On Picket Duty.

Henry George’s “Standard” agrees with an opponent that “there can be no natural property value in land not created by labor,” and says: “Therefore we propose to tax away that legal property value in land which is not created by labor.” It would seem more natural, more simple, more direct to do away with this legal value by abolishing the law. That is what the Anarchists propose.

At the next meeting of the Anarchists’ Club, to be held in Caddo Hall, 170 Tremont Street, Sunday afternoon, December 18, at half past two o’clock, the principal address will be delivered by E. B. McKenzie on “The Sovereignty of the Individual.” The success of the Club continues; its audiences are larger than these days of our organization holding regular public meetings in Boston.

It is a common thing to see references, both in the capitolistic and the labor press, to one individual or another as “the arch-Anarchist.” Such a term shows how little the writer knows of the meaning of Anarchy. It never could have occurred to him that the affirmative arch before the hyphen is precisely the same arch to which, after the hyphen, a negative form is given by the privative ar. There is no more sense in the term Arch-Anarchist than in the term Theatric Athlete.

By the kindness of generous friends a special edition of ten thousand copies of this issue of Liberty is printed and will be distributed broadcast over the United States. Two extra copies are mailed to each subscriber, and it is hoped that these will be given to interesting truth-seekers. Whoever obtains a copy of the special edition is requested to notice that it is printed on cheap newspaper. The regular edition furnished to subscribers is always printed on an excellent quality of book paper.

“X little child that is familiar with the Christian Catechism is really more enlightened on truths that should come home to every rational mind than the most profound philosophers of Pagan antiquity, or even of the so-called philosophers of our own times. He has mastered the great problem of life. He knows his origin, his sublime destiny, and the means of attaining it.” This utterance is not from “Puck,” but from an article by that gifted amateur humorist, Cardinal Gibbons, in the “North American Review.”

The sermon of Rev. John C. Kimball of Hartford, one of the leading lights of the Unitarian denomination, is so conspicuous and honorable an exception to the flabby utterances of almost the entire body of his fellow-clergymen of all sects in regard to the hanging of our Chicago comrades that I surrender a very large portion of my space to his address. It was nearly all in type before I knew that the author had revised and added to his discourse and published it in pamphlet form, together with an account of the persecution which his bravery has brought upon him (unparalleled since slavery days), his address in his defence, and his triumph over his adversaries. I can best make amends for the inadequacy of this report by recommending every one of the thousands of people in whose hands this issue will be placed to send to Rev. John C. Kimball, Hartford, Conn., for one or more copies of the pamphlet. The price is but ten cents, and the discourse with its account of persecution to be preserved or distributed many times that sum. As an exposition of Anarchism the sermon is in many respects far from reliable, but as a rebuke of the prevailing attitude toward new and revolutionary thought in such marked contrast with the great fact that it deserves it has not been surpassed for many a day.

Taking his cue from the English Personal Rights Association, which exists to secure the exercise of individual liberty, T. B. Wakeman, in the “Free-thinkers’ Magazine,” advocates the formation of a similar society in this country, enumerating among the objects to which it might well devote itself the handling-over of the railroads, telegraphs, and many other things to the State and the passage of liquor laws as stringent as the laws governing the sale of poisons. If the use to which Mr. Wakeman is putting their example were to be brought to the notice of the officers of the English society, says A. H. con Herbert or Peter Taylor or Jacob Bright,—I fancy that the next “personal right” they would set about vindicating would be the right to free speech.

The “Anti-Monopolist,” published at Enterprise, Kansas, declares that “of the twenty-two prominent anti-monopoly papers in Kansas, twenty-stout the Henry George land value tax, one opposes it slightly, and the other admits it has never studied the question and is not ready to take sides until it has done so.” Does the “Anti-Monopolist” mean to say that “Lucifer” is not prominent, or that there are twenty-two anti-monopoly papers in Kansas more prominent than “Lucifer,” or that “Lucifer” is not an anti-monopoly paper? If that is not published in Kansas, or that it sustains the land value tax, or that it opposes it slightly, or that it admits it has never studied the question? The “Anti-Monopolist’s” statement seems necessarily to involve some one of these things as a corollary, and yet I had supposed them all to be false.

The Weaver.

[Reprinted by George Engel in his call the night he was murdered.]

With tearless eyes, in despair and gloom,
Granting their tears the right to flow.
Thy shroud, we wave, Germany of old,
We wave it in the sacred fold.
We are weaving, weaving, weaving.

A curse to the false gods we prayed to in vain.
In the winter’s cold, in hunger and pain.
Our hope, our waiting, all for naught.
He fooled us, he mocked us,—a terrible thought.
We are weaving, weaving, weaving.

A curse to the King of the rich.
For none of our brothers turned the old torch.
He takes our money, the very last cent;
To shoot us like dogs his soldiers he sent.
We are weaving, weaving, weaving.

A curse to the State, O false fatherland.
Shame and disgrace are nursed by the hand.
Where blessings are early bought by storm.
And in red and blood the Weber is born.
W. are weaving, weaving, weaving.

The rallying room, the socialist’s fight,
We are weaving, weaving, day and night.
Thy shroud, we wave, Germany of old.
We wave it in the sacred fold.
We are weaving, weaving, weaving.

Henry Bohn.

Rev. John C. Kimball on Anarchy.

[An sermon preached at Unity Church, Hartford, November 13, 1887.]

Lake xxii: 30, 21, 22, 23, 24. Pilate willing to release Jesus again unto them; but they cried saying crucify him. After he said unto them the third time, I find no cause of death in him. And they were instant with loud voices requiring that he might be crucified. And the voices of them and of the chief priests prevailed. And Pilate gave sentence that it should be as they required. These words were written of an event which occurred more than eighteen hundred years ago, and of a person who is now worshipped throughout a large part of Christendom as an saint, how some of the things that has occurred this past week with reference to the despised Chicago Anarchists and the state of popular feeling which has led to their death! The deed is over now, the popular clamour answered, the so-called majority of the law violated; and no arguments, no pleadings before Pilate, no appeals to justice and mercy and the higher sentiment of civilization, can be of any avail to save their bodily lives. But the subject itself is not over. Their teachings, their acts, and their execution are only the first red-lined chapter of what is to be a whole thousand-pegged volume of the world’s coming history. Never has the popular mind been so wrought up over any hanging, unless it was that of John Brown; never so very fresh and, and locked upon it; never so much inquired made as to what the animating principle could have been that has so inspired and uplifted them in the face of death. And that the Anarchists have gone, it is our duty as citizens, as Christians, and as students of social philosophy, to consider the principles involved and the lessons taught by this experience, so as to be ready for action in other like cases when they may come ere long.

What is Anarchy? What is the doctrine for which these men have sacrificed their lives and which so many others, some of whom are here present, have the confidence of, and which are as much inquired made as to what the animating principle could have been that has so inspired and uplifted them in the face of death. And that the Anarchists have gone, it is our duty as citizens, as Christians, and as students of social philosophy, to consider the principles involved and the lessons taught by this experience, so as to be ready for action in other like cases when they may come ere long.
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THE SCIENCE OF SOCIETY.

By Stephen Pearl Andrews.

APPENDIX.

I.

A REVIEW.

Continued from No. 113.

EQUITY AND COMMERCE. A New Development of Principles, Proposed as Elements for Economic Legislation, and a Practical Scheme of Reform. By Mr. Stephen Pearl Andrews. A new and enlarged edition of the original work on Social Science which has furnished its present editor, Mr. S. P. Andrews, with the basis for the views which he has set forth with so much force of argument and felicity of illustration in his work "Cost the Limit of Price." Of the profound importance which he attaches to the above doctrine, the author, in an address before the Students Union of Harvard, has declared. He announces it as "one of the most remarkable ever printed,—the condensed presentation of the most fundamental principles of Social Science ever yet discovered." He does not "hesitate to affirm that there is more scientific truth, positively new to the world, and immensely important in its bearings upon the destiny of mankind, contained in it than was ever before consigned to the same number of words." In his book, the system which is cherished both by Mr. Warren and Mr. Andrews, we are willing to own, which has awakened our interest in the subject, rather than any sympathy with its methods of instruction. We take an entirely fresh position. We hold an intense detestation of the taste for everything which claims to be a scientific improvement, and can never tolerate a theory which challenges our acceptance on rational grounds without first endeavoring to show it. As it is the point of view in which it is presented, we hold it the duty of every free mind to exercise a large hospitality to novel systems, in proportion to the scorn and neglect which they are likely to experience at the hands of a timid and unthinking conservatism. Indeed, in the present case we can not better show our appreciation of the ability and genuine devotion to social progress displayed in this little volume than by the perfect frankness with which we criticise its claims.

One of the two leading principles which to the work is devoted receives our hearty concurrence. This is the establishment of individual sovereignty as the object of social organisation. A variety of forcible considerations, in support of the position, are brought forward by Mr. Warren. But on this point his views cannot be gainsaid. He has, perhaps, been more successful than Mr. Andrews in his treatise on "Government"; but they more or less distinctly pervade the writings of all who have perceived the superiority of man to his accidents and accidents of individual rights the establishment of a true social order as the most perfect action of the productive elements of the earth and the atmosphere is the aim of a true system of agriculture. It is the inspiration of which the history of the efforts of every social order prepared by deism, rationalism, and eminently of Charles Fourier, the most philosophical, the most profound, and the most comprehensive of all teachers of social science in the nineteenth century. We quarrel with the present order of society because it is a system of relations, that it reduces to the lowest limits, subjects the masses (the aggregate of individuality) to oppressive and crushing influences. The elements of humanity in a state of slavery or parasitism, leaves no scope to the vast manifestations of genius, talent, and to the people to a dead level of custom and fashion, and absolutely deprives of the most precious of all the characteristics, the most important of all the capacities and the most essential of all the privileges of the individual. The development and sovereignty of the individual is a chimera without the possession of property. The universal instinct which dreads poverty as the crown of man, it is the essence of the sum total of its power, and the celerity and inexorable care. He has no guarantee that he can find a place to lay his head, for houses and lands are mortgaged. He may be in want of food to eat, for the silver and gold are no longer in the hands of the people. The life of the rich man cannot enter the Kingdom of Heaven, it is equally true in another sense that the Kingdom of Heaven cannot enter within the soil of the poor man. He is shut out from the command of himself, which is the essential foundation of all personal felicity. He cannot do what he will with his own; for he has neither choice nor ownership. He is under bondage to the external world, to society, to his own physical wants. His very selfhood is eaten out of him by the canker of hunger, because he cannot do what he will with his property. The condition of his wealth, as the possession of the sensual elements of humanity is in a state of slavery or parasitism, leaves no scope to the vast manifestations of genius, talent, and to the people to a dead level of custom and fashion, and absolutely deprives of the most precious of all the characteristics, the most important of all the capacities and the most essential of all the privileges of the individual. It is the recognition of this fact that the sentiment of humanity amid the dismal shades of ignorance and the blind terrors of superstition.

It is the recognition of this fact that the sentiment of humanity amid the dismal shades of ignorance and the blind terrors of superstition.

*This review and the copy from Mr. Andrews which follows it, appeared originally in the New York "Tribune." The review is supposed to have been written by George Ripley, a prominent editor of the Tribune and at one time president of the Brook Farm Association.*
"Deny then that you are the lover of Lady Ellen," cried Musker, "and that it was to be yours alone that she has poisoned the Duke, after having, on various occasions, tried to rid him of his friend, whose aid of Casper, whom they accuse also of riding herself of a crime.

The old Lord had given all his voice to this request, and put into it an accent of authority so strong that Bradwell, though at least doubtful, was forced to yield. She, who had been summoned to the castle, set up its choruses of lamentations, and the sinister, prolonged howlings impressed Duchess Paulfully; she imagined that they were going to throw her as food to those leprous spectres that were to have presided at the Duke’s marriage, and that this announcement of her execution was a quarry like that in which had perished the goblins, and by way of retaliation.

But Trox, after having left her for a few seconds to the horror of this fear, came back to check her. He was excited, and her case was clear. She was a Hollander, and murder of Casper was only a secondary matter, and committed only to annihilate the awk-

ly: she had the indelicate acception, of her then unsuccessful attempts up-

the Duke’s life.

The ball which grazed Sir Newington’s head on the green of Bunceley really came, as it was afterwards found out, from the back of a coach of the Duke’s horse in the hunt was also the work of Casper, commanded by Lady Ellen.

The Duchess protested with virulence, treating as miserable inventions all these baseless accusations, and either of the two acts committed by her husband at the feet of the young woman; one kills only the despicable master, not the sub-
misive, respectful, fervent slave.

"But they do not come from one bales, in order to belong only to the lover with whom one is smitten."

"Lady Ellen has no lovers," stoutly replied Musker, who had courted the Duchess and judged her to be an unassailable woman. "She has Richard Bradwell for a lover," answered Trox.

"It is false!" cried Musker.

"A false accusation is to be believed," said the Duchess at the same time, shrugging her shoulders, but deigning nevertheless, in a jesting and haughty manner, to refute the insinuation.

Richard Bradwell, who had invented, then, this silly story? Trox, Marian’s grandfather. He was, however, not ignorant, unless through unheard-of blindness or deafness, of the unlawful love of Richard for her granddaughter, even if he had any doubt left in him; Richard had clearly expressed it, it would seem. The Irish, all the English officers, all the surviving soldiers were witnesses of it: Bradwell had been the laughing-stock of his camp!

"One thing astonishes me," closed the Duchess impudently; "it is that, leaping from his funeral bed, Newington does not rise in fury at this reminder to confirm my words."

Bus was winning. The variable crew of English, familiar with the facts which she invoked in her defence, manifested its approval of this argument.

But Trox, allied to the Duchess coldly, and as if there had been no question of his participation in the intrigue.

"I repeat," said he, "that Lady Ellen, in spite of her denials, has Richard Brad-

well for a lover.

"It is false!" cried Musker again, surprised that Richard did not rise with the energy of indignation against an imposture so monstrous.

Everywhere was the same King; they summoned him, Mus-

kery called on him; but he, unmoved, deaf to the insinuations, innumerable to the rumors of unannounced repugnance excited by the revelation of Trox, looked fixedly, without thought, upon the duel corpse, which he had approached, with folded arms, and head lowered, according to his habit when near the cadaverine.

At intervals his lips moved in silence, uttering some word into word, and he did not move from this attitude, notwithstanding the line of witnesses who testified to details tending to establish the adultery of the son and wife of Newington.

"They lie, they are guilty of the crime which they are so pleased to maintain," answered Lady Ellen, vehemently, to each of their imputations.

But the senecenousness of her distracted voice did not move Bradwell from his place, he made a story for the murderer who brought to the ears of the witnesses, of whom Trox demanded the oath, sworn on the corpse.

But, on the whole, the testimony was debatable; the charge was supported by no crucial facts. The only direct evidence was the lip of the caresses, the liberties charged, had not, perhaps, passed the limits of an unim-

portant familiarity.

A servant of the Duke, pretended to have observed demensions more compo-

mising, to have seen Sir Richard enter at night the apartments of the Duchess and reciprocally Lady Ellen glide at night, and twenty times rather than once, into those of Sir Richard. But the Duke and the Ducessa, in the necessity of the case, had not denounced the lover.

Obtaining the voice persisted that he had heard the most serious dialogue be-

 tween the Duke and the lover; she saying, "To be by turns in his arms and in

Dane sickness me; I must die!" and Sir Bradwell exclaiming: "No, no, he is my

father." This was the reason for the second charge.

The maid of the Duchess proved that the lackey, discharged some time before for
tort, was taking vile rage.

The success having been a failure, they admitted generally the crime of the

Duke, but not yet the motive, not the adultery, which nothing decisively affirmed and against which Musker set himself, sneering himself hoarse, with a heart

worth of a bold and, exulting by the destruction of himself, by the murder of one infamous more.

"Bradwell!" said Trox, in the tumult of the controversy; but he had to touch the

end, who did not hear him.

"What?" said he, at last.

"Yes then that you are the lover of Lady Ellen," cried Musker, "and that it was to be yours alone that she has poisoned the Duke, after having, on various occasions, tried to rid him of his friend, whose aid of Casper, whom they accuse also of riding herself of a crime.

The old Lord had given all his voice to this request, and put into it an accent

of authority so strong that Bradwell, though at least doubtful, was forced to yield. She, who had been summoned to the castle, set up its choruses of lamentations, and the sinister, prolonged howlings impressed Duchess Paulfully; she imagined that they were going to throw her as food to those leprous spectres that were to have presided at the Duke’s marriage, and that this announcement of her execution was a quarry like that in which had perished the goblins, and by way of retaliation.

But Trox, after having left her for a few seconds to the horror of this fear, came back to check her. He was excited, and her case was clear. She was a Hollander, and murder of Casper was only a secondary matter, and committed only to annihilate the awk-

ly: she had the indelicate acception, of her then unsuccessful attempts up-

the Duke’s life.

The ball which grazed Sir Newington’s head on the green of Bunceley really came, as it was afterwards found out, from the back of a coach of the Duke’s horse in the hunt was also the work of Casper, commanded by Lady Ellen.

The Duchess protested with virulence, treating as miserable inventions all these baseless accusations, and either of the two acts committed by her husband at the feet of the young woman; one kills only the despicable master, not the sub-
misive, respectful, fervent slave.

"But they do not come from one bales, in order to belong only to the lover with whom one is smitten."
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"An abiding real and integral, the last vestiges of old-time slav- ery, the Revolution abolishes at once the sword of the execu- tioner, the seal of the medallion, and its convulsion, the voice of the hanging of the departmental clerk, all those ignominy of Politics, which young Liberty grinned beneath its heel." — Provisional.

EY The appearance in the editorial columns of articles over other signatures than the editor's initial indicates that the editor approves their central purposes and general tenor, though he does not hold himself responsible for every phrase or word. But the appearance in other parts of the paper of articles by the same writer, with the signature of the editor, that he disapproves them in any respect, such disposition of them being governed largely by motives of convenience.

Anarchy and Christianity.

Elaborate and detailed criticism of Mr. Kimball's sermon on Anarchy would be out of place. Having gone so far, he may be safely left to complete the journey. Further investigation will remove the errors and mistakes of the formula which the certainly not his fault.

Owing to the widespread confusion and popular misinformation prevailing in relation to the subject of the laws, —"confusion made worse confounded" by the utterances of alleged public teachers, —it is absolutely impossible for the writer to form intelligent estimates of the various phases of the revolutionar y movement. Thus Mr. Kimball was led to identify the teachings of Proudhon with those of Marx, characterizing them both as believers in none except the State. And thus it is that he makes Aveling share Mot's desire "to help along" the revolution with dynamite. Mr. Kimball is guilty of a more fundamental and serious error, and of one for which it is much more difficult to account, when he speaks of a class of Anarchists who believe in government, in society both, and who "will plunge the knife deeper down than statute books." As an Anarchist, I can confidently assure Mr. Kimball that none of my brother Anarchists dream of "destroying" society, but that, on the contrary, and absolutely necessary to the constitution and its organic laws and the nature of its constitution spontaneously being lifted to perfection, and that government is the only force which holds it in check and interferes with its natural progress. No doubt Mr. Kimball has in mind some school of authoritarian reconstructionists of existing society, whom he misleads Anarchists.

But I pass on to the point which principally concerns me. It is the reasons offered by Mr. Kimball in explanation of his own position on the question of Anarchy.

Eloquently and forcibly expressing the views of the philosophical Anarchists, and accepting their idea of a future condition, Mr. Kimball, nevertheless, claims his divorce from them in the here and the now on the ground that government is a necessary evil, as an expedient while not all men prove themselves capable of wise self-government. Believing in Anarchy as an ideal, he does not think the world "ripe for its realization"; he is not an Anarchist "simply and solely on the reason that, though believing in Christ's doctrine of 'resist not evil,' etc., he does not put it in practice, — the reason that our environment and our human nature have not yet been developed into a fit- ness for them." Now, I am not prepared to rebuke Mr. Kimball for his obvious mistake. It is a perfectly possible mistake. But, I must remind him that, for a professor of follower of Christ, to plead in the way he does is to beg the question and to virtually decline to act in accordance with the Master's injunctions altogether. Jesus did not mean his disciples to wait for the ideal state, but expressly instructed them as to their immediate conduct. If Christian doctrines can only be carried out in a perfect world, then Christianity, as a working factor, does not exist in the present; what, then, is to bring the world up to the perfect state? As a minister, Mr. Kimball is illegible; as a man, he is very sensible. I, as an Anarchist, while recognizing that Jesus preached some Anarchistic ideas, can attach no value and no practical worth to his efforts. He appealed to sentiments of justice and prudence as against the force of economic and political circumstances. So it costs me nothing to entirely forgive Mr. Kimball his inconsistency as a minister for the sake of his common sense. But his intelligence must answer my question: what work is done to the law of Anarchy? If Anarchistic conduct is not to be expected as long as the world is not perfect, and who is to do the purifying and perfecting.

Government. Mr. Kimball, "It is a bridge over the cold discipline of the better world." "In its true function, it is the control of the lower elements of society by its best." Granting for a moment this theoretically absurd proposition, let me ask Mr. Kimball if eighteenth centuries of experience under governmental moulding and fitting of the people for the ideal Christian state is not sufficient to demonstrate the effectiveness or futility of the "expedient." How long ought it to take us to pass the bridge? Surely, in the course of eighteen hundred years of indefatigable and frequently painful Government, we ought, if not to have reached the promised land, then, at least, to have come near it. What is the reality? I set the eleventh of last November answer! And not only are we not encouraged by the government, but you in the ecclesiastical and philosophical, the "expedient" very often hinders rather than aids the evolution of the world. Is it not time to pause and reconsider the arguments which led to the employment of the expedient? Is it not in order to examine in the long experimental list of our future proceedings? Answering these questions in the affirmative, the Anarchists are discovering, as a result of their investigations, that the expedient is no expedient, at all, and that the arguments in its favor are false, first, that the government's participation, and its removal afterwards. Only relaxation of government and gradual familiarization with freedom and Anarchic conditions can eventually bring human nature into fitness with the ideal order of society. To expect government to prepare and fit men for Anarchy is to expect poison to restore a patient's health. Hygienic conditions make recovery possible. Society needs liberty's hygiene.

Think not, Mr. Kimball, that the Anarchists would straightway to the realization of government. No, they would still "resist evil" and restrain the "lower elements" of society. But for those that are already a law unto themselves, and who can be trusted to walk in the path of righteousness, the king-dom of heaven should now come; and for all the rest, in so far as they do show a disposition to act honorably, there should be perfect liberty. Because some persons, some times, in some matters, are incapable of self-control, shall we govern all alike and at all times? But in the meantime, what shall we do?"

Jesus taught us not to resist evil; and, as that was impracticable, sentimentalism, the world ignored it. Christianity, in its pure and ideal form, is simply a dream of the future. Anarchy appears to point out the way to a good state of society. Good evil may be and should be resisted while it exists, but only evil. Government stifles pure thought and honest aspiration. Government prostitutes and debases manhood. We try therefore, abolish it! V. YARROW.

The New York "Sun," in an editorial opposing govern- mental control of railroads, takes occasion to express regret at the blunder of the founders of this country in this respect, and cites the "excesses of government monopoly. Is it possible that the "Sun" has not heard of Lysander Spooner's famous argument in support of his belief that the postal service never was intended to be a government monopoly? If so, by all means let it familiarize itself with that remarkable document. But, whatever the intention of the framers of the constitution, if the "Sun" believes the postal monopoly to be an evil, why not abolish it, even if it may involve an amendment to the constitution? The people, not the people for the "lib- al" constitution. (Liberty cares nothing about the constitution, but it discusses this from the "Sun's" own standpoint.) A few years ago the "Sun" bitterly opposed the effort of the businessmen of New York to tamper with the traffic in small mail, but it is never too late to repent and reform.

James Freeman Clarke, in the "North American Review" gives this reason why he is not a free-ologist: "Free religion is held out to be the law of God and incompatibl with it. Education educes the present from the past by a continuous process, while Free religion separates itself from the past by ignoring the personality of Jesus." Being an evolu- tionist, Mr. Clarke expresses his disapproval of a religion which is "justified by its repudiation of the essential element of all the religions which preceded it, practically attempts to create something out of nothing. But he does not explain why he is a Christian and how he reconciles the theory of evolution with the myth of the fall of the mission of Jesus. Intelligent people are generally of the opinion that all religion is opposed to the law of evolution and incompatible with it," and, unless Mr. Clarke rises to further enlighten us as to why he is a religiousist, he will be curiously viewed as a self-styled Christian who strayed at a gust after swallowing a caravan of camels.

The Demagogue and the Sophist.

Rejected by the Standard.)

Mr. George: After reading carefully your article on the case of the Chicago Anarchists, and also Judge Maguire's legal opinion, in the recent issue of the "Standard," I am at a loss to know what to think of your feelings, although the three passions strive for mastery.

Equally as a loss I am to understand whether you believe in Anarchism or Socialism — the one desiring the evil of the individual for the benefit of the State, and the other desiring the evil of the State for the benefit of the individual. Verify you reason, Mr. George.

Leaving the reader still in doubt.

But on one point there can be no doubt: that is, on the pure demagoguism (this word seems harsh, but I know of no other word that so well expresses the idea of your entire article, and on the sophistry of the Judge's legal opinion in this case. Said a gentleman today, after reading yesterday's "Standard": "Can it be that Henry George, all, has become a second politician, 'a pandero to the mob'?"

I regret to say, it looks so.

Believing, as I and many of my friends do, that your idea of the principles of taxation will promote the best form of government, nothing that you can write, or say, or do, will affect my action so far as the encouragement of that principle is concerned when government is in question. And yet, such an article as that from your pen almost makes one despair of ever reaching the goal of better government through that form of coercive force known as government, which, after all, is simply a system of the majority coercing or ruling or governing the minority. Today the adherents of the theory of the taxation of land values, as a means to an end, are few. Coercion most cruelly by a vast majority,—which does not prove that majorities are right, or that a govern- ment so organized is the best one that can be. The true believer in this proposition that "the best government is that which governs least" might feel that the vast majority will, very likely, in time govern this country on the theory of the taxation of land values; and the novel specula- tion may be presented of an uprising to annihilate even this relic of the "divine right" of one or more men to govern. I see no wisdom, unless it is as- sumed that the government, by the machinery evolved under the necessities of the principle of taxing land values, is useless and doing mischief.

You say that "Anarchy is a reaction from Socialism." Well, what if it is? Socialism is a reaction from that sort of political faithlessness and the rich nabobs, free to prowl upon those unfortunate waifs of humanity who have not been able to join the shining few in the regal demagoguism, and he that would not stand behind the line, which keep the masses in ignorance and rage. "Henry George" is a reaction from that paradox which I shall call "the principle of the beneficence of the public," but the kind which governs only those whom the law-makers wish to govern. But is that any argument against Mr. George, if you agree, and it is in "the argument of despair," for, if this or some other means of relief is as- forced soon, the "impulses of man bitterly convicted of
Injustice and seeing no way out "will force them to do something desperate.

So "Anarchy is an importation into the United States," is it? Let us sum up the major facts in our experimental methods for "anti-revolutionary" methods. He took the evidence as he found it, as the "fence" does stolen goods, not caring whether they are fit for public use or not; it is the sign of his pretexts for "law and order," so as to screen for the police who charged on a peaceful meeting, which the mayor of Chicago had authorised and agreed to. I am well aware that the evidence of this fact that this meeting had been called to protest against murder; not a single doubt does he seem to entertain that all the arguments and bombastic threats of "Anarchist" and "blackmail" and dynamic were all innocent and guiltless of fraud; in fact, he finds no mitigating circumstances at all, and he has no reason whatever for abolishing a judicial system which could hang him for inciting this same rick just as easily as it could any of those who were hanged. I have heard him of crowd not so resolutely as ever the Anarchists did. He preach revolution just as truly as the Anarchists does. He wants it accomplished by force, moreover; it matters not that that force is the ballot box, for it is force, all the same; it is the iron rule of the majority over the minority; it is surrounding the minority with bonds which restrict it and restrain it of its liberty. Under the present system we are as liberty as is equal to a late million of dollars. Anarchist Judge Maguire comes along and destroys that law which makes one man a mogul, slights the law which makes one man a business man; they force the mortgage on the store, the home, and the farm. When the "panic" which you bring that is of the result of the abolition of the system. With Mr. Henry George has said, there is so much wool produced that thousands are dying of starvation; so many new clothes are being made that there is not enough of the poor must go bare-footed. Over-production, forsooth! But who ever heard of a policeman dragging one of these monstrosities out of the way for thousands? This is the miserable system which the Anarchists denounce. They demand a change. It may seem a remarkable coincidence, but it is a fact that Henry George and Judge Maguire have been向着 the same system, and that, in the eyes of the "saviours of society," is still worse, demanding a change. Aya, a complete, radical, and revolution. The people of the Anarchists in demanding that poverty be abolished. And yet it seems strange that Henry George and Judge Maguire should be so close together. And George had enough of society and applied the hugging of Anarchists because Pinkerton's thugs and their allies, the police, say they had nothing to do with the robbery of the farmers, and that they were not, in obedience to the demands of a mob, begun clubbing a peaceful meeting. They must feel how the alliance, and by the platitude which these monarchs of capital bestow for fighting the latter's battles so well. The man who dares show public opinion and the ignorant clamoring mob: is a brave man and must be sustained by a strong belief that his cause is a just one. Men who will die for their opinions rather than ask a pardon from a governor are more to be respected by the leaders of a new party, and it is because of these scintillas of doubt as to the wisdom or justness of executing the extreme sentence was entertained, why not have demanded a bull run, so much, and the only thing shooting. I looked for some word from Mr. George, but only a strange alien: brooded. This may be diplomatic, but it is not noble. "How to the less, let the chips fall where they may."

The whole written opinion of Judge Maguire on this subject is crudely, coldly legal. It must afoord the "saviours of society" a good deal of comfort. None of them could have been so clearly and so perfectly prorogued in his place. Maguire for "anti-revolutionary" methods. The latter openly avow the use of force, the coercion of the minority by the majority. But the Anarchist does not threaten to use force, but only to talk and, and would not use the force of the ballot to accomplish his ends. The great majority of the Anarchists do not vote at all; and the left is not so under pretext, and merely as an expendiary by which they hope to avoid the necessity for the exercise of more violent force.

T. D. WOTT.

SOCIALLY LETTERS.

[LETTER TO THE EDITOR.]

There are two Socialisms.

One is communistic, the other solidaritarian. One is dictatorial, the other democratic. One is metaphysical, the other positive. One is dogmatic, the other scientific. One will give all, the other reflective. Both are in pursuit of the greatest possible welfare for all. One aims to establish happiness for all, the other to enable each to be happy in his own way.

The first regards the State as a society sui generis, of an abstract nature, existing in the right outside of and above all society, with special rights and able to exact special obediencies; the second considers the State as an association of the individuals, and that no more than others. The first proclaims the sovereignty of the State, the second recognizes no sort of sovereign. One wishes all monopolies to be held by the State; the other wishes the abolition of all monopoly. One wishes the governed class to become the governing class; the other wishes the disappearance of classes. Both declare that the existing system of things cannot last. The first considers revolution as the indispensable agent of evolution; the second teases that repression alone turns evolution into revolution.

The first has faith in a cataclysm. The second knows that social progress will result from the law of competition.

Both understand that we are entering upon a new historic phase.

One wishes that there should be some but proletarian.

The other wishes that there should be no more proletarians.

The first wishes to take everything from everybody.

The second wishes to leave each in possession of his own.

One wishes to expropriate everybody.

The other wishes everybody to be a proprietor.

The first says: "Do as the government wishes." The second says: "Do as you wish yourself."

The former threatens with desperation.

The latter promises liberty.

The former regards the subject of the State.

The latter makes the State the employee of the citizen.

One proclaims that labor pains will be necessary to the realization.

The other declares that real progress will not cause suffering to any one.

The former is confidence in social war.

The other believes only in the works of peace.

One appeals to command, to regulate, to legislate.

The other wishes to apprehend everybody.

The first will fail; the other will succeed.

Both desire equality.

One by lowering heads that are too high.

The second desires to raise heads that are too low.

One sees equally under a common yoke.

The other will secure equality in complete liberty.

One desires the Great Compromise.

The other desires the Great Compromise.

One frowns, the other smiles.

The first wishes to instruct everybody.

The other wishes to be instructed everybody.

The first wishes to suppress everybody.

The second wishes to enable everybody to support himself.

The land to the State.

The State to the people.

The people to each other.

The State to the people.

The State to each other.

The makers of the future may be such as to instruct himself.

The first wishes to suppress everybody.

The second wishes to enable everybody to support himself.

The land to the State.

The State to the people.

The people to each other.

The State to the people.

The State to each other.

The makers of the future may be such as to instruct himself.

The first wishes to suppress everybody.

The second wishes to enable everybody to support himself.
the dominion of appetite and passion, and cannot be trusted to govern themselves. What we need for ages yet is to perfect, general, and universal elements of society, of religion's work — you see how the whole thing falls in with my idea of a church — and then by-and-by those religious, political, and economic in the law of life, just as proportion as each member of society doth inductively what is right, the need of outward law will pass away, as soon as the human system, the human moral muscles, the organs of various kinds, each of the utmost value to him once, have fallen into disuse and shrivelled up. Then the kingdom of heavens comes; men dwell together in the earth, as the fishes of the sea are in the sea. In all the world, in all the highest states of social anarchy — people with no legislative government — everywhere prevails. It is a sort of thing far off only one class of Anarchists, those who believe in society and only disbelief in government. But there is another class who go a great ways further still, these are the Abolitionists, the Radicals, the Socialists, both — at any rate in existing society. They look around them and see wrongs, oppressions, poverty, degradations, the enslavement of the mother by the child, of the husband by the wife, of the free man of nature; and when they war against them, they say, it is not in the interest of lawlessness and disorder, but for the interest of liberty, larger and freer, and then the man unhappy and burdened has been fought for, in which man uncontrolled shall live obedient all the more to nature's own eternal law.

Now this is what the Anarchist is. He is one who at least as a theory is entirely philosophical. It is in perfect harmony with that idea which is gradually permeating all modern thought, that nature is not the foe of man, but his friend, the very highest order of law and government being, but only to be carried out to be sufficient for all his ends, so that this is the foundation of all science, and in every more or less logical sense, and the reason that we liberally folks recognize in the sphere of religion, an idea that medicine has caught a glimpse of, an idea that all the medical men of Europe are holding to, and the men of science, the free man of nature; and when they war against them, they say, it is not in the interest of lawlessness and disorder, but for the interest of liberty, larger and freer, and then the man unhappy and burdened has been fought for, in which man uncontrolled shall live obedient all the more to nature's own eternal law.

Now this is what the Anarchist is. He is one who at least as a theory is entirely philosophical. It is in perfect harmony with that idea which is gradually permeating all modern thought, that nature is not the foe of man, but his friend, the very highest order of law and government being...
bure, or to conceal the evidence against some other crimes, as that of libel or treason. But no one has ever claimed that the Anarchists were engaged in this sort of thing, or in any of the more ordinary crimes. They were engaged in a struggle against the influences which they considered to be the cause of all these, whatever bad feeling they might have had afterwards against the authorities. Some of them had recently been down as the result of this struggle in several places, where they had been tried by juries and sentenced to death, and the verdicts had been reversed by the courts. At this time, however, the ideas of the state of society that would tolerate such outrages, that 7 y meet together; and to defend themselves against the police, the Conferences, and the authorities, the Conferences, were thrown for murder with the same penalty of the gallows as the chief who creeps into a house and strikes down a victim for murder, or the railroad who waylays and ravishes and murders as immortal grief, is to ignore the whole Christian doctrine of motive as the measure of guilt, and to confound and dishonor the very name of justice.

Worse than this, at the very time these Anarchists, strik- ing, as they believed, a blow for suffering humanity, were being hanged, were being burned by some of the murderers about whose selfish motives there could be no question, abroad free in our land. We have had two foul examples of this sort of thing in the last year, in Illinois and Indiana. Illinois and every State has had them, with or without their consent.

Now I am not going to enter into the details of this case, because I think it is a matter of common knowledge, and it is a matter of public interest. I think it is a matter of public interest, and I think it is a matter of public interest, and I think it is a matter of public interest, and I think it is a matter of public interest.

But I want to say, in conclusion, that this is a matter of public interest, and I think it is a matter of public interest, and I think it is a matter of public interest, and I think it is a matter of public interest.

Again, I believe they ought not to have been punished as murderers, because all experience shows that the taking of any lives in any cause is a matter of great delicacy, and because, I believe, an impression to that effect is a matter of great delicacy, and because, I believe, an impression to that effect is a matter of great delicacy, and because, I believe, an impression to that effect is a matter of great delicacy.

And yet with all this, there are millions of plain common people to whom even Co’s one thing which strikes re- minds us of the idea that all things are the majesty of Anarchy rather than of law.

I have one reason more to offer why they should not have been hanged, why they should not have been hanged, why they should not have been hanged, why they should not have been hanged.

The law, as you know, is a thing which is not understood by the jury, and is not understood by the jury, and is not understood by the jury, and is not understood by the jury.

The law, as you know, is a thing which is not understood by the jury, and is not understood by the jury, and is not understood by the jury, and is not understood by the jury.

The law, as you know, is a thing which is not understood by the jury, and is not understood by the jury, and is not understood by the jury, and is not understood by the jury.

The law, as you know, is a thing which is not understood by the jury, and is not understood by the jury, and is not understood by the jury, and is not understood by the jury.

The law, as you know, is a thing which is not understood by the jury, and is not understood by the jury, and is not understood by the jury, and is not understood by the jury.
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