On Picket Duty.

The Independent Theatre of London will give its second performance during the third week in June, when a translation of Zelda's play, "Théâtre Rappels," will be presented.

"Every indirect tax is in the nature of a fraud," says the "Locking Glass." But what is the nature of direct taxes? Do they differ from the indirect except as highway robbery differs from pocket-picking?

Prohdhon's works are selling very rapidly at the reduced price of one dollar a volume. Many poor laborers hail this opportunity with delight. Let all who wish to hasten the publication of additional volumes send me their pledge to take each volume as it appears at one dollar.

A press despatch stated that the Cobden Club was dying of starvation, Europe being more protectionist than ever. The truth is, as Mr. Johnstone told us nearly a year ago, that the Cobden Club is dying of inconsistency. Advanced thinkers demand a more virile and logical kind of individualism than is professed by the Club. Cobden-club individualism is dead. Long live radical and consistent individualism!

That the "Critic" should charge Anarchists and Socialists with "shaltfulness of thought" and "disregard of accepted principles of political morality" is not at all surprising. But when it invents the novel charge that they have a passion for wealth it becomes ridiculously unfair. A passion for wealth is incompatible with reform. The trouble with many reformers is rather that they have too great a contempt for wealth.

The Boston aldermen are making a tour of leading American cities, at the public expense, of course, ostensibly in search of information about streets and sewers. Knowing the average City Father as I do, and judging also from what I have heard regarding similar junkets in the past, it is my opinion that these worthies will bring home with them much less knowledge of streets and sewers than of rum-shops and houses of ill-fame.

The Atlantic (Iowa) "Investigator" contains sarcastic references to Liberty as a "scientific" journal and to its "scientific" editor. If the "Investigator" is disposed to ridicule this journal's pretensions, it would be interesting to know why it recently solicited my praise to be used as a "puff" in securing new subscribers. Evidently the temperate tribute which I sent in response to this request, and which the "Investigator" printed under the heading, "A Cheiflain's Greeting," was not flattering enough to inspire gratitude.

The "Journal of the Knights of Labor" says that "Friend Pentecost has been flattering himself that he was an Individualist, if not an out-and-out Anarchist, but Friend Tucker of Liberty has served notice upon him to get off the Individualist grass." This is not true. A more accurate statement would be that Pentecost has been insisting that he is not an "ist" of any kind, and that I have served notice upon him to show cause why. Far from warning Pentecost off, I claim him. I insist fundamentally he is an Anarchist, though at times taking positions inconsistent with Anarchism. It is always annoying to inconsistent people to have their inconsistencies pointed out. And because I refuse to let them contradict themselves in comfort, Pentecost, Powderly, and a long list of others who have it that I want to be a pope.

In his lecture on Shakspeare, Col. Ingersoll dismisses the claims of the Baconsians in the following utterance: "Those who contend that Lapidaries make diamonds say that Bacon was the author of Shakspeare's plays. Look through Bacon's works, and you will find his philosophy mixed with a foolishness that would have prevented him from writing a great drama. He was lamentably ignorant of every branch of science and advanced theories that a child must laugh at. He turns to natural philosophy, to biology, geology, and shows the fool in every one of them."

Here Ingersoll ventures beyond his depth and makes a fool of himself. Of Bacon's services to science he is incompetent to speak, and he can gain nothing by recklessly exposing his ignorance. Ingersoll should read what scientific men like Mill, Lewes, or Spencer say about Bacon's contributions to science and philosophy, and revise his lecture, which is not a bad one by any means.

E. C. Walker, writing from Cincinnati concerning the Labor Conference which he attended in the interest of Liberty, says: "I desire to assure you that this is a difficult crowd to work in; it is grab and haul, here and there and everywhere. One cannot utter more than two sentences to a person before some friend rushes up and hauls him to one side to introduce him to another of that particular clique, or to pour into his ear the details of a plan for downing the other crowds. There will be fun today in the open conference, a mile high, for there are men here with a terrible power of lung. More than one hundred and fifty editors are present, and the poor devils who are not present are having a hard time of it. It may safely be said that a more heterogeneous crowd was never gathered. Farmers' Alliance (northern and southern), Citizens' Alliance, Union Labor, United Labor, Knights of Labor, Federation of Labor, Single Taxers, Prohibitionists, Greenbackers, Silver men, Pessamites, Woman Suffragists, Anti-Suffragists, Anti-Prohibitionists, — well, that's only a beginning. Republican henchmen are making themselves numerous, while Livingstone of Georgia and other Democrats are working in the interest of that party. But they all agree on one thing; they want more law."

In an article justifying the prohibition of the liquor traffic, the Atlantic (Iowa) "Investigator" says: "According to the Anarchistic theory, the government has no right to prohibit anything, but only has the right to interfere where a wrong has been done, and then only to make the wrong-doer repair damages." I know not the sources whence the "Investigator" derived this notion of Anarchism, but it is certainly a nice one.

A more accurate statement would be that Anarchism holds that it has no business to do anything whatsoever or even to exist; but voluntary defensive associations acting on the Anarchistic principle would not only demand redress for, but would prohibit, all clearly inva-sive acts. They would not, however, prohibit cons- invasive acts, even though these acts create additional opportunity for invasive persons to act invasively. For instance, they would not prevent the buying and selling of liquor, even though it be true that some people are invasive when under the influence of liquor. The "Investigator" has failed to grasp the Anarchistic view. It makes the dividing line of Anarchism run between prohibition of injury and compulsory repress, whereas Anarchism really includes both. Its dividing line runs in an entirely different direction, and separates invasion from non-invasion. Let the "Investigator" try again.

THE POOR POPE.

(Translated from the French of Oscar Amouge by Bea. E. Tecklen.)

SCENE: The Streets of Rome.
CHARACTERS: P. Pope, An Italian. 

Piglin: The city mournful seems. Forgive me, Sir, I pray. Around the Vatican what's happening today?

Pope: A powder-magazine blew up a week ago; the city ever since has lived in fear and woe.

Piglin: His Holiness the Pope? 

Italian: The Pope! He's far from ill; with fresh and ruddy lips, he's hair and hearty still.

Piglin: Poor man! 

Italian: The dead are three hundred wounded lie! With broken arms and legs unnumbered hundreds sigh! In many a house in Rome they suffer, yes, they weep!

Piglin: His Holiness the Pope? 

Italian: Awakened from his sleep By the tremendous shock that brought Rome to its knees, A dainty meal alone his anger could appease.

Piglin: Poor man! 

Italian: Ah! Sir, 'twas sad, the scene that morning saw! 

Piglin: The hospitals overflow. The multitude in woe! 

Italian: Round homes in ruins throngs of frighted mothers press Their naked, homeless babes more tightly to their breast!

Piglin: His Holiness the Pope? 

Italian: He directs all. 

Piglin: They broke the news to him, while lingering o'er his plate, That he would be obliged to have new glass put in. His face at once seemed a look of deep chagrin.

Piglin: Poor man! 

Italian: I need not tell this that in this grave Each lent his hand in hopes his fellow-man to save. 

Piglin: His Holiness the Pope? 

Italian: He quietly stayed at home. And, when the papers came, he quietly read the news, And to his faithful then vouchsafed his holy views.

Piglin: Poor man! 

Italian: Since then a work has passed away, and yet 

Piglin: The Romans, as at first, unable: forgot, Perused their grief throughout the city's darkened ways. 

Piglin: His Holiness the Pope? 

Italian: He sleeps as eats, he prays.

Piglin: Poor man! He has God's ear while writing o'er his breast! "Thy frighted! I will run to give him all my joy!"
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In abolishing war and interest, the last vestiges of old-time slavery, the Revolution abolishes at one stroke the scourge of the assassin, the seal of the tyrant, the yoke, the yoke of the despot, the bonds of the slave, and the chains of the captive. The people of the department, all those images of despotism, which Liberty grinds beneath her heel. — Fouché.

The appearance in the editorial columns of articles on other subjects, not of a like class with that of this number, is required in no sense. If the editor approves their general purpose and general tenor, though he does not hold himself responsible for every phrase or word, but the appearance in other parts of the paper of articles by the same or other writers by no means indicates that he disapproves of the same, merely as a precaution, which might be realized by the removal of them being governed largely by motives of convenience.

The accompanying letter from Mr. W. A. P. French, and now a regular contributor to the columns of Liberty, is also an original agreement for Liberty and for all books and pamphlets published by the same.

A NEW BOOK GIVEN AWAY WITH EACH RENRAW.

Payment will be accepted at the rate of 25 cents for four numbers (a year). The names of subscribers not heard from within two weeks after expiration of subscription will be struck off the list.

Billings, who sends his renewal for one year, accompanied by the cash, so that it reaches his publisher not later than the date. The long, bill will be sent, postpaid, any book published in the United States that the subscriber desires, for forty cents in post paid, or with a post card. The price does not exceed 50 cents if published by Ben. R. Tucker, or 75 cents if published by the other publishers with free offer, and enables every promptly-paying subscriber to get a new work every week by paying the usual price for protection. This privilege will be given at a time, no matter how low the price of the book selected.

Words That Will Live As Long As Hate.

A prominent American journal, commenting on the recent refusal of the French Chamber of Deputies to order an investigation of the massacre of women and children at Puebla, in Mexico, thus summarises the situation:

For several days on May 1 May 1, the strike then in progress at that place, the idea that such a deed could have been done with impunity by soldiers of the United States, and declared that in this country the legislative and executive branch of the government are responsible for an outrage of this character, and visit the severest penalties upon the guilty. The asser tion seemed to me an optimistic one when I read it; and my view received most shocking confirmation a few days later, when the report of the massacre of the Mexican women and children was published. I cannot express in adequate terms the feelings of indignation that surged through me as I read the report of the Mexican women and children being driven from their homes and massacred by the Mexican army on May 1, 1868.

The following words that will live as long as hate:

In view of the speaker's denial that the law is to judge both its assailants and its defenders, his qualification — inserted from motives of prudence and to avoid a possibility of his being held criminally liable for his actions — that the law will protect its defenders "so long as the means . . . are kept within the preestablished precepts laid down by law itself," means nothing at all unless it means that those who use force on the employers of whose property they are a part of their acts. In plain words, this is what the commander meant to say to his subordinates: When you are called out to protect order, do not hesitate to shoot; I assure you that no one will or can call you to account for it.

Having thus relieved the soldier of any fear that he will be punished for shooting, General Ordway proceeds to fill him with fear that, if he should not shoot, "the army is told that no gunman will be employed, but that is only in case of rioting, and not in case of simply carrying on the business of the peace and order of the city." This is the only danger of assassination at the hands of rioters led by Negroes. Don't refrain from shooting through fear of the law, but shoot through fear of the terrible foe. Such is the advice, given in the following language, which will surprise none more than those who have for the first time of their wonderful proficiency as military strategists.

It is fully as important in this country to prepare for internal disorder as for external war, and much as much as we have to provide for coast defence. Our people seem to be wholly blind to the lessons of the past, the dangers of the present, or the possibilities of the future.

In 1877 an insignificant trouble at the small town in Martin, in West Virginia, suddenly developed proportions of a kind and character we had never before experienced, in order to preserve the forts in the same state of the soldiers' worth of property was destroyed, millions of dollars' worth of human labor lost, and the fabric of lawful order received a severe blow. What does this mean to us? It means that the future of our country is now being overthrown with hundreds of thousands of the most criminal and ignorant classes of Europe, who can neither assimilate with us nor make war, and by violating the terms of our institutions or the force of our laws; men who know no law but force, and can appreciate no punishment less than death.

Following the wake of these immigrants have come the professional agitators, who may be called the priests of the future. They who have come to this country to spread the gospel of revolution, to enslave the working people of this country, and to destroy the future of the United States. If you ever have occasion to meet these men, you will find that they are no tyros in the art of war, and will be a match for the bestMinute men.

The hands of this people is not shown in ordinary affairs, but we know enough of them, of the organizations they control, of their political aims, that the time is near when they will be the heads of the military, of the police, of the army, and of the government. They are the future leaders of the future.

Any thoughtful man, especially a military observer, must realize the fact that riots in the future will be more frequent and more formidable than in the past. Just as such a man of war as a fellow of the golden fleece of their own society, and, though having been seized to desire those who labor, make dopes of them that they may live well and be contented with the means of our institutions or the force of our laws; men who know no law but force, and can appreciate no punishment less than death.

They have learned that they will be conditioned to the interests of the moneyed classes, to the interests of the rich, and to the interests of the idle. They have learned that they will be conditioned to the interests of the moneyed classes, to the interests of the rich, and to the interests of the idle.

These facts should teach the lawless element among the workingmen, that they lose in the specious arguments of the Anarchists, they will not have the support of their intelligent fellow-workers, and should also convince the soldier that he may be the reason for the future, and which has been organized under the plea of glorious work to be dressed, in reality composed of at least eighty-five per cent. of these men, and Anarchists and Socialists have no, from whom no one knows, and to a few striking railroad men.

These facts should teach the lawless element among the workingmen, that they lose in the specious arguments of the Anarchists, they will not have the support of their intelligent fellow-workers, and should also convince the soldier that he may be the reason for the future, and which has been organized under the plea of glorious work to be dressed, in reality composed of at least eighty-five per cent. of these men, and Anarchists and Socialists have no, from whom no one knows, and to a few striking railroad men.

The Socialists should be confronted with the Anarchists. Socialism is generally a mild sort of being, who indulges in vague theories of the proper construction of human society. He is a dreamer, and no more to be feared than any other harmless lunatic, except as far as he may lend aid and countenance to putting his theories into active opposition to legitimately established government.

Anarchists and Socialists practically applied; he believes or asserts a belief in a com.
diction of society in which there shall be no law or supreme power, and in which each individual shall do whatever he pleases with the fruits of his labor. Even by the most ruthless of critics he has not a rule, and he is generally pictured as not only not a powerful, but a most astrol: ruler. If one could imagine him being overthrown the conclusion of such a society on the chance that his fall would make it clear to everyone that this world would be an Anarchist world, the Anarchist, a professional ruler, and he brings to his profession all the arts and sciences of which he is the heir. If you are ever brought into contact with a mob, let us hope that the Anarchists will constitute the front ranks, that it is no longer a question of personal rights, but only public. Then, by this means, we may get a taste, not of Liberty, but of Liberty, which he despises, but of the object of his ideality, — Force.

Swords, Pokers, Logic, and Anarchism.

Referring to Mr. Donisthorpe’s reply, on another page, to the critique of his position in favor of “Limits of Liberty,” I am certain that our readers will be grateful to him for the breach of his rule to pass his reviewers’ suggestions in silence which he has been good enough to decide on in my case. It is always a delight to read Mr. Donisthorpe, whether we find ourselves in accord with him or not. I cannot see that Mr. Donisthorpe has disposed of my charge of self-contradiction against him. He explains that, while perfectly aware that there are no people who like to believe in unlimited liberty, he has always been liberal in unlimited liberty when he declared that he should not quarrel with those who answer “No limits” to the question in regard to the limits of liberty. Turning to the page and verse in which the matter is spoken of, I find there the following expression: “With those who answer No limits, I will not quarrel. Such answer implies the belief that we are ripe for perfect Anarchy.” Now contrast this with the statement, on another page of the essay, “We may put the question of the same side and imagine a purely Anarchistic form of society, and the same question (as to the limits of liberty) still arises. Is there not a palatable contradiction here?” Thus we are told that Mr. Donisthorpe need not quarrel with those who answer No limits, because such answer implies that we are ripe for a purely Anarchistic form of society; then, in referring to Anarchists, the statement is made that even if we adopt Anarchist we are brought back to the same question as to the limits of liberty. I do not object to Mr. Donisthorpe’s determination not to quarrel (in the sense of debating) with those who say No limits — I have too little respect for them to approve of his wasting effort with them. But I do not give two contradictory reasons for declining to quarrel with them. If it is true, as Mr. Donisthorpe now says, “that they have never realized the conception they try to express in words,” and that any attempt to do so would inevitably lead them to relinquish their meaningless solutions, be true, then it implies that we are ripe for perfect Anarchy.

Coming to another point, Mr. Donisthorpe says “I cannot honestly say that I deny the right of the government to trench upon my individual freedom, nor do I think that the individual, while entitled to his livelihood, may not transgress as divulge from the equal claims of fellow-citizens.” This is a correct statement of the social condition towards which we are slowly moving I admit. But unfortunately it is not so yet. This fills me with deep concern. I cannot weigh my words and say nothing to warrant the construction which Mr. Donisthorpe puts upon my statement regarding his own unconsciously Anarchistic point of view. I simply said that Mr. Donisthorpe’s way of stating the problem showed that he took the Anarchistic view; that “to him as to us, the question presents itself as one dealing with the relations between one individual and another; between the question of justice between man and man there is the question of justice between the individual and society, or the State, and that society has rights as such. The principle is the same in which all are equally bound to respect. To decide what the rights of one man are as against another man is to decide what the right of the State is as against the individual. The State, therefore, as a whole, has the right, that, beyond the question of justice between man and man, there is the question of justice between the individual and society or the State, and that society has rights as such. And the Anarchist, in defining to the limits of liberty, utterly ignores the State as an independent entity having claims and rights, and refers to it merely as a power enforcing individual claims and adjusting the lation of the units among themselves. Thus, I pointed out, is the Anarchistic method of procedure, which adopts this method thereby proclaims himself an Anarchist.

Touching the question of practical rules to be adopted now and followed pending the definitive settlement of the problem, — the tracing of a black and white regt on between the region of legitimate acts and the region of invasive acts, — Mr. Donisthorpe, admitting that he has no unexceptional practical rules to furnish, nevertheless refuses to concede to the right to complain of his failure. The position of government is influenced by the action of government on the laws which he does offer (and which, though better than Mr. Donisthorpe’s poker, is not a sword) a sword. I am in need of a practical rule. Mr. Tucker frankly tells me that the best rule he can frame (not, pardon, but you possible rule) is, No force except in invasion (or lower form of competition), and in doubtful cases no force unless for personal safety absolutely demands the use of it. I am not satisfied with this, and decide to apply to others. I am not satisfied with Mr. Donisthorpe, however, and I am forced to admit the relative excellence of Mr. Tucker’s suggestion. At this juncture Mr. Donisthorpe appears and claims to have something at least as servicable as that of Mr. Tucker’s offering. My rule, he says, which I do not regard as excellent, is, No force except against lower forms of competition (or invasion), and in doubtful cases consult the Odd Man, the Majority, and act upon their decision. Whereupon I turn to Mr. Donisthorpe and say: I beg pardon, but you possible rule. No force except against invasion (or lower form of competition), and in doubtful cases no force unless for personal safety absolutely demands the use of it. I am not satisfied with this, and decide to apply to others. I am not satisfied with Mr. Donisthorpe, however, and I am forced to admit the relative excellence of Mr. Tucker’s provision. As a juncture Mr. Donisthorpe appears and claims to have something at least as servicable as that of Mr. Tucker’s offering. My rule, he says, which I do not regard as excellent, is, No force except against lower forms of competition (or invasion), and in doubtful cases consult the Odd Man, the Majority, and act upon their decision. Whereupon I turn to Mr. Donisthorpe and say: I beg pardon, but you possible rule. No force except against invasion (or lower form of competition), and in doubtful cases no force unless for personal safety absolutely demands the use of it. I am not satisfied with this, and decide to apply to others. I am not satisfied with Mr. Donisthorpe, however, and I am forced to admit the relative excellence of Mr. Tucker’s provision.

As regards a frank declaration of purpose, it was not offered as a substitute for argument, but as an amiable concession toward a basis of mutual understanding.

Economic science is based upon wants and their satisfaction. The necessity for objects of consumption and the facts of their perishable nature and limited supply are of chief significance. Hence arise labor and property in the economic sense. This property, whatever else it shall be, is alienable. The giver or seller parts with it in conveying it. This characteristic distinguishes property from skill and information. Property, in this sense, is the result of the labor of baking is property held that it is alienable, — it.

Monopoly consists in the attempt to make property of liberties, discoveries, sciences, and arts by a pretended or forced alienation. This may be no argument with which to make none. Property ends when monopoly begins.

“Literary property” has its special definition in the dictionary. It would readily be seen to be a false term were there not a mass of generally received claims of property based on more perfusely acknowledged assertion. An author may sign an agreement to part with his thoughts and not to reproduce them, but that is merely a bargain in restraint of his own liberty. If liberty is inalienable, the author, having had the ad-
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An Uncivil Answer to a Sner.

Mr. Francis D. Tandy, of Denver, writing in the "American Architect," for "quibbling over the copyright question," to the neglect of the problem now occupying the attention of biologists, whether acquired habits are inherited. He reminds us that "Spence never found it necessary to study psychology and biology in order to get at the subtle social phenomena." A little more or less, he adds that the idea of the inheritance of acquired traits held by Darwin, Spencer, and their followers is now looked upon by the best authorities as biological heresy. Now, if, as Mr. Tandy seems to maintain, a man cannot exercise his will to make himself strong in mind and body by using his intelligence, it follows that, if a man's biological studies lead him to erroneous biological conclusions, his subsequent sociological conclusions must be vitiated by his biological errors. Therefore, if Spencer is wrong in his biology, as Mr. Tandy says he is, then he is wrong in his sociology also.

In the next paragraph Mr. Tandy further tells us that the new accepted biological doctrine of the non-inheritance of acquired habits (the opposite of Mr. Tandy's views) is "the strongest possible argument against State Socialism and for Individualism." Now Spencer's sociology is intensely antagonistic to State Socialism and favorable to Individualism. Whence it follows, in violation of the conclusion that the nation is the true moral community. Again, Mr. Tandy must have arrived at correct sociological conclusions, not indeed without previous biological study, but, stranger still, in spite of such study.

Until Mr. Tandy can discuss the relations of biology to society without making himself in contradistinction as hopeless as this, I would advise him, if he cannot keep his mouth shut altogether, at least not to open it in sneering criticism of people who, when they open theirs, do not put their feet in them.

A Case of Pure Charlatanry.

That contemptible humbug, Samuel P. Putnam, who rose to prominence when the "quiet man" was to be pretty nearly an Anarchist, if not quite, and who, going to the Pacific coast to start "Free-thought," began his campaign there by an attack on Anarchism that would have done credit to the most shameless capitalist, is now assuming a friendly tone once more, in pursuance of a plan to flirt with all parties in the hope of saving "Free-thought," which, now that George MacDonald has left the editorial chair, would no longer be worth saving for "quiet man" features really similar to those Donald continues to contribute. In other words, in order to get subscribers from all the different schools, Putnam has become an eclectic. He has discovered that no political theory is right, but that all political theories are right. From each he proposes to select its valuable element. Here is the result of this process of selection.

Anarchy means personal liberty. We select that and stand by it. Socialism means fraternal cooperation. We select that and stand by it. We select the rights and dignity of labor. We select that. Communism means a commonwealth. We select that. Free trade means reciprocity. We select that. Protection means industrial advancement. We select that.

I assure the probably incredulous reader that the words quoted are actually to be found in one of Putnam's editorials in "Free-thought" of April 25. The most contemptible feature of this humbug is its ludicrous transperpy. Every one sees at a glance that the trick consists in treating some quality or virtue or belief, which is really common to or claimed by all schools, as the peculiar property of a single school. Only in the cases of Anarchism and Communism does such "fraternal" feature really similar to those schools respectively. But "fraternal cooperation" is no more the object of Socialism than of Anarchism, Nationalism, Communism, Free Trade, and Protection. And the same is true of the "rights and dignity of labor," "reciprocity," and "industrial advancement. All schools have these objects in view. The question is: which is on the right road to attain them? And here the eclectic aç-thed sadly falls, because even such a strong a position as Putnam takes the same time two horses going in opposite directions, not to say four, headed north, south, east, and west.

Pentecost's plan of belonging to no party is foolish, but has at least the merit of honesty. Putnam's plan of belonging to all parties is imposture mere and sheer.

S. P. Putnam professes to think that "the State should be the guarantor of the protection of rights." At the same time he insists that it is the duty of the State to suppress the Church, "so far as it is force." He says that "the Church is in its very nature an organized force," and proceeds to prove it in a characteristic manner. "The judge in the court room represents force; the legislature, though its members have no arms, is an organized force; the ballot is force. A majority of ballots compels just as swords and bayonets and guns compel. This is not a figure of speech, but a real statement of the case. Take any one of these or any may not be any "armed company" at the polls, no soldiers even a policemen, yet the ballot is an expression of force. The ballot is not a form of advice, but a form of compulsion. In exactly the same sense the Church is force. There is not a very necessary Charles, therefore, the Church is organized force and the State is unorganized force, there must be a war always between them. There may not be any "armed company" at the polls, but there are armed companies ready to enforce the decision of the majority. The ballot is not a form of advice, because the armed companies are at the back of it. Is the Church force in exactly the same sense? Has it armed companies a command to enforce its claims? It has not, and therefore it is plain that the Church, as an organized force, is in a better position to continue. "Of course, the State can only deal with an 'over act.' But what constitutes an 'over act'? A member of the Church of Rome, a mother, sends her children to the public school instead of the parochial school. The priest forbids this. The mother refuses to submit. She keeps a bakery for her support. The priest orders a boycott. The congregation obeys. The woman is ruined and driven to starvation. This happened in our own country. Is this an 'over act'? Of course not. Of course the State has a right to interfere and must interfere to prevent it. Of course it is, in the opinion of those who do not know what equal liberty means. Those who do regard boycotting us entirely legitimate; and to them it is perfectly obvious that S. P. Putnam does not know what he is talking about.

Absolutism in Political Ethics.

To the Editor of Liberty:

Sir,—As a rule I do not review my reviewers, favorable or unfavorable. I am too much beholden to them. But Mr. Yarros, after two very able articles criticising my contribution to "A Plea for Liberty," expresses the hope that I shall "frankly tell my opinions," and I am adding a few minor points. Mr. Yarros's two articles really amount to an independent inquiry into the true method of political ethics. I will not make him the chief part of the first (paras. 5, 6, and 7) are wholly occupied with this question. I do not feel sure that I should be justified in describing this as a misapplication to the Empirical School, or whether it would not be fairer to characterise his articles as a skilful attempt to build a golden bridge of union between the two schools.

In no, not mine. In discussing the limits of liberty (or State interference, for the two things are complementary) I am charged with contradiction when I say that with those who say "No limits I will not quarrel," I am disposed to do so, and with those who believe in unlimited liberty. Quite so: I never said there were. Similarly there are no people who believe in the Holy Trinity, but there are many who believe that it is divinely inspired. And I have heard Anarchists both in this country and in France who never tires of saying, "If everybody were allowed to do as he wanted, they would all be in a higher level and come out all right in the end." That they do not believe it I admit; but they think they do. They have never really held that any generalities of any value are more than the equally-pronounced trinitarians.

The only other point on which it is necessary to touch before we come to my own point is the question of Anarchist and Individualism. I cannot honestly say that I "deny the right of the government to trench upon my individual freedom," for I regard that as the very basis of all moral and individual actions not transgressive as deducible from the equal claim of fellow-citizens." That this is a correct statement in its own way is not denied, but slowly moving I admit. But unfortunately it is not so.

Just because it is the way to ascertain the limits of freedom, what is the practical rule by which we must decide? Mr. Tucker offers one which is admirable until it is put to the test, when, as I said, it fails. Whereupon Mr. Yarros says, "The complaint which Mr. Donohue brings against Mr. Tucker is this. Mr. Tucker's practical rules to be adopted now, I may with equal justice bring against Mr. Donohue himself, for the most careful study of his case would show that his rules, like those of the majority of the human species are useless in the practical conditions of the present day."

Indeed, I claim the right to count Mr. Yarros among those who are not counting to me the practical conditions of any practical rule of this kind.

This is now all perfectly true.

I cannot possibly bring another rule. And yet I claim the right to count Mr. Yarros among those who are not counting to me the practical conditions of any practical rule of this kind.

My whole position is based on the necessity of understanding the practical conditions of the present day. As the practical conditions are not the same as those of the past, the rules which were once good and useful have no longer the same value, and the method of reform which suited the past is no longer applicable to the present.

There are many who believe in unlimited liberty, and they have never really held that any generalities of any value are more than the equally-pronounced trinitarians. But I cannot say that I wholly agree with them. I am inclined to think that there is some truth in what they say, but that we must not lose sight of the fact that the practical conditions of the present day are different from those of the past.

The problem of liberty is not merely a question of individual rights, but it is also a question of the welfare of the community as a whole. The individual's freedom must be balanced against the needs of society. This is a difficult task, but it is a necessary one. We must strive to find a way of living that is both free and just. We cannot afford to ignore the needs of society, but we must also be careful not to allow our own personal freedoms to be trampled on by others.

The problem of liberty is not merely a question of individual rights, but it is also a question of the welfare of the community as a whole. The individual's freedom must be balanced against the needs of society. This is a difficult task, but it is a necessary one. We must strive to find a way of living that is both free and just. We cannot afford to ignore the needs of society, but we must also be careful not to allow our own personal freedoms to be trampled on by others.
The New Theatre.

M. A. Antonie, to whose ingenious initiative and real genius is due the establishment of the Théâtre Libre at Paris and therefore the coming revolution in dramatic art, writes the following letter to M. Sarcey, the conservative dramatic critic, regarding the failure of Henry Becque’s “Parisiennais” at the Théâtre Français after that chef d’œuvre of the new school had scored an immense success on a more insignificant stage:

Are you not struck by this coincidence: three pieces, “La Parisiennais,” “Grand’Mère,” “Le Maître,” all three coming from the same direction, conceived in that spirit of renewal which appears in three different theatres, and, by general opinion, finding an inadequate interpretation, though at the hands of comedians bearing forth some of the finest names of the French drama, to defend themselves, by respectively Statistics and experience, you may say, that is not the proper explanation of this three-fold coincidence: Is it not interesting to look into its causes?

Notice that this three-fold coincidence does not rest, as you may say, upon Ancy [the author] in giving him all the blame.

Well, the simple reason of this triple coincidence, in which comedians, usually excellent, have been considered ordinary for one evening and “for this occasion only,” is that one of the three works was “staged” and played in harmony with its real significance.

It has been said that the (renewed) theatre requires different interpreters: it is that they should not play works of observation (or works pretended to be such, if you will) as they interpret the same. And by being played in the same classic piece needs, above all, to be spoken well, since the performance is generally only an abstraction, a synthesis, or a philosophical entity without flesh or bone; it is that the characters in “La Parisiennais” or in “Grand’Mère” are people like ourselves, living in homes like ours and not in vast halls as big as cathedrals; it is that these people live, think, and move as we do, by their fire-side, under the lamp, around a table, and not before the spectator-box; it is that they have voices like ours, habits and manners like ours, and that their problems are real and their situations concrete and its familiar terms, and not the pompous rhetoric of the classic works.

When M. Reichenbach opens the first scene of “La Parisiennais” with her voice of a mistress, and when M. Prudhon answers I, with his timbre de Doreme, they immediately convey to us the sense of the characters, that they are not gods with the long faces of the characters in a classic piece needs, above all, to be spoken well, since the performance is generally only an abstraction, a synthesis, or a philosophical entity without flesh or bone; it is that the characters in “La Parisiennais” or in “Grand’Mère” are people like ourselves, living in homes like ours and not in vast halls as big as cathedrals; it is that these people live, think, and move as we do, by their fire-side, under the lamp, around a table, and not before the spectator-box; it is that they have voices like ours, habits and manners like ours, and that their problems are real and their situations concrete and its familiar terms, and not the pompous rhetoric of the classic works.

M. Reichenbach opens the first scene of “La Parisiennais” with her voice of a mistress, and when M. Prudhon answers I, with his timbre de Doreme, they immediately convey to us the sense of the characters, that they are not gods with the long faces of the characters in a classic piece needs, above all, to be spoken well, since the performance is generally only an abstraction, a synthesis, or a philosophical entity without flesh or bone; it is that the characters in “La Parisiennais” or in “Grand’Mère” are people like ourselves, living in homes like ours and not in vast halls as big as cathedrals; it is that these people live, think, and move as we do, by their fire-side, under the lamp, around a table, and not before the spectator-box; it is that they have voices like ours, habits and manners like ours, and that their problems are real and their situations concrete and its familiar terms, and not the pompous rhetoric of the classic works.

When M. Reichenbach opens the first scene of “La Parisiennais” with her voice of a mistress, and when M. Prudhon answers I, with his timbre de Doreme, they immediately convey to us the sense of the characters, that they are not gods with the long faces of the characters in a classic piece needs, above all, to be spoken well, since the performance is generally only an abstraction, a synthesis, or a philosophical entity without flesh or bone; it is that the characters in “La Parisiennais” or in “Grand’Mère” are people like ourselves, living in homes like ours and not in vast halls as big as cathedrals; it is that these people live, think, and move as we do, by their fire-side, under the lamp, around a table, and not before the spectator-box; it is that they have voices like ours, habits and manners like ours, and that their problems are real and their situations concrete and its familiar terms, and not the pompous rhetoric of the classic works.
Liberty, 1857

Proudhon's Works.
Great Reduction of Price! $1.00 instead of $3.50.

What is Property? Or an Inquiry into the Fundamental Principle of Modern Civil and Political Systems. By P. J. Proudhon. First published by a Sketch of Proudhon's Life and Works, and containing Mr. and Mrs. Frank's (The Author and his Wife) Letters from the French by Benj. R. Tucker. A systematic, brief and radical inoculation of property, its idea, its history, its present status, and its destiny,—together with an account of the leading men and movements which have done or are doing any thing, to be found in Russia as well as elsewhere,—a spontaneous impulse.

A Charge of Cannibalism.
To the Editor of Liberty: E. W. Fiske has been guilty of an opportunity of grating his cannibalistic appetite for the blood of his weaker brothers and sisters, and in a late issue of the "I. & I." in Lucifer far worse a lot. Fiske never has been a champion of the planter slave in any characteristic style. In a late issue of "Lucifer," an "edit-correspondent signing I. & I." defends free love from the insidious and subversive influence, and in the same article opposes the term as conduct of prostitution by men and women. free from the propaganda of any belief by which one comes to believe that, free from legal restraint or personal authority, woman's love would be dealt out as Methodist salvation, "whoever will, may come and drink of the fountain of life."

A Pointer for Putnam.
(W. G. Foote in London Freshwater.) You cannot have the advantages of all policies at once. Selection also means rejection. If you choose one road, you reject the rest.

Anarchists' March.
Tune: Bjørnegården Marsch (Finnish War Song).

Words by J. W. LLoyD.

Price, 10 cents.

Heroes of the Revolution of '71.
A Souvenir Picture of the Paris Commune.
Presenting Fifty-One Portraits of the men whose names are most closely connected with that great uprising of the people which it produced in a manner that will not soon be forgotten. By francois Rodin, French portrait painter. All the leaders of the Commune are represented, and of all the Communards who have ever been issued into the new republic, this is the first and only complete one. From a very rare collection of photographs, measures 15 inches by 36, and is priced at ten dollars. A fine piece for the artist and for the public.

Over Fifty Portraits for Twenty-Five Cents.

Blanqui, Flora, Manchester, Manna, Mykon, Mauro and Man, and Man and Woman: Their Reporting of the French. A Second Supplement to the Krupp Sonata.

By COUNT LEO TOLOSTO.

"Church and State" is translated by authorization from Tolstoy's original. It is a work of profound, a work of research, a work of scholarship, and that of an author's highest work, severely revealing the power of that be, and that, in the first place, is not a work for the public. It has been published in Russia, and now for the first time in the United States. It is an account of the condition of Catholicism in Russia.

Price: $1.00, cloth, $1.50, paper, $0.75.

English Organ of Anarchism.
The Herald of Anarchy.
Solely to destroy the authority and prestige of National Government as well as to combat all other forms of tyranny: advance the principles of free speech, free thought, free labor, free schools, free trade, the overthrow of all existing political and social institutions, the free and equal enjoyment of the material as well as of the spiritual privileges of life; the international labor law and restrictions on colors, free contract, and free labor. Address: 23, 27, and 31, New Wadsworth, London, N. W., England. Price, post-free, 5 cents; annual subscription 15 cents.

Liberty's Portrait-Gallery.

 Address: BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 3366, Boston, Mass.

ChurcH and S1ate, and OTHER ESSAYS.


By COUNT LEO TOLOSTO.

"Church and State" is translated by authorization from Tolstoy's original. It is a work of profound, a work of research, a work of scholarship, and that of an author's highest work, severely revealing the power of that be, and that, in the first place, is not a work for the public. It has been published in Russia, and now for the first time in the United States. It is an account of the condition of Catholicism in Russia.

Price: Cloth, $0.50; paper, $0.25. Address: BENJ. R. TUCKER, P.O. Box 3366, Boston, Mass.

The Fruits of Culture.
A Comedy in Four Acts.
By COUNT LEO TOLOSTO.

Translated by George Schuman.

In this book the great Russian writer continues in some directions the war which he began in his famous "Comedy of the Two Soviet States," but returns to the terrible weapons which he used in that aufzugstege. The most prominent characters of the so-called "Liberal" class are exhibited in a most humorous picture of their folly and weakness. The book is written with particular care and with an especially the effect of the course of Modern Spiritual England, in the Eastern Family in Russia.

185 Pages.

Price: In cloth, 50 cents; in paper, 25 cents.

Address: BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 3366, Boston, Mass.

Three Dreams in a Desert.
By OLIVE BILGRAM.

An allegorical poem poetically picturing the inscription of the soul in the desert. Price, 5 cents; 6 copies, 25 cents; 25 copies, $1; 100 copies, $3.

SARAH E. HOLMES, Box 3366, Boston, Mass.

Involuntary Idleness.
By HUGO BILLGRAM.

An exposition of the cause of the discrepancy existing between the supply of and the demand for the supply of the goods, 119 pages.

Price, in Cloth, One Dollar.

Liberty—Vols. V and VI.

Complete files of the fifth and sixth volumes of this journal, handsome bound in cloth, now for sale at Two Dollars Each.

People who desire these volumes should apply for them at once, as the number is limited. The first four volumes were long since exhausted, and it is easy to find persons eager for the privilege of owning ten dollars for a copy of the first volume. The offer will soon be fully extended.

Address: BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 3366, Boston, Mass.

CHURCH AND STATE, AND OTHER ESSAYS.


By COUNT LEO TOLOSTO.

"Church and State" is translated by authorization from Tolstoy's original. It is a work of profound, a work of research, a work of scholarship, and that of an author's highest work, severely revealing the power of that be, and that, in the first place, is not a work for the public. It has been published in Russia, and now for the first time in the United States. It is an account of the condition of Catholicism in Russia.

Price: Cloth, $0.50; paper, $0.25. Address: BENJ. R. TUCKER, P.O. Box 3366, Boston, Mass.

Michael Bakounin: Russian Revolutionist, founder of nihilism, and apostle of Anarchism. Published on heavy paper. Price, post-paid and securely wrapped, 50 cents.

P. J. PROUDHON: The profoundest political philosopher and economist that has ever lived. An exact steel plate engraving, suitable for frame and hang. Price, post-paid securely wrapped, 50 cents.
LIBERTY'S LIBRARY.

For any of the following Works, address,
BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 3266, Boston, Mass.

ANARCHISM; ITS AIMS AND METHODS. An address delivered at the first public meeting of the Boston Anarchist Club, and its subsequent publication in its official organ, "Proletaire." By Benj. R. Tucker. 50c.

CAUSES OF THE CONFLICT BETWEEN LABOR AND CAPITAL. By J. D. Irwin. 30c.

TENDENCY NOVELS. By Benj. R. Tucker. A collection of Tendency novels and reviews. 75c.


THE SCIENCE OF SOCIETY. By Stephen Pearl Andrews. This work, long out of print, is now republished to meet a demand for it. It is a comprehensive study of society and its development, published in 1895.

MONEY. By Emile Zola. A work on the science of money. Translated by Benj. R. Tucker. $2.50.

Just Published.

MONEY. BY EMILE ZOLA. A work on the science of money. Translated by Benj. R. Tucker. $2.50.

The novel, the latest from Zola's pen, represents the author accurately at the very zenith of his career. Having captured in his works the spirit of the world, the art world, the intellectual world, the scientific world, the commercial world, the industrial world, the political world, he has concluded his novel upon the science of money, the final expression of his genius.