On Picket Duty.

A society supported by, and to some extent patterned after, the English Fabian Society, has been formed in Paris. It calls itself the Society of Social Progress.

Miss Ada C. Craddock, the secretary of the American Secular Union, is the most far-sighted person I know. She foresees a compromise between the Nationalist centralists and the Anarchist individualists."

"The Journalist" states that neither Judge Touroges nor Powdery wrote "Cesar's Column," and that the publishers expect to obtain the author's permission to announce his name. I have been told, and am strongly inclined to believe, that the author is Ignatius Donnelly.

"Discriminating persons," says the New York "Nation," "have, in all probability, already arrived at the decision that the war of Russia must be a man of good judgment, whose condemnation, real or fictitious, is a sure indication of the bad quality of a book."

Well, if your "discriminating persons" are the same folks we used to know as "the readers with the penetrating eye," their latest decision is not at all surprising.

General Master Workman Powdery, in his report this year, recommends an annual meeting of representatives of all schools of reform, specifying among others the Anarchists. Time was when Terence pretended that he wouldn't touch an Anarchist with a ten-foot pole. There is no surer sign that a doctrine is readily gaining ground than its recognition by the lobbies and demagogues. However, Powdery's idea is a good one, and he should have credit for it.

From an official statement recently made, it appears that the total sales of Mr. Herbert Spencer's "Forty Books in Great Britain up to April 15, 1890, amounted to 104,000 copies, exclusive of the "Descriptive Sociology." This number includes 55,700 copies of the various volumes of "The Synthetic Philosophy," 39,000 copies of "Education," and 20,000 copies of "Man versus the State." The total sales of the authorized American editions of Mr. Spencer's works to date amount to 101,000 copies. To these must be added the cheap editions.

The paragraph on Ingersoll's article on Tolstoi which Mr. Yarro debited to the editor of the "Twentieth Century" and criticized in an editorial article in a recent issue of Liberty, was written, it appears, not by Mr. Pentecost, but by a correspondent of his paper for whose views Mr. Pentecost does not wish to be held responsible. Liberty willingly withdraws the charges contained in the editorial question, although it suspects that Mr. Pentecost is not more nearly right in his view of Tolstoi and Tolstoi than is his correspondent.

Henry George recently delivered an address in Memphis, Tenn., on free trade, Cleveland-reform, and the Democratic victory. Liberty is not surprised that he thanked the Democrats for the result of the late elections; but when it reads that the chairman of the meeting introduced him as "one of the first thinkers of modern times, a benefactor to his countrymen, a man who has pointed out the injustices of the iniquitous tariff," it is tempted to exclaim, reflecting on the difference between "then" and "now," O, what a fall is there, my fellow radicals and reformers!

"The Herald of Anarchy" is certainly mistaken when it declares that "government is a failure." No, "association of thieves, murderers, and madmen—some busybodies" has been altogether too successful in its conspiracy against our liberties and opportunities. The amount of legislation annually inflicted upon a superstitious-ridden and impoverished people by the one who is called upon the throne. At the last session the American Congress passed seventeen thousand bills, among which it would be impossible to find one useful bill and difficult to find one not fraught with serious injury to the people.

Mr. G. Bernard Shaw, referring to criticisms upon his recent piece published by the editor of "The Free Life," objects to rhetoric about force-worshippers, monsters, and dragons, and calls the editor's attention to his essay, "Rejection of Anarchism," in which he endeavors, however, to show the charge that it offers no solution whatever of economic problems when it is applied, unmodified, would produce a free fight ending in the enslavement of the vanquished. Mr. Shaw tells the editor that he must either answer him rationally or let him alone. May Liberty remind him that his columns appeared recently a "rational" answer to his criticisms and contentions, a sober examination of the economic views of the Fabians, with special reference to his own party. If he will read it, he will find no rhetoric, but facts and logic, and that is the difference. It really is Mr. Shaw's turn to speak and defend his economic theories.

Philadelphia "Justice" protests against Henry George's advocacy of restriction of immigration in connection with the Chinese, and says that it is absurd for any man who teaches the "brotherhood of man" to draw the line at the Chinaman. The editor adds: "I should not have said anything upon this subject, but Mr. George seems to advocate this form of restriction more often in the "Progress and Poverty.""

In "Progress and Poverty" the doctrine of the "natural monopoly" of money and transportation and interference if "Progress and Poverty" was their first book. The wonder is that they have so long remained under these delusions, unless indeed we suppose that "Progress and Poverty" was also their last book, in which case no absurdity of theirs need occasion surprise.

Referring to a certain landlord's opposition to the alleged tendency toward confiscation of the property of the landlords for the benefit of the tenants, the editor of "Today" says: "Whatever may be said of the personal element in this conclusion, there can be but one opinion of its soundness. The notion of finding any other basis of support than that of uninterrupted possession throughout generations is absolutely visionary." The editor's usual (?) modesty and carefulness and circumspection are conspicuously absent in the above emphasis expression of opinion. There is more than "one opinion" as to the soundness of the landlord's conclusion. Many people will tell the editor of "Today" that his notion is absolutely silly and heartless. Why is uninterrupted cultivation, occupancy, and use inferior as a basis for the claim of ownership to uninterrupted robbery made possible by governmental force? The land in Ireland, Scotland, England, and every other country, should belong to the people who occupy and cultivate it. The present terrible misery of the peasantry in Ireland and Scotland is mainly the result of the absurd and iniquitous system of landlordism, and yet we are cooly told that it is a absolutely visionary to think of righting this gigantic evil and bringing about a rational and just arrangement. Must the peasantry forever remain wretchedly poor and stupid, simply because the landlords have successfully kept them so for centuries? But the editor of "Today" declares that there is not "the slightest pinch of evidence" to show that good will result from disregarding the claims of the proprietors! Perhaps not,—to the editor. To us the evidence is overwhelming,—so much so that we declare a moment's reflection is sufficient to find no evidence to show that good would result from the British and Irish peasants declining to support idle landlords and keeping their products for themselves and their children.

Liberty's new English contemporary contributor, "The Herald of Anarchy," receives a more welcome note from the journal commonly looked upon as Prince Kropotkin's London organ than was tendered it by the journal commonly looked upon as Prince Kropotkin's Paris organ. But though "Freedom's" hand is extended more cordially than that of "La Révolte," I doubt if the heart goes with it; and I really can't see why it should. To be sure, there is a little more generosity and very sincere cordiality that must exist between all honest antagonists of the exploitation of labor, but the word comrade cannot gloss over the vital difference between so-called Communist-Anarchism and Anarchism proper. "Freedom," however, claiming that the term Anarchism covers both the Communist and the Individualist, declares that here again it differs with its Parisian prototype, for "La Révolte" has always denied the name Anarchist to Liberty, tells the "Herald of Anarchy" that it is misleading and unfair when it labels its Individualist economic programme as "the principal economic creed of Anarchists," and protests against the setting-up of an "orthodox church of Anarchism with unlimited economic competition as its dogmatic creed." The wording of the protest justifies the very thing against which it is directed. If "Freedom," professing Anarchism, disputes the doctrines of unlimited economic competition,—which is equivalent to saying that it wishes to limit economic competition,—it at once becomes inimical upon real Anarchism to so define Anarchism as to absolutely exclude such limitation. If orthodoxy, dogmatism, and party spirit are not to be avoided except by identifying liberty with the denial of liberty, then the Anarchist is no more than orthodoxy, dogmatism, and partisanship. Since "Freedom," has inveighed against my unworthy person with the robe of the High Priest of Mutualist Anarchism, I may as well begin the exercise of my ecclesiastical authority with this unmistakable proclamation.
Modern Journalism.

[New York Sun.]

"Then you consider yourself a perfectly honorable and upright man, although, as you point out, you are always ready to find fault with anything and anybody, you are bound to come to the conclusion that any matter how important the subject may be?"

"That is". [snatches his spectacles]

"You haven’t understood me properly, and perhaps I didn’t speak with precision. In the first place, I would not deal with all questions in that way. In the second, I don’t intend to do anything at all often come up for discussion, and then I perfectly understand the writers and their views. If I have to write about them, of course I must, and then I will analyze the thing. The journalist can generally manage to lose himself in the knapsack and to ignore in a cloud of verbiage that he has been very successful — extraordinarily successful! — in doing this. I send the article to a magazine, and it is nearly always published, and I always publish it on the newspapers. In order to get a newspaper to publish the next one, you have to put the articles on the newspapers. If you have no articles on the newspapers, you have to put them in a magazine. A man like myself can reap a rich harvest from the religious journals, providing he is fairly well read and understands the terminology of theological and critical phraseology rather better than the editors do. By sophistication an article and mystifying the editor the one may easily make sure of seeing it printed in almost any of the religious journals, and, as a rule, of being well paid for it, some of those journals being enormously rich.

"Don’t you feel any qualms when you write in this way?"

"Certainly not," said the man. "I know what is the proper way to handle the subject. If I were not able to do so, I would not do it."

"But how do you feel about the subject of the present?"

"Well," said the man, "you see, Mr. Van Alten, I am naturally and by education a religious man, and I am a religious man. In other words, to say that I feel about the question. That is to say, I am a partisan on the side of negation; or, as Goethe put it, ‘Ich hab die Götter der wahren verleugnet’ and the notion of the man."

"But the temptation to make fun of the editor is always there. If one understands the game as, for example, Steinhoff understands chess. His theory, as I see it, is that the ‘Sun’ is the most respectable daily paper, the ‘Times’ is the most correct morning every move, and that chess may be brought to such perfection that every game, properly played, must result in a draw. Just so. But Mr. Steinhoff is a fool, his game is not, and his idea is not, and he must not marry it, and, as the ‘Sun’ says about chess, then we must have a new game. It would be the same way with chess. The sports would not be in a position to regulate the game. Here the board has to be swept every once in a while before the game is half finished, and new pieces, with values that are not the old ones, have to be placed upon it. Indeed, the pieces change under your hand, and in talking or writing about them this fact must always be taken into consideration. The chessplayer is not a mere part of the game. He must not make the rules or change them, and he is not even allowed to print and pay for, if he says the same. It is the case with what one commonly finds to say in the religious journals, which you can judiciously assert or deny anything you choose.

"You don’t look upon yourself as in any way bound to say what the public wants to hear, and you don’t care for that?"

"No, not bound," said the man, "but very often it lies in my way to say what I think, and then I am glad to do it. I don’t see that it makes any real difference, however, or that it is anybody’s business what I think. All those people have anything to do with is the spoken or written word. With a writer’s interior personality they have no concern whatever. Cervantes was a terrible bitch, but that does not vitiate his formula for the solution of comic equations. Besides, you see, I myself do not know what I shall say at the time. I may change as time goes on. Things that I said in jest when I was young now I often hear say in earnest when I am old, and what I said to myself then, and wouldn’t, or not so, a certain person in the past and the present to be the entire limits of my personality. So far as my business goes, I am merely a pen in the hand of God, and I am not a pen but a pen."

"Any pen the other’s a pen kept who does not sell all the people want. Occasionally, however, you will find such a man. Thirty-five years ago, when the whole of the modern literature was the square-foot book coming, a shoemaker at whose shop I wanted to buy a pair of the new-fashioned boots told me that he did not sell them. Then I asked: ‘Why? Have they a pair of them in their store. He had to tell the mark, however, or he would have lost his custom.’

"No,” said the man, "the shoemaker makes more money, and as far as the absolute value of his warren is concerned, he is head and shoulders above any other shoemaker, and he is selling his own warren, but without the shoemaker’s warren."

"It is fortunate that everybody does not think as you do."}

Free Trade and Monopolies.

The Newcastle (England) "Chronicle" has opened its columns to discussion of State Socialism and Individualism, and our English comrades have contributed valuable articles to the discussion. The following is one of them: The New Statesman; and Albert Tarsn wrote in comment on an editorial article on free trade.

I read with interest your article in today’s "Chronicle" on the subject of free trade, and whilst agreeing with all that the writer has said in its favor, it seems to me that the threats of those who advocate the abandonment of the existing system may be stated thus: "The state shall be a market for every one of the varieties of trade that exist in the present state of society."}

"When you write do you think your copy invariably right?"

"There are a good many sorts of rot," said the man. "For instance, there is good rot and bad rot, pretty bad rot, damned bad rot, and damned good rot. Then there is the rot inappetible which I may liken unto the grapes of the German make their Arm какой than the fruit has reached the stage known as Edelviolet, which, being interred, rot, no longer rot, no longer rot, no longer rot, no longer rot, no longer rot, no longer rot, no longer rot, no longer rot, no longer rot, no longer rot, no longer rot, no longer rot, no longer rot, no longer rot, no longer rot, no longer rot, no longer rot, no longer rot, no longer rot, no longer rot, no longer rot, no longer rot, no longer rot, no longer rot, no longer rot, no longer rot, no longer rot, no longer rot, no longer ro
Beauties of Government.

(Trippings from the Press.)

The Paris "Bulletin" says that letter:—

Editor:—I desire to acquaint you with a fact that happened yesterday at the Hôtel Necker, relating to the vaccination of children. Yesterday morning the doctor vaccinated the patients in the Monmouer ward, and I noticed with how little precaution the vaccine was applied. One of the patients was a syphilitic in bed, but it seems that no precautions were taken, and when the doctor had finished, he was left in the ward naked and without any protection. This is a serious case of dyspepsia, and I did not wish to risk being vaccinated in this way, so I hurried from the hospital.

In the Bristol County (Eng.) Law Court, on Thursday, Judge Metcalfe, sitting in the case of the County Constabulary against three secretaries of the Dockers' Union for damage sustained by him being induced to leave a grain steamer in the middle of the night, and being assaulted by the dockers. A ring of stevedores had agreed to raise the rate of stevedoring to 4d. per ton, and had an understanding to this effect with the United Dockers' Quays Employers' Unions. Employers took the job at 2d. per ton, and the men were called off. The Judge denounced the intolerable tyranny of the Unions.

Matilda Fargis, 35, otherwise Mathilde Chiron, a French girl, was brought up on remand from Hampstead Workhouse, and charged with behaving in a disorderly manner by appearing in the public streets, in the presence of a constable, to Division, now informed the Bench that he had waited on the French Consul-General and explained the circumstances. The Consul-General had been unable to have any communication with the girl's father in Paris, and had received a reply from him making that she might be restored to her parents. The Bench adjourned, and the girl was taken to the French Viceroy in attendance, but was only allowed to bid her good-bye in the presence of Inspector Soper.

The French Government have prayed at Salamanca are allowed on certain days to see their relatives. Now, the Administrator, M. Géoguet, has a wife whom he is anxious to receive in prison as she is to visit him. But bail in marriage is not distributed by the sect to which they belong, who, Mr. and Mrs. Géoguet have never been married, and so the authorities forbade the desired interview.

WASHINGTON, Nov. 10. The Supreme Court of the United States, at its sitting on Friday, decided a case in which the court, broadly lays down certain fundamental principles affecting the relation in which the liquor business and the laws of the country stand in relation to the States.

In the case of Justice Field, the Supreme Court says:

It is undoubtedly true that it is the right of every citizen to pursue any lawful business, subject only to such restrictions as the laws of the State may impose, as to time, place, condition. But the possession and enjoyment of this right (and, indeed, of all rights) are subject to such restraints as may be necessary to protect the health and morals of the community. Even liberty itself is not unrestricted. It cannot be absolute, for the public interest requires that freedom from restraint under conditions essential to the equal enjoyment of the same right by others. It is therefore restricted.

The court says the regulations governing all the various paraphernalia of life are almost infinite, varying with the nature of the business and the time of day, as well as with consideration for safety, noise, others to protect health, others to remove odors, and so on.

"It would hardly be necessary to mention this," the court continues, "were it not for the position taken and vehemently pressed, that there is something wrong in principle in the regulation of business and the sale of intoxicating liquors, which is the subject of the business of selling by retail intoxicating liquors.

"It is urged that, as the liquors are used as a beverage, and the injurious effects of the individual who consumes them are known, it is the duty of the State to prevent the business of selling intoxicating liquors.

"It is urged, that these liquors are used as a beverage and the injurious effects of the individual who consumes them are known, it is the duty of the State to prevent the business of selling intoxicating liquors.

"The effect of the prohibition of a fact which does not exist: that when the liquor is taken in excess the injuries are confined to the party offending. The injury, it is true, falls upon him in his health, which the habit accelerates, and in his self-assalvation which it creates. But, as it leads to neglect of business and waste of property and general demonlization, it affects those who are immediately connected with and dependent upon him.

"By the general concurrence of opinion of every civilized and Christian country, the consumption of crimes and misery to society equal to the dram shop, where intoxicating liquors in small quantities, to be drunk at the time, place and individual pleasure of the user. The sale of the liquor under such conditions has been declared to be the proper subject of legislative regulation. For that matter, it is the duty of the State to prevent the business of selling intoxicating liquors.

"The State, in the exercise of the power of the State, may prevent the business of selling intoxicating liquors by the State, or of a citizen of the United States. In the pre-his maximize the regulation of the liquor, discretion may be vested in the officers of the States to determine for the public peace the sale of intoxicating liquors.

"The sale of intoxicating liquors under such conditions has been declared to be the proper subject of legislative regulation. For that matter, it is the duty of the State to prevent the business of selling intoxicating liquors.

"The courts have jurisdiction to restrain the business of selling intoxicating liquors, and that the sale of intoxicating liquors under such conditions has been declared to be the proper subject of legislative regulation. For that matter, it is the duty of the State to prevent the business of selling intoxicating liquors.

"The sale of intoxicating liquors under such conditions has been declared to be the proper subject of legislative regulation. For that matter, it is the duty of the State to prevent the business of selling intoxicating liquors.

"The sale of intoxicating liquors under such conditions has been declared to be the proper subject of legislative regulation. For that matter, it is the duty of the State to prevent the business of selling intoxicating liquors.

"The sale of intoxicating liquors under such conditions has been declared to be the proper subject of legislative regulation. For that matter, it is the duty of the State to prevent the business of selling intoxicating liquors.

Well Said for a Catholic Priest.

(Boston Herald.)

In Maribor, where the organized operative element is very strong, the Comité Général, Laborunions, has addressed to the clergy of the vicinities, requesting them to devote one Sunday to a discussion of the labor problem.

The address was spoken on the labor question, in response to the circular, was Rev. P. A. McKenna, pastor of the Church of the Immaculate Conception, who delivered a very able and forcible address. He said:

"The terrors of the economic point of view, complains of the wrongs which he suffers from competition, from monopoly, the sub-division of labor, the combinations of capital, from corrupt class legislation, from social greed and luxury.

"The State to interfere to regulate these matters? Frankly, I do not see how the public powers of a community—that is, the executive, the legislative, and the judiciary—can so far interfere with a contract between two private individuals as to control the rate of wages or interfere with the division of the profits.

"The idea of attributing to the legislature the right to fix the hours of labor, even for the adult toil; the right also to impose great and complex combinations of capital. To give such rights to the State would be unconstitutional, for the idea of a State, either in its executive, legislative, or judicial powers, furnishes nothing on which we can construct any such right.

"Against State Socialism let us set up the two principles of liberty to labor and liberty to property, that the lines laid down by religion, by education, by industrial and commercial development, and political power used as a means to an end, must be the two lines of attack upon monopolies, condemn trusts by law, wipe out all privileges. Liberty of the individual, liberty of association, with the development of the State to the protection of rights and the repression of abuses—such should be our formula in the social or labor question."

A Sceptic's Tribute to Proudhon.

Henry Forngler, a member of the French Chamber of Deputies and one of the leading journalists of Paris, who contributes leading articles to "1 Echo de Paris" over the sign A. F., has published a book, "A Sceptic's Tribute to Proudhon," in which he endeavors to show how liberty and socialism may be reconciled, to show how liberty and socialism may be reconciled, to say to nobody in anybody. Nevertheless, he concludes a recent article suggested by the death of Joffrin, the incorruptible Socialist, with the following appreciative eulogy of Proudhon:

We have the true, literary people, who live many here, who have been more or less successful in journalism, literature, and who have found in our crusades either fortune or the education. Proudhon was just what the English and others of the American Club, who have the protection of the rights and the repression of abuses—such should be our formula in the social or labor question."

Washington, Oct. 26. The World's Fair commissioners have been called to a halt in their reckless dispensation of the Government appropriation. Secretary Windom recently had in the execution of the government contract for the World's Fair and the Washington Monument. The Department has addressed a letter to the House and Senate committees. They have asked that some recognition of their tax be accorded the Washington Monument. The Department, for political economy, makes provision that there should be an auxiliary board of lady managers. There was little said at the time of the World's Fair committee, and the World's Fair association, that the lady managers should be appointed, or how they should be paid.

After the bill became a law, the House committee on the World's Fair began to consider a supplemental measure to define the number, pay, and powers of the lady managers. It was agreed, however, in the committee that there was no particular need of haste, and the matter was laid over until the next session of Congress. But it appears that the World's Fair commissioners have conceived that the bill might be construed to mean that they should furnish the space for the auxiliary board. Without waiting for Congress to legislate they have appointed the board of lady managers. They have put on the board one hundred and fifteen ladies. Several ladies of prominence, like Mrs. Corbin, Mrs. Sullivan, the board, and the rest of the lady managers have been given to the relatives and personal friends of the commissioners. Two of the leading ladies of the State have boldly named their mothers-in-law to represent the State, and one of these mothers-in-law does not live upon the Pacific Coast, while Mrs. Sullivan is in her sixties, and is very good for the work. The commissioners have not only made these personal selections, but have voted compensation at the rate of eight dollars a day to each of the ladies despatched from Chicago. Furthermore, they have notified the ladies to come to Chicago on November 10, to have a good time, organize, and begin to draw pay.

When the fares had proceeded thus far, Mr. Windom wrote to the commissioner that he would not allow any draft of the appropriation for this purpose, which has now been released by the Senate.

They are still laboring. It seems the lady managers are being ginned to pester the commissioners about their pay. The meeting for November 19 has been called off. By this time Congress meets, the row over the lady managṣhips will assume great proportions. The World's Fair will come from many of the States about the way these chosen appointments have been distributed to the pleasure and profit of the commissioners' female relatives.
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In abolishing rent and interest, the last vestiges of old-time slavery are removed — the last of the Greek tyrants, the last of the Roman grocers, the last of the French timsters, the end of the corporatist, the club of the policeman, the gauge of the corduroys, the crossing-posts of the department clerks, and the toll-booths who guard the gates of liberty, which young liberty grants beneath her seal." — PROCTOR.

The appearance in the editorial columns of articles over other signatures than the editor's initial indicates that the editor approves their central purpose and general tone, though he does not hold himself responsible for every phrase or word. But the appearance in other columns of the paper of articles by the same or other writers by no means indicates that he disapproves of any such disposition of them being presented, largely in the interest of convenience.

"My Uncle Benjamin."

"I resurrect a buried treasure; a novel unlike any other, by an author unlike any other; a novel, as Charles Dickens has no equivalent in the literature of this century; a novel which, dear to the pessimism with which it opens and the pathos with which it closes, — yes, even in these, — must take rank among the wittiest and most humorous ever written; a novel of the thoughtfulness, of the grandeur of real men, of the humanity; a novel of the heart and the head; a novel that is less a work of art than a work of genius, — the work of an obscure genius, a child of the French Revolution, who published exactly in the eighteenth-century and will be famous early in the twentieth."

I have written the above as a preface to my translation of Claude Tillier's novel, "My Uncle Benjamin," which I have just published and wish to recommend to the readers of Liberty as worthy of their especial attention. If they heed my recommendation, I am sure they will be as grateful to me as I have been to my friend, George Schumull, even since he first brought the work to my notice. It is a neglected masterpiece of literature, a gem of the most brilliant and original kind, a novel whose unobtrusive and natural greatness has been unable to obscure, a social sword which has been suffered to remain in its scabbard, but which, if my comrades will aid me, may yet be wielded with tremendous effect in the battle of "isms" which still rages. Of all the various "isms" in this world, "ism's" or "isms" and "ism" are among the least understood, and which, perhaps, will be the first to be understood and which will be the last to be discarded.

"Severe as Uncle Benjamin is upon kings, he is no less upon the people."

"That's the way with all of us!" cried my uncle, giving free course to his torrent of invective against the common people against one gentleman, and they allow the gentleman to walk over their bellies. Furthermore, they flatter themselves that they are as good as they can for this noble pedanteque may stumble."

"What do you expect, M. Batheur, against forces of which we are not equal?"

"But the Anarchists," continues the editor, "by mistaking the nature of the difficulty, exaggerate the benefits which may follow a restriction of government, and get tempted into believing that the abolition of the government is, in fact, the father of all social evil — an utterly untenable belief. They speak as though society — or at any rate the industrial relations — would immediately spring into a state of bordering on perfection if the incessuous grind of the State was removed."

This way of thinking of society is erroneous, and harmfully so; because there are disorders which may be removed by a little artificial oil, just as they have been artificially produced, and it is injurious to confound these with ill which are really degradations, but are inaptitudes.

We have, then, the admission that there are ill which have been produced by governmental interferences and which are necessary in order to remedy these is the abolition of that governmental interference. The editor does not tell us how numerous and serious those artificially-produced disorders are; and I may as well say here that I am convinced that the opposition would be more definite and explicit on this point. The appearance of strength in his case is largely due to the vagueness characteristic of all his discourses upon the matter in question. But since it is true that some disorders are due to governmental incompetency and dishonesty, it is manifestly absurd for him to say that "it is absurd to talk about abolishing the actual which produce the evils," and that "the thing to do is to talk about abolishing the feeling and ideas which produce the actions . . . by changing the nature of the men composing society." If some of us realize that governmental interference with finance, trade, marriage, and other things, is conducive to evil, why is it necessary for us to talk about abolishing such interference? It is possible to point out the absurdity of a given method of abolition, or the absurdity of the idea, supposing it to be entertained by anybody, that governmental interference is necessary in order to succeed in abolishing the objectionable features of government.
and principles of government. The talk about chang-
ing our political institutions is too much com-
forting to the individual, because it sounds profound and convincing, and men who have
the interests of truth and reform really at heart should
not indulge in it except when they are sure it is per-
manent. People who realize that government is directly
responsible to the people, and not to the political class
at bottom, realize (or why is it published?), are bound
not to magnify the difficulties, but to emphasize
the possibility of improving an awkward condition of
things. The only thing it is necessary to do is to
get the community will cooperate for the purpose.
The reforms which are most sorely needed today are not
to be sure, very easy of accomplishment; but no
changing of the natures of the men composing society is
necessary to accomplish them.
And now let us look into the difficulty about
the "ills which are not merely derangements, but inap-
titudes," about the "balance of ill" which is "the result
of organic conditions, and may be described as want
of adaptation of the individual to social relations." It
is true that the Anarchists affirm that the abolition
of governmental interference with finance and trade,
and the abolition of the present landlord system,
would totally revolutionize all social relations to
a state of perfection, but cause the dis-
appearance of the labor troubles and the problems
of involuntary idleness and employment at starvation
wages. It is also true that the Anarchists believe that
under the present social conditions these evils would
tend to disappear. They affirm that the domestic
relation between the sexes, and the parental rela-
tion, and all the other relations to which men are said
to be not fully adapted, would tend to improve. Do
these domestic and social misconceptions of the
state? Is it not rather the editor of "Today"
guilty of a misconception of the nature of society
and the law of social development in saying that "the way
men are made and shaped is principally by the dying
off of old and the coming in of new." If the condi-
tions of life remain unaltered, there are ob-
viously no difference between the feelings and ideas
of the "sons" and those of the "fathers." If, on the
other hand, there is any change in the scenes —
material and other — competent to produce a change in
the feelings and ideas, then the fathers are on
"gain to feel and display, to some extent, the effect of
the change." Perhaps Spencer can assist us in
mastering this problem, in determining which side
is burdened with the misconceptions.

Discussing the evolution of altruistic sentiment,
Spencer, after saying that "clearly, if the temporary
forms of conduct needful initiate temporary ideas of
right and wrong and expressive exclamations and
sentiments, it is to be inferred that the permanent
forms of conduct needful will initiate permanent ideas
of right and wrong with responsive exclamations of
the sentiments," and after saying that the ego-altruistic
sentiments and the altruistic sentiments are simul-
taneously aroused, and that "there is nothing in the
intrinsic nature of the selfish emotions which makes
their evolution more difficult than is the evolution of
the selfish emotions excited by the same manifesta-
tions," proceeds to answer the question how it is
that we find that the ego-altruistic sentiments may
become very active while the altruistic sentiments remain dor-

mal. The reply has already been indicated at the close of the chapter on "Sociality and Charity.
Some luminaries were there given showing that with the emotions, as with the sensations, frequent repetition of a painful situation brings about a remedial callousness. And we saw that conse-
quently, if the conditions of existence are such as necess-
itate depression and a depressive sentiment, the pain sympathetic will become gradually less, and there will result indifference. Further, it was pointed out that the intelligentsia of individual societies, originally very intense and even now by no means ended, the condition have been such as to make imperative the indifference and have overcome the twanged
press-feeling. It may be here added that beyond this checking of the sympathies which the antagonists of socialism dislike, will still necessitate has been a checking of them consequent on the struggle for
existence within each society. Not only does this struggle for existence involve the necessity that personal ends must be
pursued with little regard to the evils inflicted on unaccom-


will certainly become more and more diseased and
men less and less adapted to the social state, until
the present civilization will fall to pieces. The Anarch-
ists warn the people and seek to direct their way
in the progress of "Today" and its allies in a
vice circle.

Supreme Imbecility.

In view of the decision of the Supreme Court of the
United States in the California liquor license case (see "Beauties of Government"), Liberty challenges any
philosophical standpoint, that nearly every governmental authority of the country, the judges of the
Supreme court, are ignorant babblers and disgraceful middle-
class. The court affirms man's right to liberty, saying
that liberty does not mean the right to act according to
one's own will, but freedom from restraint
under conditions essential to the equal enjoy-
ment of the same right by others. This is the
Schopenhauer's "first principle" of happiness exactly,
and the equity liberty principle which all Individualists
advocate. Yet in the same breath the court denies
that a man has the right to sell intoxicating liquors by
retail! Loos, then, the man who sells intoxicating
liquors "by retail" deprives others of the enjoyment of
their own liberty! To act so and feel at
the back of the court, would claim this to be the case. Hence we
find the supreme court introducing another "first principle," in blin
dial ignorance of the deep and wide
existence of law in between it and the "equal liberty" prin-
ciple they consider. This principle of enjoyment of all
rights, the court says, "is subject to such restric-
tions as may be deemed by the governing authority of
the country essential to the safety, health, peace,
good order, and morals of the people to be
enacted as a principle which does justify the restric-
tion of liquor selling, and which (and this is the trouble
with it) will justify anything and everything tyranny
can conceive. The governing authority may consider
that the sale of liquor has a direct and indirect effect on
marriage (or late marriages), criticism of existing creeds
and institutions, and a thousand other things, injur-
ious to the safety, health, morals, etc., of the
community. This principle is admitted by the Rus-
skies, and the Individualists, and all the differences
between those "despot countries" and this "free
country," if Americans are to be governed by auth-
orities with peculiar conceptions of "order" and "good
moral conduct," the court is considerate enough to explain why liquor selling is injurious to the health, etc., of the
community. Let us see whether this explanation is
true, as to reassure us and banish all fear that other things,
now left unregulated, may benext attended to
by the courts, "It is urged," says the court, "that, as the liquors are used
as a beverage, and the injury following them, if taken in
excess, is voluntarily inflicted and is confined to
the party offending, their sale should be without
restrictions, the contention being that what a man shall
drink, equally with what he shall eat, is not properly
matter for legislation. There is in this position an
assumption of a fact which does not exist, — that
when the liquor taken is taken in excess, the
persons who are confined to the party offending. The injury, it is true,
first falls upon him in his health, which the habit
undermines; in his morals, which it weakens, and in
his property, which it destroys; and, as it leads to
negligence of business and waste of property, and
general moral destruction, it affects those who are im-
mEDIATELY connected with and dependent upon him.
Now, the man who eats too fast, or too much, or the
microbe which in the liquor in the excise the injury to the
public health, and social questions, or the man who is too fond of dancing
and flirting, is equally guilty of neglecting his business and
wasting property. Why not regulate all these
matters? Besides, it is easy to demonstrate, from a
philosophical standpoint, that nearly every governmental author-
ity we enjoy is germane and injurious to the peace
and order of the community. With Harrisons and
Wastamakers and Enough large in power, are we not
sure that the supreme court is exactly correct.
present judges, who are so silly enough to say that "by the general concurrence of opinion of every civilized and Christian community, there are few sources of crime and misery to society equal to the dram shop, where intoxicating liquors in small quantities, to be drunk to excess, are manufactured and sold with the utmost art in making them appear wholesome and innocent," and that "the statistics of every State show a greater amount of crime attributed to this than from any other source." It is needless to say much more. To conclude as I began, is there not strong evidence of the necessity, and of the unsuccess which the judges of the United States Supreme Court are of a lot of contemptible ignoramuses?

V. V.

Adaptation.

Onísimo Torre:

I thank you for your courteous comments on my "Survival". If I understand you, you object to the phrase "survival of the necessary" because that which is necessarily necessary for us to be alive is better adapted or more nearly fulfilled the required conditions than others, must have been the "fittest"; yet, as the species perished, it is more nearly the "survival" of the "fit" that was not. And if the fitness of the fittest, then, does not reach a certain necessary relation, destruction cannot be averted. Darwin did not mean that the whitest (or fittest) would survive, but if, it were there, it would survive; if anything survived, it would be the fittest. And I do not assert that must needs to be, that the fittest will survive there, but that, if it is there, it will be that which survives, and, if the adaptation and fitness are sufficient, will inevitably survive. The necessary, the fit, the essential, the requisite, in my mind these are synonyms. And by the necessary I more meant the ideally necessary than Darwin by the fittest meant the ideally necessary one at any given time with which we can interpret him. And by the best I meant only the best possible under the circumstances.

It is in every expression sound fatalistic, and consider myself as in a certain way a fatalist. Perhaps you are right in speaking of controlling nature's laws. I do not feel sure that you are not, but it is not yet clear to me. To my laws, the necessities of nature control us, and, in order to attain our own ends, we are obliged to skillfully adapt ourselves to them in their relations to us.

Thus, in scientific rifle-shooting, the marksman must skillfully adapt himself to every point of the target, to the wind, etc. The weapons must be sighted at a certain elevation to allow for the attraction of gravitation, interfered with by the propulsive forces of the explosive; the wind, the recoil, the presence of the atmosphere, must all be taken into account. The strength of the metal must be adapted to the explosive power of the powder. In the form of distribution of weight, position of the score, etc., countless adaptations are apparent. This reveals many points of necessity, where according to the term, we should not see. If we say that the weakest must perish, then the weakest is the necessary, and if it is the necessary, then it is the best. This is a contradiction of the principle of necessity.

Mr. Herbert's disclaimer is of course sufficient to establish the fact that he did not mean to charge me with an attempt to prohibit lending and borrowing. But I must remind him that the charge which he has made against me he has made also at the same time of Mr. Greenleaf, who corresponded in saying that Mr. Aramden interpreted it as I did and protested against its application to himself (though gratuitously allowing that it was justly applicable to me); and that Mr. Herbert made rejoiner, if my memory serves me, that the doctrine is not so much misunderstood as not understood. I cannot see why Mr. Herbert should not admit in the same unqualified way that he misunderstood me, instead of suggesting that I misunderstood him. This is of little consequence: I am satisfied to call it a case of mutual misunderstanding.

To avoid such misunderstanding in future, however, is of real importance; and to that end I must further remind Mr. Herbert that, when I use the word "fit," I mean what corresponds to the best or to the degree in which the most generally determine, — either in the moral sense of irresponsible prerogative, or in the social sense of accorded guarantee. Mr. Herbert, knowing that I am an Epicure, must be perfectly aware that it would be impossible for me to enter upon a moral campaign against any special right in the sense of irresponsible prerogative, or for the Epicurean position either that no one has any rights whatever or what amounts to the same thing, that every man has all rights. But it would be impossible for me to enter upon a moral campaign against a right in the sense of accorded guarantee, unless it were a case where I should consider myself justified, if it seemed expedient, in turning that moral campaign into a force campaign. For I could have no objection to any accorded guarantee save on the ground that the thing guaranteed was a privilege of invasion, and against invasion I am willing to use any weapons that will accomplish its destruction, whether moral or physical, so long as they are effective, with the will to resort to those of physical force.
force whenever necessary. So Mr. Herbert is now daily cautioned not to charge me with maintaining, against his express wish, a sovereign power to know anything but expediency exclusively makes moral.

To go now from the general so the particular. I could not engage in any so. of campaign against the right to lend and borrow, because I do not consider that it holds a position of pre-eminence. If, however, I could make a difference in the overthrown of that form of invasion which consists of the monopoly of the right to issue notes as currency, that is not my affair. In the proposition of the Anarchists that lending and borrowing, and consequently interest, will virtually disappear when banking is made free. Mr. Her- bert's only answer to this is that he considers interest moral and useful. Does he mean by this that is moral and useful which will disappear under free competition? Then why does he favor free competition? Or does he deny that interest will so disappear? Then let him disprove the Anarchists' doctrine and accept the argument that it will. In my last article, to which his present article is a reply, I strongly invited him to do this, but as usual he ignores the invitation. Nevertheless he and all his Individualistic friends will have to meet us on that issue sooner or later. I wait for the occasion.

Now, a word about rent. It is true that Anarchists, including sober-minded Liberty, do, in a sense, propose to get rid of ground-rent by force. That is to say, if landlords did try to evict occupants, the Anarchists advise them to acquire title to the land. So, the ground by force wherever they see that they can do so successfully. But it is also true that the Individualists, including sober-minded Mr. Herbert, propose to get rid of the right of property in the land by evicting the occupant out of the house and taking it for themselves. The Anarchists, I am sure, do not mean the same.

In my last article, to which his present article is a reply, I strongly invited him to do this, but as usual he ignores the occasion. Nevertheless he and all his Individualistic friends will have to meet us on that issue sooner or later. I wait for the occasion.
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