On Picket Duty.

Mr. Yarros' review of George Gunton's "Wealth and Progress," begun in this number of Liberty, will continue through two more issues.

E. C. Walker's "Fair Play" has appeared. Instead of the eight-page fortnightly at fifty cents a year announced in the prospectus, it is a four-page weekly at seventy-five cents a year. Printed mainly from new type, it makes a much better appearance than "Lucifer." I am accordingly disappointed in finding it less exclusively devoted to anti-Comstockism than I had supposed, from my previous acquaintance with "Lucifer." That is as it should be. On the contrary, it does vigorous battle against Authority all along the line. May it steadily grow in influence and circulation!

M. D. Leahy, whose doubts on the subject of compulsory taxation J. W. Lloyd made vigorous effort to dispel in the last number of Liberty, generously surrenders a large portion of his little paper, the "American Idea," to a reproduction of Mr. Lloyd's article. In his comments, however, he does not so much as touch a single one of Mr. Lloyd's arguments. The upshot of his remarks is that he has not yet sufficiently examined the question and must have further time before announcing his position. Which is very fair; only, in my judgment, it should have been stated in something like the following direct and simple fashion: "Mr. Lloyd's arguments seem to me unanswerable; otherwise I should try to answer them. On the other hand, there are difficulties which I am likewise unable to overcome. Therefore I must suspend judgment." But, instead of such simplicity, Mr. Leahy gives his readers over a column of "free writing," which, though in no sense a reply, has the air of one, and sounds as Ruskin wittily said of Mill's definition of productive labor, "so very like complete and satisfactory information that one is ashamed, after getting it, to ask for more perhaps." Perhaps Mr. Leahy approaches nearest to argument when he expresses sympathy with Labadie's statement that, "if the State would only remove those laws that stand in the way of free land, free money, and transportation, ... the laws for the punishment of crime would not be need to be executed." Labadie is perfectly right, but Leahy errs if he understands him to assert that free land and free money would render compulsory taxation useless. The position of the Anarchists, as Mr. Lloyd clearly showed, is that the law establishing a compulsory tax is a law, not for the punishment, but for the commission, of crime, and that it is the most potent of all those laws that stand in the way of free land and free money. The logic of Labadie's statement classes the abolition of compulsory taxation as a means rather than as a result. I have no doubt that Mr. Leahy will soon see this, for he has an open mind and sincerely desires the truth.

The following sentences occur in an editorial in "Lucifer" written by Moses Harman: "In his criticism published two weeks ago the charge was made by Mr. Tucker, or at least such was the legitimate inference from his language, that I had treated Mr. Walker so unfairly as to drive him from "Lucifer." When he spoke of the 'necessity' of his (W's) conduct in practically disappearing from its columns as a writer; the only legitimate inference was that in some way the Junior had been so trammeled by me that he could not be heard through "Lucifer's" columns. Then, if I were to say that I find myself under the "necessity" of going into the house when it rains, Mr. Harman would 'legitimately infer,' I suppose, that I am forbidden to stay out doors. Must I inform that gentleman that necessity sometimes takes other forms than compulsion by arbitrary will—often resulting, for instance, from the force of circumstances? The word necessity is generally used with reference to some end implied, and implied so dearly oftentimes that it would be an insult to that gentleman's sense to apply it. When I speak of the "necessity" of going into the house when it rains, it is superfluous to add "in order to avoid getting wet," unless I am talking to an idiot. Similarly, when I spoke of the "necessity" of Mr. Walker's disappearance from "Lucifer's" columns, it was superfluous, in the context, to add in order to avoid the shame and humiliation of responsibility for the facilitating policy of a paper bearing his name as one of its editors. That and nothing else is what I meant. But Mr. Harman chooses to "legitimately infer" that I not only go against him with excluding Mr. Walker, and on the strength of this print-column after column of ludicrous absurd complaint against me. His especial grievance is that I refuse to reprint his stuff in Liberty, and so he begs such readers of Liberty as see "Lucifer" to send him the names of all other readers of Liberty in order that he may supply them with copies of "Lucifer" containing the explanation of the establishment of "Fair Play." I hope to be the means of saving much trouble by notifying all readers of Liberty that the address of "Lucifer" is Valley Falls, Kansas.

Respectability.

Dear, had the world in its caprice
Delighted to precise I "know you both,"
Have recognized your pigmented truth,
Am sponsor for you: live in peace!—
How many precious months and years
Of youth had passed, that speed so fast,
Before we found it out at last.
The world, and what it fears.
How much of priceless life were spent
With men that every virtue decked,
And women models of their sex,
Society's true ornament,—
Ere we dared wander, nights like this,
Through wind and rain, and watch the Seine,
And fear the Renault break again,
To warmth and light and love.
I knew: the world proscribes not love;
Allows my finger to dance
Your lips' counter and downness,
Provided it supply a gleam.
The world's good word!—the Institute:
Grievous, but not forever.
Eh? Down the court three lamplight stars,
Put forward your best foot!

Robert B. Aurelio.

The original: 'You know I am not the daughter but the mother of order - but there is such a thing as respectability.'

The Decline of Compulsion.

[From the Election Sermon preached by Rev. Phillips Brooks before the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company, June 4, 1888.]

The military idea is in its broadcast statement the idea of recognized and more or less organized compulsion and restraint. Into the power of that idea man enters at a very early period of his development. If there is a time before he enters it, a time of unrestained willfulness, without compulsions, when every man does that which is right in his own eyes, "but time is very early left behind, never to be re-entered till man: at the other end of his life shall need no power beyond the self will of every individual, because every individual shall have become perfect and incapable of willing anything but what is absolutely right and good ... Man, having left falsehood behind, having outstripped the region of compulsions, dwells in that region, we cannot say how long, but while he does live in it finds its place in an abundant and organized society, it needs for its compulsion for higher competition and yet higher, the coarser for the finer, the brutal for the spiritual, and so it is to be judged at any special moment by the kind of compulsion which at that special moment is ruling his and giving shape to his life.

Now, he time upon which our thoughts are specially fixed is that which lies two hundred and fifty years ago, was peculiarly a time when the world was passing, or rather was realizing that it had passed, from the power of one compulsion to the power of another, which was higher and deeper and more real, and more we study the life of the eighteenth century, the more impressive it becomes, the more we feel that, as we study, we are attending at the birth of modern history, we are watching toe by toe Ytton's plan laid by the strongest army that decided the movement of the world's affairs. When the century closed, the world had fairly and distinctly entered on that new condition where to find and to conform to the most essential facts of the universe was the ambition and the purpose of mankind. That is the difference of ancient and modern life. ... To find the fundamental facts in every region and conform to them, to put the sceptre into the hands of the nature of things small, this is modern. It is Puritan: it is scientific. It has left the old empire of France on the barren, dead land come. And evidently now the military idea will undergo a change. The soldier will be no longer the minister of wanton force. He will be the embodiment in its crudest and most palpable form of the power of fact. He will be no thunderbolt flung into the midst of an amazed world. He will be the symbol and expression of the vital forces which are working everywhere for the expression of the essential facts. He will be the sole destructive power, but the conservative. He will appeal to man's admiration, not by the splendor of the sword he wields, but by the justice of the cause he represents. To put it in the simplest and severest form, the modern as distinguished from the ancient idea of war is the police idea. The soldier is not himself the changer of the world. He is only the secure and preserver of those conditions in which the vital forces which proceed out of the bosom of the eternal facts can do their work and make their mighty revolutions.
LOVE, MARRIAGE, AND DIVORCE, AND THE SOVEREIGNTY OF THE INDIVIDUAL.

A DISCUSSION

by

Henry James, Horace Greeley, and Stephen Pearl Andrews.

Mr. Andrews’ Reply to Mr. Greeley and Mr. Andrews.

Continued from No. 125.

Dismissing Mr. James, perhaps no one can attach more weight to your opinions. You at least, I think, have the right to speak by your own conclusions, unless you are fairly driven off from them.

"You affirm that the human race is working towards the perfection of the individual, and I will defend it. It is simply the clear understanding, with its necessary extension and limitation, of the affirmation in the American Declaration of Independence that "all men are entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." The principle of human freedom is the same in the enlightenment of the moderns and in the conservative judgment of matters of faith and conscience. Either assertion includes virtually and by direct consequences the whole doctrine of the sovereignty of the individual, or, "the right of man to do pretty much as he pleases." The right or wrong of this principle, dimly understood heretofore, has been the world's quarrel for some centuries, clearly and distinctly understood, with the full length of its reach before men's eyes, it is to be the world's quarrel for ever, and finally settled. All men are now again summoned to take sides in the fight, with the new light shed upon the length and breadth of the quarrel, by the development of modern ideas, and especially by Socialism, as the world is something to foster. Let those who wish to draw back do so now. Hereafter there will be no pretext of misunderstanding or intentions uncommunicated to the side of freedom.

Still, you are not upon the opposite side in this contest. So far as any guiding principle is concerned, it seems to me to have to do with the great name of progress, or half-way reformers in the world, are simply without any — what you are willing to trust. The conservatives are a great deal better off. So far as any guiding principle is concerned, it seems to me to have to do with the great name of progress, or half-way reformers in the world, are simply without any — what you are willing to trust. The conservatives are a great deal better off. So far as any guiding principle is concerned, it seems to me to have to do with the great name of progress, or half-way reformers in the world, are simply without any — what you are willing to trust. The conservatives are a great deal better off. So far as any guiding principle is concerned, it seems to me to have to do with the great name of progress, or half-way reformers in the world, are simply without any — what you are willing to trust. The conservatives are a great deal better off. So far as any guiding principle is concerned, it seems to me to have to do with the great name of progress, or half-way reformers in the world, are simply without any — what you are willing to trust. The conservatives are a great deal better off. So far as any guiding principle is concerned, it seems to me to have to do with the great name of progress, or half-way reformers in the world, are simply without any — what you are willing to trust. The conservatives are a great deal better off. So far as any guiding principle is concerned, it seems to me to have to do with the great name of progress, or half-way reformers in the world, are simply without any — what you are willing to trust. The conservatives are a great deal better off. So far as any guiding principle is concerned, it seems to me to have to do with the great name of progress, or half-way reformers in the world, are simply without any — what you are willing to trust. The conservatives are a great deal better off.

A more favorable condition of things, then, is to be regarded as a conjunction of circumstances, and to do what has its actual sequences, as the principle of order as well as of liberty and happiness among men, and challenge its acceptance by mankind. The whole dr is drifting to our post-Revolution Meyer, who is a monarch. We have had merely the good or ill fortune to arrive intellectually at the central point in advance of the multitude. It gives us at this happiness, that we look with pleasure on the progress which is so little and so often against the interest of others — is a subject of horror and dismay. In our view, the ultra-political Demo- crats of our day have only half finished his lessons in the rightful expansion of human freedom. The law, so far as we can tell, is the source of the final absence of legislation to any vague notions of the natural goodness of all. We are naturally aware that no sum total of good intentions, allowing them to exist, amounts to much unless they are the right of science, which analyzes the causes of crime and neutralizes the motives which now induce or provoke men to commit it.

To be continued.

THE RAG-PICKER OF PARIS.

By FELIX PYAT.

Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker.

PART FIRST.

THE BASKET.

Continued from No. 125.

The conversation ceased, and all eyes were fixed on Berville, erect and petrified. The sinister finger tracing the fatal handwriting on the wall at Belshazzar’s feast could not fail to affect the heavy appearance of the king upon the throne, the words of the eunuch produced an almost immediate effect on Berville.

Presentiment, that shadow of no-ﬁrmament, which precedes it instead of following it, and over the moist brow of the ﬁnancial, who, as a statue and pale as death, left the dining-hall with Bremond, without an excuse or a bow to any one.

The guests, who had seen him turn pale, watched him go out, some with surprise, others with suspicion; and even, with those who previously had been on terms of the greatest intimacy, the last traces of the social smile, which so often has its cause in the false pride of the social man, were gone. As for the Berry banker, the miracle which changed him, he said in the director’s office.

"You explained the banker in a tone of anguish, "my ruin is complete. He will not return."

No more festivities. All is silent, dark in the Berville mansion, except a hand that, despite its effort to hide it, increased its intensity to the ideal of order." He seems, indeed, wonderfully endued with the half-light of intuition to discern the profounder and to enucleate them in delightful forms of expression. It is less a subject of horror and dismay. In our view, the ultra-political Demo- crats of our day have only half finished his lessons in the rightful expansion of human freedom. The law, so far as we can tell, is the source of the final absence of legislation to any vague notions of the natural goodness of all. We are naturally aware that no sum total of good intentions, allowing them to exist, amounts to much unless they are the right of science, which analyzes the causes of crime and neutralizes the motives which now induce or provoke men to commit it.

As for the Berry banker, the miracle which changed him, he said in the director’s office.

"You explained the banker in a tone of anguish, "my ruin is complete. He will not return."

No more festivities. All is silent, dark in the Berville mansion, except a hand that, despite its effort to hide it, increased its intensity to the ideal of order." He seems, indeed, wonderfully endued with the half-light of intuition to discern the profounder and to enucleate them in delightful forms of expression. It is less a subject of horror and dismay. In our view, the ultra-political Demo- crats of our day have only half finished his lessons in the rightful expansion of human freedom. The law, so far as we can tell, is the source of the final absence of legislation to any vague notions of the natural goodness of all. We are naturally aware that no sum total of good intentions, allowing them to exist, amounts to much unless they are the right of science, which analyzes the causes of crime and neutralizes the motives which now induce or provoke men to commit it.
"That is what I did, Monsieur; Louis Dupont went with him, and I wonder..."

"You sent one with him?... All is explained! Shared between them!"

"But, Monsieur, I scarcely understand you."

"I understand myself only too well.

"Their route was long, extending outside of Paris," ventured M. Brémond."

"Perhaps they could not find a carriage to bring them back."

M. Berville stamped his foot.

"Stay rather that they have run away together!"

"Jacques and Louis?" replied the cashier. "Impossible! I would answer for their honesty almost as quickly as for my own."

"Be silent!", cried the cashier, "or I don't believe that you are accomplishing anything."

The cashier started, and, in a voice choking with indignation, said:

"II! Oh! I tell you that Jacques is no robber," exclaimed the enfant terrible, stopping his father.

But the crazed banker overruled his son as he had overruled the clock; and, at the risk of his life and in spite of his weight, he cleared the stairs four at a time, followed by the others.

CHAPTER VI.

THE DIDIER GARRET.

A moment later M. Berville, his cashier, the collector, and the police, were being driven rapidly in the vessel of the Faubourg Saint-Antoine.

On the way the four men could not exchange a word. The cab, going at full speed, made a deafening noise.

They stepped into an inviting street before a sorry-looking house.

"This is the place," said M. Brémond, opening the cab-door.

M. Berville cast an impassive glance at the Rue Sainte-Marguerite and the entrance of the house.

"Why, this Didier lives in a hovel!" he exclaimed. "And you knew him, Brémond?"

The officer, too, made a significant grimace.

"Find the treasure in there! We are fooled!"

The cashier observed the cashier, "the laboring class is obliged to live in low quarters; at a dollar a day one does not live where he likes, but where he can. Poverty is not a crime, Monsieur."

The banker made no answer.

"They all entered a dark passage."

Reaching a staircase as steep as a ladder, M. Brémond stopped in embarrassment.

"I do not know the floor," he said, casting his eyes about for the janitor's lodge.

"The top story, I think," said Dupont.

"No matter, let us go up at any rate," said the officer.

"Yes, and without delay;" exclaimed the banker.

A door opened at the top of the house, and a light appeared.

At the same time a woman's voice was heard, a voice of gentleness shaded with anxiety.

"Is that you, Jacques?"

The officer shook his head.

"Not returned!" said he, simply.

M. Berville stifed a cry of despair.

Brémond and Dupont looked at each other in consternation.

The four men rapidly ascended when they reached the last step of the fifth flight, they saw the wife of Jacques Didier.

The attic room was so disorderly it seemed large and so clean that it seemed almost a rag, not a straw or a grain of dust; a cleanliness, not of the surface only, but of the depth; the nooks and corners: that never entered into the middle of the room thoroughly searched with the duster: the brasses worn to the color of the horsehide shining as if wet; everything in place, nothing out of place; Jacques's spare pantaloons and shoes drying on a chair before a remnant of fire; a table set for two persons, perfect in its neatness, sewing the ragout strewing on a cloth; but the crown and base of all those great and little care was a pretty, white cradle for the rosy-faced baby.

Ah! the amount of courage and virtue that such a woman as Louise Didier expressed in struggling with her fortune from the kitchen! Always neatly shod and weeping on her head a linen cap that added to her thorough-going look, anxious at this moment and more than anxious, alarmed, open to nurse her child, her head, her eyes starting from their sockets, and planted himself in front of the collector.

"Clear out, you scoundrel! I'd miss you... Or rather, no, I keep you. You will be imprisoned in Le Force there to await the other, with your fellows, bandit!"

And, addressing M. Brémond, he added:

"An officer! Go get a dozen! Not a word. It is my will!"

The cashier started to obey this preposterous order.

"No, stay, you too!" exclaimed the banker, stopping him at the door. "You shall not go out either!"

And he began to scream at the stairs, calling the janitor.

"Flunit! Flunit! Bring me the police. Do you hear me?"

The janitor, with a start, had crossed Eisenhard obeyed passively, like an automaton, without knowing why.

Soon an officer made his appearance.

"What is the matter?" he inquired.

"Here I am, surrounded by fools and knaves, who have robbed me and allow me to be robbed," cried the banker, beseeching.

The officer, even right straight to the point, and, designating the cashier and the collector, asked:

"Which is to be arrested?"

"The other first!" exclaimed the banker.

"The other?" echoed the officer, with a look of surprise, searching the room w th his eyes.

He was looking for the third, almost suspecting the employer's sanity.

"Yes," explained the banker, coming back to his senses, "another: Jacques Didier, who has to be arrested."

"I see," the officer exclaimed, almost ascertained what has become of him. He must be found and arrested!"

"Is he married?" asked the officer.

"Undoubtedly."

"Indeed! Where does he live?"

"Faubourg Saint-Antoine."

"He must have gone home. We must start at once. Perhaps we shall catch the bird in his nest before he flies again. The paired rubber always returns to his home to carry away his female."

"You think so?" exclaimed the officer. "Let us be off."

And, taking his hat, he opened the door.

Alarmed, with eyes and ears wide open, two human forms then faced him,--his cousin and his son.

"What are you doing there?" cried the banker.

"Berville, my fortune is yours," said Gervaise.

"Food, keep your pear, keep your tit, and let me be.

"And he pushed her aside brutally.

Continued on page 6.
Trying to Be, and Not to Be.

I do not write this with the idea that you will publish it, for the tardiness with which you inserted my last question indicates too well my position in your estimation. I also have no reason to suppose that you will publish anything that I may write in your paper. You are too good a reasoner to not know that, if it is proper to interfere to compel people to regard our social condition as it really is, and not imagine or say, that it is not incompatible with happiness, there is no satisfaction in doing so. If there are no natural rights, there is no occasion for conscientious or other scruples, providing there is no false idea of right or wrong. Therefore there is no sense that there will be even as much individuality permitted under Anarchistic rule as under the present plan, for the principle of immum usus is now recognized, however far we may be from a true application. The "equal liberty" social convention catch-phrase can be stamped out as easily as any other. There are but two possible views of our present conditions of right and that of expediency,—and as you have knocked the idea of right out, the thing is narrowed to the lowest form of selfishness. The best way to argue with Anarchists, who deny very obligation on the ground of right, should be consistent in standing by the platform put forward when weak, than that ordinary political parties should stand by their ordinary platform.

I called "equal liberty" a "catch-phrase." It sounds nice, but when we criticise it, it is hollow. For instance, "equal liberty" may give every one the same opportunity to take freely from the same cupage patch, the same meat barrel, and the same grain-bin. So long as no one interferes with the other, he is not even supposed to have the "equal liberty," but when one undertakes to keep others away, he is, and you can only justify the provocation by saying that one ought to have liberty there, and the others had no, that the one who is working in the pail might not have the "equal liberty" to appropriate. But if nobody has any "natural rights," then the thief only does not interfere with the freedom of liberty, he does them no wrong. You have done well, considering your opportunity, but your case is weak. You are mired and tangled in the mire of the most shallowest material help. Still, I see a ray of hope for Anarchism. Just unite with the Christian Science metaphysicians, and the amalgamation will be an improvement. As I have looked it over, I am sure the philosophical condition will be perfect, and the result will be the most pleasing nectar ever imbibed by suffering humanity.

S. BLODGETT.

As Mr. Blodgett says, it is not proper to enforce one social convention as another "providing there is any other opportunity for the same." But Anarchists, from the very fact that they are Anarchists, take no satisfaction in enforcing any social convention except that of equal liberty, that being the essence of their creed. Now, Mr. Blodgett asked me to define the sphere of force as viewed by Anarchists; he did not ask me to define what the sphere of force would be if there were no Anarchists. In my opinion, the sphere of force is the same whether there are Anarchists or not. Mr. Blodgett is a good enough reasoner to perceive this distinction, but I fear that he is not.

It is true, also, that, if there are no natural rights, there is no occasion for conscientious scruples. But it is not true that there is no occasion for "other scruples." A scruple, according to Webster, is "hesitation as to action from the difficulty of determining what is right or expedient." Why should not disbelievers in natural rights hesitate on grounds of expediency? In other words, why should they be less scrupulous? After all, it seems to me that Anarchists do not recognize the principle of human rights. But it recognizes human equality as a necessity of stable society. How, then, can it be charged with failing to guarantee individuality?

Anarchists, therefore, that equal liberty can be stamped out as coolly as anything else. But people who believe in it will not be likely to stamp it out. And Anarchists believe in it.

It is true, still further, that there are two standards of conduct, which I have already mentioned. But why does elimination of right narrow the thing down to the lowest form of selfishness? Is expediency exclusive of the higher forms of selfishness? I deem it expedient to be honest. Shall I not be honest, then, regardless of any idea of right? Or is honesty the lowest form of selfishness?

It is far from true, however, that Anarchists have no more reason to stand by their platform than ordinary

Herr Most Distilled and Consum'd.

After proclaiming, in "Freiheit" of May 19, his intention of proceeding to my final demolition, Herr Marx has only the other day completed the last act of the controversy with me with such a homoeopathic dilution of his preceding articles that it is scarcely worth attention. Summarized, his positions are that the controversy is unequal, because he quotes and then criticizes, while I criticise without quotation; that I am the dodger, not he, because the essential question is the private property question, while I insist on discussing Proudhon's banking system; that he has read Liberty for six years, and has no plausible defence of that system in its pages, and that the statements in my last reply were probably correct; that the system has been put into operation in Germany; and else where with no further effect than to enable the smaller bourgeois to hold out a little longer against the "larger" that I only half understand Proudhon's works; that, if I would read the whole of Proudhon, I might know something about the economics of Socialism; that Proudhon's banking system has no longer a single champion in Europe; and that, if we are once through with the political tyrants, then the economic ones will no longer do us any harm. If I am not in danger of us, we will surely have had their necks broken with the former, especially since both kinds are essentially one and the same persons.

I answer, with little brevity and succinctness, that I have accepted Herr Most by restatement, while he has misrepresented me by garbled quotations; that the essential question is not the private property question, since Herr Most promised to abandon Communism for private property on being shown that the latter is compatible with production on the large scale without the exploitation of labor, which immediately made the arguments on which the claim of such compatibility rests the essential question; that the principle of Proudhon's banking system has been expanded and developed in Liberty, and farther more fully and adequately than in the present controversy; that neither his system nor any similar system was ever put into un-selected operation so far as I know, and that, if my knowledge on this point is deficient, it is Herr Most's business to supply the deficiency by distinct specification of facts; that, other things being equal, those countries and those periods have been the most prosperous in which financial institutions have most nearly approached Proudhon's idea; that to understand half of Proudhon's works is better than to understand one whole of them; that the ideal of intelligent persons whom I know and who read "Freiheit" thoroughly, tell me that they have failed to derive any such benefit from it as Herr Most promises; that within a very few years a book of several hundred pages has been published in Paris by able stating and attacking Proudhon's banking theories.—"La Question Sociale" by Emile Chevalot; that many ideas of transcendental importance have been launched into the world, only to lie dormant under the pressure of reaction for long years before being revived and realized; and that it is not enough for a socialist to merely multiply the most disastrous political tyranny.—a fact which the Individualistic Anarchists have always relied on against the "Communistick Anarchists," whose claim has steadily been that to abolish political slavery and to that extent the campaign against economic privilege is necessary. In this last sentence of Herr Most's article, he gives away his whole case.

The Next Campaign.

While it is true that free trade, as an economic measure, if unaccompanied by other reforms, contains no relief for the victims of the present disorderly industrial system, and is therefore, from this point of view, a sum of economic laws, and that its friends of reform, it is nevertheless not to be denied that a political campaign fought upon the issue of Free Trade or Protection would incidentally prove of incalculable value to the Anarchistic movement and the cause of the people's emancipation. That the coming campaign will be so fought is of course extremely unlikely. Whatever individual Democrats here and there may say and do, the party machine and the chief influential organs of the so-called Democracy will never allow anything like a square and honest battle between the two.But if the Republicans should persist in ignoring the apologetic attitude of the revenue reformers and their protestations that they are not in favor of free trade, and succeed in compelling the Democrats to finally raise the banner of complete and honest free trade, they would render the Anarchists a great service and entitle themselves to our warm thanks. The Anarchists could not promise them to go into politics as their allies and help them defeat their antagonists, but they certainly would devote themselves not to furnish aid and comfort to the c.-ocrats.

No intelligent person can attempt a discussion of the tariff question without finding himself obliged to define his views of the most fundamental principles of social and political relations. To discuss the tariff means really to discuss the merits of paternalism and laissez faire. A protectionist, in defending his position, cannot escape the necessity of endorsing Communist conceptions of the Individual and the State; and a free trader, in refuting the protectionist, cannot exhaust his arguments on the theory of the State, State activity and control, the salutary effects of artificial regulation and control in the utilization of economic laws, etc. Or the other hand, how can a vigorous attack upon protection and a sound and consistent defense of liberty be conducted in favor of spectacle, State sovereignty, of private enterprise, of individual sovereignty, and of the beneficence of free competition? The past has shown that this issue cannot be argued without involving others more radical and vital. And we may expect to find a fight for free trade, Communist, Socialist, Universalist, Anarchist, Individualist, Nationalist, between the tribunes and organs of the opposite parties.

Anarchists can (and therefore should) derive great benefit from such a campaign. Without disgracing and lowering themselves à la George and the other labor politicians, they can watch the struggle and study the lessons of the hour, profiting by the concentration of the people's attention and showing them the logical bearings of the principles discussed. In pursuing this subject, those who feel compelled to leave unsaid and demonstrate that the real issue between Protection and Free Trade is, in its economic aspect, an issue between absolute freedom of industry and governmental monopoly, and, in its political and ethical phase, an issue between Individual Sovereignty and compulsory Communism.
politicains have to stand by theirs. Anarchists derive the advantages of harmonious society and know that consistent adherence to their platform is the only way to do this, to specialize in the division of labor, itself and "ludicre", and make platforms simply count votes. Even if it were conceivable that hypocrites could step upon the Anarchist platform, simply for their temporary convenience, would that not be to condemn those who are Anarchists? But Blousquet reject all govt principles the moment they are embarked in party "arms" by political tricksters.

General opposition to all to take freely from the same cabbage patch is not equal liberty. As was pointed out some time ago by a writer for the New York "World", the "assumption into Liberty, equal liberty does not mean equal slavery or equal invasion. It means the largest amounts of liberty compatible with equality and mutuality of respect, on the part of individuals living in society, for their respective characters of action. The appropria..."

The author of "To-Whit! To-Who!" is not yet at his "w..."

v.

Phillips Brooks Becoming "immoral."

The editor of Liberty has no reason to love Rev. Phillips Brooks, the Episcopal patriarch of Trinity Church, Boston. Calling at Mr. Brooks's house one fine January afternoon, the writer was confronted with a wa..."

w.

But June 4, the occasion of the two hundred and..."

x.

Be this as it may, the sermon referred to is so Anarch..."

y.

You have here substantially the means proposed by the two men, representing different schools and distinct periods, for the abolition of the control of the only passive factor in production, the state, the housing and standing-place and work-room of the whole human family. Question of the absolute evil to..."

z.

In sharp and significant contrast with the uterances of Rev. Phillips brooks at the hundred and fifty anniversary of the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company stands the toast given by Robert C. Winthrop at the anniversary of fifty years before: Ballots and bullets, the paper currency and metallic coins of a free people! The farmer can only be saved from..."
No difficulty in finding three hundred thousand dollars. Your fortune is no more than Jacques is," she continued.

The banker and the officer had soon examined the whole room.

"No, we are just as ostentatious as you are, my friend," replied the young woman, with a smile.

"An only infant," said the officer, in turn.

"Oh, yes," said the banker. "But that is not important, is it?"

"No, Monsieur," said the mother. "That is why I am anxious. He should have been here at eight o'clock, as usual, or at nine at the latest. See! his supper is there on the table, and he has been for him.

"Does he sometimes play?"

"Yes, he does." The officer smiled. "But he sometimes plays with the other children."

"Does he go to the wine-shop?"

"No, he has never been there."

"Papa!" cried the banker, with an air of importance and raising his voice again.

Mme. Didier turned to them, quivering with indignation, and called them witnesses to her husband's honor.

"Come, gentlemen, I say that Jacques is a robber," she cried, in turn. "Is that possible, tell them?"

All men, women, and children shook their heads, and unanimously, "No," almost falling to the accusation as they asked the question.

But a noise from the street came up the stairs, growing louder and more distant.

To be continued.

Socialist Economics and the Labor Movement.

BY VICTOR YARRO.

Socialistic schools of reform are undeniable acquiring greater popularity and receiving more thoughtful consideration as time rolls on and organized labor, or the revolutionary forces all over the bourgeois world in general, grow weary, sceptical, and discouraged. Correct methods of Socialism by which in the past the great battle against capitalism has been carried on. All the resources of our "intelligent American mechanic" have been exhausted to no purpose, and all the means that are necessary to secure the definite triumph of the working class are found utterly inadequate for the accomplishment of the end of the labor movement, nothing was more natural than that "foreign importations" should be examined. A long period of time was necessary. If the day of conservative "labor reform," trades-unions, strikes, and boycotts was over, and the emptiness of the talk about "fair wages," "harmony between capital and labor," arbitration, profit-sharing, and the American statement of "labor questions" had been "demonstrated beyond a doubt."

Recent events have been viewed with alarm by so many enthusiastic delight: by others— which mosse imposes every student of the labor movement that nearly all the able and influential leaders and tribunes of organized labor are, if not professionally Anarchist or Socialist, at least very much influenced in their tendencies and inclinations to either or the other of these schools of radical and revolutionary reform; that the number of the sectarian organs of Anarchism and Socialism is large and increasing; and that most of the leaders in the one (not the most important and important among them) exhibit strong sympathies and decided leanings either toward Socialism or toward Anarchism. Little is now heard about "fair wages," but the propositions that labor is entitled to its full natural reward, that utility must be abolished, and that capital must be destroyed, are everywhere being discussed.

But let no Socialist or Anarchist prematurely congratulate himself. Their triumph is still far from permanent, and they are seriously threatened with being dislodged from their position and trampled into dust. After a temporary mental aberration, they need to understand some lesson. Under the stimulus of a new expert, rapidly recovering his sober sense and conservative wisdom, and will some time his vigorous opposition to "imported" ideas in a fashion that will make that claim: that no market exists in this healthy and beautiful land for the drudges of Socialism.

Self-feint forces us to seek to inform ourselves about the man who shall be known. In the words of the new leader, "we are greatly and fully made acquainted with the simple, beautiful, natural, easy, modest measure, which, carried out according to instructions, would immediately secure the permanent health of the socialist question."

Under the leadership of the new expert, rapidly recovering his sober sense and conservative wisdom, and will soon renew his vigorous opposition to "imported" ideas in a fashion that will make that claim: that no market exists in this healthy and beautiful land for the drudges of Socialism.

As intimated above, Mr. Gunton girds himself for no smaller task than the overthrow of all radical schools of reform in the sphere of economic relations. After the labor movement, as we have seen, under the stimulus of new expert, the drudges of Socialism.

Self-feint forces us to seek to inform ourselves about the man who shall be known. In the words of the new leader, "we are greatly and fully made acquainted with the simple, beautiful, natural, easy, modest measure, which, carried out according to instructions, would immediately secure the permanent health of the socialist question."

But let no Socialist or Anarchist prematurely congratulate himself. Their triumph is still far from permanent, and they are seriously threatened with being dislodged from their position and trampled into dust. After a temporary mental aberration, they need to understand some lesson. Under the stimulus of a new expert, rapidly recovering his sober sense and conservative wisdom, and will soon renew his vigorous opposition to "imported" ideas in a fashion that will make that claim: that no market exists in this healthy and beautiful land for the drudges of Socialism.

But let no Socialist or Anarchist prematurely congratulate himself. Their triumph is still far from permanent, and they are seriously threatened with being dislodged from their position and trampled into dust. After a temporary mental aberration, they need to understand some lesson. Under the stimulus of a new expert, rapidly recovering his sober sense and conservative wisdom, and will soon renew his vigorous opposition to "imported" ideas in a fashion that will make that claim: that no market exists in this healthy and beautiful land for the drudges of Socialism.

We might state here Mr. Gunton's central position and make it an object of extended criticism, leaving minor points for the reader to dispose of in the light of our fundamental assumptions. But let us determine to closely follow Mr. Gunton's line of argument and examine one by one his claims and conclusions. The logical way to attack and only attempt to build up a systematic scientific theory upon the uncritical and fallacious. In his theory of private labor reform, and to put forward the policy of trades-unions in distinct and absolute opposition to Socialism, Mr. Gunton's methods are superficial, hitherto defended on grounds of expediency, is raised by Mr. Gunton to the dignity of an historical method of economic progress, and, far from accentuating the palpable errors of the present, and the only true and certain means of reform.

While we have no fear that the book will lead astray any considerable number of intelligent and informed people, yet, in view of the admiration, approval, and praise that the engine of capital-labor is now receiving, there is no danger of the Henry George farce being played over again. For, even more than Henry George, is Mr. Gunton determined to maintain the present system, and the discussion of its ostensible defects, must be regarded as essentially a plea in behalf of capitalism and an effort to shield it from the onslaught of the radical movement.

Perhaps it is proper, in view of the defense, to give an outline of our case and of the points we seek to establish. We expect to prove to the reader's satisfaction that Mr. Gunton is incompetent to deal with the subject-matter of his book; that his theories are based on a misapprehension of Socialistic economics; that his criticisms only expose his own lack of understanding; and that he has no more firm grasp of the scientific, historical, and philosophical facts of the case. We propose to argue from the highest plane of argument the whole question, to place in the average unenlightened laborer who joins a union for the purpose of fighting the "capital and" and honorable means.

In the Introduction, admitting that poverty is more ironical to society today than ever before" and that there is no surge with which the cry that the rich are growing poor and that the poor are growing richer is no better off than in the middle ages, but grants that his poverty is now more intense in kind and dangerous in character than ever before. Without stopping to argue this point, he proceeds to assert that, for example, it is passing over to his first important postulate and objection against Socialism. To eliminate poverty, he affirms, there is but one way; to increase wealth and further his question for the aggregate wealth per capita of the population be increased. Schemes involving "artificial manipulation of profits, rent, or taxes" contain no remedy, as they would best result in a transfer, not an increase of wealth, and be true in complaint among the working classes and their intellectual advocates that distribution of wealth is unfair and inequitable, and that consequently the problem to deal with is how to change the social, economic, and political institutions of society to secure an equitable distribution, is due to their inability to see that distribution is only a mental abstraction which is not actualized and is limited because it is only in reality an inseparable part of the process of production, no reform in distribution is possible except through direct influence upon production. A greater diffusion of wealth is manifestly, and can be effectuated by an increase in aggregate production, and such an increase of wealth is only possible by extending the use of machinery and improved methods of production. The question how to abolish poverty resolves itself into the two simple alternatives: 1. How can the means of production be increased? 2. How can the general rate of wages be advanced?

When we add that the incomes of the rent- and profit-receiving classes must not be diminished by the arrangements, we have stated the whole problem as it appears in the Introduction of Mr. Gunton's "Wealth and Progress."

The result of the new expert's statements is to show the inexplicability of the Socialist position in itself sufficient to prove to all competent to express an intelligent opinion that Mr. Gunton is criticizing proposals which he might have adopted himself. The only way to get through a book like Mr. Gunton's "What is Property?" or Marx's "Capital," with any attention, he would have avoided the sin (and consequently the mortification resulting from exposure) of a false and formal statement. Mr. Gunton will be surprised to learn from me that all Socialists do seek to increase the "aggregate wealth per capita," and well understand the sphere of distribution. An attempt should be made in his claim to originality (he or Mr. Stewart, who appears to have been his teacher), it shows that his "twentieth year of study" of economics have left him at a point where it is impossible to change social, economic, and political institutions of society to secure an equitable distribution. We shall explain just what the Socialists mean by charging the present system of distributing wealth with being mainly responsible for our industrial evils. And that the Socialists recognize the difficulty of organizing all schools base their wholesale condemnation of rent, interest, and profits—that is, usury, or reward of capital—precisely and strictly on the consideration that they alone are responsible for the evil, and propose to base their plan on the extension of improved methods of production and lay their effective veto upon the tendency of rates to rise concurrently with material progress.

Throughout the book Mr. Gunton's Socialist schools are clearly, purely verbal, and utterly forceless. In the First Chapter, treating of the respect for labor and capital in production, we have a fair sample of his logic. He combats the popular idea of the division between labor and money, ad

Besides this argument in favor of reward of capital, which is new and which, in spite of the appearance of force, ought not to deceive those who profess to be intelligent Socialists, engaged in the cause of the working class, if our leader, who has at least the merit of being original with our author. He speaks of the objection of interest advanced by some reformers that capital is simply labor, and labors in his book, "a vessel for the purpose of preserving antiquated expression," "where the error begins." It appears that labor being "simply human force or energy," cannot be stored up, and the most important fact to the almost opponent of the working class, that it is that an activity expended in producing an object is transferred to and preserved in that object. Between "stored" labor and "preserved" labor there is doubtless as vast a difference as between between wheat and wood, and yet it is difficult to argue against the absurd conclusions of the ignorant Socialists who fatally err at the very start in confounding these two concepts...
An Ordinary Occurrence.

One fine evening, as I walked home from my place of work with a fellow-employee, the question of the "social evil," or, more plainly and shockingly, prostitution, faced itself upon my attention. I immediately proceeded to discuss it with him.

In the city in which I live, as in all other "civilized" and populous centres, there are entire blocks and streets almost exclusively inhabited by prostitutes. The world rests from the labor of the day, who are relentlessly persecuted and bitterly denounced and abused by their patients and customers in spite of how liberal and progressive a place is. "Prostitution is universally abhorred" even that even these unscrupulous money-making concern, the newspapers, refuse to directly mention or allude their names.

Prostitution! What of it? Has it been seen to them? What? To be brutally truthful, has not explored their quarters? Surely, this is a subject upon which more must abound information.

I had to pass through one of those long and narrow streets in the city where, provided one has a certain object in view, it matters little what bell you ring and how many flights you climb. It was at the hour when the windows are opened and heads seen in all of them. Dark enough, but not too dark. No lights needed within, and none wanted. Unnotice a policeman in sight, walkers-by are sure of pleasant greetings and cordial requests to "stop in" and be made welcome.

Familiar though the pavement was, that evening my mind was occupied in considering all the various phases of the strange characteristic of our "civilization." When I mentioned it to my fellow-employee, the idea of it was the same. A controversy then began. My friend was angry (and therefore wrong) with everything and everybody. That prostitution was condoned with by all the great men of the land, was regarded as the most despicable, utterly indefensible, goes without saying. He held, of course, the industrial system largely responsible for this evil, but he had no pity or compassion with those men whose miserable world is more than the sin of and God's worthy creations, their bodies without affection, passion, or discrimination.

Thus a view I could not accept. Leaving out the moral phase as meaningless, the question of the social, with its unnatural phenomenon, something which could not exist under proper industrial and social conditions, and which is more so than any other, affecting everything. And under those circumstances, not even the present status of society and the free and peaceful application of the principles and their logical, legal, and legitimate consequences.

I declared that, in my honest thought, these principles, with the consequences which flow from them, are the whole of social evils, and that outside of that is nothing but stupid and ashamed.

I swear that these principles, and in the entire doctrine for that matter, are as much in need of a refuge as the absolutely nothing, contrary to the family, to liberty, to public order.

The Bank of the People is the only financial formulas, the transition into every language, of the principle of modern democracy, the sovereignty of the People, and of the republican motto, Liberty, Equality, Fraternity. But if it was that, in either case, or rather the totality of institutions of which property is the pivot, I have never intended, either to attack individual rights recognized by prior laws, or the legitimacy of acquired possessions, or to provoke an arbitrary redistribution of wealth, or to place any obstacle in the way of free and regular acquisition of property by sale and exchange, or even to suppress, or by sovereign decree, rest of land and interest of capital.

I think that all these manifestations of human activity should be free and equal. I admit that there would be no other modifications, restrictions, and suppressions which result naturally and necessarily from the universalization of the principle of reciprocity and from the laws of synthesis which I propose.

And what I say of property I say equally of every political and social institution. I propose in practice the several portions of the social symbolism through the concrete criticism of business has been arrived, by a long and laborious analysis, at the discovery of superior principles, the algebraic formulas of which is given in this set of incorporation.

This is my testament of life and death. I permit no one to suspect my sincerity more the man who could lie with his dying breath.

If I am mistaken, public reason will soon have done justice to my theories: it will remain for me only to disappear from the hierarchy of the society of society and say brothers for the trouble that I have cast into their souls, and of which I, after all, must be the first victim.

But if, after being thus contradicted by general reasons and other expressions, you see, if I hope, by new suggestions, to again actuate minds and inspire false hopes, I shall call upon myself upon the contrary the conception of honest people and the curse of the human race.

Competition Not a Nurse of Inequality.

In modern society competitiveness is far from occupying the sphere of its natural action. Our laws place counter to it; and when it is asked whether the inequality of conditions is owing to the efficiency of the farmer, laborer, or manufacturer, or to look at the man who makes the greatest figure among us, and dazzle us by the display of their scandalous wealth, in order to assure ourselves that inequality, so far as it is artificial and unequal, has for foundation, conquests, monopolies, restrictions, privileged offices, functions, and places, ministerial trafficking, public borrowing,—all things with which competition has nothing to do.

Was Proudhon a Hypocrite?

In a lecture recently delivered in London Pierre Kropotkins conclusion was "undoubtedly one of the greatest writers who have ever dealt with economical questions" and perhaps «the most sagacious» amongst those writers who lead men to think for themselves." But "his system of Mutual Bank, egged, the lecturer, "was an evident contradiction between the middle-class working-class, class contemporary with, than ever before in it himself, and only hoped that it might stir the workers to act on their own behalf." Coming on Kropotkins, I cannot believe that the beliefs to Proudhon's memory contained in the words I have italicized were deliberate, but certainly he could have said nothing more unwarrentable, more false, or more cruel. Proudhon's estimate ofPane's work is a major embarrassment. His conclusions are therefore matters are reiterated and emphatically dwelt upon in nearly every book that he wrote from 1846 until his death in 1865. The importance which he attributed to his system is established the "Bank of the People," and that Kropotkins should be ignored and upon his ignorance should base so gross a misjudgment makes one question the justice of that his repentation as a man of scientific habits.

I am not, before God and before men, on the Constitution, that I have never had or professed any system as inferior to those of the present status of incorporation, and that I ask nothing more, nothing less, than the free and peaceful application of these principles and their logical, legal, and legitimate consequences.

As I declared that, in my honest thought, these principles, with the consequences which flow from them, are the whole of social evils, and that outside of that is nothing but stupid and ashamed.

I swear that these principles, and in the entire doctrine for that matter, are as much in need of a refuge as the absolutely nothing, contrary to the family, to liberty, to public order.

The Bank of the People is the only financial formulas, the transition into every language, of the principle of modern democracy, the sovereignty of the People, and of the republican motto, Liberty, Equality, Fraternity. But if it was that, in either case, or rather the totality of institutions of which property is the pivot, I have never intended, either to attack individual rights recognized by prior laws, or the legitimacy of acquired possessions, or to provoke an arbitrary redistribution of wealth, or to place any obstacle in the way of free and regular acquisition of property by sale and exchange, or even to suppress, or by sovereign decree, rest of land and interest of capital.

I think that all these manifestations of human activity should be free and equal. I admit that there would be no other modifications, restrictions, and suppressions which result naturally and necessarily from the universalization of the principle of reciprocity and from the laws of synthesis which I propose.

And what I say of property I say equally of every political and social institution. I propose in practice the several portions of the social symbolism through the concrete criticism of business has been arrived, by a long and laborious analysis, at the discovery of superior principles, the algebraic formulas of which is given in this set of incorporation.

This is my testament of life and death. I permit no one to suspect my sincerity more the man who could lie with his dying breath.

If I am mistaken, public reason will soon have done justice to my theories: it will remain for me only to disappear from the hierarchy of the society of society and say brothers for the trouble that I have cast into their souls, and of which I, after all, must be the first victim.

But if, after being thus contradicted by general reasons and other expressions, you see, if I hope, by new suggestions, to again actuate minds and inspire false hopes, I shall call upon myself upon the contrary the conception of honest people and the curse of the human race.

Competition Not a Nurse of Inequality.

In modern society competitiveness is far from occupying the sphere of its natural action. Our laws place counter to it; and when it is asked whether the inequality of conditions is owing to the efficiency of the farmer, laborer, or manufacturer, or to look at the man who makes the greatest figure among us, and dazzle us by the display of their scandalous wealth, in order to assure ourselves that inequality, so far as it is artificial and unequal.
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