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On Picket Duty.

Mr. Yarros's edition of Lyndaker Spooner's "Trial by Jury" is completed. When it is published in pamphlet form, it will be one of the best things for Anarchist propagandists to circulate far and wide as a means of popularizing the true conception of political liberty.

The editors of the "Twentieth Century" are now openly advocating free money. This doubtless is the best answer that could be given to the question which I addressed to them recently in reference to their absurd criticisms of the doctrine of the "Mutual Union Propaganda."

Mr. Hugo Blighman possesses the faculty of expressing his opinions clearly and forcibly, and Liberty would gladly welcome a statement of his reasons for advocating government management of financial interests rather than free and mutual banking. A discussion of this vital point cannot fail to be highly useful.

Every reader should subscribe to the new Boston reform paper, "Waterman's Journal." Its quality may be judged by the extracts in recent issues of Liberty. If not an organ of thoroughgoing Anarchism, it is at least an exceedingly able and scientific exponent of Spencerian individualism. I heartily wish that every intelligent man now interested in the social problem and hesitating between individualism and nationalism would compare "Waterman's Journal" with the "Nationalist,"—the mature logic of the first with the cant and rhetoric of the other.

Guy de Maupassant says that "man, agitated to the last degree by the passion to rule somebody, invented tyranny, slavery, and marriage." I've lost hope of the defeated; they've too easy a meaning to grasp their apparent necessities. To be a tyrant or slaveholder, one must be in a certain sense superior to the average man,—stronger or more cunning. But not everybody possesses such superiority. Then there are certain perils attached to the exercise of tyranny: there is the fear of revolt on the part of the subjects and slaves. So marriage was invented. Anybody can become a husband and a master of one being over whom he may tyrannize without fear or hindrance.

Professor Sumner's magazine article showing that industrial peace is not desirable is vigorous and sound enough relatively to the tireless and meddlesome activity of the philanthropic reformers and the devices of the chivalrous gentlemen who are determined to fight for the peace of Warsaw and to enforce universal equality and harmony. Better industrial war than the Warsaw peace, a thousand times better. But what the professor perversely declines to grasp is the truth that this industrial war is the direct result of just such improper and unwarrantable denial of freedom, on the part of the self-seeking monopolists now in power, as he so unsparingly denounces in the schemes of the beneficent would-be monopolists who would save society by force. Our complaint, professor, is that the industrial war is forced upon us by tyrannical restrictions, and, to prove this, we do not ask anything more than true political and industrial liberty.

When Mr. Pentecost averred that it looks as if there are a few Anarchists who would rather see the world go to smash in a process that is not their own, he is certainly wrong. He simply does not distinguish between a positive, emphatic expression of a personal conviction and a feeling or emotion of intolerance. The word "world" is confusing. What Anarchists really object to is being made "happy" by others without being consulted as to their own conception of happiness. They insist that Mr. Bellamy, or Mr. George, or any other savant, while at liberty to save himself and his admirers in any way he chooses, shall not attempt to force his taste and notions upon the unwilling. The "world" is not made up of Bellamists and Georgeites alone, thank heaven! and those of us who have opinions of our own excuse the self-elected dictators from taking cars of us.

So anxious is Frederic Harrison to gain a point for the movement he espouses, that he does not hesitate to make a mountain of a molehill. The recent victory of the London strikers is hailed as an event of historical significance, and the fact that the strikers were led by a Socialist is taken as an indication of a new departure in the labor movement,—the first step in the direction of a new unionism equally free from the extreme aims of revolutionary Socialists and narrow work of labor benefit-societies. The new union is to continue the fruitful work of the strike,—namely, the effort to "moralize" capital, for therein lies the solution of the labor problem. Now, I rejoice at the success of the strike, but it is used to magnify it. Capital is not more moral today than it was a few years ago; only it is more crafty and prudent. It yielded to it feared, and because it was so urged and advised by high representatives of the Church-State Smuggling Association, who found that small sacrifices avert great dangers. In Mr. Blighman's "Invaluable Idleness" the following passage occurs: "The thorough ventilation which a robust intellect has received through the works of Ricordo and his followers, especially Henry George, while showing that a lowering of the margin of cultivation can account for a lowering of wages by a reduction of the productivity of labor, has brought forth so clear explanation for the excess of the supply of commodities and services. As long as there exists any uncultivated land capable of affording a living to its cultivator, the law of rent cannot account for enforced idleness." In other words, the single-tax is no solution of the labor problem, and the thunders and tears of "Progress and Poverty" are ludicrous in their inappropriateness and uselessness. That is just what Liberty has continuously asserted, and it is very glad that Mr. Blighman, who expects economic result to be distributed in some fashion, so emphatically subordinates this desideratum to the study of the ways and means by which labor can gain the upper hand in the market and capital be deprived of its usurping powers. Free money and free land will solve the labor problem, and give us progress without poverty.

Those aggressive and ubiquitous reactionary writers, Lilly and Mallock, in "savagely attacking the spirit of the age, generally bring the charges of indefiniteness, inaccuracy, cowardice, inconsistency, and vengefulness against those whom they assume to be the representatives of the Revolution." Thus are Morley and Spencer, Mill and Harrison continually attacked.

Well, it is not difficult for keen-witted controversialists to triumph over their moderately radical opponents. But just as Stephen's "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity" was only a refutation of Mill, not of those who, like Warren and Andrews and Spooner, had the intellect and the bravery to follow out the logic of Mill's positions to their ultimate conclusions, so the assaults of Lilly and Mallock can only affect those who imperfectly expound and defend the General Idea of the Revolution of the Nineteenth Century. When these are vanquished, there are still the real radicals, the consistent antagonists of Church and State, the Anarchists, to hear from. And when I think of the struggle between those and the champions of an absurd theology and a rotten, effete State, and of the inevitable fate of the latter, I almost become sorry for them.

"At a time when Guizot was prime minister of France and just leading the opposition, the latter, in a political debate, was criticizing the government, when Guizot indignantly exclaimed: 'But you and your friends do nothing but criticise. What would you do if you were in power in our place?' 'We would sing,' replied the opposition, 'the same song, only we would sing it better,' calmly replied Thiers. This was a frank confession for a practical politician to make. Were the professional politicians in this country as candid, the majority of those out of office, no matter to what party belonging, would admit that, were they in power, they 'would sing the same song.' The professional politicians of the outs are always fierce in criticism of the ins, and strong in promises of reforms should they be intrusted with power. But, when they are placed in power they 'sing the same song.' Probably they think that they 'sing it better,' but that is a matter of taste. Our people must recognize this fact,—that no matter what set of professional politicians are placed in power, they will 'sing the same song.' To those observations of the 'National Economist' Liberty would add: 'And recognizing this fact, they must resolve to boycott the singers.' I have not yet seen any notice or review of Hugo Blighman's "Invaluable Idleness" in the "Standard," but it is said that the agitation among the single-tax sect has not been altogether without effect. Contrary to his traditions and inclinations, Henry George prints a 'condensation of a long communication from Mr. Alfred B. Westrup, of what style itself the 'Weekly Labour Propaganda,' in reply to a criticism by Thomas G. Sheehan upon a 'false statement issued by that concern.' And by way of reply to Mr. Westrup's arguments, he makes the following luminous observations: 'Who would profit if everybody were allowed to have some money? Evidently the richer class, who could start banks and issue money, and the large employers of labor, who could in many cases force money on their employees... If the free money people had their way, Holloway's post-office checks would be lawful money of the United States, and pretty much every large employer would constitute himself a bank and begin issuing this sort of money.' It is not at present necessary to disprove these confident statements, but only to again call Mr. George's attention to Mr. Blighman's book, and ask him to disprove the abolition of interest would follow upon the freedom of monetizing all valuable property. If by honest confession or silence he will indicate his inability to do this, it will be easy matter to expose the vulgar error involved in the statements quoted above.
THE RAG-PICKER OF PARIS.

By FELIX PYAT.

Translated from the French by Benj. H. Tucker.

PART FOURTH.

THE STRUGGLE.

Continued from No. 115.

His companion, in corroboration, exhibited a pocket-book full of bank-bills.

"What affair?" said Mme. Potard again, still on her guard.

"Oh! not so many airs," exclaimed Jean. "You needn't be afraid, I tell you. Hold out your hand; we bring you your share.

"My share?"

Then Jean said abruptly:

"You refuse?"

"No, no, madame."

He turned on his heel, took his comrades by the arm, and started for the door.

Madame Potard, after a look of surprise.

"Oh? What is it? What did you say?"

"Nothing! Nothing! We will keep the whole," declared Jean.

Madame Potard was sweating big drops.

"One moment!" she exclaimed. "Just listen; I did not understand, on seeing you two so unexpectedly; I did not know that Monsieur... Ah! he is connected with the affair;"

"It was necessary, you see," intimated Jean, retracing his steps. "I was not presentable, in my pitiful costume. For a barrack, it requires a Mousie; see this gentleman is a Mousie, and a substantial one."

"Oh! Madame understands," said the substantial Mousie.

Jean continued:

"So I took a partner... with a black coat, as capital. A black coat and gloves, with those everything is all right."

"Why, is it not Madam more turmoiled, still anxious.

"We come, then, dear Madame, to make an honest division of the money," said Jean, emphasizing the last word.

The word money had its usual effect upon the midwife.

"All right," she said, thoroughly enlightened. "Better late than never. Be seated, then.

Jean turned to his companion.

"Give her her share."

"Her share and my heart," said the partner, gallantly taking Madame Potard around the waist.

Madame Potard quickly released herself, saying:

"Oh! come, come!"

And seriously:

"How much?"

"Thirty thousand francs!"

"And to think I had given you up! May one offer a drop to these gentlemen?"

"No, thank you," said Jean.

"I am not mad," she added, as she retired, went to her table on which a case of liquors stood, saying at the same time:

"And the share?...

"Is it large?"

"Why, yes, it is fat," said Jean; "but with three of us... that cuts the slices down a bit."

"How much then?" exclaimed Madame Potard, in a disappointed tone and seeming already to regret the three full glasses. Jean replied emphatically:

"We have drawn from the barrack thirty pretty notes like those he paid to you. Your interest.

It made a pretence of drinking, but, turning around a little, he emptied the little glass into his hand.

"Thirty thousand francs!" cried Madame Potard, disappointed.

Jean, pretending to misunderstand, repeated the sum, dwelling on each syllable:

"Yes, that is fat; but the money isn't inserted."

"It is little," exclaimed Madame Potard, with an expression of disdain. "Is that really all you got? You rebuke me!

"Ah! Madame Potard, for not to do you take us? Your associates!"

"Then fifteen thousand francs for me," declared Madame Potard in a tone that seemed final.

"There you go; there are three of us," said Jean, by way of correction.

But the midwife would not listen.

Not at all: Nothing of the kind! I want fifteen thousand francs. I did not agree to a division in three parts. You said nothing to me about it; it is on your own responsibility that you took a partner. So much the worse for you. That's your lookout. I give the letter for a half, not for a third. I want my half."

"Greedy creature! And what about us then?"

"Divide with the other: the rest is for you."

"But we shall have nothing but the crumbs."

Madame Potard was inefltable.

"Oh, you believe that," said she. "It has not brought enough. You have managed it badly. I thought you were more cunning. With such a secret you ought to have broken the bank.

Jean drew back at the same time making to his companion an inexpressible sign that escaped Madame Potard.

"We shall lose," he declared.

And, lowering his voice, he asked:

"Then really you got but twenty thousand francs for putting the child into paradise.

"Hush!" exclaimed the frightened midwife.

"All right, let us say no more about it," said the rag-picker in a consolatory tone. "Don't argue the point; perhaps I should lose. After it, it is just, and if we were not honest with each other... So no more chicanery. A bargain's a bargain. My friend and I will waive this point, and arrange between ourselves as must have half," he continued, while the unknown drew the notes from the pocket-book and passed them to him one by one. "There you are."

"That's all right," said Madame Potard, soothing down. "The good friends."

Received:

Nevertheless she counted the notes again.

"Fifteen! That is the account. Minus two, the burned ones... I want those also."

CHAPTER IX.

THE COUNCIL.

A very big fish for a police commissary's net was the banker, Baron Hoffmann; and, even under the Republic, the magistrates hesitated to arrest a prince of the stock exchange, not daring to trust to a vulgar assassin without first consulting his superiors.

But the agent did not fail to notify the prosecuting attorney of the Republic, who in his turn was unwilling to take the responsibility of so important a step and sent him to the Minister of Justice, who referred him to the entire government.

The same day Baraduc passed from Anne to Calphaes and from Calphaes to Pilate, before being arrested as the Just. The council was engaged in the discussion of three serious, complex, and connected questions, the combined solutions of which were destined unhappily to bury the Republic.

Those questions were:

1. The Roman war.
2. The national workshops.
3. The return of Prince Louis Napoleon Bonaparte.

On the first point the government had decided to send the mayor of Paris, Armand Marrast, to Gaite to find the Pope and bring him to France, pending his reestablishment at Rome. Which would favorably dispose the priests toward the Republic.

On the second, it had been decided that the national workshops should be abolished.

Which would favorably dispose the employers toward the Republic.

On the third point, two good friends of the prince, Jules Farre and Louis Blanc, who had Bonapartist leanings from sentiment and even from family,—at least Louis Blanc,—in spite of the secret admission made to them by the prisoner of Hill baskets, no way of Empire, spoke in favor of the pretender, guaranteeing his republicanism and saying that a dissolution and return would result in the salvation of the Republic.

At this moment the Minister of Justice introduced the commissary of police who propounded the fourth great question of the day, the affair of the banker, Baron Hoffmann.

At the council itself was half incredulous and half scandalized, but in face of the proofs unfolded one by one by the commissary, it was necessary to come to a decision, solve the question in one way or another, execute the law, or else evade it. The situation was not so inviting at the escape of the accused. Cremeaux, a Jewish lawyer, full of metallic affinities and Minister of Justice, was for compromise.

Geodeaux, another Jew, Minister of Finance, was obliged to hold the same opinion through; esprit de corps.
The Minister of War, Cavaignac, for several reasons obeyed a similar conscience. A sort of soldier-monk: a Catholic republican; dreaming of the presidency of the Republic by the grace of whom Hoffman acted as banker through the Abbé Venustor; having married the daughter of a financier, — he was turned into a statesman. One of Napoleon's most threatening labor, a dictator reader to exaequor starving labours rather than murderous bankers.

But Lamartine, one of the troubadour knights of the Restoration, pariticipated also by the law of the Girondists, — had a hero of Turcoture, like the noble spindrift that he was. So he pleaded against the banker with one of those guitars that he played so well. He had no sooner broken the bankruptcy law than he was invested in a regime of trials, imprisonments, etc., — the whole sonata of rights and duties, — concluding democratically that it is not the same with rascals as with negatures, and that two crimes cannot make an innocent man, even of a hospital bed.

Albert, the witticism, Louis Blans, the Socialist, and the Jacobin, Ledru, formed a chorus with the poet; and in spite of reasons of State, Church, and Bank, in the face of the three sources of government's interest, interest of the throne, in spite of the highest political, religious, and platit-docular considerations, by a majority of one the constitutional government decided that the banker, Baron Hoffmann, this extraordinary culprit, must submit to the common law, and that justice must take its course.

CHAPTER X.

INTO THE BASKET!

Let us return to the house of the banker, Baron Hoffmann.

Clairvoyance is yielded. She has placed her heart upon the altar, sacrificing herself to save her father's bank and honor. Her mind is made up. A victim, if not an accomplice, she will marry Camille.

The day of the judgment, the holocaust, has arrived.

In an elegant boudoir of the former Hotel Berville, the daughter of the banker is seated before a swinging mirror, while two maids arrange her bridal costume.

All around the house, the doorkeepers and the half-guarders, in the back, the illuminated greenhouse and garden shri as a firmament. Clairvoyance, resigned and swallowing her tears, abandons herself mechanically to the care of the two acolytes. She will go to the very end.

To be continued.

FREE POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS:

THEIR NATURAL ESSENCE, AND MAINTENANCE.

AN ABRIDGEMENT AND REARRANGEMENT

Lysander Spooner's "Trial by Jury."

Edited by Victor Yarros.

Concluded from No. 32.

In criminal cases, the atrocity of accusing a man of crime and then condemning him unless he prove his innocence at his own charges is so evident that a jury could hardly, if ever, be justified in convicting a man under such circumstances. The free administration of justice is not only indispensable to the maintenance of right but man and man; it would also promote simplicity and stability in the laws. The mainia for legislation would be in an important degree restrained. If the government were compelled to pay the expenses of all the suits that press upon the court, they would be heard and justice would be dispensed under circumstances in which the party who presses the suit controls the tribunal and the law is made for the benefit of the party, and not the party for the law.

The free administration of justice would diminish and nearly extinguish another great evil, that of malicious civil suits. It is an old saying that "multis litigat in prospere aliqua inter se melius annullent." (Many litigate in court, not that they may gain anything, but that they may harass others.) Many men, from motives of revenge and oppression, are willing to spend their own money in prosecuting a suit to compel any of their victims, who are letable than they to bear the loss, to spend money in the defence. Under the prevailing system, in which the parties pay the expenses of the suit, nothing but money is necessary to enable any malicious man to commence and prosecute a groundless suit to the terror, injury, or perhaps ruin, of another man. In this way a court of justice, instead of being the protector of the common law, might be called upon to aid in imposing minor, and the party who has to support the expense of the suit, and not the party for the law.

In estimating the evils of this kind resulting from the present system, we are to consider that they are not by any means confined to the actual suits in which this kind of oppression and abuse before the same. At the same time, many suits are not so grave, or so flagrantly disgraceful, as that the jury in such a manner as to make suits of justice: it is very large that their rights.

VIII.

JURIES OF THE PRESENT DAY ILLEGAL.

It may probably be safely asserted that there are at this day no legal juries, either in France or America. And if there are no legal juries, there is of course no legal trial, nor "judgment," by jury.

In saying that there are probably no legal juries, I mean that there are probably no juries appointed in conformity with the principles of the common law. The term jury is a technical one, derived from the common law, and when the American constitutions provide for the trial by jury, they provide for the common law trial by jury, and not merely for any trial by jury that the government itself may chance to invent and call by that name. It is the thing, and not merely the name, that is guaranteed. Any legislation, therefore, that creates a jury for any essential part of the police of the common law, is unconstitutional, and the juries selected in accordance with such legislation are, of course, illegal, and their decisions are, of course, illegal.
Liberty.
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"In abolishing rent and interest, the last vestiges of old-time slavery, the Revolution abolishes at once the stroke of the executioner, the spell of the magician, the club of the policeman, the tenure of the lease, the ease of the urbane, the brute of the beast, the fangs of the savages, and all those illusions of Politics, which longly Liberty grins beneath her heel." — Emerson.

The appearance in the editorial column of articles on the nature of the great theme that is agitating the country, and the demand that they be given more space, has led us to determine that we can no longer sustain, or even afford, the present style of the paper. The three or four queries which Mr. Stuart addresses to me and upon which I have no intention of dwelling, are now, and must remain, unanswered; not because I do not consider them pertinent or perfectly legitimate, nor because I am not prepared to make explicit, confident, and frank answer, but because, in this discussion, I am not exclusively in favor of those principles which think the present value of Mr. Stuart's views and methods, in showing him that they suffer under probation, and in obtaining from him the admission that they need amendment and modification. For this reason I urge upon Mr. Stuart to limit himself to a defence of these points which I am persistently attacking, in order that the final issue may be more speedily decided. Then, it is needless to say that I shall take pleasure in following Mr. Stuart into any particular spot in the domain of Aristotelian or Platonian meaning which he may point out in us being scantly illuminated.

Strangely contradicting himself, Mr. Stuart, while predicting that "law, applied to man as a social being, is that rule of human social conduct the observance of which is rewarded by happiness and the non-observance of which is destructive of happiness," refuses to acknowledge that civilization creates rights and that individual rights have no source other than social expediency. One would think that, as an evolutionist and utilitarian, he must recognize that, instead of ascertaining our rights in social life by the deductions of right reason, we develop them by observing phenomena and learn from them experiences. A social animal no more could or should be capable of making deductions of right reason than that it is reprehensible to steal or deceive than a child could, by the same method, discover that fire burns or that certain weeds have a poisonous effect upon the organism. As long as the Buckstone found it perfectly pleasant and safe to steal other men's wives, he could not and did not ascertain that it is just as bad to steal another's wife as to have his own dragged away by another. But when, under a certain degree of civilization, it became extremely inconvenient to steal because it was no longer considered that theDesire for a scientific and philosophical view of history. At one time war was an agency of progress, and so was slavery; now they are no longer so. Those are now wrong; they let's us one time right. If comparative sociology is an art, one more strongly than another, that it is necessary to consider the humanly-organized rights, like free-will, are disfranchised in the republic of the social sciences and treated as unreal, immaterial shadows which serve only to haunt and paralyze feeble intelligences.

Upon this point we cannot resist the negation of Mr. Stuart's contentions, let us hear John Morley: "Moral truth is only a set of individual propositions, and there is not one of these propositions which any rational person now holds to be, and to have been, a universal obligation for all times and all ages. We may believe that moral truth is immutable, as soon as we have found any one moral precept immutable, and not before. In the most primitive times there was such a crime as murder; there was such a precept against killing persons. But then, there was in some relation to one. But the precept, 'Thou shalt not kill,' is meaningless until the question has been answered, 'Thou shalt not kill whom?' Nobody can say that the answer to this question is always the same. So, and not the moral precept, but that is what is meaningless. Closely examining persons can only mean by the immutability of moral truth that under all circumstances there is such a thing as duty, some obligation incumbent on every member of society."

What a man absolutely free from the direct and indirect influences of civilization, or socialization, might be, my mind refuses to picture. We only know socialized men, and we do not know the number of different societies and civilizations. Each society has its own ideas of right and wrong, is governed by its own more or less peculiar laws. And within each society there are further divisions of men into classes, with varying degrees of civilization, or socialization, or humanization, each class having its own more or less distinct ideas of conduct and organization. To be sure, all these diversifications can be accounted for, and some of them we are able to account for, by tracing the conditions of the particular society, or the tribe, or the state, of the race, or the nation, or the country, or the world, or the part and parcel of this, or that, or the other. But the only generalization which a scientific study of history permits is that, by virtue of natural selection, which never ceases to operate, all societies destined to be saved from the white death, which is the destruction of the race, will ultimately come to resemble a certain type, the superiority of which is more and more becoming manifest. And the superiority is not due to deductions of right reason, but its rise and growth is due to the conditions of the race, which might have taken on different forms, but that is the only one that is possible. And if this be so, it is evident that we ourselves use words without meaning. They justly demand that we should have explained them to them in dry scientific terms how exploitation of the people by the few idlers can be stopped, and equality of opportunity secured for all. If individualism is incompatible with their ideal of life, they will not be induced to consult our wishes and ideas of right, but will willfully trample under foot every part and parcel of this obvious individualism. Either we can give them an argument, or we can remedy our suffering, or we cannot. If we can, there is no need to appeal to any abstract rights; if we cannot, there is no use in introducing this irrelevant and unintelligible conception.

Mr. Stuart, if I am not mistaken, is a Darwinian, but his method of ethical investigation is decidedly pre-Darwinian and metaphysical. If sociology is to take its place among the sciences, its truths must be verifiable. That is right for men in whom they are made known, and which can be proved to be so by any ordinary intelligence. What is good for one society, however, may be bad for another differently conditioned. What is good at one stage of development may become pernicious at a succeeding stage. Hence rights are not abstract, universal, immutable, but concrete, relative, local, and variable.

By Way of Reply.

And so, Conrard Tucker, you also consider that I take no notice of the real issues at stake? Well, let all that pass; life is too short to waste in defending against such charges; there is no more disputing about a belief that can be done.

But leaving the general charge, I do not see what cause Mr. Yarros had for complaint in this particular instance. It would have been much too much to expect; neither do I think it otherwise that I "took pains" to comprehend him, and understood him to assert that the true basis of individual expediency to declare, in the most unequivocal language, that there was nothing whatever in nature to interfere such a policy as taxay or slavery; that humanity is the original of the civilization, and that the Denver paper's claim that Spencer's maxim was a scientific formula was a base mistake.

Was I mistaken? These are the only points to which I alluded.

Mr. Yarros says that I assumed that the "individualist" means the "mother of all rights," and I thought it. I assumed nothing of the kind; there is not a word in my article having any reference to the meaning, so-called meaning of the "individualist." Evidently, Mr. Yarros sometimes "takes pains," and I think it was sufficient for my purpose to show that there was a sense in which the term natural right could be properly and scientifically used to
justify its employment by any one as a watchword. This I conclude afloat.
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versal and instinctive idea of right is that of "a code to be obeyed regardless of results." Money and materiality have a way of, let us talk a moment of manners. I am sorry that Mr. Lloyd looks on me, in this respect, as such a disgrace to my cause that he must beg others not to confound my person with it. Yet it is for the sake of the cause, and not from any desire for mercy, that I applied to him to make no more such pleas to the class of readers he describes. When a reader refuses this paper because of its manners, it is safe to say that he doesn't appreciate its ideas, how- ever stately he may pretend otherwise. Such a reader is not only not entitled to my respect, but, according to the man who really enjoys truth will be attracted by a clear statement of it, regardless of personal considerations. And Mr. Lloyd knows perfectly well that there is more clear exposition of the position of every paragraph packed away in the 130 numbers that have been leased of this paper than in any other periodical ever published in America. But he may continue to apologize for me if he will: I certainly have no apology to offer for the tone which was supposed to be appropriate, and which obscured the meaning of the subject. Perhaps some will understand it better if I make a declaration of sympathy with the paragraph that concludes the preface to Wordsworth Doni- thorpe's new book on "Individualism":

In conclusion I would ask that I have little reason to expect popularity in this country, and that it is likely to attract sympathy whatever. And I have deliberately adopted a tone rather polemic than apologetic, in the belief that dull and non-moral matter is more likely to sink into the general attention and impress the memory than a more vigorous and uncompromising style of criticism. And I have done this entirely from those whom I am, in the main, accord.

italics mine.

F. Q. Stuart, editor of the Denver "Individualist," has lately published an article in the "Roc- kymountain News" to explain State Socialism and Anarchism and the difference between them. The writer backtracks through the ever-widening area of similar social theory to the question: in any particular case, the step in that direction has been pre- pared, and that the worst way to secure the advance all along the line to retire for a while from this particular event. Thus in cases of the too rapid subjection of the patriotic aversion to ordinary work it is necessary to produce other goods and even to the brain sometimes supernumerary, in which cases "it may be right," says Dr. Watson, "as an argument for a step up the scientific production of value by irrational application of one of the means of producing what is called revolution, and of diverting the current from the brain to the part it previously occupied." The chapter on "The Structure of the State" was partly written in reply to the late Sir Henry Main's "Popular Government" and the conclusion: "If people can only be induced to think straight, the social problem is solved." I fear that Mr. Stuart is not destined to solve it.
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prohibit by State force the right of gift? If not, he will on reflection consider that he has no such right, either on his own labor or on the labor of those who have voluntarily bandied the proceeds to him, by way of gift, or else for an equivalent for some duty he has rendered. It is a proposition which is more or less explicit and upon the indispensable fact that he is himself a form of capital, provided that my definition of capital is the correct one. The definition is clear, and the subject of the point is dealt with in Chapter V, and the late Professor Bonamy Price’s opinion of that chapter was naturally most acceptable.

I have enjoyed no such success in political economy. Its criticisms on communal theories seem to me perfectly groundless, nor do its proofs need be cited in class, but not in language so terse or as vivid as yours. The nonsense you parade so terribly has been the chief obstacle to the education of the world. The sentimental and luxurious nature of the doctrine has been defeated in that respect, and the principles of practical business are as discredited as the principles of the socialists. Only those who can write a book on the principles of economic science can write them in this way. Their system is often as ill-defined in the field as in the world.

The world is the only sphere of political economy; its value lies in the fact that it provides a means of guiding the man in his daily life, it is a subject only for those who can express it in such a field. . . . We can get a practical and economic result from these ideas.

I regret that the statement of the Right of Labor is based upon the indisputable fact that he is himself a form of capital, provided that my definition of capital is the correct one. The definition is clear, and the subject of the point is dealt with in Chapter V, and the late Professor Bonamy Price’s opinion of that chapter was naturally most acceptable.
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I regret that the statement of the Right of Labor is based upon the indisputable fact that he is himself a form of capital, provided that my definition of capital is the correct one. The definition is clear, and the subject of the point is dealt with in Chapter V, and the late Professor Bonamy Price’s opinion of that chapter was naturally most acceptable.

To say that I am, the present state of affairs is the only one that is to be considered. It is much easier to attempt to have arranged it otherwise than it would have been a successful attempt to accomplish the universe. Hence-for that which is done is done, and be it done in the best possible way, if ever, I think it is not more than the name that a system can ever be justified. Miss Rose will not describe this as either practical or paradoxic. Its name, and I cannot agree with her here. I can only say that, if the scheme turned out, it was right that it should be so. I have no right to interfere with the process by which Mr. Victor Yarros brings the same absurd charge against me in connection with my defense of private property in a social system. I cannot, however, say, "Victor Yarros’s position is that I hold as in another manner whatever is right, since the effective majority will let it be." And then they must proceed: "It might easily have been managed differently, then we could have had a more perfect result," and so forth. The world is different, and we can get a practical result from these ideas.

In the ethical sense in which I prefer to use the term, it means that which conduces to the ultimate welfare of the individual; as the means, it is a political question. The group, then, that which harmonizes with the welfare of the Group is right. In this sense, that which is morally wrong, is the Group. I mean of labor, Mr. Morris, Mr. Yarros, and myself. When we come to improving matters, we begin to differ again. Mr. Morris would re-arrange society on the assumption that we were all Morrices. (I wish I were. Mr. Yarros would put all the rabbles on rations; he would treat human beings as though they were all mental and moral beings, an assumption of his, and have a moral pre-eminence. In future I will ask both Mr. Morris and Mr. Yarros to keep perfect silence when I talk about rights or wrongs or good or evil, etc., etc.)

In spite of its deplorable pessimism, human beings will al- ways desire a better life, even if it be a life of common association; even if they can be frightened, or their views of life can be triumphed by Alastair, — just that nothing and more. Nothing.
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Neither Nationalism nor socialism are likely to prevail in an age where the reasonableness of the individual is not only asserting itself more and more, but is conceded by more liberal laws in the direction of personal freedom of action. There is just this to be said of sensible socialist literature, among which "Looking Backward" is not included. It points out what is wrong in the system, and it teaches the means to reason and think. It is a process of evolution in the development of better things, and as such it has done, and will do, much good.
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Address: B. T. TUCKER, Box 3306, Boston, Mass.

**The Story of an African Farm.**

A NOVEL.

BY RALPH HENRY WOODS.

A story of the life and adventures of W, a young Englishman who goes to Africa, and there passes through a series of experiences, including his capture by the natives, his deliverance by the white men, and his return home with a new appreciation of life.

Price, cloth, $3.50; full calf, blue, gilt edges, $6.50.

Address: B. T. TUCKER, Box 3306, Boston, Mass.