On Picket Duty.

I do not know how it will be in the twentieth century, but in this nineteenth century everybody who has opinions and courage must fight,—even the "Twentieth Century."

Mrs. Besant has become a convert to theosophy. I also am given to understand that some Theosophists are to be found among our Nationalists. Knowing that these good people insist on styling themselves "scientific" Socialists, one is tempted to exclaim: "Oh science, what nonsense usurps thy name!"

Mr. J. G. Fisher, of Leeds, England, has sent me a copy of his pamphlet on "Vestimentary Taxation," which he asks us to notice in Liberty. I have read it with great pleasure, and recommend it as a bright, original, and interesting contribution to Anarchist propaganda. It costs but two cents, and it will probably have a place in Liberty's advertising columns.

A reviewer in the "Open Court," laboring under the error that the Anarchists cling to the theological fiction of a blessed, absolute right, places them on the same footing with the "enlightened theologians." We beg to decline the honor. Anarchists hold that "rights" are determined by the progressive intelligence and humanitarian advances of the people.

John Stuart Mill humorously stated that the only reason for the separation of women that he could think of was that "men liked it." In the last "Contemporary Review" a woman corrects him by saying that the real reason is that women liked it. And it is true of all grievous wrong that the ignorance or cowardly of the victims alone makes it possible for the knaves to successfully play the oppressor.

The prohibition law having been rejected in Rhode Island at the last campaign and no new law having been substituted, that little State enjoys free trade in rum. So far the pillars of civilization have remained unshaken, and business, religion, and morality have not suffered in the least. Will the legislators of that State be wise now and let well enough alone, and will other States profit by that practical lesson?

The "Workmen's Advocate" offers to enlighten the Denver "Individualist..." upon the philosophic thought of Herbert Spencer. Beggars are generous. Its editorial plainly shows to all who have studied that great thinker that it knows a great deal about him than the Denver journal. If it doesn't believe me, let Mr. Gronlund's treatment of the subject in his chapter on "The Sphere of the State" convince it that I am right.

I have received two or three criticisms of the ideas expressed in the editorial on "The Basis of Individualism..." and the Denver " Arbitrator," which now appears in a greatly improved and enlarged form under a new and better name, "The Individualist," has also made a few remarks in reply. As it is impossible to attend properly to any of these in the present issue, I think the discussion of the interesting subject of natural rights will be renewed in our next.

The San Diego "Beacon," started a few months ago as an organ of authoritarian reform, has passed into the hands of Mr. Sigemund Danielewicz, one of Liberty's friends, and has become an organ of Anarchist Socialism. I hope it will prove a useful and valuable ally, and that it will live and prosper for the rest of the people of the coast. Liberty will watch its progress with sympathetic interest, and will keep its readers informed about it.

I am glad that "Freedom," has at last understood the difference between Anarchist Socialism and Anarchist Communist. It means just what John Most and other authoritarians mean by "Communist Anarchism." It is to be hoped that Directionists like Mr. Lloyd will increasingly increase his attempt to distinguish between these two positions. Let him accept the name of Anarchist Socialist and reduce the chances of misleading his readers to a minimum.

Frequenters of public meetings and debate cannot fail to observe that verbal and logical reasons have no sort of "show" in an encounter with shallow and glib-tongued talkers. The audience generally requires smoothness and cheap humor. To hesitate before it is fatal; he who appears in the capacity of a teacher is expected to have answers ready for all possible objections and queries. Unless you boldly pretend to know it all, you are quickly laughed down as a know-nothing. Now the deft of those who wish to be honest with their talkers, with their listeners. "Though it make the unskilful laugh, cannot but make the judicious grieve"—grieve over the crassness of the indiscerning crowd.

The press having circulated the falsehood that the severance of Donn Piatt's editorial connection with the "World's Magazine" was occasioned by his failing physical and mental health, the gallant colonel wrote a vigorous letter to the "Journal of United Labor," in which we are given the real reasons of his withdrawal. There are a few magazine editors whose state of mind approximates in clearness and power that of "bold Donn." Elsewhere will be found a portion of that explanatory letter, from which it must be inferred that Donn Piatt knew altogether too much and liked too well to impart his knowledge to others, but he conveyed it in the most direct and plain terms to be fit to survive under the conditions of journalism which exclusively demand a thorough familiarity with the art of how not to say it.

Replying to a complaint, an editor who objects to the universal establishment of Communism immediately after "the revolution," "Freedom" makes the following addition: "Of course there may be individuals suffering from the bad conditions under which they are placed, who will interfere with the harmonious working of a free society, and in the transitional revolutionary period communities and individuals may sometimes be obliged in self-defense to make it their rule that 'He who will not work neither shall he eat.' It is not always possible for us to accept up to our principles, and . . . . expedience may force us to confine our Communism to those who are willing to be our brothers and equals." I am not quite clear as to the meaning of this, and would ask to be enlightened on the question whether those objectionable individuals are to be let alone to live in their own way, or whether the State Socialist plan would be pursued in dealing with them.

If the "Forum" is jealous of its reputation of a reliable and high-classed magazine, it will in future keep out of its pages the impudent twaddle of such blackhearts as Richard Hinton. It is sad and surprising that, after the recent appreciative and intelligent presentations of Anarchist principles in English and American reviews, the editor of the "Forum" should discredit himself by allowing the following sentences to disgrace his periodical: "There are two classes of Anarchists. One calls itself philosophical, which is certainly a misnomer. Philosophy involves system; Anarchism teaches the reverse: it is discontent reduced to a negation. The American advocates of this class can do little harm to any one but themselves, and, in view of their opinion, that is nobody's affair but their own. Their organ, if they can logically be supposed to have such a thing, is a paper called Liberty. It is hardly necessary to waste space over those who, by their own declaration, recognize nothing." But we do recognize that Richard Hinton is a jackass, and no amount of space can disprove it.

Speaking of the desirability of uniting all radicals on a Communist platform, John Most, in a foot-note, makes the following statement: "Among these we class all Anarchists, but by no means those crazy fellows who indeed call themselves 'radical,' but who by their conduct simply play into the hands of the police, the press, and the government in general. This riff-raff ought not to be tolerated either in small or in large organizations of the labor movement. Their influence is simply ruinous. To destroy this dangerous source, every labor association must close its doors to it. Partly these fellows are notoriously cracy, possessed of fixed ideas, or otherwise idiots; partly they act as the conscious or unconscious tools of decay detectives; partly they are crafty scoundrels whose sole pleasure consists in calumny and abuse. That this refers to the "Communist firebugs," there is no doubt whatever; yet when Liberty denounced them Most foamed at the mouth, vehemently denied their connection with the movement, and his "sole pleasure consists in calumny and abuse." "Time will tell," it is said in reply, and time, with severe justice, has pronounced the verdict against Most from his own mouth.

Conscious of his inconsistency, T. L. M'Credy, who loves and understands freedom, tries to justify his advocacy of the land tax by explaining that he looks upon it as a temporary measure. Unlike the other followers of George, he is convinced that, "as men assert their equal right of access to natural opportunities, land values will constantly diminish, and when perfect equality of rights shall be established, land values will practically disappear." He thinks that them, "the more men crowd together, the more opportunities will increase, and the more nearly equal they will be in value." This explanation, instead of reconciling with us Mr. M'Credy, gives us still greater cause for criticism. Georgism is based on the Ricardoan rent, and contends that rent is not the result of accidental legal inequalities, but of natural monopoly which would exist under any conditions. Hence, if the necessity of taxing this economic rent is admitted, government is at the same time immortalized. If rent is merely the result of legalized monopoly, then not taxation, but freedom, is the remedy.

The principle of occupying ownership is all-sufficient to destroy existing abuses of landholding, and the place of Mr. M'Credy is among its advocates. The last tie between him and the tax-dissidents is severed.
FREE POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS:
THEIR NATURE, ESSENCE, AND MAINTENANCE.

An Abridgment and Rearrangement of

Lysander Spooner's "Trial by Jury."

Edited by Victor Yarros.

TRIAL BY JURY AS A PALLIUM OF LIBERTY.

Continued from No. 146.

But this is not all. These legislators and this government, so irresponsible while in power, will in a few years turn against us. For if they can deceive the legislature is authoritative upon the people and enforce obedience to it; for they can not only declare their power perpetual, but they can enforce submission to all legisla- tive acts. They must be, therefore, the discipline and the authority of the people. One day — that is, it can, for a day, enforce obedience to its own laws — it can, in that day, name the king, the queen, who wishes to be one day, but in that day caused the king, her husband, to be slain, and usurped his throne.

Nor will it avail to say that such acts would be unconstitutional, and that unconsti- tutional acts may be lawfully resisted; for everything a government pleases to do will of course be determined to be constitutional, if the government itself be permitted to make the constitution. It is the same with the constitutionality of all its acts. These are then the powers of the government, as the powers of the wolf; and all the acts of the government are, in the eyes of the government, its laws, and they are, as such, obedience, as such, their power alone.

The trial by jury is based upon a recognition of this principle, and therefore forbids the government to execute any of its laws by punishing violators, in any case whatever, to the degree of "the country," or to the degree of any individual act of "the country." In this way the people, at all times, hold their liberties in their own hands and never surrender them, even for a moment, into the hands of the government.

The trial by jury, then, gives to every individual the liberty, at any time, to disregard or resist any law whatever of the government, if he be willing to submit to the decision of a jury the questions whether the law be intrinsically just and obligatory, and whether his conduct in disregarding or resisting it was right or wrong. This is why such a trial obviates the imprisonment of twelve men, taken at random from the people, and judging according to the standard of justice in their own minds, free from all dictation and author- ity of the government, and yet considers and submits to impunity by whomsoever it pleases to transgress or resist it.

The trial by jury obviates all this, or it is a sham and a farce, utterly worthless for protecting the people in their just rights. It does not authorize the individual to resist the first and least act of injustice or tyranny on the part of the government; it does not even authorize him to resist any act of "the country," or of any individual who is become their king, except by a jury through a jury. In this way the people, at all times, hold their liberties in their own hands and never surrender them, even for a moment, into the hands of the government.

Those who deny the right of a jury to protect an individual in resisting an unjust law of the government, deny him all legal defense whatsoever against oppression. They, therefore, at the same time, establish a government which does not authorize individuals to resist those acts of injustice or tyranny on the part of the government, or to resist any act of the "country," or of any individual who is become their king, except by a jury through a jury. And in this way the people, at all times, hold their liberties in their own hands and never surrender them, even for a moment, into the hands of the government.

It is manifest that the only security against the tyranny of the government is in forcible resistance to the execution of the injustice; because the injustice will certainly be executed unless forcibly resisted. And if it be not suffered to be ex- ecuted, it must then be borne; for the government never makes compensation for its own wrongs. Since this forcible resistance to the injustice of the government is the only possible means of preserving liberty, it is indispensably necessary for all liberty that this right be acknowledged and legislated. The question is, whether this right be not only, or not only, proved by the nature of the trial itself, but is acknowledged by history.

This right of resistance is recognized by the constitution of the United States as a strictly legal right. It is so recognized, first, by the provision that "the trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury" — that is, by the country; and second, by the provision that "the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed." This constitutional security for the right to keep and bear arms implies the right to use them — as much as the right to use them, as the right to buy and keep them — it does not imply the right to use them. The constitution, therefore, takes for granted that the people will not use the conduct of the government, and that they have the right, they will also have the sense to use arms whenever the necessity of the case justifies it. And it is a sufficient and legal defense for a person accused of using arms against the government, if it can be shown to the jury, to that effect, that the law was unjust, or, even in any case of a jury, that the law he resisted was an unjust one. But for the right of resistance on the part of the people, all governments would become tyrannical to a degree far greater than at present. Constitutions are utterly worthless to restrain the tyranny of governments, unless it be understood that the people will be able to resist the government to keep within constitutional limits. Practically speaking, no government knows any limits to its power except the endurance of the people. But that the people are stronger than the government, and will resist in extremis, means, our present purpose for the purpose of bringing him before a jury for trial, unless in pursuance and execution of a judgment or decree rendered by a jury upon such evidence, and such law, as are satisfactory to their own understandings and consciences, irrespective of all legislation of government.

To be continued.

THE RAG-PICKER OF PARIS.

By Felix Pyat.

TRANSLATE FROM THE FRENCH BY BERNARD TUCKER.

PART FOURTH.

CHAPTER I.

THE STRUGGLE.

Continued from No. 146.

Camille held her in his arms.

"Marie! dear Marie! Good news, you will be free!"

Marie sobbed.

"I am not guilty! ..."

"To the scaffold!" repeated Camille; "as much as so the child they have killed."

"A poor child that I found and kept without saying anything about it," said Marie, sadly, "Must one boast of a good deed? And they killed the innocent girl that I was out raising the money for!"

"I know your devotion. Jean has told me all, dear victim," answered Camille, eagerly.

Marie continued: "I could not make a merit of my conduct, and they have made it a crime."

"You are a victim," said Vellime, "genuine martyr of the past and purest love, that of humanity. What are the goodness and the beauty of the saints beside your own, dear Marie, you, whose religion is self-sacrifice?"

"Oh! thank you for these words of esteem!" exclaimed the young girl.

And Camille said passionately: "Say rather of love, of deep, unchangeable, eternal love:"

"It is not so! Zozemier, do not use such words to a poor girl accused as I am. You believe in my honor; that is enough."

"If you should be proved untruthful, I would believe in you in the light of day, and I would prove it to all. I would raise you up, fallen, and branded in the eyes of the world, but all the higher and more noble in mine, heroine of duty. And, in spite of the law, I would still give you what I have promised you, all that I have left, the name borne by my mother, who was as good as you are. I would take you in my arms and say proudly to the world: Marie Déjard is no more; I present to you Madame Berthe, Marie Déjard!"

"May we have the love of him who has never faltered?"

"It is only as an eclipse; your innocence will shine out like the sun, and you will go out of here as radiant to all as to me.""}

"But remember that it is with increasing warmth:"

"After, before, always, and everywhere; and I come here to tell you so as if you were at home."

"Then, after a pause, he added:"

"Now it is who am not worthy of you, Marie, I who have nothing left to offer you, even with which to pay for so much virtue."

"He looked at her steadily and said:"

"Marie, I am as poor as you."

"Happy!" she cried, with involuntary joy, as she grasped his hands. But suddenly, repulsing her embrace, she said:"

"Pardon me, Monsieur!"

"On leaving you yesterday I wrote to the baron, breaking off my engagement and calling for an account. His reply informs me of my ruin, while leaving me the choice, he says, between poverty and disgrace, and a marriage with Claire."

He smiled and continued:

"Much obliged! Contentment is better than all. My choice is made; but it is yours to show how you will live. I swear to you, when I offered you my fortune, I foolishly supposed that I still possessed it; I have it no more. I have been obliged to confess as much to you; am I still worthy of you?"

"Ah! even more so, but ..."

"And Marie stepped, seemed to hesitate.

"But what?" asked Camille."

"After what has happened to us," replied Marie, gravely, "I cannot but be your wife."

The surprised young man looked at her sorrowfully.

"What do you say, Marie?"

And Marie answered in a tone of deep sadness:

"Camille, dear Camille, I loved you enough to sacrifice myself for you, but I love you too much to sacrifice you for myself. Be free. I give you back your promise."

"And I refuse it," said Camille. "That would convict both of us of calculation.
and cowards. Let us not doubt each other; dear Marie; in spite of all that is blind, fortune and justice, we are united, equals. Your pride can no longer re-
achieve my wealth. There is no longer any difference. I shall be the better able to
purposely ruin his life; and I shall tell the woman he loves, that I have
recovered it, and that I shall be the happier for it. I shall be the better able to
restore my reputation, and to revenge myself on those who have injured me.
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- y, the noblest sacrifice a woman can make to the man she loves. Make your-
self forgotten to save him. He loves you to the point of sacrificing his fortune for
your happiness, and he desires it to be restored to you. He loves you to the point of
sacrificing his life for your happiness, and he desires it to be restored to you.

Marie concluded in a fit of excitement.

"Love, honor, conscience, these are our possessions! We are rich. No more
problems. I have resolved it, and I will do it and know it, and believe it.

Camille concluded in a fit of excitement.

"Yes, Marie, I am coming to see you," said the baron, good-naturedly.

"Yes?"

"Yes, to serve you, if I can," continued the baron, in a paternal tone.

"I hope for that," exclaimed Marie, with a last trace of distrust.

"Thank you, Monsieur.

"To save you, if I can," continued the baron.

"No, no, not in that way.

And I was very pleased.

"I am innocent.

"Innocent or not, it doesn't matter," said the baron, in a voice of confidence; "I am
interested in Marie Diderot's daughter.

But Marie answered with dignity:

"I am a known tool and have no reverence, pray keep it!"

The baron, in a more and more wheeling way, calmed her with a gesture.

"Very well, then, innocent. Unfortunately your conscience will not be your
judgment.

And first I must say that the words uttered in my surprise of yesterday and the rather severe ones spoken in my
frankness today. Examine your position and listen to reason. To be and to say
what you have done is sacrilegious and against you and weight

lyFE.

Such at least is the opinion of the barrister whom I have en-
aged for you. To him the case seems doubtful, the admission suspicious,
and the murder certain. Though the child was not yours, the less it
is killed; and some may believe that you got rid of it after obtaining
the money, I must think you were half insane, and I must think you
entangled in a net of disgraceful circumstances, beginning with the ball and con-
cluding with the visits of Camille, which you have so often charged.
and now, to cap the illusory promises, you have written, to your
father, that rage, that passion, that despair, Jean.

"He, Monsieur!" cried Marie, explosively; "as a murder, as I fear."

"And arrested as you are," said the baron.

"Ah! was notions. The misfortune enough?" grunted Marie, falling back on
her chair.

The Baron resumed:

"All this, be sure, is not absolute proof, but serious presumption: which makes
the crime seem real, if not so, and punishment probable, if not sure.

Take care! She is not set for accusation painful, and justice severe.

"You fill me with despair, Monsieur," exclaimed Marie, losing her head.

"Such is not my intention, but the contrary; and if you will believe in my
promise, you will have a chance of being released.

"Monseigneur, I ask neither pardon nor indulgence. I have neither confession nor
repentance to make, for I have committed no sin.

"I am only telling you what the lawyer says. And be sure, your freedom at that price.

"The roar of my honor and of truth! Never!

"Unhappy girl! Futility is stronger than truth . . . ; and the shame lies in the
crime, not in the confession. Believe me, it is the only way you can save yourself.

But I did not refuse for fear that what is offered you . . .

It is a question of an affective and ignominious punishment—death perhaps,
imprisonment at least. Confess, and poverty, youth, indigence, will plead in your
favor. The crime is punished with justice, you can save yourself with
salvation; in short, imprisonment for life or liberty and prosperity . . . Choose.

Thank you, Monsieur, what you offer me is worse than death," said Marie, firma.

And she bowed as if to retire.

"Well, she will yield nothing for her own sake; let us see if she will for his,
said the baron, aside.

"Very well," he continued aloud; "if you will not save yourself, surely you will
not save another.

"Monseigneur Rerville?" exclaimed Marie, eagerly.

A gleam of joy flashed through the baron's eye.

"Yes, madame; do you know it?

"More than all the world.

"And you would save me at any cost?

"At any cost of my life.

"Well, you are ruining him.

"No, you are doing me a favor.

"You! For your sake he breaks off a marriage that would be his salvation.

"I will release him if necessary, Monsieur.

"He will remain yours as long as he believes in you.

"What! what you want more?" exclaimed Marie, in terror.

The baron came straight to the point.

"Yes, the noblest sacrifice a woman can make to the man she loves. Make your-
self forgotten to save him. He loves you to the point of sacrificing his fortune for
your happiness, and he desires it to be restored to you. He loves you to the point of
sacrificing his life for your happiness, and he desires it to be restored to you.

But he, my God, is everything to me," said Marie, wringing her hands.

"He is the only man in the world to my heart. He is the only man for me.
 Others may

"I love him, you, then, so well?" asked the baron, in a hollow voice.

"As I love him," said Marie simply.

The baron rose with the same.

"Then marry in the prison chapel. It is a favor sometimes granted to prisoners
and be happy!"

"Marie recalled him, saying in a voice of anguish.

"Ah! strike me in all that I love, but do not rail at my suffering."

"Oh! I do not rail; declare, brave, and gentle, one.

"Marie Diderot, some one to see you," said the sister, suddenly returning.

And again she went out, to introduce this time Baron Hoffmann.

"Ah! you torture me," cried Marie, beside herself.

"A doctor is not an executioner," said the baron. coldly, and you are strong
enough to endure a pain.

Stronger and more prudent than Camille, weigh well my last word, spoken as
a friend in your interest and his own.

Let us suppose, taking the most favorable view, that both of you were
free, married, happy. How long would it last? Do you suppose that love is
eternal? Alas! no more beauty. Love without bread is short-lived, and his
shorter than another's. Do not give up a novelty before he will measure
the loss of property, rank, society; in short, to regret the sacrifice of the marriage
of reason to the marriage of folly.

"Ah! you flatter him, Monsieur; and if you had heard him.

"Slander him? Impossible!" exclaimed the baron. "You esteem him too highly;
you judge him by yourself. I, his guardian, counsel him better than you do,
for a life of luxury and repose, better than a life of poverty and
sunshine . . . but in winter? He is a sickle fellow, as well as a prodigy and a
fop. No, I will not marry a girl, be his name or fortune, like his heart.

With twenty thousand dollars a year for his life as a young man, he owes even for
his shirts. Judge what a sort of a husband he would make. He would send For-
chette home. He would give his gilt and jade, his flowers and cakes, and his
sunshine.

"Ah! you can endure misery, you poor people who are accustomed to it.

But with us it is different; we cannot live with impunity. Our courage does
not know fatigue, nor can we be in comfort, nor can we be in leisure, nor can we
bear the wretchedness which torture and beggary impose. We judge for our
peace.

The voice of a newsboy was heard outside.

"Just out. The arrest of Marie Diderot: . . .

The baron calmly looked at his watch, and said to himself:

"Punctual!

"Then aloud and solemnly:

"Listen!

"The boy's voice rang out:

"The working-girl of the Faubourg Saint-Antoine, accused of killing her,
with interesting details. One cent.

"Ah! I have mercy, my God!" cried Marie, in delirium. "I am going mad.

"It is the red iron," said the executioner, "the order can be efficacious.

"You are killing me," said Marie, in fear.

The baron went to the door, opened it, and introduced his daughter.

"Ah! come and help me to save them," said he.

And in a low voice:

"Apply the finishing stroke.

Clair, as white as a statue, advanced with repugnance.

"Marie, I have come here with my father to advise you. Being a patrician of
your family, I have a right to advise you. Go on, and do everything in my
power to make your position more endurable.

"After a pause and upon an encouraging gesture from the baron, she went on:

"But I must console you at least. I hope that in following my father's advice . . .

"But you too," said Marie, overwhelmed; "you believe my guilt?"

"I believe you unfortunately," said Clair, with embarrassment, "and I desire to
put an end to your troubles . . . but I see no other way . . . But I have already
told Monsieur that I was not an obstacle to your happiness,
answered Marie, gently.

"My happiness," replied Clair, sadly. "Listen to me as I speak to you, with
the self-same fortitude and with the same determination.

We are in the house of Camille, and it is there that you are safe. It is not a question
of my happiness, but of his; do not every me; I shall not be a happy and triumphant rival, a
but a victim more unfortunate than yourself.

For you love him and you will do it.

"Ah! exclaimed Marie, with surprise mingled with joy.

"Considered.

"Yes, we both sacrifice ourselves for a man who does not love me and who
loves you. Which of us is the more unfortunate? You leave him and I take him.
With us, always the harder. I yield to my father, who deserts Camille's
safety and your own even at such a cost. Let us unite in sacrifice. For
women on this earth, in France as in India, everywhere and always, there is nothing
but sacrifice. Our lot is to turn ourselves over for our lords and masters . . .

To be continued.
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A Choice Worse Than Indecision.

In the thought of Mr. Lucien V. Pinney we are presided over by a figure of a house divided against itself. As the editor of the Winster "Press," Mr. Pinney proved himself a brave and fearless defender of freedom. Treating of social wrongs strongly intrenched in popular ignorance and stunted law with a rare and splendid courage, he scattered wholesome and diflusion along the camps of prosperity and philanthropy. The high talk and writing to which he treated the prudes and hypocrites of society is almost a fair imitation of the behavior of all lovers of justice and progress. True, his defense and championing of the cause of the people was not always along the lines of liberty, but it was unique, and ever such as to carry with it the promise of improvement in the right direction. And the way he did it, nearly a year ago, he fortunately forced the "Press," his biographer original farewell to his readers confirmed the impression his previous work had given that he was strong enough to startle the public. For whereas in 1875 he had not come to a final decision as to which of the two radical plans advanced for the regeneration of mankind possessed the superior merits, he was inclined to cast his lot pretty clearly in favor of the free soil party, and the time for the endearment to all anarchists, and I, for one, appreciated him the more for declining to hasten his decision and for abiding the time when he should come by it naturally.

Whether this time has now been fulfilled, and whether Mr. Pinney has had a glimpse of the light he will henceforth unavervingly follow, I cannot say; but in the "Word" for June he records his present manner of viewing things which is anything but friendly to and intelligently appreciative of individualism. We need rest under no delusion that Mr. Pinney's thoughts have not turned over adversely to our expecta-
tions, for he plainly testifies to his "increasing faith that State Socialism is the only escape from the innumerable wrongs that are to be found in the public and political life of the people."

He feels something has got to be done to check the price monopoly power, and turn the vast advantage of combination in the direction to benefit common folk, and that government monopoly can do it. Rejecting the Anarchistic view that the state is the chief obstacle in the way of the realization of labor property with which the people of authority embodied in the State, and that it is consequently obliged on progressists to overthrow the State and give things over to the equilibrating forces of liberty and free competition, Mr. Pinney declares that he is a dualist, and that the true problem of the State is neither of monopoly nor of favor, but that the suppression of individual initiative and the turning of things over to the regulating powers of government. Why tax one's patience with the multi-paged process of societarian evolution under liberty when the fact of government can work miracles? While it will "take money for a gun instead of our fingers and toes," a man can count on "the cost of the life of a local government" and live by the principle of "cost the life of government," and as such, and put this principle into action without the necessity of "converting" anybody to a recognition of its justice.

Extravagant as this statement is, it does not exhaust Mr. Pinney's storehouse of praise and admiration of the powers and actual achievements of government. Chivalry, the "duty " of politics, tells his highest mission is that of "the superintendent of the streets, all in an illusion of Politics, which young Liberty grinds beneath her heel."—PROCEEDINGS.

The appearance in the editorial column of articles over other signatures than the editor's initial indicates that the editor approves their general purpose and general tenor, though he does not hold himself responsible for either phrase or word. But the appearance in other parts of the paper of articles by the same or other writers by no means indicates that he disapproves of them on any specific basis, which disposal of them being governed largely by motives of convenience.

Unconscious Anarchists.

To me, one of the most encouraging signs of the times is the way in which the unconscious Anarchist crops up from unexpected places and in increasing numbers. He is usually a person who has only a vague and newspaper idea of what Anarchism means. In his mind the word is very likely to be a collective synonym of blood, violence, dynamite, and chaos in general. But at the same time he has principles that have got a lodgment in his brain and have undermined his former hesitations, belief in government authority. Very often he has not even put this belief clearly before himself. Not only in his recent reasoning he is still in mind, and it is not until some one announces to him a downright Anarchistic principle that he realizes the full meaning of what he has been thinking.

Not very long ago a quietly enthusiastic Anarchist fell in, on a railroad journey, with a high and very respectable light of the Republican party,—one whom the ultra-good Republicans look to, and have been looking to for the last six or seven years, to purify their faith in their institutions. Although he has not succeeded, even from his present vantage point of a place on the civil service commission, his faith in him is as strong as ever. Perhaps it would have been weakened somewhat if they knew that on one occasion, after a long and earnest discussion with the Aarchist, the Republican said, very thoughtfully, "If it is Anarchy, I am more than half an Anarchist myself."

All the meaning to the first exposition of Anarchistic principles which he had ever heard, and asking a few pertinent questions, a certain United States senator of the Democratic party not long ago made the same sad admission concerning himself. This two in three might be many times multiplied will outflaunting the number that has come under my own observation. Most of these indeed are of a much more decided character than the two described. They are people who have thought out the question...
Solutions of the Land Problem.

With no contributor to the interesting “symposium on the land question” in the London “Personal Rights Journal” do I find myself in complete accord. Mr. A. Beveridge’s conclusion is that “subsidies to land is improving agriculture,” but his political views are arbitrary and his method of reasoning unscientific. On the other hand, his collectivist opponent starts out with sound propositions, but manages to arrive at impossible results. Perhaps Mr. Beveridge’s views are formed in proportion to both his premises and his conclusions. Briefly, his position is that in all matters, whatever is right, is right, because the effective majority holds it so, and that the minority, however, did not have any appeals for reformation or reform. But Mr. Spence disposposes of this by pointing out that, in discussing what the law ought to be, no light is afforded by the theory that rights are determined by legal authority; that the formation of group issues is not helped by anything that can be said. And that every minority may hope to gain and obtain the controlling influence. It might easily be shown that neither statically nor historically there is a sufficient foundation for Mr. Donisthorpe’s curious view of politics, and perhaps it will be worth while to return to the subject.

Concerning the land question proper, I agree with Mr. Oliver that the method of the prior deduction of private property in land from notions of social and political value is impractical in the manner and against their justice and social utility. The only tests of the rightfulness of institutions, but I am convinced that, from this standpoint, all the schemes of land nationalization and rent taxation will be eliminated as the projects of the individualist as outlined by Mr. Herbert will commend itself as decided the safest and wisest. To quote his own language:

The individualist believes in the power of voluntary association to solve many present difficulties, and to win many future victories, but it is to be so, “associations on the voluntary principle must have no impediments thrown in their way. Difficulties in the ownership of land would be a serious impediment. There are already signs that cooperative societies are likely to become owners of land, and it is most important in the political and social general public opinion in the name of the poor, who are the best interests of both men and women. Otherwise, how can they say with regard to the business or trade interests of women that they think it “safer and wiser to trust to organization itself”? I believe in the growth of a better public opinion among the new men, than to the exercise of a political right,” and not see that it is the safer and wiser thing with regard to all interests, both of men and of women, to trust to organization itself. I believe organization to be effective in the exercise of a political right?” Evidently with them sauce for the goose is not sauce for the gander. Or, for a mission with social culture and address, coupled with the requisite amount of enthusiasm, to go among the people and teach them to think and to pray to the goddess of Liberty!

In the July number of the same magazine Mrs. Fawcett and Mrs. Dille, as quoted in the speech of Mr. Dille, offered special reply to the appeal of the Liberty men. From the standpoint of governmentalists, to whom the ballot is the only means of determining the will of the sovereign body, every exercise their sovereignty and guard their interests, Mrs. Fawcett and Mrs. Dille are at least progressive, and with the exception of one great lapse in Mrs. Fawcett’s paper, consistent. One of the objections to female suffrage is that when the franchise is given—under which is it is for a female to exercise the privileges and functions of office as a woman, it would “introduce changes in family life, and in the English conception of the household, of enormous importance, which have never been adequately considered.” Certainly not; but Mrs. Fawcett has some of her aims and fears of the result, should all women, even those who are “bound by law to obey their husbands’ vote,” and in order to guard the family and the household against dire calamity, she would enslave women from married women. Here are the horns of the dilemma; in getting around them Mrs. Fawcett jumpeš her logic as well. The family, the conception of the household! I can only give the champions of female suffrage the word, which is a rather husky German expression—to throw the sausage after the ham. They may in their turn stand astern; but fear it, deny it, or ignore it as they will, there is no other logical outcome of the “emanipulating process,” except by arbitrarily fixing its limits (a vain attempt, by the way), as the ladies of the Appeal would do, than the abolition of marriage. They have said female suffrage, and they cannot stop until they have said free love.

To Earnest Questioners.

In a recent issue of Liberty an editorial dealt with “The Profession of the Landlord,” endeavoring to recall them to reason and honest manner of investigation. But even serious and sober-minded questioners need to be reminded of certain truths relative to rational methods of seeking information. A reviewer of Wallace’s new book on “Darwinism” quotes the late Professor Yonus as saying that, “while all men of science have come to accept the doctrine of evolution as unscientific, or as they do, the doctrine, as an instance of verification, there is not one in a thousand of them who could give a brief and intelligible statement of the reasons that has convinced him. The evidence lies not in one thing or a few things, but in every fact of animal and vegetable existence, so that the proof is ceaselessly cumulative and completely overwhelming.”

My experience in social reform convinces me that the confidence and assurance of one is in inverse ratio to the knowledge of one. Knowledge one is the greater the serenity in what does duty for his thought, and that the clear-sighted thinker and analytical student is necessarily cautious, guarded, and doubtful. To the ignorant, reasoning is plain, to the trained mind everything is involved, intricate, and difficult. For this reason, chiefly, State Socialism has made no appeal to the average and rationalistic people; its “simple plan” must needs be powerfully rejected by those who have learned to look philosophically on society and history.

The firmer grasp of the Anarchist philosophy becomes, the more reluctant I am to engage in direct advocacy of it. Every positive statement I make approaches the danger of society cannot be encompassed by a few precepts, and that, as Burke says, “a clear idea is another name for a little idea.” All that I can advise sober-minded questioners is to study, ponder, observe, analyze, while adding the necessary recommendations, or partial elucidation. Anarchism will supersede authoritarian views of life in the same way that dogma has been superseded by the doctrine of evolution. All the moral questions which are so much talked about when the importance of freedom in sociological experimenation is understood, and when the difficulties in the way not only of solving sociological problems rightly, but of scientifically investigating the theory of sociology, freedom of thought leads to demand freedom of action. He who relies on force in matters of social organization either dispenses with the process of thinking himself, or commits on the credulity and unfortunate blindness of others.
The Two Socialisms. We hear of all sorts of Socialism now-a-days. There is scientific Socialism and sentimental Socialism; Christian Socialism and utopian Socialism; Blummerian and Fabian; and a dozen others. Each makes a distinction between Collectivist and Communist Anarchism; so that the ordinary reader must get considerably muddled. Then, unfortunately, the "true" clergies is a sub-class of the "false" clergy, which is not less subject to the State. As a disciple of the anarcho-communist, I take pleasure in the political Science Quarterly."
You make little of forms of government (p. 34). Their influence is wholly subordinate to that of other things. But you are not making a very fine distinction. On the one hand, the means of government have little influence; they say, with you (and mainly, farther, that that influence is mainly for the bad—and on the other, for the good. We have been talking about the public domain, this malign influence. Let us be not timorous of this humane nature which is behind all government, which has been always either good or bad. As long as the people do not become the in a way, it may or may not be true. Let me give an instance now, and the reason for the old designation of the term. The title is taken from the act of Congress. In the early days of this country, the term "society" was given a special meaning as it related to the legal and political arrangements of the time. However, the concept of a society has evolved over time, and its meaning has been redefined in various contexts. In social sciences, a society is defined as a group of individuals who live together, communicate, and share a common culture, language, and way of life. The concept of society is often used to refer to a particular group, such as a community or a nation, that shares these characteristics. The term is also used to describe the interaction of people in a group, such as in a family, a workplace, or a school. It is important to understand the context in which the term "society" is being used to accurately interpret its meaning. In this case, the term "society" is being used to refer to the group of individuals who share a common culture, language, and way of life. This is a broad definition that encompasses a wide range of social groups and arrangements. The concept of society is often used to describe the interaction of people in a group, such as in a family, a workplace, or a school.
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