On Picket Duty.

A remarkable confession from the "Nation": "In truth, nothing depends itself more fleetingly, and with such an appurtenance of conscience as to the means to be used as property in danger." This of course is true only of property acquired dishonestly.

The London "Freethinker," in its fifth number of L. M. Creedy, says: "Although Mr. M. Creedy wrote mainly on social subjects, his utterances were always thoughtful and manly." Since when did Sociology become so degraded as to deserve this "although?"

An Irish judge has advised the people of greyhound to leave the aid of law in order to stop boycotts. And now, somebody, with far more reason and propriety, will advise the boycotters to invoke the aid of dynamite against such tyrannical judges. So does force breed force.

In the "Twentieth Century" does not appear this tribute from a puritan named Remington: "There is no impunity nor intolerance between its covers. It is a paper that I am not afraid to have my whole daughter read." Does the "Twentieth Century" print this compliment? Because it is proud of it or because it is ashamed of it?"

"Mr. of the Denver "Individualist," says with an air of dignity that he "cannot agree with Liberty that Mr. Sullivan is a single-taxer." But Liberty has no reason to say that J. W. Sullivan is a single-taxer; it stated that he calls himself a single-taxer, which is a different thing entirely, and which is a fact. Before "agreeing" or "disagreeing" with Liberty, the "Individualist" editors should take pains to understand it. For they are not averse to be suspected of undue partiality for the workingmen; yet his words on the subject of the relation between organized labor and organized oppressor, which I elsewhere reprint from the "Argonaut," may be read with profit by some editors of individualistic papers who regard themselves as eminently just and even friendly to labor, but who pretend to be unable to soberly pronounce capital and capitalistic government responsible for the misery and degradation of the masses.

"My recent address on the subject of the evils of organization," writes Mr. Porteous, "has been misunderstood by my brother editors and other workers in the social field than anything I remember to have written." That's because it was your best, Mr. Porteous. Liberty is the most misunderstood paper in the world. That's a strong indication that it is the best paper in the world. Bear up under misunderstanding, Mr. Porteous. And remember that at least your own (perhaps your most truthful critic) has borne enthusiastic testimony to his admiration of the address in question.

The Atlanta "Constitution" urges a boycott on Northern industries if the federal election bill becomes a law. If the people of the North were really guilty of any injustice to the South, such a measure would be wise and Anarchistically commendable (provided of course the Southerners do not lose more than the Northerners by it). We are glad that the "Constitution," which deems itself aggrieved, favors this Anarchistic weapon of defense, from which there is a short step to complete secession. But the Republican legislators do not represent the people of the North; it is therefore the politicians, not the people, that deserve boycotting.

The "Whirlwind," recognizing that "young ladies are as much harassed by the canons of Society as individual citizens are by the enactments of Parliament, and that the result is just as frivollous and offensive as that of our Grandmother, the State," counsels the girls to strike. It says: "Let them enter into a solemn league and covenant, refusing to attend a single church, drum, ball, or dinner, until the dresses are removed. All half-burial blacklegs, and blackstacks must be rigidly boycotted, and the fullest and completest liberty be alone accepted at the hands of the arbiters of Society. All entertainments are got up for the benefit of girls, and without them the whole fabric of Society would ignominiously collapse."

"Do Nationalists propose to leave unused land free for occupancy?" is the question which Mr. Pentecost puts to a Nationalist critic who has denied that Nationalism is irrevocable and arbitrary, and he adds: "If Nationalism means what is said and shall be free, I have no objection to it." I think I understand Mr. Pentecost's meaning, which is undoubtedly. But he has laid himself open to serious misinterpretation, and he should make himself clear to those who are not so familiar with his thought as his Anarchistic readers. Nationalism may leave vacant land free and yet be an intolerable and odious tyranny. It may deny other valuable liberties, such as the liberty of trade, of exchange, of love, of education, of speech. To become Anarchistic, Nationalism will have to allow, not merely the use of unoccupied land, but the exercise of every liberty except that of direct and unmitigated invasion.

John Swinton claims to have discovered a city in which there is no trace of the porcine element. He writes to the "Sun" that there are no human hogs in Edinburgh,—no stinging hogs, no police hogs, no car hogs, no tobacco hogs, no jetting hogs, in a word, no hogs and no hoggishness of any kind. Everybody is polite, amiable, considerate, and helpful. But I find also this significant statement in his letter: "I have seen gentle manners among the most abject wretches of the city." To me, there is sufficient circumstantial evidence here to overturn John Swinton's whole claim. A city free from hogs and hoggishness would also be free from "squalid parts" and "abject wretches." It is safe to say that there are lots of hogs and money lending hogs and other ursinous hogs in Edinburgh, as well as numerous government hogs. It is strange that John Swinton, the enemy of usury, should have missed such a plain inference from the petition faults he observed.

"National greenbackers believe that the birth of greenbacks was the beginning of a new and better civilization. . . . They believe that the word greenback was not an accident, but was beavers-born, and is the most fitting emblem to handle all the products of God's green earth, from whence all the wealth, luxuries, and necessities we have in this world are derived. They believe that, as green is the only color on which the eye can always rest and never tire, so greenbacks will always remain to promote liberty, free government, intelligence, and human happiness." If I think that that is so, but if I think that our greenbacks are as insignificant as our missionaries, I should be inclined to award their author, Col. Geo. O. Jones, the cake for superstition. But Col. Jones is an old man of sixty-six years and knows better. He is not superstitious; he is simply a high financial priest preaching to a superstitious congregation,—namely, the greenbackers of Alabama in conventional assembly. He knows that the greenbackers are even greedier than the greenbacks, and will never interrupt him with the question: "What are you giving us?"

When Mr. J. W. Sullivan, in reviewing the "Twentieth Century," the "Symposium on the Land Question," characterizes Mr. Wordsworth Donisthorpe's contribution to the pamphlet as "some pages of his usual inconsequential chatter," he is himself guilty of chatter as well as, if I may be called to believe it, not usual with him. Mr. Donisthorpe easily ranks among the foremost intellects and most brilliant writers now living in England, and, while it is proper to differ with him and to correct his errors, it is impossible to succeed in doing it without some attempt. Nevertheless the attempt is now made in the "Twentieth Century." The second time. Mr. Donisthorpe's notable book on "Individualism," of which the review is quoted by Mr. Yarros in his article on Spencer in the last number is a sample page, was recently handled in the "Twentieth Century" as if it were the work of a nincompoop. That journal will in one respect fall short of the high level to which its name is entitled for it, if it book a book as magnificent is suffered to be made ridiculous in this fashion.

"It is a matter of the simplest demonstration that no man can be really appreciated but by his equal or superior. His inferior may overestimate him in everything as is more commonly the case, degrade him in ignorance; but he cannot form a grounded and just estimate." So says Ruskin; and herein we have the true explanation of the double-dealt correct statement that liberty is uninteresting to many, and "Fair Play" unendurable, and both worthless as missionary literature among certain classes. The old Greek philoso-
A Hypocrite in a Hole.

NEW YORK VIEWS.

The "Evening Post" has been writing for some weeks a series of savage attacks upon Messrs. Fink & Wagman for selling copies of one of the American reprints of the "Piracy," an English work by the Editor of the "Evening Post," the latter being a well-known member of that body. The papers are regularly sold by jobbers of newspapers in all parts of the United States. We have never yet seen a "Piracy" published in any other country, except as pirated copies, and the source from which our stories are taken is a book published in London, New York, Chicago, etc. Some time ago we published an article upon the subject of pirated newspapers, and we have since had occasion to revive the strain. It is a question of serious consequence to the newspapers of our country to know whether they are being defrauded of their legitimate right to the sale of their newspapers, and we feel that the matter is one of the highest importance.

We are convinced that the newspapers are being defrauded to a great extent. We have had occasion to give much attention to the matter, and we have discovered that the English magazine publishers object to the "Piracy" by the "Post," in all the forty-four states of the Union. Mr. Godkin has had the courage to come out into the open and denounce the "Piracy." We hope that Mr. Godkin's confidence in his local fortunes and processes to have been all that they are for. Mr. Godkin, in his editorial of last Saturday, likens the "Piracy" to a "pirate." He also adds, "If a little more of such stories as this are con- ducted by the State at the expense of the tax-paying public, and that is prosecution for crime. The rich may oppose the State's efforts to commit a theft, but the poor man of his land or estate and drive him to a ruinous defence at law, the success of which may imperil his life. The State's efforts to recover what rich contractors will go back or stay till the classes who possess the wealth, the brains, and the leisure to consider the relations of business and capital, shall adjust them more rationally and equitably.

Inevitable Drift of Paternalism.

Bishop Katzer of Milwaukee is too old-fashioned, or, to use an adjective of about the same import, too new-fashioned for anything. The bishop the other day promised to the county board the construction of a new hospital for the lepers of the county at a cost of $200,000, which is said to be the amount of the hospital at the expense of the State. The bishop has also stated that he will go into the business of the hospital and control its act capital may secure more than it earns in its cooperation with labor. The two are working in co-op eration with each other, and it will never after be any great obstacles to the classes who possess the wealth, the brains, and the leisure to consider the relations of business and capital, shall adjust them more rationally and equitably.

Legal Privilege Cruelting American Arts.

MANUFACTured newsworthiness.
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The politicians are just now sorely exercised because the “original package” decision nullifies the “police powers” of a state in a great extent. They will have to reconcile themselves to the fact that the powers of their beloved “Nation” can be exerted to protect the open sale of intoxicating liquors by the States themselves. The police power is no longer an exclusive right of the Federal government. The license and free whisky (if there be any of the latter) States have equitably granted, is a reality, and has never found lodgement in the brain cavity of the straight prohibitionists, or, at least, has made no outward manifestation. The police powers of the States are not contained in a “National prohibition amendment.” His conception of justice and equal liberty is that the Federal government shall aid the States in the prohibition problem in the State, where there is a State, to be a very small majority favorable thereto, but in Texas, where there is an overwhelming majority against it, the same Federal government shall forbid and prevent the sale of intoxicating, thus overruling and rendering nugatory the “police powers” of that State. This is what a “National prohibition amendment” means. You see it makes all the difference in the world whose ox is gored. The “police powers” of a prohibitory State are as sacred in the eyes of a prohibitionist as the Ark of his God, but the “police powers” of a license state he would remorselessly wipe out by means of a prohibitory amendment to the Constitution. The spirit of rebellion is rife in Kansas. From the “Capi
tal” down to the cross-road post, the Republican shocks, with a few exceptions, are, with very great moderation, openly countenancing the idea of mob violence against the original package men. So with the Attorney General of the State and his uniformly acting solicitor, it is to be feared that the officials will still further encourage the encouragement of mobocratic measures, but all understand what they mean. In the face of the decision of the Supreme Court, under cover of which decision the original package men are acting, and of decisions by Federal judges in the State, the prohibition.combined attorneys are piling costs upon the shoulders of the impoverished taxpayers by continued prosecutions, under one pretext and another, of the agents of the breweries and whiskey dealers, who, under the pretense of selling beer to Kansas City or turn them into the gutter, and war dealers to leave or take the consequences of their temerity if the law be not obeyed. There is no dynamite or ultra-fanatical element. It is not far from belief of temperance that amasses many of the most vociferous: of this fact there is no need of any doubt whatever. There has been pronounced in enormous quantities in this State during all these years that the fate of prohibition has been on the boards. But their plight is toughened. They have claimed that prohibition was a success, although they know that it was not, that the evil of intemperance prohibition had added and super

beaucoup” whiskey, and while the system, the glass, the spigot, the swag
total of the stock in trade of the sanitarian journalist and censor. Skillful and persistent falsification of the facts was resorted to, and the Department of Agriculture was induced to say that the original package house was another thing entirely. It introduced an element of canard into the business that made the talkers howl with mirth. This is one of the reasons for the fact that, and for the reason that it was open to the light. That its tendency would be to reduce the consumption of the vile spirits compounds, giving in their place the in
deniably less harmful beer, counted for nothing. “Let loose the dogs of war” was the cry of the Supreme Court; “amicable wipe out the outside of the platter while sharking a few extra lumps of fish on the inside,— the sanitary public has an easy task. When they see what is hidden, Ha! How is all diseased and sickens one?”

And not alone in Kansas is the value of rebellion heard; it is sounding on the halls of legislation in the States, and from beyond their borders as well. For an hour the potent moralitarians can not use the Federal sword to cut down their breaths. The question is whether they will have determined that they will use it or break it. The recent utterances of their leaders can only be interpreted to mean that the Constitution-forgetting and liberty-denying legislator, if it so may be; but then, by the mask and sword, and torcher. We have the Whiskey and barrel, and bread, or, these, falling by red-robed wrath.

Is there an exaggeration or a misrepresentation? Let us see:

In June 1870, when the postal system was only a few years old, it was held in the city of New York. Among the speakers was Rev. W. J. Basset. Here is a paragraph from his speech as reported:

If the Constitution furnishes no power to impose it shall be taken in connection with the credit of the second
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BOSTON, MASS., AUGUST 2, 1869.

TO THE EDITOR OF "LIBERTY." I

Will you permit me to ask you for the definition, from an Anarchistic standpoint, of the "Right of Ownership"? What do you mean by property? By what right do you possess, or take, or appropriate the product of another? Before directing my attention to the study of this question, I would like to say that the philosophy of this theory of property, as developed by the late Professor Wheaton, is, in my judgment, equivocal. It seems to me that a man, as he has the right of property, has the right of self-determination. A property of a man is a thing to which he has the right to do anything with, without injuring any other person. It is up to a man to use his property as he sees fit, and the only thing that is required of him is that he pays the proper tax for the use of the property. It is, therefore, a question of a man's right to do what he pleases with his property, provided he does not injure another person.

The Right of Ownership.

In the second paragraph, after, Anarchism does not recognize the right of ownership, but it has been recognized by the law of the land. The property of a man is a thing to which he has the right to do anything with, without injuring any other person. It is up to a man to use his property as he sees fit, and the only thing that is required of him is that he pays the proper tax for the use of the property. It is, therefore, a question of a man's right to do what he pleases with his property, provided he does not injure another person.

Clearing the Way.

In No. 192 I assured the editor of "Today" that I should never attempt to satisfy his desire 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," ground that refusal on the fact that I had never announced such a proposition. The editor rejoined from No. 113 this sentence: "It is an evil to be without the power of government." This makes his statement as calumny and triumphantly as if it were identical with the words which he originally put in my mouth. He does not apologize for his first misquotation. He does not even allude to the difference between his statement and the presence of the word social in the correct version. His disregard of this word, here so vital, is the most beautiful specimen of sheer cheek that I ever met.

But at any rate the phrase is now given correctly. (It never appeared in the editorial column, but I am willing to become responsible for it.) This is a point gained. The next step of the editor of "Today" is to criticize me for refusing to maintain this "anarchistic concept of the social order," and he says, in effect, that I am unable to maintain this concept of the social order. The latter proposition I am entirely willing to maintain.

But before maintaining it against the editor of "Today," it is well to be sure that he understands its meaning. When the proposition was originally stated in Libery, I understood that I desired to show that government is the father of all evil that arises out of our social conditions. Mr. Yarros, the author of it, tells me that he meant precisely that. In that case the thing that I am bound to prove is that government is the cause of all evil that arises out of our social conditions and purposes — the only serious obstacle in the way of their change.

But this is the very point which I have illustrated the social order by discussing with me, and which refuses to discuss on the ground that it is the Anarchistic conclusion rather than the Anarchist premise. It is not the Anarchistic conclusion. The Anarchistic conclusion is that we should be abolished. The Anarchistic premise is that it does not carry the implication which its carries and which he points out. From an Anarchistic standpoint, the right of ownership is that control of a thing by a person, and all social sanctions, whether or else unanimous individual sanctions, when the laws of social expediency shall have been finally discovered. (Of course I might go farther and explain that Anarchism considers the greatest amount of liberty compatible with the fundamental law of social expediency, and that nearly all Anarchists consider labor to be the only basis of the right of ownership in harmony with that law; but this is not essential to the argument, or to the refutation of Mr. Bilgram's point against Anarchism.)

It will be seen that the Anarchistic definition just given does not imply necessity the existence of an organized or institutated social power to enforce the right of ownership. It contemplates a time when social sanctions will be superseded by unanimous individual sanctions, thus rendering enforcement needless. But in such an event, by Mr. Bilgram's definition, the right of ownership would cease to exist. In other words, he seems to me to have agreed upon a property standard and should voluntarily observe it; property would then have no existence simply because of the absence of any institution to protect it. Now, in the view of the Anarchists, property would then exist in its perfection.

So I would answer Mr. Bilgram's question, as in his concluding paragraph, as follows: Anarchism does not recognize the right of ownership, but it has been recognized by the law of the land. The property of a man is a thing to which he has the right to do anything with, without injuring any other person. It is up to a man to use his property as he sees fit, and the only thing that is required of him is that he pays the proper tax for the use of the property. It is, therefore, a question of a man's right to do what he pleases with his property, provided he does not injure another person.

* * *

The Status of the Saxon.

To the Editor of "Liberty.

The Saxon is the greatest moral and political problem of our day. It is a problem that has been before us for centuries, and it is a problem that will continue to be before us for centuries to come. The Saxon is the source of all our troubles, and it is the cause of all our divisions. It is the cause of all our wars, and it is the cause of all our political and moral anarchy. It is the cause of all our social and economic difficulties, and it is the cause of all our personal and national miseries.
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we are under no delusion now. We have long known him for what he is, — a man with much blith and no sense either of restraint or two only with respect to the part which he seems to consider substantial and argumentative.

The "argument" is two-fold, economic and ethical.

In the first place:

The main object of all social legislation is to work for equality, not for uniformity or equality, as that of the mediæval serf, armed with a lath sword, against a multiçoid knight. As in that case, so here, there are a host of struggling, and the whole struggle of the workers being an assault upon the benefices of privilege, when... one only or not does not affect the fact that the lower classes receive a wider range of opportunity in the struggle for life, the question becomes pertinent, on which sides of these contending forces does program lie? For the English tendency leads to a higher civilization. Capitalism entrenched behind legalised ramparts, necessarily strives to maintain a status quo, and thus being essentially militant is revolutionary in its industrial evolution which ever demands abolition of privilege and the widening of the scope of industrial opportunity... Once labor and organized "capitalism" stand arrayed against each other, and upon the issue depends a higher civilization. Although there are a host of stragglers, there is no third side: "wherever abstract sympathy may be, wherever it is not with labor, in spite of professed "sympathy," extends aid and comfort to "capitalism" in its entrenched position, and therefore to a class against humanity, it is as dangerous as the old feudal system.

If this is reasoning, I do not know what is idiocy and insane twaddle. Every assertion here is a bare assumption, as well as arbitrary. That capital enjoys unfair privileges and that labor is a victim of inequality, which the "social" civilizers must remove these privileges and establish equal and liberty; and every person, whatever his occupation, calling, name, who works for the removal of prejudice is a friend of progress, while, conversely, every person who presses for higher civilization and works for tyranny and inequality is an enemy of progress, be he laborer or capitalist. Good intentions should be taken into account, but they do not alter the fact. The laborer who believes in democracy, in regulation and government of man by man, is justified in the struggle of the higher civilization as a capitalist of the same faith. Mr. Lunn means that labor, as such, works for higher civilization, simply because it is the victim of that civilization, and hence, beg the question by saying that it makes no difference whether it consiously or unconsciously struggles against privilege. According to this, a laborer may favor tariffs, banking nationalization, monopoly, government, and yet be "unconsciously" striving for the same privilege that the "intrapreneurship", which I should be ashamed to stop to expose. Every man of sense knows that labor, generally speaking, simply fights for better conditions, whose one is the liberty and justice of all the laborers who have been gathered into trades unions by leaders are more disposed to favor despoticism and compulsory equality than industrial liberty. Capitalists are not demons, and laborers are not angels. The present system is sustained by laborers as much as by capitalists, and no class is personally responsible for its existence. Victory for labor would certainly mean a much lower civilization than the present, as long as the principle of social privilege and domination of the real causes of existing evils. If Mr. Lunn means to identify capital with militarism and labor with industrialism, he is an ignoramus. If he does not, he is a deceiver.

The ethical argument is intended to show that it is the duty of the state to sacrifice its personal welfare to social welfare and rather die of hunger than fill a striker's price. Why the state rather than the striker should sacrifice his life is not explained; nor is it demonstrated that social welfare is always furthered by the strikers and never by the seizes. Who is to define "social welfare" and the means of attaining it? Mr. Lunn, being hopelessly illogical, cannot see the irrefutable point which he quotes from Spencer; but nobody would be more amused and indignant than Spencer at this perversion and abuse of his ideas. I cannot undertake to popularize Spencer in the same manner as Mr. Lunn's benefit, and so I must leave him with the assurance of my careless contempt for his mentality as well as morality.

V. V.

Sense and Nonsense from Simon Newcomb.

Professor Simon Newcomb has acquired great celebrity as a scientific character; it seems worth the while, therefore, to call attention to his unscientifc treatment of an important question, in the May number of the "North American Review.'

He entitles his article "Soap-bubbles of Socialism," and has State Socialism, rather than Anarchistic Socialism, in mind, apparently, but he classes Socialism. As a thinking man, he ought to know that socialism, "together reaching a certain "view" with a large body of the "educated" community, and, apparently, he means to imply that the doctrines of all those just mentioned contain serious fallacies which he thinks it his duty to point out.

By way of alluding to the works proceeding to the fortifications, he calls attention to a question to the affirmative of which he thinks the reader may be sceptical, — namely: 'If all men were very good and nobody wanted to be richer than his neighbor, while everyone was ready to do whatever the combined wisdom of the community ought to be done, would the masses really be much better off than they are now?'

Is Simon Newcomb himself a Socialist? If not, why does he not show that the so-called question is not a question at all, because it involves inexplicable elements, so "very good" man being willing to do the combined wisdom of the community ought to be done, instead of endeavoring to show the affirmative improbable by statements which are incorrect. These will be referred to later.

"Assigning a certain order to the fallacies," the first, in his opinion, is, "that the inequality between the rich and the poor in the enjoyment of wealth is continually increasing." It would seem white, while, if possible, to point out the fallacious character of the above affirmation. Why, then, does he, instead, proceed to maintain that "the benefits of wealth are not so unequally divided as its ownership?" Suppose some one should take the five numbers, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5; and say, their square, 1, 4, 9, 16, 25, 36, etc., their cubes, 1, 8, 27, 64, etc., and so on. In particular, if we say: "The first and greatest object of wages and wealth is to be comfortably housed, fed, and clothed. The man who can succeed in this without an exhausting toil, is an anomalous being, one of the great ends of human existence, and has the right to congratulate himself, whether his daily income is five cents or five dollars?" In connection with this subject the big doogoe of division of property is exchanged.

It is an unfortunate fact that some persons who call themselves Socialists do advocate avariepatism, and it is to be feared that they might find their justification in this for Professor Newcomb's "Principles of Political Economy," page 56: "The first step in improving our system will be to give up entirely every attempt to tax a man's total possessions, and indeed to give up every idea of an arbitrarily, csakur system. Our policy should be, to tax all visible manifestations of wealth in what the old geometers called a duplicate ratio: that is, in a ratio yet higher than that of the amount of wealth manifested. These Socialists give up every idea of an abstruse system or of doing so.

They propose to levy a higher rate of tax, probably, than the author of the "Principles." They would think advisable, but this would be their system; and to the discussion of this, the language of the "Principles," page 54: "That the rate of which animals in the pursuit of wealth are in the highest degree beneficial, and have led to a system which inures to every man's life to the maximum of enjoyment from his labor, if he will only adapt himself to the system." They hold that the principle of the wealth that the world at present would be "pleased" for its in-hand's.

The proposition next treated as a fallacy is "there is plenty and to spare of food, raiment, drink, and recreation for all the poor and rich of the land; the average difficulty is, that they have not money enough to buy it."

The writer of these remarks doesn't know of any intelligent Socialist who maintains that the wealth of the world at present would be "pleased" for its in-hand's.

That there has been an unfair distribution of its wealth, however, and that there has been much consequent suffering among laborers from the lack of ownership of the products of their labor or a more equivalent, is held by many intelligent Socialists.

The laborer who receives his wages: the form of money does not: in most cases, receive enough to buy food, raiment, drink, and recreation for all the poor and rich. The system given an addition which makes interest rent, or some other form of vey, so that there is an accumulation of products on the one hand, while there is a corresponding lack of products on the other, and this lack is painfully felt by the oppressed.
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The next statement treated as a fallacy is that the laboring classes are oppressed by capitalists.

Professor Newcomb says: “Everyone knows that one great feature of modern law in our own and most civilized nations is the distinction between capital and labor. The capitalist, and the laborer are equal before the law, and that to the first, individually and collectively, is allowed the most extreme liberty of action so long as he does not injure any other than the immediate rights or property of people. Thus we have many who know that the laborer, the capitalist, the laborer and the capitalist are not equal before the law, and that the laborer is not “allowed the most extreme liberty of action so long as he does not injure any other than the immediate rights or property of people.”

Suppose that when Simon Newcomb was teaching school, he had thrown down a dozen pencils before his pupils, saying: “Any pupil who will first pick up any of these pencils may go out to play at recess time, the others must remain in their seats.”

Suppose there were fifty pupils; would not thirty-eight have reason to complain that all were not equal before the law, although the words “any pupil” occurred in it? Obviously, the pupils nearest the pens would have had an advantage not possessed by others. They would have had a monopoly of shortest distances.

Now, a vast number of laws produce monopolies. By their nominal words, they do nothing. By their real effects, they produce inequalities.

Being a lawyer, Professor Newcomb is well aware of the fact, and it is the current doctrine of the “class enemies.”

The law which America has sustained since the peace from the position of a nation on the moral and political frontier between man and man, man and nature, and man and government, constitutes an enormous debt against the States chargeable with this unavailing measure which must long remain unsatisfied, or rather: an accession of guilt which cannot be expiated otherwise than by a voluntary sacrifice of the whole of any government.

“Such,” says Professor Newcomb, “are the enlightened opinions of our wisdom, our sages, and our judges, and the array of folly and wickedness on which these opinions were founded. And yet here we are repeating the sophisms and reiterating the history of a past century.”

Thus, the “ordinary results of legislation” which entitled “the most enormous evils on the country” appear to exist at the time of writing, apparently.

Certain acts of government are spoken of as follows, p. 151: “The laws which now prevail, discountenaze, and all of the class who work for the nation, is to say nothing of the workers, and the worker who does not carry the feeling of honor into the performance of his task is not worth his salt.”

I cannot believe that Bellamy is such a fool as to think that workers “carry the feeling of honor into the performance of their task.” I know that in countries where, at least, the workmen do not carry the feeling of honor into the performance of their task, those who receive equal pay with the rest of their fellow-workmen, nevertheless, seek to display superiority of skill, are frowned upon and scorned by the masters of the arts in this country. Therefore, I say nothing about the workman who is actuated by dishonest motives, and the workman who is actuated by self-interest, or overcomes to resist certain categories of labor, or the dislike to the wearing monopoly of the daily task. It may make a hero, but not a worker.

Bellamy’s conclusion to this is so silly, so childish, so utterly and flagrantly false, that I am delighted to reproduce it in full:

I beg leave to differ more emphatically from M. de Laveleye. Honor does make a workman as well as a hero, and as essential to the make-up of one as the other. This is a matter of common observation, and every man and woman4 in the room knows it. This is the sentiment, the despair of Laveleye and myself on the issue raised. Upon it I am ready to rest the whole case of Nationalism, and appeal to the country. I know that in countries where, at least, the workman who does not carry the feeling of honor into the performance of his task is not worth his salt.

Among those who designate themselves by this name of Anarchist Communists, two different schools should be distinguished, who hold that under a condition of perfect liberty the greatest beauty of the Communist principle would, according to the law of natural selection, speedily gain general acceptance and become the prevailing method of social organization. They would not institute a Communist system by force, but would seek to prove theoretically and practically the supremacy of such a system, depending upon the reason of emancipated humanity. Their ideal is voluntary Communism, which is to be brought about by the method of trusting to individual liberty, the unattached educator and elevators. Then there are those who plot the forcible suppression of the entire system of industrial liberty and private property, who hold that there is no way of eliminating exploitation of labor by capital save by abolishing private enterprise and organizing Communist control and enjoyment of wealth.

An examination of the various current doctrines of State Socialism. Concluded from No. 105.
It is not our intention to maintain a prolonged and elaborate discourse with the formidable array of the Denver "individualist's" editorial paragraphs. The chief reason is that, as the last issue of the paper has convinced us, we are, one and all (excepting the anonymous "Authorize C." and the anonymous "Author of the last chastician, and who is responsible for the paper's absurdities only by his participation in the Communitarian editorial arrangement), too ignorant of Anarchism, and also too hostile to it, to attempt to dignify much time and space to the correction of their innumerable misconceptions, blunders, and inconsistencies. The long editorial rejoinder to Mr. Yarros' criticism of Spencer is remarkable for nothing but solid imbecility and unreasoned nonsense. The writers, "J. W.," has not the remotest idea what the Anarchist position is: nor has he grasped our objections to Spencerian Individualism. We can only refer him to the editorial arrangement of the last number of Liberty, hoping against hope that he may hereinafter find therein what he has not been able to discover and imitate elsewhere in Liberty. The same writer's paragraph on interest and banking is so opaque with ignorance that we despair of the attempt to render it transparent. In the unsigned reply to Liberty's rebuke à propos of the un-Anarchistic management of the "Individualist," the ridiculous statement is made that "there are Anarchists and Anarchists,"—a state of affairs which gives no ground whatever for the implication in the meaning of the words, "liberty is the mother of order." And the assertion ventured, in exact opposition to the truth, as a study of "The Science of Merchandise," a car in the editorial chair of an Anarchist paper would be most un-Anarchist. To this is added the purport of the old maidish charge that the editor of Liberty is trying to be a carnal pope of the Anarchist movement. Now it is neither a duty nor a pleasure to patiently analyze and refute every crude and chaotic notion irresponsibly and confidently put on paper by mysterious strangers. We have a right to choose our opponents for debate. What Liberty wishes to say, plainly and positively, is, that it does not regard the "Individualist" as an organ of Anarchistic Socialism, and that it holds its editors wholly innocent of any real knowledge of the ideas and principles which has been spreading everywhere, and which is not, of course, of its own volition, promulgated by Liberty and its allies. The "Individualist" may talk of "differing" from Liberty's position, but we have no hesitation in saying that its editors are simply to the right of us. They need to learn before they can teach. They publish a paper for their own amusement, and we cannot take them seriously. For the rest, we think it safe to leave it to intelligent readers to decide which of the two papers is the more consistent in its political and social principles, and which made one of the wittiest and most biting attacks on the doctrine, and which framers and jibbers and inoffensively chatterers and makes confusion worse confounded.
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