On Picket Duty.

The "Nationalists'" reviewer says: "The individualist considers man as the unit of intelligent organized life, while the Socialist regards the large living organism, society, as the true unit." How scientific! How philosophical and profound! Society is the unit of society! Or, better still, society is the unit of the individual! Is there anything in the world that the Nationalist writers may be credited with knowing or understanding?

How much the Nationalists know about Anarchism may be gathered from the fact that Mr. J. H. Levy's "Out
ome of Individualism" is characterized in the "Nationalist" as "one of the most logical short treatises on the aims and desires of the so-called scientific Anarchism."

Mr. Levy, my readers will remember, favors cooperation among the nations and nationalization of the means which only editors and reviewers of Nationalist papers can regard as compatible with consistent individualism, or Anarchism.

A writer in the "North American Review," dealing with the city of New York, states that the records of the Police Commissioners show that within a few years hundreds of complaints have been made by reputable citizens who have felt that their persons have been most shamefully abused by policemen. We must remember that the average citizen has neither the opportunity nor the inclination to lodge complaint against police ruffians, and that only in exceptional cases are complaints made. This gives us no idea of the kind of protection we receive from the hands of the police.

When J. Arndt, declares in "Free Life" that he disentangles his position, and that he takes his stand upon the open market and the principle that the desires, feelings, and needs of men are a true guide of the right, he does not understand what my position is. Mr. Arndt has been writing some very excellent letters to "Free Life," and with almost all that he says in them I am in thorough sympathy; but, as he is a reader of Liberty, I cannot excuse him for failing to write with Mr. Herbert's misconception of my views and then uniting in them in dissent thereto.

The "Nationalist Educational Association" advertises its recommendations, in its organ, a number of books dealing with industrial and economic subjects, presumably for purposes of propaganda. But think of my astonishment when I found in "The Nationalist Bookcase" such works as Bastiat's "Sophism of Protection" and Bonham's "Industrial Liberty!" Do the Nationalists recommend these works? If so, must it be because they are ignorant of the positions of the authors and the contents of the books? If the Nationalists wish to prosper, they should discourage the study of such writers as Bastiat and Bonham, who really clear the ground for Anarchism.

Moses Harman has received official notification that he is to be tried in Judge Foster's court on the charge of mailing the copy of "Lucifer" containing the Oath letter before said letter was, in the advice that he in the superior court possibly might be reached. Mr. Harman makes this announcement without any comment, say-
Love and Sex.

It is a physiological truth that the sexual nature of individuals is to a great extent innate. It would seem that the same truth applies in sociology: ideas may be nurtured on other people's ideas and be transmitted to other people; but ideas as to the matter of sexual relations. Not long ago Grant Allen wrote an article on the marriage question, in which he spoke of persons who married for convenience only, and about those who married for love. He concluded that, "if we cared to learn the cause of the death of each person we shall see that there are more causes than one."

But the marriages and population questions are up to be settled. It is impossible to talk of population without talking of marriage, and not bringing both to bear in the same context. There is no half-way house or logical dividing line between the two. Marriage and population are the two great social facts of the world. The two are inseparable. They are the two keys to the whole of human nature. They are the two keys to the whole of human society.

There are a few who think that marriage is only a matter of convenience, and that it is possible to live without marriage. But this is a mistake. Marriage is not only a matter of convenience; it is a matter of necessity. It is a matter of nature. It is a matter of the very foundation of society. It is a matter of the very foundation of human nature.

But the marriages and population questions are up to be settled. It is impossible to talk of population without talking of marriage, and not bringing both to bear in the same context. There is no half-way house or logical dividing line between the two. Marriage and population are the two great social facts of the world. The two are inseparable. They are the two keys to the whole of human nature. They are the two keys to the whole of human society.

There are a few who think that marriage is only a matter of convenience, and that it is possible to live without marriage. But this is a mistake. Marriage is not only a matter of convenience; it is a matter of necessity. It is a matter of the very foundation of society. It is a matter of the very foundation of human nature.

But the marriages and population questions are up to be settled. It is impossible to talk of population without talking of marriage, and not bringing both to bear in the same context. There is no half-way house or logical dividing line between the two. Marriage and population are the two great social facts of the world. The two are inseparable. They are the two keys to the whole of human nature. They are the two keys to the whole of human society.

There are a few who think that marriage is only a matter of convenience, and that it is possible to live without marriage. But this is a mistake. Marriage is not only a matter of convenience; it is a matter of necessity. It is a matter of the very foundation of society. It is a matter of the very foundation of human nature.

But the marriages and population questions are up to be settled. It is impossible to talk of population without talking of marriage, and not bringing both to bear in the same context. There is no half-way house or logical dividing line between the two. Marriage and population are the two great social facts of the world. The two are inseparable. They are the two keys to the whole of human nature. They are the two keys to the whole of human society.

There are a few who think that marriage is only a matter of convenience, and that it is possible to live without marriage. But this is a mistake. Marriage is not only a matter of convenience; it is a matter of necessity. It is a matter of the very foundation of society. It is a matter of the very foundation of human nature.

But the marriages and population questions are up to be settled. It is impossible to talk of population without talking of marriage, and not bringing both to bear in the same context. There is no half-way house or logical dividing line between the two. Marriage and population are the two great social facts of the world. The two are inseparable. They are the two keys to the whole of human nature. They are the two keys to the whole of human society.

There are a few who think that marriage is only a matter of convenience, and that it is possible to live without marriage. But this is a mistake. Marriage is not only a matter of convenience; it is a matter of necessity. It is a matter of the very foundation of society. It is a matter of the very foundation of human nature.
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play, but the nature of Greeks and Romans was little different. They were both robust, courageous, resourceful, and insatiable for conquest. But the Greek was more of a man, as we see in the ancient records, and would warrant any man's testimony in the matter.

The difference between Romanism and any other form of government is that the Greek was more of a man, as we see in the ancient records, and would warrant any man's testimony in the matter.

But while human nature remains the same, the institutions and the minds of man have changed. The spirit which impulse will have free scope, and the result— as in all other matters where freedom has prevailed— will be greater hopefulness, more progress, more welfare, more individualism— the triumph of the human spirit, — that it claims freedom in all things, and the individual is becoming more and more individualized. Never was there a time when the spirit of man was more fully realized, or its possibilities as yet fully realized. Never was there a time when the idea of freedom was so fully realized, or its possibilities as yet fully realized. Never was there a time when the idea of freedom was so fully realized, or its possibilities as yet fully realized.

But the great change in human nature, so far as freedom is concerned, is not only in the present age, but in the future. The idea of freedom is no longer the idea of freedom in the present age, but is the idea of freedom in the future age. The idea of freedom is no longer the idea of freedom in the present age, but is the idea of freedom in the future age.

The Voluntary Co-operation

[Walter P. Wills in The New Idealist]

Although the "Nationalistic method" is to extend the functions of government to the inclusion of all industry, it is claimed by its advocates that the relations of individuals to the government will be purely voluntary, and that the government will never be felt. If it is true that this "government theory" can ever be realized without force, the idea of a government that is to be an agency for the protection of all individuals, and that the government will never be felt, — it must also be true that its individual units will have attained to such a degree of perfection as to render the services of the government unnecessary. The government, as a whole, will be a mere agency for the protection of all individuals, and the government will never be felt. But it is true that this "government theory" can ever be realized without force, the idea of a government that is to be an agency for the protection of all individuals, and that the government will never be felt, — it must also be true that its individual units will have attained to such a degree of perfection as to render the services of the government unnecessary. The government, as a whole, will be a mere agency for the protection of all individuals, and the government will never be felt.
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"In abolishing rent and interest, the last vestiges of old-time slavery are swept away, and the colonist at once takes the wreath of the corona, the soul of the magistrate, the club of the policeman, the whip of the overseer, and the shears of the tailor. With them all are the insignia of Politics, which young Liberty plucks bare her soul." — PROCLAMATION.

An Unwarranted Question.

Auberon Herbert, in his paper, "Free Life," asks me how I justify a war against the rich men to lend and to borrow. I answer that I do not justify such a campaign, have never attempted to justify such a campaign, do not advocate such a campaign, in fact am ardently opposed to such a campaign. In turn, I ask Mr. Herbert to justify his apparent attribution to me of a wish to see such a campaign instituted.

It is true that I expect lending and borrowing to disappear, but not by any denial of the right to lend and to borrow. I expect it to disappear by virtue of the affirmation and exercise of a right that is now denied: namely, the right to use one's own credit, or to exchange it freely for another's. In such a way that one or the other of these credits may perform the function of a circulating medium, without the payment of any tax for the privilege. It has been repeatedly demonstrated in these columns that the exercise of such a right would accomplish the gradual and peaceful without a resort to force, and the nature of this economic process has been described over and over again. This demonstration Mr. Herbert steadily ignores, and the position itself he never meets save by a sweeping denial, or by characterization as an anarchy, or a scheme of graft, or for it a man of straw of his own creation and then knocking it down.

The Anarchists assert that interest, however it may have originated, exists today only by virtue of the legal monopoly of the use of credit for currency purposes, and they trace the process, step by step, by which an abolition of that monopoly would gradually reduce interest to zero. Mr. Herbert never stops to analyze this process that he may find the absence of interest without a resort to force, old or new, and the nature of this economic process has been described over and over again. This demonstration Mr. Herbert steadily ignores, and the position itself he never meets save by a sweeping denial, or by characterization as an anarchy, or a scheme of graft, or for it a man of straw of his own creation and then knocking it down.

The Anarchists assert that interest, however it may have originated, exists today only by virtue of the legal monopoly of the use of credit for currency purposes, and they trace the process, step by step, by which an abolition of that monopoly would gradually reduce interest to zero. Mr. Herbert never stops to analyze this process that he may find the absence of interest without a resort to force, and the nature of this economic process has been described over and over again. This demonstration Mr. Herbert steadily ignores, and the position itself he never meets save by a sweeping denial, or by characterization as an anarchy, or a scheme of graft, or for it a man of straw of his own creation and then knocking it down.

The Anarchists assert that interest, however it may have originated, exists today only by virtue of the legal monopoly of the use of credit for currency purposes, and they trace the process, step by step, by which an abolition of that monopoly would gradually reduce interest to zero. Mr. Herbert never stops to analyze this process that he may find the absence of interest without a resort to force, and the nature of this economic process has been described over and over again. This demonstration Mr. Herbert steadily ignores, and the position itself he never meets save by a sweeping denial, or by characterization as an anarchy, or a scheme of graft, or for it a man of straw of his own creation and then knocking it down.

John Stuart Mill furnishes a better statement of the problem with which we are dealing. He writes:

To do as you would be done by, and to love your neighbor as yourself, is the maxim of utilitarian morality. As the means of making the nearest approach to this ideal, utility would enjoy, first, that law and social custom which give it power to defend itself; second, that security with which it is associated in the eyes of the public; and, third, that power, which, having a vast power over human nature, should so use that power as to establish in the mind of every individual an indubitable association between his own happiness and the good of the whole, and, secondly, that association between his own happiness and the good of the whole, and, especially between his own happiness and the power of such modes of conduct, negative and positive, as are the most conducive to the general good, and that the power which is so used as to make the general good may be in every individual one of the habitual motives of action, and the sentiments connected therewith may fill a large and prominent place in every human being's sentient system.

It is an error to think that, in saying that the law should place the happiness or the interest of every individual as nearly as possible in harmony with the interest of the whole, Mill implied something different from the demand for equal liberty and equal opportunity. The words in question are Mill's, as represented by Mr. Thompson. Mill was not altogether opposed to government regulation of industry and commerce, while we, as thinking, as we do that man's interests can only be secured by regulation and intervention on the part of government. But what concerns us here is the fact that Mill laid stress on the urgency of securing harmony between men's material interests as a condition of their social and personal well-being. This Mill indicates: "Do you wish to improve social relations, to reform prevailing maladjustments? Make men's interests harmonious and coincident, and dwell on the higher advantages of mutualism and just dealing."

Now what the Anarchists say is this: Let us have complete industrial liberty; let government cease to interfere in matters of finance, trade, commerce, and production. Such liberty would bring us as near to the point of idealism as is possible for us ever to attain. And then let culture and education do all that may be done to eliminate those elements of compulsory government and elevate men so that they will neither command nor obey, — in a word, give us free and unfettered minds.

The only objection I anticipate from the individualists to such a statement of Anarchism is that society never will reach that stage of development where all governmental compulsion becomes superfluous and impermanent, while the idea of direct compulsion will always be found necessary in dealing with invidious individuals. Mr. Thompson distinctly says: "While governmental control is necessary to extend, no matter how far, the higher civilization demand its continual limitation within narrower bounds and its reduction to a minimum."

And Mr. Thompson agrees with the Specerians that there can be no objections against a government which really restrains itself to the function of protecting life and property and liberty.

But it would be a mistake to imagine that Anarchists protest against this "minimum of government" favored by the individualist, and insist on the entire absence of any government. It is that belief that society will reach that ideal condition and will live under perfectly Anarchistic conditions. Were this the case, the present Anarchistic movement might reasonably be considered by practical men as a sentimental and utopian affair. For surely it would be folly to waste time on the discussion of such an idle question as the ultimate possibilities of humanity. Whether the possibility of a state of perfection and absolute adaptation is granted or not, the certainty that the elimination of the last vestiges of compulsory government not to be thought of now, would justify level-headed reformers in pursuing their useful and practical plan of limiting government without the least concern about the trivial complaints of idealists and extremists.

It is important, therefore, a like for reasoning friend and opponent, to understand that we Anarchists recognize the rights of the more popular individualists as improvements, real and vital; and that we claim not merely theoretical soundness, but practical superiority. We say: the individualists and the scientific sociologists represented by men like Comte, Spence, and the Socialists, and individualists regarding taxation and to be consistent and logical enough to pronounce in favor of competitive protection. Compulsory taxation, even for the purpose of defending life and property, is, in the eyes of the Anarchists, a most objectionable principle, if the principle is once admitted that force should be exercised against force only. Those who decline to support a government instituted for purely protective purposes cannot be said to invade the rights of their fellow-men. If they choose to run risks, it is in their own affair. People who decline to enforce the virtues of temperance cannot, without sacrificing themselves,
Tort and Retort.

The editor of "Today" does me the honor to criticize a recent article of mine in "Liberty," and he opens his criticism with the following very respectful remark:

"It would be difficult to match the superficiality of the criticism made by Mr. Yarros to reply to Miss Gardner's letter on "Woman," published in the "Twentieth Century," Of the letter itself I cannot speak, but the reply to it is simply

And here is the rest of the courteous criticism:

"Neither the Socialists nor the Anarchists have neglected the 'Woman' question. . . . Socialists and Anarchists have been accused of wounding the great source of information, the knowledge is easily acquired, etc.

What stuff is this! I almost thought that I was reading in "Liberty," but I was taken in, asked to be supplied with a hand-book containing the "facts and statistics" bearing on the various sociological topics. Only a few years ago, I think, the hand-book had been compiled already. Socialists and Anarchists may have discussed the question abundantly, and, some will say, very ably, but their apparatus is over-equipped, over-abundant, with a net result of nothing to show for their pains. It is astonishing what facts of rationalization philosophers have accumulated by simply passing over facts and a world out of their own bowels, how do Socialists and Anarchists know about biology? Well, let it be known that we know, and, they may say, not quite, as much about biology as biology does about us.

Leaving the Socialists out of the question, as persons not worth of consideration in a scientific discussion of society, let us return to the right. Yarros regards Evolution as the factor (or fact) which we must look for in the solution of this matter. Very well; let us look for Evolution, let us see if it can be found. Let Evolution be our guide: agreed; but the region through which we are to be guided is out of "Liberty," is it not? Now that are the facts? I do not see in which facts for Anarchist facts, but just plain, ordinary facts. For instance, by way of illustrating the kind of facts to which I refer, I have been frequently told that Socialists and Anarchists, as the case may be, stand guard over vast treasures of knowledge. I apply merely as a foot-sore wayfarer, asking for a drink, and, with me, an in-exhaustible fountain of blessings of gratitude. Also! How unkindly fortunes have used us! While Anarchists and Socialists have been laying down trusty stores of knowledge, "easily acquired," a cruel fate has left me dried and starved. What is Sex? Socially, industrially, politically, historically even, something may be known of sex. But I beg leave to call attention to the incident that sex is also a biological phenomenon. Is sex, therefore, a biological phenomenon? Is it not the hypothesis that the physiological fact must be learned before any of these others will be rightly understood? If I had a few pages of "Liberty," I would, so to speak, set down the ex- offense. I would be willing to rank a few of those "Origins of Sex" and then go down to my throats, to see what effect these stomachs could produce on what their minds have been unable to digest.

As far as I am of the uselessness of any attempt I might make to emulate the editor of "Today" in gentleness, I can do no better than say at once in my own blunt way that I consider the criticism both silly and unfair. And so little difficulty there is in exposing the blinding wrongdoing-headedness of my critics that I am not inclined to waste space on a superfluous counter-criticism.

In the first place, I did not say in the article that knowledge on sex is "easily acquired." The editor of "Today" has, in fact, misrepresented me: I said "knowledge on sex is acquired with the same sociological knowledge, not the knowledge on sex is easily acquired." The first sentence which the editor quotes occurs in the middle of my article, in a paragraph answering Miss Gardner's absurd charge that I had been "blundering." The editor seems to have been a thoughtless yes to the pauper status of women and justify certain restrictions upon their freedom. The second sentence occurs in the concluding paragraph of the article, and deals with the subject of women's manhood. I might add that the question, namely, whether Anarchists have really found a scientific solution of certain social problems, and whether Miss Gardner, who confesses to her inability to give positive remedies, is entitled to criticism and denounced established institutions and creeds.

claim that it is right and proper to compel others to take certain precautions to preserve their own possessions. The recent individualists flagrantly and blunderingly violate their own basic doctrine when they refuse to endorse the Anarchistic demand for voluntary taxation and competitive protection. We insist that voluntary taxation is practicable among people of common sense, and that it is essential to emphasize here and now the right of the non-}

viable individual to ignore the reorganized and improved State. It is sufficient for us to recognize that the State imposes a public service and choses individuals who will never willingly aggress or invade or tyrannize, and there is no reason why these (who may be very imperfect when judged from a higher standard than the readines to do simple justice) should not be left free to do their own business. We may be, and doubtless are, imperfect enough to need some kind of protection against anti-social people; but we ought to possess sufficient intelligence and suf-

ficient regard for elementary equity to appreciate the absurdity of the act of taxing and punishing non-

viable and just individuals.

Touching the practical aspect of the matter, it seems to me that both our general conceptions of human nature and the facts of our daily experience abundantly establish the fact that insecurity, slav-

ery, and dishonesty are inseparable from monopoly, and that only the wholesome fear of competition can secure proper and prompt discharge of obligations. If we are to abolish the monopoly, we must abolish the monopoly. We are convinced that the facts do not support the assumption that government based on compulsory taxation would cease to be tyrannical and become pure and competent if it were entrusted with no function save that of administering justice. Therefore, while ready and eager to help the individualists in their efforts to restrict and limit governmental authority, we do not propose to stop where they stop, since we can discern no good against continuing the war upon

upon the name of liberty and justice and eliminating the element of tyranny from social organization altogether.

Nationalism: Two Views.

In the last "Nationalism," a writer who undertakes to enlighten us upon the blessings of true democracy says: "Voluntary association, the cry of the individ-

ualist, is as incompatible with civilization as volun-

tary association, the cry of the selfish, is of our body.

As for salvation look to the State." The individual who writes this, of course, a fool; but he is a true and con-

sistent Nationalist. In the same number of the magazine, however, another writer, who is anything but a fool; after declaring that "it is manifestly an injustice to compel any adult citizen of sound mind to work under any arbitrary authority, individual or social, at least on those from which he is given free access to the natural resources and opportunities necessary to become a self-
sustaining and useful member of society and to prove his ability and efficiency;" that "these natural op-

portunities have never been secured to all the people of any nation that is large and strong enough to protect itself from foreign interference;" that "all we have equal civil freedom we cannot know how much restraint and composition is necessary to protect liberty before he is given free access to the natural re-

sources and opportunities necessary to become a self-
sustaining and useful member of society and to prove his ability and efficiency;" that "if State Socialism is the true ideal, man will voluntarily choose it when he is in freedom, and he cannot be forced to accept it before," — after saying all this, which no Nationalist ever heard before, the writer goes on to repeat the following statement with regard to the aims and methods of the Nationalists:

Nationalists do not propose to force State Socialism on any of the people they are to govern. They assume control of those industries and functions which are manifestly of public — State or national — use, and of necessity must be under some kind of public government; and

which, if not conducted by the responsible government for the people, are monopsonistic, sure to be monopolistic, and used by irresponsible petty governments for robbing and oppressing the mass of the people to gorge the few and de-
normalize the whole. The only way to assure the ade-

propriation of production, whatsoever its origin, is to curb and check the activities of men themselves, an individual, a company, or the government; all who seek it will have steady employment; no one will work for anything better than for himself; and the consumers will be all free to buy of
to whom they can serve best. This would give free scope to the activities of individuals whatever.

Although the editor of the "Nationalist" allows this statement to appear without correction, we all know too well that the writer does not voice the sentiments of the followers of Bellamy or any other leading and representative Nationalist. What he says is astonishingly excellent — for a Nationalist; and I honor him for his mental and moral superiority to the crowd with which he uselessly and uselessly identifies himself; but he evidently speaks without knowledge of the origin, condition, and prospects of Nationalism. He has not studied a mass of facts and statistics, and is altogether mistaken in his impressions as to what Nationalists do and do not propose to do. He should read the article of his fellow-contributor whom I quoted in the opening paragraph, and who shows what Nationalism practically is.

State Patronage of Literature.

One cannot help admiring the eleventh chapter of Bucée's "History of Civilization," in which he lays down the cardinal and degenerate principles of State intervention in literature in France in the latter half of the nineteenth century and part of the first half of the eighteenth. It contains such clear and unmistakable evidence for the national meddling that anyone who has been reasoning with reasons cannot help drawing important lessons therefrom.

In 1661, when Louis XIV became king, a system of patronage was practised in order to improve literature and to make it degenerate. Literature was then the expression of the most profound investigations; but from the moment that governmental favoritism became felt, the objective method of investigation was displaced by the metaphysical method, and literature was the shadow of the great science. The tendency in England was toward a contraction of the sphere of government, thereby affording wider scope to individual activity. The pursuit of knowledge becom-

less a spur than in France, those who really cared for learning for the sake of the sub-

jective dominating mind the objective method was purer, and the generalizations were rich with useful information.

What a splendid lesson this contrast conveys to the student who intelligently observes the social specula-

tions of our day. He sees that every theory seeking recognition can be placed in categories which reflect the English experience on the one hand, and that of France on the other. French theory can escape the alternative, and the division in which one is placed determines its possession of the elements either of progress or retrogression.

If, as the opinion of competent writers, the experience of France and England is the best illustration of the general experience of Western civilization, the element representing paternalism is judged before hand, for the application of this principle necessarily conditions necessary for further advancement. It must be agreed that the best guide contains the elements of "further development, unfolding all the good possible in society," and renders attainable a more complete adaptation of the individual to his en-

vironment. As we approach to modern government, mentalists take on a somewhat scientific, yet, but surface speculations cannot long survive the diffusion of more accurate thought, and the future promises the entire extinction of "that spirit which weakness ever teaches."
The knowledge which I advised her to acquire, and which, I added, might be easily acquired, was the knowledge which enables the editor of "Today" to assume the rôle of a teacher and guide, and which enables one to agree with him in many things and to differ in certain other things. The editor of "Today" admits that socially, industrially, politically, historically even, something may be known of sex. Now, what I ventured to say was that the Socialists and Anarchists have abundantly discussed the "Woman Question" in the light of this available knowledge. Is this knowledge insufficient? Possibly; but this has nothing to do with the basic conflict between the Gardener and myself. The conclusion is being more and more forced on me that the editor of "Today" is an extremely careless and hasty reader and writer. He is not anxious to be just to his opponents, and he frequently passes over or ignores the less intelligent parts of which people with half his intelligence might be ashamed.

No better proof of my editorial critic's superficiality and untruthfulness is needed than his readiness to make the gratuitous statement that Anarchists have been unable to digest the "Origin of Species" and the "Principles of Biology." In the first place, he knows nothing about the accomplishments and selections of Anarchists, and secondly, he apparently believes that there is no such thing as "scientific" thinking. And this is certainly nothing in their teachings to warrant the inference that they are ignorant of biological sciences. I am bold enough to say that I understand Darwin and Spencer as well as the editor of "Today"; and if he says that I misunderstand them, I may be right (or not?) because I am a more consistent and anxious reasoner than he is. What the Anarchists have written on the "Woman Question" may be very imperfect and inadequate; I never claimed absolute truth for their views; but I call the editor's attention to the fact that a biologist like Grant Allen finds it possible to fully accept their solution of the problem. On the other hand, we find Wallace taking the Social and industrial solution of the problem and endorsing Nationalism in his "War". All this shows that Wallace and Socialists may know as much about biology as the editor of "Today"; yet their biological knowledge does not authorize them to dismiss the views of Socialists and Anarchists on the "Woman Question" as frivolous notions born of absurd conclusions.

Doublas is "quite within the range of tenable hypothesis that the physiological fact must be learned before any of these others will be rightly understood." But the editor of "Today" cannot consult any material efforts to 'provisionally solve the "Woman Question" in the light of what is socially, industrially, politically, and historically known of sex? If he has no conception of the development of scientific and philosophical thought, and if he does not desire to do so, he is not qualified to consult. It behooves him to sing small when the Socialists and Anarchists have the authority of such biologists as Wallace and Grant Allen for continuing to offer solutions of the "Woman Question" and doing the best they can with the material at hand.

Mr. Tolstoi, Ingersoll, and Pentecost.

Mr. Pentecost writes:

"It would scarcely be possible for a man of Colonel Ingersoll's ability to write anything so凶手 in his review of the "Kreutzer Sonata" as the New "American," unless, indeed, he had some special interest of some kind in the case of a Beecher or a Blaine. The following sentence is enough to show that he does not in the least understand his subject: "Certainly, it is absurd to imagine that Schumann would write a serenade for every saint, and every virtuous husband." This is the most glorious absurdity in the article, and, of course, it is absolutely impossible for a man so trained as is the writer of the "American" to make of such a serenade for every saint, and every virtuous husband. Tolstoi profers seeking a heaven somewhere else to make one, and that the long and short of it is that Tolstoi is absolutely ignorant of the meaning of "Kreutzer Sonata." For he has evidently not read the book, and the passage that he quotes from the book he is, according to his own admission, to adopt a figure of his own, the bow of the worm to harden the sun. Ingersoll is a master of ridicule and sarcasm, and this is his whole burden of argument. But he must know that the whole point is not the mere".

There is always this danger in reading a post we cannot be to read it as a whole; for relying on it in an attempt to make out a case which is not a case. Relying on a man who, in the midst of his excellent reputation, will now and then spring up as a pamphlet to build up his chances of the same. He is in this to be a very bad place to do it in the midst of the discussion, to show what Ingersoll did when he wrote "The Building of the Ship." Now that he has been exposed, in all his naked nakedness, we can see for how long we have had to read the following lines without a suspicion of their wickedness:

The Lounger should have written in a foot-note that the "above is "content." There is certainly ground for wonder that it has not been suppressed. The "Kreutzer Sonata" is a most subtle piece of writing as a sober and earnest expression of honest opinion. Nor has the Lounger a right to blame such readers as feel offended at their failure to appreciate his (or her) true quality. The Lounger has given the readers a new society as a whole, and the absence of literary art on occasions not greatly dissimilar to the present. From the justification and approval of Wannamaker's attempted suppression of the "Kreutzer Sonata" as the "Sonata" affair will be that hereafter nothing will be said about "Kreutzer Sonata," but the Lounger good-naturedly for the Lounger to be responsible for. The Lounger has forfeited the right to depend on the readers' acuteness, sympathy, or generosity, having once at least outraged our sense of dignity and individuality.

An Old Error Revised.

In the "Twentieth Century" of September 25th, Mr. Pen- tecost said: "Without perfect persons there can be no perfect institutions, and without perfect institutions the happiness of social miseries will cease... on the one hand, we must not be afraid to say what society is, and on the other, we must not be afraid to say what it is not. Do we not see that it is not the fact of the rich that poor. We are not afraid of the rich, but we are afraid of the poor because they are lazy and immoral. Do we not wish to improve their morals by telling them that, if they want to be happy, they must work hard. But the Lounger, in "Kreutzer Sonata," is not wholly emancipated from the theological spirit. I have noticed several times that this spirit has obscured his logical thinking. The preacher will soon say with surprise: "I must confess that I was wrong; and the Lounger in "Kreutzer Sonata" is an echo, then we were always, and are, Anarchists. Do we not say that it is not the fact of the rich that poor. We have not seen enough of society, and have not yet wholly emancipated himself from the theological spirit. I have noticed several times that this spirit has obscured his logical thinking. The preacher will soon say with surprise: "I must confess that I was wrong; and the Lounger in "Kreutzer Sonata" is an echo, then we were always, and are, Anarchists. Do we not say that it is not the fact of the rich that poor. We do not say that it is not the fact of the rich that poor. We do not say that it is not the fact of the rich that poor. We do not say that it is not the fact of the rich that poor. We do not say that it is not the fact of the rich that poor.

Mr. Pentecost means to tell us that we must not expect after the abolition of monopolies that society will become perfect at once, since the individuals will still be imperfect; that he, as an evolutionist, does not suppose that the Communists, that it is only necessary to abol-lish monopolies and live in common order to achieve a perfect state of society, then he is right, no doubt, but nearly original. But it seems to me that he is far from meaning that Mr. Pentecost, as an Anarchist, believes that the main cause of industrial poverty is governmental privileges and monopoly. He also must know that ignorance goes hand in hand with poverty, and that we cannot ask poor and ignorant people to be perfect, as we cannot ask the poor to be completely educated. We must not know that most of the prostitutes are prostitutes because they do not see any other way of living. Does he not know that to abolish monopolies would abolish prostitution, it is impossible to make them think or feel that they ought to abandon their only means of living? If he refuses all that, then what is the use of saying that prostitution would cease if the prostit-utes were unwilling under any circumstances to be prost-utes? He who does not think that Mr. Pentecost really believe them for preferring to live, considering their mental and moral condition. The same may be said about stealing and murder.

But let us see whether even those people who have a con-ception of a better society, and know what it is necessary to do to bring it into being, are satisfied with Mr. Pentecost's expectations. To my mind, to have ideas about life means to have at the same time a desire to pro-duce the greatest possible happiness. It is not that Mr. Pentecost fails from their adoption. In private life, a person who is not a typeocrat will always try to live up to his ideal, and to be as much as a real radicalist as he wants to be an example to others, but for his own satisfaction. Therefore it seems selfish and ridiculous to urge others to
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