On Picket Duty.

Elizabeth Cady Stanton, in an address at the annual meeting of the Personal Rights Association, held in London June 25, said: "I do not believe in compulsory education, but I do believe in free schools." That is to say, Mrs. Stanton does not believe in compelling people to educate their own children, but she does believe in compelling them to educate other people's children. This logic (paragon me, Mrs. Stanton) is truly feminine.

"The Rag-Picker of Paris" is now in book-form. Though it has been published but a week, I have already sold 4,000 copies, and the third printing is being pressed. It is destined to have an enormous sale and to exercise an enormous influence. Every reader of Liberty who fails to follow it as a serial will now cease to read it, and everyone who reads it in the paper will have only a greater desire to own the volume.

The price is one dollar for the cloth edition and fifty cents for the paper edition. See the advertisement in another column.

"Government," says the editor of "Today" in summarizing up the "conditions that have been realized," must be considered as having been ever, in all its branches, political, religious, and ceremonial, beneficial and indeed absolutely necessary. I deny that any such conclusion has ever been reached, and would like to tell him to go to the principles of the "Rag-Picker of Paris." In this connection, Mr. Yarros' article on "Ameri- canism vs. Legalism," reprinted in this issue from the "Twentieth Century," will prove suggestive, as it deals with a notion very similar to the one expressed in the above quotation.

People are asking themselves in wonder how it is that the only distinctly laborive paper of Boston, the "Labor Leader," which claims to champion the rights and interests of the workingmen and to fight monopoly and political corruption, has not: "...word about the revelations of the tactics of the Boston legal, carcass, lobbyist, and monopolist made in the recent State House investigations. Is it because one or two of the self-styled labor advocates have benefited by the present methods of securing legislation? Is it because the interests of labor and of monopoly often strangely coincide in the action of "labor—lobbyists?"

"Was not your wife an eccentric person?" asked Lawyer William M. Evans of Witness Stephen Pearl Andrews in the Beecher-Tilton trial. "I never thought so," was the reply. "But would she not have been considered eccentric by an ordinary person?" persisted the lawyer. "That depends on how ordinary a person you mean," came the quick rejoinder. I was reminded of this "delightful" retort when I read in L. M. H.'s letter (published in another column) that the "Beacon" is intelligible to an ordinary person, while Liberty is not. Given a sufficiently ordinary person, and I have no doubt the statement is correct.

If one doubts that the single-tax slogan is playing the role of politics' side of the debate in the last number of the "Century." If there is to be found anywhere in the writings of students another excuse argument so shallow, ignorant, wild, hypo-
Anarchism versus Legality.

(Victor Yvan in the Twentieth Century.)

The article on "How Far Are We All Anarchists Even Now?" from the pen of C. D. Cambodia I (the "Rev. no. 1, no. 2, etc.), has recently appeared in the "Twentieth Century" of June 21st. It is so eloquent and philosophically shrewd that I cannot forbear extracting a few sentences for the benefit of all really independent thinkers. In the "Twentieth Century" of June 21st it is said: "Your judgment of government has been or is to educe men as fast as possible of legalese up into acting right freely for themselves." It is not easy to believe in the veracity of this statement. We discuss the political and social superstitions that render us submissive to authority, and we begin to view the whole thing in another way, by the light of the Enlightenment. The phrase "are numbered, not because the governments of today are ready to grant us individual liberty, but because we have discovered that there is no better in theory or practice than other forms of tyranny.

The Anarchists ignore government pending the time when it becomes a necessary evil, and agree with Mr. Kibal feeling that "it is not necessary to abolish or repel existing laws. They are now teaching the people that the abolition of the state is impossible; it is a mistake to think that by the elimination of the state, it is possible to say that there is no longer any law". But in the latter case, it is to educate them as far as possible to make the best of the totality of their lives by themselves. How can any sensible man, when he knows it, do otherwise than accept this conclusion?

Now, I have always regarded myself as an Evolutionist, and yet I am emphatically dissent from Mr. Kimball's views as follows.

It is unnecessary to make a public opinion. In a word, social progress goes on in spite of government and in opposition to it. Neither historical nor philosophical study of the object of government has been or is to educe men as fast as possible of legalese up into acting right freely for themselves. It is not easy to believe in the veracity of this statement. We discuss the political and social superstitions that render us submissive to authority, and we begin to view the whole thing in another way, by the light of the Enlightenment. The phrase "are numbered, not because the governments of today are ready to grant us individual liberty, but because we have discovered that there is no better in theory or practice than other forms of tyranny.

The Anarchists ignore government pending the time when it becomes a necessary evil, and agree with Mr. Kibal feeling that "it is not necessary to abolish or repel existing laws. They are now teaching the people that the abolition of the state is impossible; it is a mistake to think that by the elimination of the state, it is possible to say that there is no longer any law". But in the latter case, it is to educate them as far as possible to make the best of the totality of their lives by themselves. How can any sensible man, when he knows it, do otherwise than accept this conclusion?

George Macdonald Endorses Egoscim.

(Freethought.)

Every man should be given a reason for the hope that in him, and should be prepared to explain his conduct when he does good as well as when he does evil. To do good, because he chooses to do good, as a selfish pleasure, is not philosophical. Self-love is r. natural, of course, and therefore unwisely undue some benefits result to the self-lover sufficiently to make. I cannot see, as far as any principle, but it may have its uses. For what? To give the means of happiness to his possessor. One thing is certain. The true faith, from the bottom of the bay is as high as the brain of the philosopher. The latter is merely a more complex mass, and has more intelligence, as I view it, as a result of complexity. Intelligence is not put into the brain, but is the recognizable manifestation of what is already there, and is a process of nature. Therefore we are not required to inculcate in sentimental admiration for genius. We need only to recognize it as not worth the while to

life having no object, and, when rightly viewed, no high aim or romance to the same person, what shall be do with it? If I write it, I can wish with the tears on the shores of dissatisfaction. Shall we practice self- destruction as regards the pleasures of the world? Yes, if it gives us happiness, in which case we shall lead life to the point of its highest productivity, and in denying ourselves one pleasure, we have achieved a greater. The monk in his cell, the satchel in his hive, the priest among lepers, contemplates his reward and is happy, or thinks he is, than he would be elsewhere. Otherwise he would not be there.

Life has never been understood. To do which w. call virtuous is to do what experience has taught us brings, most happiness, and therefore pays us handsomely for the act of paying our own, in advance, when we have no credit. To practice what is virtuous is to make the rules of conduct that we believe in. If a person would be happy otherwise than in the performance of what he terms his duty, he would not perform it for he has followed his ruling inclination.

Debts to the state, do you ask what I am giving you? I answer: If I understand the subject, it is the doctrine of Egosim, the philosophical side of Anarchism. It appears to me to be a valuable slice of information for those who desire to get at the main spring of human action, though at the end of the investigation they are likely to emerge from the same hole they went in, and to find the things as same as over the surface.

Beauties of Government.

"(Clipping from the Press.)

WASHINGTON, July 10—The Senate resumed consideration of the civil service appropriation bill. An amendment that provoked discussion was on appropriating $400 for aid to the Industrial Commission.

Mr. Cockrell inquired as to the total number of inmates that have been sheltered at the home (which was established for the care and protection of paupers), and as the result of his information that it had never had in all more than twenty inmates, including children.

Mr. Edwards stated the purpose of Congress in adding the work, which is a very important one, to the work of the American women in Utah to save Mormon women and children. In this he is not alone. Many Mormon women took advantage of it, but said the building was the open invitation to them, and that he should be glad to have the people of the United States help the home for that reason alone.

Mr. Cockrell stated he was as able to believe that there were no per- sons at the house except those who were receiving salaries from the United States.
A RETROSPECT.

"Two in old Hopitaltall,"—
In days of yore,—
Seven thousand three hundred, at least,
Possibly more—
The Labor Question gathered life,
"Spite the good men
Who fought the theological war,
Remembered when
Their leader led to prison for
His "blasphemy."
Boldly challenged Christian churls
And "powers that be,"
And knew right well theology
Was at this base
Of every ill, whose name is
Afflict the race.
The time full ripe, Reformer new
Saw to the front,—
The laborer must gritly bear
The battle's banner.
"Come one, come all, what'd ye say a word.—
Admission, discus,—
And you are free to rise and claim
Your share o' time."
Lost rang the claims of brotherhood:
Industrial life
Reorganized; the sense of toil
In deadly strife.
With Capital; and loud decided
Against slavery
Of worksmen, and shout for all
Men's liberty.
Anathema that blazed: — "C— base
Ingratitude
Of wealth's right to listen from the poor
By wiser subdued!"
"What for do we this long while pleaded
For the Equity?
We wait the product of our toll, —
A Charity.
"The rich will never yield their gains
Till force comes off;
We'll start a State Industrial
With power to quit."
"Disturbance of our just award
To honest toil.
Industrial crimes! — Call the roll
On Freedom's soil!"
"No illustreon men forgotten
In the plan.
Nor quill
Till order from old Chase come:
First breach.
Then—plenty for the years beyond.
Pale poverty
Shall not enshroud in every town,
And there shall be
A chance for every—human soul
To live and love
On earth; shall have been come, like that
Forstold above,—
A social-well! — Equality
Secured by laws—
Of opportunities—
Calamities:
The basic clause
"Of all the rest—improving
Ethical competition,
Starting, and staying, and sending it
Home to perfection."
This said a vast deal more as years
Passed on.
The speakers win new power of speech,
New force, new grace;
And audience keep company;
Will learn, in the new
Philosophy, or all see, and
With reason
The walls of speech set in motion,
Choice toward the point,
And cry forth: "Questions," or appeal
To peace, content.
Together learns they one and all
Evolved anew.
The social state. — A forward look—
Millenial vision!
Yet they were mostly laboring men;
Nor pure nor fair,
Sending their Gospel round the world,
The same gave same.
Reporters made poor work of it,
(Still as a jest;)
Who wrote it up the funniest
Reported last.
And ministers, and editors,
And feudalism's lords,
Reformers, too, who studied but
Insufficiency quite,
All made one common cause against
This "social" view,
The whisperings of which struck them
As fully now.
Now 'ta of this I 'gun to write.
My retrospection
Is for this purpose only lest:
Of late, backdated
With flowers of rhetoric, and cast
In pleasing phrases,
The old time social talk revises.
Old shower of praise
And hint of Christianized crowd.
The "prophet" comes—
The New Thebarn—.
But tidy thrums
Our social harp. Behold the dance,
Not imp, but fairly,
The same mad heroes returned,
Dressed literacy.
"A—man burns hi—lary.
"A—man washes,
Lo there—" — the laborary
A blue corn!
Works machinery, this change of gods;
Freer and yet
Resting the other hymns
And do not know it.
The plagues may not harm;
It rests.
By stern—<— a deadlock world.
But it—should,
I'd wish in it a memory
Of prophets old
As well as new, and add a hope:
Never man nor god shall
Always be for "better class."
The "measures" taken to hold it
To portends of the soul: so oft
'The poverty!'
A happy thought persisted there it
Was to lift our age
Out of its bonds, and set it down
In storied page.
A century ahead of time.
This backward look
Disturbs us less than give the call
No hour will brook,
To straighten fore the social war
And find the peace
Of brotherhood, — a truce
That eye increase
The power of all to live and be
All men in the world,
And bless: — the best, whatever it be,
This best fulfill.
A last word more, just to relate
The little fact
That Hospital men did hold
The social state.
As Nationalists now do, to mean
Substance of
The individual,—man's liberty
Of further stimulation by laws.
And in their meetings of did score
The "Warrenites;"
Took them to task for selfishness,
Unjust as lit rights.
Decided those who freely spoke
Against the State
As wise depositories—
Of man's earthly fate.
They never seemed to see that such
Social freedom was,
Beyond all logic, — the rage,
The Sacred Cause;
That Equity, set free to work,
Would build defence
Against progress that was taking till
Of unrest, rest,
From centered slaves who feared to hurt
Their landlords:
"Respect your lord's privilege;
We'll do the rest."

Pity for Our Quaking Victims.

To the Editor of Liberty:

One cannot help admiring the ability displayed in the general make-up of Liberty, and were it not for one fact a lover of freedom might be quite enthusiastic: — but, as it is, liberal readers can but feel deformed and punished over its spirit of insouciance, severity, and invective toward a virtuous radical person, paper, or movement not in strict line with Liberty's teachings. It seems to use a special ferocity against other reformers, as the real enemies of liberty never catch a title of the whining that unfortunate radicals who differ from Liberty's writers must tremble under.

I realize that the intellectual writers of Liberty who have studied deep and long, and are sure of their ground, feel they have a right to call a man a fool who shows he does not reach the conclusions they have reached. But it seems to me rational wisdom is simple, modest, not over-confident. Because the higher we go, the more we find there is to know,—the clearer we see that every line of intellectual research reaches into the unknowable, and every step is debatable ground.

When it comes to close definitions, even the editor and writers in Liberty have been known to bumble, and are not always o. cristal. I believe there is a great deal in the Universe we none of us know yet, and no one can be so positively sure he is right that he can afford to call another student a fool. It sounds so vain, so harsh, so cruel, as the old believers in the infallibility of the church, to call people who have proved by years of devoted work their sincerest, "ignorant," "bureaucratic," "devisers of knowledge, common sense, style," etc. It is simply the opinion of Liberty's editor that the "Beacon" is "no friend of labor;" that it has all the marks of the "Alarm" and one of its main contents; that it shows ignorance and brutality, is insignificant and wild," etc. But it is a poor taste, looks narrow-minded, bigoted to express such an opinion so severely. Many others have been delighted with the bright little "Beacon." It is interesting, which Liberty in its profanity is not. It is a paper one can hand to any ordinary person with the assurance it will be understood,—which Liberty is not. Dandelion is one of the few who has no idol dearer than the cause: he works outside to earn money for the publication of the "Beacon" and sea type, writes, reads prof. at night on a salary of nothing a week. A great many people in the country must be convinced even by the a. Mr. Tucker that the editor of the "Beacon" is a fool, is b. moral, or needs to study for years under that profound and mundane bigot, E. C. Walker. He perhaps is wise in his revolutionary utterances than his learned critics. For great barriers across the path of progress have as yet, as into "bollihood of bread," reasoned away as "grape-wine;" if the word were better and wider, there might be more chances of Dandelion's being mistaken.

Other workers and writers, who know a devotion, self-sacrifice, and ability should "go with them from their friends," have been glibly dubbed by Liberty's staff "fools," "ignorantists," "grovelers," etc. Why should a lover of liberty show such a pagan conception disposition? I like to believe all "our kind of people" are kind-hearted, liberal, tolerant, fraternal in their feelings; it paine me to learn that we are not. The class—aristocratic reasoning, a recommended; but harsh means only witness a vindictive spirit. Argue as well as possible; then let readers judge who is the fool.

L. M. H.

LA VETA, COLORADO, June 26, 1890.

[Print the above, but cannot stop to answer it at any length. The question involved has been too recently exhausted in these columns. It is a curious fact that on the day I received the letter from L. M. H. I received another from a woman certainly her equal, and living in a territory not far from Colorado, warmly complimenting Liberty's attitude toward the "Beacon." Which I think shows that opinion differs. I like Dandelion's example better than her precept. She thinks E. C. Walker a bigot, and her frank expression of this view pleases me, even though it fails to win my assent. But why she should be accorded the privilege of debating Walker a bigot and should be denied that of declaring the "Beacon" a brute is one of those things intelligible only to "an ordinary person." To me it is a puzzle. —Editor LIBERTY.]
The Best Way to Help Harman.

I have said in Liberty that I know no way of helping Moses Harman, editor of "Lucifer," out of prison. I still know none. But there is a way of making his burden lighter than is more important—of flogging his enemies in their real purpose, the suppression of his paper. That way is to keep his paper "live till he is free. In such an effect any Anarchist may well take part, whatever his opinion may be of the paper itself. I certainly hold it in very light esteem. But it is a Liberal paper, and that is enough. The foes of liberty want to suppress it, and if they fail, it will afford them little satisfaction to have imprisoned Moses Harman. Let us then keep "Lucifer" alive.

All funds raised for that purpose will be acknowledged in this column and forwarded to the office of "Lucifer."
principle that "force is only justified against force." I was therefore obliged to decide to hold the editor of the organ of the Association guilty of a palpable inconsistency until he proved himself innocent.

When in this frame of mind, I happened to glance at the editor's "Answers to Correspondents," and then I read, in answer to an Anarchist who entered a protest against the policy of running protection upon monopolistic rather than competitive principles, the editor says, "There is no capitalist individual who does not wish that this [referring to the possibility of voluntary association for defense] were true, as it would be with the progress of humanity; for, under individualism, State functions would become "individual." By means to till at last individualism and Anarchism would coincide.

From these remarks it would appear that the "Personal Rights Journal" agrees with Liberty, though, in consequence of its erroneous assumption that Liberty would "attempt to realize Anarchism now" all at once and in its entirety, it imagines that it differs from it, because insisting upon slow and gradual realization of the programme common to Individualists and Anarchists. Where the "Journal" could find the all-important belief that Liberty transfers "the attempt to realize Anarchism now," I cannot surmise; yet it must have felt confident of the absolute correctness of this interpretation of the Anarchist position when recently replying to a criticism of Mr. Tucker's.

If, however, the editor is with us, some of his contributors are plainly not yet ready to admit that the logical outcome of individualism is Anarchism. One of them, Mr. Spencer, speaks of the "common individual, unattached, individual, and Anarchist," which Professor Huxley defined in his review article on government. He does not "pretend for individualism: a theoretical perfection," but regards it as a "point of contact" to counteract the ultimate logical consequences of State interference." This correspondent claims to speak in the name of "the individualist," and presumably of the association represented by the "Personal Rights Journal"; yet the editor allows these statements to pass without critical comment.

On the whole, we find plenty of evidence that these are times that try English Individualists' souls. That the actual position of the Anarchists will finally squarely face the Anarchist position is a foregone conclusion. Let us watch them now.

Spencerian Government and Anarchism.

Let us reason together about the Spencerian position on the question of government. Let us understand clearly the distinction between Spencer and the Anarchists. Are the Anarchists right in regarding the Spencerian defence of government as lame and impotent and fatally defective? Are they warranted in demanding the total abolition of the compulsory political institutions? Or are they passing the limits of philosophical discussion in this contention and may they be dismissed as visionary and wild theorists by those who treat the subject scientifically and who draw no conclusions that are not legible from demonstrably correct premises?

It is more in mind that we deal, not with the "Social Statists," but with the "Spencerians" set forth in Spencer's recent sociological works.

Spencer's doctrine for the substitution of minority to majority arising from inability to resist phylogenetic law, a "moral justificatio" for the suppose absolute power of the majority, an admission that the social compact hypothesis, finds a difficulty confronting him. On the one hand, it may be urged that in the absence of any agreement, with its implied limitations, the rule of the majority is unlimited; because it is merely in the position of being the stronger than that the minority should have its way.

On the other hand, it may be contended with equal force that "the absence of an agreement, the supremacy of a majority over a minority does not exist at all." But, continues Spencer, further reflection reveals a solution of the difficulty.

For if, dismissing all thought of any hypothetical agreement to cooperate herefore made, we ask what would be the result of the "Spencerian" saying, we get a practical unification, we get a sufficiently clear answer; and with it a sufficiently clear justification for the rule of the "Spencerian" saying, that the majority unifies the said. Let us first observe a few of the limitations which at once become apparent.

Were all men now asked if they would agree to cooperate for the teaching of religion, and would give the majority power to fix the creed and the forms of worship, they would not be a large part of whom. If, in pursuance of a proposal to revive summatory laws, the inquiry was made whether would they bind themselves to observe or abstain from the fashions and qualities of their clothes, nearly all of them would refuse. In like manner it is to ask an actual question of the day, whether in the case of the beverages they drank, they would accept the decision of the greater number, certainly half, and probably more than half, would be unwilling. Similarly with respect to many other customs which men now days regard as of purely private concern. Whatever desire there might be to cooperate for carrying on, or regulating, such actions, would be far from a unanimous desire. Manifestly then, had social cooperation to be commenced by ourselves, and had its purposes to be specified before consent to cooperate could be obtained, there would be large parts of human conduct in respect of which cooperation would be declined; and it is not to be supposed that the majority over the minority could be forcibly exercised.

Turn now to the converse question. For what ends would men agree to cooperate? They would do so for defensive war (not, however, for offensive war); and they would, by so doing, tacitly bind themselves to conform to a great variety of regulations directed to that end. There would be practical unanimity, also, in the agreement to cooperate for defence against internal enemies (the concept of an alien party against criminals), all most likely to have person and property adequately protected. In short, each citizen desires to preserve his life, to preserve his property, and (for the common good) his liberty and the enjoyment of it, and to prevent others from his liberties both of using these things and getting further such. It is obvious that he cannot do this if his acts alone. Again, if foreign invaders he powerless unless he combines with his fellows; and the business of protecting himself against domestic invaders, if he did not similarly combine, would be alike energetical, dangerous, and inefficient. In one other cooperation all are interested—use of the territory they inhabit.

Details are not needful here... It is sufficient to recognize the undeniable truth that there are numerous kinds of actions which it would be wise, if we were asked, agree with anything like unanimity to be bound by the will of the majority; while there are some kinds of action in respect of which the more unanimous will agree to be thus bound. Here, then, we find a definite warrant for enforcing the will of the majority within certain limits, and a definite warrant for denying the analogy of its will beyond those limits.

Again Spencer says, somewhat more explicitly:

"When that "divinity" which "doth hedge a king," and which has left a gloamer around the body inheriting his power, has quite died away; when it be comes to be seen clearly that, in the composition of the government, is simply a committee of management, it will also be seen that this committee of management has no intrinsic authority. The latter conclusion is unanswerable by those appealing it; and has just such bounds as they choose to impose."

The above was submitted to a keen and vigorous critical examination by Mr. M. P. Morse's "Debates on Anarchism," and portions of which the following may be appropriated to voice my own thoughts:

After all, the outcome of Mr. Spencer's criticism of Hobbes and Austin results in the substitution of a hypothetical social compact for a hypothetical social compact made a long time ago...

But Mr. Spencer's social compact is a sort of chronic plebeianism of an electoral option. We know it to be found by the process of wondering what would be the result if the people were polled. This of course is the referendum. But the result would depend on a length of taking a poll of the people in order to justify each new piece of proposed legislation. He would rather work out the question for the people—not the people—whether they would agree to cooperate for the teaching of religion?" and he would answer himself with a "very emphatic No." In the like manner, if people were polled to ascertain whether in respect of the beverages they drank they would accept the decision of the greater number, certainly half, and probably more than half, would be unwilling."

Now this is just what local-optimalists deny. It is just what pacific others want to know. Spencer settles the issue..."
without their express consent, the Speculator's "process of labor and the results it brings forth were the outcome of his own inventions and were pollit" must be declared a hypothetical con-
trivance. And yet the editor of "Today" expects us to admire the scientific and philosophical Speculator's view of the proper sphere and authority of govern-
ment! Did he but suspect that, as a matter of practical wisdom, we ought to endeavor to unite all 
liberal elements on an eminently sensible platform of 
restricting the activity of the State to defence of equal liberty, a platform which can be victorious supported 
by an overwhelming amount of theoretical and prac-
tical argumentation, the Anczachists would gladly re-
spond to the call and cooperate in the formation of a 
strong popular opinion favoring that immense and 
healing work. The idea of a "personal legislature" never 
condoned, and no progressive practical movement will 
be denied their sympathy. But when the question is not 
one of practical warfare, of skilful, gradual conquest, 
or of scientific definition and limitation of the au-
thority of government, they demand "evidence" and "facts" in support of every proposition. No "ethical 
warrant" for government has been shown, and we re-
ally cannot indulge the Speculators and felicit that we 
see farther beneath them.

According to the Anczachists, the "laws of human 
life as carried on under social conditions" authorize 
certain restraints upon certain lines of conduct, which 
restrains, however, may be imposed by individuals 
and sanctioned by custom as well as by majorities. The 
right of justice bears no relation to numbers, and if one in-
dividual is unjustly dealt with by the whole society, 
he is ethically warranted in treating the society as 
criminals and compelling them to abide by the rules 
of justice accepted and defended by himself. The An-
czachists, entertaining certain views of rational and 
just social organization, views that conflict with those 
of the supporters of the existing governments as well 
as those of many reformers, have simply to decide upon 
what course to follow in order to cleanse the social, political and as social as industrial — can only be 
solved by men applying themselves to a scientific 
study of them, by a free and full discussion, and by 
the complete abandonment of all compromises with 
truths evolved and discovered in the process of such 
study and discussion.

After all, to conclude as I began, it is scarcely neces-
sary to take pains to refute a position almost wholly 
abandoned by the followers of Marx themsevles. Marx's "Scientific Socialism" was loud and noisy, but not 
deep, and the progress of thought has left it be-
hind. As in all cases of crisis and disintegration, so 
in the case of the Socialists, retrogression divided the 
field with pretenders, the better with the worse. While 
on the one hand, a portion of the "scientific Socialists" 
have really advanced and taken up higher ground, 
another and more numerous portion de
duced and mingled with the masses. Christian Socialism and Nationalism must be looked upon 
as cases of striking retrogression and decay. The 
case of higher development is found in the English 
Fabian Socialist movement, to which I now turn.

"Fabian Socialism" is comparatively free, at least 
in the persons of its ablest spokesmen, from the fal-
lacies and vulgar blunders of the schools we have ex-
amined. So far as their philosophical and ethical 
views are concerned, few exceptions can be taken 
against them by those who are abreast of the scientific 
progress of the age. They do not base their system on 
mysticism and superstition. They are not theo-
lurgians or metaphysicians. They demand collective 
wealth as the means of life only in so far as they 
think this the only method of abolishing involuntary 
poverty and economic inequality, of securing real 
equality of opportunity to all deserving members of 
society. To quote one of the most prominent Fabians, 
Mr. G. B. Shaw:

*Fabian Socialism* is comparatively free, at least in the persons of its ablest spokesmen, from the fallacies and vulgar blunders of the schools we have examined. So far as their philosophical and ethical views are concerned, few exceptions can be taken against them by those who are abreast of the scientific progress of the age. They do not base their system on mysticism and superstition. They are not theologians or metaphysicians. They demand collective wealth as the means of life only in so far as they think this the only method of abolishing involuntary poverty and economic inequality, of securing real equality of opportunity to all deserving members of society.
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ence,—the remunerative extirpation of the weak,—the assurance that the truly natural selection will come into play. Socialism seemed too good to be true; it was passed by as merely the old optimism foolishly running its hand against the wall. The early socialists had met with many chal-

lenges: individualism, asceticism, pessimism, worship of na-
sure personified as a devil, on their own ground of science. The idea, however, persisted, until, in the hands of a political economist, it affords no basis for the current national belief in the divinity of the common welfare, with which it binds together and makes the free opposition to capital a well-defined and earnest political power. As political economist. Thus, no longer the theory, and, in the words of the opponents of social science,—"Moreover, if the knowl-
edge and the control of power change hands, the latter will have the power to enslave the former, to exploit, to dominate."

The present situation, with the unemployed, the starving proletarian, and the thousand and one horrors of industrial slavery and of the system of rent," which it is assumed that the unemployed laborer can find no work which is not the property of some one else; which is not true of any country in the world. There is little of unoccupied land, of land that could be used for any purpose other than there to cultivate it. It is assumed that all the rent paid is economic rent, when even the political economists know and declare the largest portion of it to be mono-

poly rent! It is assumed that interest is but another form of rent, springing from the same source, whereas it is the result of the monopoly of credit and banking. And those sources of profit—the tariffs and patents—are ignored altogether.

Let us not, then, base our analysis of what does not exist at all, and seek for an analysis of a true individualist system. It is not difficult to imagine a system in which everybody who occupies and uses land personally is recognized as the private owner of that small tract; in which the general interest is free to exchange it with others; in which capital be-

longs either to its individual creator, or to the small association of r. f. owners engaged in a given pursuit or industry. It is the system in which every man is his own landlord, and where the only thing one might not be expected to make of man by man, any laborer by capital, be possible under it? No man in his senses could answer affirmatively. What the Fabian Socialists do is to point out the way in which the so-called "economic rent" would not exist, since the differences in the returns to labor due to the differences in the fertility of the soils and advantages of location are in no way equalized.

Whatever advantage there is in Fabian Socialism is due to this fact, which they alone, of all Socialists, set much stress on. They have this one truth to build upon, and it remains for us to consider just what sort of superstructure this foundation will sustain.

The question of the distribution of the economic rent is decided. First, whether it is necessary for the peace and harmony of society to equalize the returns to labor. Second, whether it is possible to advantageously direct the distribution of the economic rent by the authority watching over the community and its redistribution among all the members equally? If so, can it be done? Assuming the necessity, let us turn to the practicality. Now, experience as well as deductive reasoning has abun-
dantly established the fact that no governing body of officials can economically and honestly and ably admin-
ister business affairs in the interest of the citizens. Corruption, extravagance, and incompetence are ab-

sent from governmental management of industrial or financial offices. A very large portion of the sum collected would go over the heavy expenses of maintaining the institution established for the purpose, and the remainder would be distributed among the citizens directly, whether distributed by the officials directly among the citizens or expended on common public conveniences, very little would actually accrue to the individual citizen. It may of course be contended that the principle of free competition, under the industrial conditions would not be like the governments we are accustomed to; but the rejoinder would be that it is the part of wisdom to put aside all cares and plans for the distribution of the economic rent, it is useless to puzzle one's self over details when even the materials out the workers are at hand. Assuming, however, practicability for the sake of the argument, let us inquire into the points of eco-

nomic rent by a government if it could be shown that the in-

equalities of wages or incomes due to the inequalities of natural opportunities would not be appreciable,—

in the sense that the former would be greater than the latter. It is well to bear this in mind when discussing the effects of the progressive taxation and the size of the state on the distribution of wealth. With these reservations, one can scarcely fail to see that the solution of the problem would be very great. Man governed by purely utilitarian considerations would not care to maintain an institution for the purpose of equalizing incomes and economic rent by the least cost; and the least cost is the least sacrifice from the standpoint of the individual, regardless of the sacrifice from the standpoint of the individual.