The Congressmen have gone home. Of course the treasury is empty and there is a big deficit for us to make good. Long live "law and order!"

The French Government, with the view to "encourage young people to become merchants," is offering bursaries, to be gained by competitive examination. "If the French Government," says Bertrand, "would grant itself a perpetual vacation, allow France to enjoy Free Trade, leave the merchandise and industrial life free of restrictions, and cease to be the worst tax-grinding machine in Europe, its young men would not require bursaries to attract them into commerce."

I cherishfully exonerate Mr. Pentecost from the suspicion entertained by Robert Retelie (see article in another column) that his criticism of "My Uncle Benjamin" was prompted by a desire for revenge against one who gave him his honorable opinion. Comrade Retelie, who has heretofore taken off his hat to Mr. Pentecost's honesty, need not feel obliged, on account of the review of "M., nee Benjamin," to stand covered hereafter in Mr. Pentecost's presence. The editor of the "Twentieth Century" did not speak from malice; he simply spoke from the depths of a huge intellectual vacuum.

It was only a few months ago that, according to John Most, my influence was confined to a small circle in Boston composed mainly of old women; now, in the eyes of that clergyman of Communism I am so well worth killing that my violent taking-off would be an unparalleled service to the world. Filled with jealous and brutal rage at the brilliant success achieved by Mr. Yarros when lecturing recently in Chicago, this Tsarist sentimentaly quotes a column of the "Freiheit," the closing spurt of which I here reproduce (in translation) just as it appeared, black letter and all. "Unfortunately many others good persons (but who are at sea in social matters) have allowed themselves to be led astray by Tuckerian, to the extent, indeed, that these crack-brained 'ideas' are being aired in most of the English and also in two German reform papers, causing great confusion in the minds of the respective reading classes, a circumstance surely not calculated to dispel the fog in the ranks of the American labor movement. America seems to be a land where hunger and confusion of ideas constitute the foundation of the intellectual life and where the only use of logic is to be abused as sophistry. The man who could bring about a change here would do the world a service such as was never before accomplished by a glorious deed."

A woman writes to the Galveston "Navs," saying that factory laws and restrictive legislation of a certain kind. Among other things she contends that "if a woman does as much work as a man, let that woman receive man's wages." The comments of the editor upon this are local and keen that he reproves them here in full. He says: "Taken in connection with the subject under discussion, the resort to legislative authority as arbiter of an economic question, the proposition carries considerable significance. Such a suggestion is of course unexceptionable as a moral rule, but in that respect it would leave the case practically as it is before the law. Some employers are more liberal than others toward women in employment. Moreover it is seldom that the woman is not handicapped with some circumstances creating more or less unavailability in an employment as compared with a man. Where such condition exists and the employment is reputable it will generally be found that a tendency exists to the employment of women in such particular branch. Then the comparatively smaller demand elsewhere for women's labor creates a competition among women who works in the smaller number of employments well open to them, and so, if demand and supply is to rule in wages, the wages in such employments under the circumstances must be somewhat lower than in others not subject to a similar rule by which employer will be simply generosity, not business. What then is the pericline of the demand for equal wages when presented in connection with a legislative scheme, if it be not a demand for legislation fixing wages to the extent intimated as and equal? But employers may prefer men when equal wages are ordered in some future development of the State verging upon a Socialist order. Hence, after the women were found to be neglected as workers under the arbitraries of old commandments, the new calculation of industry would have need of reinforcement by yet another rule restraining the employer from exercising any discrimination in the selection of his employees as regards sex. Having gone thus far would it be worth the value of a column here to discuss adherences to the present basis of business relations? Ultimately the aim of which gains the support of a majority of organized laborers must be understood and subscribed to. It contemplates a State organized somewhat on the lines of General Bellamy. There is logic in acts and it is a progressive logic. All classes should perceive what is the tendency of any act of the legislative and look to the good or evil of the system of which such an act would be a logical part, as nearly as they are able to appreciate its bearings."

Sentimental and Incomplete.

(Tak, Tak In Epochs.)

Reading the article by Mr. Westrup on "Scientific, Against Religion Methods" I agree with him that Mr. Pentecost's treatment of the interest question is manifestly not. It is not only because a sentimental conception predominates in Mr. Pentecost's presentation of the case, but also because that presentation is very incomplete.

The man who by economy and self-denial has saved $1,000 has probably done much more than $1,000 worth of work in exchange for that sum. His labor products are somewhere in the mass of wealth and not his possession. While he has not been paid in intangible values, he has been paid in veritable money. The possession and the market value of this money may give him a prospect or chance of ultimately getting $1,000 worth of products, or what he has earned. We can have out of the most sentimental part of the arrangement, which may give him more or less, while we are analyzing a pretence that the man is not entitled to more than $1,000 worth of products. The persons who paid him his money could not pay him in full, because money was with them a scarce thing. They paid him a sum with a potentiality of receiving from society the balance due him if he can wait. This is one point which Mr. Pentecost has not considered.

If now he lends his money at interest he is told that he will be appropriating from among the borrower's goods a sum that he will have done nothing to earn. Has the borrower no judgment about that? The leader who saved "by economy and self-denial" has already earned more than he lends if he lends without interest, for he has earned $1,000 worth of means, interest-producing money, which is a very different thing from earning $1,000 in a free currency that would represent only labor value and that value fully paid for at the time. But the principal thing to which I now wish to direct further attention in this question from whose goods is the interest taken? Mr. Pentecost says from the borrower, and he means it strictly, of course, for he suggests that the man who lends money at interest has no mark of this very monopolly money which one has worked disadvantageously to get. But the fact that the borrower pays the interest and did not that he would have been interest, because he had been refused, may be deemed proof that the interest does not come out of the borrower's goods. It comes out of the general stock of financial capital, of money.

One must smile when he hears the assertion that the borrower under the present regime performs for the lender a service for no equivalent. The borrower who could get money without interest would compete with others who have to pay interest and would put so much more profit in his pocket.

To view this subject the better let us suppose that the owner of the $1,000 locks it up instead of lending it. Mr. Pentecost, on the principles he has laid down, would not lend him his $1,000 and he would not take interest, but he does not think it a duty bound to lend, neither willing to allow another to perform a service for him without money. Then he is not such a misanthropic as to pay the borrower for taking his precious monopolly money and exploiting society with it. So he does nothing. He has thought of the interests of others and has not calculated upon men's refusing interest, what will be the effect of locking the money up? That the would-borrower may seek elsewhere, with a tendency to higher interest; that they shall seek employment will come to stand; and that while the owner of the money will not draw from the general store any products in excess of $1,000 valuation, the accumulation of labor caused by his withdrawal from circulation of $1,000 in money under present circumstances will arrest production so as to leave the total stock smaller than it would have been if he had accepted interest and let the money go into circulation. These points also Mr. Pentecost does not touch upon, yet they concern one taking any comprehension on the subject.

There is one expression used by Mr. Westrup which is perhaps questionable. He says: "It is the very essence of Epochs. What we seek in the States is that they be reached through Epochs." I think that nothing which is contingent or doubtful can be logically of the essence of Epochs. But I will take it that Mr. Westrup means: the essence of Epochs is such that there must be a break in the effect mentioned. With this understanding Epochs is logically an independent of any process of negation or delivery from altruistic dogmas as Free-thought is independent of any negation or delivery from the dogmas of Christianity. The epoch is cast in model, however, presents certain phenomena in modes of expression and in eagerness by the individual to validate his new tenets with special combinations. A general inconceivable about any sort of Altruism that does not seem to interfere with the enjoyment of life will be found to characterize the mature Epochist mind. With Mr. Westrup Epochs is probably as yet a theory rather than a condition — a theory which he perhaps understands well enough and which I have applied better if I looked earnestly into the complicated questions of money as it is.

For Those Afflicted with Mental Myopia.

(St. Louis News.)

That lively magazine, "Today," takes exception to an argument against copyright illustrated by the supposition of perpetuity as in other property, by wondering if the argument would not be as good in principle against copyrights for a short time. If it would, what some people can see a certain which can be quoted in a certain...
A Brush with Bibliokleptomanics.

[Woodworth Donahoe in Personal Rights Journal.]

On November 2, 1877, my neighbors, or a majority of them, perpetrated a most unmelodious trick, which naturally brought about a quarrel between us, lasting till last summer. They declined to relieve me of a volume of money (say a small sum) to be spent in buying themselves some novels and magazines. They were warned to tell me that the sum was very small, and very little more than the cost of a Poor Rate ticket. Now, first of all, I am a litot of a stickler for a principle, which was not affected by the smallness of the thing in question. To me it was not a question of a Poor Rate ticket; it was a question of the character of the wight. I had in my analysis of the case, in my previous criticism of the work of the public library, mentioned that this request I am unable to comply with. Having bought a large number of books, and being a subscriber to a lending-library, I have no use for the library you purport, nor do I feel any obligation to subsidize any such institution. Those who require it should pay for it. Failing that, there is charity to fall back upon for our fellow-men. 

To Mr. W. S. Meyers, Rate-Collector.

"Sir,—I enclose a cheque for $18. 6d. for rates due since the last rate night. Services are usually paid for after they have been rendered. And this rule would seem to apply more particularly to these services which are unmixed.

Yours truly,

R. GREEN, Vestry Clerk."

On July 5th I again paid my rates, less the library-tax, and improved the occasion by telling Mr. Meyers a little anecdote:

"July 7, 1888,

To Mr. W. S. Meyers,

"Sir,—I enclose a cheque for $18. 6d. for rates due since the last rate night. Services are usually paid for after they have been rendered. And this rule would seem to apply more particularly to these services which are unmixed.

Yours truly,

R. GREEN, Vestry Clerk."

On July 5th I again paid my rates, less the library-tax, and improved the occasion by telling Mr. Meyers a little anecdote:

"July 7, 1888,

To Mr. W. S. Meyers,

"Sir,—I enclose a cheque for $18. 6d. for rates due since the last rate night. Services are usually paid for after they have been rendered. And this rule would seem to apply more particularly to these services which are unmixed.

Yours truly,

R. GREEN, Vestry Clerk.

On July 5th I again paid my rates, less the library-tax, and improved the occasion by telling Mr. Meyers a little anecdote:

"July 7, 1888,

To Mr. W. S. Meyers,

"Sir,—I enclose a cheque for $18. 6d. for rates due since the last rate night. Services are usually paid for after they have been rendered. And this rule would seem to apply more particularly to these services which are unmixed.

Yours truly,

R. GREEN, Vestry Clerk.

On July 5th I again paid my rates, less the library-tax, and improved the occasion by telling Mr. Meyers a little anecdote:

"July 7, 1888,

To Mr. W. S. Meyers,

"Sir,—I enclose a cheque for $18. 6d. for rates due since the last rate night. Services are usually paid for after they have been rendered. And this rule would seem to apply more particularly to these services which are unmixed.

Yours truly,

R. GREEN, Vestry Clerk."
The Poor Devil's Reply to Pentecost.

When I read the sickening review of "My Uncle Benja-

mia" that lately appeared in the "Twentieth Century," my first thought was: How Pentecost will catch it from his ad-

miring friend Reitel for this drive! I had waited eagerly for this "Poor Devil's" review for the Poor Devil. It came, and I was not disappointed. Under a heading difficult of translation, but which means that such an assault as Pentecost's puts a new feather in Uncle Benja-

mia's cap, appeared an editorial article, of which a transla-

tion is given below for Mr. Pentecost's benefit, lest he think himself belittled or equalized with the ministry, it was not keeping its promise to balance the debt by economy, the Right did not abandon Signor Crispiglione, nor the Left the Conservative party.

The bourgeois, which had allowed the people's bread to be taxed without a word, were much agitated by a law which injured its interests in the provinces where the prefectures were to be suppressed. But it was said that Signor Crispiglione would have yielded and would finally have consented to the other measures if, at a subsequent meeting, the Right had promised the ministry the treasury to a deputy of the Right, Signor Luzzatti, who had reported the bill for criticism the day before. The Right would not agree to this, therefore, in favor of the ministry, when, on Saturday, January 12, Signor Crispiglione allowed himself to be led into a compromise which was to deprive the treasury of the public Right which had been in power up to 1876, accusing them of having presented budgets which balanced only in appearance, the Right, therefore, of the Chamber, felt protected by the Left. The National Chamber, which had spent many a word 'freed' and some 'writ', but one cannot but wish that he might associate with more cleanly and honourable people than one such as Signor Crispiglione.

This situation is not very well understood abroad. The French newspapers believe that the Chamber has given a vote against Signor Crispiglione's policies; this is an error; it is only a family quarrel between Signor Crispiglione and his allies of the Right, who regard the question of preference to be taken the latter. The person who should read only the report of the proceedings of the Chamber would get no idea of this. Here were deputies who were all favorable to the bill, one of them, Signor Luzzatti, who reported and defended the bill, declared that, after all the old-fashioned words from Signor Crispiglione, he would vote against it. The Right, therefore, is no more a party than the Left, but a group of old-time politicians who have met to have jokes at the expense of a long-suffering ministry. The periodical has already told you the secret of all this: the ministry had only one hundred and twenty-six votes in its favor, a bare majority; one hundred and eighty-six voting against it, and Signor Crispiglione tendered his resignation.

Now what will happen? When this letter shall reach America, the telegraph will have already told you whether Signor Crispiglione has been charged with the formation of a new party, of which he is to be the supreme head; or whether the deputy of the Left, like Signor Zanardelli, or even some deputy of the Right, like Signor Radula; but, whatever the result, the question will remain an open one for longer than a month. The resignation of the ministry, however, may result in a resignation of the ministry, which is the country's real pleasure.

The different parties in Italy are not only due to the differences in the government, but also to the different conditions in the country itself. The reader who has followed the exposition given in my last letter, will know that the majority was composed largely of people who had supported Signor Crispiglione, and who supported him simply because he was in power and they needed him, either for their private affairs or to def- end the Conservative party against the Radicals. But after the elections the Conservative party, finding itself much stronger, thanks to the support of the government, began to think that that was too good. Now they will manage its affairs all by itself, without further recourse to Signor Crispiglione. From that mo- ment the latter had only this choice: either to become the servant of that party, or to abandon the government. He did not al- lude to this; he hoped to balance the forces of the Right with those of his friends of the Left, and remain master of the situation. Then in the last attempt that he made, in his condition it continued to connect its support to Signor Crispiglione, and would have voted all the taxes which he desired. So, when Signor Crispiglione, in his last attempt, tried to get the minis- try, the ministry was not keeping its promise to balance the de- bust by economy, the Right did not abandon Signor Crispiglione, nor the Left the Conservative party.

The bourgeois, which had allowed the people's bread to be taxed without a word, were much agitated by a law which injured its interests in the provinces where the prefectures were to be suppressed. But it was said that Signor Crispiglione would have yielded and would finally have consented to the other measures if, at a subsequent meeting, the Right would not agree to this, therefore, in favor of the ministry, when, on Saturday, January 12, Signor Crispiglione allowed himself to be led into a compromise which was to deprive the treasury of the public Right which had been in power up to 1876, accusing them of having presented budgets which balanced only in appearance, the Right, therefore, of the Chamber, felt protected by the Left. The National Chamber, which had spent many a word 'freed' and some 'writ', but one cannot but wish that he might associate with more cleanly and honourable people than one such as Signor Crispiglione.

This situation is not very well understood abroad. The French newspapers believe that the Chamber has given a vote against Signor Crispiglione's policies; this is an error; it is only a family quarrel between Signor Crispiglione and his allies of the Right, who regard the question of preference to be taken the latter. The person who should read only the report of the proceedings of the Chamber would get no idea of this. Here were deputies who were all favorable to the bill, one of them, Signor Luzzatti, who reported and defended the bill, declared that, after all the old-fashioned words from Signor Crispiglione, he would vote against it. The Right, therefore, is no more a party than the Left, but a group of old-time politicians who have met to have jokes at the expense of a long-suffering ministry. The periodical has already told you the secret of all this: the ministry had only one hundred and twenty-six votes in its favor, a bare majority; one hundred and eighty-six voting against it, and Signor Crispiglione tendered his resignation.

Now what will happen? When this letter shall reach America, the telegraph will have already told you whether Signor Crispiglione has been charged with the formation of a new party, of which he is to be the supreme head; or whether the deputy of the Left, like Signor Zanardelli, or even some deputy of the Right, like Signor Radula; but, whatever the result, the question will remain an open one for longer than a month. The resignation of the ministry, however, may result in a resignation of the ministry, which is the country's real pleasure.

The different parties in Italy are not only due to the differences in the government, but also to the different conditions in the country itself. The reader who has followed the exposition given in my last letter, will know that the majority was composed largely of people who had supported Signor Crispiglione, and who supported him simply because he was in power and they needed him, either for their private affairs or to de-
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In a struggling state and interval, the last vestige of old-time slavery, the last purpose at which the world seemed to be in execution, the vest of the despot, the club of the policeman, the grasp of the creditor, the restraining-heel of the department store, all those incumbrances of political, which young Liberty grants beneath her heel. — PROCTOR.

The appearance in the editorial column of articles by other editors than the author of the initial isozon suggests that the editor approves their central purpose and general tenor, though he does not hold himself responsible for every phrase or word. But the appearance in other pieces of the other parts of the articles by the same or other writers by no means indicates that he disapproves them in any respect, much less of a disposition of them being governed largely by motives of convenience.

A Trip to Chicago.

The friends of Liberty and of liberty of Chicago having secured for me an opportunity to present my Anarchistic views to the modern social presses of the Economic Conference, I visited Chicago in February for the purpose, and passed a few days of busy and delightful activity. Some of the things I have seen and heard there now wish to communicate to the reader, and I have interest in them for more than one reason.

I arrived Saturday evening, February 14, and met all the "plumbers" of the office at the Conrade Schilling, Chicago, by the way, has sixteen "plumbers," and many solicitors for candidates for the presidency. I was assured that individualistic Anarchism was growing and making excellent progress in Chicago, while so-called "Communist Anarchism" was speedily becoming a thing of the past, ancient history. The meeting at the Schilling's Committee are very poorly attended, and intelligent men have ceased paying attention to them. On the other hand, the interest in radical individualism, in philosophical Anarchism, is spreading among students of social movements and principles.

The Sunday evening meeting I shall never forget. The ball — Recital Hall, in the Auditorium — was crowded, over six hundred men and women being gathered to listen to a presentation of Anarchism. The Economic Conference has been arranged for the purpose of bringing business men and working men together and helping them to understand each other, to become acquainted with each other's views on theoretical as well as practical questions relating to industrial and political relations. Those conferences have accomplished a great amount of good, and Chicago is justly proud of them. To Mr. Sailer, the leader and teacher in the ethical culture movement, is due the credit of having conceived and organized these conferences, now in the fourth year of successful operation. At the meeting which I addressed there was present all sorts and conditions of men and reformers. Workingmen were there and millionaires, bankers, manufacturers, professional men, and politicians were there, and Communists as well as single-taxers and conservative labor reformers. In a word, the audience was an intelligent one and inclined to be critical — which made my position very critical. I had never addressed such an audience before, nor in any other capacity assisted at such a gathering. I do not think any other city in the country can boast of harboring such an institution as the Economic Conference, and he must regard himself very lucky whom the proposition of appearing on that platform is conferred. No man with firm convictions and a good cause to champion can reasonably wish for a more discriminating audience.

I may well confess that I rose to speak with the-[insert]-perhaps expectations of failure. Nothing hurts a sound cause so much as loose and faulty arguments advanced in its behalf; and I had not been able to prepare any careful essay or address, and was obliged to make it up as I went along. Even the few disjunctive notes I had jotted down I had forgotten to take with me. But a pleasant surprise was in store for me. I had not used up ten minutes of the hour allowed when I was made aware that the audience was being very satisfactorily impressed. I was satirical in my manner of speaking, but not so much as to be sarcastic at my expense at once incurred the displeasure of their fellow auditors. I mention all these facts because nobody was more astonished at them than myself. The enthusiastic endorsement and cordial reception which I received is the hands of my audience, and is, really, a great surprise to me; and not to me alone, but also to my comrades in Chicago. Schilling could not account for it, or any other of the plumbers who were present.

The Chicago newspapers reported the lecture, and many contained editorial criticisms of it. But as the report, with one exception, were misrepresentations, the editorial criticisms, based upon these reports, were not, of course, criticisms of my position, but of the reporters representation of my argument. I am positive, however, that none of the reporters meant to do me an injustice; on the contrary, they vied with one another in paying me compliments. But the unfamiliarity with the thought expressed made it next to impossible for them to appear fair. Even the editor of the Chicago "Arbeiterzeitung," who ought to be able to grasp the ideas and point of view of his individualistic opponents, showed in his report that he had misconceived my position and that my elaborate explanations of certain important points had been utterly wasted so far as he was concerned.

Besides the Economic Conference I addressed the "Working People's Social Science Club" at the Hull-House on "Socialism and Individualism" and spoke at a "parlor meeting" arranged by Mrs. Charlotte C. Holt, the Hyde Park plumber, in her own house. Both these gatherings were truly successful. I regard not to have been able to accept the kind invitation of that other remarkable Chicago institution, the Sunset, to attend on February 19 to discuss the money problem. Nothing would have pleased me more, had circumstances permitted it, than to lay before that intelligent body the plan of mutual ownership by which the power of labor as brought themselves suggest for the treatment of by me; but there were no many things for me to do, to see, to hear, and so little time to accomplish all that in, that some had to be sacrificed.

The people of Chicago — of the city itself (stockyards and all) am I too charitable to speak — I have nothing but praise and admiration. A more tolerant, hospitable, social, liberal people it would be unreasonable to wish to deal with. The manners, the customs, and the habits of the people, had almost led me to doubt the validity of the generalization regarding man's being a social animal. My Chicago experience, however, have strengthened my confidence in the correctness of that indication, and I now am disposed to look upon it as that only prove the rule. I am aware that many will smile sadly and wonder at my unstinted praise for the people of Chicago — the people who a few years since:

In a characteristically stupid and mean document, Herr Motz in the "Freihart," commented upon my alleged strictness upon strikers, boycotters, and other persons fighting monopoly. As Herr Motz is a friend, the best that I can say of his article is that it is to the best of my knowledge and belief that it is, no matter who. As to Herr Motz's personality, I have too much pity for his own interests to say even one harsh word against him. I can only say strong words over me success people. Poor, desperate wretches appeal to my generosity and are always sure of indulgence.
will it be found easier to gain support for a movement against government monopoly of money, mails, and similar functions, than in Chicago. Many years ago I heard John Swinton speak, on a New York platform, of the rapid growth of labor in the sentiment in favor of labor reforms in Chicago under the genius of Geo. A. Schilling. I am happy to assure the grand old man, John Swinton, that Geo. A. Schilling continued to be an important work to do than agitating for tradeunionism. He leaves that to others, and successfully works for the popularization of the principles of true individualism and Anarchistic Socialism. He is a power in the community, and he is ably supported by his comrades.

I am deeply grateful to the Chicago plumb-liners for the honor and pleasure which they accorded me in arranging my trip to their city, and rejoices in the knowledge that they think that my visit may result in some good to the movement.

Inexcusable.

One is always anxious to place a charitable interpretation upon the conduct of a friend when he suddenly takes a surprising course that has a very questionable outcome. Now I saw the Chicago "Zucker" Mr. Bechtold's editorial assault on Mr. Yarro's lecture in Chicago, in which the most despisible words were unhesitatingly attributed to the lecturer and outrageous sentiments placed in his mouth which he never uttered. I tried to think of it as some woful mistake which would be followed by adequate explanation and rectification. But this hope almost entirely disappeared when I was shown, a few hours later, the following extract from a letter written by George A. Schilling of Chicago to George Schultze:

If you have such a severe censure for Mr. Schultze, what must you say of our plumb-line friend, Mr. Bechtold, who, in two columns of his newspaper "Zucker," accuses Mr. Yarro of doing what he did not say? I confess I do not understand it, because Bechtold was at the meeting, and, on account of his poor hearing, I gave him the best read possible. Notwithstanding this, he takes the report of the "Times," which was full of falsehoods, and uses it as the sole basis of his article. And, worst of all, he called my attention to the "Times" next day, and I told him, in the presence of Schultze, that the report was entirely unreliable. I had a talk with Schultze yesterday, who was also present sitting on the platform, and he admitted that Bechtold's article was not warranted by the facts.

Unless Mr. Bechtold can offer some explanation of which I do not dream, my former feeling of great respect for the man instantly changed into one of great contempt. His course seems to me inexcusable.

Let Us Have Justice.

When Victor Yarro went to Chicago in response to an invitation from the "Economic Conference" to address its members and the general public on the subject of Anarchism, it was of course to be expected that but scant justice would be done him by the capitalistic press. We were indeed all prepared to see his utterances twisted out of all resemblance to their original shape and his true position grossly misrepresented. And without entering into detail, our fears in this respect came true to the very letter.

It was of course predicted that but little, if any, more justice would be meted out to Mr. Yarro by the daily organ of Communism published in the Western metropolis, the "Arbeiterzeitung." The very tone of the announcement made of his forthcoming lecture by that paper led us to look for the worst for our friend at its hands. Yet in this case things turned out differently. For, while the "Arbeiterzeitung" did indeed grossly misconstrue, and utterly fail in perceiving the true significance of the efforts of the lecturer (which I half think due to a constitutional incapacity of the Communist mind for grasping the Anarchistic idea), it was on the other hand exceptionally just and even highly complimentary to him personally.

But there was also awaiting us a surprise of a totally different nature. For while we had not expected anything except those misrepresentations of Mr. Yarro at the hands of our enemies the capitalist and the Communists, we did look to Mr. Bechtold of the "Zucker" for enlisting in his defence against calumny and hostile criticism. We had every reason to entertain such a hope. Mr. Bechtold is one of the very few German editors who understand individualistic Anarchism, and he is neither a Communist nor a Social Stateist. Besides, he had warmly beseeched the attention of his readers for Mr. Yarro's lecture. His conduct in this matter is not only remembered, but it is, in noble contrast to that of the editor of the "Arbeiterzeitung," and last, he is generally known as an eminently just man.

And so our fears of the promises of false treatment at the hands of Mr. Bechtold, we were sorely disappointed. Instead of getting a faithful report of what Mr. Yarro said and commenting on that, he accepted the report of the "Times" and that report he published, as far as I can remember, was in noble contrast to that of the editor of the "Arbeiterzeitung." And last, he is generally known as an eminently just man.

No wonder we are astonished at these promises of false treatment at the hands of Mr. Bechtold, we were sorely disappointed. Instead of getting a faithful report of what Mr. Yarro said and commenting on that, he accepted the report of the "Times" and that report he published, as far as I can remember, was in noble contrast to that of the editor of the "Arbeiterzeitung." And last, he is generally known as an eminently just man.

The alleged divergence of Mr. Yarro from Spencer's position, to make a distinction between the right to property in inventions and the right to literary property, is not as such a distinction to be paraded in front of Mr. Tucker in view of the fact that Mr. Tucker was not attacking merely perpetual copyright and patent right but the temporary right also, and in view of the fact that Mr. Yarro believes in the temporary right as much as anyone else. There is, I think, a possible objection to his view of the paper, for instance, that he would make a distinction between the right to property in inventions and the right to literary property, is not as such a distinction to be paraded in front of Mr. Tucker in view of the fact that Mr. Tucker was not attacking merely perpetual copyright and patent right but the temporary right also, and in view of the fact that Mr. Yarro believes in the temporary right as much as anyone else. There is, I think, a possible objection to his view of the paper, for instance, that he would make a distinction between the right to property in inventions and the right to literary property, is not as such a distinction to be paraded in front of Mr. Tucker in view of the fact that Mr. Tucker was not attacking merely perpetual copyright and patent right but the temporary right also, and in view of the fact that Mr. Yarro believes in the temporary right as much as anyone else. Tucker is after the Canselects and the Aamikailets, whereby Yarro comes in and says: I perceive a distinction. These are not all Anarchistic ideas.

Copyright.

Mr. Yarro is an easy writer. A proverb tells the consequences to a worm. He began on copyright by designating the "monopoly of ideas" as "too silly to require any force for its re-
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Prohibition and Equal Liberty.

"We didn't suppose the Anarchists were going to repeal even the laws of logic," snarls the "Voice" in winding up a reply to my criticism of its position on prohibition. In this arena I find cause for regret as well as satisfaction. Theas charge in crime and coolheaded "Voice" which I have learned to appraise in a comparatively short time; it would do well enough in a shallow paragraph of a "popular" paper, but to one who has been ashamed of and sorry for the "Voice." On the other hand, I cannot but derive satisfaction from the reflection that, if the "Voice" is losing temper and getting angry, this is an indication of its consciousness of failure and weakness.

As the "Voice" has not grasped my point about the change of the line of defense, I will not occupy space with a reticulation of it, and will proceed to show that the two charges made by the "Voice" against me, namely, that I believe in the proposition that the state has no duty to provide you in doing. If, however, you are so illogical as to pretend that, in offering to purchase or sell ardent spirits, I violate equal liberty because some other man may drunk to excess and commit crimes, then I point out in your proposition is that the state has no duty to buy or sell a knife, because some man may lay a knife for purposes of homicide. Remember that, as we have proposed, government is to interfere in every case where equal liberty is defiled and disregarded. We can do this, and we will do this, and as the proper answer to this is an appeal to common sense.

I have no doubt the "Voice" thinks this crushing. As for me, I am simply amused. I have not the slightest objection to an appeal to common sense. What does common sense say? Why, that government is to protect society only in cases where it deems it wise and practicable to interfere. Isn't the whole question made clear and settled finally? I fear not.

The "Voice" has not been touched at all. How is the government to determine when it is wise and practicable to interfere, and where it is not? As the "Voice" knows, opinions differ on this as on all other questions. Some good people are not ready to stop short of the "Voice" goal, and others decline even to take one step in line with it. How, then, is the government to decide? Let the majority decide, let the voice of the people be heard. It is only as much as rights as are afforded. Has the "Voice" a guiding principle? It claims to follow the principle of equal liberty. In other works, it professes to think that it is wise and impracticable for government to interfere except where equal liberty is violated. And I, for the sake of self-examination, have further asked Mr. Yarros, who supplies the idea is aiid by Spencer from the principle of equal liberty. Spencer's language does not lead me to think that Spencer would make quite this claim. He finds little favor of government interference on ideas, and, as far as shown by the quotations, he does not perceive any violation of liberty in reaping a harvest from the activity of others whom he may have to be paid by the idea. He does not see the burden of the method by which the man who supplies the idea is aimed to secure his alleged share in the results of its application. The most, I make of Spencer's position as viewed by Spencer is that he thinks property in ideas is a principle of equal liberty; and included in his notion of producing ideas is a projection of power which I shall not admit to be part of the science of industrial relations.

TAX NAZ.

Weak and Illogical Criticism.

On Sunday evening, February 22, Master in Chancery J. K. Boyesen lectured before the Chicago Economic Conference upon "Liberty Regulated by Law." The lecture was in the nature of a reply to Mr. Yarros at the previous meeting. One of Mr. Young's friends and contributors writes as follows with reference to Mr. Boyesen's reply:

I was at the Auditorium last night and heard Mr. Boyesen on "Liberty Regulated by Law." It was far below my expectations. A much stronger case can be made against the defendant in the recent case of the "Liberty Regulated by Law" than in the case of the "Liberty Regulated by Law." The case is not even the most interesting. You have often read articles in which the general proposition is made that governmental functions should be divided into political and economic, and dealing with a principle violative of the principle continually. His remarks were of the same nature.

He opened his address with the statement that, if your pre- sentation of Anarchism is Anarchism, then there surely is nothing dangerous in it, - not even practically dangerous. He said, "My idea of that of Mr. Yarros. If the people of any community were disposed to act in such an extent that there would be no desire to encroach on each other it could not be injurious, but that not being the case, it must be recognized only as a question of practic- al connection with the present. Taking things as they are, no one can realistically assume that freedom of action without restriction is a real matter in the present state of affairs. He looks upon government as an iron band which enforces society and prevents its members from violating the law of equal freedom. In this connection, he says, to your statement that taxation without consent is robbery, he says, "If men secured from the State, the result must be self-sufficiency. He further stated that all men who would or could withdraw from State protection, withdrawal because protection is offered at a lower rate by an organization or individuals in competition with it (that is, protection is at all necessary). His criticism of State Socialism was rather good. While not making any plea for, or against equal authority per se, he cited numerous cases of State enterprise which performed the functions in a slow, cumbersome, and extra- velt manner. He concluded by saying that the tax is not a tax, but does not see how government does the most simple things badly should do everything good. No doubt he was under- powered by the fact that he feels that the State is the curse of the world which feels that be- cause of his criticism of State Socialism.

He knows absolutely nothing of economics. He says the working man are receiving of their product than they ever did and that that proportion is constantly increasing, and looks to the time when they will be able to do the work of the employer, and that the State is responsible for its failure to find employment, and that bakers stand behind their counters fearing disaster.

There is indeed much ground for emphasizing the impor- tance of a good tax on industries. In a modern economy, a condition of society where exchange of products is the most prominent feature in connection with production, and this is the case through the civilized world. What is the effect on society of the present depression the gold and silver coin is a want of a circulating medium. It is not the case that a circulating medium might be entirely exhausted without making men any poorer than they now are. There is truth in the last words but the argument is grossly faulty. It is conceivable that a world without gold or silver might be a prosperous world with pennies of real currency. But it is not conceivable that there would be a sudden rise for want of a circulating medium. What might happen is, in fact, the result of the national currency system to the present depression under actual conditions. To illustrate this another sphere. Unhappily, in the states the people of the United States, the present condition of the country制度 would be possible, except for the fact that the government would be unable to do it. But if tomorrow all the foreign markets were closed against American wheat and cotton, that would be quite a different proposition. It would take a more parallel case. In some small city the epistemic appears and the street car service is affected. Fools, says a thing, but the result is that it is not able to do its work. Not that the service suffer for want of horse. If there were no horses in the world it is conceivable that there would still be excellent street car service. Truth - truth impressed into the service of error. The "Herald" coalesced.
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