Vol. II.—No. I.

BOSTON, MASS., SATURDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1882.

Whole No. 27.

" For always in thine eyes, O Liberty! Shines that high light whereby the world is saved; And though thou slay us, we will trust in thee.'

On Picket Duty

Read Lilerty's splendid offer of premiums to new subscribers in another column.

"Leaves of Grass" is now sold openly by nearly all the Boston booksellers. We have won our victory, and the "guardians of Massachusetts morality" have ignominiously retreated. This is well; but much trouble would have been saved, if the cowardly Osgoods had only stood up in their shoes, instead of surrendering without a struggle.

The woman suffragists of Boston met at Mrs. Fenno Tudor's a few days ago, and voted despite the recent declaration of the Democratic party in favor of woman suffrage, that it would be time enough to endorse that party when it had done substantial work for the reform in question. Ingratitude, thy name is woman!

Literature i about to be enriched by an unexpected treasure. Proudhon's family lately discovered among the manuscripts of that celebrated publicist a posthuthous work, entitled, " Caesarism and Bistory." It is already in press, and will doubtless be before the public in a very short time. The eagerness with which the people of Continental Europe buy and read the works of Proudhon is highly creditable to them, and it will not be our fault if, before many years, the English speaking-peoples do not have a chance to similarly honor themselves. Neither France nor the whole world can cherish too carefully every word that was written by him whom the next century will probably rank as the foremost man of this.

General Ben Butler has the reputation of possess ing a large amount of check, but he is by no means the cheeklest of the candidates for governor between whom Massachusetts voters are to choose this fall. The palm in that respect is unquestionably borne off by the most honest and estimable of them all, Charles Almy, of New Bedford, the candidate of the Prohibitory party, who, with an unapproachable sublimity of inconsistency, declares, in a letter accepting the nomination of a party which proposes to decide what men shall and shall not drink, that "the minimum of organized government and the maximum of self-government is to be encouraged." This is virtually a proposition to encourage men to govern themselves by prohibiting them from doing so, and is a fine specimen of the humors of politics.

The Providence "Journal" gave the last number of Liberty a half-column of attention, for which we are its debior. Among other comments, it said, after quiting some of our criticisms of the State: " We do not think that the Rhede Island ' reformers are quite educated up to this standard." How this may be we do not know. The "Journal" ought to be better posted than ourselves concerning the educational status of Rhode Island reformers. But this we can say,—that, after Massachusette, Rhode Island no other city in the Union takes as many copies of equality with man, by all means; but do it by the Liberty as Providence itself. We are rapidly developing power from man, not by giving it to woman.

ing Anarchists in Little Rhody's bosom, and creating PREMIUMS FOR NEW SUBSCRIBERS. a constituency of very lively neighbors for the arrogant thieves who rule her through the columns of the "Journal."

A mission is in progress at St. Mary's Catholic Church in this city under the conduct of Fathers Hamilton and Lancake. "During the past week," says a Boston newspaper, " the fathers have labored with the young men of the parish, and the week for the young unmarried women commenced last evening." We know little about revivals, but strongly incline to the opinion that the week which "commenced last evening " will prove the more fruitful of

The Liberal League is spending a tremendous amount of intellectual energy in an effort to induce the people to date their letters and papers and documents E. M. 82 instead of A. D. 1882. "Where now, asks Carlyle," are the Hengsts and Alaries of our stillglowing, still-expanding Europe; who, when their home is grown too narrow, will enlist, and, like Firepillars, guide onward those superfluous masses of indomitable living Valor; equipped, not now with the battle-axe and war-chariot, but with the steam-engine and ploughshare? Where are they? -- Preserving their Game!" Where now, asks Liberty, are the Paines and Jeffersons of our still-glowing, still-expanding America; who, when their fellows have become too wretched and down-trodden, will enlist to lift the yokes of poverty and tyranny from the neck of Industry; equipped, not with the bullet, or even with the ballot, but with reason and earnestness and printers' ink and peaceful rebellion and non-compliances? Where are they? -- Changing the Calendar!

Time brings queer changes. The Democratic party, heretofore supposed to be the bitterest foe of woman suffrage, has embodied it in its platform in Massachusetts, and even declared unequivocally in favor of woman's equality with man in the broadest sense. If the Democratic party ever gives woman the ballot, it will be the most unselfish deed ever done by a political organization, for it will amount to nothing less than suicide. Immediately woman gets the right to vote, she will use it to thwart and overturn every principle that a follower of Jefferson is supposed to believe in. She will vote for prohibition against free rum, for protection against free trade, for a State religion against free thought, for Comstockism against a free press, for indissoluble marriage against free love, and for greenbackism against free money; in short, she will do nearly everything that is outrageous and tyrannical and absurd. For, even to a greater extent than the men, she believes that all wrongs can be set right by statute. It will be a cold day for Liberty when woman takes the reins of power. Not that Liberty is entirely without friends among the ladies. In the ranks of Liberty's champions there are not a few genuine Amazons, who may be depended upon in all emergencies. But, generally speaking, the feminine mind seems to have no conception of freedom or human rights, and believes thoroughly in flat morality. What does this teach us? Simply that, while woman should be devied no real right, she should be is the hanner state on our subscription list, and that entrusted with no arbitrary power. Give woman

Liberty makes the following offers to new subscribers only, and in so doing affords them an opportunity of purchasing a considerable library of standard literature at rates at least five times lower than could be obtained through the ordinary channels of the book

To each new subscriber sending us FIFTY CENTS.

the regular subscription price of the paper, we will send Liberty for one year and a copy of the first volume of John Ruskin's Letters to Workmen and Laborers, entitled, "Fors Clavigera."

To each new subscriber sending us

ONE DOLLAR,

we will send Liberty for one year and a copy of each of the following works :-

Christmas Stories: A Christmas Carol, The Chimes, The Cricket on the Hearth, The Battle of Life, The Haunted Man.
By CHARLES DICKENS. With 16 full-page litustrations by derick Barnard. Complete in two volu es. Svo. manila

Fors Clavigera: Letters to Work:nen and Laborers. By John RUSKIE. In two volumes, 4to, manila.

Sarior Resarius: The Life and Opinions of Herr Teufelsdrückh.

By Inomas Camerica. Octave, manila.

To each new subscriber sending us

ONE DOLLAR AND A HALF,

we will send Liberty for one year, and, in addition to the works above mentioned, a copy of each of the following :-

Idyls of the King. By ALTHED TENNYSON. Arranged in the order designed by the author. 4to, manila.

hight of Asia; or, The Great Renurciation. Being the Life and Teaching of Gautima, Prince of India and Founder of Buddhism, as told in verse by an Indian Buddhist. By EDWIN ARNOLD.

Macaulay's Essays: Milton, Dryden, Bunyan, History, Samuel Johnson (two essays), Athenian Orators, and Robert Montgom-ery's Poems. By T. B. MACAULAY. 4to, manila.

To each new subscriber sending us

TWO DOLLARS.

we will send Liberty for one year, all the works above mentioned, and a copy of each of the follow-

Lothair. By B. DISRAELI. Complete in two volumes. Octa-

Memories of My Exile. By Louis Kossurn. Translated from the original Hungarian by Ference Jausz. Complete in two volumes. 4to, manila.

To cap the climax, to each new subscriber sending THREE DOLLARS AND A HALF,

we will send Liberty for one year, all the works already mentioned, and a full set of the

Popular History of England: A History of Society and Cov-ernment from the Earliest Period to Our Own Times. By CHARLES KNIGHT. Complete in EIGHT volumes. etc., munits.

Thus we offer, besides an annual subscription to this paper, a library of twenty standard volumes for \$3.50. And these books, remember, are not issued in trashy form, but printed from good type, on clear white paper, and bound in fine postal-card manila,books as durable as the average workingman can afford to own until the doctrines of Liberty shall be realized, after which he alone will be able to dress his favorite authors in gilt leaves and morocco covers.

Liberty.

Issued Fortnightly at Fifty Cents a Year; Single Copies, Two Cents.

BENG R TUCKES, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER

Mice of Publication, 18 P. O. Square.

Post Office Address : LIBERTY, P. O. Box No. 3366, Boston, Mass.

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter.

BOSTON, MASS., OCTOBER 14, 1882.

"A free man is one who enjoys the use of his reason and his faculties; who is neither blinded by passion, nor hindered or driven by oppression, nor deceived by erroneous opinions." -PROUDHON.

Bound Volumes of Liberty.

We have for sale three handsomely-bound copies of the first volume of Liberty. As the number who desire them is large, we have determined, not as a matter of equity, but as a means of voluntary taxation of those best able to give us a helping hand, to award the volumes to the three persons sending in the highest bids for them prior to the next issue of the paper. At that time the successful bidders will be notified, and, on receipt of the sums offered, the books will be forwarded.

Liberty the Mother of Order.

It is gratifying to be informed, as we have been, by many of our patrons now renewing their subscriptions that they have already come to see plainly what we are driving at and are more and more deeply interested to follow us.

When our little sheet was first sent out to do battle for reform we naturally expected to be immediately confronted by such superficial objections as these: "You are subversive of law and order: " " your syston invites complete social chaos;" "you destroy without offering anything upon which to build anew;" "you offer nothing in the place of government;" "you are all sail and no compass," etc. Of course no keen student of social science could descend to such unscientific objections, but a little reform sheet like Liberty has not chiefly to deal with trained students of sociology, but with the average citizen of a "practical" world.

Not a few of our readers, however, are already beginning to see that so far from being subversive of law and order are we that our mission is really to establish law and order in the place of the prevailing social chaos which goes by that name. There is no such frivolous catch-word in the air to-day to gull the weak and unwary as this canting whine of "law and order." Law! yes: but what law? The law of nature as developed out of a rational analysis of social forces and based upon the sovereignty of the individual, or some law manufactured for designing ends before we were born and without our consent? Is law a thing to be exacted by rogues in caucus, and executed by force upon the unwilling, or is law a dooty." principle of nature, -- a thing that is, and that cannot be made. As brave old Lysander Spooner says, it is absurd to talk about "making" laws. Laws are. and the only right of a human being is to search after them and obey them for himself, leaving others to do the same, or contrarywise, at their own cost.

And order, too, - all reverence for order! But whose order? Is it the order of nature, meaning the harmony begotten of a true knowledge of social forces and their healthy coordination in practical life, or is it the order concocted by ward politicians within walls recking with bribery and open-handed corruption in the interest of social slave-masters? Order means nothing until you institute a currect philosophical stendard of order. The thing now called order does not even project life; witness the pauper rate in Great Eritain, and all the murderous results of capital's sway over labor. If the prevail-

virtually the whole scheme of property.

Now, so far from not offering anything in the place of what is now falsely called government, we have something very tangible to offer, - something very rational, practical, and easy of application. We offer cooperation. We offer reciprocity. We offer associative combination. We offer non-compulsive organization. We offer every possible method of voluntary social union by which men and women may act together for the furtherance of well-being. In short, we offer voluntary scientific socialism in the place of the present compulsory anscientific organization which characterizes the State and all its ramifications.

Is not this government in its only rational sense? If this be chaos, then there is no natural law. If men and women can be governed under arbitrary compulsion, and cannot be governed under the very law of their own being, then the universe is a failure, and a type of reformer above the level of the Czar of Russia and John Kelly has little left to live for.

There are three prevailing social drifts now at work. The first is the State, or the present order of political government, whose synonym is usurpation. The second is socialism, - that phase of it now manifest in the Social Democracy of Europe and which is only a modification of the State. The third is revolutionary socialism, and to that phase Liberty is allied. The revolutionary socialist, like the ordinary socialist, believes in the substitution of integral organization for the old political organization, with this distinction (and it is an irreconcilable one),namely, that the old order must not be remodeled. but utterly overthrown and discarded, and that in all subsequent social cooperation no manner of organization or combination whatspever shall be binding upon any individual without his consent. Revolutionary socialism denies the right of a majority to coerce a minority. It insists upon the absolute sovereignty of every individual. Its synonym is Liberty

But it has a system as rational, just, and potent as nature. It aims at true law and order. It is constructive at every point where it is destructive. It is the very antipode of chaos. It is an indefatigable builder. Follow us patiently, friends, and our light will begin to reveal to you the chaos existing in the high and holy places where you have been falsely sducated to believe in a quack God, bogus government, unlawful law, and masked disorder.

"Dooty."

The New York papers report that the policemen in charge of Central Park look upon the ragged urchins who frequent hat public ground as "suspicious characters," and in numerous instances have proceeded to "club them out," while other children, well dressed, are left to romp at pleasure. And, when these guardians of the public good have been remonstrated with, they have either resented with indignation the "impudent interference of a mere civilian," or have protested that they were "only doing their

Tis but a sample of the solemn farce being daily enacted throughout the so-called civilized world.

All the tyrants, great and small, are "only doing their dooty."

And what is remarkable in it all is that so many otherwise intelligent people are resting under the delusion that the preservation of needful order depends on their adhesion to this old tyrannizing system. Half asleep, they indulge in the dream that they are only doing their dooty."

We are, however, convinced that the great mass of them are, at the present time, not without a suspicion, at least, that something is radically wrong. They are striking out in many directions, hoping, as we suppose, to hit the evil in the eye.

For instance, there is just now in this country a ing order does protect property, it simply protects Camerons are being a ept away in the name of to do, and bent only on honestly doing it, let the robbery; it does not protect honest possession of the outraged people who are clamorous for their people give thanks or how).

fruits of labor by those who create it, but rather freedom They will not be dictated to. They want despoils producers of what they produce, which is freedom of opinion and freedom of action. All of which is very commendable. The spirit of it is excellent.

> But the question is, Will it go far enough and strike deep enough? Will it cover over and take in all the bosses? Will it plough up the old soil and sow new seed? Does it mean to be thorough? Will it establish freedom in reality, or will it only daily along, suppressing these comparatively inoffensive party bosses, while the vast system of governmental bossing is to run on indefinitely?

> We realize the slow pace at which the world moves, and so are not sanguine that this incipient rebellion against the tyrannous rule of "bosses" will ripen into an immediate and fruitful harvest. But as we have said, the spirit of it is good, and it afferds us the opportunity to meet these freedom-shrieking rebels on their own ground, where we shall strive to show them that, if they mean to steadily maintain it, they must conquer more. As it is, they have only run out for a little skirmish. The great battle is still impending.

> Therefore, to the enemies of "boss rule" we say: What else have we everywhere established from president down to policeman? If it be not "boss rule," what is it? When you come seriously to ponder this question, we declare to you that you will see that cur entire governmental system is a system of irresponsible bossing. Sometimes this boss is one individual, and sometimes many. It is whoever or whatever is in power. Now it is the Republican party that is bossing us. When we get to the point beyond which endurance is impossible, what shall we do? Why, change bosses, -- if we are able. For a Republican we shall try a Democrat; and so, swinging back and forth, get matters eased up as much as we can.

> But always a "boss," who, under the specious but effective plea, of doing his "dooty," is entitled to defy and drive us like so many dumb sheep, fit only to be riecced. What a scandalous intimation of power was that indulged in by the judge in the Star Route cases, when he said to the jury that he might yet decide to shut them up on bread and water, and so force them into a verdict. A jury thus assailed, had its members been in any degree alive to their rights as freemen, would bave instantly declined further service. Such a threat should only have been scorned and defied. But no; the judge could claim that he, under the common law, was "only doing his dooty." And it was the traditional "dooty" of the jury ignobly to submit.

What is the remedy?

The remedy is for the people to refuse as individuals to delegate a power which cannot at once be confronted by every individual interested, and revoked. There is, in one sense, plenty of bossing to be done in this world, but not against the will or desire of any the humblest person. Personal government is the only true government, but the difference between a free people, so governed, and a slave people governed, is that the government instituted by the former proceeds only by the constant consent of all interested, while the latter is carried on in the name, either of one absolute monarch, or, as we of America say, in the name of "the majority," whether those who are governed consent or not. We have an idea in this country that the majority can do Liberty no wrong. Laws a king might proclaim in the interest of tyranny become, we seem to think, not tyrannical if they are only enacted in due process of our majority legislation. The thing done does not so much signify with us. We pin our salvation to a form of doing Our "ballot stuffing" Carlyle roared at throws a sanctity over every kind of iniquity. We lose sight of the crime enacted, seeing only that it was ground out by our Republican formula, and that there is a party in the country strong enough to enforce it. Carlyle was far nearer right when he great outcry against "boss rule." Everybody ap- lustily called for the "Able-man," - the man with pears to be down on it. The Conklings and the sense crough always to know what is the right thing

Here are three conceptions:

- 1. The right thing without regard to method.
- 2. The method at all hazard without regard to the thing done.
- 3. The method and the thing done inseparably connected.

The first may summarize the doctrine of the Carlyle school; the second is our Republican dogma; the third is the gospel of Liberty.

As to the first, while we unhesitatingly declare it to be infinitely better than the second, it is simply a question as to whether it is to the advantage of the people to have their work done for them irrespective of their wish or consent, or to have it done by their free consent and earnest desire. Waiving here the question of right, we simply raise the test of advantage. We ask, is it better for the people to have the right thing done by despotism or by freedom? And our response simply is that it must certainly be best for the people to have exercise in the doing of the right thing for themselves. This must be true, if also be withheld, if the ruling "boss" has the disgrowth, self-reliance, and individual capacity are alone attainable through individual experience and here, as it is. Every individual may be said to have culture.

of freedom. The right thing, in fact, can only be done by that method. Whatever despotism does has a false foundation. In the end it fails for want of support. It has no basis in the character of the people. It has not grown out of them, is not a part of them; they do not understand or appreciate it. It fails, and must one day give place to what the people freely build. Not that freedom makes no mistakes. No one affirms this. But the mistakes of freedom are its education and its discipline. By its constructed, acting not under the rule of force, but mistakes, as by its successes, the people grow in stimulated by the intelligent appreciation by all its strength and improve in capable action.

Hence Liberty stands not for result alone, as this is impossible. The true result is obtainable only by the true method.

The idiotic delusion to which this country is for the time being wedded, — that of sticking to the formula of majority rule, let the result be what it may -- is the most ignoble thing done in freedom's name that the sun shines upon. For it places Right, Justice, Individual or Personal Freedom in the background. Under its sway the most devilish things are not only possible, but can be bolstered up and made respectable. When they become "the law," we enshrine them in a sacred circle within which no one may set foot but at his peril.

Shift and explain the facts as you may, the most conspicuous fact of all remains,-unmely, that the whole system is an arbitrary one, founded not in free choice, but relying on force, which good and honest citizens for the most part support only because they have an inherited instinct that they are thereby doing their duty. They will say: "Certainly, we are for liberty. But, then, society needs some safeguards, and the worst government is better than no government." It is their duty, therefore, to maintain the government, whatever that government may be.

Now, we suggest to all such persons that, if they are seriously in love with Liberty, it is wholly wrong in there to contribute their influence and their means to perpetuate organizations whose very inception is a blow aimed directly at the suppression of Liberty. Society-that is, the individuals composing societymust, indeed, have "safeguards." But the very first step of your despotic organization is to teer down all natural safeguards and place the individual wholly at the mercy of some instituted "boss." In Republican America, as in Autocratic Russia, that is the inevitable first step in what is called governmental organization. It is to establish a machine rule; and although, gentlemen, you may profess to play that machine in behalf of Liberty and good order, you can not give to it one solitary motion without defying Liberty and rendering good order impossible.

Grant, if you please, that the running of such a machine has in past times been a necessity; grant, even, that for some time yet for various causes it

have advanced for enough into the light of Liberty to see that the "machine" in politics and "boss rule" are Liberty's enemies, to you who would earnestly do somewhat to deliver the country from all manner of oppressions. What ought you to do to be consistent with your aspirations?

Shall we answer for you? Then, we will say: Leave the organization of despotism, and turn to the organization of freedom.

Liberty asks you to see your duty in that direction. Give no more support to bosses, low or high, who are "only doing their dooty" when they invade every personal right a free people may claim.

Under the old system the people surrender all rights, their whole freedom, into the hands of governmental officials, and receive all they get in return that bears the semblance of freedom as something granted to them. We know well enough and do not dispute that in modern times and in this country much is "granted." But what is "granted" may position and the power. And much is withheld, even a certain length of rope, but he is fastened thereto; Therefore, Liberty holds steadfastly to the method and, when the "boss" requires either his person or his property, he is hauled in, and must surrender both,—and that not because he is a criminal charged with an offence, but because the "powers that be," to whom he is in "dooty" bound to submit, have so willed it.

> But under the new system, under the organizations freedom shall invent and maintain, nothing is surrendered, all rights are reserved, and Liberty to maintain itself does not invade itself. A society to members of their common interests, furnishes the only example of good order, true prosperity, and enduring peace which it is possible to conceive.

> In its realm will be found no officials ignorantly and inhumenly "doing their dooty." "Dooty" will become duty, and duty be transfigured into Love.

"Unhappy Ireland."

We might as well speak plainly and say that the Irish Land League, of cace glorious promise, has degenerated into a miserable, humiliating farce, and what there is left of it is not worth holding a secondclass Irish wake over. We regret exceedingly to say this, for at one time, while the mammoth no-rent strike was in full blast, Ireland seemed destined to score a victory in modern social methods which would have revolutionized reform and struck with sure death landlordism and politics at one blow.

The cause of Ireland's lamentable defeat may be plainly traced to a few cowardly nuisances who have figured as "leaders." The first of these is God, Patrick Ford's man, who as usual has gone over to the heaviest battalions and left the poor Irish to wrestle on in the toils of the landlords and that army of blood-sucking priests who, although the Irish do not like to be told of it, are the bottom enemies of Ireland.

The second nuisance, not divine but human, is Charles Stewart Parnell, the distinguished parliamentarian of Kilmainham-compact notoriety. A more contemptible piece of political small wars never sold out a confiding nation of poor, outraged, man-worshipping dupes.

The third nuisance is Michael Davitt. This once brave Alaric of the cause, who sent terror to the oppressor by declaring all rent to be an immoral tax. proves to be made of such soft stuff that all his moral and mental stamina can be wiped out between the good cloth and respectability of Parnell and the infantile sophistry of Henry George.

There are many more nuisances on the stage of this melanchely Irish farce, but the point which we wish to get at is that there is little hope for Ireland until her people become so far enlightened that they can keep God and the priests out of reform, and learn will necessarily be kept in motion; we are not discussing that point. But, we are talking to you who dean who invariably goes back on the people, and tion, this monopoly, for the benefit of a few against

the priests are fat vultures who live on the succe the State and all it portends for despotism.

When the Irish people get so far emancipated that they will stop rushing servilely with their pennies, now as Parnell men, now as Davitt men, and learn to be independent, self-reliant individuals, no such righteous move as the mighty no-rent resolve can be successfully misguided to its ruin by individual corruption, cowardice, or stupidity.

A Religion of Hypocrisy and Barbarism.

letter to the Bishops of his the daily newspapers. diocese.

Anarchy in Egypti meant danger to that wide Empire the Cologne Gazette declares which we have received as a that the Egyptian wounded trust, and which we may not were murdered by the British abandon; and our war against in the trenches at Tel-el-Kebir, anarchy was an inevitable wer. long after all resistance had Through God's great goodness the struggle of a few hours has scattered the rebels, has missioned officer of the 42d made order and freedom possible in Egypt, has rescued London Times, says the orders that country from the impend- were to spare none of the ing loss of next year's crops, enemy, and to bayonet every and has so prevented its ruin, one of them, as they would Mourning as we do those who shoot the soldiers treacherhave fallen for their country, ously if the latter passed we are thankful that the skil- them. ful dispositions of our commander have saved many lives, and have preserved a great city from irreparable ravages. For these mercies, as for many others vouchsafed to us by the Most High, we owe Him thanks and praise. At the request of the Archbishop of Canterbury I invite you to direct that next Sunday shall be observed as a day of thanksgiving in all churches and chapels in our diocese.

From the Archbishop of York's From the cable despatches to

The Cairo correspondent of ceased.

A letter from a non-comregiment, published in the

Law and Authority.

1V.

[Translated from "Le Révolté."]

If we consider the millions of laws that govern humanity, we see at once that they may be subdivided into three great categories: protection of property, protection of persons, protection of the government. And, in analyzing these three categories, we arrive, in regard to each of them, at this logical and necessary conclusion : Uselessness and perniciousness of the

As for the protection of property, socialists know what that is. The laws on property are not made to guarantee to the individual or to society the enjoyment of the products of their labor. They are made, on the contrary, to strip the producer of a portion of what he produces and to assure to a few the portion thus stripped from the producers or from the entire society. When the law establishes the right of Mr. So-and-so to a house, for example, it establishes his right, not to a cottage which he has built himself, or to a house which he has erected with the aid of a few friends; no one would have disputed this right if such had been the case. The law, on the contrary, establishes his right to a house which is not the product of his labor, first, because he has had it built by others to whom he has not paid the full value of their labor, and, second, because the house represents a social value which he could not have produced himself: the law establishes his right to a portion of that which belongs to everybody and to nobody in particular. The same house, built in the interior of Siberia, would not have the value that it has in a great city, and the latter value results, as we know, from the labor of fifty generations who built the city, adorned it, provided it with water and gas, fine streets, universities, theatres at d warehouses, and railroads and highways radiating from it in all directions. In recognizing, then, the right of Mr. So and so to a house in Paris, London, Rouen, &c., the law appropriates to him - unjustly a certain portion of the products of the labor of entire humanity. And it is just because this appropriation is a crying injustice (all other forms of property have the same character) that a whole arsenal of laws and a whole army of soldiers, policemen, and judges are necessary to maintain it against common sense and the sentiment of justice inherent in humanity.

Well, half of our laws - the civil codes of every country

humanity. Three-fourths of the cases passed upon by the courts are only quarre's arising between monopolists,—two robbers disputing over their plunder. And no small portion of our crimina! laws have also the same object, their purpose being to keep the labore subordinate to the employer in order to secure to the latter the exploitation of the former.

As for guaranceing to the producer the products of his labor, there is not a law which undertakes it. That is a matter so simple and so natural, so much a part of the customs and habits of humanity, that the Law has not even considered it. Open brigandage, with weapons in hand, belongs no longer to our century; no laborer in these days ever disputes with another over the product of his labor; if there is any misunderstanding between them, they settle it without recourse to the Law, by addressing themselves to a third party; and the only my domains of another a certain portion of his product is the proprietor, who deducts in advance the lion's share. As for humanity in general, it universally respects the right of each to what he produces, not needing special laws to compel it to such a course.

All these laws upon property, which fill huge volumes of codes and are the delight of the lawvers, having, as we have seen, no other object than that of p ...ding the unjust appropriation of the products of the labor of humanity by certain monopolists, there is no excuse for their existence, and the revolutionary socialists are fully determined to wipe them out on the day of the Revolution. And we can, indeed, with entire justice, make a complete auto-da-fe of all the laws in relation to the so-called "rights of property," of all property titles, of all the archives,—in short, of everything referring to this institution soon to be considered as a humiliating stain upon the history of humanity equally with the slavery and servitude of centuries gone by.

What we have just said of the laws concerning property fully applies to this second category of laws, — the laws serving to maintain the government, or constitutional laws.

Here again is a whole arsenal of laws, decrees, ordinances, opinions, &c., serving to protect the various forms of representative government (by delegation or by usurpation) under which human societies still struggle. We know very well (the Anarchists have often mough demonstrated it in their incessant criticisms of the various forms of government) that the mission of all governments, monarchical, constitutional, and republican, is to protect and to maintain by force the privileges of the possessing classes,—aristocracy, priesthood, and bourgeoisie. A good third of our laws,—the "fundamental" laws, laws on taxation, on custom-houses, on the organization of ministries and their departments, on the army, the police, the church, &c. (and there are tens of thousands in every country) - have no other object than to maintain, rehabilitate, and develop the governmental machine, which serves in its turn almost exclusively to project the privileges of the possessing classes. Analyze all these laws, observe their action day by day, and you will perceive that there is not a single one worthy of preservation, beginning with those which deliver the communes, bound hand and foot, to the parish-priest, the big bourgeois of the locality, and the sub-prefect, and ending with this famous constitution (the nineteenth or twentieth since 1789), which gives us a Chamber of idiots and petty speculators preparing the way for the dictatorship of the adventurer, Gambetta, if not for the government of a crowned cabbage-head.

In short, regarding all these laws there can be no doubt. Not only the Anarchists, but even the more or less revolutionary of the bourgeois, agree in this, — that the only use that can be made of all the laws concerning the organization of government is to make a bondre of them.

There remains the third category of laws, the most important, since to it attaches the greatest number of prejudices, the laws concerning the protection of persons, the punishment and prevention of "crimes." In fact, this category is the most important, because whatever consideration the Law may enjoy is due to the belief that laws of this sort are absolutely indispensable to the maintenance of security in our societies These are the laws which are developed from the nucleus of customs useful to human societies and taken advantage of by the rulers to sanctify their sway. The authority of the chiefs of tribes, of the wealthy families in the communes, and of the king was based upon the judicial functions which they exercised; and even to the present day, whenever the necessity of government is spoken of, its function as supreme judge is tacitly understood to be referred to. "Without government men would cut each other's throats," says the village philosopher. "The final purpose of every government is to give twelve honest jurors to every accused person," said Burke.

Well, in spite of all the prejudices existing in this matter, it is high time for the Anarchists to declare boldly that this category of laws is as useless and pernicious as the preceding ones.

In the first place, as for the so-called "crimes," assaults upon persons, it is known that two-thirds and often even three-fourths of all these "crimes" are inspired by the desire to get possession of the wealth belonging to some one. This immense category of so-called "crimes and offences" will disappear on the day when private property shall cease to exist. "But," we shall be told, "there will always be brutes to assail the lives of citizens, to deal a knife-thrust in every quarrel, to avenge the slightest offence by a murder, if there are no laws to restrain them and no punish-

ments to withhold them." That is the refrain sung to us as soon as we call in question society's right to punish.

Nevertheless, as to that, there is today one thing well esuablished: The severity of punishment does not diminish the number of "crimes." In fact, hang, quarter, if you will, the assassins, the number of assassinations will not diminish by a single one. On the contrary, abolish the death penalty, and there will not be a single assassingtion the more; there will be even fewer. Statistics esublish this. But let the harvest be good, let bread be cheap, let the weather be fine, and the number of assassinations will immediately diminish: statistics again prove that the number of crimes increases and diminishes with the price of provisions and the severity of the season. Not that all assassinations are prompted by hunger. Not at all: but, when the harvest is good and provisions are easily obtainable, men, gayer, less wretched than usual, do not give way to the darker passions and feel no desire to plunge a knife into the heart of one of their fellows from trivial motives.

Further, it is known also that the fear of punishment has never deterred a single assassin. He who goes forth to kill his neighbor from vengeance or from poverty does not reason overmuch about the consequences; and never assassin who had not the firm conviction that he would escape prosecution. There are a thousand other reasons besides, which we might adduce here,—our space is limited,—but let each one reason on this subject for himself, let him analyze crimes and penalties, their motives and consequences, and, if he knows how to reason uninfluenced by preconceived ideas, he will necessarily reach this conclusion:

Saying nothing of a society in which man will receive a higher education, in which the development of all his faculties and the possibility of enjoying them will secure him so many pleasures that he will not care to lose them by a murder,—saying nothing of the society of the future, even in our present society, even with these sad products of the misery which we see today in the pot-houses of the large cities, on the day when no punishment shall be inflicted upon assassins the number of assassinations will not increase by a single one; and it is highly probable that, on the contrary, it will diminish by all those cases now due to second offenders who have been brutaized in prisons.

We are continually told of the benefits of the law and the beneficent effects of penalties. But have those who tell us these things ever tried to strike a balance between these benefits which they attribute to Law and to penalties, and the degrading effect of these penalties on humanity? Let them only calculate the sum total of bad passions awakened in humanity by the atrocious punishments formerly inflicted in Who, then, nursed and developed the instincts of cruelty in man (instincts unknown even to the monkeys, man having become the most cruel animal on earth), if not the king, the judge, and the priest, armed with the law, made him tear flesh into shreds, pour burning pitch into wounds, dislocate limbs, crush bones, and saw men in two to maintain their authority? Lct them only estimate the torrest of depravity shed into human society by informers, favored by judges and rewarded with the ringing coins of government, under pretext of aiding in the discovery of crimes. Let them go into prison and there study what man becomes when deprived of liberty, shut up with other depraved wretches who imbue each other with all the corruption and all the vices which coze from the prisons of today, and let them only remember that, the more we reform these institutions, the more detestable they are, all our modern and model penitentiaries being a hundred times more abominable than the dungeons of the Middle Ages. Let them consider, finally, what corruption, what depravity of mind is maintained in humanity by this idea of ob-dience (the essence of the law), of chastisement, of authority having the right to chastise and to judge regardless of our conscience and the esteem of our friends, of an executioner, of a jailer, of a common informer,-in short, of all these attributes of Law and Authority. Let them consider all this, and they will certainly agree with us when we say that the Law inflicting penalties is an abomination which ought to cease to exist.

Moreover, non-policed and, consequently, less depeaved peoples have clearly understood that he who is called a "wimal" is simply an undertune se,—not to be flogged, chained, or put to death on the scaffold or in prison, but to be comforted by the raises fraternal cares by treatment as an equal, by, association with honest people. And in the next revolution we hope to hear this cry go forth:

Burn the guillotines; tear down the prisons; banish the judge, the policeman, the informer,—as unclean s crew as the earth ever held; treat as a brother him who has been driven by passion to do evil to his neighbor; above all, take away from the great criminals, those ignoble products of the idleness of the bourgeoists, the possibility of arraying their vices in seductive garb,—and be sure that our society will then be signalized by very few crimes. That which maintains crime (beside idleness) is Law and Authority: the law on property, the law on government, the law on penaltics and offences, and the authority which assumes to make these laws and apply them.

No more laws, no more judges! Liberty, Equality, and the practice of Solidarity form the only effective barrier which we can oppose to crime.

Just the Size of It.

"Le Révolté," referring to the theory of land nationalization advocated by John Stuart Mill and now championed by Hyndman, George, and Wallace, truly says:

The idea of the nationalization of the soil is only a compromise between private property and socialism. The soil is to be proclaimed national property (reimbursing the landlords, say the authors of the idea,-without reimbursing them, say the workingmen). The State, which is to be manager, is to rent it to such as desire to cultivate it themselves, and this rent is to replace taxation. This, then, would be an introduction of the same system that exists in certain portions of the English Indies (which does not prevent the cultivators of the soil from dying of hunger by millions), or else in Siberia, where also the land belongs to the State and is rented to the communes, which nevertheless are ruined by taxes and officials. The idea itself is not worth much. But what interests us is the fact that this idea of dispossession of the landlords is approved by large numbers of people, even in the ranks of the bourgeoisis and the well-to-do classes generally. Its progress may almost be said to be visible to the eye.

RUSSIA AND NIHILISM.

BY COL. W. P. BLACK.

A LECTURE delivered before the Chicago Libera! League and Industrial Reform Club.

PRICE, POST-PAID, 10 CENTS.

"A masterpiece, which has given me profound pleasure. The compreheasiveness and accuracy of the author's knowledge, the elevation of his spirit, the charm of his love for truth, justice, and man, the generosity of his sympathy, and the oldness and freshness of his manner riveted me to his pages as soon as 1 v4 opened them."—JOHN SWITTON.

"Such a masterly and logical summing-up of the case against the Romanoffs must give our people pause, and make them think. Then we shall see a public opinion more worthy of our past and our national position among civilized states."—WENDELL PRILLIPS.

Address: BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 3366, Boston, Mass.

ENGLISH TYRANNY AND IRISH SUFFERING.

BY AVERY MERIWETHER.

A PAMPHLET of 27 pages discussing the social and political bearings of the Irish agitation. Dedicated to the Irish Land League of Memphis, Tennessee. Fifty copies donated to the Red Cross Fund to be sold for the

BENEFIT OF THE SIBERIAN EXILES.
Price, post-paid, 10 cents.

Address: BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 3366, Boston, Mass.

LIBERTY'S LIBRARY.

For any of the following Works, address, BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 3366, Boston, Mass.

TRUE CIVILIZATION: A Subject of vital and serious Interest to all People, but most immediately to the Mee and Women of Labor and Sorrow. By Josiah Warren. A Pamphlet of 117 pages, now pussing through its fifth edition, explaining the basic principles of Labor Reform, — Liberty and Equity. Price 30 cents.

WHAT IS PROPERTY? Or an Inquiry into the Principle of Right and of Government. By P. J. Proudhon. Prefaced by a Sketch of Proudhor's Life and Works, and containing as a Frontispiece a fine steel Engraving of the Author. Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker. A systematic, therough, and redical discussion of the institution of property,—its basis, its history, its present status, and its destiny,—together with a distalled and startling expose of the crimes which it commits, and the evils which it engenders. 500 pages octavo. Price, cloth, § 3.50; full calf, blue, gilt edges, § 6.50.

THE RADICAL REVIEW: Vol. I., handsomely bound in cloth, and containing over sixty Essays, Poems, Translations, w. Reviews, by the most prominent radical writers, on induct in financial, social, literary, scientific, philosophical, citical, and collegious subjects. 828 pages octavo. Price, \$5.00. Single narcher, § 1.15.

PROSTITUTION AND THE INTERNAtional Woman's League. By Henry Edger. Price, 15 cents.

INTERNATIONAL ADDRESS: An elaborate, comprehensive, and very entertaining Exposition of the principles of The Working, People's International Association. By William B. Greene. Price, 15 cents.

THE WORKING WOMEN: A Letter to the Rev. Henry W. Faore, Mirister of King's Chapel, in Vindication of the Poorer Class of Beston Working Women. By William B. Greene. Price, 1se cents.

SO THE RAILWAY KINGS ITCH FOR AN ...npire, Do they? By a "Bed-Hot Striker," of Scranton. Pa. A Reply to an article by William M. Grovenor in the International Review. Price, 10 cents; per hundred, \$4.00.

THE LABOR DOLLAR. By Stephen Pearl Andrews. Price, 10 cents.

CAPTAIN ROLAND'S PURSE: How It is Filled and liow Emptled, By John Ruskin. The first of a projected series of Labor Tracts. Supplied at 37 cents per hundred.

ANARCHISM OR ANARCHY? A Discussion between William H. Tillinghast and Benj. R. Tucker. Frenced by an Open Letter to Rev. William J. Potter. Sent on receipt of a postage statup.

WORK AND WEALTH. By J. K. Ingells. Price, 10 cents.

YOURS OR MINE: An Essay to show the True Basis of Property, and the Caures of its Inequitable Distribution. By E. H. Heywood. Prec; 15 certs.

SUPPLEMENT.

Liberty 27

10.27

BOSTON, MASS., SATURDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1882.

HENRY GEORGE EXAMINED.* Should Land be Nationalized or Individualized P

BY J. K. INGALLS.

Editor Irish World:—However interesting for the moment may be the questions as to whether Messrs. Parnell and Davitt are acting in unity, and as to whether Mr. George has captured the latter gentleman, a far graver question must ultimately present itself in connection with the disposition and final control of the land. Among the advocates of the "new departure" I have observed but one who has seemed to apprehend the exact issue,—viz., your correspondent, "W. M. C." Phillip," indeed, apprehends that the solution must have a more individualistic application than is necessarily embraced in the term "nationalization of the 'and," but, until he fully develops his ideas, I will suspend judgment on them.

Now, potentially, there can be no difference between monopoly under lease and monopoly under freehold, as we shall see on careful investigation. But let us first ascertain what this phrase really means. Does it mean land for the whole people? Then who would want to rent or let? Does it mean ownership by the government or State? If so, it is not the solution, but only the stating, of the land problem. At the outset this is the theory of all governments.

When William of Normandy defeated Harold, he, as head of the State, assumed control of the land and parcelled it out to his bandit lieutenants and favorites. The English monarchs did the same in Iraland.

In ancient Rome the nation claimed the domain; but after a few hundred years it was all in the bands of a few patricians and military cheftains. The land in these United States, at the anoption of the Constitution, was mainly national domain. Less than a hundred years sufficed to place it in the hands of speculators, favored corporations, and domestic and foreign landlords. Less than one-quarter is now held by the government, and but is small proportion by actual cultivators, and even one-half of that is mortgaged to money-lenders beyond all hope of redemption.

I shall be told that it is not intended to allow private property in land at all, and that hence no monopolistic accumulation could arise. Well, then, there can be no public property in land; or, if so called or held, it must be with this sweeping limitation,—that the public, State, or government can never transfer it to private control. What I wish to indicate here is that no step whatsoever towards securing the individual people in their "rights of soil" can be taken without "Enitation of the principle of property" in its application to the land.

But I shall be told also that for the individual to lease his land from the State or government will obviate all danger that any person will be excluded from cultivating the soil who honestly seeks to do so. This would be satisfactory if it were proposed, as "W. M. C." proposes, to limit lease-holds so that all could have opportunity.

Without such limitation lettings would have to be made at auction; and it would be no more difficult for the millionaire to bid off all the leases of a section, township, or county than to buy up all the fees simple. Indeed, it would be far easier, for it would require him to invest none of his capital in land, an now. To nationalize the land in any such sense as that would help no poor man to a piece of land, but would only subject labor to dependence on a speculating and adventurer class instead of an hereditary landlord, and upon the favors of a partisan bossism instead of a foreign government.

We should have our "seventy-thousand-acre farms" run by "produce kings," aided by machinery and "transient help" in seed time and harvest, resulting in the ultimate exhaustion of the soil and the reduction of labor to the tramp state. Our stock-jobbing system would be merclessly applied here, and the condition of the poor, by lack of opportunity for self-employment, would be rendered constantly worse and worse instead of being improved.

I do not mean in any degree to intimate that Mr. Davitt or Mr George contemplates any such results, but this is the logical outcome to any plan of occupancy which does not positively assure the individual right to enter upon and cultivate the land necessary to his sustenance, and that without accounting to landlord or government official. I am gratified that the "Irish World" has not committed itself to any plan which does not effectually realize this aim.

"Rent," according to Mr. Davitt, " is an immoral tex," and, according to Mr. George, is "the price of monopoly," and, whether paid to a single or to a collective landlord, is unchanged in its nature.

in view of the brave and noble work which Mr. George has done and is still doing for the cause of land reform, it pulns me to say that he does not seem to have appreciated his own

* The introductory portion of this article, preceding the dialogue, appeared originally in the "Irish World." The remainder was offered to the editor of that pager, but rejected by him.—Enron

words, much less comprehended the clear-cat definition of Mr. Davitt, and, as to the twin blasphenry of usury, not to have apprehended it at all. Even as lare as March 10, 1882, he speaks of the increase of rent with the growth of society as "a most beautiful evidence of creative design."

in so late a number of the "Irish World" as July 8th, in the report of his Dublin lecture, after reiterating that the present agitation "means land for the whole people-every man woman, and child, rich and poor," a " solution which gives to every man that which he fairly earns," he gives utterance to such inconsistent economic twaddle as this, saving it is Michael Davitt's plan:" "To solve the land question and the labor question it is merely necessary [not to nationalize the land] to take for the benefit of the whole people those fruits coming from the land which are not due to the exertions of labor or use of capital of those who are engaged in using it." Doubtless, Mr. George would be unable to find even in Ireland an instance where, the landlord being a judge, anything more than these fruits were taken as rent. The only difference between this plan, which Mr. George was careful to state was not "Mr. Davitt's particularly" (I should hope not), and current landlordism is that in one instance those fruits go to a class, and in the other to the whole people; in other words, to the ruling political party or administration. He does not stop r that this circumstance would in no sense change the immoral nature of the tax, however it might mitigate its public impolicy. As to the portion of fruits which are to go to the use of capital employed in cultivating the land, it would e hopeless to find any farmer or operator in any field of industry to admit that more was now received than was their due. Political economists do not admit any such thing, and we look through "Progress and Poverty" in vain to find any such intimation from Mr. George.

That he aims at the same general result as other land reformers, I have no shadow of doubt; but his prenises as to the use of capital and its reproductive power, together with his theory of rent—that it is the result of something produced by the land without labor,—is wholly unsupported by any known facts; and his plan of taxing back what is wrongfully wrung from labor under this false pretence can but prove delusive. If successful as a tax, it would to that extent prove useless as a measure of equity. If successful, as he conceives, in giving every one a foothold on God's footstool, it would cease to yield any revenue whatever, and thus prove self-destructive, for no one not deprived of land by law or force would pay rent to government or landlord.

The farther discussion of the question I have put in the form

DIALOGUE.

JONATHAN—Good morning, George. I am glad you have called. I am becoming deeply interested in the land question. To me it seems of importance to other countries as well as to Ireland, and that we cannot fully sympathize with the movement there until we understand it as a problem of world-wide application.

George—You cannot be interested in a question of deeper importance, and you are right in thinking it a subject of universal concern. The monopoly of the land in every country lies at the foundation of class domination and of the poverty and industrial subjection which prevail widely even in this land of civil and political freedom. Private property in land, whether under inheritance or commercial traffe, necessarily ends, sooner or later, in its absorption into the hands of a small and privileged class, while the majority of the cultivators, and, indeed, all workers, will be reduced to the condition of tenants, wage-workers, and tramps.

J.—That is also my thought, although as to private property in land I am not certain it could not be so defined and guarded as to make it operate in favor of equal opportunity and equal security. For instance, here I own forty acres. This would interfere with no one's opportunity if some were not allowed to buy up hundreds and thousands of acres, not for the purpose of cultivating or occupying, but to hold them against the poor and homeless, in order that they may tax the toil applied in their cultivation and prevent those who need from going upon them and making homes.

G.—I see you have not studied this land question in all its phases. Private property means property, and, if you attempt to guard or control it, it ceases to be such. I think nationalization of the land the only practical solution of the question, and that can be most readily effected by taxing back the value of the land—i. s., the rent which it will bring—for the benefit of the whole people.

J.—The netionalization of the land in a comprehensive sense is a thing generally admitted, I think. No one disputes that the land of any country belongs to the whole neople of that country. The only question is, how can the praciple be applied to protect the individual in his natural right of access to his normal environment so as not to invalidate the right of condition as opportunities increased and as chances of eminent domain," which is exercised more or less widely and

wisely by the governments of all countries, and which by the genius of our laws is supposed to reside in the whole people? The whole people cannot be evicted. It is only by allowing the individual to be evicted and debarred from his natural inheritance that society can be endangered by land monopoly. Society has, therefore, an undoubted right to prohibit the occupancy by any person of such extent of the common inheritance as would crowd or exclude the weakest member from his footheld on the soil.

Whether the occupant holds his house as property, contributing his share of the public burden in the form of a tax, or as a tenant and contributing under the form of rent, would seem to matter little so long as the large occupancy of the richer and stronger did not imperil the opportunity of the poor and weak. By the late mention of a book I have not yet read, I judge that Mr. Wallace alone among English land reformers recognizes the necessity of limitation of occupancy under leasehold, and advocates features of fixity which will secure permanent holding and the inviolability of home to the family. As to letting rent go on, as under the landlord system, and then taxing it all back for the benefit of the whole people, I am unable to see how that plan can be made to harmonize with any democratic idea or fail to become a most dangerous experiment for any government to attempt. Industry at most should be taxed only for the reasonable necessities of government, and only after such necessity has risen and honest estimates made. To levy taxes for the accumulation of an indefinite sum, for which expenditures have to be found, is to create a fund inviting corruption and peculation and the betrayal of public trusts. No experience which any people in any time have had would justify it, and it could not logically be sanctioned by anyone but the advocate of the nationalizing of industry as well as of the land, and of wholesale governmental co-operation, which would make the government the employer of all labor and the determiner of all wages. I do not understand you to advocate this.

G.—Oh, no. However I may agree in the abstract with what you say, I cannot avoid seeing that it is private property in land which is the foundation of the evil. Abolish this by making the nation the owner, and, of course, no such thing as monopoly could exist. You must admit that to equally distribute the land among the people would be impossible, even if desirable, which it is not. Many want no land, but all are entitled to their share of what it produces, minus the amount justly due the cultivator, and minus the part rightfully due the capitalist, who has furnished or advanced means to furnish the stock and general plant employed in cultivating the land.

J.—And the cost of collecting and disbursing the same among the whole body of claimants?

G.—Yes; but that is unavoidable, and might be considered as compensated by relief from all other forms of taxation. I was going to add that rent is an economical fruit not the result of lebor, but in addition to it, which the holder of land who cultivates it himself receives over and above the compensation of his labor just as truly as the idle landlord.

J.—Is rent at the same time, then, "an immoral tax," as Mr. Davitt asserts?

G.—Yes, when paid to landlords, but if paid to the government, and by that applied to the public welfare, each member of the community gets his just share of the natural produce of the land. Rent, economical rent at least, arises wholly from the different fertility of special soils, as explained by Ricardo and other political economists.

J .- I am not unaware of that, or of the use Malthus and other writers have made of this theory to satisfy the laborer that eviction and starvation are in the order of Providence and not the results of unjust and barbarous laws of tenure. That under any system of freedom of the land there would be a choice of locations and of qualities of the soil there can be no doubt; that parties would be willing to pay something for such choice there can be as little; but that such transac would degenerate into fixed rents, without landlords, is bardly conceivable. - not certainly while as at present there is abundance of land of good quality to produce all that is neces for the public consumption. The inhuman mockery of this plausible theory is all too apparent when we reflect that much of the best land even in Ireland is now untilled, while tenants are being evicted from the poorest because they will not pay a rent at a rate almost, if not quite, as high as the best l would command. Take away the writ of ejectment from the handlord, with which he is now clothed, and the constability and military which enable him to enforce it, and all the rent he would be able to collect from choice of place or prefer of soils would not distress or seriously wrong any. Cwnership under such limitation as would a!ways leave land open to occupation, even of a poor quality, would remove dis poverty far from the door of the industrious and frugal. The few who are lazy and improvident also would improve their condition as opportunities increased and as chances of doing

G. — It seems to me you treat the rent theory with too little consideration. It is very clear to me that rent only represents the difference between the productiveness of the best lands and that which is not sufficiently productive to yield rent. If the cultivator owns the hand himself, this production in excess of that of poorer land which is cultivated is a gratuity to him which comes from Nature, and not from his toil, since he has tolled no harder than the man who has produced the smaller yield; and the only way to equalize the award of industry is to tax away this excess and give it to the public. The theory is itself so plain and generally accepted that i wonder you have the courage to dispute it. Mr. Mill denominates it the "pons axinorum."

peal of the class laws of tenure and the extension of the principle of limitation found so salutary in all other matters of

ciple of limitation found so saturary in an other material religibility.

G.—In view of all you have said, I still think that rent arises, to an extent, at least, from a "gratuity of Nature," and does belong properly to the whole people, and I see no better method than to tax away this gratuity from the landlord for

the benefit of all.

J.—Without arguing that point farther, it really appears to me that to estimate that as a gratuity which is acknowledged to be "the price of monopoly," is illogical in the last degree. If Nature has gratuities, it is for those who gather them. With equal opportunity, if any refuse or neglect to gather them (not infants or disabled), they have no equitable or moral claim upon that which others have gathered; for, by rendering a reciprocal service in that which they prefer to io, they can secure what they need. Whether any such thing as economic rent exists at all can only be determined in the absence of monopoly. That rents are greatly above any possible bid for choice, and wholly separate therefrom, is seen by the fact that, where highest, premiums are often paid on leaseholds. Taxation on a basis so indefinite, so wholly dependent on monopoly and the limit of endurance which the poor will sustain, is as devoid of economic judgment as of democratic sustain, is as devoid of economic judgment as of democratic simplicity. G.— Bu

simplicity.

G.—But an end must be put to the oppression of landlordism, and, as the land cannot be divided in such a way that all shall share its benefits, I knew of no other way to make the thing equitable. The tendency of productive industry to consolidate itself in the hands of large corporations must necessarily extend to the cultivation of the land, where it is seen that a few large enterprises can be curried on much more successfully than many small ones. To divide up the land into small holdings would be detrimental to production, as is held by many writers.

J.—But many writers of enterprise take an opposite view.

than many small ones. To divide up the land into small holdings would be detrimental to production, as is held by many writers.

J.—But many writers of entinence take an opposite view citing France, Belgium, Switzerland, &c. But, though the issue is at least evenly contested, I do not propose to make a point of that. Even if wholly as you say, in its mere relation to production, it would not be conclusive. There are other and broader questions than that of large production. The maintenance of the fertility of the soil and the development and improvement of the individuals of the race are aims to which minor economics should be sacrificed, if need be.

G.—You will admit that the "division of labor" has exerted a powerful influence in that direction!

J.—Certainly, but you must also admit that, carried to the extremes which are exhibited in our large manufacturing establishments, it tends to reduce the worker to a mere appendage of a machine, and can have only one effect,—the deterioration of all mailness and the destruction of all self-respect. The pointing of a pin, as a continual employment for twelve or fourteen hours a day, can end only by reducing the man to an automaton. Large production of pins can well be sacrificed to a greater diversity of employment for the individual, and the development of a higher manhood; if not in the interest of serial political economy, at least in the higher interest of social economy.

G.—My plan embraces the idea of "giving to every man that which he fairly earns," and to capital what is "due for its use;" but that which goes as rent to the land I would have divided equally among all, since it belongs to all. Interest on money and profits derived from commodities in process of exchange interest in the first many that it is wholly technical. The union of capital with labor is no more complete than that of the land which theory. No essential difference can be shown between rent, interest, and profits.

returning the elements of fertinity and proper continue. Let or original difference of most cultivatable land will soon disappears of the control of the con

Production is the only thing which can be taxed. Improvements should be exempt, while coercive taxation remains. The "No-Rent" manifesto is the true gespel of Land Reform, and bee mes realized as soon as the legal grocess for edection and for ejectment is taken away, and the constable and soldier are withdrawn from enforcing such laws. Only courage and moral purpose in the people are necessary to sholish this great will; schemes and plans to circumvent it, by indirect means, will prove vain.

G.—But the difficulty still remains. Equal distribution is impossible. Besides, some want much hand, others little, and still others none at all. "Nationalization might be changed to Townshipization," and so the local government, whatever its form, have control. The large holders would then share, under the system of taxation, with those who held little or none. Each would rent of all, and so the values be equally distributed.

under the system of taxation, with mose who near mass or none. Each would rent of all, and so the values be equally distributed.

J.—I am very glad to hear you say this. It is one step more in the right direction. This would approach nearly to the township or village community, once the general system of land tenure in Europe. A step or two more will place you on solid ground. The familization and individualization of the land follows as a logical sequence from your admission.

G.—But you do not notice my point that many individuals do not want land at all.

J.—I was about to say that it is untrue. Every individual needs a place to live and work in. Thus far the wants of all are nearly equal. We are "tenants in common," upon the bosom of mother Earth, and no one has any just claim against another for obtaining that which with equal opportunity he declines to appropriate. His refusal to occupy proves that he estimates his advantage greater not to occupy, and that all assumed advantage to the occupier is quite if not more than compensated through reciprocal exchange.

There exists no reason why any one should hive a home which does not apply with greater force to the reasons why he should own it. Even a single room can be owned, since it can be hired. Requiring to change his residence, one would experience no more difficulty in finding a purchaser than would the landlerd (nation or township) in finding a tenant for it. Any disposition of the land which does not embrace the individual will not be the final one. Under that, even the changeful and migratory would find no serious inconvenience, with the many would enjoy, in its security and stability, a representative to beautify and adorn the limited portion falling to their control.

* See Henry George in "Irish World" for August 26.

Republished!

THE SUPPRESSED BOOK!

WALT WHITMAN'S POEMS:

"LEAVES OF GRASS."

" Truth, crushed to earth, shall rise again."

A new edition, reprinted from the Osgoods' plates without alteration or emendation, of the book which Ralph Waldo Emerson, during his life, hall-da as "the most extraordinary piece of wit and wisdom that America has yet contributed," and which, after his death, was suppressed as "obscene" by the authorities of Massachusetts at the instigation of the Society for the Suppression of Vice.

Price, \$2.00.

Seni, post-paid, on receipt of price.

Address: BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 33e5, Boston, Mass.

To ULIVER STEVENS, District Attorney of Suffolk County; George Marston, Attorney-General of the Commonwealth of Massachn. State 18. S. Tobey, Postmaster of Boston; Anthony Comstock, Secretary and General Agent of the Society fo. the Suppression of Vice; and all other enemies of Liberty whom it may concern:

of Vice; and all other enemies of Liberty whom it may concern: You are hereby distinctly notified—all of you in general, and you, Oliver Stevens, in particular—that I have in my possession, and do not of the stevens of the work advertised above. If you, or any mitting an unlawful act, you are faviled too, its oding, I am committing an unlawful act, you are faviled too, its oding, I am contently bigoted, or intolerant, or hyporritical, to share with you, or pretend to share with you, or pretend to share with you, such bellef, or affectation of belief. And, to avoid unnecessary trouble and make the evidence of sale indisputable, I offer, on receipt from any one of you of an order for a copy of the work, to deliver a copy to you in my own person, at such place in Boston as you may designate, and take payment therefor.

Yours, disrespectfully,

BENJ. R. THOKER

Just Published!

NATURAL LAW:

OR, THE SCIENCE OF JUSTICE.

BY LYSANDER SPOONER.

A TREATISE ON NATURAL LAW, NATURAL JUSTICE, Natural Rights, Natural Liberty, and Natural Society, showing that all legislation whatsoever is an absurdity, a usurpation, and a

Address: BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 3366, Boston, Mass.

LIBERTY'S PORTPAIT-GALLERY.

For either of the following Pictures, address,

BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 3366, Boston, Ma

- J. PROUDHON: The profoundest political philosopher and comomist that has ever lived. An elegant steel-plate engraving, suitable to frame and hang. Price, post-paid and securely wrapped, 75 cents.
- MICHAEL BAKOUNINE: Russion revolutionist, founder of Nihilism, and aposte of anarchy. A fine, large photo-lithograph, printed on heavy paper. Price, post-paid and securely wrapped, 60 cents.