On Picket Duty.

I publish today Tolstoi’s latest work, “The Fruits of Culture.” It is a comedy in four acts, and gives a very amusing picture of the aristocracy of Russia. Fuller particulars will be found in the advertising columns.

A most excellent editorial is that which Liberty reprints from the pages of the Galveston “News” on the subject of resistance to tyranny and the proper methods of securing liberty. It will furnish abundant material for reflection and discussion to those who talk about the right of belligerent peoples to revolution and of the efficacy of “propaganda by deed.”

A bill has been introduced in the Quebec Legislative Council rendering voting compulsory on every qualified “elector.” At first sight, as an exchange observer, “the idea looks purely farcical; at second sight, decidedly tyrannical; at third sight, full of humanity and far-reaching wisdom.” The social disturbances that would result from the operation of such a law could have but one issue, — the total abolition of voting and universal disgust with the whole scheme of “popular government.” Of course, there may follow a reversal to despotism, which is what the reactionaries anticipate; but there may come real political freedom, which is what we hope and work for.

The complimentary references to the American Economic Association made by some English economists are entirely undeserved. The Association’s treatment of Hugo Bilgram’s paper on “Involuntary Idleness” considered in its relation to the existing monetary monopoly, and President Walker’s last annual address, in which very important questions were dealt with, are of the most open and candid, and courageous, and not a few of the Association, and that it represents nothing but mediocrity, unreasoning conservatism, and exploded dogma. Our American economists are far, far behind their English co-workers. The American school has not yet produced a Toynbee, a Liddell, an Ingram, or even a Marshall.

Labor Commissioner Carroll D. Wright read a report on Statistics at the recent meeting of the American Economic Association. He referred to the work done by American official statisticians during the past two decades, candidly, however, admitting that it had fallen in quality below the work of the statisticians of the European continent. He also expressed regret that little progress is apparent in regard to the more complete registration of births, deaths, and marriages. Then, after other regrets and admissions damaging to officialism, the Colonel, who, it must be remembered, is known to sympathize with State Socialism, called attention to the fact (the significance of which he probably does not realize) that “great journals” are paying increased attention to the accurate use of statistics, and remarked that this work of the “great journals,” published by private parties, not by the government, and for private benefit, not for the public good, — that their work “is rapidly retarding the statistical machine,” — the men “who are ready to distort statistical statements in order to prove particular theories.” I compare the results of private enterprise and competitive activities with those of official work carried on “in the interest of the whole people.”

The reader’s attention is called to the remarkable and able article reproduced on another page of this issue, from the New York, “Sun” under the caption “Political Organization versus Mutualism.” The reader will need no help from me to discover that the article teaches Anarchism pure and simple; but not every reader may detect, as I do, in the author’s style and phraseology strong indication of his familiarity with and indebtedness to the father of Anarchism, Proudhon.

It is certainly very gratifying and encouraging to find among the contributors to the “Sun” a man of more or less consistent discipline of Proudhon’s. One error in the article must be pointed out right here.

The author says that the Farmers’ Alliance is determined, by its Sub-Francey scheme, to destroy the economic banking system and substitute in its place a political banking system. There is no warrant whatever for this charge. The present banking system is essentially political, and the farmer’s scheme does not aim at changing its “political” nature, but is intended to improve its economic side. The farmers are economically worse off, politically no more so, than the defenders of the present monopoly banking system. Economic banking will come when the business is taken out of the hands of government entirely and left to be dealt with and carried out by private agencies.

The chief of the Massachusetts bureau of labor statistics, in his last report, calls attention to the fact that while the tendency during this century has been to the removal of restrictions upon the interchange of commodities, there has been, on the other hand, marked tendency toward governmental regulation of the exchange of services. But he does not regard the two tendencies as opposed to each other, holding that they have really been mutually dependent, the movement which in one direction has aimed at unrestricted competition having in another direction necessitated governmental interference with individual action.

This is a very ingenious explanation. The trouble with it is that the facts perversely refuse to bow to it. We see that the class in whose interest this very governmental interference with individual action has been urged and practised are not at all satisfied with the results of the policy, and demand, in addition to the restrictions upon the exchange of services, a great deal of regulation upon the interchange of commodities. In fact, they demand nothing but restrictions, disploting and all other opposites. Further investigation, the Chief will find, is bound to disclose to him the truth that no compromise between liberty and restriction will answer, and that the choice lies between complete liberty and complete regulation of the exchange of services and the interchange of commodities.

Referring to “X’s” letter on Parnell, on another page, Liberty has overlooked nothing. Liberty’s paragraph was not a defence of Parnell, but an attack upon his critics. The phrase complained of was used to little Parnell’s office as compared with one much greater which passed uncondemned. It had been discussing his offence intrinsically from my own standpoint, I should have used different language.

“X” admits that all the opposition to Parnell in the English press was “the noisy outcry of Cant.” I think it more important to drown this outcry than to overwhelm Parnell. I quite agree that X’s did not mean what he wrote, but I no longer rise quite to “X’s” pite piti indignation against him. If O’Shea had been a citizen of a country where wives are kept veiled and where to view the features of another woman’s is an offence as adultery is in England, and if Parnell had under such circumstances opened the house of his friend O’Shea and, while pretending to be ignorant of the prevailing morals, had succeeded in inducing Mrs. O’Shea to lift her veil in his presence, he would have been guilty of as outrageous a breach of his friend’s trust as with w76 he is now charged. Nevertheless, in both cases I myself half inclined to exclaim: “After all, the fool who believes in such nonsense deserves to be cheated.” At any rate, I am very sure that it is not proper for a great lươngist to take cognizance of such offences, and in that sense Anarchism does mean “the liberty of every man to violate the trust reposed in him by a friend’s hospitality.” But, instead of visiting his looting and contempt on Anarchy for this reason, he would consult “X” to exclude all of them on the objectionable offenders, from which punishment he will suffer sufficiently. It may be true that “a man who will cheat his friend will betray his country.” It seems as if it ought to be true. Nevertheless it will be generally admitted, I think, that many statesmen who never did betray their country have cheated their friends substantially as Parnell cheated O’Shea.

And if I were an Irishman and desired Home Rule above all other things, I believe I should trust Parnell to get it for me, and take the chances.

Force, Right, and Intelligence. (Galveston Sun.)

So far as abstract propositions go it is merely to assert that the right to meet with force. The application of force, however, seems to be outside of considerations of right; hence it is as pertinent to say that there can be no reasonable requirement for ascertaining the right to use force as it is as purely right is assumed by the aggressor as to assert that resistance is right. Where tyranny has overthrown all right, resistance simply does not have to justify itself at all or by any rule which the tyrant can lay down. It only has to be successful if it can, and just to third parties meanwhile. To argue the question of right of resistance to tyranny betrays a fatal superstition. But it is a very much worse thing that the Memphis “Appeal-Avalanche” says in this:

Force should meet force. Toleration begets confidence in the mind of the tyrant. To yield an inch is to give an inch. This is history. The band of the despot is only stayed when his at violation of his friend’s trust as with w76 he is now charged. Self-preservation justifies any remedy.

Here is a sad mixture. The justification of any remedy and the tendency of tolerance to encourage tyranny are propositions entirely separate from the advice to meet force with force. Force should meet with intelligence. The hand of the despots generally come down with more crushing power when his subjects are silly enough to rise in their imagined might in protest mobs. First of all they need advisors who possess brains and reflection enough to discern the differences between belligerent idiocy and expeditious policy and who do not go off at half-cock on making the wonderful discovery that resistance to tyranny is always right. These fellows would have made a great advance if they had realized that the tyrant is intellectually far ahead of them. He doesn’t have to be right. He prepares to spit them on their sentiments, borrows into his own programme, till fellows cannot help “rising” and giving the tyrant just what he wants. The tyrant will generally have a law on his side, order on his side, and the right of acting in an idiosyncratic manner is preached to people that ceases them into throwing away their lives and their cause.
Proudhon, the Father of Anarchism.

[From Don E. McElveen’s "The Abolition of the State."

Proudhon, then, proving that the Republicans that they had no idea of setting up a government that contemplated: "Monarchy is not one of those things which vanish with the first breath, or by a decree of the Hotel de Ville. Do change society from a monarchical to a democratic one can be justified by human mind. Centuries, the work of twenty generations, are needed to reach the goal. You believe when you last the Emperor and the Republic are on a solid basis, and that are not analytical nor in any moral, political, religious, intellectual or intellectual sense. Will I, that you had destroyed this institution, whereas you had last taken the reigns. The system is inviolable, it is absolute; I would defend an anarcho-communist, a socialist, a communist, a federalist; simply, I am a Republican."

The Constitution of the bearers, what is it but absolute monarchy? Even so it is with the other systems. Rights, duties, property, citizenship, stability, politics, effects of the state in itself, a government, the State, that is, the State's personal and political advantage. What can you add? Directly answer me most of my young readers; you are a Republican? Republicans? yes; but that word denotes; and that if a thousand, then also you are a Democrat? No! How? You are a Republican. No! A Constitutionalist? Heaven forbid!

Then you are an Aristocrat? You want a mixed system of government? Still less. What are you then? I am an Anarchist!"

This view of Proudhon pervades all his writings, and he confirmed it in his Parliamentary course. On November 4, 1848, he made a speech in the Constituent Assembly, in which he explained his vote against the Constitution. He said that after four months' discussion he found it impossible to vote for a constitution, but that he considered it necessary to give an account of his vote.

He did not vote against the Constitution from an empty place. He was a good democrat, and because he thought it contained matters which he much wished away, and did not contain other matters which he should like to have seen in it. Furthermore, even more than the Constitution, there presentative, there would never be a vote about a law. He had voted against the Constitution because it was a constitution. What constituted a constitution - he referred to a political system, as a law that was want only to establish the partition of sovereignty, the separation of power into legislative and executive. In that consisted the principle of the Constitution.

Proudhon held that in a republic a constitution was supposed to be written on the state's laws which had been in the power for the previous eight months, could be made definite with somewhat more regularity and some constitutional tradition. He was convinced that the Constitution, the first act of which consisted in the establishment of a Presidency, with all its prerogatives, ambitions, and follies, had been rather a danger than a resource, a crime rather than a benefit, and that the reality of its representative carefully expressed in his letter, that he consistently elaborated in his writings, not in blind opposition to the beneficent and concert, and in full consciousness of liberty.

This view of Proudhon's doctrine is for us who have had a taste of England will exactly prove that State is an abstract and incomplete. Our State is practically only an abstract formula, which can only exist as the immoral and unreality of the last, but in the state's laws which had been in the power for the previous eight months, could be made definite with somewhat more regularity and some constitutional tradition. He was convinced that the Constitution, the first act of which consisted in the establishment of a Presidency, with all its prerogatives, ambitions, and follies, had been rather a danger than a resource, a crime rather than a benefit, and that the reality of its representative carefully expressed in his letter, that he consistently elaborated in his writings, not in blind opposition to the beneficent and concert, and in full consciousness of liberty.

This view of Proudhon's doctrine is for us who have had a taste of England will exactly prove that State is an abstract and incomplete. Our State is practically only an abstract formula, which can only exist as the immoral and unreality of the last, but in the state's laws which had been in the power for the previous eight months, could be made definite with somewhat more regularity and some constitutional tradition. He was convinced that the Constitution, the first act of which consisted in the establishment of a Presidency, with all its prerogatives, ambitions, and follies, had been rather a danger than a resource, a crime rather than a benefit, and that the reality of its representative carefully expressed in his letter, that he consistently elaborated in his writings, not in blind opposition to the beneficent and concert, and in full consciousness of liberty.

Statistics of a State can prove its prosperity by the clearest figures; we can from these figures come to the conclusion that the greatest number of people can be more prosperous in the most flourishing condition, and yet it may not be true. The total amount might not be redounds to separate moments, but the greatest number of people, the people of the State, may be the greatest. National economy has at present treated all these questions in the lump, it has reflected only the total amount of the State's wealth, but as it can ascribe to the highest amount of political freedom, and yet no conclusion as to individual freedom can be drawn. The example of the United States is nothing but a logical formula. The demands of individual political freedom are three compiled with as in no other country, and yet the individual is not really free.

For making up a law, about tax in a country, we can of course, makes it self-sufficient, which constantly manifests itself in these discussions, in regard to the amount of personal data on the one hand, and on the other the taxing of money or banking circulation, which has products to be transferred from one set of producers to another.

When I pay $100 in gold to the bank, or when I pay in a country's currency of $100, then $100 is paid to the bank, but you can pay for the use of the circulating medium or banking credit that I can command.
Political Organization versus Mutualism.

W. N. B. in "New York Sun."}

It is difficult to talk candidly on the questions that have been proposed for consideration by the various parties of Socialism. It is difficult not only on account of the incoherency of the Socialist theorists, but of many of the supporters of the Emperorism also. Taking up a journal, for example, which is classified as an economic journal, and is widely known, I read an article on what was conceived by its writer to be the growing popular tendency of the political analysts. And first mention the broadly manifested disposition to form cooperative corporations, truly conceiving them to be good illustrations of the tendency of the time—this is no new questioning of the nature of the contest and the mischievous nullity of the means that are proposed for placing society on firmer foundations. In the papers and journals at the present time are not opened to our view. While few have risen to a full perception of the force, efficiency, and real meaning of the Cooperative tendency, it is sought how completely it is capable of supplying the need herefore met by political organization. Whether may be done, and whether is done, is the question now that society may go forward with perfect safety in re-orienting political authority and in trusting even its provision and defence to a less irresponsible force. The day is not necessarily distant when political organization may be abandoned altogether, its duties having been assumed by economic agencies. There are few of the departments of government, and especially of so-called municipal government, that might not be made self-sustaining and peaceful foun calculi for the increase of social wealth instead of a base of turbulent competition.

It may be held that this is looking too far into the future. It may or it may not be a long forecast, but it is necessary to point out that these two things cannot be separated. There is not a political organization that is free from a cooperative disposition. In the matter of government, and the other economic and having for its chief purpose the creation of wealth and its distribution through individual interests, it is not possible to separate the two. But this hardly seems possible. It would be better to say, perhaps, that if they have made the discovery, they have made it in the same way, and with such a disregard of its meaning, that the truth fails to make any impression on their minds. They are still far from discovering that these two things cannot be separated. And the reason why it is that this question is not yet brought up to the same plane, and taken over the same, is as irreconcilably antagonistic as two bodies that try to occupy the same space. The professional Socialists, who themselves have no special interest in the question, are the object of especial enmity. They are often held to be of no weight in the matter of the political organization, and they are the only work real for which any kind of social organization is maintained. They would have an industrial society, inspired by no motive but the desire for subsistence, controlled and driven by a world of political departments. Many men are advocating paternal and strong government measures without any perception of the fact that they are seeking to destroy the very subject for which government exists. They talk of universal cooperation, yet fail to see that their proposed system of cooperation could go no further than a restoration of the conditions that once made it legally possible. If true universal cooperation is to be preserved, it must be made possible by the cooperation of the people at large. But, however they may be unequaled in their relations to the public interest, the effect of the political organization is such that they are unwilling to care for the election of the people and in the same time be a party against the public interest.

But, wherever they may be inclined to their relations to the public interest, they must be unwilling to make the election of the people and at the same time care for their election and decide upon the system most worthy of their allegiance. Let us divest ourselves of all supposition, let us examine the facts, let us consider the prospects that promise to be peaceful, hopeful, and progressive in the relations of men.
Liberty
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"In abolishing rent and interest, the last vestiges of old-time slavery, the Revolution now strikes one stroke after another at the gold and silver coin, the banknotes, the real estate, the goldsmith, the banker, the politician, the publican, the grasping official, the usurer, the factor, the lottery ticket, the college ruler, the church, the absentee landlord, the usurer, the public officer, the politician, the bank official, the banker, the goldsmith, the gold and silver coin, the banknotes, the real estate, the grasping official, the usurer, the factor, the lottery ticket, the college ruler, the church, the absentee landlord, the usurer, the public officer, the politician, the bank official.

Edward Atkinson’s Evolution.

The great central principle of Anarchistic economies — namely, the destitution of gold and silver from their position over all epochs and all conditions of life, the destruction of their monopoly currency privilege — is rapidly forging to the front. The Farmers’ Alliance sub-treasury scheme, unscientific and clumsy as it is, is a glance in this direction. The importance of Senator Stanford’s bill, now more scientific and reasonable, but incomplete, and vicious because governmental, has already been emphasized in these columns. But most notable of all is the recent revolution in the financial attitude of Edward Atkinson, the most orthodox and cook-smoke of American economists, who, now, with his voice the growing demand for a direct representation of all wealth in the currency.

In a series of articles in Bradstreet’s and in an address before the Boston Boot and Shoe Club, this old-time foe of all paper money not based on specie, this man who fifteen or twenty years ago stood up in the town hall of Brookline in a set debate with Col. Wm. B. Greene to combat the central principle of Mutual Banking, this man who has never lost an opportunity of insulting the Anarchists, now comes forward to save the country with an elaborate financial scheme which he offers as original with himself, but which has really been Anarchistic thunder these many years, was first put forward in essence by Proudhon, the father of Anarchism, and was championed by Atkinson’s old antagonist, Col. Wm. B. Greene, to the end of his life. Of course, all the papers are talking about it, and, on the principle that “everything goes” that comes from the great Atkinson, most of them give it a warm welcome, though precious few of them understand what is meant. Those which probably do understand, like the New York “Evening Post,” content themselves for the present with a mild protest, reserving their heavier fire to be used in case the plan should seem likely to gain acceptance.

The proposal is this: that the national banks of the country shall be divided into several districts, each district having a certain city as a banking center; that any bank may deposit with the clearing-house securities satisfactory to the clearing-house committee, and that it may receive in return a certificate in the form of bank-notes of small denominations, to the extent of seventy-five per cent. of the value of the securities; that these notes shall bear the bank’s promise to pay on the back, and shall be redeemable on demand at the bank, and shall be negotiable from hand to hand, and shall be legal money, and, in case of failure of the bank’s part to so redeem them, they shall be redeemable at the clearing-house; and that this new circulating medium shall be exempt from the ten per cent. tax imposed upon State bank circulation.

Of course a scheme like this would not work the economic revolution which Anarchism expects from free banking. It does not destroy the monopoly of the right to bank; it retains the control of the currency in the hands of the individual; it undertakes the re-embellishment of the currency with money, and, regardless of the fact that, if any large proportion of the country’s wealth should become directly represented in the currency, there would not be sufficient legal-tender coin to redeem it; it is dangerous in its feature of centralizing the money supply, nationalizing it, and it is defective in less important respects.

I call attention to it and welcome it because here for the first time Proudhon’s doctrine of the republicization of specie is more perfectly championed by a recognized economist. This fact alone makes it an important sign of the times.

I am surprised that its importance has not been fully appreciated by the Galveston “News,” which journal alone among the great dailies of the country is an exponent of radical finance. It has not noticed Atkinson’s scheme, instead of pointing out its introduction of a revolutionary principle, remarks that “the one infallible way to reach the real solution of organized credit is to reach the ideal of a popular check on the central bank. It was good and the important bearing that the monetization of all wealth would have upon it, that I expected to see emphasized by the Galveston “News” in its comments upon Atkinson’s proposal. I hoped, and still hope, to hear it rejoice in the fact that this solution of the labor problem has consisted mainly of nine-dollar bills and ten-cent meals and patent ovens has at last broached a measure that, instead of being beneath contempt, is worthy of profound consideration.

The Right to Buy and Sell Liquor.

No greater contrast can be imagined than that subsisting between the two states of New York — "Voice," and the organizer of political liberty, the New York "Voice," the organ of organization. Not alone in our principles and methods do we differ, but also in our life; not alone in our conclusions, but also in our interpretation of experience and rules of evidence. Here we stand in the true and fruitful path; there in the dark and neglected path, where the thing that looks true is false, and where the right is never seen. I shall not therefore make any great effort to convince the "Voice" of the error of its ways, but will content myself with so answering its criticism upon the attack I recently made upon the Federal Supreme Court for a more decisive place to place the "Voice" in a position to grasp the ground that we demand liberty.

By way of justifying the prohibition of the sale of intoxicating liquors by retail, the "Voice" alleges that the man who runs a saloon "deprives other men of clear heads, families of means of support, children of equal opportunities with other children." Did the saloon keepers really do this, they would be criminals deserving of severe punishment. But what men do is not the same as what is done. The "Voice" is against the law which says that, as long as they be their neighbors? No. All men who visit them? No. Some men? Yes, will be the reply of the "Voice." But how? By giving them what they ask and desire. Is it a crime to supply a man with liquor because he wants it? (That is the right of the consumer — to buy and sell to his heart’s content without anyone’s permission. . . . The consumer is not the man who drink more than is good for him; but some men eat more than is good for them, and some men work more than is good for them. The reason urged for making liquor-selling a crime applies to the selling of eatables and the giving of work to those who apply for it. It is no crime to sell razors and knives; yet some men kill themselves with these weapons. I hope not to fail very low in the editor’s esteem by confessing that I am rather fond of a glass of beer, a cocktail, and a glass of claret. My friends, the saloon keepers, have not deprived me of a clear head yet, and I do not think they ever will. Will the editor of the "Voice" claim that I have no right to ask for a drink, or that the saloon keepers have no right to sell me one? Not unless he is very illogical. But if I have a right to ask for a drink, shall the saloon keeper be required to sell one? It is no business of the saloon keeper to inquire into the antecedents of his customers and find out the "tonnage" of each of them.

The position of the "Voice" would be logical and tenable if saloon keepers were in the habit of dragging in people by main force and compelling them to drink intoxicating liquors and pay for the drinks thus forced down their throats. Then could it be said that men were deprived of clear heads, etc., by the saloon keeper. As long as no force is used, and the saloon keepers can be convicted of nothing more serious than giving men that which they ask, it cannot be logically said that the saloon keepers deprive anybody of anything. The "Voice" cannot distinguish between this ethical necessity and as much control or forebearance and interference. The remedy for human weakness, vice, and disease is not to be found in the denial of rights and the suppression of legitimate activities.

Peculiar "Scientific" Methods.

Whether from ignorance or dishonestness, the Socialist Religion is entirely refraining from attacking the position of logical and constitutional liberty.

They find it easy to create dissatisfaction with things as they are, and have manifestly come to the conclusion that it is necessary for them to pretend that the only alternative to the prevailing order is complete State Socialism. The facts are that there are schools which, while rejecting State Socialism, hesitate not to denounce the existing system, and labor for the achievement of a better arrangement, is not one that they can conveniently recognize. They fraudulently cast about for simple theories, warning them that in these alone is salvation to be found.

The present system they call the embodiment of the principle of individual liberty and unrestricted competition, utterly disregarding the protest of those who think ethical necessity and as much control or forebearance and interference.

Recently E. Belfort Bax, the ablest Marxian Socialist in this country, has written an article entitled "Socialism versus Liberalism" before the National Liberal Club of London. After describing the feudal principles and institutions and their steady decay under the fire of the revolutionary bourgeoisie, Mr. Bax says:

"Finally, in this nineteenth century, the right of every individual to autonomy has been conceded. But now, when the victory is won, — a victory necessary in the interest of progress, and without which Socialism would have been impossible, — it is seen that individual autonomy, — that is, individual liberty as conditioned by private property, — is a failure, inasmuch as the institution of private capital is incompatible with liberty in an industrial sense.... Mediavism is broken down all round; the surviving relics of the social and political organization of the older world, as serfdom or feudalism is everywhere dying and free and equal before the law. ... It is the legal position into which a man is born that weighs him down; it is the constitution that limits that of his own free choice. Progress, therefore, on the old lines of individual freedom before the law has plainly reached, or is fast reaching, its extreme beyond which it is impossible, and would be worst of all if it were to continue. The new Liberal individualism is therefore played out. Progress towards freedom, in short, has turned a corner. Its old position has been abandoned, and the substitution of the maximum of formal liberty has produced a maximum of real slavery. Free contracts under a system of unrestricted individual freedom between man and man is an absolute anarchy, — a chaos, — a confusion of middle classes, as the embodiment of the principle of individual autonomy, are now themselves confronted with the problem of the organization of individual and social life. The freedom of the individual in and through the solidarity of the community becomes now the watchword of progress."

What have we here, deliberate, studied unfairness, or primitive simplicity? In vain will the reader look
for a single reference to that strong and growing ele-
ment of radical individualists, to those who emphatic-
ally deny that anything even remotely resembling
individual autonomy has yet been conceded, that the
victory of the individualist principles has been won,
that free contract exists or has existed, that the
reader will find ample evidence of his mistakes in the
criteria of those who claim that the evils of our social
system are the result of violations of the principle of
equality, and that the remedy for the economic maladjustments
lies in a further extension of the restrictions
previously sanctioned for the sake of social
reform or political authority. In vain will the
reader wait for Mr. Bux to turn his attention to
the real individualists and Anarchists and show them
that "it would be useless" to adopt their solutions.
In vain, in vain. "It is impossible to go any further.
Could one declare to Mr. Bux, Podiatrist, that his
"science" could be of no use whatever if it were
possible?" But, O, Socialist, where is your proof
of the uselessness? And how can you say that
it is "impossible" to go any further when men
are intelligent and equipped as you are against the
possibility and urgency of going further, very much
further? Does your "science" teach you to deny
what nobody affirms, affirm what nobody denies, attack
what nobody defends, and assume as a palpable fact
which everybody questions? Or, if not, this
"science" is not worthy of its name, it is not a
science at all. The whole of your objections to
yourself and the most logical and
thoughtful opponents of your doctrines? Is it a
"scientific" course to imitate the ostrich and hide the
head in the sand? The conspiracy of silence will
not prevent the public and wise acceptance of
such unreasoning, political, and ethical fallacies.
It is absurd for the
State Socialists to feign complete unconsciousness of
the existence of those who have done and are doing
so much to weaken their ranks, discredit their claims,
and diminish their influence. However, if they can
claim it, we certainly can.

"V. V.

Huxley on Social Reform.

Professor Huxley does not join the theologians and
mischeivous philanthropists in singing the praises of
the General of the Salvation Army for his scheme of
rebuilding "the city of God" amid the ruins of
darkening England. He thinks that, at best, the scheme
will result in doing very little good at the expense of
invaluable human energy. He objects to the
corrosive Christianity of which the Salvation Army is the
militant embodiment. In the social complications of
today, no less than the cool observation of all intelligent
contemporary thinkers is wholly adverse to the assumption
that the existence of the religious emotions by the
peculiar process resorted to by the Salvationists is a
method calculated to neutralize the conduct of men
in a permanent or beneficial way.

This is as it should be. Moreover, it was to be expected
that Professor Huxley would perceive the unfai-
sity of such a scheme of reforming the world, even if
the religious element were entirely absent from it.
But Professor Huxley indulges in certain general
statements and reflections which are as surprising as
they are puzzling to those who are conversant with his
deliberations on social topics and who have regarded
him as at least an agnostic. In his address to the
Manx, he has suggested that Professor Huxley could be easily
convinced of error and even absurdity in the cavalier
attitude towards religious questions by the
impartial processes resorted to by the Salvationists is a
method calculated to neutralize the conduct of men
in a permanent or beneficial way.

This is as it should be. Moreover, it was to be expected
that Professor Huxley would perceive the unfai-
sity of such a scheme of reforming the world, even if
the religious element were entirely absent from it.
But Professor Huxley indulges in certain general
statements and reflections which are as surprising as
they are puzzling to those who are conversant with his
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PHILADELPHIA, JANUARY 3, 1901.

It gave me considerable satisfaction to answer Mr. Farrar's argument for copyright, because Mr. Farrar was the first person who, in his speech, mentioned the proposition that the public has no interest in the expression of an idea which is held in common, and, if one can show that the other derivates from it, then a point is gained. It gives me much less satisfaction to answer Mr. Biglow, because I have to follow him through a series of considerations based upon a mistaken beginning by equating, so that the result in any case cannot be particularly helpful.

(1) Nevertheless, impossible as it may appear, I answer this question in the negative. I admit social expediency as a form of social solutions, but what is social expediency? To me the highest social expediency consists in general rationality of social conduct. Those principles are matters of discovery. The principle of property is already discovered, namely the exclusive control by each individual of the results of his exploitation of nature, so far as he may have it without impairing the equal right of opportunity of every other individual to similarly exploit nature. I maintain that the contract to possess or sell his hats, without impairing the equal right of all other persons. I maintain that the author cannot be forcibly secured in the exclusive right to possess or sell an arrangement of words which he has made, without impairing the equal right of every other person. I argue this question at length in the next number of Liberty. It is the question which must be settled before any prosperity can be made in this controversy. It is the question which Mr. Farrar and I are discussing. It is the question which Mr. Biglow intends to discuss on the ground that it is an irrational foundation. I must simply disagree with Mr. Biglow, and turn my criticism back upon himself.

(2) I deny, in the absence of copyright, and in the absence of competition, authors would have "no earthly chance of being financially remunerated." In what I shall say under this head, I shall speak as a book publisher and an expert, and I claim for my statements as much authority as any right-mindedly be awarded to such an authority. It is a rule that exceptions are very rare, that, even in the absence of copyright, competing editions are not published except of books the demand for which has already been large enough to more than reasonably reward both author and publisher for the labor and capital involved. Taken for improvements in the paper work that retails at fifty cents. We will suppose that for this book there is a demand of ten thousand copies. These copies cost the publisher to make and market, say, seventeen cents each. He pays the author five cents each for copies sold, that is, the customary royalty of ten per cent of the retail price. The total cost to the publisher, then, is twenty-two cents each. He sells these books to the jobbers at twenty-five cents each, leaving himself a profit of three cents each. He pays these two cents each to the printer. For if the demand is not to exceed the edition of ten thousand copies, the sale of the balance will drop along slow and more slowly, through several years. During which time he will pay only his royalty five hundred dollars in payment for a book which he was probably less than sixty days in writing. I maintain that he is more than reasonably paid.

No rival edition of his book has sprung up (we are supposing) as an alternative opinion of the author. For the demand did not prove large enough to induce a second publisher to risk the expense of making a set of plates. But now let us suppose that on publication so brisk a demand had immediately arisen: as to show that the same idea is a common property of ten thousand. The publisher, as before, would have sold three to six thousand in advance, and the balance of the first ten thousand would have disappeared before any rival publisher could have made plates and put an edition on the market. As before, then, both author and publisher would have been more than adequately paid. But at this point steps in the rival. Having to pay no author and to do no advertising, he can produce the book at say fourteen cents a copy, and perhaps will sell it to the trade at twenty cents. It now becomes unions with the author and first publisher to maintain the old price and sell perhaps one thousand of the second ten thousand, or to reduce, the one his royalty and the other his profit, sell the book to the trade almost as low as the rival, and control the entire market. In either case, both author and publisher are sure to get still further pay for services that have already been more than reasonably rewarded, not the public meanwhile benefits by the reduction in price. Why has no competing edition of "The Kreutzer Sonata" appeared during the six months that it has been on the market? Simply because, though a more than ordinarily successful novel, it did not develop a sufficient demand to tempt another publisher. Yet it has paid me more than twice my royalty. In the advertising market, in either case, both competing editions of "The Kreutzer Sonata" appear on the market before mine had had the field two months. Simply because the money was pouring into my pockets with a rapidity that nearly took my breath away, instead of later. I maintain that I was not paid fifty times over for my work, I long to find another book that will tempt somebody to compete with me. Competition in the book business is not to be shunned, but to be courted. How ridiculous, then, to claim that, when there is competition, authors will not be rewarded! But why, it will be asked, do authors and publishers clamor for copyright? I'll tell you why, Mr. Biglow; it is because they have a right and want the earth. I am sorry many spots have not been taken for imprints. As G. B. Shaw has well said, the cry for copyright is the cry of men who are not satisfied with being paid for their work once, but insist upon being paid twice, thrice, and a dozen times over.

In the absence of copyright, could we not get their reward, I think it would still avail a good deal to say that they would write notwithstanding. It does not follow that, because a. bidder will not make hats for pleasure, an author will not write books for pleasure. There is an aesthetic and an editor for pleasure. Though I am an enthusiast in typography, I should never set type for enjoyment. But not only do I edit for enjoyment; I even pay handsomely in money for the privilege. There is something in the art and literature that seems to stimulate the human soul. And I am of the opinion that it would be much better both for the world and for the world if they could be entirely divorced from commerce. (1) If it to be said that certain things are properly appropriable, and that others are not, are, indeed, -- are not properly appropriable, is to be a communist, then I am a communist; that is, a man who, under a contract, without another's consent, without necessarily thinking it expedient to prevent others from doing so.

(2) Here the premise may be right, but the conclusion is not. Publishers are bound to publish the exclusive right to publish his productions is not necessary to the people's happiness or to literature.

(3) Yes.

VIOLOUS LIES.

Have you heard Mr. Bernard Shaw on the "Tramp," accompanied by Mr. Auberon Herbert on his piano? I have. "Tramp" is a word which is now popularly elbowed to that point where we would be, except for what Science has done and is doing. But we can also see that Science may at any moment become, in part at least, the enemy as well as the friend of man. Among many other things, it is true, that with the weights of regulation, make it the property of any caste of men, and, as we have only too much reason to believe, it may be the source of waste and confusion. And those who, like Mr. Gildersleeve, try to weaken it by removing its foundations from the eternal rock of nature to the shifting sand of their own fancy deserve the excoriation of honest men. And at the same time the ethical society should be formed for the purpose of defending the national morality against the immoral teachings of Christian preachers.

No Legal Privilege for Science. (Free Life)

Immense is our debt to Science. The light that has come to us, and is coming from every direction, is of the highest, and is the most valuable. To be sure, the world has not yet reached that point where we would be, except for what Science has done and is doing. But we can also see that Science may at any moment become, in part at least, the enemy as well as the friend of man. Among many other things, it is true, that with the weights of regulation, make it the property of any caste of men, and, as we have only too much reason to believe, it may be the source of waste and confusion. And those who, like Mr. Gildersleeve, try to weaken it by removing its foundations from the eternal rock of nature to the shifting sand of their own fancy deserve the excoriation of honest men. And at the same time the ethical society should be formed for the purpose of defending the national morality against the immoral teachings of Christian preachers.
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monopoly of their profession, and to prescribe what we shall do and not do; of sanitaryian, too liable to peregrination and spreading ground, and to have some bad affectation of a Perfection, which in Paris or New York have simply to be decently left. of other scientific men, who ask the Government to supply them with salaries, and a power of direction—of officials of Government departments, laboring, their views of the day upon their fellow men, as if they were a corporation, in charge of our public welfare. and of all this class of men, whatever in such cases we find making their knowledge—prescriptions for religion, we insist, in the interests of neglecting education of the community in our mutual service, to the death of the The Bible should not be the property of priests, and therefore need to be the property of all men, not just the religious leaders. Hence the importance of educational service and access to religious materials.

The medical profession is one of the noblest that exists, and we must take every step possible to protect it from such encroachments. Like other professions, they must have their own laws for their own guidance; but, outside them, independent of them, every man must be free to practice who likes, and every fellow-man to be able to enter the field. We are not going to be deterred by the empty cry of “snakes” into preventing the liberty of calling which is necessary for the free development of the medical profession as well as for the purposes of the public.

"This Patry O'Shea Episode." To the Editor of Liberty.

It is in the interests of Liberty that Liberty refers to the great Irish scandal. In the same paragraph an attack is made on Michael Davitt for his desertion of Parnell. I should like to ask why, if Liberty (like our English papers) has not overlooked the chief feature in this case? Apart from all theories of government, apart from the law of marriage, apart from the law of personal relations, the public policy at this time is this:—A man who will cheat his friend will betray his country. As for the noisy outcry of Cant (represented by the “Fall Mall Gazette”) against the move of the act of justice, I may say that I have not heard such a thing, if the respondent had been a policeman or a private tried to be, for which he was punished, he would have had something of that. They must not be found out, might have been forgiven. But I sincerely believe that the noble and chaste principle of every man to violate the trust reposed in him by a friend's hospitality, and for such a view of society I can have no other but a love of liberty. I believe that the right of every man to violate the trust reposed in him by a friend's hospitality is a noble and chaste principle. It is nothing to say that the party was what is called “marital.” I would have revoluted the selfish treachery just as the lady has been revoluted by Sir John A. Macdonald. It is our party that has impaled him and directed his host's silver spoons. I could have despised him less. O'Shea was Parnell's best friend; it was he who made the Irish Treaty by which Parnell was imprisoned in jail; and it will be the last word in his house when threatened by the party of his immediate ancestors. And this is his reward. “The fruits of the Shoshone and the Snake has been stilled with relentless effect.”

Yours truly,

THE FRUITS OF CULTURE. A Comedy in Four Acts. By COUNT LEO TOlstOY. In its First Publication in England.

In this book the great Russian writer continues in some directions the war which he began in “The Kreutzer Sonata,” and also in some degree, as in the part to some extent, the furthering sketch of nihilistic and satirical. The title of the so-called “enlightened” people, the worst of which is their fashion, “Inside,” they have in their own way, views, and mental freaks, and a foolish and shallow sense of the uprooting of Modern Spiritualism upon an aristocratic family in Russia.
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P. J. PROUDHON: The profoundest political philosopher and economist that has ever lived. An elaborate steel plate portrait, handprinted on heavy paper. Price: post-paid and securely packed, 35 cents.

A VINDICATION OF NATURAL SOCIETY. By Edmund Burke. Showing the Inherent Evils of All State Governments. "In vain you tell me artificial government is good, but that I fall into with the absurd. The thing—the thing itself is the absurd." 36 Pages. Price: 10 cents. Address:
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STURM. By JOHN HENRY MACLAY. A collection of Equity and Anarchistic pieces in the German language. Second edition, with dedication to Max Stirner. 110 Pages.

Price, cloth, 75 cents; paper, 50 cents.
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IDEO-KLEPTOMANIA: THE CASE OF HENRY GEORGE. By J. W. Sullivam. The Author offers evidence to show that Henry George took his doctrines bodily from the works of Professor Edward Davis. The earnings authority for his argument against the commoners, chiefly those of William Godwin, whom he held as a model. The matter to the work is that it is the whole of Henry George's argument against the commoners, and to a certain extent, his whole work. A brilliant display of the splendid prose of Mr. Edward Davis, full of wit, satire, and satire. The book is liberally illustrated with cut in his own, no matter how he comes by them.

With Henry George's Denial of Plagiarism. One Hundred Pages, 15 cents.
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TOLOSTI'S NEW NOVEL,
THE KREUTOZNA SOTNA.

Suppressed by the Czar.

Translated by Benjamin R. TUCKER.

This novel is the boldest work yet written by the famous Russian author—Feuchtwanger. The characters are all drawn with a morality that is more than juridical in its severity, while hand- 
ing the decisive climax of the plot the author has realized the

in St. Petersburg and Moscow manuscript copies pass from hand to hand and are read aloud in literary circles.

This book, so far as the central lesson to be drawn from it is con- 
ed, is a return to the fundamental principles of Leo Tolstoy's ethical and social doctrine. A book of this kind could not have been written, was in the habit of referring to it as the most

broad and complete prose in a few words. The ideas that have never been written or ever could be written. It will undoubtedly take rank in the future among the famous books of the nineteenth century.

It consists of two parts, as follows:

PART I.—The True Constitution of Government in the Sover- 
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