On Picket Duty.

In the "Twentieth Century," under the head of "Anarchist-Communist Notes," it is stated that "the first number of 'Proletarian has been issued at Edinburgh.' Mr. Pentecost's sarcasm is always keen, but this bit of editorial classification is his most delicate thrust.

The Massachusetts legislature, in legalizing the lobby, has adopted the policy of licensing political prostitution. The next thing in order is a Contagious Diseases act providing for the periodical examination of the legislative hall by the aid of some moral speculum yet to be invented. A leading Nationalist of Boston, in answer to a question of a friend of mine, bluntly said that Gronlund's new "work," now running serially in the "Nationalist" and entitled "Our Destiny: the Influence of Nationalism on Morals and Religion," is "worse than nothing." Isn't this "the most unkindest cut of all?" Poor Gronlund! Even the power behind evolution cannot save him from ridicule.

Mr. Pentecost says that the State, in renewing the charter of the Louisiana Lottery, has made a scheme of robbery respectable. As I look at it, the case stands just the other way. The State has made an otherwise respectable scheme a scheme of robbery by endowing it with the dishonest privileges of monopoly. Except in this monopoly feature, wherein is the Louisiana Lottery Company a robber? Does it not do as it agrees? Is that which it agrees to do robbery? In short, is it invasive to be? If so, why?

In response to my article, "Individuals, Sovereignty, Our Goal," the "Open Court" declares that it is not in harmony with Anarchists who think that the laws should be obeyed. The implication is that these words define Liberty's position. Of course they do not. To admit the right of society to do so it pleases is not at all to assert the duty of the individual to acquiesce in society's pleasure. The "Open Court" adds that, in its view, Liberty is not the mother of Order, but Order is the mother of Liberty. I will for an extension of the genealogy. Who or what is the mother of Order?

The editor of the "Twentieth Century" explains that, when he pronounced Nationalism practicable, he meant that it is not theoretically impossible. All right; the explanation is satisfactory. But when the editor further says that practicality does not mean (as I suggested that it might) "conducive to social health and stability," I think he is wrong. The really practical thing is not that which can be established for an hour or a day or a year, but that which does not carry within it the seeds of its own death; in other words, in the case of a proposed form of society, that which is "conducive to social health and stability."

J. M. L. Babcock, opposing freedom in the "Twentieth Century," says: "Money is an order on the matter for labor and to be available to the whole people must stand sponsor for the order." This condition is not necessary. If the order is issued by a now known and trusted 1. the nation, or by a bank known and trusted by the nation, it will be just as available as if the whole people had issued it. Now the claim of the advocates of free banking is that such banking can be so organized that its notes will be as widely known and trusted as the government's. In answer to this Mr. Babcock will probably cite the old State banks, regardless of the fact that those were privileged institutions.

Answering an opponent of free money, Mr. Pentecost declares his willingness that government money should retain its legal tender character, provided the freedom of Tom, Dick, and Harry to issue money is not restricted. I have always considered my confidence in private enterprise equal to the greatest, but such faith in it as Mr. Pentecost's puts me to shame. I confess to serious misgivings as to the circulating power of private currency if it must struggle against the legal tender handicap. When Mr. Pentecost tries to reflect that, while professing to believe in liberty, he grants to the holder of government money the power to levy a forced loan, he will see, I think, that he has gone too far.

In one of his recent Sunday addresses Mr. Pentecost, from the standpoint of materialism and atheism, rationally and vigorously and ruinously….

The pamphlet report of the convention held in Washington last winter to organize the "Woman's National Liberal Union" is a highly interesting document. The call for this convention was issued proffered in the interest of woman's suffrage, but indicated a marked and progressive departure from the old lines of suffrage agitation by inaugurating a bold attack upon the Church as the worst enemy, not only of woman's freedom, but of freedom in general. So intelligently directed was this attack on the part of many of the leaders of the movement that I was unable to reconcile so much appreciation of liberty with a desire to get possession of that instrument of coercion, the ballot. I began to joyfully suspect that some of the women were becoming conscious that the ballot for woman and freedom for woman are two distinct and indeed antagonistic issues, and that this convention was the first indication of the new drift. The suspicion was strengthened when the new organization adopted resolutions and framed a declaration of objects from which all mention of the ballot was significantly omitted. This fact, coupled with many of the sentiments expressed in addresses before the convention and letters sent to it, leads me to believe that the Anarchist leaves that is rampant in the woman suffragists. Indeed, Anarchism is squarely represented in the personnel of the new movement by Voltairine de Cleyre. And in the letter sent by Mrs. Matilde P. Kreckel I find the following affirmation of the egoistic philosophy, or at least of a truth intimate connected with it: "I don't believe much in what you call 'inherent rights,' any more than I believe in what our hard money men call 'intrinsic value.' A right 'inherent' if there is power enough to secure it and vigilance enough to perpetuate it, not otherwise. Natural rights are a phantasm; natural man is a savage. Acquired rights are the product of the civilized process applied to natural man. The report contains much which is true, but I can't for fifty cents from Mrs. Matilda Joelyn Gage, Fayetteville, New York.

"A Debate in Rhyme."

(Two Free Lives.)

Shall life or free speech be, Shall each do as he will, Or shall we heed to order'd Law, And live united still?

Regard our neighbors, and ourselves, In every act of life, Or you will act for yourself, And hope there'll be no strife.

One third of us are infants yet, Another three are fools, And how will these misguided go Without eternal rules?

But rules without some penalty Have never yet failed, Hence, as it seems, a sad free life Has hitherto prevailed.

REPLY.

Dear lady, if thou dost not live two-thirds Are infants or are fools. 'Tis plain this very same two-thirds Must give the world its rules.

So don't you think the wise plan Is safe with rule? But fool and wise should be content Each one to go his way.

Editor of The Free Life.
An Enemy of Society.

ACT IV.

[Uncorked from No. 161.]

Ah, listen. The chairman expects the speaker to withdraw his churchman's remark.

Burr. Now, Mr. Auckram. For it is this great majority of our society that robs me of my freedom, and wants to forbid me to speak the truth.

Burr. It is the principle of the majority. Billings. Yes, and the truth too, God bless me!

Dr. Stockmam. The majority is never right. Never, I say. I see no evidence that a large majority does anything to the foolish folk near at hand, or present, in a terribly overwhelming majority all around us and about us the wide world over. But, devil take it, it can surely do those things that have been done by the vast majority. (Noise and shouts.) Yes, yes, you don't annoy me, but you cannot satisfy me. The majority has no sense, has no feeling, no understanding. (To Burr.) You are a passion for a bad passion.

Burr. The minority is always right. (Much noise again.)

Hosted. Hey! No, no! Dr. Stockmam has turned aristocrat since the day after yesterday!

Dr. Stockmam. I have said that I will not waste a word on the little, narrow-chested, short-minded lie that is be- ing debated among you. For you people cannot understand us. All the issues in this discussion are clear and plain. But I think of the few individuals among us who have made all the new evolutions of their tribe of their own. These men stand at the crossroads of the roads and the bed of the ground, that the society is in the majority. What sort of truths are those that the major- ity is wont to take up? Truths for all the world of the world's truths. It is the only way to become a lie, gentlemen. (Laughter and interruption.) Yes, yes, you may believe me or not; but truths are by no means truths in the way in which the people think them. A normally-constituted truth lives — let me say — as a rule, seventeen or eighteen years, at the outside twenty years, seldom longer. But a lie lives for always and forever. (Laughter and interruption.) Yet it is only then that the majority takes a hold upon us and recognizes us as the only society we know. But I cannot recognize this society; I know nothing about it. All these majority-truths are as last year's salt pork; they are like rotten salt pork, producing all the morbid peril that destroys society.

Hosted. It seems to me that the honorable speaker is wandering very considerably from the subject.

Burr. Excuse me, I quite agree with the chairman.

Dr. Stockmam. I really think you quite mad, Peter! I am keeping as closely to the subject as I possibly can, for when I speak upon a subject — that is, when I speak upon a subject that is not the majority, the 0-1 compact majority — it is I, I say, who are poisoning our spiritual life, and making pestilential the greatest mischief of this world.

Hosted. And this the great, independent majority of the people do, just because they are sensible enough to reserve everything possible for the majority.

Dr. Stockmam. Ah! my dear Mr. Hosted, don't talk so glibly about our truths! The truths acknowledged by the uncles, the truths that are acknowledged by the majority, that 0-1 compact majority — it is I, I say, who are poisoning our spiritual life, and making pestilential the greatest mischief of this world.

Hosted. But instead of all this vague talk it would be more interesting to learn what are these old, true life truths for which you are living up to the last. Only a small number of the people think as you do, do you not think? And that the vulgar herd, the masses, are the pith of the people — that, indeed, they are the people — that is, the true men that the common man, that man of ideals, that man of the force of the nation, that man of the force of the world — this is the vulgar herd, and that the vulgar herd is the pith of the people. (Noise and shouts.) Hosted, Hosted, Hosted! (Shouting at the same time.) Citizens, please note that.

Dr. Stockmam. Ah! I couldn't go over the whole heap of abominations; but, to begin with, I'll just keep to one particular truth which I think better, and know better, than which, the all the —

Burr. Hosted, the Messenger, and all afterdr. (shout live upon.

Hosted. And so —

Dr. Stockmam. ... the doctrine that you have inherited from our forefathers — and that you liberally proclaim with a loud voice — the doctrine that the state, the vulgar herd, the masses, are the pith of the people — that, indeed, they are the people — that is, the common man, that man of ideals, that man of the force of the nation, that man of the force of the world — this is the vulgar herd, and that the vulgar herd is the pith of the people.

Burr. We don't care! (Noise and shouts.) Hosted, Hosted! (Shouting at the same time.) citizens, please note that.

Dr. Stockmam. And so —

Hosted. (Dining at the same time.) Citizens, please note that.

Dr. Stockmam. And so the doctrine that you have inherited from our forefathers, and that you liberally proclaim with a loud voice — the doctrine that the state, the vulgar herd, the masses, are the pith of the people — that, indeed, they are the people — that is, the common man, that man of ideals, that man of the force of the nation, that man of the force of the world — this is the vulgar herd, and that the vulgar herd is the pith of the people.

Hosted. (Dining at the same time.) Citizens, please note that.

Dr. Stockmam. And so the doctrine that you have inherited from our forefathers, and that you liberally proclaim with a loud voice — the doctrine that the state, the vulgar herd, the masses, are the pith of the people — that, indeed, they are the people — that is, the common man, that man of ideals, that man of the force of the nation, that man of the force of the world — this is the vulgar herd, and that the vulgar herd is the pith of the people.

Hosted. (Dining at the same time.) Citizens, please note that.

Dr. Stockmam. And so the doctrine that you have inherited from our forefathers, and that you liberally proclaim with a loud voice — the doctrine that the state, the vulgar herd, the masses, are the pith of the people — that, indeed, they are the people — that is, the common man, that man of ideals, that man of the force of the nation, that man of the force of the world — this is the vulgar herd, and that the vulgar herd is the pith of the people.

Hosted. (Dining at the same time.) Citizens, please note that.

Dr. Stockmam. And so the doctrine that you have inherited from our forefathers, and that you liberally proclaim with a loud voice — the doctrine that the state, the vulgar herd, the masses, are the pith of the people — that, indeed, they are the people — that is, the common man, that man of ideals, that man of the force of the nation, that man of the force of the world — this is the vulgar herd, and that the vulgar herd is the pith of the people.

Hosted. (Dining at the same time.) Citizens, please note that.

Dr. Stockmam. And so the doctrine that you have inherited from our forefathers, and that you liberally proclaim with a loud voice — the doctrine that the state, the vulgar herd, the masses, are the pith of the people — that, indeed, they are the people — that is, the common man, that man of ideals, that man of the force of the nation, that man of the force of the world — this is the vulgar herd, and that the vulgar herd is the pith of the people.

Hosted. (Dining at the same time.) Citizens, please note that.

Dr. Stockmam. And so the doctrine that you have inherited from our forefathers, and that you liberally proclaim with a loud voice — the doctrine that the state, the vulgar herd, the masses, are the pith of the people — that, indeed, they are the people — that is, the common man, that man of ideals, that man of the force of the nation, that man of the force of the world — this is the vulgar herd, and that the vulgar herd is the pith of the people.

Hosted. (Dining at the same time.) Citizens, please note that.

Dr. Stockmam. And so the doctrine that you have inherited from our forefathers, and that you liberally proclaim with a loud voice — the doctrine that the state, the vulgar herd, the masses, are the pith of the people — that, indeed, they are the people — that is, the common man, that man of ideals, that man of the force of the nation, that man of the force of the world — this is the vulgar herd, and that the vulgar herd is the pith of the people.

Hosted. (Dining at the same time.) Citizens, please note that.

Dr. Stockmam. And so the doctrine that you have inherited from our forefathers, and that you liberally proclaim with a loud voice — the doctrine that the state, the vulgar herd, the masses, are the pith of the people — that, indeed, they are the people — that is, the common man, that man of ideals, that man of the force of the nation, that man of the force of the world — this is the vulgar herd, and that the vulgar herd is the pith of the people.
The Modern Maid of Orleans.

The following letter from Charlotte J. Thomas, of Portland, Me., is printed in the report of the convention held in Washington last winter by the liberty-loving wing of the woman's rights party:

Summary legislation is death to individual growth or action. I believed thoroughly in the "Mass Law" for many years; have been a prohibitionist; but when I saw Miss Willard's followers working should to shoulder for a "Sunday Best" law, as they call it, with Cardinal Gibbons and the Roman Priests; and also with the old blue laws that we once had in the constitution, making a real union of Church and State, I began to carefully consider my position on the prohibition question, and I found that it was the same as it was in the anti-Catholic procession principle. If you may regulate a person's private conduct in one respect, you may in all respects, until you take his or her freedom entirely away. The drift of church effort is now towards religious coercion by law to force conscience. For give me as much clery as a monopoly at least one-seventh of the time and to stop all other business on the day they propose to monopolize. I am convinced we can restore the liberty of conscience to the blue laws which we had, as it was supposed outgrown. The church saw its chance and went over in the body to the G.W. C. T. U. Sen. and state papers. Senator Blair of New Hampshire, has united with Miss Willard, making a powerful party, to strike down Republican institutions in this country, to have the church in power so as to establish complete temporal power and are ready to help Blair and Will "hard put the knife to the throat of Protestantism", as they claim, in the land of the civil power in behalf of church interests. The central idea of protestantism is left out, which is, right of individ¬ual conscience to conscience. The entire protestant principle is surrendered and lost, and the United States become Roman Catholic in principle, and it will not be unless the church is bent on the total destruction of a great woman, of great heart, but in my opinion does not see the evil of taking away individual freedom and putting this great nation into another war of greater horror and destruc¬tion to this republic, and taking us back to a state of monararchy. She finds the potteries of the church, pro¬testant and Catholic, at her feet. She finds herself the head and the leader of adorning millions of men and women who have been "reduced by the blood of Christ," and imagines herself his favorite wife for the recreation and salvation of the world. She is drunk with the visions of good she is to be instrumed to do; the great results of the church and his true and his holy char¬isms of kindness! (Cheers.) The meeting is dissolved! (No lessence.)

Bidding: Three cheers for the chairman!

All. Hurrah for President Asklen.

Dr. Stockmann. My hat and cape, Petra, Captain, have you got it on? (Yells out.)

Petra. For you and yours, doctor, we make room.

Dr. Stockmann. (while Petra helps him on his coat.) Good! Come, Kristina, come, he is the doctor (He gives his wife his arm.)

Mrs. Stockmann. (in a low voice). Dear Thomas, let us go out by the back way.

Dr. Stockmann. No back ways, Kristina! (In a louder voice.) You shall hear of the enemy of the people before the joke from the doors! I'm not gc, not as a certain person: I don't say, I forgive you, for you know not what you do.

Alien (shouting after them as they go out). Enemy of the people! Ips of the people! Enemy of the people!

Bidding. Will, God bless me if I'd drink toady at Doctor Stockmann's stock-jitght!

(The people throng toward the door; the noise is heard throughout the house.)
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The strength. I do not understand that he either admits or denies their soundness. If he sees unsoundness in them, he would point it out, instead of calling for proofs already in his hands. Unless he does so, his charge that the Anarchist becomes too much of a boomerang. Anarchism’s claim that certain economic changes would follow the disappearance of all government limitations of the freedom of the market, and that these changes would amount to a transformation of society into something quite different from what we now see, is a (not sudden) substitution of voluntary laws where force now prevails, — this is the problem that the editor of “Today” must tackle if he wishes to discuss Anarchism in earnest.

Liberty, Labor, and the State.

“Today” occupies considerable space with an attempt to answer a recent Liberty paragraph in criticism of its characterizing members of labor organizations as “slaves by nature.” In the first place, the editor objects “to the implication which excludes ‘Today’ from all right to a place in the list” of champions of labor. I might explain that no such implication was intended, and that the attack was directed against an error of judgment, not one of sympathy. But it is perhaps true that the opportunity evaded by the objection, and express a few thoughts on the general position and policy of “Today” and the journals akin to it, such as “Free Life” and the “Personal Rights Journal.”

All these journals usually advocate individualism and vigorously combat State Socialism. In the main, they coincide with the teaching of the Anarchists. Yet firmly believe that they will exert very little influence and gain very little, in the event of agencies that shall arrest the present tendency of the people to look and walk backward and determine a healthy change in their dispositions and ideas. I believe that theirs will remain a voice crying in the wilderness, and that the present political scramble has not only no power to cause them to fear? Why? Because they do not appreciate properly the exact position of the enemy and do not see where his peculiar strength lies and where his weakness they fight to exhaustion without inflicting upon the enemy any material injury, and their most heroic efforts cannot fail, if these tactics continue, to advance and triumph. State Socialism is strong and is growing stronger and stronger in consequence of the intolerable economic conditions which prevail and the poverty which oppresses the toiling masses. The tollers will not and ought not to submit to such an economic condition as the present, with its starvation wages, involuntary idleness for thousands of men, the only way out of this state that indicated by the State Socialists; they flock around that standard not because they thoroughly admire it, but because they see no other ultimate hope of liberty, independence, dignity, is to waste energy. Can they be expected to be impressed with the moral and philosophical argumentation of “Today” or of the “Free Life,” when even Mill, who certainly understands and feels the value of liberty and well; and all there is to be advanced on that side, declared that the Communist system was preferable to the present, which unjustly condemns masses of honest and industrious men and degrading work? Personally I dissent from Mill and Mr. Tucker, would rather choose (were it necessary to make this choice) to live in a society resembling our own than to be a member of a slave society organized on the Communist basis of personal liberty and well.

Can they be expected to be impressed with the moral and philosophical argumentation of “Today” or of the “Free Life,” when even Mill, who certainly understands and feels the value of liberty and well? and all there is to be advanced on that side, declared that the Communist system was preferable to the present, which unjustly condemns masses of honest and industrious men and degrading work? Personally I dissent from Mill and Mr. Tucker, would rather choose (were it necessary to make this choice) to live in a society resembling our own than to be a member of a slave society organized on the Communist basis of personal liberty and well.

Can they be expected to be impressed with the moral and philosophical argumentation of “Today” or of the “Free Life,” when even Mill, who certainly understands and feels the value of liberty and well? and all there is to be advanced on that side, declared that the Communist system was preferable to the present, which unjustly condemns masses of honest and industrious men and degrading work? Personally I dissent from Mill and Mr. Tucker, would rather choose (were it necessary to make this choice) to live in a society resembling our own than to be a member of a slave society organized on the Communist basis of personal liberty and well. -

A Recall to the Real Issue.

The editor of “Today,” complaining that Liberty does not respond to its repeated calls for evidence in favor of Anarchism, expresses his willingness to listen. To an argument to show that ‘government is the father of all evil, and of nothing but evil, as the Anarchists of course believe.” I can assure him that he will never hear any such argument from Liberty. The editor of Liberty is not in the habit of attempting to prove things that he has not asserted and does not desire. All of the beliefs that are tacitly attributed to Anarchists are logically essential to the truth of Anarchism. One may admit that there are some evils in the world which are not traceable to government and some of government are not without their good results without impairing in the least the validity of the proposition that government had better be abolished.

As to Liberty’s inattention to the questions and criticisms of “Today,” I submit that, despite the outward show of reason for the editor’s complaint, the boast is really on the other leg. The many disavowals and admissions (it is needless to describe them) under which Liberty is edited and published often cause the editor to pass unnoticed and finally disappear in the distance. This is my excuse to the editor of “Today” for my remissness. But if he really desires to discuss with me the fundamental claims, which I shall do with pleasure, I refer him to the papers under which Liberty is edited and published.

The question which we who desire personal liberty and oppose State Socialism have to settle before we enter the arena is, whether we are prepared to affirm that the laborer and to demonstrate that the laborer and give him the full fruit of his labor; that the present absurd and iniquitous economic condition is the result of State interference to be removed to better with its cause; that liberty alone is essential to the development of a system which should satisfy our reason and moral nature. Anarchists claim to be able to support this affirmation, and therefore they have been able to overcome the opposition of those who oppose the system against the existing system. If “Today” and the “Free Life” do not feel warranted in seconding the Anarchists, they can accomplish very little by dwelling upon the abuses of the great social problems. Anarchists claim to have reduced their economic position, at the same time urging them to duly study it first.

“Today” recently criticized Dr. Wayland for saying that the Yankee country cannot get the little boys to work more than ten hours. Yet Liberty is bold enough to come to the side of the doctor and emphatically protest that a country in which such things exist is not free. And Liberty’s conception of a free country does not differ from that of Thorold Rogers, “the legions of the working classes is the direct and deliberate world of politicians and law-makers.” “Today” has recently denied that “the inequality which exists has evolved mainly from the connection of men with industrial matters,” but it does not admit that the interference has been the chief cause of the inequality. It is to be hoped that the journals mentioned will investigate the matter and form a decided opinion as to the real causes of the present inequality and slavery of the toiling masses. If the opinion turns out to be similar to ours, well and good; if antagonistic, we stand ready to defend our ground; but we do not intend to be end in the same corner and futile talk of its and perhaps, it is tiresome.

Coming now to the main question in dispute, I find that “Today” endeavors to make a two-fold answer to Liberty’s criticism. Firstly, it says in effect that the aspect of trades-unions to which it took exception was not at all the act of voluntary cooperation for defence against the encroachments of capital, but the tyranny exercised over non-members and members. This answer will not be found. The language used plainly conveyed. Not a syllable do I find in reference to the “encroachments of those voluntarily associated upon the personal freedom” of non-members.

The piece in question lamented the readiness with which the workingmen of the trades-unions and the dictation of the walking-delegates, and described the workmen who thus "bar their liberty for a mess of pottage" as "modern Esau" and "slaves by nature." The implication clearly was that free men, those not slaves by nature, would not identify themselves with such unions. And to this I objected, averring that irresistible necessity drives men into unions, and that the very freest among mortals must belong to unions in obedience to the prime law of self-preservation. True, “Today” denies that in this country “the lives of those who unite in trades-unions are usually at stake,” but as long as those who work in trades-unions hold the definitive opinion of the country, they are not to be stigmatized as slaves by nature, however much we may deem them mistaken in their pessimistic view of their present condition and future prospects. It is to be added that, withprising, belonging to unions in obedience to the prime

---
unionists only. If "Today" had said that all those who will to tyranny can be bought by nature, Liberty would not have raised this quarelling, as it is true that there exists an irreparable necessity for workingmen to unite at the cost of independence to fight the capitalists. The States are as much at the expense of the masses — the workers, as of the sufferers — the people. The consequence is that under Anarchist nobody would know to whom a piece of property belonged, and nobody would understand how it was to be transferred. Anarchist tends generally define property by use and possession; that is, whoever uses and possesses an object is the owner of it, and he is entitled to it as well as any one else. The leads to the property, and the law to the use of it. Thus set each free may secure protection in the possession of any amount up to ten acres after January 1 by appearing on December 15 at a certain hour and paying one dollar for each year of occupation. Now, says Mr. Herbert, the scramble will begin. Well, perhaps it will. But what of it? When a theatre advertises to sell seats for a star performance at a certain hour, there is a scramble to secure tickets. If a provincial city announces that on a given day it will accept loans from individuals up to a certain aggregate on attractive terms, there is a scramble to secure the bonds. As far as I know, nobody complains of these scrambles as unfair. The scramble begins, and the scramble ends, and the matter is settled. Some inequality still remains, but it has been reduced to a minimum, and everybody has had an equal chance with the rest. So it will with the scramble. The scramble is no more, qualitatively as any other scramble, and those who are frightened by the word are simply the victims of a huge bugbear.

And the terror of rigidity is equally groundless. The idea of a ten-acre property, or any similar one that may be adopted, is no more a rigid crystalline custom than is Mr. Herbert's own rule of protective titles transferred by purchase and sale. Any rule is rigid by the rigidity of its terms than by the way it is enforced. Now it is precisely in the tempering of the rigidity of enforcement that one of the chief excellences of Anarchism consists. Mr. Herbert must remember that under Anarchist there are no formal suggestions for the guidance of juries, and that all difficulties whether about land or anything else, will be submitted to the law, the justices, the penalty to the given circumstances, and the penalty or damage to be inflicted because of its infraction. What better safeguard against rigidity could there be than this? "Machinery for altering" the law, indeed! Why, under Anarchist the law will be so flexible that it will shape itself to every case and need and not be altered. And it will then be regarded as just in proportion to its flexibility, instead of as now in proportion to its rigidity.

As to the letter to me, written when he was contemplating the establishment of "The Free Life," Mr. Herbert proposed that, in case of any friendly discussion between his journal and mine, each should reprint all that the other might say. Mr. Herbert will observe that I have been prompt to act upon his suggestion, and I have no doubt that he will reciprocate so as to be fit to make rejoinder in the present instance.

"Today's" Departure from Spencer.

Not long since "Today" professed to believe that "scientifically the conclusion that Anarchism is the ideal is valuable; the facts which lead to the conclusion show the utter futility of Socialism,—tear the mask from every face of that hydra-headed failure." But now it appears that "Today" has been much more candid than sincere, and that what it proclaims in terms of a valuable thing is very barren, or a very barren thing valuable. "Today" has undergone an important change of opinion within the last few months. Moreover, the new view is radically incorrect. In the following, we will show that "Today" is far in advance of practicality though it may be, it is always needful for right guidance. Since a need-

Property under Anarchism.

The current objection to Anarchism that it would throw property titles and especially land titles into hopeless confusion has originated an interesting discussion in "The Free Life" between Auberon Herbert, the editor, and Albert Tarn, an Anarchist correspondent. Mr. Tarn is substantially right in the position that he takes; his weakness lies in confining himself to assertion, — a weakness of which Mr. Herbert is very fondly afraid.

Mr. Tarn's letter is as follows:

To the Editor of The Free Life:

Sir,—In your article "The Great Question of Property" in the last number of "The Free Life," you speak of the Anarchist position as involving "endless chain of absolute customs very difficult to alter, or "some perpetually recurring custom of society." It is strange that you can attribute to Anarchists just the weaknesses that characterize our present property system. Why, it is now that we have "land cr.inality" pure and simple.

Anarchists, above all, though in favor of free competition, are averse to the eternal scramble which is now going on for the privileges which legal money and legal property confer, overcome the advantage of the masses.

Anarchists would sweep away such privileges, and, there being no longer any chance of obtaining them, people would be able to retain what they earn. There would be little or no straitened property, no revolu-

tionary movements to try to get hold of it, no taxes, no licences of any kind, and wages would return only to the workshop and counting-house, but in the political field, are caused by the stupid laws of property and money, which result in a never-ending scramble.

Anarchism means peace, it means everyone getting what's his own worth and no more, — so thi.ing at all, neither by land-

ownership or by wages. The one is as uncertain as the other, but the one is the result of a law, and the other of a free scramble.

The law would be slow, no more than the workshop and counting-house, but in the political field, are caused by the stupid laws of property and money, which result in a never-ending scramble.

Anarchists mean peace, it means everyone getting what's his own worth and no more, — so thi.ing at all, neither by land-

ownership or by wages. The one is as uncertain as the other, but the one is the result of a law, and the other of a free scramble.

In Mr. Herbert's rejoinder the case against Anarchism is exceptionally well put, and for this reason among others:

It is not enough for our correspondent, Mr. Tarn, to say that Anarchism "does away with scrumble; we want to know what the law and the why." Any contention is that under the law of the free man, everybody knows, first, who owns a piece of property, and, secondly, the conditions under which property can be acquired. All is clear and definite, and businessness is worth far more to the human race in the long run than any temporal advantage to be gained by forcible interferences with the law.

Mr. Tarn seems to me to be quite right. Anarchism is only "a recognition of the law," as he says. It is not a new thing that under Anarchism nobody would know to whom a piece of property belonged, and nobody would understand how it was to be transferred. Anarchism tends generally define property by use and possession; that is, whoever uses and possesses an object is the owner of it, and he is entitled to it as well as any one else. The leads to the property, and the law to the use of it. Thus set each free may secure protection in the possession of any amount up to ten acres after January 1 by appearing on December 15 at a certain hour and paying one dollar for each year of occupation. Now, says Mr. Herbert, the scramble will begin. Well, perhaps it will. But what of it? When a theatre advertises to sell seats for a star performance at a certain hour, there is a scramble to secure tickets. If a provincial city announces that on a given day it will accept loans from individuals up to a certain aggregate on attractive terms, there is a scramble to secure the bonds. As far as I know, nobody complains of these scrambles as unfair. The scramble begins, and the scramble ends, and the matter is settled. Some inequality still remains, but it has been reduced to a minimum, and everybody has had an equal chance with the rest. So it will with the scramble. The scramble is no more, qualitatively as any other scramble, and those who are frightened by the word are simply the victims of a huge bugbear.

And the terror of rigidity is equally groundless. The idea of a ten-acre property, or any similar one that may be adopted, is no more a rigid crystalline custom than is Mr. Herbert's own rule of protective titles transferred by purchase and sale. Any rule is rigid by the rigidity of its terms than by the way it is enforced. Now it is precisely in the tempering of the rigidity of enforcement that one of the chief excellences of Anarchism consists. Mr. Herbert must remember that under Anarchist there are no formal suggestions for the guidance of juries, and that all difficulties whether about land or anything else, will be submitted to the law, the justices, the penalty to the given circumstances, and the penalty or damage to be inflicted because of its infraction. What better safeguard against rigidity could there be than this? "Machinery for altering" the law, indeed! Why, under Anarchist the law will be so flexible that it will shape itself to every case and need and not be altered. And it will then be regarded as just in proportion to its flexibility, instead of as now in proportion to its rigidity.

As to the letter to me, written when he was contemplating the establishment of "The Free Life," Mr. Herbert proposed that, in case of any friendly discussion between his journal and mine, each should reprint all that the other might say. Mr. Herbert will observe that I have been prompt to act upon his suggestion, and I have no doubt that he will reciprocate so as to be fit to make rejoinder in the present instance.
Unscientific Socialism.

Next we have to examine Marxian, or "scientific" Socialism. Do we debts the modern visionaries and utopists whom I have been considering are simply reviving, with slight and few modifications, the ideas of the old pre-Marxian sentimentalists and philanthropists. I do not need to remind the pre-Marxian sentimentalists and philanthropists of the marxian struggle, and are beginning to make definite common cause between one or other of the inferior schools whom the master so vehemently as I intolerantly denounced in his "Communist Manifesto." And even aside from this trachery, a strong - lency may be observed on the part of the marxianists, reconstituted successors of marx to emancipate their movement from all distinctively and characteristically marxian conceptions and tenets. This is true of England as well as of America.

Kirkup and other socialist writers declare that nothing in Marx's work is of any value and use today except his extraordinary picture of modern industrialism and his survey of capitalist history, which means that his theories are of no value. Very few there are, among admirers no less than among antagonists, who have subjected themselves to the irksome strain of studying "Capital." Those who have read the "Manifesto," know the whole law and spirit of Marxian socialism. But it may be well to present here a few extracts from the book which has been styled with pride the Bible of Modern Socialism - those containing the quintessence of Marx's method and some of the claims, formerly made by so many of the ablest socialists, in its name, and the dedications drawn from it, are at all justifiable.

The present capitalist system differs from others in that the producers of wares do not produce for social consumption, nor for the purpose of direct exchange of their products against products of others which they need for consumption, but for the sake of profit. In other words, those who possess capital are the masters of all business concerns with a view to selling them to consumers for a sum of money that shall compensate them for all the labor embodied in the manufactured article and in addition amass some profit. The question is, whence comes that profit, or the surplus value?

Marx postulates free competition, and accepts the Ricardoian theory of value. Those who are familiar with the simple and lucid statement of Ricardo cannot but feel disgusted at Marx's metaphysical tricks in his superfluous chapters on value. The exchange value of anything capable of being produced indefinitely tends to become equal to the cost of producing it, to the amount of labor socially necessary to produce it. But, says Marx, if this almost self-evident theory of value is accepted, there is plainly no possibility of surplus value, or profits, which is not payment for labor performed, but pure gain. The capitalist who begins with money and studies it, as he must, and this is what all capitalists do, cannot obtain any profit from the mere purchase or the sale of commodities.
The value of labor-power resolves itself into the value of a definite quantity of the means of subsistence; the minimum limit of the value of labor-power is determined by the value of the commodities which labor-power is capable of purchasing. The value of labor-power, the latter is its use-value. The fact that half a day's labor is necessary to keep the laborer alive during twenty-four hours does not in any way prove the existence of this minimum. It is not the value of a day's labor-power that has value; his, therefore, is the use of it for a day; a day's labor belongs to him. He finds in the workshop the means of production necessary for working, not only during six, but during twelve hours; as during the six hours' process 10 lbs. of cotton absorbed six hours' labor and became 10 lbs. of yarn, so now 20 lbs. of cotton will absorb 12 hours labor and will be changed into 20 lbs. of yarn. Of the various commodities that enter into the process of producing the yarn amounts to 27 shillings. The value of the yarn is 30 shillings. Therefore the value of the product is one-ninth higher than the value advanced for its production; 27 shillings have been transformed into 30 shillings; a surplus-value of 3 shillings has been created.

This fact ascertained, we must realize that "the conditions of production are also those of reproduction." Then the surplus-value, or capital in its process of reproduction will be reproduced. If this revenue [surplus-value] serves the capitalist only as a fund to provide for his consumption, and be spent as periodically as it is gained, the process of production is complete. To accumulate it is necessary to convert a portion of the surplus product into capital. It is the old story: Abraham begat Isaac, Isaac begat Jacob, and so on. The original [capital] of £10,000 in a surplus-value £5,000, which is capitalized. The new capital of £20,000 brings in a surplus-value of £10,000, and this too is capitalized, which in turn produces a further surplus-value of £20,000.

Having looked into the Marxian analysis of the process of extracting surplus value, we may now come to the last link of his argumentative chain and see how he proceeds to terminate this process, how he deduces the law of value and the revolution of society, as he is known to have favored. We shall not find much; on the positive, constructive side of the question he says but little, and that little is the opposite of clear; but those few pages are the most characteristic of the "scientific" Socialist. The obscurity and indefiniteness of Marx has naturally helped to sustain the claim of profundity and nessness. When we know what his arguments are we can pass judgment upon the whole "science."

"Within the capitalist system all methods for raising the social productivity of labor are brought about at the cost of the individual laborer; all means for the development of production transform themselves into means of domination over, and exploitation of, the producers. It follows therefore that in proportion as capital accumulates, the lot of the laborer, be his payment high or low, must grow worse. The law . . . that always equilibrates the relative surplus-value, plus the relative surplus-energy of accumulation . . . establishes an accumulation of misery corresponding with the accumulation of capital." Along with the constantly diminishing number of the magnates of capital, who measure the monopolistic conversations in itself an embodiment of labor, and consequently a creation of value. The owner of money has found on the market such a special commodity in capacity for labor or hire, that labor itself becomes a mere means. "But the just laborer is in itself labor-power, and the living labor that he can call into action, the daily cost of maintaining it, and its daily expenditure in work, are two totally different things. The former determines the exchange-value of the labor-power, the latter is its use-value. The fact that half a day's labor is necessary to keep the laborer alive during twenty-four hours does not in any way prove the existence of this minimum. It is not the value of a day's labor-power that has value; his, therefore, is the use of it for a day; a day's labor belongs to him. He finds in the workshop the means of production necessary for working, not only during six, but during twelve hours; as during the six hours' process 10 lbs. of cotton absorbed six hours' labor and became 10 lbs. of yarn, so now 20 lbs. of cotton will absorb 12 hours labor and will be changed into 20 lbs. of yarn. Of the various commodities that enter into the process of producing the yarn amounts to 27 shillings. The value of the yarn is 30 shillings. Therefore the value of the product is one-ninth higher than the value advanced for its production; 27 shillings have been transformed into 30 shillings; a surplus-value of 3 shillings has been created.

This fact ascertained, we must realize that "the conditions of production are also those of reproduction." Then the surplus-value, or capital in its process of reproduction will be reproduced. If this revenue [surplus-value] serves the capitalist only as a fund to provide for his consumption, and be spent as periodically as it is gained, the process of production is complete. To accumulate it is necessary to convert a portion of the surplus product into capital. It is the old story: Abraham begat Isaac, Isaac begat Jacob, and so on. The original [capital] of £10,000 in a surplus-value £5,000, which is capitalized. The new capital of £20,000 brings in a surplus-value of £10,000, and this too is capitalized, which in turn produces a further surplus-value of £20,000.

Having looked into the Marxian analysis of the process of extracting surplus value, we may now come to the last link of his argumentative chain and see how he proceeds to terminate this process, how he deduces the law of value and the revolution of society, as he is known to have favored. We shall not find much; on the positive, constructive side of the question he says but little, and that little is the opposite of clear; but those few pages are the most characteristic of the "scientific" Socialist. The obscurity and indefiniteness of Marx has naturally helped to sustain the claim of profundity and nessness. When we know what his arguments are we can pass judgment upon the whole "science."
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