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NOT THE DAUGHTER BUT THE MOTHER OF ORDER.

"For always in thine eyes, O Liberty!\nShines that high light whereby the world is saved;\nAnd though thou slay us, we will trust in thee."—JOHN HAY.

On Picket Duty.

The strike has failed.
But, sooner or later, the Western Union and all other monopolies must go.

We are indebted to Mr. Samuel P. Putnam of New York for a copy of his admirable and entertaining romance, "Golden Throne." Our readers will remember the long extract which we once printed from one of the chapters of the philosophy of the Anarchists. It is enough to say that the selection in question was a fair sample of the whole. While fascinating as a story, it is also bold, broad, and powerful in its intellectual and moral teachings.

Louise Michel, the Anarchist, who did not know a Paris mob to pileage bakers-shops, was sentenced on that charge by a French court to six years' imprisonment and ten years' police supervision. M. Feulaint, the Orleans editor of the "Gaulois," who did not know the same Paris mob to march on President Garvey's residence, has been sentenced on the same charge by a French court to three months' imprisonment. Such is the justice that is administered in so-called republic France, which is not a republic at all, but a monarchy in disguise.

The failure of the telegraphers' strike is in itself a success,—perhaps a greater success than victory would have been. What more convincing demonstration, indeed, could have been given the people of the tremendous and dangerous power now wielded by capital? Certainly no body of workers has better advantages for carrying a strike to a successful end than the operators. If they make a failure of it, who can succeed? That is the question which the laborers will ask themselves, and, asking, will answer by eventually rescinding the strike in the assurance of that word, and devising and adopting more effective and far-reaching methods of obtaining justice.

Dr. R. M. Bucke's unique and interesting life of Walt Whitman, recently published, does a great service to raceism and to letters by reproducing that wonderful and passionate defence of intellectual liberty, "The Good Grey Fact," written by Wm. Douglass O'Connor of Washington in burning condemnation of the act of Secretary Harlan in turning Whitman out of the Interior Department for publishing an "immoral" book. The book also contains a new letter from Mr. O'Connor, which deals no less effectively with the persecutions to which Whitman has since been subjected. The two together furnish perhaps the highest example of invective launched in the cause of righteousness which English literature can show.

The movement to prevent English landlords and other aliens from owning American soil is one of those half-backed schemes which men who attempt to act upon a fundamental principle before they comprehend it are so apt to set on foot. The idea being in the air that property in land is robbery, certain patriotic Americans rush to the conclusion that Englishmen should be allowed to rob no longer, and that Americans must monopolize this form of theft. Why has not an Englishman, pray, as good a right as any other man to own soil anywhere on the globe? The truth is that no man, of whatever nationality, should be permitted in the possession of any soil except that which he is actually using. Liberty will aid with all its might to turn out the landlords everywhere; but she has condemned race discrimination against laborers, so she must also condemn race discrimination against capitalists.

Judge Nelson, whose fairness prevented the conviction of E. H. Haywood, and Judge Lowell, the other United States judge who presides in this section of the country, have given new proofs of their determination to do substantial justice by their recent decision in a case brought under the Chinese exclusion act. The master of a vessel was prose- cuted for landing a Chinese laborer in Boston. It being proved that Ah Shong, the laborer in question, was born and lived in Hong Kong after that island became British territory, the court decided that he is a British subject and hence does not come under the provisions of the Chinese act. This decision confines the application of the law strictly to Chinese subjects. Thus our courts have done what they can to restrict the operation of the tyranny created by our congress. Judges Nelson and Lowell will have no share, except as American citizens, in the shame that will be felt twenty years hence at our cowardly conduct toward the Chinese.

"Every man's labor," says the New York "Nation," "is worth what some other man will do it equally well for, and no more." That is to say, if one man demands for his labor the whole product thereof, he cannot have it because some other man is satisfied to perform the same labor for half of the product. But in that case what becomes of the other? Who is entitled to it, and what has he done to entitle him to it? Every man's labor is worth what it produces, and would command that, if all men were free. There is no natural rate for telegraphers any more than for bookkeepers or tanners. No more, truly, just as much. The natural rate of wages for ten hours of telegraphing or bookkeeping or teaming is as much money as will buy goods in the market for the production of which ten hours of equally tireless labor is required. And this rate would be the actual rate if unlimited competition were allowed in everything. That competition is a potent factor in the regulation of wages we admit, but what we further assert is that, if competition were universal and applied to capital as well as laborers, it would regulate wages in accordance with equity. All that we ask is absolutely free play for the economists' boasted law of supply and demand. Why are the capitalists so afraid of the logical extension of their own doctrines?

We call especial attention to the admirable letter from Switzerland, printed in another column, written by Marie Le Compte. No one who reads it can fail to be interested. In translating Bakounine's "Dieu et l'Etat" into English she is performing valuable service to the Revolution. Such a book is much needed in England. We have a translation nearly completed, and shall publish it as soon as we are able. Miss Le Compte errs in comparing the man whom Labadie supposed to be unwilling to sell his land for public purposes to the man whom we supposed to be unwilling to give up his tools in order that individual production might be abolished. Instances of the former are not frequently met, and, when Liberty, which tends to make men reasonable and accommodating, shall prevail, they will be very rare birds indeed; hence it is comparatively idle to discuss the cases of such men further than to say, as we did at the time, that their rights must be respected. But instances of the latter would certainly be very common if "Le Révolté" should attempt to carry out its plan of preventing men from earning their living in their own way. Many reasonable and public-spirited men would as soon rebel against any such act of tyranny. This, then, is not an idle but an important supposition, and we observe that "Le Révolté" shows no desire to consider it.

The letter in another column dealing with the controversy between General Walker and Henry George is very welcome. Such discussion of such a subject is always pertinent to Liberty. Upon the main question at issue between Walker and George as to the effect of improvements in transportation upon rent, we have nothing to say, for we are not sure that we know which is right and are very sure that we don't much care. We are after the entire abolition of rent, and know that this can be effected only by lifting all restrictions from the abuses of baking and de-}
THE TELEGRAPHERS' STRIKE.

A strike having the character and proportions of the recent struggle between the telegraph operators and their autocratic bosses stills the whole social atmosphere. The Anarchist, who from his methods of thinking is an outsider in such contests, except as a passive sympathizer with the strikers, finds in this many a curious and interesting lesson in the developments of the agitation, besides abundant confirmation of his belief that existing governments are deliberate conspiracies to blind, gag, and rob the producing masses.

The so-called "labor question" has come to be noised about so much that the American people have finally drifted into a vague conception that something is ticklish. They are no longer called to call monopolies a grave evil among us. But a monopoly is impossible in a nation and under Liberty. Monopoly is at war with the natural sense and the very self-interest of free individuals, wherever they are massed and left to their native sense of equity. There is no monopoly among the fishermen, the salt, fish, on the great banks of Newfoundland. There is no monopoly in a huckleberry pasture, where hundreds are gathering berries side by side. There is no monopoly among a hundred rude clam-diggers working side by side along the shore. Even in the Western mining regions, thousands of the roughest men have worked side by side upon their claims, without laws or lawyers, and never a monopolist dared raise his head. Upon any open field of free conditions a "mass of men sufficiently deprived, ignorant, and stupid to see a man of wealth rise among them, and use them as a means to attain to a free chance at natural wealth and opportunity could not be gathered from the face of the earth.

Whence, then, springs this hideous thing, monopoly? If it is at war with natural sense and is never suffered among aggregations of people left to themselves, it is evident that it can never be born, except from its parent, Authority. The root and great central leader of monopoly is the State, and all monopolies are simply appendages of it. Who owned Jay Gould and Cyrus Field with power to oppress their operatives, and who sustained them from day to day in the struggle just over? These thieves are simply using powers and prerogatives vested in them by the State, and any attempt to own them monopolists, must therefore consistently defend their lives and the property which has accrued from the monopoly.

If the governmental arrangement which vests Gould with a monopoly, and then defends his life and property under the consequent oppression, is legitimate and worthy of obedience, then why abuse him? He has the natural right to do what he will with his own. If this property is his, then that fictitious notion that the State has no more right to meddle with his business than with any other man's, that is, no right at all. The greedy miner in the far West, or the presuming clam-digger on the shore, who attempts to secure a monopoly, does so at the risk of his own life and property, and soon learns that most wholesome of all lessons, that he must take the consequences of his own deeds. If the government which arms Gould with monopoly, and then fortifies his life and property against the natural retribution that attends tyranny and theft, deserves to be curbed, then Grant is a gravely injured man who, when the public begin to vie him.

The fact is that Gould is not the monopolist at bottom. The machine behind him that falsely calls itself government is the real culprit. Gould is simply the creature and ward. Goulds and châtelles acquired through monopoly and then defended against combination and destruction by the State constitutes what is recognized under the law as property. Property thus defined is utterly impossible except through monopoly; it is virtually an existence in natural law. It is robbery, as Proudhon pronounced it, to defend it.

Hence the State, in defence of its creature, is bound to defend Gould's property. The vital secret of Gould's and the châtelles' system is in keeping the striker under the secret delusion that the monopolist's property must not be molested; for the capitalistic press well know that an intelligent attack upon the property of Gould soon resolves itself into an attack upon the State itself, which is virtually as equally protected by the laws as the child or the man of property. And the principle is the same.

Gould's life and property being safe, and strikers being as yet so blind as to believe that they ought to be safe, the strike has failed ignominiously. Our steady consolation is, the face of this and other failures, is that it is only a question of time when industrial slaves will learn to strike at the vitals of the whole conspiracy. If they learn their lesson rapidly enough, the revolution will be a peaceful one, and that Liberty may be inaugurated.

But the tyrants continue to put on the screws before the lesson is thoroughly learned, then physical force will be resorted to, and it will not take many well-directed blows to tumble down the whole mass of such thieves as Gould and Vanderbilt fleecing for their lives. The time of strikes which will launch swift and thrilling thunderbolts at the heart of monopoly is perhaps not so far off as these blind demons of greed imagine. They are too drunk with power and plunder to heed the voices beneath them. A new "brotherhood" is steadily developing that will yet make strikes mean something.

AN INNOCUOUS EHABUDE.

Opportunities of establishing one's reputation as a prophet are rare in this world; therefore the editor of Liberty propone to improve the present occasion. In the summer of 1878, Denis Kearney, then in the height of his glory, came to Boston. Brass bands and "Sons of Toil" flocked to his depot, and the Hall as it was never filled before to do him honor. Labor leaders of all shades sat around him on the platform and joined in the applause. The present writer then chanced to be in charge of the "Word" during the first sessions of Kearney that day as "the bravos" of the State coming from California to advise Massachusetts workmen to 'pool their issues,' forgetting that men can be permanently and effectively united only by ideas, hence the idea of the song is to commit suicide. Kearney's opposition to the Chinese long ago branded him as a Know-Nothing in policy; his incoherent utterances on Massachusetts platforms show him to be an object of derision to friends and enemies alike.

We do not mean to understand that, where there are people with want, names, and nowhere can they be applied more deservedly than to American capitalists; but indiscriminate and uninformed abuse, founded on neither sense nor reason, is a weapon that is dangerous only to the person using it. In the name of Labor before the protest most earnestly against its friends connecting themselves with, or in any manner countenancing, a man who can see no connection between ideas and the workman's stomach, and denounces all remaining beings as 'Ukrainian centurions,trees with the man in the moon.' For this outspoken language concerning the idol of the hour our loyalty to labor was seriously doubted, the "Word" was assailed of going back on its record under its improm
He knows that the capitalists have been estranged by society, through its external representative, the State, with privileges which enable them to produce and distribute; and that, in case of the loss of these privileges, they have seen to it that any demand for labor should fall far below the supply, and hence have taken advantage of the necessities of the laborer and reduced his wages. The capitalists have always had to think of the public opinion; therefore we print below an extract from a letter which appeared in the "Nation" of July 1st, and defy any one to gather any other practical meaning from it than which we have stated.

The truth is that a society like ours, and like that of all commercial nations, is one of themarriage of capital and labor, one of themarriage of capital and labor, where the latter is acting as a mere machine in the process of production. The loss of all three would mean a total degrivaation, for a longer or shorter period, of nearly everything which the community most values. It would seem a suggestion of business and social relations equal to that caused by a hostile invasion, barring the terror and bloodshed. It is consequently a question of whether the capitalists will have the power to extend the process of production, or whether the public will be able to prevent it from going further.

During the rebellion, when all of us, except the much-abused "copperheads," temporarily lost control of our reasonable faculties, we were told that the editor of the "Nation" at that time forgot himself and acted for the benefit of the "Nation." We do not believe that the editor of the "Nation" would permit this, and one or two more experiences like the railroad strike will cause every legislator to take measures to ensure that the country remain in the hands of the people. The people should be given a voice in the government, and not be left to the choice of a few millionaires.

A Very Interesting Letter.

Codex Tomek.

The London mail has just brought me Liberty of June 9th. That it was read over and over before any thing else was looked at goes without saying. In the course of my article "A few words about the Fourth of July in America," I mentioned that the "Stars and Stripes" were probably the best and most highly valued of the many emblems of liberty. How could we be sure of this, I asked? By what means are the stars and stripes so valued? By what words are they associated with the idea of America? By what names are they called? By what ideas are they symbolized? By what words are they associated with the idea of America? By what names are they called? By what ideas are they symbolized?

Le Reveillon.

Yes, I can answer for Kopockite, who will not see Liberty (no paper being allowed in prison), that he would not want to create barriers between A. B., the shoemaker, and C. D., the tailor, to prevent the exchange of the shoes made by the one for the coats made by the other. How could he make such a mistake as that? It is not too difficult.
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Over-Production.

We do not remember having seen the over-production theory more forcibly refuted than in the following significant editorial from the Boston "Globe":—

In attempting to explain the strike now going on in various branches of industry, particularly the strike of the coal miners in Pennsylvania, the Boston "Journal" falls into the old error of attributing the trouble to over-production. The sanguine get of economicassume that the principles were true herefore, they may have been true still. But the fact is that most of them never were true, and, even if they had been, would not be applicable now, and if they have been true, will be found to have been universally true, with all their teachings, with the vast influence they possess, are arched so unwaveringly against the rights of labor and the laborers. They get their theories by inheritance, and they have not the time nor the time to think about it, so they were thought to be right more than it is now. And the consequence is that they can not adjust themselves and their arguments to the present circumstances.

General Walker's article is a thorough exposure of this spirit. Henry George's main propositions consist of fallacy cunningly woven. One of these is the apparent application to the arguments by which Mr. George advances to his conclusion and denies their truth in the white. Notwithstanding the great number of thinkers ground, he at once points out the fallacious conditions and knows the extent of the evil of which he speaks. And there is a vast deal of truth in what he says, along with the obvious error.

George devotes himself at length to Mr. G.'s proposition the "irrespective of the increase of population, the effect of production in methods of production and exchange to increase rents," and pronounces it not only false, but ridiculously false. And to prove his side of the argument, he quotes from Sir James Caird and Prof. Amable de Laveleye. Perhaps an industrial writer will some time arise who will see that the conditions in the United States are entirely different from those of any other country, that no comparison can be established between the two. General Walker approves the two principles, viz, that the transportation accenture to the reduction of rents and cannot act in any other way, since it shows in an evident manner that the scale of rents is fixed, by reason of the power of the market, thus raising the rents, and, by reason of the power of the market, thus reducing the rents.

Very nice, for a patent theory but, if General Walker would get a few actual facts to put in it, they would be shown to be quite a different order. It is strange that a man of General Walker's experience and observation has not seen that, when a railroad is built through a new region of country, it enhances the value of property, rents go up in proportion, the poorer lands, instead of going out of cultivation, are made slightly more valuable, those already out are brought back, and the old cultivation is increased. This is the case instead of raised. This movement invariably adds to the building of a new road.

He regards it absurd that a man should withhold land from cultivation for the purpose of speculation, and pronounces "a lawless assumption for which not a particle of proper statute evidence can be adduced." Mr. George's proposition that increase in the value of land above its income-producing value will withholding large bodies of land from cultivation, a living labor and capital to poorer and more distant parts. Nevertheless, in a new country where land is rapidly increasing in value, the expense of bringing it into cultivation is greater for a number of years than its "improvement" power, and if General Walker's statement "it is not to be considered" is proved, he can find it in numberless vast tracts of land through all the Western States withheld from cultivation for speculative purposes. General Walker gives him a kind of "benefit" - "improvement" that injures them far more than benefits, waiting for a rise in price.

In his opinion of the beneficial influence of land speculation General Walker thinks that Mr. George has been led aside by the man to the California, and has magnified into a universal virtue features which are local, and material. Whether or not Mr. George argued by induction from a single fact, General Walker has not in his argument condescended to consider facts. One fact is a great deal better than many more.

BOSTON, AUGUST 11, 1883.

Walker versus George.

To the Editor of Liberty:

Hoping that it may be to your interest, to bring to the public notice the following article from the "Boston Journal," we respectfully request your insertion in your paper.

W. R. WILLARD.

McWilliam's "Magazine."