On Picket Duty.

An entire edition of the El Paso (Texas) "Times" was confiscated by the postmaster because the paper contained a synopsis of a court decision in relation to lotteries, on the ground that the decision indirectly advocated lotteries.

The London correspondent of the Boston "Herald," in writing about authors and literary and social movements, took occasion to discuss Auberon Herbert's "voluntary taxation breakfast." That he botched the job, goes without saying. Of course there isn't a word of truth in the statement that Mr. Herbert "astonished" his friends by inviting them to such a breakfast. Mr. Herbert's views and plans are well known to his friends and published in his paper for the benefit of the rest of his fellow-citizens. Then the correspondent affects to believe that the ladies and gentlemen who made the speeches didn't know what they were talking about. It is much nearer the truth to say that he didn't know what the speakers were talking about. At any rate, it is to be hoped that the correspondent will continue to write about the English individualists and let the readers of his paper know what's going on. As a rule, the most interesting news is written from London.

Within a month two women who killed their lovers have been acquitted by New York juries. Mr. Pentecost professes to find in this action of the juries "delightful!" evidence of the decay of the belief in capital punishment. The truth of course is that such action clearly testifies to the influence of fanatical and fantastic and paroxysmal notions among the common people of the country,—to their utter lack of respect for equity, liberty, and individuality. The juries acquitted the women, not because they abhor capital punishment, but because they have long been accustomed to it. The juries acquitted the women because they have long been accustomed to murder. They are not so much "delighted!" with the current sexual morality. The juries tacitly enunciated the monstrous doctrine that if a man deserts a woman with whom he has maintained illicit relations, she is justified in killing him. The juries obviously regard human life as of less value than the sacred institution of marriage, and the only reason why they inflicted no punishment on the women, either for the murder of their lovers or for the monstrous crime of sexual irregularity, is that they look upon women as inferior beings, without the right and power of voluntary assumption of responsibilities or making of contracts. The juries allowed the "dishonoured victims" to go free, because they desired to give men a "terrific warning" and "teach them a lesson." If there is anything "delightful!" in all this, Mr. Pentecost is the only man who penetrates to it.

Through the thoughtful kindness of my friend, John Henry Mackay, of Germany, I experienced a few days ago one of the pleasantest surprises of my life. For many years I have been my wish to obtain possession of a file of the newspapers published in Paris during the years 1840, 1846, and 1850. Mackay has gratified this desire. Presumably after diligent search in the library stacks and corners of Europe, he has unearthed the treasure, and has sent it to me as a present. I now have on my desk a complete file of "Le Peuple," and a file of "Le Réprésentant du Peuple" which lacks only the half-dozen numbers that the French government confiscated. I communicate this news to my readers, since they are not likely to have been permitted to appear. It is a report of our German comrades. This is a good time to state that Mackay's new book is nearly ready. I expect to receive it this month. As he has already announced in a letter to Liberty, its title will be "The Anarchist's Political Economy in the First Third of the Nineteenth Century." An idea of the interesting character of this novel of four hundred pages may be formed from the following table of contents: Introduction. I. The Heart of the World-Metropolis. II. The Eleventh Hour. III. The Unemployed. IV. Carrard Auban. V. The Champions of Liberty. VI. The Empire of Hunger. VII. The Tragedy of Chicago. VIII. The Propaganda of Communism. IX. Trafalgar Square. X. Anarchy. The earliest opportunity will be taken to convey further information regarding this interesting volume, the arrival of which is awaited with the greatest eagerness in the office of Liberty.

The Boston "Herald" refused to insert an advertisement of Karl Heine's "Rights of Women and the Cause of Liberty," on account of the title of the book. From the same issue of the "Herald" from which the advertisement was excluded I learn that "old Dr. Hall" supplies "medicines for ascetic or poisonous diseases of the urinary organs" and "cures recent cases in case day, stopping mucous discharges, irritation, scalding, and inflammations; that Dr. J. A. Bailey, "long and successful practice in the treatment of private diseases in both sexes is acknowledged by all, may be consulted every day from eight to ten. Mrs. M. B. Bell supplies ladies with golden pills that relieve in three days, and charges only two cents for a free trial; that only one box is required of Dr. Herman's German female pills; and that the Woman's Medical Home furnishes ladies a regular system of female faila and is both a friend and a friend indeed. But the same readers before whom these disgusting quacks are allowed to extol their fraudulent and filthy wares must be protected from knowledge of the fact that the keen and honest thinker has written a book in the title of which the word "sexual!" appears. Such hypocrisy is not surprising, however, on the part of a paper which General Butler once properly branded as "that vile, venal, and veneral sheet." But what are we to think when the same advertisement is rejected by the New York "Nation," whose managing editor, a son of William Lloyd Garrison, insists the memory of his father by virtually branding as indecency at the work of a man whom his father was proud to consider his friend and associate? The suspension of a Boston firm which was generally regarded as one of the most substantial on the street was a painful surprise to the business community. A member of the embarrassed house is reported to have said that the suspension was due, not to insolvency, but to inability to get ready money for immediate liabilities, and that the firm can pay its creditors in full. Referring to this statement the Boston "Herald" says: "Assuming its correctness, we do not hesitate to say that the suspension should be received with satisfaction. The firm is a representative firm, and the banks if a well known house, with an honorable business record, and assets plainly exceeding its liabilities, was allowed to go down. On the suspension of such a condition of affairs, no Scotch or English firm of any standing is ever forced to the wall. The British banks recognize that a proper regard for their own safety, to say nothing of their duty to the mercantile community, calls them to support in times of stringency all solvent business houses that require assistance to carry them over the strain of the time. It would be a wise and proper thing if the sound principle found equal recognition on this side of the Atlantic." Instead of calling upon the banks to come to the assistance of solvent business houses, would it not be better to allow such firms to become members of free mutual banks, which could and would supply them with ready money free of interest charges? Why should a solvent firm be compelled to pay interest by law? These firms do not need the assistance of the banks or the government; they need liberty to help themselves. This liberty is denied by the government, with the approval of the "Herald."

A writer in the London "Academy," in reviewing "A Plea for Liberty," lumps it with what he ignorantly calls two other pleas for liberty,—Prof. Graham's "Socialism New and Old," and "The Eight and the Eight Hours Day," by Sidney Webb and Harold Cox. Of Prof. Graham he says: "Speaking very cautiously,—so cautiously, indeed, that it is sometimes difficult to understand his exact position,—he argues that in many ways the State can exercise a beneficial control, and may usefully extend its functions without fear that the extension will end in the slavery which Mr. Spencer predicts. Yet even if Socialism were slavery, says Prof. Graham, it "would still be a question of the comparison of the degree of slavery under the present system with that under Socialism full-blown." In our modern communities there is no real freedom for the property-less, and by the force of the State something can be done to diminish the existing inequality. The "Academy" also concludes with a plea for liberty. And of the advocates of limitation of the hours of labor, the reviewer says: "On what ground do they advocate this interference? Simply on this: that the liberty of some must be curtailed in order that the liberty of others may be extended. Here is also a plea for liberty." Such contradictory "pleas for liberty" puzzle the reviewer, and he tells the reader that he will find in either of the books, or in all of them together, a solution of the question. As to which is the wisest plea, he says, it is not a subject that the "Academy" can discuss in its columns. Very true; but it does seem as if the "Academy" ought to know better than to report a book on Individualism and Socialism for review to a man who has no clearer conception of liberty than has possessed by the most ignorant of State Socialist writers. Intelligent men know that Prof. Graham and the eight-hour advocates do not plead for liberty, but for regulation. The question is not as to what liberty is, but whether it is better or worse than regulation. Instead of permitting an ignorant man to confuse his readers by talking to them about "three pleas for liberty," the "Academy" should simplify the problem by stating that the readers are called upon to decide between one plea for liberty and one plea for regulation.
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In abolishing rent and interest, the last vestiges of old-time slavery, the Revolution abolish at one stroke the second or the worst, the massacre, the club of the pollicemen, the gaol of the slave, the cramping of the department of the state, all those institutions which young Liberty prides herself over.

The appearance in the editorial columns of articles on the subject of equality as one of the critical features of the present discussion of the Pacific coast. Articles by various authors have appeared recently in other parts of the paper, and the subject has been much discussed in various forms. The discussion has been long and continuous, and it is hoped that the present article may help to bring the subject to a satisfactory conclusion.

The true nature of equality is of the utmost importance, as it affects the whole of our social system. The question of equality is one of the most vital questions of our time, and it is essential that we should make a clear distinction between the various forms of equality.

Equality and Justice.

It is interesting to follow the reasoning of Leslie Stephen in the essay on "Social Equality" contributed to the "International Journal of Ethics." What he offers on the subject of equality as conditioned by justice will certainly prove enlightening to all those who are interested in the fundamental principles of society. The essay is carefully written, and the arguments are clear and convincing. The essay is a valuable contribution to the discussion of the subject, and it will be no doubt of great interest to all who are concerned with the question of equality.

The main point of the essay is that equality is impossible without justice. Equality means the same treatment for all, and justice means that everyone should have the same rights and opportunities. The two are inseparable, and it is impossible to have one without the other.

Stephen writes:

"All men ought to be equal. If you mean equal in natural capacity or character, it is enough to say that what is impossible cannot be. If you profess that the industrious and idle, the good and bad, the wise and foolish, should share equally in the enjoyments of life, according to their innate merit, you are an idealist. If you say, do you mean to abstract from the practical advantages of education, social surround-

ings, and so forth, or to take men as they actually are, whatever their capacity or character may be? To ask what a man would have been had he been in a different position from his youth, is to ask for an impossible solution of the problem. In this respect, supply and demand would regulate the proportions of protection, and the just method would be the method arrived at by the agents operating in the open market. But, of course, we cannot expect Mr. Stephen to interpret the law of nature and the laws of society, and to translate them into rules for the guidance of the individual. This is not within the undoubted fiction of the law, and to overhaul the condition, no less than the law, are the most important of the individual rights to which the individual is entitled to this, Mr. Stephen conceives to be as follows:

The school of so-called individualists finds, in fact, that equality in their sense is incompatible with the varied differences due to the growth of the social structure. They look upon men simply as so many independent units of varying qualities, no doubt, but still capable of being considered for political and social purposes as equal. They ask virtually what justice would demand, if we had before us a crowd of independent individuals for the good things of the world, and the simplest answer is to distribute the good things equally among all, since the individuals involved in the example are not in any way or constitution to be distinguished by the same proportions. But it soon appears that the various classes into which society is actually divided imply differences, not due to the individual and his intrinsic merits, but to the conditions of his birth and environment. To make justice universal, then, it becomes necessary to get rid of these differences.

This, however, is too vague. The general rule insisted on by the individualists is the principle of equal liberty, which implies equality of opportunity in the conduct of individual affairs. The equality implied by justice is this equality of liberty and opportunity. This rule may not be ideally perfect, but it does contain within itself a sufficient indication of what is to be relevant. A man should have the power to do or possess, in so far as it is consistent with the like claims of others. If this equality is guaranteed, justice is satisfied. Against any inequality due to nature it is irrational and useless to protest. But the man who disturbs the social harmony and deliberately de-

Property is sacred, it is said, because a man has (or ought to have) a right to what he has made either by labor or by a course of fair dealings with other men. I am not about to discuss the doctrine that ground on the plain to prevent property is justifiable, and, as I think, satisfactorily estab-

lished. A man has a right, we say, to all that he has fairly earned. Has he, then, a right to inherit what his father has earned? A man has the advantage of all that a strict father has done for him. Why should he also have the father's fortune without earning it? Are the merits of money so great that they are transmitted intact from one to another? If a man has not been as good as to become rich he is elevated to the third and fourth generation? Why, as a matter of pure justice, is there no right of property in the case of the person, the last survivor of the family, who has no income and is destined to die without issue? Is he not entitled to the fruits of the labors of his forebears, just as the heir who is entitled to the fruits of his own labors? If the estate is derived from the work of a living person, why should not the estate be held on the same principles, and in that sense equally? But the problem remains, what considerations should be taken into account by the rule itself? Let us put the case of equality in a different shape, namely, that there should always be a sufficient reason for any differences in the treatment of our fellows. This rule does not imply that I should act in all cases as though all men were equal in character or mind, but that my action should in all cases be justified by some appropriate consideration. It does not prove that every man should have a vote, but that, if one man has a vote and another has not, there should be some adequate reason for the difference. It does not prove that every man should work eight hours a day and that another man should work ten hours or pay and, equally, uniformity of hours and pay should have some sufficient justification. This is a deeper question, and it is not decided for this rule to justify the rule of equality. The rule of equality follows from it under certain conditions and has gained credit be-
Free Trade in Banking.

To the Editor of Liberty:

It is a question frequently asked when Liberty is wounded in the house of her friends. This is caused by those who regard liberty as a panacea for every ill, or perhaps it would be better to say, who believe that liberty is so beneficial that the inequalities of life as evil. There is no more philosophical reason for believing that all men can be equal, rich, and happy than for believing that all animals can be equal, including, of course, that they should all be equal to men.

Freedom is exceedingly fair. It is by far the most excellent way. Under it the company, every department of human activity, including commerce, will be obtained. But it won't make fools successful. One of its results by reining in the government of the country, by putting an end to the currency and the expenditure of the state. All we know is that I desire the sweeping more than I desire the bread, and the laborer desires the bread more than his ease and his comfort. But if I give a man a loaf for sweeping any door step, and he does not represent the work, nor does he work represent the loaf. All we know is that I desire the sweeping more than I desire the bread and the laborer desires the bread more than his ease and his comfort. But if I give a man a loaf for sweeping any door step, and he does not represent the work, nor does the work represent the loaf. All we know is that I desire the sweeping more than I desire the bread, and the laborer desires the bread more than his ease and his comfort.

Schemes to bring about the abolition of the interest, especially when the authors promulgate this as a necessary consequence of free trade, are quite common. When I hear of schemes for the abolition of the interest, I am inclined to think that the labors of the people are indeed unpaid.

The Financial Problem, both of which tacitly attempt to expand a method to enable everyone to get into debt and keep there. (9)

The introduction to the first-hand essay seems by implication to assert that the price of gold is to be reduced by some means, to assign the gold to the proceeds, which it proceeds in arriving at the conclusion. (11)

1. Would the value of gold be (c) increased (b) reduced by some means? (c) increased (b) reduced by some means? (c) increased (b) reduced by some means?

2. Is the demand for gold only produced and bought by people who don't want to consume it? (9)

3. How are the commodity the commodity the value of which is most correctly estimated, and which is therefore least to buy at market value when disposing of our own or other people's capital? (9)

4. What has the rate of interest to do with the net or residual increment of wealth remaining as a surplus after maintaining the population? Is this less in the United Kingdom than in the United States where interest is high? (9)

5. How could legislation maintain the value of gold if it was reduced by some means? (9)

6. How is the voluntary custom of selling preferentially for a price which equals or has equalized a commodity where used as a medium of exchange? (9)

7. What analogy is there between a law to require the quantitative classification of goods made before, and any law specifying that the word Dollar in a bond shall imply a certain quantity of gold? Does any government force anyone to consume gold in preference to any other commodity? (9)

8. Is all silver or gold in the United States delivered? (9)

9. Is it an actual act that the interest and, in mutual banking, only seeks to make it possible on easier terms, the terms that will prevail under competition in the form of the terms that do prevail under monopoly. The man who has no experience must be either much too impudent or ignorant. Unfortunately it is true that some believers in mutual banking do "dream of symbolic money of inefinite value," but none of the popular expositions of the subject offer any such fallacy, and it is with these that Mr. Fisher seems to deal as to be opposed to the mutual banking idea. (9)

10. Mr. Westrup's method, if I understand it, would not "enable every one to get into debt and"
Is This Our Critic, My Lord? The late and unlearned Denver “Individualist” glorified in a contributor whose paragraph exercises manly independence and audacity. He is a man of sound common sense and clearheadedness and understands mischief and misrepresentation. His capacity for misleading, misunderstanding, and misrepresenting things was truly phenomenal. “T” was his signature. Now there is strong circumstantial evidence to support the theory the I have formed that Mr. Francis T. Dandy of Denver, the late and unlearned Denver “Individualist,” was the now famous author of the treatise on “Biologic and Sociology,” which the “Twentieth Century” has been fortunate enough to give to the grateful world, no other personage than our old and honored acquaintance Mr. Francis T. Dandy (such is my working hypothesis); and I am glad to note that there has been correspondent of that exclusive monetary utility conferred upon it by the State. The percentage of this reduction no one can tell in advance, any more than he can tell how much whiskey would fall in price if there were unrestricted competition in the whiskey business. Neither gold nor any other commodity is bought by people who don’t want to consume it or in some way cause others to consume it. Gold is in process of consumption when it is in use as currency. Merchandise-money is not money; it is the very essence of gold in which it is indispensable. Unless a man can make a golden dollar, he cannot cause gold to lose its preeminence as the most thoroughly constituted value. If it should do so, then some other commodity more constantly demanded and uniformly supplied would take the place of gold as a standard of value in the most obvious way. It is true of course that what Mr. Dandy attempts to prove is so well established that no intelligent man doubts it. But it is to be remembered that there are many unscrupulous men in the world, and Mr. Dandy is not the only one who is unscrupulous. It is a very important relation between biology and sociology to those who, like him, have no familiarity with either science, if rather unfavorable, are at least prompted by humanitarian sentiment.

The second statement is that “the theory of use-inheritance, held by Darwin and Spencer, has been overthrown, and has hitherto been practically ignored in sociological discussions.” Now let no frivolous individual interpose here the idle question that when a scientific statement is in contradistinction to another scientific statement is in contradistinction to another, the second statement is contained two distinct statements, namely, first, that the theory of use-inheritance has been overthrown, and, second, that this theory has been ignored in sociological discussions. The question is as to the truth of the second statement. Mr. Dandy will promptly reply. The statement is that the theory of use-inheritance has been overthrown is an ignorant and absurd one. It has not been overthrown, and is not likely to be overthrown, as everyone knows who is conversant with the nature of evidence and arguments. As to the alleged failure of sociological writers to refer to use-inheritance, it is simply not true that those who believe in it have ignored it. And of course no man would expect those who doubt it and are endeavoring to disprove it, to speak much about its sociological implications. Mr. Dandy reveals his ignorance and incompetence in the most striking manner in the following tissue of reckless falsehoods.

Governments force people to consume gold, in the sense that they give people no alternative but that of abandoning the use of money. When government swaps off gold for other commodities, it thereby constructs a demand for gold, induces people to purchase gold, and the government purchases its gold and silver. It can hardly be said, however, that it purchases silver in an open market, because, being obliged by law to buy so many millions each month, it thereby creates an artificial market.
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Spencer is a staunch advocate of natural selection, a theory which is making the end of "inherited unfitness," and it is from this biological law that he has derived his sociological ideas, ignoring the question of "use-inheritance" altogether in his attempt to solve the problem of nothing ascertainable in the fact that Spencer should arrive at many correct sociological ideas, in spite of an error in his theory of a basis, which is not at all in accordance with the social idea built entirely upon the use-inheritance doctrine, ignoring the theory of natural selection, and had still arrived at the same conclusions.

Those who understand Spencer's sociology know that he has built largely upon the use-inheritance doctrine, and they will dismiss the man who, claiming to have studied Spencer, seeks to prove the incongruity of the question of use-inheritance in relation to sociology is ignored altogether in Spencer's sociological writings, as a fool. Fortunately there is evidence on the subject of a more direct kind, and the reader will be able to judge Mr. Tandy without undertaking an expository examination of Spencer's sociology. Here is what Spencer writes in his preface to "The Factors of Organic Evolution," a book chiefly devoted to the demonstration of the use-inheritance doctrine:

Though the direct bearings of the arguments contained in this Essay are political, and the conclusions it contains is its first half have indirect bearings upon Psychology, Ethic, and Sociology. By my belief in the profound importance of these indirect bearings I have been led to present the whole of the argument; and it now prompts me to reissue it in permanent form.

Though mental phenomena of many kinds, and especially of the simplest kind, are explicable only as resulting from the natural selection of favorable variations; yet there are, I believe, still numerous mental phenomena, including all those of higher and more complex character, which can be explained otherwise than as results of the inheritance of functionally-produced modifications. What theory of psychological evolution do I adopt, and depends on acceptance or rejection of the doctrine that not only in the individual, but in the successions of individuals, use and disuse of parts produce respective modifications of them.

Of course there are involved the conceptions we form of the genesis and nature of our higher emotions; and, by implication, the conceptions we form of our moral character. If functionally-produced modifications are inheritable, then the mental associations habitually produced in individuals by experience of those emotions between actions and their consequences are unalterable or changeable, or painful, may, in the successions of individuals, generate innate tendencies to like or dislike such actions. But not, the genesis of such tendencies is, as we shall see, not satisfactorily explainable.

That our sociological beliefs must also be profoundly affected by the conclusions we draw on this point, is obvious. If a nation that can work and not eat is the better and happier nation than another that cannot work and must eat, consequences of use and disuse do not change their nature and relation to any of the physical phenomena of which they are the cause. Use and disuse producefunctionally-produced modifications, which are inheritable.

The third statement is that the overthrow of the use-inheritance doctrine strengthens the individualist position. Again, those who understand Spencerian sociology know that the reverse of this is true. Spencer's theory of social evolution and the conclusion that Anarchism is the ideal condition which humanity is destined to reach are closely related to the doctrine of use-inheritance, are in fact largely based on it. The overthrow of the doctrine would materially strengthen the arguments against Anarchism as an ideal condition of society.

The author of "The Rights of Women and the Sexual Relations," a work on the treatment of the dream of marriage, in a very bold and outspoken fashion, and, on the whole, very radically. The translation is the work of Emma Heller Schumm, whose articles have often appeared in these columns; and to Karl Schrammen, of Detroit, belongs the credit of taking this initiative in publication and assuming the financial risk thereof. In thus laying the works of Heinzen before the English-reading world, Mr. Goddard expresses the feeling that Schrammen carried out one of the dearest wishes of the staunch old German radical, and contributing a stone to an even worthier monument than that erected in the cemetery where his remains lie buried. For it they alike would have been ready to perish and have been, for the present at least, but they are yet ready to perish. In the extra-judicial thanks of Heinzen's true friends a d real admirers, I will send the book, post-paid, or receipt of the price, which is fifty cents for paper copies and one dollar for copies bound in cloth. It has nearly two hundred pages.

I commend to your reading these writings over breathed by the Anarchistic spirit, and who, were he now living, would I surely be working with the Anarchists for the realization of their aims.

Plumb-Line Pointers.

Sometime ago A. K. Wild said in the "Twentieth Century": "It (Anarchism) can only be an evolution from Socialism, which is the foundation of Anarchism." Italy was to me the seed of this thought, a fruit of a revolt against a pre-existing tyranny, and in this sense alone, is Anarchism the child of State Socialism. So the Italian people, and so the Italian people, just as the foundation of Frenchcraft. In each instance the heart of suffering and the light of intelligence have, plucked in the heart of depots a germ which has developed into a strong nation, and made of an articulate people, capable of inspiring and assimilating the entire mass of patriotism and to transform what was a deadly poison into healthful nourishment and nourishing strength. Speaking in French, Anarchism is the foundation of Socialism, for only when there is freedom (Anarchism) can there be a true social organization, a theory of action, not of compulsion. Hence so many units which are pleased together by bayonets can properly be called society. It is in consequence, a union, not a state.

New York "Herald" has this in its local news columns:

Mary and Michael Downes, of No. 121 Ninth avenue, and their daughter, were before Justice McMahon at the Jeferson Market Police Court. The three children were arrested Saturday night. The children, Downes told the justice that their parents, habitual drunkards, and that the little ones were totally neglected and allowed to run in the streets at all hours of the day and night. According to Downes, Mr. and Mrs. Downes, of the city park, have never been seen before, and the three children were said to be taken from them and committed to an institution through the alleged neglect of the parents. The chief of the police had a very different story to tell. They denied that their children were neglected. They also denied their being drunk, and brought a petition to be allowed to go home, where they care for the children of poor people. Nevertheless they were committed to the almshouse because the children were detained from their mother was frantic, and they were literally torn from her arms by the agents of the society.

A report that Mr. Goddard was arrested at 2 a.m., Tuesday, was arranged on the charge of interfering with the arrest of the children. Agent Schrammen testified that, after taking the children in charge, the entire party, which included another woman, were allowed to remain in the house until the arrests were made, freed, and negro was shot. It is true that the fact was unfrumly told. Under existing economic conditions the children had been forced to be deprived of their home and brought to the degradation of mankind, and that the doctress who recklessly kills into life a large number of children.

Hereafter correspondents will please address me at Boston, Mass., care of Box 3969.

E. C. Walker.

Ideas and Land.

To the Editor of Liberty:

Anon. Against equality.

It follows that no one has a right to the exclusive control of land. Land, however, being of such a nature that it is impossible for one person to hold the same quantity at the same time, there is a necessary infringement of the law, and the best we can do is to approximate it to as far as possible.

Certainly the occupier has no unassailable, the occupancy and use theory seems to apply better than anything else. If each could use the same land at the same time, the first to see would have no right to exclude.

It follows that no one has a right to the exclusive control of ideas. Ideas are of such a nature that a person has no right to use any one's ideas for his own personal purposes, but that both ideas and land are of such that no individual can have a exclusive control of them.

Ideas and land, then, are the same situation in this respect.

G. L. Womans.
The Degradation of Journalism.

The Year-Book of the French Press for 1884 contains a preface contributed by Henri Marot, editor of "Le Radical." His keen criticisms of present journalistic tendencies apply in this country as well as in France,—hence I reproduce them in full.

A few years ago, when some dispute arose between the members of the Chamber and the representatives of the press (I believe it was a question of some door to be opened or closed), a journalist said so blithely that very disagreeable things were said on both sides. "Ah!" cried a deputy one day, who was not a journalist, "the press is the chief of all the powers of the State!"

"You are mistaken, Monsieur," I answered him; "it is the first.

It is indeed the first, for this excellent reason, that it makes and unmakes all the others; and, if it were united, nothing could resist it. Suppose for a moment the entire press were to act together with a sense of the public good; and I should like to know how long the great bodies could stand before it, however well constituted they may seem.

The idea is so astounding in this; since the real name of the press is opinion, and opinion governs the world. It is useless to rebel against a fact, and the political man who parades his contempt for the press simply shows himself a fool, for it is exactly as though he were to defy the opinion which has placed him where he is. A private individual, a misanthrope, may disclaim the newspaper; but every man who regards himself as a politician must address himself to the public of the press, because the public, of which the press is the organ, is the greatest and the most powerful of all, and the only one to which we have to address ourselves, if we propose to influence the public.

The greatest homage rendered to this force comes from the tyrants of old, who understood how to appreciate it, and how to appropriate it, the instrument of reining in spite of it. The day when Gutenberg placed the first sheet of paper into the press, he triumphed a sovereignty of which all others are condemned to be no more than reflections.

To write the history of journalism in the nineteenth century would be to write the history of the century itself. For it has passed through various and similar phases, transforming itself at the same time that it transformed everything around it.

The history of the Restoration was doctrinaire. These were the days of long articles and small circulations. Just as nature, after the conflagrations, leaves white patches of such, and just as it is possible, today for instance, to discover the customs of primitive races by studying those of savages, so it should not be hard to search in the vicissitudes of this century one or two shots which give a sufficiently exact idea of the journalism of that epoch.

Later comes the creation of the novel as a form of the press, and of the cheap newspaper. Girardin appeared. The "Journal" began to be a business enterprise. Until then it had been only an expression of the press; consequently it has become a formidable instrument in their hands.

From the moment that they desired the journal to make money, and they are the only ones who can make it as interesting as possible. Politics continued to maintain the first rank, but two other elements were not slow in taking a place in their turn, and soon a preponderant place,—literature and news.

There is nothing more curious than to follow this double in- volution. We might draw maps on it, like those of the Roman empire blotted out by the barbarians, and then slowly driven back from year to year.

At first there was the red-decorator, * which the novelists occupied; Alexandre Dumas, Eugène Sue, carried to the highest point the power of "To be continued in our next." Beside them were installed the critics,—dramatic, musical, and political.

While this movement was in progress, an analogous movement was going on upon the floor above in the direction of new issues from the press. Every paper was occupied by the longer articles. Neither chronique nor reporter were known as yet, but chroniqueur and reporters were to be born from the merging of the two from the north and from the south.

To the Second Empire we owe the outburst of the chroniqueur. Politics, being too much tolerated, had to assume some colour and smallness in order to be able to escape the close attention of the censors. The educated public, it is certain, was as interested in politics as in the newspapers, and accordingly, the press took as a part of its own business the duty of informing the public of the most minute details of news and events.

The phrase has been the more successful because it is utterly meaningless.

Mutualism and Its Abuses.

The co-operative and fraternal forms of insurance are receiving a good share of criticism, especially in the east, where numerous ingenious applications of their principle have found favor. As is usual in such matters, the arguments with interested parties, the principle of legal protection is appealed to, but they are not content to stop at requiring every insurance to be a co-operative one. They demand, and propose that the people be protected against their own want of business sense. Here paternalism begins, and we find the legislators are not really paternal and wise, however serious are the errors and certain forms of abuse that they point out.

This gives the excuse to monopolists that a sweeping prohibition or severe disabilities would be imposed upon some form of association without adequate cause. The railways, the action of the foreign governments, and the foreign trade, has been much of the kind, but this has not induced the American people to relinquish their confidence in the ability in the long run to make their way in spite of flour and high tariffs and other annoyances every man has the insalubrious right to take his chance of being united in a matrimonial engage-
ment. Though some are duped, the good rule of individual choice continues. What is wanted in all lines is the free use of the public enterprise and responsibility in any shape, but there I am cured for errors of judgment short of destroying freedom, and man is destroyed when his power is destroyed. What can be more faith than that which has the whole world for its object? A movement that can be made easily is a movement that can be made easily is a movement that can be made easily.

The Importance of the Ideal.

[John Hayne.]

Remember always that the most important part of the idea is not in the end, but in the process. It is not in the final result, it is in the process.

A Politician's Blunder.

[Today.]

The Boston "Herald" has given its attention to a amusing blunder committed by Senator Hoar. In an article elaborating the protectionist views he avers one of the results of the Atlanta exodus is "so that the municipal services are better provided for," and that the city has been made more beautiful. This is a blunder.

Three Dreams in a Desert.

[Oliver Ditton.]

An allegorical prose poem beautifully picturing the vision of a woman of the future found on pages 10-12. Price, $0.50, 30 cents, 15 cents.

Sarab S. Holmes, Box 256, Boston, Mass.

Involuntary Idleness.

[By Hugo Bilgram.]

An exposition of the causes of the anarchy existing between the supply of services and the demand for them. 119 pages. Price, in Cloth, One D. Tar.

English Organ of Anarchism.

The Herald of Anarchy.

Seeks to destroy the authority and pretensions of National Government as well as the pretensions of public utility companies. Free to all who will contribute a few pennies to defray the cost of publication and mailing. Price, $0.50, 30 cents, 15 cents.


Proudly's Works.

Great Reduction of Price!

$1.00 instead of $3.50.

What is Property? Or an Inquiry into the Nature and Necessity of Man's Right to the Possession of the Products of his Labor. Written by F. J. Frondeur, Preceded by a Sketch of Frondeur's Life and Work, and containing the Author's Notes on the History of the Labor Movement in England. Translated from the French by Ben. R. Yockey. A systematic, thorough, and rapid work of the highest importance in the Theory of Values, Division of Labor, Machinery, Commodity, Money, Taxation, and Jehovah, showing the economic progress is achieved by the appearance of a succession of economic forces, each of which is in part the result of the previous one. Furthermore, by developing the evil of its own, necessitates in successor, the process continues until a final cause, corrective of the whole, shall establish a stable economic equilibrium. 400 pages octavo, in the highest quality of cloth, $1.00; full cloth, blue, gilt edges, $1.00.

Address: BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 236, Boston, Mass.

Effect of the 4th and 6th volumes of this journal, handful-bound in cloth, now for sale at Two Dollars Each.

People who desire these volumes at all should apply for them early, as the number of copies is limited. They will be sent on receipt of the price of $2.00. Express charges to be paid by the purchaser for the privilege of sending them to the different places for the convenience of the subscribers.

Address: BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 296, Boston, Mass.

A Vindication of Natural Society.

By E. W. Burke.

Showing the Inherent Evils of All State Governments.

39 Pages. Price 10 Cents.

The Fruits of Culture.

A Comedy in Four Acts.

By Count Leo Tolstoi.

Translated by George Scribner.

In this book the great Russian writer continues in some directions the war of ideas he began in "The Kreutzer Sonata," but substitute for the terror of that novel the more terrifying spectacle of the condition of man in society. The title of this work is "The Kreutzer Sonata," but substitute for the terror of that novel the more terrifying spectacle of the condition of man in society.

428 Pages.

Address: in Cloth, 60 cents; in paper, 25 cents.

Address: BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 296, Boston, Mass.