecy of peace, were at the same time a justification of war. Neither Shelley nor Proudhon preached peace-at-all-costs, nor do the American Mutualist papers. Liberty prefers peace to war only when it is less costly than war, and has never based its preference on any other ground. Before "Freedom" can intelligently criticize Individualistic Anarchism, it will have to make a fuller and closer study of it.
Socialist Economics and the Labor Movement.

BY VICTOR YANCHEW.

The true question of the right of capital to reward having been settled, it remained for the author to unfold his plan of removing poverty without affecting the income of the capitalist. We have seen that extension of the use of machinery is the only method by which the laboring man can be finally liberated from his toil. For an answer we are referred to Chapter Second, and in it we are told that there are two necessary requirements to be fulfilled to induce the capitalist to invest his money in machinery, the first of these being that its profit shall be, and, second, that the investment yield the capitalist increasing returns. (Mr. Gunton’s logic is exhibited in the fact that the order of stating these two conditions is reversed in the first, the investment profit, and, second, that it be sold. But perhaps only Socialists cannot see that, after a thing is sold at a profit, it cannot be unsold.) Considering that the working population consists essentially of wage-earners or “class” who “have no wealth or capital of their own,” and also that unless the majority of consumers are able to buy the increased quantity of goods, there is no market for them. And as the consuming capacity of the workers is increased, the relative demand for the produce of the new machines, as cost rate must be permanently raised in order to enable them to enlarge their consumption.

Gradually this is brought to the question of the law governing wages. But before we follow the author into Part Second of his book, we must put it out a contradiction in his argument. When contending for the right of the tool-laborer to a share (and a lion’s share) of the increase in the total productive capacity of the tool, Mr. Gunton is obliged to suppose that the inventor of the tool was the first to its form and have no hand to lend him the tool for a share of the benefit of its use, and that the laborer, seeing a chance to gain a greater return from the same amount of labor, readily and gratefully accepted the offer. Now, when speaking of the consuming power of the laborers, he lays it down that all introduction of new and better methods in production has invariably been by a demand for higher wages on the part of the laborer, which demand grows out as an invariable result of the increase in waged laborers and men in production. Therefore, the question of the law of the idle tool-laborer will have to be reopened and reconsidered. It is evident that if employers are forced, in the interest of self-protection, to increase wages, and are made by law to increase wages leisurely and as a matter of choice, the argument of extra inducements and increasing returns being a condition of extension of machinery fails to the ground.

With these points of view, or views, the readers of Part Second of this work are concerned. Suffice it to say that its criticisms of Mr. George’s theory of wages are very strong, though not new. Readers of Liberty will recall the arguments of Mr. Tucker in his book, "Social Economy," and of a passage of similar import. Mr. Tucker shows that even those who live most miserably on scant earnings and those who, having no employment, earn nothing and have only the hope of securing a few, would rather endure hardships in the cities than settle on unoccupied land.

After some preliminary remarks the author proceeds to state his idea of the law governing wages as not unadulterated socialism, but as a right which is granted to him who has the skill and the energy to bring about a greater return to society from a given amount of labor to which he is supposed to own. He then analyzes some general law governing all other things in the domain of exchange, the author accordingly first gives us a general law of prices: "The ratio in which quantities of different commodities are exchanged must differ according to the different values of those commodities and the degree of their scarcity, or, conversely, the degree of their abundance. The quantity of the goods produced, the cost of production," etc.

"Not by the relations between supply and demand, as it is popularly, but erroneously, held among economists, and not by the amount of labor employed in the manufacture of the goods, but by the value of the means of subsistence which the goods contain. If such goods contained in them silver or gold, they would be more precious than if they contained only wheat or cotton. This is the law of cost of production." Not by the relations between supply and demand, as it is popularly, but erroneously, held among economists, and not by the amount of labor employed in the manufacture of the goods, but by the value of the means of subsistence which the goods contain. If such goods contained in them silver or gold, they would be more precious than if they contained only wheat or cotton. This is the law of cost of production.

"The rate of wages paid by the employers must reflect the same law, viz., the amount which will produce the largest amount of other goods. This is the law of cost of production." Not by the relations between supply and demand, as it is popularly, but erroneously, held among economists, and not by the amount of labor employed in the manufacture of the goods, but by the value of the means of subsistence which the goods contain. If such goods contained in them silver or gold, they would be more precious than if they contained only wheat or cotton. This is the law of cost of production.

"The rate of wages should be determined by the same law, viz., the amount which will produce the largest amount of other goods. This is the law of cost of production." Not by the relations between supply and demand, as it is popularly, but erroneously, held among economists, and not by the amount of labor employed in the manufacture of the goods, but by the value of the means of subsistence which the goods contain. If such goods contained in them silver or gold, they would be more precious than if they contained only wheat or cotton. This is the law of cost of production.

"The rate of wages should be determined by the same law, viz., the amount which will produce the largest amount of other goods. This is the law of cost of production." Not by the relations between supply and demand, as it is popularly, but erroneously, held among economists, and not by the amount of labor employed in the manufacture of the goods, but by the value of the means of subsistence which the goods contain. If such goods contained in them silver or gold, they would be more precious than if they contained only wheat or cotton. This is the law of cost of production.

"The rate of wages should be determined by the same law, viz., the amount which will produce the largest amount of other goods. This is the law of cost of production." Not by the relations between supply and demand, as it is popularly, but erroneously, held among economists, and not by the amount of labor employed in the manufacture of the goods, but by the value of the means of subsistence which the goods contain. If such goods contained in them silver or gold, they would be more precious than if they contained only wheat or cotton. This is the law of cost of production.

In view of all of this, it is necessary to consider the case of laborers, who, as cost rate must be permanently raised in order to enable them to enlarge their consumption.

But there is an entire change to the thought of a "Marx, Prudhon, Bla-kounie, and Lasalle," and knowing nothing whatever of either their positive or negative positions, I have already said as I shall prove later on, I am relieved to know that the "socialists" are not under the impression that the iron law of wages is a Socialist invention, a result of their recommendation, which does not describe any real phenomena, past or present. Yet the Socialists (in the person of Lasalle) have only so, to speak, an etymological change in the matter, for the "iron law of wages" refers to the law of supply and demand. The fact is, whatever the fluctuations of wages upon population, and vice versa. Mr. Gunton, in no obvious reason, leaves out the subject of population altogether from discussion of wages; and moved to inhibit the "law of wages" at liberty (or "as a barometer") he would have known that it is futile, thoughts, and inexcurably arbitrary to dissociate the iron law of wages from the question of population and the other results of the "principles of distribution," which must be said to an extent for the benefit of Mr. Gunton, more unscrupulous or meaner reader who is liable to be misled. First, then, Mr. Gunton evidently under the impression that the iron law of wages is a Socialist invention, a result of their recommendation, which does not describe any real phenomena, past or present. Yet the Socialists (in the person of Lasalle) have only so, to speak, an etymological change in the matter, for the "iron law of wages" refers to the law of supply and demand. The fact is, whatever the fluctuations of wages upon population, and vice versa. Mr. Gunton, in no obvious reason, leaves out the subject of population altogether from discussion of wages; and moved to inhibit the "law of wages" at liberty (or "as a barometer") he would have known that it is futile, thoughts, and inexcurably arbitrary to dissociate the iron law of wages from the question of population and the other results of the "principles of distribution," which must be said to an extent for the benefit of Mr. Gunton, more unscrupulous or meaner reader who is liable to be misled.
But we must follow Mr. Burton's argument and let him make out his case. The standard of living being the regulator of the price of labor, no permanent increase in the rate of wages is possible except through raising that standard. The habits of the workers have been changed and renewed, their appetites enlarged, their wants multiplied, their appetites developed. A loud and emphatic demand for a larger portion of the fruits of labor is the signal before which the comfort of the employer would be moved to action. As long hours of hard toil are destructive of health and the most refined cravings, a reduction of the hours of labor is the first step toward a new order of things. It is true that the manufacturer, but even he, cannot possibly exist without a market for his goods, and the demand for supply the increased demand for commodities. He would have to call in all idle hands and give them employment at good wages. In short, once begun, this movement would be irresistible. Extremes meet and moderate themselves toward the mean. If once fairly put in motion, the machine would swing on its own way, and greater reforms indispensable, finally working out the solution of the labor problem. This reform, however, must not begin where it is most suitably needed. There is no immediate help from the masses of labor most disastrously wrecked by the industrial war. Sentiment must submit to "economic necessity," and those who are least pinched must first be attended to and surrounded with greater comforts. Only slowly, therefore, will it act itself up, and its future classes of laborers, for their degradation and brutality are too deep to allow them any rapid elevation and development.

To be continued.

LOVE, MARRIAGE, AND DIVORCE,
AND THE SOVEREIGNTY OF THE INDIVIDUAL.

A DISCUSSION

BY

Henry James, Horace Greeley, and Stephen Pearl Andrews.

MR. ANDREWS' REPLY TO MR. JAMES AND MR. GREELEY.

Continued from No. 120.

You speak in the most hopeless manner of the final removal of murder from the face of the earth. Do you reflect that already among us one-half of the crimes of the Old World are—shall we say?—are accounted for by jealousy and hatred, and by the desire to punish? That is, by a breach of the law as it is written, or as it is, in the popular sense, as it is understood. Here it is unknown, even by name, among the common people. What, now, is the cause of this wonderful phenomenon,—that one-half of the known crimes of the world is accounted for by the desire to punish? It is simply this,—that the artificial institutions against which these crimes are but the natural and necessary results of oppression and rebellion. These, however, give themselves ground for existence—because there is no other institution, to be replaced by better institutions, but by the absence of institutions—by the natural and untrammeled action of individuals in a state of freedom. There is no law against murder, because there is no institution of slavery; there is no law against suicide, because there is no institution of suicide; there is no law against robbery, because there is no institution of robbery; there is no law against stealing, because there is no institution of stealing, and the abolition of institutions is nothing less than the establishment of the natural and untrammeled action of individuals in a state of freedom.

There is already far more murder among us than elsewhere in the world, because there are less protections of the individual. With still less protection, there will be still less murder, and, with the addition of equitable relations between capital and labor, there will be none. Crime is just as much a matter of cultivation as potatoes, and the way to prevent it is the way to prevent the growth of the plant, just as much as any chemical process. Chemical processes go on and fail to go on in nature without our knowledge, but we can learn them and hasten or prevent them. Crime is just as much a matter of cultivation as potatoes, and the way to prevent it is the way to prevent the growth of the plant, just as much as any chemical process. Chemical processes go on and fail to go on. We are not aware of the existence of artificial institutions, and the ignorant and false ideas in men's minds growing out of our relation to those institutions, whereby acts are construed to be crimes, which, by the institutions of nature, are not crimes; and, 2. The denial of equality, grown out of ignorance of the scientific principle of equality, and out of the want of sufficient intelligence and expansion of the intellect to enable men to see that their interest is secured by the principle of equality, or "the life of the whole," out of the denial of the sovereignty of the individual in all things, and out of a false or scientific commercial system.

I see clearly that a system in which I do not participate the fears of the conservative and half-way progressive, from the growth of the sovereignty of the individual. Still further, I recognize that evils and disorderly conduct grow out of the system of law and order, and that the way to prevent it is the way to prevent the growth of the plant, just as much as any chemical process. Chemical processes go on and fail to go on. We are not aware of the existence of artificial institutions, and the ignorant and false ideas in men's minds growing out of our relation to those institutions, whereby acts are construed to be crimes, which, by the institutions of nature, are not crimes; and, 2. The denial of equality, grown out of ignorance of the scientific principle of equality, and out of the want of sufficient intelligence and expansion of the intellect to enable men to see that their interest is secured by the principle of equality, or "the life of the whole," out of the denial of the sovereignty of the individual in all things, and out of a false or scientific commercial system.

You expressly acknowledge, you can not but acknowledge, that marriage does not work well for all the parties concerned,—only for some of them; and that the first must be consulted in the framing of their life in which the individual is the others. No such system will ever content the world, nor ever should. It does not mean that the wants of the community have been satisfied in the union of the burdens and benefits of life. But I see just as clearly that the remedy for those evils does not lie in the direction of repression or forcible constraint, but in the acceptance of the principle of the individual. I will go back to the system which has been tried, and disastrously failed, for thousands of years, but is going forward to the discovery and application of a new and effectual system.

The Rag-Picker of Paris.

By FELIX FYAT.

Translated from the French by Benj. B. Tucker.

PART FIRST.

THE BASKET.

Continued from No. 120.

Some of the neighbors leaned over the bannisters and jumped back, frightened.

"It is he?" asked Mme. Didier, with a gleam of hope.

There was no answer.

"What is the matter?" she continued.

"Nothing good," murmured a member of the group.

She rushed to the stairs, preserving her child to her bosom.

"Do so farther, poor lady!" said a man who was hurriedly ascending.

It was Jean.

But, borne on by her impulse, the unfortunate woman violently pushed him aside.

Banker, collector, cashier, and officer followed her.

Some municipal guards appeared, bearing a torch.

"Arrêt!" cried the banker, deceived by appearances.

But suddenly the body of Jacques Didier came into view upon a stretcher.

"Not dead!" said the poor woman, with a terrible cry.

"Yes, at least," answered the banker, "it is all to keep from falling. Murdered! Murdered!" repeated the widow, throwing herself upon the stretcher.

"Disdained!" he reproached.

"My husband! My baby!"

"Oh! Maman! God! My God! restore my uncertainty!"

And a flood of blood rushed to the banker's neck and head.

"You see that we are not all knaves or fools," said Brémont, gravely, "you ought to be a richer and you find yourself a rich man."

The banker heard no more; his apoplexy stifled him; and, stammering these incoherent words: "Maturity, end of the mouth, bankruptcy!" he sank at the head of the stairs like an ox fed to a club.

The widow, raising her head, saw the miserable man fallen near Jacques at her feet, and with a movement of sublime compassion she exclaimed:

"A poor millionaire!" Then, quickly entering her room again and depositing her baby in the cradle, she was the first to go to the banker's bed, moistening his temples with salts and water.

"Ah! he would not do as much," said the cashier, deeply moved and looking at her employer, who was recovering consciousness. "A strong-box is not a heart!" he boasted around the banker. The cashier aided the guards to bear him away.

It is said that the name Calais was found in the heart of Queen Elizabeth. The word was heard, and would have been understood by the others. No such system will ever content the world, nor ever should. It does not mean that the wants of the community have been satisfied in the union of the burdens and benefits of life. But I see just as clearly that the remedy for those evils does not lie in the direction of repression or forcible constraint, but in the acceptance of the principle of the individual. I will go back to the system which has been tried, and disastrously failed, for thousands of years, but is going forward to the discovery and application of a new and effectual system.

You expressly acknowledge, you can not but acknowledge, that marriage does not work well for all the parties concerned,—only for some of them; and that the first must be consulted in the framing of their life in which the individual is the others. No such system will ever content the world, nor ever should. It does not mean that the wants of the community have been satisfied in the union of the burdens and benefits of life. But I see just as clearly that the remedy for those evils does not lie in the direction of repression or forcible constraint, but in the acceptance of the principle of the individual. I will go back to the system which has been tried, and disastrously failed, for thousands of years, but is going forward to the discovery and application of a new and effectual system.
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There are times when the course that such men follow is the best policy, and then their conduct is of the noblest. But there are times also when it is sheer lunacy, and then their conduct is not for sane men to admire. Did Mr. French ever hear of the Charge of the Light Brigade at Balaklava? Does he remember the comment of the military man who witnessed that memorable, that splendid, that insane exploit, fruitful in nothing save the slaughter of half a thousand men: "It is magnificent, but it is not war." The editor of Liberty is engaged in war.

Mr. Underwood and the Anarchists.

To the Editor of Liberty:

In your issue of May 20 you speak of my "slandrous references to Anarchists" in the Boston "Investigator." If I had been so guilty as to call any class or body of men "slanders" I should have done so consciously. I am confident that I have not done so at all. Who are Anarchists? You say Thomas Paine was an Anarchist. If this be true then I agree with Paine in his views of government. Perhaps you will be kind enough to reproduce one or two of the "slandrous references to Anarchists" with which you say I am charged. I am in truth to be just to every class of thinker, whether I concur in their views or not.

Yours truly,

F. B. UNDERWOOD.

The "Home Guard" Heard From.

The last issue of the "Workmen's Advocate" contains the following communication:

To the Workmen's Advocate:

Oh! what a feeling of rapture came over me as I began reading the dialogue between Tucker and Fenno in the last number of Liberty. I need not needlessly say that Fenno is the friend who collected the poll tax. My thoughts went back to another age and to distant climes. I thought of John Hampden refusing to pay his poll tax; and how often had asked myself, who will be the leader in this, the struggle of the fourth estate? Where is the man who will dare resist oppression and to the last? Here was the man who would risk all for Liberty! And although he lost his life, still would he be true to her!

But notice how he maintained his position! He took the big iron dollar from his pocket and gave it to the minister.

Oh, Ignorance! Instead of refusing to pay, he indulges in a little bilinguism,—a favorite pastime with him. He pays, and as he does, he and we must wonder whether the other leader. Is this what Ego Anarchists call "passive resistance"? If it is, it is certainly passive.

DEALER, JUNE 5.

When I published the poll-tax interview, I forewarned that it would call out some such rubbies as the above from my社会主义 critics. The fact that timely re- treat often saves from defeat seldom saves the retreating soldier from the vengeance of the "home guard." The "stay-at-homes" are great worriers of glory, but they are always willing to kill others win. It the man of peace who man runs is never a hero, although the true soldier may know him for the bravest of the brave. After reading such a criticism as Mr. French's well may one exclaim with Wilfred Scawen Black: "What men call courage is the least noble thing of which they boast." To my mind there is no such depth of poorness as that of the man who does not dare to run. For he has not the real courage to obey his own judgment against that "spoils" public opinion, above which his mind is not sufficiently emancipated to rise in so. Placed in a situation where, from the choice of one or the other horn of a dilemma, it must follow either that fools will think a man a coward or that wise men will think him a fool, I can conceive of no possible ground for basing my selection. I know my circumstances better than Mr. French can know them, and I do not permit him to be my judge. When I want glory, I know how to get it. But I am not working for glory. Like the base ball player who società the individual is the man who has re- ceived of his club, I am "playing for my team," that is, I am working for my cause. And I know that, on the whole, it was better for my cause that I should pay my tax this year than that I should refuse to pay it. It is this principle of self-interest that has guided me, and that some of them were men of distinct superiority in education, intelligence, and humanitarian sympathies, not only to the average American, but, in my judgment, to Mr. Underwood himself. And yet it would be a slander upon Mr. Underwood to apply to him such language as he applies to them. Is not his language equally a slander upon them?

Mr. Underwood's question as to who are Anarchists is not to the purpose at the present moment. Perhaps I ought to have been more definite in my accusation. In charging Mr. Underwood with "slandrous references to Anarchists," I may class various references to the men whom I call Anarchists.

As the "Investigator" has published a letter from a correspondent in which I am called upon to substantiate my complaint against Mr. Underwood, I hope that paper will have the kindness to reproduce this article, which I tender as a reply.

Liberty in the Incidental.

In reviewing my comments on Comrade Lealy's position, I am reminded that the subject is not exhausted; that there are incidental injuries as well as incidental benefits; that there is a reverse as well as an obverse to the coin. And this side of the question puzzles me. What exactly is the meaning of Anarchism at least as much as the other, and perhaps more.

The question appears and reappears in a hundred different forms, but so far, by holding fast to the principles of individuality and cost, I have always been able to answer it, at least to my own satisfaction. I have said that the fact that we are troubled is a false conception of what constitutes liberty, and, consequently and necessarily, a false conception of what constitutes a violation of liberty. They do not consider their problems in the light of Anarchism.

The most disagreeable, yet perhaps the most necessary, part of a teacher's function is the frequent reference to first principles, the constant repetition of fundamental definitions, the patient restatement of apparent truths. And this labor we Anarchists may consider our own, but it is no accommodation. Where else with definitions of liberty and of government, knowing right well that, when all men accept these definitions, our battle will be more than half won; and when all men understand them, there will be no more battle for all time.

Liberty for the unassociated man is the right to do as he pleases. But the unassociated man is either the man unknown or a criminal. If we do not know him, he is to us non-existent, and if a criminal, we are against him. Therefore the only liberty we are concerned with is social liberty. Social liberty is the right of each to do as he pleases co-equal with his fellow, or the right of each to do as he pleases at his own expense,—equal liberty. Crime is an invasion of social, equal, liberty. Government, viewed in its history and progress, is the enemy of liberty; the enemy of the invasion of equal liberty. Therefore government and crime are synonyms, governments are criminals, criminals are governors, and action or association to resist crime, government, is not properly to be called government (for that is confusion and contradiction), but defense.

Tiresome and ridiculous as the following questions must appear to many, they are asked every day by awakening minds of the first intelligence, and urged as objections to the philosophy of liberty. Thus: "I am a Christian, and a belief in the sacredness of marriage, but there's my neighbor, Mr. White, living right opposite me with a shameless creature whom he has not married. He takes walks and rides with her, and wherever she goes, and it's the scandal of the neighborhood, a perfect nuisance. I know a family that moved away rather than endure it, and it is frightfully demoralizing to my son and daughters. As a free woman I have a right to live in a decent neighborhood. She ought to be arrested, any way," etc.

Sad case. Let's see,—you appeal in the name of freedom?—to freedom we will go. You are Christian and married, these "nuisances" are un-Christian and unmarried; equal liberty, all right. He goes with the "shameless creature, walks, to ride, everywhere. Well, you go with your husband, who appears equally shameless, to walk, ride, everywhere. Right again. The "scandal of the neighborhood"? "Whose fault is that? If the neighborhood minded its own business,
would there be any sound? Certainly these people desire not.

Scoundrels have a right to scare themselves with their own phantasms, but let them take care they do not tell lies that the accused have no chance to refute with the truth. The "nuisanceappears to be of their own construction; for, if you agree with these, you are your friends, and no nuisance, yet their attitude would be unchanged.

What shall be thought of those who construct nuisances? The family that moved was free to stay, therefore not invaded. The "demoralization" of your soil is inherited and protected on the idea of immortality, and, accordingly, upon their self-satisfaction of the "demoralizing" agent or agencies. Suppose this "shameless" one begets a son and daughters, who are demoralized by your Christianity and marriages.

What then? As a freeborn citizen I am in a "shameless neighborhood"—if you can find your ideal in that respect—but no right to compel any neighborhood, or any individual, to subscribe to your ideas of decency; for in so doing you cease to be a free woman and become a tyrant woman.

Finally, you would have me arrest a tenant in preference to the man, because, although they are equal in fact, act, you have made the greatest "nuisance" in your fancy.

Pardon, reader, this is dull, but it discovers a most important fact, that a nuisance can only be a nuisance through some supplementary and voluntary act of our own is not an invasion.

Just as my neighbor opposite cannot compel me rightfully to share the expense of his lawns-plaing because of my delight in it,—the benefit being no less selfish except to me—are by law my Christian friend cannot hold the "shameless creature" responsible for an injury that is only an injury through her own fancy. Suppose that I am not aesthetic, and the lawn is to me a nuisance, and suppose that my friend is not Christian, nor his lawn to me any nuisance, and the benefactor's injury, what then? The lawn and the lady have not changed. If I leave a loaded pistol on my table, and my neighbor comes in and shoots himself with it, can he hold me responsible for the hole in his leg? If I have a gleaming dog, chained, and my inquisitive neighbor interviews him, with disaster to the cutie, can I blame me for the bite? Leave the dog, the pistol, and the "shameless creature" alone, and they are all equally harmless; concern yourself with their affairs, and you do so at your own risk. Let these injuries, real or fictitious, be ascribed to an invasion, where it is necessarily and unavoidably injurious, in the probable course of events, and without any voluntary assistance or cooperation on the part of the one injured.

Here is another problem: "Jake, the newly-boy, baited and raked every falling pine on all the woodland on the esplanade. He was promptly arrested for the outrage."

But the outrage was in the arrest. Jake had a right to be clean, a right to bathe, a right to such dress, or undress, as pleased him. Nothing in his behavior was injurious, unless something was added to it by the one injured. To be sure, the dwellers on the esplanade were shocked. Old women in caps fainted, and old women in whiskers muttered "Comstock"; nuns who were prudes gasped, and nuns prudently giggled; but it must be confessed that a buck town in Turkey would have been equally aghast at the undressing of a lady's stockings. And there were three remarkable exceptions. Miss Palette, the artist, sat down with innocent enthusiasm and sketched the handsome skull; Dr. Griswold was inspired to write an article for the "Popular Science Monthly" on "The Sanitary Value of Sun, Air, and Water Baths for the Poor"; and Prof. Idaho fell into a profound and delightful reverie upon the Golden Age. Griswold and Prof. Idaho were not offended, but Convention and Christian Morality had fits. Jake, I acquit you; but—go bathe with your breeches on hereafter, for it was said by one of old time that a prophet had no honor in his own time and country."

Supposing that in Anarchia a majority of city residents paves a street, on which other residents, not shakers of the cost, choose to travel. These latter wear out pavements they have not paid for, and destroy property without, and get something for nothing, which is injustice. You will be obliged either to forbid these non-cooperators to travel your streets, or you must tax them with a share of the cost.

That is one of the fundamental rights is the right of free travel, in any direction, and with as much directness as is reasonable and consistent with the necessary occupancy and cultivation of the major part of Earth's surface. The public streets do not belong to any one man; neither are they the property of any one community, or region, or wilderness, unpossessed except at the moment of using it. If I lay a look down in the street, I may go in and recover it, for it is my property: but if the foot of a pedestrian has defaced it, I can call for no remuneration, for the road is for everyone to travel in and out of the wilderness; nevertheless, on the other hand, if I fell a tree into the street, I may be compelled to remove it, and pay all damages, for the road is for travel, and must not be obstructed. If I lay a pave stone in the street in order to cross it, without the consent of him who goes that may travel on it; I may put what I please in the street at my own cost, for the road, being nobody's, is as much mine as anybody's; but anybody may travel on what I put there; for the road was left to promote the liberty of travel, and not to pay for improvements made in the road before he can travel to obstruct the liberty of travel,—is to be an invader. Howbeit I may make private roads, competing with, but not obstructing, the public roads, as many as I please, and the tolls from all who use them.

The right to travel being so sacred, you cannot, in Anarchia, prevent a sick traveller from carrying germs, or in any way establish quarantine.

Why not? In the order of liberty superior rights necessarily take the form of inferior ones, and the same fundamental right is the right to live,—the right of self-defense. A man has a right to travel, but if his travelling, necessarily, in the probable course of events, will bring sickness and perhaps death to me, I am justified in stopping it till I feel safe. A man whose travelling is a means of escape, is not travelling at his own expense,—is not fulfilling the necessities of equal liberty. Certainly a justifiable quarantine does not invade liberty.

"A exposes whiskey for sale, and tempts young men by various devices to go to his saloon and drink. He should be prohibited."

Not so. The temper can do no injury except by the willing cooperation of the tempted; the injury is not a necessary or unavoidable one; therefore the right to tempt, which is a right of free exchange and communication of ideas, must be kept inviolate. But the tempter has no right to obtrude his temptation upon the unwilling to be tempted. I have a right to prohibit his tempting me, just as I have a right to prohibit all non-defensive acts toward me. I can always lock my doors, and he cannot compel me to listen to go beyond temptation,—is utter invasion.

Tempor [never] can be prohibited by law; it can only be made, at the most, infrquent and secret; and the infrquent and secret temptation is the more dangerous, because there is no moral courage as a defense. There must be free competition between temptation and counter-temptation, between persuasion and refusal, vice and virtue, and wisdom, the run-seller and the total abstainer, the prostitute who sells mock love for corson and the soul-worn man who has eschewed the love.

And we must trust Liberty as we hope for happiness. J. W. Lloyd.

J. K. Ingalls, the well-known pioneer in land reform and author of "Social Wealth," announces a course of Industrial Economy Lectures, dealing with the questions of land, money, credit, competition, and cooperation. The terms are ten dollars for the course and one dollar per lecture. Mr. J. K. Ingalls and Mrs. O. H. F. Ingalls, live at Glenora, Yates Co., New York, one of the most healthy and picturesque spots on Seneca Lake, and parties who would like, not only copies of the lectures, but oral illustra-

*See A. Warren's communication on the seventh page.
"Ah! his poor blood! Dumb, dull, cold, dead!"

And, despairing of saving her use, she took the body in her arms and laid it on the coffin lid.

She perceived by her Jean had remained a witness of it desolation. At all risk he had rejoined the patrol and guided it to Didier's address. Agitated, she discovered to the story just above the ground-floor, where the janitor's lodge was located.

"Have you anything to let here?" he asked the janitor, abruptly.

"Yes, a loft," answered the janitor, slowly.

"Nothing. I simply wanted to know. I will come back."

And he descended, or rather jumped down, the rest of the stairs, wiping two big tears from his eyes, as he dashed the janitor saying:

"Really, I didn't think I knew how to weep. Ah! yes, I will come back, by tomorrow at the latest."

CHAPTER VII

AT THE PAVILION.

The next day the entire press reported the double tragedy of the Berville mansion and the Didier garret.

The authorities, convinced that the body was the remains of Jacques to his widow, instead of sending it to the Morgue, as is the rule. Right-thinking journals, well-cared for out of the secret funds, did not fail to affirm that it was a grand consolation to those six women in her afflication able to buy her husband at her own expense.

It was necessary, then, to pay for burial in any cemetery save that of the criminals, which receives its bodies from the Morgue and from the scaffold, scoundrels and outcasts, murderers and suicides, the whole offscouring of civilization, no less good than Providence, that other Divine.

An immense current of interested sympathy was formed. . . . for whom? For M. Berville. And everybody repeated after his newspaper: "This poor man!" As for the widows, these of her own free will, she was left to herself. For she had no stockholders, no person interested in her safety.

What is the ruin of a woman of the people? That of a banker is quite another thing.

The principal creditors and stockholders of the Berville Bank granted a renewal of their claims for a fortnight, thus permitting the banker to double the cash of maturity, which they thought confirmed the viability of the treasury; but at least M. Berville had a breathing-spell before the inevitable crash that awaited him on the fifteenth of the month, the wealthy classes' day of settlement, the final of the cedounced delay.

That of the poor, the petty rent-day, as it is scornfully called by the proprietors, was near at hand with no prospect of indulgence. Consequently the pawn-shops were as busy as bees. The central office in the Rue des Blancs-Manteaux, was crowded from morning till night. The entire laboring and consequently needy population of Paris came to this shrine of Saint Necessity to pledge their poor offerings of watch chains, of cravats, of pianos, of pianettes.

A woman dressed in black made her way into the office of pledges and redemptions.

Undeciphered or unknown, she looked on for a moment at the continuous and varied procession, by turns ludicrous and pitiful, of those coming and going. She did not notice the presence of a man in a boote, who had entered behind her and was borne concealed on a bench in a dark room.

Summoning all her courage, she finally took her place between two raltinings, running in front of the graded windows.

The clerks, bending over their registers, noted the pledges, took strict account of the names, addresses, and professions of the borrowers in order to strip them as much as possible, delivered them their pawn-tickets, and handed them cards against which the cases of the sums loaned.

The attendant went back and forth, taking the packages and carrying them into an adjoining room, where they were estimated in a loud voice.

The woman was the last of a trio of thirty persons, arranged in sing-song as at the ticket-office of a theater, all having packages or articles in their hands.

A girl dressed with the elegance of an interloper, with a fine India cashmere on her back and a short silk mantle under her arm, then entered as if perfectly at home and went straight to the window without noticing the procession.

"At the end of the line!" cried the crowd.

Not disconcerted, the beauty slipped a coin into the attendant's hand and advanced.

"At the end of the line! at the end of the line!" the voices repeated, louder than before.

"It is an outrage!" exclaimed a Hercules with a husky voice.

"What do you expect?" answered the attendant; "it is a custom.

She was already at the window, on the other side of the raling, handing in her shawl.

"Ah! this has been here before," said the clerk, not examining it very closely;

"number 66, ninety dollars.

"I need a hundred dollars.

"Then provide your security, my dear.

She took off her face veil.

"Oh!" exclaimed the coquettish, "it is Sophie."

"My daughter! Sophie! Sophie!" cried in a turn of the head at the head of the line, "give me a dollar."

"What is this creature mean?" said Sophie, superciliously.

"All right! One hundred dollars," said the clerk, receiving the veil. "Forty cents to be deducted for the wrapping."

Sophie threw over her received the hundred dollars, and, putting on her mantle, went out, as proud and irresponsible as Queen Victoria.

"Number 67. Come, be quick," cried the clerk from his window, the space in front of which was occupied by a woman.

And the denied mother, a poor madonna with a poor Jesus clinging to her neck, who, either from shame or fear, had hesitated a moment before opening her bundle, with a trembling hand laid a heap of rags upon front of the window.

They were the woman and the innocent who had presided at the lottery of the bank at Hood's Hotel.

"We cannot lend on those," said the attendant, pushing back the needy woman's collar.

"I am in such need, good people," she murmured. "Only twenty cents. I have nothing but these things, and no bread."

"You know very well that we do not lend less than sixty cents," said the clerk.

"Monsieur! I beg of you," said the poor woman.

"This is not the charity department; go to the board of public relief."

"Come, my old woman, make room for the others," said the attendant.

The unfortunate creature left the railing and went away, saying in an undertone to the staidie:

"Nothing left, nothing! Ah! such heartless people as my daughter!"

She passed by the woman in the other, and, crippled with slipping a few coins into her hand, said, in a voice of inefable sadness:

"For the little one."

"Ah! thank you," exclaimed the other. "God bless you! This saves us till tomorrow."

And she passed on, pressing her baby, who also uttered his moan of thanks, more closely than ever to her breast.

"Number 68," cried the clerk.

A drunken and dissolute man, another acquaintance of the Hotel d'italie, the homeless of the North, asked by the policeman to lay down his revolver, stumbled for a moment, and, with her shoulders, said:

"One moment, and I will show you, governor... I have been robbed..."

"One could say that my aunt has nephews and all sorts of relatives. What a family! It is enough to stifle one! It makes one hot and thirsty. Ah! but don't push so in the rear. Say, easy there, relatives!"

"Well!" said the attendant. "Will you clear out?"

And he gave him a push.

"Take care... fragile! You are answerable for breakage. I come to put myself in page, I tell you."

"In case you mean," said the clerk, intervening.

Then, calling the officer on duty, he said:

"We have had enough of this. Officer, take Monsieur into the jewelry room."

The drunken tried to resist.

"I tell you that I wish to be hung up."

"That's what we are going to do with you," retorted the clerk. "Next!"

The officer led away the obstinate man, who still went on jangling:

"You will give the ticket to my wife. She will come to redeem me, the tall woman, who will not open her cashmere. She loves me like a brother; as a matter of fact, I do it as a pleasure. When one is a fine specimen of a man, he ought to live on his physique, eh?"

"Number 69, a clock. . . . Ah! we are deaf with them, two dollars," cried the clerk: "number 70, a set of teeth, not new, sixty cents."

Number 61, a mere cast, 

"Not a dollar?"

"Boy, we have too many of these traps. Eighty cents. . . . will you take it?"

"I must."

"Twenty cents for wrapping, you know?"

The workman bit his nails and crumbled as he passed to the cashier's office, where he was given but sixty cents.

A freshly-slated individual, looking like a clergyman, advanced a picture.

"Number 72, a sword, three dollars. No, it is a sword of honor, with the name upon it: only two dollars and forty cents."

The valuations continued.

A gentleman, decorated and serious as a diplomat, was at the window.

"A necklace of the order of the Golden Fleece . . . an imitation. Number 73, one dollar."

A workingman, in the prime of life, bended in the implements of his toil, saying in a discouraged tone:

"No more work... No need of tools..."

"Number 74, a hammer, tippers, etc., eighty cents."

"Not a dollar?"

"We cannot take that. Ah! yes, the frame is copper: a dollar and forty cents."

"That is not much for my poor little one, Monsieur."

"Or your mistress," muttered the workman on his way to the payment office.

And he added, laughing:

"See, the Good God! the Good God also pulls the devil by the tail."

A musician took his place before the window.

"A violin," said he.

"Try it," said the clerk.

The artist began to play the "Marseillaise."

"Stop, or I arrest you!" exclaimed the officer, just then coming in. All right, Number 76, six dollars, continued the appraiser.

A score of people in several husts under the head of objects of art.

"Number 77, Charles X, Napoleon I, and Louis XVIII. Three plasterers, not much difference: a dollar, forty cents, twenty cents,—in all, a dollar and sixty."

The Herculoids had returned behind the cashier.

"Louis Eighteen," he cried, with his massive wit, "Louis Eighteen! I prefer eighteen louis! Where is she, who has twenty-five? I must have her."

Again the officer put him out.

"Ah! Number 78, a silver watch with its chain, and a second-hand wedding ring, with three small diamonds, five dollars."

The tired clerk raised his eyes upon the person offering them.

It was the last comers.

"Your name?"

"Madame Didier."

"Residence?"

"Rue Sainte-Marquetaire."

"Business?"

"Seamstress."

"Have you your husband's authorization?"

"I am a widow, Monsieur."

"Then a death certificate is necessary; two licensed witnesses must answer for you and sign upon this register, respectively."

"Two licensed witnesses?"

"Yes, two merchants of your neighborhood."

"But I have nobody, Monsieur. I cannot make my position known to everybody. It is impossible."

"I am very sorry, but it is indispensable."

"The gift you will make my things: I will go to a second-hand dealer."

"No. The pledge is seized. Here is a receipt."

To be continued.
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Equity in Love.

To the Editor of Liberty.

Zelman's letter (No. 115) resembles mine: "Independent men and women, in independent homes, leading separate and independent lives, with full freedom to form and dissolve relations, and with perfectly legal and respectable "opportunities to happiness, home and love."

The difference seems trifling, yet without equity her beautiful life would be sterile. That Zelman does not fully appreciate equity, is shown by his suggesting that freedom assumes the costs of maternity and the rearing and educating of children, obligingly assigning men to the role of a drone in a bee hive. It will never to encourage robbery by favoring baby-killing and female infanticide; we must not forget that we are laying a foundation for pure and unselfish equity, which cannot compensate with interest for voluntary contributions, to pay the costs of maternity and childhood; said fund constituting a restraining balance-wheel by throwing the costs of sexual invasion and folly upon the transgressors, by the worsted parties refusing to support them.

Intelligent men cannot afford indifference in matters of education, which does mean the perpetuation of our hobbies through children, whose education should be free and who should be allowed to educate themselves, the task of educating oneself being sufficiently supplied for students, selected with impartiality.

Truly yours,

James Therry.

Laramie City, Wyoming, June 3, 1889.

The Rights of Babies.

In determining the rights of classes of persons, there is but one standard that will bear radical criticism, and that is the absolute sovereignty of each individual. It is true that few, if any, of every year's generation, live, and, in fact, more than this standard. Even the great apenches of freedom, Warren and Andrews, adopted it only with the limitation, "Each of his own kind.

"According to this principle, a man could not own land out of the salary received very near it, and none nearer, perhaps, than the editor of Liberty. Some of these, with him, go so far as to be satis- fied with no land at all, even for the superior- ity of land. They want no government, at all; which, indeed, seems quite radical enough,—seems to mean absolute freedom for every human being. I will admit, for the present, that it does mean that; but do they construct it in the affairs of every-day life? Has any one ever pretended to take the idea of land? I have been led to utter this criticism by the appearance in Liberty, No. 125, of "A Reply to Victor," which Mr. Tower very concisely and unqualifiedly endorses. Zelman has come closest of all authors I have seen to a correct application of the principle in the sexual realm. She (I take Zelman to be a woman) has expressed my thought on the subject, that I shall have been very near it, except upon one point. As to this one point, without depre- cating the many beautiful truths of her article, I wish to enter a protest. In her sensitiveness to the needs and aspirations of true womanhood, she has, I think, overlooked the needs and rights of children. I credit her with overlooking these. She was not thinking of the rights of a child, or soul went out, just as the child goes out. If so, there can be no other person. Zelman says: "Except in those cases where the mother has been left a widow, she has never known what it was to own land; it is not any particular plot of land, but what it was that she bargained for." "I do not feel that it is a blessing to a woman to bear children whom she can not control," says Zelman. This is the point I wish to fault. I do not fault the right of the mother to control her child. This is included in her individuality; but it is not her exclusive right. It belongs to the father also, and to everybody else. The right is not different for women than for control adults. It is not derived from motherhood or fatherhood; and it is not a commodity that can be purchased on any terms. Good sense and fair manly affection, or any idea of benefit to the governed. It is simply a prerogative of sovereignty. There is but one question as to controlling others, or attempting such control, and that is, "Will it pay?" To this question the answer is not a constant quantity; and this is why I am not an Anarchist. I am in favor of government wherever there is need of government. I do not see that government necesarily consists of a denial of individual freedom. If all could agree to respect one another's sovereignty, then government would be useless, but until we come to this agreement, I shall resist any effort to make us both offensive and defensive. I am in favor of preserving this agreement, and, in saving it in practical life, so as to save all agreements, by the terms, the form, the true exchange of services, justice, liberty, security, property, all express the same idea under different aspects.

Power for Power's Sake.

[Emile Zola in His Excellency Eugene Rongon.]

Without, frightened France was dominated by monarchists, emperors. He knew Rongon's iron hand; on the day after the attempted assassination, he had said to him, in his wrath of a savaged man: "No moderation! you must make yourself understood!" And he had just armed him with that terrible law of general safety, which authorized banning to Aligar or expulsion from the empire of any person who practiced political offences.

Although no French hand had been stept in the crime of the Rue Le Peletier, republicans were to be ferreted out and exiled. On the removal of ten thousand arrested persons who had been forgotten on the Second of December. They talked of a movement set foot by the re-oligary party; it was given out at arm's length, and papers did not print a single line. Many hundred and eighty exiles had been shipped from Toulon. Now, every week, a convoy started. The country trembled, in the terror which reeked, like storm-rager, from the green vaulted offices in which Rongon laughed all alone as he stretched himself. Never had the great man tasted such contentment. He was the most glorious of men; freedom had come back to him with power. When he walked, he buried his heels heavily in the carpet, that the weight of his steps might be heard in the four corners. It was his desire to be recognized, and all his desire for recognition, was to show the world where he was going; he has no tobacco, no hat, no clothes to speak of,—and yet here are taxes! "But what are you paying for?" I inquired, in my astonishment.

"I pay for two souls!"

"But why, then, do you not wish to have one?"

"Just as I stand!"

"So you must have some land?"

"No. I pay for not having land."

And he added by way of explanation:

"It is best to pay in this manner... If we had to pay for the land, we could not get along... As it is, Heaven be praised!"

"You prefer to pay your taxes without accepting your allot- ment?"

"I asked, uncertain whether I really understood him.

"Very much so."

"Hold on. You mean that you part of your own free will with your right to the land while paying taxes on it?"

"Exactly."

"Why so? Could you not rent your land to somebody, if you cannot use it yourself?"

"No: but it is nothing but swamp," said he triumphantly.

"Nobody would take it."

"Swamp! Well, don't use it then. But why not hold it? It can do you no harm."

"You mean to help yourself to have anything to do with such land?"

"Well, don't have anything to do with it; but why not keep it? Something may turn up to make it advantageous."

"Re, you! I see, if I hold the land, I am free to do as I please."

"Yes, if I own the Mir, and am compelled to do everything that is required of active members of the commune. I should have to pay for the highway, the maintenance of police, and a sum of money for other members of the commune. As it is, I buy my immunity by agreeing to pay the tax on two souls and leaving the land to the Mir. I pay my tax, and I am free and can do as I like. You see now?"

Parentage and Function of Politics. [Bureaucr.] The progressive nature of man causes spoliation to develop resistance, and knowledge, which unrolls its implications. But spoliation does not confer self- conquered; she only becomes more crafty, and, enveloped in the folds of forms and in a system of checks and counterchecks, she gives birth to politics, long a profligate resource. We then see usurping the liberty of the true notion of protection, and every one appeals to law to give his services a fictitious value.

The True Meaning of Laissez Faire. [Repar.] When we assert that men's interests are harmonious, when we conclude that they naturally tend and gravitate towards the reality of the common good, it is essential per- cept to state the point on which we are not, allow them to be disturbed. According as we conform to these laws or violate them, good or evil is produced; in other words, right or wrong. In every branch of government and services are freely and voluntarily exchanged against ser- vices. Does this imply that we lose sight of, or approve, the efforts which have been made in all ages, and are still being made, to alter by force or fraud the natural equili- brium of services? This is exactly what we repudiate as a violation of the natural order. But it should be known, that in all the terms, the forms, the true exchange of services, justice, liberty, security, property, all express the same idea under different aspects.

Not Public, But Private Works. [Star News.] A Memphis writer says: "The secret of English's great power, her success in her war with her continental enemies, lies, after all, in the liberality with which public works are conducted than in force of arms. The arts of peace, as well as those of war, are the most efficacious means of winning and maintaining friendship. Nevertheless, there is not a commercial harbor in Great Britain which has not been improved by an incorporated company, contrary to the plans of the people. If Great Britain owes her life to the British fleet, to the enterprise of second and third generations of her people, which always accommodate himself. His sole passion was to be superior. Only, at the present hour, the circumstances under which that renovated policy has to be conducted, the way he has been forced to do it, the emperor he held entire liberty of action, thus realizing his old desire to drive men with the lash, as he would a herd. Nothing daunted, he turned his back on the people. Then, sometimes, when he was branded between the shoulders with the name of tyrant, he smiled and said those profound words: "If some day I should become liberal, they will say that I have changed."

As Usual, Protection Only for the Rich. [Star News.] One of the peculiar arguments of the congressmen is that misery weighs more with the poor than with the rich. This is not printed. In other words, if "privacy" has been practiced for one day or for years, piracy of the same kind may go on. If there were any justice in the world, privacy of six months or six or seven years' duration. The sill does not really guard the national copyright of a poor foreign author. It allows any publisher to pirate the works of all authors who had not rich enough to invent a copyright name in printing this in country or famous enough to get some American publisher to do so for them.
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