On Picket Duty.

The New York "Sun" has discovered Walt Whitman.

Certain labor organizations in New York and Brooklyn have decided to boycott the militia and admit no applicants who are members of the national guard. This is the first sensible step taken by labor in a long time. Nothing is more disheartening and sickening than the spectacle of workmen perfectly familiar with the industrial conditions rushing to join their detachments for the purpose of shooting down other workmen. At least force the plutocrats to send their own sons to protect them against the violence of their desperate victims.

From the last issue and the present one other pressing and valuable matters have obliged me to omit "The Beauties of Government," much to my regret. It now looks as though I might have to omit them from one or two more issues. But I keep on collecting the material, and the readers of Liberty have responded effectively to my appeal for their cooperation in such collection; so that I now have a magnificent assortment. Let the collection grow. Continue to supply me with clippings. Even those that never find their way into the paper are very useful to me.

Explain the Spooner idea of a jury to an average lawyer, or layman plunging himself on familiarity with legal principles, and he will sneer at it as chimerical and fallacious. Nothing but facts will cure him of this disposition. Now, it appears that within a few weeks, among the important cases decided by the United States Supreme Court, was one hinging on this old question of whether juries are judges of fact only, or of law as well, in criminal cases. It would be interesting to state the involved facts of the case; the important point is that two of the justices dissented from the decision of the majority of the court on the ground that it denied the right of the jury to judge the law as well as of the facts. This goes to show that Spooner's idea of a jury is not as whimsical as some of his critics seem to imagine.

The loud demands of the jingoists, and of editors who are patriotic "for circulation only," for more ships, soldiers, and territory, lead the Springfield "Republican" to make the excellent suggestion that the government should impose a special tax on these patriots, and give them what they want at their own expense. The income tax makes Dana furious; well, then, let him be made to pay a still higher tax, if he wants a larger army and navy. But does the "Republican" perceive that all suggestions are Anarchistic? If the jingoists are to pay for their ships, why should not other sections of the community pay for whatever they demand, leaving others free to withhold pay and dispense with governmental services? Let those who want police pay for them; let those who want schools pay for them; let those who want congress pay for it. Unless this principle is accepted, there is no way of suppressing the jingoists and busybodies.

How is it that so many of the so-called "sound money" papers in the East are strenuous in their defence of the greenbacks? Does it lie in their mouths to denounce as crooks and ignoramuses the fiascos of the West and South, when they themselves are determined to prevent the retirement of flat money? The people love the greenbacks, say these sneaking fiascos; well, then, why not have more of them, according to the demands of the government-currency champions? It is funny to see these humbugs trying to reconcile contradictory opinions. They tell us that the people don't pay interest on the floating loans represented by the greenbacks. But they are firm upholders of usury; why, then, is it right for us to retain money without paying interest for it? Again, they object to issues of bonds because the country is saddled with interest-paying debts; but these bonds are necessitated by the re-deposition of greenbacks in gold, and the interest is paid for the privilege of issuing and reissuing the alleged non-interest-bearing greenbacks! Really, it is impossible to credit these self-styled sound-money men with any settled opinions—good, bad, or indifferent. This is not an unmixed evil; we have a case of knavery tempered by middle-headedness. It would be worse for us if they were more consistent in their plutocratic beliefs.

The vicious spirit of the press is strikingly exemplified by the following utterance of the Philadelphia "Telegraph" (a paper exhibiting considerable independence in politics) in connection with the Brooklyn strike: "They have been induced to put themselves beyond the pale of the law, and in that position they inevitably attract all the lower elements of society habitually abiding beyond the pale of the law. All the thieves, pickpockets, hoodlums, plug-uglies, robbers, roughs, and rogues; all the political desperadoes, Anarchists, dynamiters, Socialist speakers, red-revolutionists, and disciples of W. D. Howells and Professor Ely; in short, all the criminals and idlers and good-for-nothings within walking distance, will be attracted to the scene of the strike disturbances as surely as crows to carrion." One has indeed to be not only vicious, but blin and stupid, to imagine that such brutal talk will help the cause of the conservatives. This trick of applying the epithets Anarchist and red-revolutionist to any one expressing dissatisfaction with present conditions has an effect directly opposite to that intended. The "disciples of W. D. Howells and Professor Ely" are not terrorized into abjuring their beliefs and returning to the ranks; but many of those who feel the outrageous injustice of this indiscriminate abuse are impelled to leave the ranks and make common cause with the reformers. The violence and malice of the reactionary press are doing good work for radicalism. Let the fanatics continue to undermine their own citadel.

There is no violation of egoistic propriety in distinguishing between inferior and superior forms of human nature, Mr. Byington to the contrary notwithstanding. The human being acquires new tastes as his organism develops in delicacy and complexity, and there is no reason why the fact should not be stated. The egoist objects to the assumption of superiority only where the assumption is false. It is false when the Moralist assumes superiority because he is unselfish, or thinks he is unselfish, the fact being that the Moralist is precisely as selfish as the rest of mankind—or brutish, for that matter. To the Moralist a man is not high or low according to his loves and hates. He can only be high unless he loves that which is considered low and at the same time deliberately and consciously avoids it. Kant distinctly says that there is no virtue in any act that is not performed at a (fancied) sacrifice of inclination. The egoistic view is just the opposite. To the egoist no man is really virtuous save he who possesses those tastes which belong to a high degree of development and who is able to live an admirable life without (fancied) sacrifice of his inclinations. If Mr. Byington really preferred quail on toast, but nevertheless insisted on tackling an Archist half-back in order to crucify himself, he would be a moral man according to Kant and not the highest type of man according to Tucker; but since he actually and consciously obeys his preference in tackling the Archist half-back, Kant would have to consider him immoral, while Tucker considers him high (by which remarks, however, Tucker must not be understood as deprecating quail on toast).
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"In shadowy rest and interest, the cost wearisome of old-time days, the revolution which is yet to strike its awe of the conmen, the will of the magistrate, the club of the policeman, the yank of the executioner, the creeping-fear of the department clerk, all these the guilt of police, which young liberty proveth beneath her ban." 

فرضION.

"The judgment of the editorial column of articles over other signatures than the editor's initial indicates that the editor approves their central purpose and general tenor, that he does not hold himself responsible for every phrase or word. But the appearance in other parts of the paper of the signatures of other writers by no means indicates that he disapproves them in any respect all disposition of them being governed largely by motives of convenience.

Spencer's Defence of "Robbery."

Liberty once charged the editor of a Spenceinan journal with a "brutish admiration for Spencer," and I am free to confess that, in many respects, I have been, and still am, open to the same charge. But Spencer's treatment of certain social problems certainly fails to command the least respect of unbiased and logical thinkers, if it does not come perilously near provoking contempt. The most honest friends of Spencer prefer to pass over in silence his amazing self-stultification in connection with the subject of land tenure, — a self-stultification lately again forced by him upon our notice. In the course of a controversy with the English land-nationalists, who had inflicted great annoyance on Spencer by persistent use of his name in their propaganda, he wrote a letter to the London "Chronicl" in explanation of his change of opinion on the land question, which was significantly headed "Robbers All Round" (to the cynic it doubtless irresponsibly suggests another expansive motto, "humbugg all round"). The gist is contained in the following passage:

"My argument in "Social Statics" was based upon the untenable assumption that the existing English community had a moral right to the land. They never had anything of the kind. They were robbers all round: Normans robbed Danes and Saxons, Saxons robbed Celts, Celts robbed the heathen races of whose earth-houses we find here and there. Let the English Land Restoration League find the descendants of these last, and restore the land to them. There never was any equity in the matter, and, as for the培植 of a supposed original equity in a dream. The stronger people have been land-thieves from the beginning, and have remained land-thieves down to the present hour.

The inference intended is obvious: it is silly to dream of, and criminal to attempt, a change in the system of land tenure apart from the free acquisition of the present holders. The fact that the landlords are not ethnically entitled to their possessions does not invest other classes of the community with a superior title, since from the very beginning "they were robbers all round." Nothing remains to be done except persuade the landlords (or force them under the theory of "eminent domain," reo, and by Spencer in his latest work on sociology) to sell their estates to the community. No, not even this remedial plan is left to comfort us, for Spencer has, by a remarkable appeal to arithmetic, shown the ruinous nature of such a speculation. More would be paid to the landlords, according to him, than their lands would ever be worth, and the result of the transaction would be a loss offset by no advantage whatever. The happiest solution is to leave matters in status quo and — pray for the best. Mr. Auberon Herbert sincerely and glowingly sizes upon Spencer's defence, and develops it with keen relish, thus:

"If there were a true "equity" in taking land from its present holders, there would be further equity in dividing up all Europe, and indeed Asia also. If we are to divide up, why is one race to be worse off than another race? It will want some very persuasive logic to convince the Russian — since the faulty origins of land settlement everywhere are to be made an excuse for breaking up present arrangements — that he is to stay in the front and the snows . . . . There has never been equity in the true history of the whole transaction; and how what has been throughout inequitable could be mended by another glaring act of inequity only a nationalist can explain. The free and open market is the fundamental system, and through all past violations and inequities we must slowly make our way up to that goal.

The gratuitous assumptions, transparent sophistry, and loose thinking characterizing these quotations from Spencer and Auberon Herbert are such that a person who was not aware of the intellectual status of these men would be abundantly justified in dismissing them as unworthy of serious consideration. Let us analyze the propositions and the deductions drawn from them.

Bears in mind that the problem is to secure, if possible, equity in land tenure. Spencer assures us that equal freedom is the first condition of social stability and harmony, and equity and expediency are really synonymous terms. Now, still according to Spencer, under the law of equal freedom, men — each and all — are entitled to certain particular freedoms or rights, and one of these rights is that of using land and other natural media. To tell us that one of these rights is unattainable, and that we had better cease our vain agitation for it, is tantamount to discrediting the so-called law of equal liberty altogether. A chain is no stronger than its weakest link, and, if one clear and unimpeachable corollary from the law of equal freedom is invalid, inexpedient, inequitable, impossible, the whole law is shown to be a sham and fallacy. It ceases to be a law. There is no way of rehabilitating it, except by proving that the alleged right to natural media is not strictly a deduction from the law, but a false conclusion illogically drawn from it. Were this done, it would devolve on Spencer to reason out and formulate the proper and true injunction of equal freedom with regard to the question of natural media. Since, however, he is still insisting, the right to the use of nature is a corollary from equal freedom, his assertion that men cannot equitably obtain a recognition of this particular right under existing conditions involves the total collapse of the whole edifice. Spencer's sociology and political system are a wreck, and all his talk about justice, equity, and social law is cant and empty sound.

But perhaps I am too hasty. Reflection discovers another possible solution of the dilemma. Let us assume that neither the major premise nor the minor premise of Mr. Spencer can be successfully impugned, and see what the conclusion must be.

Major premise: Under the law of equal freedom, — the fundamental condition of society, — men are entitled to the use of the land, — satisfaction of needs, or use, being the criterion.

Minor premise: The law of equal freedom having been subjected to criticism from the beginning, it is now utterly impossible to establish equity in land tenure.

Conclusion: Society must perish as the victim of its own folly and wickedness.

Grant the premises, and there is no avoidance of the conclusion. Society cannot long survive the violation of a fundamental law; war, chaos, and savagery must naturally be unchained and let loose. A glance at the activities around us attests the absolute correctness of this conclusion. Bombs, violent strikes, advocacy of wholesale massacres, — all are the direct result of the violation of the "fundamental condition," and all proclaim the existence of a state of war. Ignoramuses are appalled at the spectacle, and rave about the futility of the poor and working classes; rascals are aware of the true causes, but pretend ignorance and strive to get the spoils of war. But the intelligent and conscientious are endeavoring to secure observance of the fundamental condition as a means of establishing peace. And what assistance do they now get from Spencer? He virtually abandons the scene of the struggle, and leaves society to its doom. Such an attitude, however justifiable on the part of a theologian who despairs of enforcing God's will, is irrational and inconsistent on the part of an evolutionist. An evolutionist can never despair of securing obedience to a social law. It is by studying human conduct that he discovers the law, and he knows that the very miner, produced by imperfect observance of it is the best school in which men learn the need of stricter conformity.

But to recur to Spencer's reason for discontinuing attacks on the present land system. Nobody, he declares, has a better title than the present holders; there has never been equity in the transaction. Now, this assertion requires much more evidence than Spencer has thus far supplied. Some writers on early English tenures maintain that there existed at one time in that country a peasant proprietorship which closely approximated equitable requirements. They may have robbed the aborigines, just as the first American settlers robbed the Indians; but Spencer ought to be the last man to introduce such a dubious and uncertain element into a discussion of equitable land tenure. No attempt has yet been made to define, in the light of justice and equity, the right relation between civilized societies and their tribes. Kindness and gentleness have often been urged on white invaders of new territory inhabited by savages, but kindness is not justice. Expropriation of savages is not necessarily robbery; from the standpoint of the race, it would seem to be unjust for a few thousands to monopolize land capable of sustaining millions.

All this, however, is said merely in passing,
by way of showing the unphilosophical, un-
Spencerian way in which these assertions are
plied on to prop up a false conclusion. Let
us concede that there never has been any equity as
in the appropriation of the land, and that,
therefore, there can be no question of reestab-
lishing equity here and now,—of making a
new departure? Having learned to comprehend
the equity, ought we not to realize it? Our
ancestors may have been all both robbers and
idiots; but we, who glory in our abstract con-
ceptions as well as in our strong sentiments,
have certainly no reason for acquiescing in ine-
quality. In our efforts to secure equal freedom,
we are bound to adjust the relations of men to
natural media along with the other changes
embodied in our programme. Are we to strive
for all rights except the right to land? What
has become of our right to land?
Yes, replies Spencer, this is precisely what
we must do. Equity in land-ownership is a
dream. We cannot justly expropriate present
holders without compensation, while any fair
compensation would entail greater burdens
than society could bear. The rejoinder to this
is that, even if the computation yielded such
a curious result were not extremely faulty,—
and it is,—the dilemma would have no terror
for us. The fact may be under some obligation
to compensate the landlords, but the people
are certainly not, and they are in no way respon-
sible for the State. They are not endorsers
or guarantors, and are entirely free to repudiate
the State's promises. In other words, I am
audacious enough to hint at expropriation by
the people without compensation. The land-
lords, you admit, are robbers; well, then, rob-
bers have no title, and those to whom the land
belongs under equal freedom will take it. A
good many sensible and intelligent people are
appalled at such a "revolutionary" suggestion,
but they may be safely left to the enlightenment
involving the changes that will be necessary
for the material welfare of the State. Their
critique is not here be great, no doubt, but their children will
recognize the justice of the "revolution." An
amusing and striking proof of this is at hand.
One of the staunchest supporters of the present
class-of-landowners régime, the New York
"Evening Post," says, in referring to inroads
of State Socialism in France, that "one of the
greatest results of the French Revolution,
which must be duly weighed in reckoning up
the good and evil of that mighty convulsion," is
that "it at least broke down the feudal land:
laws of France, and made land-owners out of
two millions who were serfs." Should anybody
suggest a "migthy convulsion" against modern
landowners which might make landowners of
millions of men who are little better, or much
worse, than serfs, of course the "Post" would
fear at the mouth and call for the immediate
imprisonment of the dangerous rebel. But that
need not cause anybody any uneasiness. The
"Posts" of the future would praise the mighty
convulsion of the end of the nineteenth cen-
tury, and point to the change of land tenure as
one of its greatest results.
Let those who gravely talk about the duty
of compensating landholders explain why the
people are bound to carry out the contracts of
an invasive, corrupt, and inefficient State rest-
ing on violence and living on plunder. Were
the people under any obligation to compensate
the slave-holding class? Yet the State was as
clearly bound to compensate the slaveholders as
it is to compensate the landlords, for every
argument employed in the latter behalf can be
applied thereto. Under the supposed injustice
from the observance of equal freedom is to
deny that equal freedom is a law, can confront
the problem which this attacking army raises,
give these hypothetical facts unprejudiced con-
sideration, and still maintain that equal free-
don is a law.
Mr. Spencer and Mr. Yarros actually do
maintain this, and they maintain further that,
as a corollary of this law, all men have an
equal right to the land; of course, then, Mr.
Yarros may properly complain when Mr.
Spencer refuses to enforce this equal right to
land. Liberty joins Mr. Yarros in charging
this inconsistency, but it does not join him in
advocacy of the dogma that men have an equal
right to land. While Liberty would not hesi-
tate, in case of necessity, to deviate from equal
freedom, in dealing with the land question it
finds itself confronted by no such necessity, for
to Liberty, as has been stated in these columns
before, equal freedom means, not equal freedom
to use land, in the sense that all land or land
values must be distributed equally among all
men, but equal freedom to control self and the
results of self-exertion.
Space is here, on earth. Not one of us has
any right to the earth. But every one of us
must use the earth, and means to do so. To
secure ourselves in this use, each contracts, or
will ultimately contract, with his fellows not to
encroach upon those portions of the earth which
they are actually using, in return for their
agreement not to encroach upon that portion of
the earth which he is actually using. By this
contract, and by similar contracts pertaining to
other matters, each becomes secure in his per-
son, in his property, and in control of his pro-
duct. Such security = equal liberty. But it is
not necessarily equality in the use of the earth.
This is the view, the occupancy-and-use
theory of land tenure is as inconsistent with
Spencerian ethics as is the existing system of
land tenure. Spencerian ethics requires the
believers therein to adopt some method, be it
Communism, or Land Nationalization, or the
Single Tax, of giving to all men equal use of
the entire earth. Of course, no method can
possibly accomplish that result; but that only
shows the absurdity of the Spencerian ethics.
Liberty thinks that Mr. Spencer can answer
Mr. Yarros: Tu quoque. Y.

Fruits of the "Reform Waves."
Having elected a "reform" administration in
the State and city of New York, the inno-
cent believers in "good government," expect to
fold their arms and enjoy the fruits of their
arduous labors in the shape of pure politics.
Alas! they are bitterly disappointed. No
sooner was Tammany "crushed" than a Re-
publican boss and machine stepped cynically
into its place and proceeded to re-enact the
Tammany performances under another name.
The great Lexow committee, in obedience to
Boss Platt, submitted a report which made the
reformers froth at the mouth, so, lame and im-
portant were its conclusions, so impudent was
its treatment of the dear, confiding public. Betrayed, mocked, and defiled, the poor reformers are now constrained to resort to "indignation mass meetings" and similar demonstrations as a means of compelling the "reform legislature" to carry out "the will of the people." Mass meetings have no terror for politicians when elections are far off. The reform movement will end in smoke, and the only way to punish the bosses will be to return to power their rivals, recently dislodged. Very amusing is the solution of the trouble offered by the New York "Evening Post," which traces the power of the bosses and the machines to their control over the purses of the wealthy corporations. It says:

So long as the present system is maintained, we shall be in a constant struggle with the legislature, seeking to get by popular uprisings and mass meetings what we supposed we were getting through popular elections. A more grotesque method of government by the people could not be imagined. The responsibility for the situation does not rest on Platt, for he is the more agreeable of the two bosses that furnish him with the money without which he would be powerless. A quickening of moral sech among the contributors would be the surest way to destroy the system.

This is delicious. If the system cannot be destroyed except by quickening the moral sense of the corporations paying blackmail and buying legislation or immunity, according to circumstances, then the outlook for reform is gloomy indeed. If the "Post" remembers how difficult it is for a rich man to go to heaven it ought not to be a hard matter for it to form an idea of the easy practicability of its remedy.

The Law of Monetary Value.

In comment on Mr. Byington's letter on "The Value of Mutual Money," I can say at once that with him I should oppose any legal restriction of the denominations of the notes issued by mutual banking associations. It is probable that Colonel Greene himself would oppose such restriction, were he alive today. It must be remembered that his "Mutual Banking" is an economic rather than a political treatise, and was written at a time when the philosophy of Anarchist had been scarcely heard of in this country. Nevertheless I consider it an exaggeration to say that Greene, to keep mutual bank notes at par, "would depend wholly" on this restriction, or even on the customers' contract to take the notes at par with the standard. I have not a copy of "Mutual Banking" at hand, and do not remember whether there is any sentence in it which warrants Mr. Byington's statement; but, even if there is, it is none the less an exaggeration (by the author himself) of his real position. For the customers' willingness to make this contract depends in turn upon their knowledge that the notes will ultimately command their face value at the bank. As soon as the general public, through time and experience, becomes possessed of this knowledge, the customers' contract may be dispensed with without the least impairment of the value of the notes. The restriction and the contract were, in Greene's mind, only devices for making plain to the public the truth upon which he placed his real dependence,—viz., that, if the original borrower of the notes should fail to meet his obligations to the bank, the security for the notes would be converted into the actual commodity adopted as standard, and this commodity used in redemption of the notes. It is this great fact that will always keep mutual bank notes at par. And it will do this whether the standard is actually coined and in circulation, or not. Nothing is needed but the standard's presence in the market as a commodity. The market quotations of the price of gold per grain serve the purpose as well as the actual circulation of coined dollars.

Mr. Byington's plan for keeping the notes at par doesn't make as great an impression upon me as it did upon his professor of political economy. He seems to think he has made a discovery. But all that is true in his plan is old and has long been accepted as a matter of course, while all that is new in it is in flat contradiction with the canonical truth about mutual money which distinguc—'

A Politician's Doubts.

In another column Mr. Labadie quotes from and very well answers a letter from a friend who finds difficulties that prevent him, as he says, from accepting "some of the extreme deductions of Anarchist." An examination of the letter shows, however, that what he really refuses to accept is not Anarchist's extreme deductions, but Anarchist's fundamental doctrine,—that of no coercion of the non-invasive individual. That is to say, he starts by acknowledging the State, which Anarchist defines as "the embodiment of invasion in an individual, or band of individuals, assuming to act as representatives or masters of the entire people within a given area." This assumption of mastership is the prime act of invasion, and stands as such, no matter how liberal the policy of the State may be after its invasion of property and maintenance; and in accepting this initial invasion Mr. Labadie's friend abandons the very foundation of Anarchist and permanently sets aside equal liberty as a guiding principle.

But he says that it is necessary to do so,—that life is not possible otherwise. Now, if it really is necessary to do so, I shall be with him in favor of doing so; but in that case I shall frankly recognize that I have adopted the policy of invasion, and not try to cheat myself into the belief that I am still libertarian by the use of any such vain phrase as "compulsion, not necessarily invasion." For this initial truth that the establishment of the State is compulsion applied, not only to invaders, but to non-invaders as well, and therefore is itself invasion.

But it is not necessary to acknowledge the State's authority, and, as Mr. Labadie well points out, the reason his friend supposes it to be necessary is that he shares the politician's incapacity to appreciate the broad view of the philosopher, and so cannot imagine any realization of that view except it come in the politician's fashion,—that is, all at once, on some election day. Now, the method of the philosopher is not the method of the politician. It is the method of the social philosopher to exhibit society as it should be, all its branches harmonizing with a fundamental social principle. When he has once arrived at his principle, he traces its applications, and, having traced them all, declares. Society, in the main, should be thus and so.

Now, if all men were philosophers, it would be perfectly possible for them to make social action conform to equal liberty, even in the city of Chicago. For this would require a degree of intelligence, a degree of appreciation of the necessity of narrowing community functions to those in which the force of competition can come into play only with the greatest difficulty,
which, coupled with the right to refuse to pay taxes, would make it unnecessary for dissenters to insist upon setting up a rival community power. The work of the municipality would be so simple, and the slightest abuse would be so quickly met by a withdrawal of supplies, that no other check would be needed.

But a philosophy of non-cooperation, and hence things are not done in this way. The politician and the voter do not arrive at a principle which they then proceed to apply. They have no power of generalization, and their breadth of view is only sufficient for the comprehension of the fact immediately before them. They see an evil, and they try experiments in search of a remedy. After many failures, they finally happen to try liberty in that particular matter. It works well, and the special problem is solved, or as nearly solved as it is possible to solve one problem alone when it is intimately connected with other problems. But now it does not occur to the politician or the voter that it would be a good thing to try liberty in all matters. They have not brains enough for so intricate a logical process. They experiment again at another point, until they finally find that liberty is the cure there also. And so on, point by point, until authority has been lopped away, branch by branch, and only the root is left. This, which the philosopher attacks first, the politician and the voter attack last. Consequently, in practice, the central theory of the State itself is not challenged until the State has been so cut away and simplified that it is then an easy matter to substitute voluntary for compulsory taxation and to secure the voluntary adhesion of all to the single and simple administrative body that remains. This, however, does not in the least invalidate the philosopher’s claim that it is an invasion for any man or majority to assume and exercise authority over all the people within a given area. And it is important to insist upon this claim because it is the theoretical centre of the libertarian or Anarchist position, by branching out from which we perceive that liberty is the cure for social evil, and continuing to follow out this truth by a philosophical method that the unphilosophical are sometimes induced to try the experiment of liberty at a particular point.

It may sooner or later cause even Mr. Labadie’s friend to perceive that there is a law against banana-peel in the streets of Chicago, in spite of the law that prohibits its deposit there, and that the way to reduce this evil to a minimum is not to attempt the enforcement of so ridiculous and impossible an ordinance, but to cut off the salaries of the street-cleaners until they conclude to do their work properly, that is, roughly, and carelessly. But as Mr. Labadie’s friend, knowing that there is a law against banana-peel, proudly walks the streets of his beloved city wrapped in contemplation of its manifold beauties, calmly confident that no treachery can illegally lure beneath his feet, and will doubtless continue to do so until some day his feet slide outward and sordid broken bones destroy his faith in the omnipotence of law.

Life in Boston grows funnier. Young man—philosophical student—goes to Sunday night "sacred" concert to secure evidence of its non-sacredness. Young man—theological student—sees opera and makes appearance before committee of the Truly Good; questioned variously, says he heard nothing of a sacred nature sung at said concert; further questioned, what did he hear? says he heard song relating to the shortness of a pair of pants worn by person named McPherson, who did not think song sacred; further questioned by manager of theater, did he not hear the "Ave Maria" sung? says he did; would he not call that sacred? couldn’t say; did he know the meaning of "Ave Maria"? did not. Consecration, extinction of young man witness—theological student.

One More Anarchist.

The Boston "Globe" of February 3 published a symposium on the subject: "Is It Better to Be Born Rich or Poor?" The leading contribution was from the pen of Mr. J. Morrison-Fuller, who founded and for several years edited an independent organ of the Specerian philosophy, "Today,"—a journal no longer in existence. Between "Today" and Liberty, which held much in common, there were nevertheless numerous controversies, one of which concerned interest on capital, "Today" upholding it. Below is reprinted a short article of the "Globe" symposium, showing what Mr. Morrison-Fuller has become convinced that Liberty’s opposition to Interest is well-founded:

Two years ago, when I had given less attention to industrial relations than now, I maintained, in conversation with a friend, that, if wealth was really in-just to the individual, nature would doubtless supply its well known selective prerogative to remove from our midst those who had either the faculty or desire for acquiring it. Nature has a way of its own in this case, which has not yet found expression.

At that time I was ready to believe that the only remedy for the evil of inherited wealth lay in just this condition; that, by not being trained in the most fundamental of all activities, the self-assertive (to put it in terms of the present) and the inheritors of wealth men—generally their descendants—would be slowly perhaps, but surely extirpated. If, as a fact, the development of the faculties that fit the individual for life requires the expenditure of those faculties—and no other means of development has ever been indicated,—then it follows that the non-exercise of these fundamental faculties must lead to their atrophy, and, as the acquisition of the millionsaire entails extinction on his offspring.

To this view there are several rejoinders which cannot be examined here. I can only say that I see no reason to doubt the reality of the correlation indicated,—that inherited wealth is injurious for the individual by exempting him from the activities which alone give exercise to the most fundamental of all faculties, and that the dispersion of the wealth is the sure means of the survival of the family.

For reasons too complex to be sifted here, I do not any longer regard this correlation as the only remedy for the evils of inherited wealth. When all is said, I harden back to the reply made by my friend several years ago, when I knew less of industrial relations than now: Men will cease to accumulate fortunes, and hence to transmit them, when they are no longer able to accumulate wealth.

Wherever the Anarchist stands in, he naturally comes round in the end to his eternal Delenda est Carthago: Cut off the sources of wealth at the twin fountains of monopoly, rent and interest, and then we shall not be vexed with selfish millionaires (wealth excludes from remunerative labor) or is not injurious for the individual.

The Nucleus of a Mutual Bank.

The following extract from the St. Louis "Chronicle" of February 12 is only the most interesting and significant because the Mr. Clarke who takes the initiative in the financial experiment described is in no way connected with Liberty’s work. Mr. Clarke’s begin-ning is necessarily crude and simple, but the principle upon which his enterprise is based is thoroughly sound.

If Uncle Sam will not increase the currency, there are other ways of doing it, as F. P. Clarke, of 7119 South Broadway, says in his letter.

Treasury notes and greenbacks, silver and gold, are alike unimportant to the Carondelet financier. The thousand perplexities of bimetallism will never bother him. His is a single standard advocate of the most pronounced type. His standard, however, is somewhat unique, being labor or the products of labor in their most elementary form.

Mr. Clarke is organizer and first president of the Carondelet Labor Exchange, which embodies his financial views. The Exchange received its State charter December 18, but just held its first meeting.

Its membership may consist of all true workingmen, — carrying cards for those whose work is speculative. On joining, each member deposits some article of value, such as a chair, table, etc., for which he receives a certificate or due-bill naming the article and its appraised value. This article may be recovered at any time by a holder of the certificate, or, if it has been sold, its value will be returned in legal tender.

In order to give the certificates a circulation, each member keeps himself at all times to act for them at their face-value in the payment of debts. Besides the members, a number of the largest stores, among them being Humphrey’s, Blanke Brothers, Rice-Silas, and others, have agreed to receive them.

The advantages of the Exchange, says Mr. Clarke, “are apparent at first sight. A stable market is furnished for all the products of labor, and a currency is floated which cannot fluctuate at the will of money brokers. We will be able to do all the article we receive more easily than the workmen themselves, because we will be more widely known and will know just exactly where to go with our wares. As the Exchange grows larger, we expect to have a wood yard and issue certificates for the wood.

“Some of the other unions have even gone to the extent of building houses by paying the workmen with certificates. These houses are sold at a good profit, and at the same time work has been furnished to the needy.

“We have received more encouragement in St. Louis than I expected. Grocers, butchers, photographers, bakers, and dry-goods men are all numbered among our members.”

The Rule of Behavior.

(From the Truth Seeker.)

The prophets of the old and the prophets of the new are all at sea when they enter the domain of behavior.

1. The servants of Christ hold that immortality is the foundation of morality; but upon this it ensues that, inanity not being of this world, there is no certainty of it. The immortality of man is a philosophical conception of the world, and to light the imaginations of the future life.

2. The advent of the Prince and Church, it is necessary to do right because it is right to do right; in saying which they are as much as the philosophers who explained that cold was cold because it was cold. They might avoid tautology without sacrifice of clearness bycontenting themselves with saying we should do right because it is right to do right.

3. Precedo, O Ananda, to follow the line of conduct which experience or to do; as the man of the principle for intelligent defence, whether accused of doing wrong or right.

In Praise of Liberty.

(The Conserver.)

We celebrate thy glory, Liberty,

In stately periods; we fill the air

With she-sots; to what is highest and most fair—

A star, a sun, a goddess, or a sea—

We worship, hear! but thee

Thyself—will, strong, and brave, thy floating hair

A flame among the hills which some, who dare

Thy joy and peril, follow a are free,

Free in their free souls who shall chain can bind—

We know thee not—’tis but a bloodless ghost.

But let me know thee, goddess; let me find

That star, that sun, that strange sea’s farthest coast;

Let me tread all thy ways with steadfast foot

That knows no bonds save its own strong control.

Wayland Smith.
A Disconnected Preface.

Shall the business man be allowed to praise his work, and shall the artist not be allowed? Doubtless. Art should be sought as a market; but, if it be not, what then? The inventor may say of his machine that "it is the best in the world" every machine has at least that small merit, but the artist must appraise and depreciate with a coldness, modesty and hire some other man to magnify and explain: In all this the element of hypocrisy is not lacking, I think; and at any rate I run my risk and set a new fashion hereinafter.

In all frankness, reader, I am going to talk to you about my songs, and the book of them that I wish to print and for which I wish you to subscribe. Not till I was almost a man did I write verses. I stumbled upon poems in art—seemingly—when I was a boy. I remember, the clearness, the sureness, the power of verse, the music, the power of a verse. I was listening, and here was music. I was attired, and here was never I hungered, and with this I could feel myself. My failures tempted me more than my successes. I could not desist till I had done better work,—till the inner music rang true to the outward ear. And my victories flashed me with triumph.

The art grew upon me and became a habit, and as the years went on it was the solace of my cure, the safety-value of my emotion, the one interest which never flagged, the magic which translated every experience, dark or light, and a song. Long before I knew that Emerson had ever written "the poet also reigns himself to his mood," I had learned to thus resign myself, and my poems became, as I have described, "the songs in many moods." I learned to respect my latent innate impulses. I guided my life by ear, not but with too much faith. In my moods, when my spirit was fluent with music, I recognized, that the inherent experience of my ancestors was moving also to expression, and often I gave it room and voice as one who might respectfully give place to the spirits of his fore-elders, should they visit his m insignificant frame.

For who knows what is life but the songs and this the song of life. Burns wrote short songs, and so I, and for the same reason. A wandering and broken life, full of failures, chastened by poverty, with days of toil calling for nights of sleep, gave no time for applied devotion to prolonged themes. When the golden moments of rest and passion came, then I wrote.

"Says the Fore-Wire! ... Songs of my winged thoughts, of life, nature, love and liberty; composed, not for the public, but for the poet himself—on the plains, in the forest, in the wake of the plough, on the horseback, on the crowded street, by the bedside of death, in the storm, the sleet of midnight, and when the face of the God I am being blushed through the golden tresses of your—" The fire burned within, the flames sang, and the free winds fanned them to music.

From the heart of fire, with the wind's touch, came these, and the writing of them was my joy and easement. Only lately did the thought of publication come to me as other than a remote possibility, but now I have selected, from the written words, a hundred of the most representative of my poems to be placed in one book with the title, "Wind-Harp Songs." Now, I am sure that I am not alone in life and experience, and that you, whatever you think, are not the thought of many others. As I read books chiefly for the insight they give me into the lives of their authors, and care more for the emotion of the poet than for the song itself, I am sure, if I say something about a few of the "bit songs" in my book, I shall not tire, but shall even interest.

And the same faith and the same interest have constituted me the advocate of my songs eclogie. I write of myself, but I speak profoundly for the race. I know that every poet, voiceless or spoken, will understand my poem and its aspirations.

Give me a finding thought, a subtle state, a vivid word. Let me within the well, and let me learn! With every sa a that burns to its hills of sleep I burn. With every leading lightning flash I year—Ah, would that I might be a singer, too! That that half kindled music in my soul

Might burn melodiously all the while Of human memory, a fearless View! I would my song could kiss with lover's lips! Could weave all charms whereby men's thoughts are drawn! And speak to shatter hearts a guiding word! My lay could paint the sea with wind-swept shingles, Point waiting skies with torches set alight! And breathe a bugle note to souls unsatirized!

The title of the book is from the first poem: "The Wind-Harp Song."

1. I sing a wind harp song, Dreamily musical, Strings none and clear; Beneath the steady stars The dim, sweet night floating, Mystically floating.

Nature is full of music, to me, mental and audible, with all the psychometrical tales and associations, one after the other, to infinity, and it is with this melody and mystical romance, that our songs are charged and of which many others in the book treat. To catch this music of Nature, perfect, ineffable, forever elusive, is the deepest yearning of the true poet. To read that music aright is to know all truth.

This little thing I find every woman endorses: "This is the secret with." The prayer of womanhood: "Give me a friend who reads my heart! Let me be understood!"

And as the poet's realm is the emotional, and as woman is the incarnate poem, it is not strange that many of these songs treat of Woman and Love. The love of her whose companionship was to me so perfect, whose death was the hardest of the tragedies I have yet known, inspires three of them,—"My Lady Gentle-Wonderful," "Only a Memory," and "My Dead." The death of my wise and gentle mother names another, though my song is not of future things. Love proper I have treated of in almost every phase, from the melancholy of "A Song of Sad Love," "A Sonnet to a White Lady," and the tenderness of "You Look so Sweet," the playfulness of "O Cup!" the ecstasy of "Twelve Fairies," and the amorous passion of "I Love My Love in the Morning," which last Dr. Aikin likened to a song of Hafiz; from the rude romance of "O Love Was Red" to the caroused dininess of "Wild Roses and Mallow Hail" and the triumphant enjoyment of "Chocolate." And, of course, my peculiar views of love and sex tinct many poems, as "My Woman," "True Love," "Love Is a Riddle;" and some of these love-songs are of experience, some of fiction, some of hearsay, some of pure imagination. I cannot distinguish; the reader must guess. In "Emily Dickinson" there is a tribute of admiration; in "Cleopatra" the only touch of the dramatic; in "Quicksand" theLincoln in the White House, and the amorous passion of "I Love My Love in the Morning," which last Dr. Aikin likened to a song of Hafiz; from the rude romance of "O Love Was Red" to the caroused dininess of "Wild Roses and Mallow Hail" and the triumphant enjoyment of "Chocolate." And, of course, my peculiar views of love and sex tinct many poems, as "My Woman," "True Love," "Love Is a Riddle;" and some of these love-songs are of experience, some of fiction, some of hearsay, some of pure imagination. I cannot distinguish; the reader must guess. In "Emily Dickinson" there is a tribute of admiration; in "Cleopatra" the only touch of the dramatic; in "Quicksand" the

And I dream in at-one-ness with Nature, Stained through with her beauty and pain; I drank with the wise with the pangs of her deaths I am slain.

Many of the poems relate to my sojourn in Florida. When I read "The Voice of the Turtle," I once more find myself in the cotton field among the yellow blossoms of the "long-suffering" pearl-necked jacks before, the sand parts before the small plough, the gentle breeze swings the Spanish moss on the giraffe trees, the sun flashes from the still waters of the bayou, and the "piny woods" are musical with the incessant point of the cooking gator. The "Mock Bird" calls up visions of dazzling mornings and of groves of waxen-leaved orange trees, where this bold and musical mocking, secure in man's love and his own dauntless courage, lived without fear or care.

In "The Whoop-Cane's Changer" the remembrance is more savage:

Aloof the Floridian ferns, Wild with creeping sand and hammock Edemas, Crouks the importantune, crows dry.

From out the , pinted, sunet sky, Of whoop-coons, as they roostulfly fly.

And in "Hall Conrade:" I salute my true and gentle neighbor, David Hammond, Florida before I did, for "the land of gown, snow and Sweden," as he happily described Wisconsin. Dear old Hammar: modest, big-brained, soft-voiced, great-hearted, do you remember how you used to sit across the heart in "Ooreover" and play the "Firthofig Sages" and "Torgney" on the violins, and sing of the "Stehnings Karlen" and "Fredman's Epistles"? Do you remember our standing ankle-deep in the black mud by the Ockhawka, from which we had been "tooting" the "alligator beer" all day to water Joe Blediger's cabbages, and how you looked at me with comical gravity, all tired, wet, and muddy as we were, and said in your quiedy accented English,
The Value of Mutual Money.

To the Editor of Liberty.

In No. 285 of Liberty you raise the topic of how mutual bank notes are to be kept at par, which needs ventilating. Greene would depend wholly on the customers’ contract to take them at par with silver. But this could not be done unless plenty of silver were circulating alongside them. Greene recognizes this, and would maintain a silver circulation by having the bank issue no note for less than $5 (“Mutual Banking,” p. 52). But I doubt whether people can thus be induced to have freedom, to use coin wholly or mainly for the denominations between 50 cents and $5. Neither do I think, if all this circulation were in coin, that there would be enough of it, compared with the amount affixed in notes, to compel the notes to measure themselves by it.

I confess that I do not quite understand your present description of the way it is to be done. I wish you would explain it more fully.

A few weeks ago I undertook to expend and defend mutual banking before an economic club. In preparing for this, I for the first time perceived myself that there was a clear and comprehensible way for keeping notes in the money market: I made such an impression on a professor of political economy as I had not expected to. He said that people ought to have a chance to try it, and that the notes might be expected to go good, only it is insisted that they must depend on mutual confidence among the people, while I thought they had something behind that to fall back on. But he was specially pleased (he volunteered the statement) with my doctrine of the value of notes in the market and the notes of value.

I proposed that, supposing the standard to be gold, the property pledged to the bank as security should be appraised in gold at face value; and that the loans offered should never exceed a certain ratio to this appraisal — so many dollars in notes to so many ounces or dollars of gold value in the security. Such a uniform ratio could best be maintained by agreement among the banks. Then, so long as the ratio is uniform, the supply of notes will bear a steady relation to the amount of property held by those who use the notes. Their need of money will furnish a steadily steady demand. This steady supply and demand will keep the value of the notes at a steady ratio to the gold in which the property is appraised.

By careful adjustment of the ratio between notes and property an exact par with gold could be had; but this seems to me so important that I should not think it worth the trouble of adjusting the ratio. What we need is not more at par with anything else, but money whose value, measured by a definite commodity standard, is uniform. The paper that is always at thirty per cent. discount is as good as paper that is always at a premium.

My plan, as you see, is quite independent of whether any other money is or is not to circulate alongside the mutual money.

STEPHEN T. BYINGTON.

The Politician.

I am a statesman, I am a speaker, a spell binder, and a apostle.

I can talk nine ways for Sunday in a minute.

I can conjure up the voters,

The hustlers and flatterers,

When there’s any dirty scheming, I am in it.

I enjoin with Hans and Mike,

And do exactly as I like;

My friends all come to me to grind their axes; I fix them for a fee;

It’s all the same to me;

For the people think it’s fine to pay their taxes.

When we’ve had our costly “go,”

And the treasury’s getting low,

All we have to do is simply raise the rate.

With more of joy than woe

They to their pockets go;

For the mufflungs admire the glorious “State.”

I promise them protection,

High wages, and perfection,

And tell them of our lovely “Yankee Nation.”

I never leave a sigh,

But live exceeding high,

While they hump themselves to get a half a ration.

I of patriotism brag,

And wave the striped rag.

At the numb-heads I laugh in my sleeves.

I am always for:

For office and for self;

I’m a member of the “Brotherhood of Yalecats.”

I control the people’s money,

And they think it very funny,

I help myself to either more or less,

And, besides this money-taking,

What other bribes I’m taking

I leave you howling Anarchists to guess.

Anna K.
SLAVES TO DUTY.

By John Badcock, Jr.

A unique addition to the panorama literature of emancipation, is that which comprises the volume of "Slaves to Duty," a personal narrative of the events and experiences of a slave woman who was able to escape from slavery and make her way to freedom in the North. The book is a valuable contribution to the study of the history of slavery in the United States, and serves as a reminder of the struggles and sacrifices made by those who sought to break free from the bonds of bondage. Price, $1.50. 
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