On Picket Duty.

When Victor Hugo was asked to sign the petition for Prince Kropotkin's release, printed in another column, he wrote on the margin at the bottom of the page the following words: "All questions of amnesty have an interest for me, and I take particularly to heart this petition in favor of the Liberation of Prince Kropotkin. The great French poet evidently does not read the long "Adre's"; else he would have known that Kropotkin is a disorderly ignorant man, for whom Americans are supposed ever to have hearing of, still less to take interest in.

John Morley, the discriminating biographer of eminent freethinkers and one politician who speaks god with his small "g," in his book, herebefore apparently one of the fairest and truest men in England, has made himself suddenly unpopular among English radicals, and of course correspondingly popular among the more numerous conservatives, by approving in his paper, the " Pall Mall Gazette," the recent outrageous sentences for blasphemy. Explanation: John Morley has been elected a member of parliament. As M. D. Conway says, in becoming a partisan of Gladstone he has become a partisan of Gladstone's god.

As if the despatches which the cable brings us concerning the political and industrial situation in Europe were not sufficient, the stupid and erroneous in themselves, the omniscient, editor of the Boston "Herald" has adopted a practice of supplementing them in his columns in a style of government, and alleged elucidation of his own. His explanations seldom explain and often mislead. A few weeks ago an election was held in the thirteenth arrondissement of Paris to choose a successor to Gambetta in the chamber of deputies. No candidate receiving a majority of the votes cast, a second election was held some days later. When the news of the result reached the "Herald," the editor appended a statement recalling and summarizing the vote of the first election. After misrepresenting almost beyond recognition the names of most of the candidates, he commented upon the small vote thrown for "Jules Guesde, the Anarchist candidate," as showing the weakness of the Anarchist party even in Bellelville, the stronghold of radicalism. Now, to appreciate the idiocy of this untrue it is only necessary to know that Guesde, far from being an Anarchist, stands at the very opposite pole of political belief, and, instead of wishing the abolition of the State, wishes the absorption of almost everything by the State. In fact, he is the principal representative of Marxism in France. An Anarchist would as soon think of voting for Prince Jerome as for Jules Guesde. Moreover, full-blooded Anarchists never vote at all. "Abstention from the polls" is one of the rallying cries of their party, and that it was vigorously sounded in the ears of Gambetta's old constituents is shown by the manifestos printed in another column. When the editor of the "Herald" has occasion again to estimate the strength of the Anarchists of Belleville, let him ascertain the number of voters that remained at home on election-day, and he will come nearer to the truth. Pepe will he also find that their ranks are steadily swelling.

The trial of E. H. Heywood, which began on Tuesday, April 10, is drawing to a close as we go to press, and before our readers see this paragraph the telegraph will probably announce the decision of the social question. The editor says: "The trial of Heywood would have the surgeon's knife destroy the possibility of a young crop of drunkards, wherever and whenever a man became incurable; it would have all persons, men and women, tainted with insanity deprived of the power of reproducing their kind; it would have every person guilty of incest, every felon, idiot, and wifebeater castrated." This is what he calls the "anti-social control of the reproductive function in the human," and because of the discovery of this "radical cure" he thinks "that fate of reason has been lighted and its flame fills the high arch of the heaven of progress." If castration is the flame of the lamp of reason, and this flame is burning in any such proximity to the celestial arch referred to, we fear that its heat will speedily crumble the keystone and that the whole structure will soon tumble into ruins. The position thus taken arouses the ire of "Herald of Industry." London correspondent, who writes as follows: "It seems to me a great mistake for women who are striving to gain from men a share in the power of law making to show what a law they would make against the men if they had the power. Even I, though a warm advocate for 'women's rights' in every direction where they have rights not yet conceded to them, would seek to withhold power from them, till they show themselves capable of wielding it wisely and soberly. The proposition of castration as an amendment of the law is a proposal of proof of want of sobriety of mind and quiet and patient thought. This is to me, not social science, but social quackery. We should say so! And it is but just to the women to say that one of the promptest protests against this proposal comes from a woman, Mrs. Juliet H. Severance, M.D., of Milwauke, from whose letter to the "Herald of Industry" we extract the following: "Your proposition to make castration the penalty for misused sexuality and by so doing thereby lessen the condition of crime and pauperism seems to me simply monstrous, and is no proper remedy for either. I can not see that the destruction of any organ that executes the will of perveted or badly generated minds can be other than in interference with the chances for development of the individual, which should be the grand consideration and aim, and not their destruction. As well recommend amputating the hands for larceny, or cutting out the tongue for vulgarity and slander. These methods belong to the Dark Ages and not to the latter half of the nineteenth century. But Mrs. Severance, it must be remembered, is one in a million, for she is a reader of Liberty and has but little faith, we suspect, in the efficacy of suffrage. Naturally she will have less than ever after this attempt to herald the Industry of castration. In another part of the paper we find this statement: "If only one woman in the world appreciates the power of the ballot, she should have it." Liberty submits that the compulsory castration sufficiently shows that at least one woman appreciates the power of the ballot, and that this proves, if it proves anything, that she should have it.
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"A free man is one who enjoys the use of his reason and his faculties; he is neither made a slave nor a pauper, nor confined or driven by aggression, nor deemed a unreasonable opinions."—Proudhon.

Karl Marx as Friend and Foe.

By the death of Karl Marx the cause of labor has lost one of the most faithful friends it ever had. Liberty says thus much in hearty tribute to the sincerity and hearty steadfastness of the man who, perhaps to a greater extent than any other, represented, by nature and by doctrine, the principle of authority which we live to combat. Anarchism knew in him its bitterest enemy, since every anarchist must hate him in his memory with respect. Strangely mingled feelings of admiration and abhorrence are simultaneously inspired in us by contemplation of this great man’s career. Toward the two fundamental principles of the intelligent society of humanity, the Christian and the anti-Christian, they must consider him an enemy. Liberty said as much in its first issue, and sees no reason to change its mind. He was at once a man of the people, a strong man, a humanitarian, and the promulgator of much vitally important truth. He was the ready instrument of all the political and economic ideas which he was persistently and irretrievably mistaken.

We cannot, then, join in the thoughtless, indiscriminate, and indiscriminate condemnation of his memory indulged in so great a banner, and on so grand a form. Perhaps, however, we might pass it by without protest, did it not involve injustice and ingratitude to other and greater men. The extravagant claim of precedence as a radical political economist put forward for Karl Marx by his friends must not be allowed to overshadow the work of his superiors. We give an instance of this claim, taken from the resolutions passed unanimously by the great Cooper Union meeting held in honor of Marx: "In the field of social science, he was the first to prove by statistical facts and by reasoning based upon universally recognized principles of political economy that capitalist production must necessarily lead to the monopolizing and concentration of all industry into the hands of a few, and that, by working the fruits of their toil, reduce them to absolute slavery and degradation." These words were read to the audience in English by Philip Van Patten and in German by our worthy comrade Justus Schwab. It was an honest这两个men who are so utterly unenlightened with the literature of socialism that they do not know this statement to be false, and that the tendency and consequences of capitalist production referred to were demonstrated to the world since the tenth years preceding the publication of "Das Kapital," with a wealth of learning, a cogency and subtlety of reasoning, and an ardor of style to which Karl Marx could not so much pretend? In the "Das Kapital," by W. P. J. Proudhon, published between 1840 and 1842, this notable truth was turned over and over and inside out until well-nigh every phase of it had been presented to the light.

What was the economic theory developed by Karl Marx? We may or may not accede to stating it unfairly, while believing that it is drawn by Louis Malon, a prominent French socialist, in sympathy with Marx’s thought. Aside from the specific purpose which we have in quoting it, it is in itself well worth the space which it requires, being in the main a succinct presentation of the two fundamental principles of political economy—

All societies that have existed thus far in history have one common characteristic—the struggle of classes. Revolutions have changed the conditions of this struggle, but have not superseded it. Though the bourgeois has taken the place of feudalism, though the aristocracy of the old patriarchal order, and though slavery and serfdom have been succeeded by the proletariat, the situation has retained these two distinctive characteristics, and the condition of the inferior class by the dominant class, and the struggle, either open or veiled, but deadly and constant, of the classes thus opposed remains the same.

The bourgeois, to obtain power, had to invoke political and economic liberty. In the name of the latter, which it has falsified, and aided by scientific and industrial progress, it has revolutionized production and inaugurated the system of capitalist production under which all wealth appears as an immense accumulation of merchandise formed elementally upon an immense number of individuals.

Everything destined for the satisfaction of a human need has a value of utility; as merchandise it has a value of exchange. Value of exchange is determined by the relative quantities containing the equivalence and exchangeability of useful objects.

As the most eminent economists have shown, notably Adam Smith, the value of a thing is the total time spent in its labor. This, of course, can refer only to the amount of labor necessary upon an average and performed with average skill, and subject to the normal industrial conditions of the day.

It seems, therefore, that every one should be able to buy, in return for his labor, a sufficient number of exchangeable values equivalent to those produced by him.

Nevertheless such is not the case. "The accumulation of wealth at one pole of society depends upon the formation of capital, at the expense of the poverty, subjection, and moral degradation of the class from whose product capital is born." What happens then? Because, by a series of robberies which, though sometimes legal, are none the less real, the productive forces, as fast as they have come into play, have been appropriated by privileged persons, who, thanks to this superaboundant revenue, can lead a luxurious and exploiter laborers.

Today he who is destined to become a capitaliste goes through a mercantile career, passes through many raw materials, and then, in order to operate thereby, buys the workingman’s power of labor, the sole source of value. He then knows nothing about it. It is a task that goes into the workers’ hands, who sell it for more than it cost him. The price of value capital is given, it is increased in proportion to the amount of value of the surplus labor of another or not paid for its wages.

For this singular state of things individuals are not to be held responsible: it is the capitalist society, for all events, all individual acts are but the process of inevitable forces slowly mobilizable, "when, in a society that has ascended in discovering the path of the nation’s law by which it governs its movement, it can neither close it at a leap nor abolish by decree the phases of its natural development. But it can close the period of stagnation and tesseract the pains of delivery."

We cannot, then, go against the tendencies of a society, but they direct themselves. The朽堕 social society goes on irresistibly coagulating centralization.

To attempt to stop this movement would be pure suicide; the necessary step is to pass the forces of concentration and to nationafize them, and that by a series of legal measures resulting from the capture of political power by the working classes. In the meantime, by the law of the wages the increase in the productivity of labor by the perfecting of machinery increases the frequency of labor power and makes poverty an inexhaustible demand for and augmenting the supply of laborers.

This is easily understood.

For the natural and logical laws of values of utility determined and regulated by real or fancied needs, which was in vogue early in the eighteenth century, is substituted the mercantile production of value of production, the inorganic rules of production, instead of the organic rules of labor, which, after running the steps in its logical course only when the markets of the world are gorged to overfeeding, increases the frequency of labor power and makes poverty an inexhaustible demand for and augmenting the supply of laborers.

Anarchism and Republicanism.

The fixed and inevitable logic of the problem of capital is the steady logic of events, renders Anarchism the certain outcome of social evolution. The, so to speak, centrifugal force of Government is universal suffrages; the centripetal is centralization. The compromise between these two forces is the fundamental orbit in which society is in a given nation moves.

Republicanism is, in its essence, a revolt against centralization. It is an attempt to segregate the function of sovereignty. Instead of the big trumpet which speaks for the executive, a little penny trumpet of authority, so that the big executive trumpet shall be the echo of all the little trumpets. Its sublime logic assumes that a command blown from one big trumpet is despotic, while, by the same command from a majority of little trumpets, it becomes the sacred and morally binding voice of Liberty.

The new economic forces which the bourgeois has appropriated have not completed their development, and even now the sphere of capitalistic enterprise is so vast that it can no longer contain them. Just as industry on a small scale was violently broken down because it obstructed production, so capitalistic enterprises, which are the result of these developments, will be broken down in their turn, for the concentration of the means of production and the socialization of the working classes is a point which renders them incompatible with their capitalistic envelope.

At this point the proletariat, like the bourgeoisie, will seize political power for the purpose of socializing the forces of production and circulation in the same order that they have been monopolized by capitalistic feudalism.

The foregoing is an admirable argument, and Liberty endorses the whole of it, excepting a few phrases concerning the nation’s state of industry and the assumption of political power by the working classes, which are its own. But it contains literally nothing in substantiation of the claim made for Marx in the Congre’s institute resolutions. Proudhon was years before Marx with nearly every link in this logical chain. We stand ready to give volume, chapter, and page of his writings for the historical persistence of class struggles in successive manifestations, for the bourgeois’s appeal to Liberty and its infidelity thereto, for the fiction that labor is the source and measure of wealth and that it is to be repaired by the oppressed in the respective remedies which they proposed. Marx would nationalize the productive and distributive forces; Proudhon would individualize and associate them. Marx would make the laborers political masters; Proudhon would abolish political mastership entirely. Marx would abolish usury by having the State lay violent hands on all industry and business and conduct it on the cost principle; Proudhon would abolish usury by disconnecting the State entirely from industry and business and forming a system of free banks which would furnish credit at cost to every industrious and deserving person and thus place the means of production within the reach of all. Marx believed in compulsory majority rule; Proudhon believed in the voluntary principle. In short, Marx was an authoritarian; Proudhon was a champion of Liberty.

Call Marx, then, the father of State socialism, if you will; but we dispute his paternity of the general principles of economy on which all schools of socialism are to be based. Marx was the greatest consequence who was first with these doctrines. As Proudhon himself asks: "Do we emulate the man who first perceive the dawn?" But if any discrimination is to be made, let it be a just one. There is nothing more that can be said as to a man of Karl Marx. Let us be satisfied with that, then, and not attempt to magnify his grandeur by denying, belittling, or ignoring the services of men greater than he.
The chief problem of Republicanism is to furnish everybody with a little trumpet. Very naturally, then, the women claim that they have as good a right to blow these trumpets of Republicanism as the men. Why not? The average woman suffragist furnishes ample presumptive evidence that she would make as good a blower as any other man, if she had a trumpet. Then, too, as Charles Sumner argued, if we have a Big Mike, the woolly-headed Sambo of the Carolinas has the natural right to blow as big a trumpet in the affairs of government as the president of the United States; for, verily, hath not McKinley, the corner gladiator, become as low, as childish, as Big Mike, the Sambo, a county judge? Yet whosoever should propose to take the electoral penney trumpet from one of the least of these would be accounted a traitor.

But as the trumpets multiply in the hands of Sambo, Big Mc., and McKinley, astounding exhibitions of political total depravity also multiply with them, and begin to startle men of serious bent. It is found that, although theoretically 'tis a trumpet of Big Mike is no bigger than that of the venerable Peter Cooper, yet, situated, on the same level, McKinley's corner groggy, he is master of all the other trumpets, and one little flourish of his is sufficient to seat McKinley in the highest chair of dignity, honor, and emolument known among his voting cattle.

Very naturally, exactly as before their eyes, men of honest industry, education, refinement, and consciousness begin to shrink from the prospect of seeing their wives and daughters flourishing peney electoral trumpets in rivalry with Big Mike or McKinley. What, moreover, is there for the poor folks in the dark waters of Salt River in the same boat with Sambo. But here even lofty and sturdy Romans like Wendell Phillips step to the rescue and plead: "Aye, from the very fact that these dirty fellows have fouled the air, therefore we should all press our privilege and all butting their wives and daughters among them to purify them, yes, verily, because Sambo, Big Mike, and McKinley will blow their trumpets in all vileness, even so much the more ought they to have them, seeing that it is the first business of all republican gentlemen to leave their...and educate such individuals to righteous trumpeting.""}

Into such astonishing straits of unreason have otherwise noble and thoughtful reformers been wedged in the confusion of Republicanism. The original fatal error consists in recognizing the business of trumpeting as authority to blind others without their consent. The scheme of eliminating the cries of the ever by marveling his big trumpet into millions of little trumpets, and then, the sign and the song of right every day more and more plainly manifest.

Long ago Mr. Phillips announced that Republicanism was a settled failure in the big cities of America. If his noble lie is spared a few years longer, he may die renouncing his faith in the whole delusion of political party.

The Anarchist alone is able to cast an unclouded eye on the whole drift of things. He does in one stroke the authority of any individual or combination of individuals to govern others with the sanction of the state. And this denial is not only based on passion, mental confusion, or madness, but it is based upon a consciously demonstrated philosophy rooted in the Logical con- stitution of man and society. Scientific anarchism is the perfection of order. It is the science of transforming politics. The man of the people...be the most pitiable construction, and there is...a declaration, skillful when there is an appearance of impartiality, the case being tried by a jury, and when there is every reason to believe that that jury was not only livingly wise, but deeply learned in the...a court of first instance on the subject, it could be accepted without question and the lives of men sacrificed. Under these circumstances the fullest liberty ought to be extended to present the greatest weight of evidence, as far as it could be got at, but the verdict of the jury. And doubly base must that government be that can first purchase the cooperation of the people and public infrumness, and then pack the jury to make conviction sure.

Then, what is the offense for which Mr. W. O'Brien is to be
LIONS AND GOVERNMENTS.

To the Editor of "Liberty:"

Dear Sir,—If a man puts his head into a lion’s mouth, or suffers his head to be forced into a lion’s mouth, before he kills the lion, he makes a great mistake. It is a very easy thing to kill a lion with a gun at his head; but if you put your head in the lion’s mouth, you may be killed by it. You must understand that the lion is very fond of its flesh, and if you put your head in its mouth, it will soon eat you. Therefore, if you want to get your head in its mouth, you must be very careful, and not put it there until you are sure that the lion is dead.

Yours truly,

A. J. Smith.