On Picket Duty.

The charge that Anarchist editors take especial delight in fighting their friends as is thoughtless as it is common. The truth is that some Anarchist editors are honest enough to fight even friends when they deserve to be fought or rebuked.

Two miners at Greensburg, Penn., have brought suit against an employer for calling them "Mollie-Magazines" and "Anarchists." If the judges to pass upon this question prove intelligent, Anarchists may expect a boom in their line of work. Just think how our chances would improve if the judges should decide, as they honestly must, that there is nothing libellous about the term Anarchist, but that, on the contrary, it is one of every enlightened, self-respecting liberty-loving citizen may well be proud!

"If individualism," confesses Rabbi Solomon Schindler in the Boston "Globe," "is the highest ideal of civilization, then Anarchism pure and simple would be preferable both to the present order of things and to the Socialism which Mr. Bellamy advocates." Will those State Socialists who believe with us that individualism is the highest ideal of civilization cease to pretend that individualism will flourish under their system, and forever part company with the Schindlers who frankly declare that Biirgermeister equality is the ideal? We thank Mr. Schindler in advance for the many conversions to Anarchism which his confession is sure to bring about.

In the "Twentieth Century" of October 17, Mr. Pentecost criticizes the editor of the Denver "Individualist" for being too extreme blind to the system, and forever part company with the Schindlers who who frankly declare that Biirgermeister equality is the ideal? We thank Mr. Schindler in advance for the many conversions to Anarchism which his confession is sure to bring about.

In the "Twentieth Century" of October 17, Mr. Pentecost criticizes the editor of the Denver "Individualist" for being too extreme blind to the system, and forever part company with the Schindlers who who frankly declare that Biirgermeister equality is the ideal? We thank Mr. Schindler in advance for the many conversions to Anarchism which his confession is sure to bring about.

In the "Twentieth Century" of October 17, Mr. Pentecost criticizes the editor of the Denver "Individualist" for being too extreme blind to the system, and forever part company with the Schindlers who who frankly declare that Biirgermeister equality is the ideal? We thank Mr. Schindler in advance for the many conversions to Anarchism which his confession is sure to bring about.

In the "Twentieth Century" of October 17, Mr. Pentecost criticizes the editor of the Denver "Individualist" for being too extreme blind to the system, and forever part company with the Schindlers who who frankly declare that Biirgermeister equality is the ideal? We thank Mr. Schindler in advance for the many conversions to Anarchism which his confession is sure to bring about.

In the "Twentieth Century" of October 17, Mr. Pentecost criticizes the editor of the Denver "Individualist" for being too extreme blind to the system, and forever part company with the Schindlers who who frankly declare that Biirgermeister equality is the ideal? We thank Mr. Schindler in advance for the many conversions to Anarchism which his confession is sure to bring about.
THE STRUGGLE.

Continued from Vol. 154.

"You still love Marie?"
"I forgive her."
"What? Then you believe her guilty?" exclaimed Jean.

Camille answered, in a voice of anguish:
"I wish I could still doubt, after her confession..."

"Don't you believe the Father's grief and indignation, Camille?" addressed the curé.

"Yes, Monsieur," said Camille, "I wish to speak for her. You are one of those just men who cannot be seduced by gold, but by misfortune... and what misfortune worthier of pity? For in spite of the confession, I still doubt the crime. Do as I do, Monsieur. Do not impute guilt to her, dictated in some moment of madness. Poor girl, her imprisonment has eroded her... That's it. Oh! before believing her, I must see her, speak to her, know the solution of this cruel enigma."

The curé has visited her; there has been some fraud, some wrongdoing brought to bear, in view of a certain marriage, upon her, upon her noble heart, her love, and her devotion to me. She has sacrificed herself to release me, to save my ruin. This will provide the explanation, I am sure. Yes, Monsieur, I swear it; I doubt no longer; I am familiar with guilty natures, with ruined women; and I declare that she is honest itself, incarnate sacrifice; this confession: the best proof of it; she is the worthy daughter of a brave...: I shall serve my father, and I cannot tell you all the secrets she merits. No, she is not guilty. It is impossible. Day by day is better. This old man is right. He alone appreciates her as she deserves. I believe... Ah! pardon me, I am having Camille to work on my behalf, for two months. Thank you, Father Jean, for having restored my faith, my hope, my love.

Jean, who had devoured Camille's words, embraced him passionately.
"Well! That's fine! Yes, she is an angel on earth... and I will love it in spite of the letter..."

"You, my friend!" exclaimed Camille, with joy.

Jean returned to his place.

"Give me... no, lend me... no, to entice to thirty thousand francs for a day, an hour, a minute, and I will show her to both of you as white as snow."

"Ah, that's all," exclaimed Camille, entirely just. "Why, I would have the world for her. I will get the money, I will have it."

"Go after it then," cried Jean, impatiently, and turning back and forth.

"Their confidence is telling on me," said Camille, addressing himself to the curé.

Jean led away the departing Camille.

"Don't you tell the curé at the baron's! Keep on in your present course, with a melancholy air, and pretend that you are going to marry the other. Don't let them suspect anything. Consent to everything! And tomorrow I will restore you your own wife and daughter... provided Monsieur allows me;" he added, humbly bowing to the curé.

"Well, all right!" said the latter, coming to a decision. "I have seen so many old tricks in the exercise of my functions. I must reject no method of getting at the truth.

Camille shook hands with the rag-picker, and started off on a run. 

"Ah, that's fine!" said Monsieur Campanis, shouting.

Jean, returning between the bars, asked her what he was doing, and at a gesture of the curé he went out, leading them after him.

CHAPTER VII.

THE GUNS.

Father Jean went back to the Conciergerie as if he were going home, free from anxiety and gloom. The sun was golden, full of promise, in a word. He went to bed and rose, satisfied with what he had done and with what he was going to do, filled only with impatience to finish.

Camille and Bonnin, meeting him in the yard again, could not get over their surprise at the change.

"So, it seems that things are going better," cried the young workman making room for him in the sunshine beside the old man.

The latter inclined in his turn.

"Then you have found your daughter again?"

"I found her!" said Camille, with joy, and saved her, or, at least, as good as that. I am only waiting now for the pleasure of seeing her again. Oh! my heart is big with joy.

"No more, she is better!... But that is not the case with me," said Chassatte.

"Let's hear, what is it?" said the rag-picker, moved. "Who knows? I am having a streak of success... Speak! If I could serve you. I make a specialty of saving people, and that is what I am now doing."

"And have the same misfortune... Well," added the old workman, "I have a daughter... but the Public Charities alone know where she is, for I have abandoned her..."

"Ah! Poor boy," said Jean, severely.

"Oh, it was not my fault. It was necessary. Her mother carried away the sick to her grave, if I could have buried her with my blood..."

"I know," muttered Father Jean, softened. "Marie too came near falling into their clutches... Yes, those Public Charity people, I know them... they are excessively..."

"What's to be done?"

---

"My poor Marianne," groaned Chassatte, sorrowfully.

"Marianne!" repeated Bonnin: "a famous name, my faith!"

"Yes, Marianne Chassatte," repeated the old man. "But they must have rediscovered her before burying her.

Bonnin, touched by the old man's pain, gave voice to a hope.

"Bah! it is only mountains that never meet. Perhaps by taking steps... to day, under the Republic...

"The Republic!" exclaimed Chassatte, bitterly: "and always the least of the Republiques. Yes, I have taken all the steps and been to all the Charity offices. And nothing, it is finished... I shall never see my child again. And now I have but one idea in my head."

"What's that?" asked Bonnin.

"I returned to the pawndrop under the Republic as under Royalty; and one more I was obliged to pawn my hammer and even my two guns..."

"Two guns?"

"Yes, I had two after February. One I snatched from a royal guard in July, and the other from a municipal in February..."

"I understand," answered Bonnin.

"Well, I should like to redeem them before they are due, and make use of them to a last time against those who are staring the people and ruining the Republic. For, at your expense, I do not view it as far off. The furbobs are already full of friends of the pretenders, who are gradually taking us from the consciousness of our rights and duties. The people's heads are as empty as theirs. Hunger makes one yaw and sleep... more than to the barricades... Our masters know it well... But never mind! There are not the least reigned... there are also the desperate. Ah! If I were only out and in possession of my pawned articles..."

"You shall have them, be sure of it," exclaimed Bonnin, enthusiastically. "As soon as I am out, I shall go as soon to work; and out of my first fortnight's pay I will buy you your things... and share them with you.

Brotus Chassatte looked him in the eye for a moment, and then drew a pawn-ticket from his pocket and handed it to him.

"There," said he, simply.

Bonnin took the paper, put it in his pocket, and observed:

"But say, that's not all. Where and how shall we meet later?"

"That is what I have to say," said Chassatte. "I shall be sentenced to prison, and, after the expiration of my term, I shall be sent to the poorhouse.

"I have it," exclaimed Father Jean, who, though thinking of Marie, had heard the father of Marianne: "you have no abiding-place; that's the reason of your arrest, isn't it?"

"Yes: what then?"

"Tomorrow I shall be free; I will give your name instead of mine to my jailor, and abandon my quarters to you. You will know that they are not very fine."

Chassatte looked at the rag-picker in surprise.

"And you?" said he.

"It?" said Jean. "Don't trouble yourself about me. Here, there is your address. You will give it to the judges. They will make inquiry... And that will go as wheels. You have a residence; then you have committed no offence!"

"Thank you, I refuse," said Chassatte, "my guns, my brave old man?"

"True," said Chassatte. "I accept, but not for long."

Jean, for a moment, pressed his hand to the old man, then turned back.

Just then the voice of the-oter was heard.

"Jean, rag-picker!"

"I am calling me. Victory! Very sorry... no, excuse me, very glad to leave you in order to save you. But I will see you again soon," cried he, as he started off.

Then reconsidering and returning, he said to the old workman:

"Stay, I forgot! there's the key; it's the top floor, the attic. Your residence is found; Bonnin will look out for the rest."

The young man applauded.

"Bravo and thank you, old man," he exclaimed.

And turning toward Chassatte as Jean went off, he added:

"I told you that he had some better than wine in his belly. Ah! the worthy man! There you are, saved!"

"Yes, I suspected Chassatte," said Father Jean.

And taking his grey head in his worn hands, he began to dream again of his lost child, thus infusing in thought his unsought thirst for paternity; that lust for so natural, so instinctive, so intense, so human, considering the length of human infancy, so impenetrable and enigmatic. Such tortures are but deriving from despair by their guilt or their poverty, just punishment of the rich bachelor and iniquitous torment of the poor, in a society founded on family and property.

---

CHAPTER VIII.

PARADISE FOR SALE.

Madame Patard, shaken by the Baron's threats and without news from Jean, was getting ready to surrender her Paradise to another master of angels.

Seated before her desk, she wrote and soliloquised thus:

"Announcement. Will be sold on account of departure from the city, a midwife's establishment, enjoying a large and fashionable patronage, very profitable, and in a quiet neighborhood. The books alone show a business of 25,000 francs, to say nothing of the transactions that do not appear on them."

Madame Patard's name may remain on the sign, if desired. Address the Bureau of Small Advertisements.

She rang, and continued her soliloquy:

"Whether the business is sold or not, I have enough to live on, and I save myself without waiting for failed... and so on, and so on, and so on, and so on..."

"Monsieur Jean!"

"Ah! let him come in," exclaimed Madame Patard, joyfully.

Then, aside:

"What luck! I was beginning to despair."

She slowly folded up the note, thrust it into her pocket, and rose to receive the rag-picker.

Father Jean entered meekly, accompanied by a person of doubtful aspect, though well kept,—a dapper-looking fellow in gold chain, and heavy cane.

"Good day, Madame Patard?" said Jean, audibly.

His companion saluted her more graciously still.

Madame Patard's face darkened a little at sight of the stranger, in spite of his gold chain.

She expected that Jean would come alone.

"Tired day, gentlemen," said she, coldly: "what can I do in your service?"
It is absurd to say that judges have no moral responsibility for a punishment inflicted upon a man against law, when, at the direction of a judge as to what the law is, they have consented to render a verdict against their own opinion of the law.

It is absurd, too, to say that judges have no moral responsibility for the conviction of a man against law, when, at the direction of a judge as to what the law is, they have consented to render a verdict against their own opinion of the evidence, or laws of evidence, dictated to them by the court, if any evidence or laws of evidence have been excluded, which they (the judges) in the absence of what they considered was no criminal intent, and in obedience to the instructions of courts that “ignorance of the law (that is, of crime) excuses no one.”

It is absurd to say that judges have no moral responsibility for rendering a verdict of “guilty” against a man for which he did not know to be a crime, and the exclusion of evidence of his innocence.

The complaint is, of course, that any judge who heard the testimony or who heard the prosecution or defense of an unjust suit. But it is not likely that the losing party was subjected to an amercement as a matter of course, but only in cases where the injustice of the verdict was so apparent as to be unanswerable in bringing it before the courts.

The principle of the free administration of justice connects itself necessarily with the trial by jury, because a jury could not rightfully give judgment against any man, in either a civil or criminal case, if they had any reason to suppose he had been unable to procure their impartial investigation of the facts.

The true trial by jury would also compel the free administration of justice from another necessity,—namely, that of preventing private quarrels; because, unless the government enforced by the more ample means of arresting the wrongs of others, the injured party would have no natural right either to chastise the aggressor or to take compensation for the injury out of his property. But as the government is an impartial party as between these individuals, it is more likely to do equal justice between them than the injured individual himself would do.

The government, also, having more power at its command, is likely to right a man’s wrongs more peacefully than the injured party himself could do it. If, therefore, the injured party can obtain redress for his wrongs promptly and free of expense to him, he is under a moral obligation to leave the work in the hands of the government; but not otherwise. When the state cannot assist him in all means of obtaining justice, except on the condition of his employing the government to obtain it for him and of paying for it, the government becomes itself the aggressor. Yet the government, having the power to make the wrongs of others redressable and free to him, is bound to do it free of expense to him. But as long as government refuses to do this, judges, if they knew their duties, would protect a man in defending his rights, if it be deemed fit, for the sake of the public, and it is of course the public interest to protect his own rights, it is bound to do it for him free of expense to him. And so long as government refuses to do this, judges, if they knew their duties, would protect a man in defending his rights, if it be deemed fit, for the sake of the public.

Under the prevailing system, probably one half of the community are virtually deprived of all protection for their rights, except what the criminal law affords them. Courts of justice, for all civil suits, are as effectually shut against them as though they were done by bolts and bars. Being forbidden to maintain their own rights by force, and being unable to pay the expenses of civil suits, they have no alternative but submission to many acts of injustice against which the government, by their protection free of expense or allow them to protect themselves.

There would be the same reason in compelling a party to pay the judge and jury for their services that there is in compelling him to pay the witnesses or any other necessary charges.

This compelling parties to pay the expenses of civil suits is one of the many cases in which government is false to the fundamental principles on which free governments are established. The government’s revenue is the凭什么 and depends on the principle of a government not to protect mere private rights? On what principle does a man pay his taxes to the government, except on that of contributing his proportion towards the necessary cost of protecting the rights of all other parties? For such the government’s revenue, which he contributes to support, instead of fulfilling its implied contract, becomes his enemy; and not only refuses to protect his rights (except at his own cost). But even refuses to do it for him free of expense to him. All free government is founded on the theory of voluntary association, and on the theory that all the parties to it voluntarily pay their taxes for its support on the principle that they have no moral right to it. A free and voluntary association for the purpose of protecting the rights of parties, when they are seeking to redress their just grievances, is not likely, for aught they themselves can know, to be declining merely the comparative length of the parties’ purses rather than the intrinsic strength of their respective rights. Judges ought to refuse to decide a cause at all, except upon the assurance that all the evidence necessary to a full knowledge of the cause is produced. This assurance they seldom have, unless the government itself produces all the witnesses the parties desire to have.

To be continued.
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A Book That Is Not Milk for Babes.

The most important book that has been published this year comes to Liberty from the press of the J. B. Lippincott Company of Philadelphia. It is a little volume of something over a hundred very small pages, reprinted except for the title-page, of a novel type. For ten years to come it probably will be read by one person where "Looking Backward" is read by a thousand, but the economic teaching which it contains will do more in the long run to settle the labor question than will ever be done by "Looking Backward," "The Poverty of Power," and "The Cooperative Commonwealth," combined. Its title is "Involuntary Idleness: An Exposition of the Cause of the Discrepancy Existing Between the Supply of, and the Demand for, Labor and Its Products." The book consists of a paper read at the meeting of the American Economic Association held in Philadelphia on December 29, 1888, by Hugo Bilgram, the author of that admirable little pamphlet, "The Iron Law of Wages," with which most readers of Liberty are familiar. I am strongly inclined to believe that Mr. Bilgram's new work as the best treatise on money and the relation of money to labor that has been written in the English language since Colonel William B. Greene published his "Mutual Banking."

The author precedes his essay with a very convenient annexation of a portion of his argument, which I reproduce here, since it gives a much better idea of the book than any condemnation that I might attempt.

"The aim of the treatise is to search for the cause of the lack of employment, which is obviously due to theobserved fact that the supply of commodities and services excels the demand, although reason dictates that supply and demand in general should be precisely equal. The factor destroying this natural equilibrium is sought for and the conditions that regulate the distribution of wealth—i.e., its division into rent, interest, and wages. The argument is carried on by the discussion of the Rent question, which has late exchanged much laborable interest, being unable to account for the apparent surplus of all kinds of raw materials, the topic of rent is eliminated by assuming all local advantages to be equal. At first an examination is made of the relation of capital to the productivity of labor, and that of interest to capital in the remuneration of labor, showing that it is a doctrine that tends to reduce the productivity of labor, as well as the remuneration for labor. Low wages being also concomitant with a scarcity of capital, it is apparent that a close relation exists between the economic cause of involuntary idleness and the law of interest.

"Following, therefore, the two separate meanings of the ambiguous word "Capital" are compared, showing that money, which can never be used in the act of production, cannot be considered as capital in the sense of quantity, but since capital is capable of producing a profit only when the same is used productively, the fact that interest is paid for money-loans, when that loan cannot be used productively, must be traced to an independent cause. The usual argument that with money actual capital can be purchased is rejected, because money and capital would not be interchangeable if their economic properties were not homogenous. This compels a search for a proper ground of the interest of money, in which it is the willingness of borrowers to pay interest on money-loans.

"It is then shown that interest on money-loans is paid because money affords special advantages as a medium of exchange, and the value of this property of money is traced to its ultimate utility, or, in other words, to the increment of productivity which is caused by the volume of money afforded by facilitating the division of labor.

"Returning to the question of interest on actual capital, it is seen that over the volume of production, the question is as to what determines the value of a product leads to the assertion that capital-profit must be due to an advantage which the entering of a new man into the business of labor.

"This is due to the fact that the interest payable by the marginal producer on money-loans. An ideal separation of the financial from the industrial world will not be the only cause of a financial horizon, because the bill on the banks is a mechanism of exchange, that would be the case if the law were to legislate the value of capital-profit to be paid by the marginal producers.

"The liability of the debtor class to meet their obligations increases the risk of business investments, and the concentration of money in the hands of the financial class depriving the channels of credit of a needed medium of exchange, a stagnation of business will ensue, which readily accounts for the accumulation of all kinds of products in the hands of the rich, the necessity of the outlays of employment. The losses sustained by the lenders of money involve a separation of interest into two branches, risk-interest and a benefit, considered the minimum, the least premiums equal the sum total of all redivisible debts, the law of interest is evolved by an analysis of the monetary circulations between capital and labor—"vivification." This analysis leads to the inference that an expansion of the volume of money, by extending the issue of credit-money, will prevent business stagnation and involuntary idleness inevitable.

The objections usual; urgent against credit-money are considered and found untenable, the claim that interest is necessarily ascertained as such in the absence of a fixed stand-point, and in the concluding remarks an explanation is given of the present excess of supply over the demand of commodities and that the real rate of interest is the only way to secure remunerative employment to all who are able and willing to work is to abolish the restrictions upon the issue of money.

Moreover, the author not only establishes the strength of his own position but also the conclusion that any unbiased mind should follow the author's reason carefully from the start to the finish and not accept the conclusion which he reaches in common with Liberty,—namely, that our financial legislation is the real law of the country and that it is not a question of the correction of this abnormal state is contingent upon the financial measure suggested.

Admirably accurate as the foregoing is as an outline, it conveys only a faint idea of the beautifully calm, logical, and convincing way in which the argument is carried through. The importance of the fact that any unbiased mind should follow the author's reason carefully from the start to the finish is not accepted the conclusion which he reaches in common with Liberty,—namely, that our financial legislation is the real law of the country and that it is not a question of the correction of this abnormal state is contingent upon the financial measure suggested.

Admirably accurate as the foregoing is as an outline, it conveys only a faint idea of the beautifully calm, logical, and convincing way in which the argument is carried through. The importance of the fact that any unbiased mind should follow the author's reason carefully from the start to the finish is not accepted the conclusion which he reaches in common with Liberty,—namely, that our financial legislation is the real law of the country and that it is not a question of the correction of this abnormal state is contingent upon the financial measure suggested.

Moreover, the author in an exchange for goods for money which the man who pays with the goods is deprived of capital while the man who pays with money is not deprived of capital. Mr. Bilgram had used the word capital to mean what he thinks it means, all wealth capable of bringing a revenue to its owner, he would have deprived his opponents of their favorite device for confusing the popular mind. But it is not the point. It involves no difference of idea between Mr. Bilgram and Liberty. On another point, however, there is substantial disagreement. When Mr. Bilgram proposes that the government shall carry on (and presumably monopolize, though this is not clearly stated) the business of buying and selling, he implies that Liberty cannot follow him. It goes with him in his economy, but not in his politics. There are at least three valid reasons and doubtless others also, why the government should do nothing of the kind.

A government in rampant living by theft, and therefore has no business to engage in any business. Second, the government has none of the characteristics of a successful business man, being wasteful, careless, clumsy, and short-sighted in the extreme. Third, the government is thoroughly irresponsible, having in his power to effectively repudiate its obligations at any time.

With these qualifications Liberty gives Mr. Bilgram's book enthusiastic welcome. Its high price, $1.00, will debar many from reading it, but money is a sign more widely and more truly than in learning the truth about money.

Evolutionary, Not Miraculous, Change.

Among the large and constantly increasing number of intelligent people who have outgrown the pitiful state of mind which allows trust and faith in the silly methods and plans of State Socialism are many who would easily embrace Anarchism, if one serious misgiving did not trouble them. They are inclined, perhaps anxious, to aid in inaugurating and perpetuating the reign of liberty, but they fail to see that liberty is the only thing needed, not only to guarantee peaceful and orderly progress after the complete dematerialization of all existing iniquities, but also as a means of breaking up the present organization of society and gradually healing the deep and dangerous wounds which injustice has inflicted upon countless members of society. You properly insist," they say," that equality of opportunity alone is sufficient, that a fair field is all one can rationally demand, and that, when this is given, reward must be left to be naturally determined by merit. Now, we quite readily second you in such pleading. But suppose you have succeeded in abolishing every vestige of privilege and legalized inequality; suppose we have freed ourselves from the yoke of authority and enjoy the fullest liberty of action. Can you for a moment remain under the delusive idea that justice would at once be enthroned and equal liberty, in the true sense of the term, really extended to all? If you only consider the enormous inequality which exists in the mental development of the various social classes, it must dawn upon your mind that exploitation and political tyranny will continue to dominate the downfall of commerce, and the obscurity of the flat-money theorists and all who hold with them that the value of money is dependent upon its volume. If Mr. Lloyd, who lately proposed the use of communistic credit-money, will be read in the minds of Mr. J. A. T. Spaulding and the others who have written on the subject since Mr. J. A. T. Spaulding and the others who have written on the subject since 1777 inclusive, I think he will be satisfied with the soundlessness of any credit-money system that does not specifically assure the ultimate redemption of each note by value pledged for its security.

Having thus declared my high regard of this portion of my book, I may venture in a very, very, by critics. The policy of the author in abandoning what he himself considers the true definition of the word capital and adopting the definition generally sanctioned by the economists is of very questionable utility. It is true that the attempt has been made by numerous minds to vitiate its argument, but it forces him nevertheless to separate capital from money; and thereby he strengthens the hold of the delusion which is exploited so effectively by the champions of interest,—namely, that
all legalized wrong were suddenly removed out of sight. Since we do not propose to abolish the present system where rich men and rich women can get away with the lie in the market place that it could be as suddenly abolished, the criticism does not seem to be pertinent. Even Rome could not be destroyed in a day; and as to Roman traditions, long periods of time and new habits of thought would be required to exterminate the modern equivalent. It being predicted that long ages of wrong have worked to bring about the ineradicable condition of today, the inference is at once suggested that no short time can be expected to effect a change so great and so radical. It is a question which is raised within our power to check the growth of the social disease and to apply to it remedies which would cause a gradual tendency towards a recovery of health. That a sudden restoration of vigor is absolutely impossible for, the long-suffering patient, we consider it a stubborn fact. We are asking ourselves whether there be really no hope, and the patient must grow worse and worse, approaching the inevitable end, or whether it is possible to furnish them with the means of recovery.

In this case of the social disease, about which we write, it is never true that the remedy is decided the only means whereby the world may be saved, and we therefore recommend the patient to try the virtues of this elixir. But it is utterly impossible for him to leave his bed and sickness, and success is the outcome of the lethargy. It is the inevitable long period of convalescence to pass through.

Dropping metaphor, the people need to be emancipated from political tyranny and from economic bondage. The people need freedom. They must go beyond where they are. They must to some extent be prepared to accomplish the work for themselves, though of course the guiding and directing of it will fall to the progressive minority. They must first virulently and intensely realize that they are suffering tyranny and want freedom from slavery, and then they must step by step discover and apply the useful remedies. The way to no authority lies through less and less authority, and the way to equality of opportunity lies through gradual extension of opportunity. In our opinion, the principle of mutualism in exchange and the principle of occupying ownership in the matter of landholding are the only important factors which can and will transform the present society, by degrees, into one governed according to strict utilitarian conceptions. This truth upon us to question the people’s intelligence, and to inculcate upon them the demand of the powers that be. Whether the liberty to practise and verify it: which task we are ready to perform to the best of our skill and knowledge. On the other hand, it is incumbent upon those who have neither the patience nor perseverance to follow, nor the penetration and insight to perceive, this evolutionary process upon which we rely, to devise or discover a shorter and speedier method of attaining the goal. The great change which at the same time should involve the sacrifice or loss of individual liberty and dignity.

V. Y.

Socialistic Prophets.

Treading of the telegraph monopoly, in an article in the “North American Review,” Prof. R. T. Elly took occasion to mention that many years hence the government will predict the state of affairs that now prevail. He had foreseen that smaller companies, like the Baltimore and Ohio, would be swallowed up by greater, like the Western Union, and now he submits reasons why the Western Union could be the great company of the future. The government. It is this power of prediction, as well as the nature of his predictions, more than his timid aspect to half his platform, that makes him so interesting. We are not certain that the world has ever been the subject of any such a prophecy. He, M. Hyndman, has been predicting somewhat of late, and in a recent article in defence of Marx, shows that Marx predicted the commercial crises, etc., that America did not care to the sun spot. The value of these predictions (taken alone) are analogous to the predictions of some eminent clairvoyan versing with its professed, and have come to the conclusion that they are on general principles in the main correct, and that the details and elementary teachings of true political economy: it is so much easier to propely than to study. They have been something about Marx’s economic categories, and though they know they are unscientier: all of them, or nearly all of them, are uncalcultated with his theory of value. It is no fault of Marx if his disciples are unacquainted with enough economic reading to enable them to grasp what Yarros and Pricey call the subtle points.

Consequently, though as a rule they have a far deeper understanding of the labor question than bourgeois have, it is not because they are better versed in that science; it is because they are better versed in the capitalist method of utilizing his power in cooperation with his fellows, for their own benefit.

How has the capitalist got possession of all the means of production? Is it because the principle of competition is a monopoly and has been carried in the form of monopoly ever since the last period, and therefore must be abolished in the future, or is it because the capitalists are a class have, by their cunning and intrigue, got legal titles to land, the source of all wealth, and, by monopolizing the means of production, have created a natural oligarchy in the form of oligarchy, and thus in a measure prevented both private property and competition? If the latter, then it is not sufficient to restore to the people the land, prevent the monopoly of the currency, and thus make possible the equitable distribution of the produce of labor?

A. H. SIMPSON.

Liberty’s Debt to the Aborigine.

The various influences that produced the spirit of independence in the early American colonist would afford a fruitful field of research to philosophic historians. Most of those who give the matter a thought attribute the spirit to the fact that the American settler soon became haughtily independent, so jealous of his rights, so restless under restraint. No doubt the Puritan revolt against the divine right of kings, and the critical and sceptical spirit which followed by such a contest, were important influences, but otherwise the spirit of Puritanism was hardly militant, tyrannical, and intolerant to the last degree. And its influence was necessarily confined to the New England colonies. The influence of America’s freedom from arbitrary government, and dignities, must have been more powerful than the influence of Puritanism, but more even limited in scope and application.

So, the central influence was more universal than any such seen in the world of today; it was an influence that struck all the colonies at once, affected them all the same time, and nearly equally, and never could be kept out of mind, and, finally, produced the same fruits in all the colonies, from the green hills of Vermont to the blue hills of New Jersey, in the influence named the aboriginal. The influence of such a character as the American savage could not fail to be tremendous upon the American settler. When we observe what an immense modifying influence the negro has had upon the Southron,—his language, manners, agriculture,—till to the Northerner it appears a theory not altogether untenable that every one south of Mason’s and Dixon’s line is negro—that” and “this is a very fugitive fancy of a man in an enginewaver room was to the explosion of the boilers, should, after his prediction, thus answer the question what was to be done in the matter: “Let us wait for the evolution of things. If we must do anything, then act on the cold, while the river swells, and let her burst.”

Yet this is precisely what one school of “scientistic socialism” are doing.

I have been studying the literature of this school— Workman’s Advocate as a sample—and com-
LAWs, and How to Make Them.

The Editor of Liberty.

The word and question in the London "Personal Rights Journal" has been referred to in your columns. A recent writer in Liberty thus alludes to my contribution: "Providing Mr. Douglas is not a ogre who succeeds in felling both in his premises and his conclusions. This is rather off-hand, and would almost justify me in offering to bet the reader of it has no more of the article he so criticizes. You can fail in your premises only by stating untruths; you can fail in your conclusion only by drawing illiberal conclusions. With Mr. Douglas, I should point out a single misstatement in my paper, or a single false syllogism? I have a right to ask this. I wonder what V. Y. would do? If I were to prove the style he has chosen to adopt,—thus, "V. Y. is altogether wrong, and no one need take the smallest notice of his remarks." However, I hope the notice of his opinions concerning my writings, because I attach not the slightest importance to them when they concern the writings of others I refer to the reason: first, because V. Y. proceeds to misrepresent my views in a positively ridiculous manner; second, because I want a pen on which some one can write the truly able criticism of Mr. Spence's contribution to the symposium.

Mr. Spence begins by attributing to me a most extra-ordinary statement,—viz., that all our laws are right. I am so unaccustomed to being charged with law-worship that I am really refreshing to find myself in such genteel company. To one who has been struggling for years to smash nearly every law, and has not, therefore, a pleasant interest in any shock. But alas! I must in honor disclose the credit of this utterance. I never said that all our laws are right, nor anybody else's; I have not set about being the one who would write all the laws. What I did say and still maintain is that every act of a citizen which conforms with the laws of his own country is right, and is a fortiori true in a foreign country, if Mr. Spence does not like this well-established definition of "right." I am quite willing to use any other term which he prefers, and if we shall call the acts of citizens which accord with the will of the effective majority, I shall call them moral, for moral is an angle of slanting, because it is not a right angle. Let us abolish words altogether when we are examining these questions in our own private minds. And if we are not all the same in a respective Group-like, there is no such thing as right in the juridical sense; or, if one prefers to put it so, every act is right. Robin- don would do to Mr. A. what Mr. Spence, "we must be guided by our ideas of expediency, or by our ideas of justice," True; and which? Here we part company. Mr. Spence chooses Justice as his guide. I do not, for a simple
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upon which I have satiated. I suppose Mr. Spence thought I was a very profound master of the law; and I should feel disposed to depute that the pony should remain the property of the purchaser. But, on further reflection, I should think he ought to be informed that it is not competent for me to steal a pony under such a law. One of them breaks the pony out of the field by night; sells it to his col-

ly; and, it would be good for Mr. Spence, if he delighted to look into the

must mean it. Justice entirely deserts me. I reflect again. There seems to be a difference of opinion. It would be well if Mr. Spence were a

with the general understanding. It may mean pumpkin-squash

to him that it is expedient for me, as I know from experience, there is no base form of lying than fly-dicing. Is it not so? No. Why then ask the famer, in the future. That is why. But to return to the flat-

as a Socialist heretic. If he says No, he will have the other half down upon him as a selfish brute. But he mustasse.

lower yet. Even supposing that justice has a distinct connotation, and furthermore that it connotes something sublime, even then why should I conform to its dictates? Because it is a virtue? Nonence; because it is expedient. Why should it be expedient? Not by any form of policy, but except that it is expedient for me, as I know from experience, there is no base form of lying than fly-dicing. Is it not so? No. Why then ask the famer, in the future. That is why. But to return to the flat-
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lower yet. Even supposing that justice has a distinct connotation, and furthermore that it connotes something sublime, even then why should I conform to its dictates? Because it is a virtue? Nonence; because it is expedient. Why should it be expedient? Not by any form of policy, but except that it is expedient for me, as I know from experience, there is no base form of lying than fly-dicing. Is it not so? No. Why then ask the famer, in the future. That is why. But to return to the flat-

as a Socialist heretic. If he says No, he will have the other half down upon him as a selfish brute. But he mustasse.
What's to be Done?

A Nihilistic Romance.

Written in Prison.
Suppressed by the Czar.

By N. G. Tschernychewsky.

With a Portrait of the Author.

TRANSLATED BY BENJ. R. TUCKER.

In Cloth, $1.00. In Paper, 75 Cents.

Address the Publisher:

BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 3306, Boston, Mass.

ANARCHISM:
Its Aims and Methods.

By Victor Yarros.

An address delivered at the first public meeting of the Boston Anarchists' Club, and adopted by that organization as its authorized exposition of the laws of anarchism. A vigorous and convincing presentation of the Anarchists' Club and explanatory notes regarding it. 30 pages.

In 5 Cents; 6 Copies, 25 Cents; 25 Copies, $1; 100 Copies, $3.

Address: BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 3306, Boston, Mass.

SOCIAL WEALTH:

By J. K. Ingalls.

This handsome octavo volume of 320 pages treats of the surmises of the old school and the new school and the social wealth, economic capital, or social wealth, exploring the right to the use of things and the extent of the social contributions. This is the book for students in economics who seek a scholarly exposition of the social wealth. 300 pages.

Price, One Dollar.

BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 3306, Boston, Mass.

THE TRANSLATICAL:

A Mirror of European Life and Letters.

(Lent on the 1st and 15th of the Month.)

"Made up of the cream of the European Press..."

No Paper Like It!


Address the Publisher:

BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 3306, Boston, Mass.

HONESTY.

An Australian Organ of Anarchism.

Twelve Pages. Published Monthly.

It is a sufficient description of "Honesty's" principles to say that they are substantially the same as those championed by Liberty in America.

Price, Eight-Five Cents a Year, in Advance.

Address: BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 3306, Boston, Mass.