On Picket Duty.

"In everything a touch of chaos," With what sententious force and penetration the poet Ingersoll speaks, in these words, characterizes one of the greatest qualities of the poet Whitman and his work.

Commenting on Ibsen’s letter to Brandes, in which the poet says he ought to engage in a movement for the abolition of the State, Anarchist Herbert claims this as evidence that Ibsen is an Individualist. An Anarchist, rather, I should say.

Reviewing H.S. Salt’s collection of Thorow’s “Antislavery and Reform Papers,” the New York “Nation” says: “If [Mr. Salt] asserts that Thorow was an Individualist in principle, but the name can hardly be applied to him with fairness now.” And why not, pray?


Some of the self-styled critics of utilitarianism and Egoism are wont to speak sneeringly of the “ego” and to admonish us that we are nothing but “bundles of traditions.” It was idle to argue with these, since they certainly are nothing but bundles of ignorant absurdities, but it may be profitable, or at least entertaining, to say a few words of these one of these days about them, and have the answer of them in the retort.

There has just appeared in England,” says “Le Rétroïte,” “a new Individualist-Anarchist journal, taking its inspiration at a distance from the ideas of Proudhon. We must regret that the first number is a bad one, but we are not prepared for the worst. This emphasis in the last sentence should be laid, not on bad, but on Liberty. Every fresh crop of Proudhon’s adherents and Liberty’s associates renders “Le Rétroïte” as tearful as John Most becomes when confronted with some new manifestation of that ascendant “Tuerkenism.” As a rule, the Anarchists take very little interest in elections and campaigns. But every Anarchist must be agreed with the results of the late elections. The defeat of Cannon, McKinley, and others. Republican ringleaders, and the sudden extirpation of “Red, Jugalla, Quay, and the rest of those building up the red and brown corruptionists, can only gladden and cheer the heart of every real lover of liberty and manhood. The Democrats are at least sure not to do much harm, and on utilitarian legislation, and more likely, to be of benefit to the people.

I reprint Grant Allen’s article on “Fair Wages,” because there is so much that is true in it. Its outspoken and practical conclusions are such as to acquaint the American Society as the Lighter Ideal and one not impossible to realize. But I cannot go with Grant Allen, or regard him as anything but a dangerous enemy to liberty, when he says that, though individualism is far greater than socialism, both are fair, and that it is foolish to combat socialism because of the strong suit towards it. According to Mr. Allen’s conception of fairness, it is unfair to rob men of their wealth, but fair to rob them of their liberty. He thinks that a fair society where all men are alike oppressed in order that they may be alike rewarded. For my part, I regard oppression as essentially unfair, however impartially it may be exercised, and I regard the man who falls to oppress simply because there is a strong set towards it as a contemptible man.

The “Saturday Review” proclaims to be glad that a tardy testimonial has been presented to Walt Whitman, but says: “It is a pity that the chief actor should have been an offensive quack like Mr. Robert Ingersoll.” Considering that Walt Whitman’s “religion,” as Ingersoll has shown in his magnificent lecture, is more entitled to the admiration of the philosophers and religious men rather than Mr. Ingersoll himself, it is difficult to understand why the “Saturday Review” says that the public is deluded in swallowing Whitman, why it finds him so offensive after praising Whitman. But perhaps it is the very fact that Ingersoll has unvailed Whitman’s secularism and made clear the least penetrating reader of Whitman that the point is an Agnostic which displeases the “Saturday Review.” Supposing that it was a mere relation to the “Saturday Review” to learn this fact (a rather charitable supposition), it is doubled by the remark that Ingersoll’s masterpiece will bring many new disciples and admirers to Whitman’s religion and philosophy.

Commenting upon a correspondent’s proposal with regard to governmental taxation of property, the editor of the “Free Life” wishes to have the following questions answered: “Why is the State to be above all rights? Why is it not to be bound by the obligations which fall upon all citizens? Why is it to be the one great example of wastefulness—of taking what it needs with the strong hand—set up in our midst? What is the State to do to men as individuals? Who are the people to be disposed of? So many other questions, only much fewer in number. We believe that the State cannot cease to be a danger and an enemy to society as long as it is allowed to possess rights superior to those of the ordinary trading citizen. Why should the State buy cheaper and have better terms in all its business arrangements than ordinary citizens? Why should be recognized as the one licensed half-breed, half-blood, which is to get all it wants below the real value? Attempts to supply reasons for the State’s being and doing all this have been made, but the result has been so unsatisfactory that our friends who favor compulsory taxation will have to try again.

In his “Civil Government in the United States” John Fiske attempts to make plain the differences between taxation and robbery. He says: “If individuals take away some of your property for purposes of their own, it is robbery. If the government takes away some of your property in the shape of taxes, it is supposed to render to you an equivalent in the shape of services. If the government takes away some of your property in the shape of taxes, it is supposed to render to you an equivalent in the shape of services, something without which our lives and property would not be safe. When the

highwayman points his pistol at me and I hand him my purse and watch, I am robbed. But when I pay the tax collector, who seizes my watch or sell my horse over my head if I refuse, I am simply paying what is fairly due to him toward support of the Government.” But after laying down the theory, Mr. Fiske, mindful of certain practical experiences not altogether praiseworthy of its soundness, observes: “In what we have been saying it has thus far been assumed that the Government is in the hands of upright and competent men and is properly administered. It is now time to observe that robbery may be committed by Governments as well as by individuals. If the business of government is placed in the hands of men who have an imperfect sense of their duty toward the public; if such men raise money by taxation and then spend it on their own pleasures or to increase their political influence, or for other illegitimate purposes, it is really robbery just as much as if those men were to stand with pistols by the roadside and empty wallets of people passing by. They make a dishonest use of their high position as members of Government and extort money for which they make no return in the shape of services, from other robbers stationed along your path. Is he justified in his act, and is he less a robber because of it? Mr. Fiske will hardly say ‘yes’; but in that case, his defence of government falls to the ground. Government—that is, the majestical one (best)—takes as much from the minority as it chooses for services to the minority as it chooses to render. It does not consult the wishes and opinions of the minority, it does not trouble itself about the majority’s confidence, or lack of confidence, in its honesty and competency; but forces its services on, and collects its pay from, the helpless minority in a manner undistinguishable from that of our hypothetical robber. Honesty is not enough to justify taxation; we want capable and skillful publicists, which the most honest of governments can never succeed in giving us. Besides, we have a right to run risks and deal with the robbers in our own way. There is no difference in Mr. Fiske’s distinction. Taxation without actual consent is robbery. Uncle Sam is a highwayman.

A SONG FOR NOVEMBER ELEVENTH.

As men who dare not be honest and speak out their earnest thought,

As men who could not be8orted nor bribed—(true or bought)

Not that they were of the best of us

Not that they were of the best of us

But as types of the rest of us

Keep up our nativity.

True men were they, whom we honor—our soul, and soul today!

Their names we proudly may utter, and teach our children to say

To England and Spain and Portugal and Long and Fisher, whom we call

And we are calling in service, “Halt, halt to you! Heroes all!”

Not that they, etc.

Each one that’s faithfully hallowed by the liberty we own.

May live as bravely as they did; if need be, the without more.

Not that they, etc.

Chorus.
Letters from Italy.

To the Editor of "Liberty":

The financial conditions of Italy are unfortunately now far worse than they were a year ago. The other side of the picture was that it had been at least on the surface, formerly believable in the past. The present government, being dependent on the cabinet minister, refrains, of course, from taking any active part in the affair. An interpretation common to all is that not, and the majority of the Italian citizens having an interest in this matter is not, and it is being reported in Italy that there is a considerable body of the population which is not willing to pay the taxes.

Another reason why the government may take it for granted that the elections will work favorably to the government, is that the people have been made to believe that they are going to be better off in the future. The government has been able to show the people that it is going to bring prosperity and peace, and that the people have been able to see that they are going to be better off in the future.

The government has been able to show the people that it is going to bring prosperity and peace, and that the people have been able to see that they are going to be better off in the future. The government has been able to show the people that it is going to bring prosperity and peace, and that the people have been able to see that they are going to be better off in the future.
Beauties of Government.

GUTHRIE, Ok., Oct. 29, 1859. The King Fisher club bill was up for consideration in the Legislature today, and the friends of the measure were circumventing truly on the floor.

The speaker's address was called to this instruction of the request that the measure be referred to Bill of Health, but he refused to have the lobbyist ejected.

Terrill thereupon drew a large revolver, stating that if the House did not agree to his proposal, all events would protect himself. The sight of the revolver caused a stampede and adjourned the House.

FINDLAY, Oct. 21. Every window-blind factory in Findlay is said to be working overtime to meet the demand for glass, although there are reports that the price is still on the rise.

The new glass, which is being manufactured in Findlay, is said to be of superior quality. The glass is being shipped to various parts of the country, and the demand for it is increasing daily.

WARWICK, Oct. 24. A party of 300 Poles, while attempting to reach Finnish territory today, with the intention of emigrating to America, met with a severe attack from Russian frontier guards. Six men, two women, and a child were killed.

HALIFAX, N.S., Oct. 30. The "Evening Recorder" announces that, owing to the small shipment of produce, eggs, etc., that has come into the city the last week, the market is not as good as it was a month ago and the prices are lower. The price of eggs is still high, but the price of flour is lower.

HARTFORD, Conn., Oct. 28. Hartford merchants have a good illustration today of the operation of the McKinley bill. A crockery merchant, who has quite a large importing business, received this morning the invoice of a large lot of white earthenware imported from England. The cost of the goods in England was $240.00. They were shipped in crates, and the insurance was 20 cents per crate, making the total cost of the goods $240.00 plus $48.00, or $288.00. The goods were sold for $150.00, and the entire package was sold for $175.00. The crates could not be sold for over 50 cents each, or $41 in all, including the straws in them. The total duties on these goods are $100, of which the owner of the goods was $90.60, and the packages containing the goods duties were $8.40, or about 16 per cent. of the total cost of the goods, which was $288.00.

That "Socialist Generalization" Again.

PROVIDENCE, R.I., Oct. 30. The jury in the suit of American Tobacco Co. against the directors of George W. Sheldon, in which she sued for $12,000 as ahousekeeper, and for $6,000 more on two promissory notes, today returned a verdict for the plaintiff. The suit was in favor of the plaintiff. The plaintiff, however, is in the view that the plaintiff lived with Sheldon before he deserted her wife and two children, and that her relations with him for twenty years were not of a proper character.

The Rich and the Poor.

Ludwig Bading, the Berliner Handelsblatt, and the Stern of Frankfurt have advanced to the Portuguese Government a demand for one cent. for each ounce, on the importation of tobacco and spirits.

To make up the shortcoming of nineteen millions in the Budget of 1881, M. Roulard, the French chancellor of the exchequer, proposes to raise twenty millions by increasing the tax on patent medicines. The next session, especially the doctors.

A high official of the Russian police has just left St. Petersburg, where he has been engaged in the suppression of chicanery and in the suppression of the Russian subjects living among us.

It is going from the German in the Baltic provinces. Those ministers who have opposed the Russianization of the districts, and especially the enforcement of the Russian language and the Russianized schools, have been granted a salary of 300,000 rubles.

This is a breach of the State bar.

The white tiger reigns supreme in that region.

It must be a sort of indolent, the electoral era at Tunis, that the Chamber of the People has been called upon, at the instance of the minister, to vote the other day, but, on opening the ballot boxes, 29,000 votes were cast for Flahault, 28,000 for the candidate of the crowning of the 1st of Aug. 1877, the validity of the election.

Arthur W. Morton, a lawyer young man, was sitting in a barber shop in that scene reading a paper when Collider of the White House, in the course of his speech, as he was speaking by City Magistrate McFallon. Mr. Woods stepped up to Mr. Morton and said: "Here is your bill for poll tax." I want you to settle it out go on jail." Morton folded up his paper and laid it down, stepped to the right, I'll go on jail then."

He accompanied the collection A. Ashburn and was locked up. He has been in consultation with lawyers.

The Servian Government has just granted the monopoly of the planting of an English potato for the duration of the potato, and the excise being free from taxation for a period of fifteen years.

About twenty years ago, the Government began the erection of its Federal building in Chicago. Government architects and workmen were employed to see that the plans were carefully followed. The material was officially tested, and the work, in the course of its progress, was being watched. The building was put on, however, the walls began to settle. This they have continued to do, until now they are from six to eighteen inches below their original position. The building has been repaired for repeating, but it is likely to be condemned, and the 3,000 employees ordered removed to other places. It is settling at an increasing rate and is expected to fall, probably, within a year, about $60,000 loss.

In a case before recently tried in a Brooklyn (N.Y.) court, it was shown that, while the accused had been out on bail, a witness had been detained or a prisoner owing to his lack of means and influence. The judge could not see why the witnesses had been sent to jail. He said: "It appears, from information given to me, that you happened, accidentally, to be an innocent witness to an assault committed by one man on another, both entire strangers to you, and that the magistrate who investigated the assault sent you to jail on a charge of assault. One of the consequences of doing business with witnesses in a matter to be tried before a Court of Special Sessions. The idea of charging a man with such a crime as that and sending him to jail is beyond my comprehension. I have never heard of it. It is an outrage, and the commitment on which you held is absolutely ridiculous and absurd."

Great dissatisfaction among the Indians of the Chickasaw Nation because of a charter granted by their government to a company of twenty men giving them absolute control of all gold and precious mineral found in a section of the Chickasaw Nation. The Indians claim that the charter has been granted to a few white men, that a number of the legislators, with the exception of two, have signed the charter. It is asserted that, if the Interior Department does not annul the charter and place the lands under the same laws that govern gold and silver mining in other states, there will be serious trouble, if not open war, against the company.

Advertising.

The British Association this year an account was given of compressed air as a motor for a steam motor. In Birmingham, at the annual promenade, a power plant was engaged in compressing the air, which was then delivered through pipes to customers who required it. Its great interest lies in the fact that it is used for all purposes of description, as that of the tailor, shoemaker, printer, turner, hairdresser, etc. We may hope that it will be the means of allowing many people to maintain a trade under the same conditions, in the even more working houses, and in fact that it may produce as much as is wanted, individual workers, following their own methods. In Paris they have established a few years ago, this work was carried into small workshops and let at so much per hour.

This is one of the little incidents of industrialism which show how the Socialist is in his rapid gain realization that the small man is done with. It is possible that we are only just entering on the stage of the small man. But in order that a perfectly free development may take place we must resolutely oppose any interference with home work, any forcible driving of men into factories. The old interferences have got to be done away with, and all new ones rest.

Governement Pawnshops.

(Today.)

"The Sun," N.Y., ridicules the notion which prevails in the Senate that the Government should establish storage warehouses for grain and other products where farmers may deposit their crops and borrow money at a low rate of interest until they sell their crops.

It is out of the question for the Government to run an agricultural pawnshop.

It is to be regretted that the writer does not explain what differences there may be between running an agricultural pawnshop and a mining pawnshop. The recent Silver Bills indicate the idea of organizing a mining pawnshop. Nor does there seem to be any distinct distinction between pawnbrokerage and banking that one can be done without the other. The Government has constituted itself banker for several purposes. In the first place, there is the grand monopoly of one end of the whole banking business, produced by attempting to itself the function of issuing money for circulating purposes, and by refusing to enforce, or to let others enforce, obligations contracted in other terms than in its "legal tender." In the second place, the post-office is intruded into the banking business of the State and of the Federal government. And since we have mentioned the post-office, someone else will kindly explain what the difference is between carrying letters and carrying money, or storing silver or grain, such that it is proper for the Government to enter into one function, but not the other. The truth is, of course, that there are no such things as "legal" or "official" banking functions, any more than there are industrial functions by the Government and the discharge of all industrial functions by it. And so it will prove, not only merely historically but logically. The Government will be gradually more to control and arrest the current and cut loose altogether from industry. Which course will be finally determined depends upon the intelligence of the people. But the idea is too complex that it is difficult — shall I say impossible? — to tell which tendency will prevail.
Justice and Liberty.

The Anarchists proclaim the sovereignty of the individual, and demand that all enjoyment of every liberty except the liberty to trespass or invade. They believe, in other words, in equal liberty, and want every individual to count for one and no more than one. They deny that society, which is a pure abstraction, has any rights or any claims which it may rightfully enforce at the expense of the liberty of the individual. Whatever an individual may properly decline to do when asked by his neighbor, he may properly assume to be ordered by the whole community. What is justice in the relations between one individual and another, is justice between the individual and all his neighbors combined in "the community." Whenever, accepting these principles, opposes the prevailing laws and arrangements and seeks to bring social relations into congruity with them, is an Anarchist. All who refuse to accept them are opponents of Anarchism.

Herbert Spencer advocated these principles in his "Social Statistic," and so was an Anarchist. He then held that all institutions must be subordinated to the law of equal freedom, and that no individual ought to be compelled to belong to any political corporation or pay toward its support. Now, however, Mr. Spencer takes a different view, and denies that the right of the individual to ignore the State—even when purified and reformed and freed from the more flagrant abuses—is a corollary to the proposition that the individual should have every liberty except the liberty to violate the equal liberty of others. He holds that there is an ethical warrant for governmental compulsion upon non-invasive individuals, and that, beyond the question of justice between man and man, there is a question of justice between each individual and the aggregate of individuals. In other words, Mr. Spencer no longer is an Anarchist; he is now an Individualist, according to the definition (or rather description) of Individualism which the organ of English Individualism, the "Personal Rights Journal," furnishes. "Individualism," says the editor, "would not only restrain the active inerjer up to the point necessary to restrain; but it would also cause the passive inerjer, a man who would otherwise be a passive witness of, or conniver at, aggression into cooperation against his more active colleague." Or, to put the doctrine in Mr. Spencer's words, the state of society which is most beneficial to the individual may require the individual to do anything which may be necessary to protect the community from external and internal enemies. The sacrifice which may be rendered needful by a state of actual defensive warfare or a state of preparation for such, the individual may be rightfully coerced into making.

Much as I would like to deal here with Mr. Spencer's arguments in support of his position, the consideration that what Mr. Spencer has advanced on the subject is fragmentary, incomplete, and necessarily vague, and that he has promised to treat of it elaborately in future chapters, I am unable to do so. The principles of Mr. Spencer's "social morality," makes me refrain from entering into such an examination. I will only note the important fact that Mr. Spencer defends the restrictions imposed by the necessities of war and the police, and that he endeavors to prove that justice authorizes the State to demand the sacrifice. Not so the "Personal Rights Journal." In denying the right of the non-invasive individual to ignore the political corporation, the editor undertakes to disprove from the standpoint of justice and absolute political ethics; he does not attempt to show that the coercion he favors is in obedience to the law of equal liberty; but seems rather not unwilling to conclude that such coercion is in violation of equal liberty and justice. He contends himself with the unsupported assertion that such coercion is necessary in order that freedom may be at the maximum. He says: "The denunciation of all taxation, by placing all taxation on the same level, really acts as a support to unjust taxes; and the association of this short-sighted cry for an impracticable measure with Individualism tends to produce in the minds of the public the idea that Individualists are people whom sober political men must reluctantly leave out of account." But we are not apt to estimate the value of social principles by the enthusiasm of practical and sober politicians. We are not discussing the ways and means of avoiding the thorny question of taxation, and gaining recognition for our political "propouso." What the editor of the "Personal Rights Journal" thinks of the method by which Anarchists expect or wish to accomplish their ends is one question; what he thinks of the ethical and practical implications of their principles is quite a different question. We hold that the violation of liberty involved in the protective methods which the Individualists approve is contrary to the principle of justice, and we want the Individualists to say plainly what they mean. If not their question between us is one of principle, and our conceptions of justice are not identical.

Let us, however, suppose that the Individualists acknowledge the injustice of the policy of compelling non-invasive people into cooperation against invaders. What, then, would remain to distinguish and separate the Individualists from the Anarchists? This, as I understand the matter: The Individualists would say that all anti-social tendencies manifest themselves in aggressive conduct and the necessity for protecting and guarding non-invasive individuals, as well as punishing criminals, continues to render cooperation for the purpose indispensable, at least in the judgment of the Individualists. As practically practicable and necessary and safe in securing such cooperation and through it the maximum of personal liberty will be to force all the members of the community to be members of the political corporation. Only when the anti-social tendencies shall have disappeared under the improved social and economic arrangements introduced by the Individualists will it be possible to dispense with all compulsion. Thus Anarchism may be conceived by the Individualists as an ultimate outcome of Individualism. They may desire and that men will gradually adapt themselves to social life and will at some future time, more or less remote, reach a state of justice between man and man, and that the whole society, a man who would otherwise be a passive witness of, or conniver at, aggression into cooperation against his more active colleague." Or, to put the doctrine in Mr. Spencer's words, the state of society which is most beneficial to the individual may require the individual to do anything which may be necessary to protect the community from external and internal enemies. The sacrifice which may be rendered needful by a state of actual defensive warfare or a state of preparation for such, the individual may be rightfully coerced into making.

Much as I would like to deal here with Mr. Spencer's arguments in support of his position, the

not invalid will not, as a rule, suffer the perpetration of an outrage upon their neighbors. They will naturally come to the rescue of the injured party and co-operate with him in seeking redress. It is the natural impulse to produce an indifference to the welfare of others in generous people is to order them to render services. They will try to avoid doing so if they are told they must. The more refined a person the less he is disposed to feel otherwise. The more kindly he is disposed to feel otherwise is the resentment aroused by, an unjust call. Rather than submit to injustice he will sacrifice a great deal in attempts to evade or violate the law, while, if left free, his own interest and love for the community will prompt him to assist in the organization of protection. And even if many should refuse to join the protective association, there would still be a sufficient number of men enlisted to insure proper protection to all who wish it.

In view of all these considerations, it seems absurd to decide to deprive everybody of a great amount of liberty for fear of a possible but exceedingly improbable decrease in the amount of security. We cannot therefore content ourselves with the hope that a state of perfect liberty will be the evolutionary outcome of a condition of Individualism, and we intend to put our shoulders to the wheel and consciously and deliberately keep before the public the idea of transition by realizing all invasion, whether of persons or property illegal or legal. Meanwhile there is a great deal to accomplish in which Anarchists and Individualists may and should work together. Before the question of the protection of property becomes a practical issue, an actual organization becomes a practical issue, government regulation in many and important relations will need to be vigorously attacked and done away with.
neither Mr. Herbert nor anybody else has yet succeeded in showing that justice to labor can be secured without the overthrow of the existing land system, nor has my own thinking been more fruitful. And seeing that the monopoly is a huge evil, I must continue, against my inclination, to urge the abolition of the monopoly and the adoption of a system harmonizing as much as possible with the law of equal liberty.

Instituting private property, Mr. Her. should admit that we are as much in favor of private property acquired in obedience to the law of equal liberty as lie and proceed to discuss the real difference between us. If he holds the monopoly as the worst thing, let him make a defence of the landlords or an attack on our unjust proposal. If he merely considers expropriation unwise and inexpedient, and can show that labor may obtain remunerative equity without any change in the land system, I cannot but say that we are anxious to give him the most eager and close attention.

V. Y.

The Relation of the State to the Individual. —

Presumably the honor which you have done me in inviting me to address you today upon "The Relation of the State to the Individual" is due principally to the fact that circumstances have combined to make me apprehensive of the theory of Modern Anarchism, — a theory which is coming to be more and more regarded as one of the few that are tenable as a basis of political and social life. In its barest form, I should say, the question which either underlies or closely touches almost every practical problem that confronts this generation. The future of the tariff, of taxation, of property, of woman, of marriage, of the family, of the consumption of food, of the working of mines, of the discovery of oil, of the prophylactics, of literature, of science, of the arts, of personal habits, of the character of the state, as a political and religious institution, will be determined by the conclusion at which mankind shall arrive as to how far the individual owns allegiance to the State.

Anarchism, in dealing with this subject, has found it necessary, first of all, to define its terms. Popular conceptions of the terminology of politics are incompatible with the rigorous exactness required in scientific investigation. To be sure, a departure from the popular use of language is accompanied by the risk of misconception by the multitude, who persistently ignore the new definitions; but, on the other hand, the more clearly these ideas are defined the more expeditious and the less troublesome will be the attempt to control. He who attempts to control another is a governor, an aggressor, an invader; and the nature of such invasion is not changed, whether it is made by one man upon another man, after the manner of a conquered people; or by all other men, after the manner of an absolute monarch; or by all other men upon one man, after the manner of a modern democracy. On the other hand, he who resists another's attempt to control is not an aggressor, an invader, a governor, but simply a defendant, a protector; and the nature of such resistance is not changed whether it be offered by one man to another man, as when one repels a criminal's onslaught, or by all other men on one man, after the manner of the state of war, or as when the members of a community voluntarily unite to restrain a criminal. This distinction between invasion and defense is not new, for it is as old as language, and perhaps as old as man. But it is vital. Without it there can be no rational philosophy of politics. Upon this distinction and the other considerations just outlined, the Anarchists frame the desired definitions. This, then, is the Anarchist definition of government: the subject of the non-invasive individual to an external will. And this is the Anarchistic definition of the State: the embodiment of the principle of invasion in an individual, or as the invasion of individuals, absentees, masters or masters of the entire people within a given area. As to the meaning of the remaining term in the subject under discussion, the word "individual," I think there is little difficulty. Passing aside the abstractions which certain metaphysical subtleties may involve, one may use this word without danger of being misunderstood. Whether the definitions thus arrived at prove generally acceptable or not is a matter of minor consequence. I submit them to you in this way, as the result of an earnest and conscientious attempt, and the desire of a clear perception of the thought. The Anarchists, having the adoption of the word "individual," have intended to have their ideas judged in the light of these definitions. Now comes the question: do relations exist between the State and the individual? The general method of determining these is to apply some theory of ethics involving a basis of moral obligation. In this method the Anarchists have no confidence. The idea of moral obligation, the universal rights and duties, they totally discard. They look...
upon all obligations, not as moral, but as social, and even then not really as obligations except as these have been combined and implied in treaties entered into, or made in agreement with men, the latter may combine to hold him to his agreement; but, in the absence of such agreement, no man, so far as the Archiarchs are aware, has made any agreement with God. No man on any other power of any order whatsoever. The Archiarchs are not only utilitarians, but egoists in the farthest and fullest sense. So far as inherent right is concerned, might is its only measure. Any man, be his name Bill Sykes, be his name the Banker, or, rather, the Chinese hightidden or the Congresses of the United States, have the right, if they have the power, to kill or coerce other men and to make the entire world subservient to their ends. Society, the individual and the individual's right to enslave society are unequal because their powers are unequal. This position being subservient of all systems of religion and morality, of course I cannot expect to win immediate assent therefrom to the audience which I am addressing today; nor does the time at my disposal allow me to sustain it by an elaborate, or even a summary, examination of the foundations of ethics. Those who desire a greater foundation than the phase of individual liberty — which should read a profound German work, "Der Einzige und sein Eigentum," written years ago by a comparatively unknown author, Dr. Caspar Schmidt, whose name allein wurde was Max Stirner. Read only by a few scholars, the opus has been destined to a resurrection that perhaps will mark an epoch.

If this, then, were a question of right, it would be, according to the Archiarchs, purely a question of strength. The Archiarchs think it is not a question of right: it is a question of expediency, of knowledge, of science — the science of living together, the science of society. The history of humanity has been largely one long and gradual discovery of the fact that individual liberty is a permanent and harmonious society is the greatest amount of individual liberty compatible with equality of wealth. The average man, of course, has said to himself more clearly and consciously than his predecessor: "My neighbor is not my enemy, but my friend, and I am, if we but mutually recognize the fact. We help each other to a better, fuller, happier life, and this service to humanity greatly increased if we cease to restrict, hamper, and oppress each other. Why can we not agree to let each live his own life, neither of us transgressing the other's?" This question of the liberty of each individual is, in fact, mankind is approaching the real social contract, which is not, as Rousseau thought, the origin of society, but rather the outcome of a long social experience, the fruit of its follies and disasters. It is obvious that this contract, this social law, developed to perfection, excludes all aggression, all violation of equality of liberty, all invasion of every kind. Considering this contract in connection with the Archiarchian definition of the State as the embodiment of the principle of invasion, we see that the State is antagonistic to society; and, society being essential to individual life and development, the conclusion leaps to the eyes that the relation of the State to society, as a whole, is one of hostility, enduring till the State shall perish.

But it will be asked of the Archiarchs at this point in the argument, "What shall be done with those individuals who have combination on a scale that destroys the social law by invading their neighbors?" The Archiarchs answer that the abolition of the State will leave in existence a defensive association, resting not longer on a collection of individuals with whom we will combine to restrain invaders by any means; may prove necessary. "But that is what we have now," is the rejoinder. "You really want, then, only a change of name?" Not so, friends. Can it be soberly pretended that the State here in America, is purely a defensive institution? Surely not, save by those who see of the State only its most palpable manifestation, — the policeman on the street-corner. And one would not have to watch him very closely to see the error of this claim. Why, the police force of the State, the assessment of the State, the production and collection of taxes, is itself an aggression, a violation of equal liberty, and, as such, violates every subsequent act, even those acts which would be purely defensive if paid for out of a treasury filled by voluntary contributions. And under the law of equal liberty, the confiscation of a man's earnings for the support of his own liberty is indeed an addition of insult to injury. But that is exactly what the State is trying to do. Let us follow the proceedings of the State legislatures, examine our statute-books; test each act separately by the law of equal liberty, — you will find that a good nine-tenths of existing legislation serves, not to enforce that fundamental social law, but either to prescribe the individual's personal habits, or, worse still, to create and sustain commercial, industrial, financial, and proprietary monopolies which deprive labor of a large proportion of the product of their common labor; and it would receive in a perfectly free market. "To be governed," says Proudhon, "is to be watched, inspected, spied, directed, law-ridden, regulated, penned up, indoctrinated, preached at, checked, appraised, sized, censured, commanded, by beings whom you know and not knowledge or virtue. To be governed is to have every operation, every transaction, every movement noted, registered, counted, rated, stamped, measured, numbered, assessed, licensed, refused, authorized, endorsed, admitted, persuaded, restrained, protected under pretext of public utility and in the name of the general interest, to be taxed under contribution, drilled, fleeced, exploited, monopolized, extracted from every channel of the slightest resistance, at the first word of compulsion, to be repressed, fined, vilified, annoyed, hounded, pulled about, beaten, disarmed,bound, imprisoned, shot, maimed, judged, condemned, banished, sacrificed, sold, betrayed, and, to crown all, ridiculed, outraged, dishonored." And I am sure I do not need to point out to you the existing laws that correspond to and justify nearly every count in Proudhon's long indictment. How thoughtless, then, to assert that the existing social order is of a purely defensive character instead of the aggressive State which the Archiarchs aim to abolish!

This leads to another consideration that bears powerfully upon the question of the individual, whether he is such a beggar to the opponents of Archiarchism. Is it not such treatment as has just been described that is largely responsible for his existence? I have heard or read somewhere of an inscription written for a certain charitable institution:

"This hospital a place, a home for the sick, but first he made the poor whereunto to fly."

And so, it seems to me, it is with our prisons. They are filled with criminals which our virtuous State has made what they are, by its iniquitous laws, its grinding monopolies, and the horrible social conditions that result from them. We enact many laws that manufacture criminals, and then a few that punish them. Is it to the advantage of society that individuals are in the worst of possible worlds, which must follow the abolition of all interference with the production and distribution of wealth which in the end so change the habits and propensities of men that our jails and prisons, our policemen and our soldiers are not the instrument of the defence, — will be superfluous? That, at least, is the Archiarchs belief. It sounds Utopian, but it really rests on severely economic grounds. Today, however, so much the nominative and depository view is taken, the view that individual liberty under a State is the key to a nation's independence of usury, and therefore of poverty, upon monopolistic privilege, especially the banking privilege, and to show how an intelligent minority, educated in the principles of Archiarchism and determined to act upon these principles, upon the State, as far as it is possible with a view to the development of Archiarchism, in order to bring about a new social order, and to substantiate the views of the Archiarch's theory of the State.

And so, you ask, what shall we do now? We have been successfully discovered, and I exist only to bear testimony to them. If you observe them, you will be just and good. If you violate them, you will be unjust and wicked. Already, among your followers, several have recognized that justice is better, for each and for all, than iniquity; and they have agreed with each other to
naturally keep faith and right, — that is, to respect the rules of transaction which the nature of things in- dicates, and the possibility of succeeding in them, in the largest measure, wellbeing, security, peace.

"Do you wish to adhere to their compact, to form a part of their society?"

"Do you promise to respect the honor, the liberty, and the property of your brothers?"

"Do you promise never to appropriate, either by violence, or by fraud, or by usury, or by speculation, the product or the possession of another?"

"Do you promise never to desire, either by justice, or in business, or in any of your transactions?"

"You are free to accept or to refuse."

"If you refuse, you become a part of the society of savages. Outside of the communion of the human race, you become an object of suspicion and fear, which protects you. At the earliest instant, the first comer may lift his hand against you without incurring any other accusation than that of crudely needlessly prac- ticing upon a brute."

"On the contrary, if you swear to the compact, you become a part of the society of free men. All your brothers enter into an engagement with you, promise you fidelity, friendship, aid, service, exchange. In case of need, or hardship, or on account of negligence, passion, or malice, you are responsible to each other for the damage as well as the scandal and the insecurity of which you have been the cause: this responsibility may extend, according to the gravity of the matter, to all the operations of the offense, even to excommunication and to death.

"The law is clear, the sanction still more so. Three articles, which make but one, — that is the whole social contract. Instead of making cash to God and his princes, the citizens swear upon his name, before his brothers, and before Humanity. Between these two oaths there is the same difference as between slavery and liberty, faith and science, justice and injustice, truth and government and economy, non- existence and being, Good and man.""
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