On Picket Duty.

I assure the "Jeffersonian" that it is wrong in stating that "the men who most fear paternalism in government have no dread of the internecinism of monopoly." On the contrary, it is the men who dread the internecinism of monopoly that most strenuously oppose paternalism in government (or rather government, for there is no more dangerous and cruel monopolist than government. A Jeffersonian ought to understand this; our contemporary does not, and hence I must be allowed to say that it is not entitled to its name.

The "Sturdy Oak" asks what incentive there would be to strive to get to heaven, if Bellamy's ideal government was a practical fact. Most sensible people think that even then it would have been gone sense in it, although of Bellamy's ideal government. By the way, "Waterman's Journal" has expressed the opinion that Nationalism would be threatened by the evil of over-population; but it seems to me utterly wrong. There would be a very painful "natural" check in constant operation,—of suicide. Life will be intolerable then; that is, it is safe to predict wholesale emigration to Nirvana.

The doctrine of a man who has no children shall not be forced to support schools for other men. Children are pronounced by the editor of the "Workers' Advocate" as "selfish and anti-social" ever proclamed. Had this been applied to the doctrine that no man should be advised, invited, recommended, or urged to pay for something his neighbors want, there would have been gone sense in it, although of the commonest order. But for the fellows who want to force everybody to agree with them and submit to their dietion without murmur to brand as most "selfish and anti-social" the protest against such tyranny is indeed impudent and hypocritical to a degree that Pecksfink can never hope to reach.

Mr. Stuart makes a long answer to my article on "The New Abolition and Its Nine Demands," the gist of which is that he demands collective maintenance and control of ferries, but not of ferry-boats; of railroads, but not of rolling-stock; of offices, but not of ships; and of highways, but not of vehicles. Will he now have the goodness to explain what he means when he demands the collective maintenance and control of "electric piles." The use of this expression in the ninth demand proves beyond a doubt that he did contemplate the collective control of boats and rolling-stock, and that his new interpretation is a deliberate and disgraceful dodge out of the corner into which I had driven him. And yet this is the man who lately passed the criticism upon the editor of Liberty that he was never willing to own up when he was wrong.

As evidence of the power and importance of the Nationalist movement, the "Workers' Advocate" advances the fact that even the Boston press, which is characterized as "the most capitalistic in the world," finds it impossible to treat that movement otherwise than with respect. The simple truth is that the Boston press is the least capitalistic in America (I cannot say more, not pretending to know the world as well as the conscientious State Socialists), and that only in Boston could the Nationalists gain so much recognition as is accorded them. There are Socialists, Anarchists, and many others, in Boston, and in Boston only, and the newspaper men here generally are not as eager to prostitute themselves as those of New York and Chicago. Boston has no paper as mean and cowardly as the New York "Times," or as shameless and malicious as the "Sun." However urgent the necessity for magnifying their own importance may be, the State Socialists, who are rapidly gaining a reputation for appalling ignorance of all social principles (despite their claim to a monopoly of science), should endeavor to get along without unwarantable bragging.

"Mr. Tucker has a strong dislike to any form of government, but if there is one thing which he dislikes more, is any man who is successful, and this is the reason why he hates Henry George." This is the impression of a contributor to Philadelphia "Justice." Mr. H. St. George, like all dogmatic sociologists, has no hesitation in stating in the form of settled conviction. I hate all hypocrites and scorners who successfully impose upon the credulity and ignorance of the masses, and I try to tear the mask off their faces and expose their hypocrisy. Those who deserve success will always find in me a warm supporter, and when success has deservedly achieved, no one rejoices more heartily than I. So far, however, as Henry George is concerned, it would be prudent to wait a little before boasting of his success. Long ago I predicted that he would go up like a rocket and come down like a stick; and though Mr. Stephenson may be afflicted with blindness, those who have good eyes can see Mr. George coming down. Once down, he will surely be left alone to meditate and repent. Justice is not vindicative or cruel.

The Fiction of Natural Rights.

[Dyer D. Luns in Pittsburg Truth.]

The very cornerstone of Anarchistic philosophy is often supposed to be a paraphrase of Herbert Spencer's "First and Second Principles." "Every man is the owner of his own. Every man has the right to his own.

What are "natural rights?" In the middle ages schools believed that they had solved a problem in physics by ascertaining that "nature abhors a vacuum;" but a very little study sufficed to convince thinkers that "the web of events" we group as "nature" neither abhors nor likes. With the growth of the conception of law as a term descriptive of mode of being rather than a fact imposed upon events, the term "natural" has lost much of its old theological meaning. Still it is often used in that sense and too often implies it.

Blockstone defines "the law of nature" as "the will of man's maker." Machiavelli calls it "a supreme, inviable, and uncontrollable rule of conduct to all men." Sir Henry Maine also speaks of "a fixed and immutable law of nature" for the guidance of human conduct. Kant defines it as that "which the creator has prescribed to man." P. G. Stuart, in his "Natural Rights," says expressly: "A natural right is a privilege vouchsafed by natural law to man to exercise his faculties," and his whole work teleums with expressions implying their faces and expose their hypocrisy. The correct position is, I maintain, that what we term "natural rights" are evoked, not conferred, and if they are more than mere "privilege" upon us than upon dogs to exercise our faculties or functions. In fact, to my mind, the very assumption of "natural rights" is at war with evolution. Even if we no longer personalize nature as their giver, the term still carries with it the implication of rigidity; when, in fact, not even that mythical "right reason" who we are supposed to be endowed can prove them historically so characterized. Every man is supposed to have a "natural right" to life. But did it exist, though unrecognized, among our pristogorous ancestors? If the savage transmogrified "natural right" in disposing at will of the life of a captive, where was it inscribed? It was not inscribed in the semi-brute. If the Roman law was based upon a "type of perfect law" in nature, was the recognition of the "natural right" of a father over the life of his family contrary to the "right reason" of the time? And this query convictions founded upon nineteenth century deductions is not pertinent.

In woman's "natural right" is a "person" the same as "all countries under polyvalency," "lymanon, and monogamy? or are those relations of the sexes, so important to "well-being and good conduct," ignored by "beneficent nature? It has been conclusively shown by sociologists that human progress is no other than consists in passing from the material régime toward an industrial one. Yet the time was when the lex toma not sanctified revenge as the highest virtue. Time was when not a human being on the face of the earth differed from Aristotle's opinion of slavery as a natural condition. Where was this "privilege vouchsafed by natural law" of which Spinoza spoke? The question of whether society would not have been far more conducive to happiness if such right had been recognized, is as idle as whether eyes behind our heads would not have been equally so. If the "Privilege" has not been established that we are to conclude that it is the final synthesis of "right reason" by which men's conviction is only now visible?

Having shown a few of the questions which arise to puzzle one who seeks for evidence of the immutability of "natural rights," let us examine closer into the nature of the human spirit. The human spirit is a province conquered from nature, and hence its relations cannot be termed "natural." It would be equally as permissible to call them more "legal," dispensable, for the being given to imply the highest validity, it would be so understood by all whom either of these words convey of such meaning. Equally dispensable and equally indissoluble as in evoluntary thought when implying fixity. But do they exist any such inherent peculiarities of human nature as "rights?" The same biological bias which-changed "natural" also regards their assertion as positive. On the contrary, every assertion of a right purely human, paradoxical as it may seem, is a protest against injustices. Social evolution ever tend's to the equalization of the exercise of our social rights. That is, social intercourse has slowly evolved the idea of truth, happiness, and security are best attained by equal freedom to each and all; consequently, I can lay no claim to equity in a privilege, for, whether all alike may enjoy claim to be privileged. The important deduction from social evolution is that as militancy has weakened and industrialism widened its boundaries, liberty has ever tended toward such equalization. Privileges finds no sanction in equity as right, because it violates the ideal of social progress—equality of opportunities.

Therefore it is that, as social relations have become more complex and integrated, the ideal of "a more perfect form of liberty" rises in the form of protest against what only then discernible as socially wrong, though ostensibly as assurances, such as "rights of women," "rights of labor," "rights of children and sailors against flogging," the right to the ballot, and the"freed and burning assertions just so far as they emphasize a growing protest against insupportable conditions. In this sense they are Anarchistic, inso much as by the accident of other words, the abolition of restrictions, is the wrong righteous. Our specific "rights" are thus dependent upon our ability to discern wrongs, or, in other words, the "natural rights"—equality of opportunities, and alike but as protests. All these wrongs, and there will be no vested rights, natural or otherwise. So it seems that the obstacles that are removed, just so will social relations flow to equitable conditions with restrictions are swept away. And probably as liberty comes in does the assertion of "rights" go out.
THE RAG-PICKER OF PARIS.

By FELIX PYAT.

Translated from the French by Henri R. Tucker.

PART FOURTH.

THE STRUGGLE.

Continued from No. 114.

"Speak," said he.

"And you are the guilty party. Yes, I allowed my child to be sacrificed to my passion, and allowed the accusation of this girl who sacrificed her honor to my child."

Then in a feverish voice:

"Take her, her things, the woman that tortures me; these ornaments that repropitiate me, these signs of purity, love, and happiness!"

"Ah! I understand. This is the end of the ordeal. ... I die relieved.

This scaffold's tears put out the fire of hell.

She fell into the arms of Marie and Rosine.

"James, on the alert, heard an officer's whistle, and, turning to the commissary, he said:

"The baron.

"Take this away," said Rosine; "take me away that I may die in peace!"

Rousette, aided by two servants, led the dying woman into her apartments.

"Two," cried Jean, when she had disappeared. "Now for the other, the third and last. ... the worse. ... And let us strike the iron while it is hot. All hands retire!" he ordered with authority.

The numerous guests withdrew.

"What a pièces de théâtre!" said Louchard, delighted.

"And the contract?" asked Leisen of Gripot.

"And the bonds?" exclaimed the latter. "Bah! nothing but a change of name."

"You are right," said Leisen; the last to go. "They will have need of us after directly. A marriage deferred, but not lost!"

Jean approached the commissary, took him by his overcoat, and said in a peremptory tone:

"Remember your promises, my magistrate. I hold the cards, and you watch the game. ... I shall finish the job; go in yonder, I pray you!"

He made the commissary go into another room. Then he said to Camille and Marie:

"You go in there."

He pushed them towards another door.

There remained Laurent and Leon, very much flustered and confused.

The ragpicker got rid of them with a few kicks, saying:

"I'll be a braun-dealing valet, cup-bearer to Mundrin! there you are then! Well, take that! And that! And dodge this one, if you can. Go look for your supper in the corner.

Left alone, he went toward a portière, took off his basket, then his blouse, and concealed himself entirely.

"Now it lies between us two," he said. "He or I!"

The private door opened, and the baron walked in.

"Madame Potard has gone," said he, as he entered. "The rasala's house is shut up. All is not well. Now to the salon.

"Ha!" cried Jean, revealing himself and barring the way.

"The oaf!" cried Baron Hoffmann, starting back in surprise.

Jean placed himself before the door by which the baron had just entered.

"Yes, Monsieur Baron," said he, quietly.

"Here?" asked the other.

"Here!" answered Jean.

"And you, and only you. I am a witness for the prosecution, with documentary evidence to confront and confound you."

He pointed to the basket and the hook.

"Look," said the baron, "do you recognize that tool? And this one? Notice the rust of Diderot's blood."

The baron tried to go out through the door by which he had entered.

"Let me pass," he growled.

Jean raised the hook and barred the door.

"No thoroughfare," said he. "I have settled Marie's account; now for my own!"

The banker tried to seize Jean by the collar, but the latter released himself with a sudden movement, meering:

"All right! A regular screw-driver. I recognize it. Twice goes, but not three times! Every day is not a free day. I am not drunk, as was at the time. We were only two, only two ragpickers, and when one of us kills Jacques, either you or me."

"It Baron Hoffmann?"

"Just you wait! You, a double knave, a false baron and a false ragpicker, a real robber and a real murderer. You killed the man as surely as you killed the child. The first crime produced the second, and the second proves the first.

"Monsieur, there is another; your daughter. ... Ah is it not known, understood; and those who have arrested the daughter will soon arrest the father. It is over with the whole race."

"Dead?" asked the banker in despair.

"Not yet," said Jean.

"How so?"

"While there's life, there's hope, and if you wish. ... "

"What? Say on," asked the baron, ardently.

"If you wish, you can escape," said Jean. "One can give the guard the slip here as well as at the castle of Ham; you are not more difficult to pass than a prince."

Showing his blushes:

"Napoleon's trick, you see."

"Ah! I understand. Well, this full pocket-book, a million, Claire's dowry! ... my distress for your basket."

"You are on the rent; but I want more than gold today! You have accused me, save me, I will save you."

"Well? How?"

"A confession that will clear me."

"So be it," ascended the baron, running to a table and writing the confession. Then, after showing it to Jean, he said:

"Take and give."

He unsewed the paper and gave his garment.

"Here!" said he; "fly in that, like a pretender. Honor the blouse!"

The baron put on the blouse over his coat and threw his hat into a corner.

Jean continued sardonically:

"Resume also the basket, which you should never abandon again. Banker, that is your punishment and your salvation. You will pass, like a letter through the mails, under the envelope of the ragpicker."

The banker hesitated and then accepted, saying hopefully:

"Thank you. I will go!"

Then, becoming Garousse again as of old, he went toward the secret exit. As he was about to rush out, he uttered a cry:

"Ah!"

The agent of the commissary who had noted his entrance had anticipated his exit.

He rose before him.

"Derailed?" exclaimed Jean, full of the contempt.

"So much the worse ... but for him only!"

The commissary, attracted by the noise, came in again with his men.

"Remain, Monsieur," said the commissary.

Then he called, and Jean was interrogated by Marie and Camille, called by Jean, entered in their turn.

The banker looked at them savagely, and then, throwing off his basket, tearing off his blouse, and throwing down the book, he straightened up desperately.

"Well," he cried, "let it end, then—this long suicide of crime! begun in the blood of another ... let it end in mine! Today as formerly. ... Better death than the basket."

He went out, led by the officers.

"Every one of his taste," concluded Jean.

And adding to the commissary, he said:

"Three! Quis, Monsieur! Here is the confession of the father after that of the daughter."

The magistrate took the paper.

"Yes, said he, quis and free!"

He followed the baron, as a final b.

Camille, Marie, and Jean threw themselves effusively into each other's arms.

"Ah! my dear wife, what joy!" exclaimed the young man.

"They suffer," exclaimed Marie, sympathetically. And Jean said to Camille:

"Didn't I tell you that I would restore her to you? Ah! here are your thirty thousand francs!"

He handed him the notes, but Camille refused them.

"O noble friend, our true father, keep them!"

"I have no further need of them," said Jean.

Camille, indicating the mansion with a gesture, responded:

"In fact, all that is ours is yours. We owe everything to you. You shall live with us."

"No, no," said Jean, giving Marie a look of ineffable tenderness, "she is happy.

That is all I want. ... Oh! yes!"

"What is it?" asked Camille.

Jean, giving the baron's old basket a kick, answered simply:

"A new basket."

CHAPTER XI.

THE MARRIAGE.

That evening, as the clock of the Invalides struck half past eleven, the coach of the Roman ambassador at Paris drew up discreetly in front of the archbishop's palace.

Several prelates got out, escorted by lackeys dressed like the Swiss of Notre-Dame, and entered the ecclesiastical residence, the door of which opened immediately for their lordships.

The pope's nuncio, accompanied by his dignitaries, had come to take the archbishop to bless the union of Camille Berville and Claire Hoffmann at his pious embassy. ... The stroll traversed the spacious and gloomy apartments of the palace, regardless of the beautiful religious paintings that vainly covered the walls with their monotonous spiritual cast. They had just entered the chapel.

The arch. Affre was at the other end, buried in a large red velvet armchair, in the shadow of the altar.

He gave no sign of life at the approach of his important visitors, and, without stirring, allowed them to approach as near as possible and low. Then, the archb. would rise, gravely return their salutes, and look at them for some moments without laughing, like a Christian angel.

"Is this the hour?" he asked at last.

And without waiting for the reply, he added:

"Let us start."

"We have still a quartier of an hour's grace," said the ultramontane.

Then let us talk," rejoined the archbishop.

The two illustrious brothers in Jesus Christ walked back and forth beside the communion table, and, while the other prelate listened or conversed in low tones, they held the following colloquy:

"In your opinion, what state be our attitude toward the Republic?" began the archbishop.

The reply awaited the reply attentively.

"Hostile, very hostile," declared the nuncio. "We must restabilish the monarchy, royalty, or empire, no matter which," he continued, making a threatening gesture under his evangelical role, "provided we get rid of the government of the canaille."

To be continued.
The Economic Tendency of Freethought.

[A lecture delivered before the Boston Secular Society by Val- taimon de Beyne.]

FREETHOUGHT.—On page 269, Belford-Clarke edition, of the "Rights of Man," the words which I propose as a text for this discussion are: "I believe in the condition changeability of the constitution of France brought about by the Revolution of '93," Thomas Paine says:

The age of the nation had changed beforehand, and, in a new order of things, had naturally followed a new order of thoughts.

Two hundred and eighty-nine years ago, a man, a student, a scholar, intellectually, artistically, and morally, became the possessor of freedom, and in his enthusiasm for the love of God and the preservation of the authority of the Church; and as the hungry flames curtled round the enflaming flesh of monarchs, the king and his courtiers would spout forth such volumes, with such terrible tongues, they shadowed forth the immense vistas of "a new order of things"; they fit the battle-ground where Freedom fought for her rights.

That battle-ground was eminently one of thought. Religious freedom was the ranking question of the day. "Liberty of conscience! Liberty of conscience! Non-interference between worshipper and worshipped!" That was the voice that cried out of dungeons and dark places, from under the very feet of royalty itself. A voice! Why? Because the authoritative despots of that day were universally ecclesiastical despots; because Church aggression was grinding at the human heart, and何况 another minor oppressor was but a tool in the hands of the priesthood; because Tyranny was growing towards its ideal and consuming the very citadel of Liberty,—individuality of thought; Ecclesiastics had a corner on thought.

But individuality is a thing that cannot be killed. Quietly it may be, but just as certainly, albeit, perhaps, as the growth of a blade of grass, it offers its perpetual and unconquerable protest against the dictates of Authority. And this silent, unheeded, ungrateful, unappreciated voice provoced him to the use of rack, thumb-screw, stake, hanging, drowning, burning, and other instruments of "infinitesimal mercy," to which the sufferers agonized seldom an appeal to the kindness of the bishop, and which was a mere protest against that authority which sought to control this frontier of Freedom. It established its right to be. It overflowed that period, pervaded the national existence, which attempted to shut off the minds of men. It "broke the corner." It declared and maintained the anarchy, or non-rulership, of thought.

Now you and I sit in this little corner of the world, this corner of the fourteenth century, the whole combat of the seventeenth century, of which you are justly proud, and to which you never tire of referring, was waged for the noble purpose of realizing anarchism in the realms of thought.

It was not an easy struggle,—this battle of the quiet thinkers against the vast hordes all the power and the army of numbers, and all the strength of armilies! It was not easy for them to speak out of the midst of foggy plumes, "We believe differently, and we have the right." But on their minds must have been impressed, the struggle between her and Error, more strength for Truth, more weakness for Falsehood, than all the fearful disparity of power that this generation assigns to the last line of Liberty. But the struggle went on, the victory was the success. So they paved the way for the grand political combat of the eighteenth century.

Mark you this: the idea of individuality under the eighteenth, possible for it, was the "new order of thoughts," which gave birth to a "new order of things." Only by depositing priestly dogmacy, discarding all that logical to attack the tyranny of kings; and, under the old religion, kingscraft had ever been the tool of priestcraft, and in the order of things or a secondary consideration. But with the downfall of the later, kingscraft rose pre-eminently the pro-eminent, domineering, and against the pro-eminent depth revolt always arises.

The leaders of that revolts were naturally those who carried the logic of their freethought into the camp of the dominant oppressor; who taught that freedom of the political felch, as their predecessors had of the religious mockery; who did not waste their time hugging themselves in the camp of orators, in order to anticipate the live issue of the day, intrigued the victory of Religion's mastership in the war of Liberty in those lines most necessary to the people at the time and place. The result was the overthrow of the prince and the Commedia dell'arte. (Not that kingscraft been overthrown, but find me one in a hundred of the inhabitants of a kingdom who will not laug at the face of the "divine right of monarch") So wrought the new order of thoughts.

I do not suppose for a moment that Giordano Bruno or Martin Luther knew the doctrine of individual judgment. From the experience of men up to that date it was simply impossible that they could foresee lines of thought and action which men centuries, and perhaps a century, to come as an example of thought, that as certainly followed as their thoughts took form and shape in the social body. Neither do I believe it possible that any brain that lives can detail the working of a thought into the future, or push its logic to an ultimate. But that many who think, or think they think, do not carry their sylllogisms even to the confines of authority, is by no means a new discovery. If they did, the freethinkers of today would not be negligible, more like, through the substratum of dead issues; wouls they. They are by no means the Adams and the Jeffersons that were burnt out a couple of centuries ago; they would have their shafts at that which is already bleeding at the arteries; they would have their glances falling on that is "laying" itself as fast as it decently can, while a monster neither ghostly nor yet like the rugged Russian bear, the armed bear, the bull-like 'one, a terrible anacostia, steel-musled and iron-jawed, is winding its horrible folds around the human bodies of the world, and from whom blood and tears and children are torn. If they did, they would understand that the paramount question of the day is not political, is not religious, but is one of individuality of thought, the great circle of principles that shall forever make it impossible for one man to control another by controlling the means of his education. Freethought, freethought movement has a practical utility in rendering the life of man more bearable, unless it contains a principle which, worked out, will free him from all oppressive tyrannies, it is just as complete and empty a mockery as the Christian miracle or Pagan myth. Eminently is this the age of utility; and the freethinker who goes to the Hovel of Poverty with metaphysics, with piety, he goes to the one corner of thought. Eccl...
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"Auld Lang Syne" and interest, the last relics of old-time storer, the remaining symbols of the age of economy, the ring of the saddle, the name of the race, the plow of the palfrey, the name of the expressman, the riding-knife of the department clerk, all those institutions of politics, which young Liberty grudgingly bears her teeth."—Pershing.

The appearance in the editorial column of articles by other signatures than the editor's initial indicates that the editor 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 the editor approves them in any respect, such disposition of them being governed largely by motives of convenience.

State Banking versus Mutual Banking.

To the Editor of Liberty:

In view of the favorable criticism which "Inevitable Idleness" received at your hands, I gladly accept the invitation to state my reasons for advocating governmental management of the currency, as distinct from the fractional system.

My studies have led me to the conviction that mutual banking cannot deprive capital of its power to bring about an earned return on capital. It may, however, diminish the proportion of the monetary circulation between the financial and the industrial group, and the inevitable effects flowing from the power of money to bring a permanent revenue, it follows that a normal condition can only be attained if interest on money loans is reduced to the rate of risk, so that, in the aggregate, interest will pay the losses incurred by bad debts; and this decrease will result from mutual banking.

The members of such banks must no doubt be in some way assisted to defray the expenses and losses incurred by the banking association. These expenses are very nearly integral payable for the loan of mutual money. While these rates are lower than the current rates of the money-lenders, the mutual bank is thereon so liberal that it will not have a depressing effect on the current rate of interest. The increase of membership will cease as soon as the current rate has adapted itself to the rate payable to the mutual banks.

We must now assume that the assessments of the mutual banks are substance capitably distributed among their members; otherwise, such banks cannot compete against others who have adopted the more equitable rules. These assessments should not exceed not only the losses of the banks, but also occasional losses; and that such losses should be assessed in proportion to the risk attached to the securities which offer for a faithful reimbursement of his obligation requires here no explanation. But other outlays, such as the making of the notes, together with all the must also be paid by the members of the mutual banks, and this increases the interest virtually payable by the borrowers beyond the rate of risk. Consequently competition will be incompetent to lower the current rate of interest to this desirable point. Money-lenders will therefore still be able to obtain an income from the mere loan of money; but the capital will not be able to return interest to the wealth. The germ of the inequitable condition of wealth will still linger after the introduction of mutual banking.

At this point the question arises as to who should pay for that part of the expenses of the financial system that relates to the production of the money tokens. The answer is not difficult when we consider the benefit of the medium of exchange accrues to those who use it. They should contribute, as near as possible, in the proportion in which their handling with the long and endless cost of production will virtually resolve itself into the cost of re-placement. Not the borrowers, then, who as members of the mutual banks are responsible for the repayment, large, in whose hands the money circulates, are in equity under the obligation of this expense. And to accomplish this I see no way but to elect our representatives to make the notes at public expense, distribute them according to the demand, and charge no cost to the borrower. Such is the rate of risk attached to the securities offered by them.

I should of course never attempt to deny that mutual banking would be by far better than the present oppressive system. But the question at issue is between mutual banking, which would not remove, but only mitigate, the source of involuntary idleness, and a system involving a complete
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Not being at present concerned with the question of the soundness of this view, I will only observe that the writer refutes his own position by the statement that the American "as a whole is built up from the very best and richest variety of ethnological materials. As a composite of Celtic, Slavic, and Teutonic blood, the American people naturally inherit the strengths and hereditary traits that are peculiar to each of the extensive families of the great Aryan race," much as no one can claim that the character of European emigration has at any time verged on selectivity. If I am to understand the high, bresher, and highest to remain at home and refuse the "immigrants,... it is obviously absurd to contend that the blessing has miraculously turned into a curse.

As to the remedy, it will be found in the education of the upper classes of the nation; but since the patrons of all our colleges and universities require "a small quantity and tracery quality of education," and decline to be bothered with ideals and art, "the American government ought to create national intellectual and educational institutions, such as, for instance, the National University of France with all its faculties and colleges disseminated over the whole land, and crowned by a great institute composed of all the intellectual lights."

One thing is certain: the writer is assuredly without the brilliancy of the Celtic blood, the wisdom and polished acuteness of the Latin, or the deepness and patient thoroughness of the Teutonic. Else he would have seen that his proposal conflicts with their desire for the same thing, and with this so-called free government; that the public servants, the legislators, cannot make appropriations for what the masters decide to exclude; and that it is not the business of the nation to raise the intellectual and artistic standards of their people; and yet, they believe their right to do so.

The writer should address himself to the patrons of the colleges and to the youth of the country; he should endeavor to popularize his ideas and to raise the intellectual standard of the people. If he sees no promise of success in this direction, he must appeal to private benevolence.

And besides, dull indeed must be the man who expects encouragement of art from the government. If he has not forgotten all the lessons of experience, he is wise. It is because he never knew them. Government is naturally and constitutionally opposed to everything that is original, fresh, sparkling, or audacious. It invariably clings to the old, the popular, and the regular. But then, I seem to have lost sight of the fact that only those individuals and groups are able to popularize and solicit the protection and aid of authority. The bold, the progressive, the ingenious, and the brilliant delight in a free field and no favors.

v. y.

Principles and Factors of Social Progress.

One often encounters a seemingly plausible argument from which perhap has not received sufficient consideration from our side. It is well known that, with the exception of some few Socialist writers whose mistake of supposing themselves deep philosophers hardly anybody is simple enough to start, such..."...Tarsus! In a state of economic servitude such as the people now endure, it can only be in consequence of a singular shortsightedness that we refuse to apply ourselves to the labor of securing for the helpless masses that economic freedom which is essential to their development; of solving for them that vital problem which they cannot be expected to solve for themselves, or even to properly master and appreciate, in their present oppressed condition; of conquering for them that which they themselves are able to achieve. The proposition that the enslaved masses cannot cultivate any of the
The Best Spirit of the Age.

To: Tucker

Regarding your recent article on the "Way of Re-Order," I find that you have missed the point quite unfortunately. Let me explain.

Firstly, I was truly disappointed at your lack of recognition for the profound implications of the recent technological advancements. These innovations have not only revolutionized our daily lives, but they have also paved the way for unprecedented levels of productivity and efficiency.

Secondly, I do not believe that the spirit of the age can be solely attributed to a single factor. While the presence of technology is undoubtedly a driving force, it is equally important to understand the role of human ingenuity and resourcefulness.

In conclusion, I urge you to reconsider your perspective and acknowledge the multifaceted nature of the current spirit of the age. It is not merely a product of one singular influence but a synthesis of various factors that contribute to its overall essence.

Yours sincerely,

V.Y.
that A is not equal to C, nevertheless A is equal to B because B is equal to C.

Harring its mathematical defect, however, Mr. Lloyd's claim that in a certain case his is the only great mind is quite the virile portion of his letter, but there is an admission of it is as earnest as my dis- sent from it.

My challenge to Mr. Lloyd to name the superiors of the men whom I cited is met by pointing to Darwin, Emerson, and Spencer. Superiors undoubtedly these are in some ways inferior to Mr. Lloyd. Was Darwin a greater poet than Swinburne? Was Emerson a greater economist than Proudhon? Is Spencer a greater artist than Ruskin? I asked to be pointed to men superior as "civilized writers and best representatives." All these men belong in the very front rank, but in different departments. They are all representative of the highest. I said that the great majority of such men (I was very careful not to say off of them) took the combative attitude, from which Mr. Lloyd, it seems, is to maintain the non-combative, he must do so on its intrinsic merits, and not by appeal to the best spirit of the age.

But there is a way of accounting for the gentleness of such men as Darwin, Emerson, and Spencer by reason of the fitness of things rather than by reason of superiority. Such men are essentially men of the cloister. They do not mingle with the world. They do not go to battle. Other men do their fighting for them, and they do some service in support of what others do. And Emerson never left the cloister; consequently they were always gentle. Spencer sometimes leaves it for the battleground, and then he uses the weapons of battle. Proudhon was always in the thick of the fight, and he lived it with his own hands. And so do all great men and true. They do the work that is for them to do in the way that it should be done.

Swinburne's complaint against Carlyle was not a disagreement with him "as to the merit and because of attacking reputations." It was a complaint that Carlyle had attacked where attack was undeserved. This is a question of fact, and as such is unrelated to the issue. I do not think Mr. Lloyd and myself, are dealing with a question of method.

But at last Mr. Lloyd admits that there are times when we must fight; only we should do so reluctantly. That is my ground exactly. I heartily wish that no fighting at all. To fight is not half-heartedness, and, when I see that I must and must fight, I do so with all the force in me. Only in this sense have I any willingness to fight, and I deny that it is accompanied by any willingness to involve. This is the line of attack which is the most clearly and palpably careful as the avoidance of victim. Mr. Lloyd's assertion on this point is on a par in point of accuracy with his next,—that I endorse the system of defaming a man to refute his arguments,—and his next,—that I consider his attack as arbitrary because he is once mistaken. The files of Liberty will show that I have expressly denounced the application of epistles without refutation of arguments, and have asserted that a man is not necessarily a fool because he has written an essay or a book. I am no longer so very heinous offence to attack an opponent, but evidence regards it as a very trivial offense, or rather no offense at all, to distort his utterances.

In conclusion, the best spirit of the age, in my view, is the spirit that would eliminate human errors, not alone by broad teaching and noble example, but by attack properly timed.

As for rebukes of my course, they are always in order. I have only to say to my rebukers: Be sure you are right before you go ahead.

F. Q. Stuart answers a recent paragraph of mine mortifyingly that it is plain that he sees the uncertainty of his ground. I had asked him to specify that half of the equal freedom in which he said cause and effect are not the Anarchists neither recognize nor understand. He says in reply that they content themselves with saying that 'every person has a natural right to do as he wills,' eliminating the additional words, "provided he

infringes not the equal freedom of any other person." This is a very obvious error. In the following statement: Three times four are twelve, provided four times three are not. The Anarchists do not believe in tautology. Does the word ever mean anything to Mr. Stuart? I had also asked him to name a principle which he prizes in their principle in accepting voluntary associations while opposing the State. Before giving this explanation, he wishes some questions answered. Here they are, followed by my respective replies. "1. Do you favor the abolition of the compulsory features of the State?" Answer: Yes. "2. Do you favor the abolition of the compulsory features of the State?" Answer: Yes. "3. What is the State?" Answer: The embodiment of the principle of invasion in an individual, or band of individuals, amounting to as representatives or masters of the entire people within a given area. Now I renew my question. Where is the compromise?

"I am suffering under an avalanche of powerful criticises," says F. Q. Stuart, editor of individualist. "Awful things are said of me and my works, provided in list; "Lum is after me, Tucker is after me, Walker is after me, Pentecost is after me, Lloyd is after me, Yarros is after me." Not so, Stuart; you are after them,—a long way after them.

Mr. Stuart's Stride to Freedom.

Dear Liberty:

I see our friend Stuart of the "Individualist" has been writing. He says it is perfectly true that "individualism" at two years old it seems his unbiased mind reached certain conclusions, and in the main they are his opinions still, and he feels a pardonable satisfaction. It is about a year, as he says, "done little valuable reading during the last time." And after reading Spencer, Andrews, George, and others, he was more strengthened in his belief. He tells of his early experience as a boy which he had as his brother, at least a hundred years. The latter advised him to "drop such lines of thought and turn on his (me) attention to the practical affairs of life." But, says Mr. Stuart, "the cross once shouldered, is not so easily unburdened. There is no halting-place on the road to freedom." And so we are to suppose that it "reached it's freedom." His journey ended. His goal reached. And so we find him where he pitched his tent twelve years ago. And there the "individualist" of the negative government. And over the door-post he would knock the legend, "Freedom." And I thought of the many examples of religious and political zeal, wherein the searchers for freedom had been equally successful, and love positive to all and have been that theirs was the true El Dorado. But the "active radicans of Denver," he says, "advise papers and writers that advocate the total abolition of the State. This I do not advocate. They are opposed to majority rule; I am not. They detest, despise, and abhor the ballot; I do not. They believe 'every one shall have freedom to do as he wills at any time.' I do not. They believe in Anarchism; I do not. From this it appears that Mr. Stuart's "freedom," like that of the greenbough, single-tax, socialistic, and all the rest, is a supposed panacea; which he, as a free individual, might wholly abhor. Good prop. And his individualism is simply that of the independent voter. In another issue he quotes approvingly, and I may say approvingly, Mr. Ingerull: "I am an Anarchist; anarchism is the reaction from tyranny. I am not a Communist. I am not a Socialist. I am an individualist."

Now I have no objection to his presenting his cure-all and labelling it individualism, but I do protest against his definition of a perfectly free man. For, if ignorance is not to be smitten at, it is at least an extenuating circumstance. If he has any knowledge of the philosophy of life, he is aware of this fact. But, he says, "It is not as we looked at Mr. Ingerull's "Anarchism" is simply an ignorant Irishman with a club proclaiming himself "agin the government." Therefore, Mr. Stuart, sickness, put yourself in my place and you will place me in a more ridiculous position still,—as simply fighting the word government, and striving to substitute the word "individualism" in its stead. We are much indebted to our friend of Denver that he needs must accept the advice of King Lear:

Get the glass eyes,
And, like a scrofulous politician, see
To things the seen than that not.

As Mr. Stuart believes in ballot deictics and majority rule, I shall have no little difficulty in "glitch" in to the police of Denver? Are they not the creatures of the ballot? ought he not to "how to the will of the majority?" He has said so, indeed, and he may again be reeled to "the town council of Eau Claire." If we can successfully "catch on" to the political whirligig, we can find our way to the government. While I object to the political methods in as much as they are an invasion of my liberty, I have no objection to Mr. Stuart or any other man acting that way to avenge himself. I am not claiming to be an Anarchist. With Mr. James it is different. I have only contempt for a man who will preach Anarchy and practice police. With me, as I think I had as to be found handling stolen goods or manufacturingurgars' tools as identifying myself in local politics. Mr. Anarchists all told that it did not surprise me. When a man sets out to force people to accept his methods, he may very consistently advocate dynamite when ballots fail. But Mr. Stuart is a man of peace, and believes in this good outlook.

If at first you don't succeed, Try, try again.

Mr. Stuart believes in repealing and forbidding all duty law, leaving the existence altogether. There is one idea very important to the Anarchist, which the philosophy of our friend does not seem to recognize, and that is human justice. To you it is in the idea of a thing that it is a republic: I was a very much more effectually, and carried out much farther than at present.) it might so strengthen its strong arm that a bloody conflict with its usual characteristics of form. It seems to me that such a government, in so far as it has jurisdiction, is as much a denial of individual sovereignty, and thereby to one point of view. The negative idea supposes a perfectly unbiased official, which would be an impossibility. To me hope lies in a decreasing efficiency, and a spreading out of government, until the citizen, constantly breaking through, awakens to the fact that humanity may be trusted to take care of itself and do away with the encumbrance altogether.

The glamour of appeasement so bewilder and deceives that otherwise clear-sighted men, like Mr. Stuart, imagine that freedom may dwell under government. Pollock says: "In a few years, the whole of the world of the state is now limited to that which is absolute, to which all other powers of the State are subject, and which itself is subject to none. This is the great principle of State supremacy, the whole of the world of Bakounine are equally true. A master, whoever he may be, and however liberal he may desire to show himself, is an absolute master. His existence necessarily implies the slavery of all below him... only in one way could it serve human liberty—by ceasing to exist." Let us summarize the principle. Liberty implies individuality. Subject to no surrender, license. In liberty we go; in license we degenerate. Let him ponder the words of Anarchists. Have not the facts shown every time when the time has been given them? Have men ever clung to protection and restraint and officiailism without entangling themselves deeper and deeper into work which they claim "shall we not trust Liberty?" cries Mr. George, and immediately sets out to show "how to do it." Freedom, the watchword of all progress for all things to all men. As a principle it has never been trusted.

Anarchism signifies that trust.

A. L. BALLOU
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