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On Picket Duty.

Moleschott is one of the few specialists who can think on social questions. He recently said that one cannot define "a criminal," since every one is, or is sure to be at one time or another, a criminal.

A writer in the "Open Court" cites numerous facts in proof of his statement that "it can hardly be said that Americans are not a superstitious people." And Liberty is the mere disposed to agree with him, seeing that he himself exemplifies the truth of his conclusion by the remark that "superstition thrives best where character and railroads and schoolhouses are few and far between."

"The Voice of the People," published in Kingman, Kansas, declares for political, economic, and social freedom, which it regards as logical deductions from Spencer's "first principle." But neither Spencer's principle nor its own belief in individual liberty deter it from making arrangements with legal and "Looking Backward" and "The Dawn," which, as everybody ought to know, have no other mission than the total abolition of political and social liberty. I call the attention of the Denver "Individualist" to this fact.

Says the "Sturdy Oak": "There is no better evidence of the need of a government than to listen to a man who claims he knows how to govern." But since all those who claim to know how to govern are thus declared, not only unfit for the office of governors, but very much in need of being looked after, the inevitable conclusion is that we must select our governors from the honest few who confess their inability to govern—which is evidently an absurdity. When the sincere and thoughtful desire to govern and the knives only respond to the call, the wisest course would seem to be to do without government.

"Measures and not men," says Junius, "is the commonest of divided states; a base, counterfeit language fabricated by knives and made current among fools." And Pope observes: "To reform and not to chastise I am afraid is impossible. To attack vices in the abstract without touching persons may be as bad as fighting against the winds."

Provided a controversyist is candid and thorough; provided it is not obvious that he is an impostor, that he says all he means to say, that he says it simply and directly, that he does not addéments, that he says it in the language of reason, and not of passion, and that he does not use ad hominem arguments, there should be no objection to his indulging in personalities. Shall a hypocrite be allowed to obtain safety behind a phrase or a proposition which he dignifies by the name of doctrine? Out upon such shallowness! While exposing fallacies and opposing falsehood, we must not neglect to hold up the mirror of our own conduct to the contempt and decision to which his mean qualities entitle him.

Col. Higginson, writing in the "Natio:alist" on the alleged tendency towards State Socialism, says: "I cannot understand why the laborers, Spooner, who make the claim for the privilege of cheap postage in this country, undertook to send letters between New York and Boston at a much lower rate than the government's price, and for a time succeeded in doing it. I can remember when Wells, Fargo & Co. practically took the conveyance of letters out of the hands of the post-office department in the early days of California. It is now hard to believe that such a state of things ever existed." Yes, hard to believe for those who neither know the present state of things nor ever had a correct understanding of the state of things they describe. It may be a revelation for Mr. Higginson that the only reason the same facts do not exist now and did not continue is that government for the most part forcibly suppressed them, thus making the facts mean to overcome which it could not even approach by means fair and square.

Mr. Ingalls calls for severe criticism of the general propositions advanced in his article on "Increase." From Liberty he will certainly receive support rather than censure, and he has entertained a new derivation from that of which he now holds. If it has any criticism to offer, it is that Mr. Ingalls is not justified in claiming originality and novelty for his important distinction. Even those who seemingly dissect from his main conclusion and who insist that cost is the limit of price do not in reality mean to contradict him. From the standpoint of economic logic, Mr. Ingalls's phrasing is doubtless to be commended as superior in point of exactness and accuracy. But it should be borne in mind that, when Warren and Andrews spoke of cost as the limit of price, they did so because they aimed at emphasizing the ethical side of their doctrine and the contrast which equity presents to commercial cannibalism.

In the Detroit "Evening News," an editorial entitled "The Underlying Principles" lately appeared, in which the present political situation was seriously and discussed. The statement was plainly made that "the logic of democracy is Anarchism, and the logic of republicanism is State Socialism or Communism," and according to all prohibitivists and prohibitionists were advised to go over to the Republicans and assume the name that properly belongs to them, while Democrats were admonished to mistrust the law and renew their old-time pledge to vigilantly guard their liberties. That no blame for these extraordinary sentiments attaches to any of the political penny-pinchers of Detroit is certain; and the finger of suspicion points to the one man in that city whose reputation for cranky notions of this sort has long since become established. But is it not astonishing to have such revolutionary sentiments stated at you from the editorial columns of a daily newspaper? The bewildermess of the respectable reader is easier fancied than described.

A State Socialist having written to the "Twentieth Century" to deny Mr. Yarros's statement that under socialism people would be "drilled, ordered about, disciplined" by the authorities, Mr. Peacock proceeds to tell him that, in truth, "Socialists and Anarchists are unnecessarily and unwarrentably bitter against each other"; that, in reality, "both are thorough believers in voluntary cooperation as an ultimate"; that "all socialists will say to you: 'We are the true Individualists,'" while "all well-educated Anarchist will say to you, 'We are the true Socialists.'"

But the trouble is that "the mind which embraces Anarchism cannot grasp the true invariance of Socialism" and "the Socialist does not and cannot understand Anarchism." Suppose all this is true; what of it? When Mr. Penteconot, or anybody else, is asked to decide between these two schools, it is simply begging the question to report what their respective claims and assertions are and to declare the inaptitude of each to appreciate its opponents; it is expected of him to examine their claims and express his own opinion. Every man who has brains is reasonably expected to do his own thinking; and he cares about the opinions of others only in so far as they form the data upon which he has to build his conclusions. And to tell a man of positive opinions that he is constitutionally incapable of grasping the ideas of his antagonists is not only to insult him, but to deprive of human reason and to deny the possession of human knowledge. A theologian, a metaphysician, a Gnostic, has only to borrow Mr. Penteconot's device in order to secure himself against the assaults of scientists and philosophers.

A Call.

In 1854 appeared "Der Einzug in sein Eigentum" by Max Stirner (Kaspar Schmitt, 1800-1866). There are still many among us who remain and who have not been excited at that time, and surely also some who stood in love or like intimate relations with the author.

I have asked to communicate to me what they remember about Mr. Stirner. Above all I request those who are in possession of manuscripts, letters, and likenesses of Stirner to favor me with an inspection of them for a short time; and I shall be grateful for the slightest information, whether it relates to Stirner personally or to his works.

JOHN HENRY MACKAY.
Saarbrücken, Hehrsbergansprech. 4, Rhein Province, Germany.

The Legislative Mania.

(Waterman's Journal.)

In one of the hotel Gazettees ou Journaux, I saw the other day a circular for a general association of hotel keepers. It is almost unnecessary to add that one of the objects of the association will be to "secure proper legislation." This is what we have come to—a system of class legislation. Everything that organizations must secure "proper legislation." Trades' unions, Knights of Labor, locomotive engineers, Nationalists, manufacturers, potters, artisans, railroad, supplying all must have it. Propriete, and why not? The legislatu is of constant evidence of their influence in their own ability to set the world right, and in putting up an appearance. Dairymen have combined in some States to secure "proper legislation" against oolong-margarine, and with notable success. Why should not hotels secure protection against boarding-houses? The truth is, the proposed association probably contemplates no particular legislation at all, but only wants to be in the swing for "proper legislation." The hotels keepers know, moreover, that they have been meddled with in the past, and that, in the course of time, they will be treated to some kind of legislation, so they very naturally wish that it should be "proper." Just as railroads perforce have come to have what may almost be called a legislative department, to secure "proper legislation." They need to be represented before the legislators and before Congress, as Mr. Huntington expressed it a few years ago, for the purpose of "explaining things." If verbal explanations are not satisfactory to the legislators, pecuniary arguments have seldom been known to fail—because legislators are so concerned about finance, I suppose. And because, directly or indirectly, pecuniary arguments seldom fail to produce the proper legislation, it has come about that those who cannot use these arguments, the so-called laboring classes, are the last to begin to get their legislative dues. But today these classes are discovering their numerical strength, and, though they are more easily convinced than the "financiers," they slowly but surely advance towards "proper legislation." Yes, in short, when all other classes have secured their legislative bantlings, if we have any sense left by that time, we shall awake to the fact that it costs us nothing to be represented in the same relative position we should occupy naturally, without a single legislative tag. If Socialism is really the only road to this discovery, the "Journal" bids Socialism welcome, because with the discovery will come the abolition of "proper legislation" and the coronation of justice.
FREE POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS:
THEIR NATURE, ESSENCE, AND MAINTENANCE.

AN ABREDITION AND REARRANGEMENT OF

Lysander Spooner’s “Trial by Jury.”

Edited by Victor Yarros.

Chapter 4: The Criminal Act

It is a maxim of the common law that there can be no crime without a criminal intent. And it is a perfectly clear principle, although one which judges in a great measure overthrown in practice, that jurors are to judge of the moral intent of the accused, to determine whether he had the necessary criminal intent to commit the crime. Consequently the jury must find that he acted from a criminal motive before they can declare him guilty.

There is no moral justice in, nor any political necessity for, punishing a man for an act which he may have committed, if he have done it without any criminal intent. There can be no moral justice in punishing for such an act, because there being no criminal motive, there can have been no other motive which justice can take cognizance of in its treatment, or in punishment. There can be no political necessity for punishing, to warn against similar acts in the future, because if one man have injured another, however unintentionally, he is liable to be injured a second time, and he will be compelled to make compensation for the injury, notwithstanding his innocence of any intention to injure. He must bear the consequences of his own act, instead of the state, for which he is not responsible.

This principle is clear because the question for the jury to determine is whether the accused be guilty, or not guilty. Guilt is a personal quality of the actor, not necessarily involved in the act, but depending also upon the intent or motive with which the act was done. Consequently the jury must find that he acted from a criminal motive before they can declare him guilty.

But this is giving no reason at all for the doctrine, since saying that a man “is accused” is not the same as saying that he is accused of a crime, or that he is guilty of a crime. The judge, and to apply the same presumption to all, on the ground of age alone, is not only gross injustice, but gross folly. A universal pre-
authority might with nearly or quite as much reason be founded upon weight,
or height, as upon age.

This doctrine that ignorance of the law excuses no one is constantly repeated
in the form that "every one is bound to know the law." The doctrine is true
in civil matters, especially in contracts, so far as this— that no man who has the
opportunity and capacity to make reasonable contracts can escape the consequences
of his own agreement, on the ground that he did not know the law applicable to it.

When a man makes a contract, he gives the other party rights; and he must
necessarily judge for himself, and take his own risk, as to what those rights are;
otherwise the contract would not be binding, and men could not make contracts
that would carry weight to each other. Besides, the capacity to make reasonable
contracts implies and includes a capacity to form a reasonable judgment as to the
law applicable to them. But in criminal matters, where the question is one of pun-
ishment or sentence, no one supposes that he may be excused by not having any
right to have the crime punished, unless it were committed with criminal intent,
and when the criminal intent is the only moral justification for the punishment, the principle
does not apply, and a man is considered as guilty as well as harmful, and as
learned in his duty. It requires of him only the same care to know his duty in
to the state that he is morally bound to use in other matters of equal
importance. He cannot say he has no knowledge of the laws because
his ignorance of the laws therefore that is unnecessary, or that arises from indifference or disregard of one's duty, is
an excuse. An accused person, therefore, may be rightfully held responsible for
the crime as easily as a man is held responsible in general. And cannot rightfully
be held responsible to a greater knowledge of the law than this.

To be continued.

THE RAGG-PICKER OF PARIS.

BY FELIX PAYT.

Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker.

PART FOURTH.

THE STRUGGLE.

Continued from No. 189.

Taking her hands, she concluded:

"Poor sister, let us submit."

And Marie answered, in dolorous exaltation:

"Yes, we must submit, and we will save him! Everything for him!"

And she fell in bewilderment.

"Good, good, Marie!" cried the dejected baron: "both of you are saved."

He added in a whisper:

"And so we are; come away."

Claire followed him with a feeling of indescribable horror.

"The torture is over," said she. "Let us carry off our forces."

CHAPTER VI.

THIRTY THOUSAND FRANCS!

The next morning the bells of the Concergerie awakened Jean, sobered but
overwhelmed. With effort he recalled all the incidents that had led to his arrest,
and thought a little of the charge against himself and a great deal of that which
kept Marie in Saint Lazare.

He had no time to become absorbed in his reflections, for municipal guards came
to take him to the Tribunal of Police for the occasion.

Thus the ragpicker again found himself in the office of the commissary who had
arrested Marie. Only the secretary was present.

Jean sat down on a bench, muttering to himself and against himself gross
insults interrupted by lamentations for Marie.

At last, unable longer to restrain his overflowing heart, he turned to the
interrogator and somewhat uncourteously:

"Ah! yes, my brave, worse than a brute! What beast drinks to ruin its
young? And I . . . what have I done? While my daughter was suffering and
weeping, I forgot her and got drunk as of old. A hardened offender, incurable,
unrepentant! Nothing has availed—the death of the one, the imprisonment
of the others, the only oath, the oath of a drunkard. Who has drunk it will
drink. That's what a man is! A vampire . . . I have drank the daughter's
blood as well as the father's, and mine too. . . . Oh! when she finds out! It is
her absence too . . . the chagrin, the pain, the trick, a diabolical temptation.
Sadistic wine! Scarcely can I remember."

And rising:

"To think that I had the proof in my hand, the salvation of my daughter, my
life . . . I had procured it so successfully from the old woman . . . and then
to ruin it to the old man! It is too much. Wine has stolen everything from me,
my heart, my soul. I murdered him, I have killed him! I've killed him! I have
killed him. In the name of God! Marie, Jean! As far as I am concerned, it is all right. So much the better, yes, but
her! Good people, aid me! What shall I do? What can I say now? Without
proof? A man like him accused me of murder, a Raggpicker against banche's . . .
. . . a penny against a pound . . . No weight! But come, come, it's no time
to whine. Some way must be found to save the girl who saves others. Where is
justice? Where is humanity? Where is the good God? She must live or I
must die! They cannot tear her from me, they are not. They cannot condemn
the innocent for the guilty, whatever the devil may do . . ."

He was interrupted by the officers of the municipal guard.

The commissary entered and gave his notes to the secretary.

"Ah! Monsieur commissary! cried Jean.

He slanted, and the commissary, sitting down, "speak only in answer to my
questions."

But Jean kept on.

"Monsieur commissary, you arrested yesterday a poor innocent.

"Come, no evasions," said the commissary.

Jean continued:

"Monsieur Didier—"

"Speak for yourself," said the commissary, roughly. "You are accused of havi-

ing murdered the Marquis on the Quai d'Anjou, twenty years ago, Jacques
Didier, M. Berville's collector.

"Monsieur, I swear to you that she is innocent."
Liberty.

Issued Fortnightly at One Dollar a Year; Single Copies Five Cents

BERN. E. TUCKER, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

Office of Publication, 18 F. Street.
Post Office Address: LIBERTY, P. O. Box No. 326, Boston, Mass.
Entered as Second Class Matter.

BOSTON, MASS., OCTOBER 5, 1860.

"In abolishing rent and interest, the last relics of obsolete slavery, the Revolution abolishes at once the sound of the executioner, the yoke of oppression, the club of the inquisition, the gage of the exchequer, the cramming-knife of the department chief, with those intolerable impositions, which every liberty preserves beneath her lid." — Proclamation.

Liberty

The appearance in the editorial column of articles over the signatures of the editor’s pen indicates that the editor approves their central purpose and general tenor, though he does not hold himself responsible for every phrase or word. But the appearance in other parts of the paper of articles by the same or other writers by no means indicates that he disapproves in any respect, such disposition of them being governed largely by motives of convenience.

Communistic Free Money.

If it were not evident, not only to J. Wm. Lloyd’s frank confession, but from the boyish nature of the proposal which he makes in another column as an improvement upon mutual banking, that his error arises from utter unfamiliarity with the principles of finance, it could not be asserted, with precision, that the recent raging with Communism, some of the virus had entered his veins. For the project which he labels “cooperative” is essentially communistic. This declaration will surprise Mr. Lloyd, for he doubtless hasn’t realized anything of the sort. But a little reflection will convince him of its truth.

The money which he proposes is communistic for the same reason, or rather for one of the reasons, that the greenback is communistic, — namely, because it is secured (not, as secured, for it is thoroughly insecure) — because it is not the property of the individual or the community. The compelling power of the new money is communistic because — to put the same objection in other words — any depreciation of an individual’s property or disaster in his business would fall, as Mr. Lloyd himself confesses, — say, as he proclaims, supposing $3,000 of money in the hands of the individual, but upon the whole mass of note-holders. It would be an insurance company indeed as he suggests. But against what would it insure? Simply against human folly, human weakness, human extravagance, human improvidence. Now, to insure against these is communistic, and it is itself folly. For to insure the individual against loss from his own blunders is to cause his blunders to multiply in geometrical progression. Insurance is an excellent thing in its proper place, but its sphere is generally a private one. There are instances of those who wish to secure money against being lost by kill or theft. It is infinitely simpler for each individual to give and take when and where and all that he can, than to have all these shopkeepers, and bookkeepers, and yardsticks, and scales, and promissory notes, and property

litigation, and prisons for thieves, that are necessary to any system of scientific and exact exchange. But I take it that Mr. Lloyd will see at once what consequences such simplicity would bring upon mankind. Now that the analogy is pointed out to him, perhaps he will see also that similar simplicity will follow the adoption of his simple money system. Again, let us take his proposition, before charging so much complexity upon the mutual banking system and assuming so many foreclosures that, it is bound first to disprove the claim of mutual money that, instead of increasing foreclosures and bankruptcies, it will reduce them. To that end, we must eliminate from commerce the chief causes of insecurity.

Intelligence and Conduct.

 Doubtless it is true that very often “a little knowledge is a dangerous thing.” This is all the more reason that the political neglect of the subject of “natural rights,” a very little knowledge would have proved sufficient to guard them from making a sorry spectacle of themselves. Instead of equivoque, sophistry, and forced arbitrary interpretation, the proper course is to drink from the fountain of historic truth and modern fact and thus fill the void of natural ignorance.

The idea of “natural right” springs from the theological dogma which taught that the world is governed by a wise and loving creator and that every act of man is directed to the production of men’s happiness. Metaphysicians, modifying this dogma, gave us the conception of a “fae natare,” a harmonious and beneficial “code of nature” anterior to civilization and independently derived. The growth of modern historical, metaphysical ideas, says Ingram, “was taken in hand by the modern negative school of Hobbes to Rousseau and used as a weapon of assault upon the existing order of society, with which the ‘natural’ order was perpetually controvrsial as offering the perfect type from which fact evolved in its inconceivable wealth of the evolutionary philosophy and inconsistent with the scientific views of society is of course too plain to require explanation. According to John Morley, such a hypothesis is “so inimical to the discovery of rules of conduct suited to the responsibilities of the modern state that it must be considered an impious, inhuman, and immoral doctrine.”

Old Wine in New Bottles.

It is instructive to sometimes trace the accepted dogma back to its beginnings. We shall then see what little resemblance a newly-dressed-up old idea bears to its original. Modifiers and commentators so much the old idea to make it fit new conceptions that nothing but the name remains, and so the label serves to keep up the tradition instead of to reveal the original. Sometimes the defenders of the old theory will so twist and torture it in course of time it bears more likeness to the theory to which it is opposed than to its own original self. The wasp-fond theory and probation after death are illustrations of this. This is a favorite trick of those who want to introduce new truths clandestinely, as it were, —like Beecher, who substituted evolution for hell in his sermons and got his flock to endorse Darwin and deny the existence of a deity. It is precisely that preposterous and the terminology and much of the paraphernalia of superstition. The motive of these revolutionists by stealth may be pious, whatever we may say of their methods, and they can generally be credited with being deliberate and intelligent in their aims.

But the same methods were used by another class of reformers, perhaps less intelligent and not at all deliberately, to pass off old ideas in new clothing. When done consciously, nothing can be said in favor of their methods or motives, as they are misleaders and corrupting the people. But of the old idea in its crude state it has no efficacy, and those who know nothing of the original but only the revised error it has a bad effect. The belief in natural law may be interested to knowing the metaphysical stage of development which is the only one in which a hundred years ago. In a debate on American taxation in England, Edmund Burke said that the project to tax American colonies was inexcusable. Referring to this, Austin (“Jurisprudence”) writes,

But to that most rational objection the sticklers for the scheme returned this assinine answer. They said that the British Government had a right to tax the colonies, and
To Comrade Yarros.

Certainly, comrade, if you can afford to treat your friends and sincere critics as you are in the habit of treating them, then I will be as sociable.

And, if you can afford to treat me in the position which you have placed yourself in your refusal to debate with me, I can well afford to leave you there.

Les plus nageurs se laissent toujours.

J. W. LLOYD.

[Since the above seems to be an appeal to public opinion, I, as a small fraction of that higher court, declare my verdict at once in Mr. Yarros’s favor. I speak not here of his severity of tone. Perhaps that should be passed upon by one less guilty than myself in that respect (if guilt it be). I simply say that in my judgment Mr. Yarros is right when he charges that Mr. Lloyd too frequently “takes no pains to get at the other side of things” and defines it [the author’s statement] to suit himself, and then blandly proceeds to assail or applaud his own creations.”

One may be indulgent for a time towards this vice in a critic who, like Mr. Lloyd, offsets it with nearly all his brilliancy. I have not a critic ought to have; but, finally, with the most patient of us, comes the inevitable explosion of impatience. By persistent disentanglement one can always successfully meet such criticism, but sooner or later the question arises whether this perplexing problem of our thought from the labyrinthine maze with which another chooses to surround it is, after all, entirely profitable business. In this view of the case, then, my counsel to Mr. Lloyd is to overlook Mr. Yarros’s manner, as of secondary importance; even if it caused him pain, and to see to it that hereafter, while exercising to the full his liberty to make his own dictionary, he tolerates the equal liberty of others to make theirs and interpret their thought accordingly. — Editor Liberty.]

George as a Derailer of Truth.

In reply to Mr. Pentecost, editor of the Twentieth Century, Henry George says: “It is well to proclaim the whole truth, but it is not well to despise the efforts of those who are advancing us to the true practical measures, however small, which are in the right direction.” It seems rather strange that Mr. George should follow this up as he does by writing some lines expressing his preference for Anarchism over State Socialism, for he has not declared in favor of government ownership of railroads and telegraphs, instead of private ironworks and other benevolent enterprises for the people out of their proposed immense revenue from a land tax? The expression quoted is a platitudinous or short-sighted platitudes of this kind. Those who believe in Mr. George’s government — for it is, despite his disclaimers, the tendency of facts being stronger than verbal assurances — may safely answer that they oppose him because he is advancing measures which they want less. How then can he condemn the economic theory of Spencer, Warren, Froude, Emerson, and Ruskin? Apparently to discriminate between the economic simplicity of the mode of exchange and the realization of equitably commerce — which probably must result from intelligence, liberty, and individual property in products and labor. One can misunderstand or misinterpret a doctrine, but surely that doctrine which emphasizes exchange rather than production is for linked as a definite solution of the needs of mankind. Equitable commerce will do better be found the more specifically linked to the complex functions of economic organization, while authoritative regulation has to be abandoned in despair. In the use of transportation, and in the distribution of products by sale, the rule of making prices by adding together items of expense plus a fair reward for services is the matter of equity, the substance of cooperation without necessity for joint stock ownership or clumsy and dangerous authoritarian meddling. To stail this hope of cooperation, one that it could be adapted to nothing but the affairs of a rustic community.
Increase: Economic or Tributary.

To the Editor of Liberty:

For more than half a century I have contended that rent, interest, and profits were wrong and should be abated. I had all that time a half-latent idea that something was lacking in rent and interest, but could not define it, leaving it pointed out to me; but so advocate of capital has ever done so. Through my own investigations, aided by comparing the pro and con of the discussion among Socialists and anarchists, and analyzing the contemporary position of the forces, so potent in social and industrial life, are economic as well as monopolistic.

Economic rent, interest, and profits as if solely embraced within the principles of exchange, Moral, and, generally, religious reformers have chased them with the tilthless-gathereth. Now, from neither of these suppositions alone can any satisfactory conclusion be deduced, because the terms embrace wholly contradictory and incompatible notions under the same name.

It has been suggested to me by Mr. C. L. James that this distinction has been noticed by Proudhon and also by Karl Marx; but he gives me no quotation or specific reference by which I can ascertain whether they also point out that, on their economic side, rent and interest are salutary as well as inevitable in their operation. All this may, perhaps, be inferred from the "Economic Contradictions" of Proudhon, but has he anywhere put it in clear form? If Karl Marx has done so, his whole scheme of State Socialism becomes a complete mess as now said. For it is economic law, not political, misdirection and misgovernment, he essays to rectify and reform. I do not see either how Proudhon could demand the abolition of the rent, and at the same time recognize the distinction between the economic and the monopolistic force involved in these terms, we have to notice the undulatory motion of the ratio of the market to the factory method. This mean, as I distinctly stated in "Social Wealth" and more fully stated in "Economic Equities," is zero.

Economic rent is confined to the more fertile soils and the more eligible situations. Properly, all becomes the more fertile by a change of culture, discovery of new uses and new methods, and nothing is more fluctuating than the valuations of land, and a change in a thousand years may reverse or change. In cities the relative value of location is of constant variation. Advantage from use of capital is balanced off and other things being equal, the value of all animals and things is balanced by their subsequent decrease and decay. There is an appearance of increase when labor or care is bestowed upon them, or the effect of an excess of loss when bestowed on them in process of decay, and these, on the whole, balance each other. That which is reaped as profit under our system of legislative interference is a wholly different class thing. The value of land is now tributized to privilege for the use of nature's forces and opportunities. Under a system of ownership where occupancy was the sole title it would disappear, and rent would then become a vibrating quantity, and subject to that modulating law which governs movement in every department of nature, securing always the best and most beneficial use. The difference between the economic value and the monopolistic price of things is that the first constantly sees the level, zero, from whence it fluctuates. Its magnitude is proportional to the value or deprecation or depressed, while the other forces an artificial level, as a dam prevents a stream from following its normal drift to the sea. Interest and money is born to a position, ratio, price, cause of "inflation" or "deflation," as proportional as is as well as by a monopoly of land, tariffs, patent rights, and other forms of privilege.

But the land, the plant, the stock, and even the currency require "care and keep," corresponding to, indeed constituting, the value of their use. Such service and such use are the complements of and balance each other. Demand and supply regulate the value of such service and use, the same as of other services and commodities, and constantly tend to bring them into a condition of equilibrium. Whether the service demanded for its care, or its conversion into more desirable or more durable forms, will command a premium. Demand, proportional to labor and capital is the law and the cause of "inflation" or "deflation," as proportional as is as well as by a monopoly of land, tariffs, patent rights, and other forms of privilege.

Letters from Italy.

IV.

To the Editor of Liberty:

The North of Italy, viewed from the social and political standpoint, does not present as marked differences from other parts of the peninsula as of old. Milan, Turin, Genoa, Turin, are cities where the working class feels and thinks, as in the cities of France, England, or the United States. Under the "bourgeoisie" and "bourgeoisie" are all-powerful, they lose their strength and prestige in the large cities of the North; to be sure, they are very strong in the small provinces where the upper classes and the bourgeoisie are sure of success they often elect very ignorant people of no value whatever; in Milan, on the contrary, they are the strength; they have been obliged to choose a man of talent and real value, like Signor Golomb.

The city government of Milan is still in the hands of the "bourgeoisie," and it has here to be said that this government of Milan has heretofore been much more restricted than political suffrage. But a recent law has increased the number of municipal elections, and it is easy to foresee that at the next elections, the city of Milan will fall into the hands of the men of the Left. That of Genoa is already partially held by them. Genoa too has a labor-depot, and, in Genoa, a remarkable man both in intelligence and character.

His election did not make so great an impression on the minds of the local people as the elections of 1848; but it place several years later. But the moderates were absolutely furious when Milan set the bad example of electing a laborer—small success, but an occasion may be made of it as an exception to their habit of never taking part in politics and bitterly deplored the event. They did not inquire whether the newly-elected deputy was an honest, born, intelligent man; the very fact that a laborer was to be a deputy in parliament seemed a scandal. From their own
standpoint these people were unscrupulously in the right. The bourgeoisie clung ever a part of their power to the fetichism still preserved by theatres in a corner of the human brain. Men begin by worshipping a stone, an animal, a monstrous imitation of a man, and so on; and now they still prostrate themselves before wealth and birth. Even republicans feel this need; they have created for themselves an aristocracy of the wealthy, and just as the rich are the only thing that counts, so they have called their way of thinking "popular sovereignty." According to them, men, who, taken separately, are ignorant and uncultivated, when united can make no decision that does not bear the stamp of the highest wisdom.

The descendants of the men who formerly adored a fetish, who prostrated themselves before a daemon, as a mark of respect under the less ignorant, who humb themselves to obtain the good graces of a patron, cannot today enjoy complete moral independence unless education comes to their aid to dissipate their superstition. And here it comes, we see, to cheapen, twist, and to cut the minute of the workmen who have used to say that they have a right to send one of their own number to parliament; in the rest of the country they will speak ill of their masters, they will even hate them as the slave does, but the idea never occurs to them that these are men like themselves, having the same vices and the same virtues. Here, for instance, is a young man who has been unable to remain at school because he would not learn anything, whose ignorance exceeds all limits, who sells nothing, and who has passed his life in gamboling about in the streets or better still, as mistresses. But he has a fine name and a large fortune; that is all that is necessary. He has only to express a desire to be a deputy, then he is elected, and nobody considers anything in the power of his fellow-citizens to bestow.

And that without spending a cent, without corruption, simply as an effect of his name and his fortune. They are treated as if they were respectables before anything else.

It is not true that the Italians are the least intelligent in thinking thus; young American misses will enter the market for his hand, and, if there is one of these suitable number of millionaires, he will be the happy wife, with outf, of course, any abandonment by him on that account of his numerous mistresses. Regularly every year Europe receives a certain number of millionaires from those countries, who consider for their daughters a husband with a fine name. This proves, among other things, that the form of government is not sufficient to protect the interest of every country, in the abundant presence of the richest republic in the world—the United States—so in many of the countries governed despotsically.

Only it must be observed that the American misses know their rights and their power much better than the European peoples. That is not easily understood here, for we never see in Europe the better position of the American misses, who are industrious stay at home; we see here only the rich illiterates, who speak ill of their country and spend their money to irritate themselves with the European shame, without having the lemons to wish to enjoin those illusory ones with which the fetichism of the people still surrounds the upper classes in Europe.

It is plain that such people are not worth having entrance into parliament—deputies more intelligent, more sensible, and inconsiderable more honest than many deputies in Europe, who represent all those who are so poor who do not even know how to write a letter in known that as he would walk through one that is deserted, neither can he walk through a tangle forested with the same freedom with which he would walk through a tangle forested with the same freedom with which he is walking through the same freedom with which he is walking through a dense jungle.

His liberty would be restricted in any of these places. Even though the man was free to walk as he wished, he would still be under the influence of the people through his feelings, all that they have sacrificed to their liberties in order that they may live together is not true: that they have sacrificed them is certain; but to say that they must be taken as a confession of a thought. A man who is walking through a dense jungle, and wants to sacrifice his freedom in walking through a dense jungle. His liberty would be restricted in any of these places. Even though the man was free to walk as he wished, he would still be under the influence of the people through his feelings, all that they have sacrificed to their liberties in order that they may live together is not true: that they have sacrificed them is certain; but to say that they must be taken as a confession of a thought. A man who is walking through a dense jungle, and wants to sacrifice his freedom in walking through a dense jungle. His liberty would be restricted in any of these places.

The history of the world abounds in attempts to divide the people into sharply defined classes, and, by making the step from one class to another different, to adapt those born interclass to the condition of life to which God called them. Such are the desire and want of a pleasant England to contemplate, to live in, to speculate about as to the future?
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