On Picket Duty.

I observe that J. M. L. Baboeck declares very positively in the "Twentieth Century" that Buckle is an abler thinker than Stirner. How does he know? I will bet the drinks with Mr. Baboeck that he has never opened a book written by Stirner.

"Most of us," says John Morley, "feel pleasure in reading the matchless writer with which Voltaire ascribed his theological enemies." What a humiliating confession! Does not "Today's" reviewer assure us that such a desire for blasphemy as Voltaire betokens a lingering fear of the terrors of hell, an imperfect emancipation from the narrowest conception of Christianity?

Comrade Mackay honors Liberty with the first copy of his new book, "The Anarchists," that issued from the press. It is a beautifully-printed volume. Being written in German, I cannot read it; but my friend Schumann is translating it for me, and I hope to publish it as an English book in September next, if not earlier. Mr. Schumann tells me that he is convinced, from such parts of the work as he has read already, that it will prove one of the most effective means of propagandism that the cause of Anarchy has ever enjoyed. He tells me also that it is a work of art; but this goes without saying to those who know Mackay's poems. I am eager to know what sort of reception the new work will get in Germany. Perhaps Comrade Mackay will favor Liberty with a letter on the subject.

J. W. Sullivan writes in the "Twentieth Century": "Freedom," an Anarchist Communist journal, says of William Morris: "Comrade Morris is not avowedly an Anarchist but is clearly approaching to that state, and in very much of his writing—for instance, News from Nowhere—the most hypercritical of Anarchists would have to borrow a pair of spectacles to discover serious points of disagreement.

By which, it is to be supposed, "Freedom" would mean Anarchist-Communist. The "is to be supposed" is delightful. Mr. Sullivan is an individualist and, finding no trace of individualism or Anarchism in News from Nowhere, he naturally "supposes" that "Freedom" speaks of the so-called Anarchist Communists, whose hatred of liberty is as intense as their ignorance of its true import and real efficacy is profound. But is it possible that the associate editor of the "Twentieth Century" does not know that its publisher recommends and advertises Morris's book as an individualistic novel, in fact, as the novel of individualism? Or is it to be supposed that the associate editor of the "Twentieth Century" deliberately chose this indirect way of contradicting and discrediting the publisher's absurd pretense?

A writer in the "Twentieth Century" says with reference to the law of equal liberty: "The word law has one of two significations: it refers either to a regulation ordered by authority or to a brief and comprehensive explanation of a whole series of natural phenomena. In neither of the above categories can the above law (?) be placed. In fact, it is not a law, but a formula, a mere statement of what Mr. Spencer believed ought to be the rights of men." The law of equal liberty is a brief and comprehensive generalization from a whole series of natural phenomena. And because the law of equal liberty is held to be a legal principle preserved by various societies, phenomena which, if we did not know this law, would remain to us without coordination, it is advanced as a statement of what the rights of man ought to be. Equal liberty is valued for the resulting human happiness, and that equal liberty is indispensable to social order, peace, and progress, the conditions as well as elements of happiness, is provable by the past and present. No a priori assumption is lurking in the argument to vitiate it. The name writer says: "Society will not be guided by formulas." What then will it be guided by if not by scientific principles and formulas? What guidance is superior to that afforded by scientific knowledge?

The editor of the "Voice" writes as follows in response to a recent paragraph in Liberty: "The editor of Liberty wants to know whether we are prepared to justify Prohibition by the novel argument implied in the expression "slow poison to the tinkling of cut-glass decanters," used in reference to liquor-dealers' business. Most assuredly. We are prepared to show, by the deliveries of science, that 'alcohol is an insidious poison.' We are prepared to show, by common observation, that people are induced, by all manner of incentives, to drink that irksome poison, most of them being ignorant of the fact that it is poison. We are prepared to show, by the investigations of the British Medical Society, that that poison kills thirty thousand persons every year in England and Wales, and, by a far inferior, an equal number in this country."

Now, does the editor of the "Voice" remember asserting Mr. Jarves that we are not trying, as Prohibitionists, to remedy 'human weakness, vice, and disease'; we are trying to protect ourselves and society in general from the consequences of that weakness, vice, and disease, and not trying to protect a man from his own folly or weakness, but to protect others from his weakness and folly. If A wants a drink and B sells it to him, who is wronged? No one, if A does not drink to excess. What right has Government to interfere? None at all, if that specific act of sale is all there is to the question. Does he remember making these assertions and explanations? If he does not, let him read his own paper of last January. If he does, will he tell us how he reconciles his January position with his midsummer mast...? I mean science?

The editor of the "Truth Seeker," who finds in Ingrcssoll that perfection which he fails to find in the Christian's Jesus, is as pains and angered by rational criticism of his idol as the pious Christian is by any attempt to apply to Jesus the test of common sense. There is the whole cast in defence of things as they are naturally move our good Ingersollian disciple to attack the infidel critics in the true old Christian fashion. He says that it is mild language to call their statements lies; that the Socialists and Anarchists object to the common sense which Ingersoll applies to the labor question and wag malicious tongues at a man too big for them to comprehend; that only "little people, so shortsighted that they cannot see their own limitations, jump around him and call him shallow," and that there is small hope of getting the obvious and dishonest social critics of Colonel Ingrcssoll to do him justice. To refute the critics' statements the editor's apologist reprints certain very familiar Ingersollian utterances, mostly platitudinous, vague, and confusing. In an attempt to enlighten the editor of the "Truth Seeker," having no confidence whatever in his capacity or rectiveness, I can only repeat that I know Ingrcssoll to be utterly incompetent to discuss scientific economics, politics, or ethics. When he is engaged in the meanderings of half-witted talk I am not surprised. If Ingrcssoll's presence appears to the editor of the "Truth Seeker" sterling and profound sense, the inevitable inference is that he is even more ignorant than Ingrcssoll is. And to show what a pitch of stupidity he can attain I only need to refer to his characterization of the editor of Liberty as a "self-elected spokesman of Philosophical Anarchy" and self-appointed censor of the human race. Who elected Macdonald spokesman of Freethought (limited) and corrector of the human race? Or is it proper to be a theological corrector of the human race and improper to be a political and social corrector of the human race?

Horace L. Truibel, in a letter to the "Open Court," while denying that Walt Whitman ever applied for a pension, suggests that "an abstract question might be asked, viz., whether as fullfilment of justice men who sacrifice health in hospitals are not as much entitled to governmental guarantees as men who travel the life of a forager and fighter." General Trumbull, in reply, says: "I do not believe that either of them ought to have a pension. I believe that pensioning is one of the most corrupt and corrupting of governmental usurpations; but if compelled to decide between the male nurse and the soldier, I should say give it to the soldier. If the question were between the soldier and the hospital nurse I might vote the other way." With General Trumbull's antipathy toward pensioning no sensible person can find fault, but the implied notion that it is manlier work to destroy lives than to save them no truly civilized nature will find acceptable. There can be stronger evidences of the dehumanizing and degrading effect of militarism than this contempt of professional menkillers for the feelings on which true society rests. General Trumbull adds: "So far as the praise of the male nurse reproaches me for having been a soldier instead of a nurse, I will bear it with such puerile humility as I can. In the excitement of the great struggle for liberty I did not notice it... Still, should the dispute have to be fought out again, I should probably act as I did before; for looking back at the conflict in the calm and quiet of old age, I am rather gratified than otherwise that I fought for the preservation of the American republic and the overthrow of slavery. There are two other things: which the General failed to notice in the excitement of the great struggle, as he fails to notice them in the excitement of his present political struggle. The first is that the great struggle was not a struggle for liberty in any sense, but a struggle against liberty in a most living sense. The part of General Trumbull and his fellow patricians: slavery was not originally an issue in the war, and its abolition was reluctantly acquiesced in, as a war measure, rather than eagerly determined upon in the interests of civilization. The second thing General Trumbull neglected is that the evils, present and to come, that may be directly traced to the great struggle are worse than the slavery which it incidentally and accidentally abolished.
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Morley on Defence of Democracy.

A remarkable volume of essays recently published by Mr. Morley contains, besides much perfect literature, and other admirable matter, his reply to Sir Henry Maine's attack upon Democracy. That John Morley is much more successful and constructive as a literary essayist than as a philosophical historian there is no sociologist and political advocate scarcely needs saying. He is one of the few, very few profound thinkers and students who have preserved their faith in the excellence and verity of democratic government; and modern radical Individualism, with which he certainly cannot be unfamiliar, fails to enlist his sympathy or elic its acquiescence. That so clear and logical a mind should be reconciled to such an impossible and infeasible system as democracy, and should do such scant justice to a movement so vigorous, so significant, and so certain of ultimate victory as that carried on by the various divisions of the great individualist army against the prevailing political order, must remain an enigma, a puzzle. John Morley has been on hand to look after the interests and fortunes of democracy when they were threatened from the camp of the reactionaries opponents of popular government, of the tories and championsof monarchic principles. But he has never attempted to join hands with the radical opponents of popular government, with those whose point of view is higher than his own, and who oppose democracy, not because it is too great a concession to individual sovereignty, but because it means an inferior recognition of liberty, because it has ceased to be associated with the age and the needs of advanced humanity. It were to be wished that he would decide to participate in the debate between democracy and progressive Individualism, and give utterance to his doubts, fears, misgivings, and conclusions of himself. Meanwhile it may not be unprofitable to glance at the defense of democracy which he has made and at the arguments with which he sought to confute the position of Sir Henry Maine.

Describing the philosopher's methods under democracy, Sir Henry Maine contemptuously says that "an audience of toughs or clowns is boldly told by an educated man that it has more political information and is an equal number of scholars." By "toughs" and "clowns" he means the urban and the agricultural laborers, as he himself explains. These epithets shock and offend Mr. Morley, and very properly so, but the charge cannot be overthrown or denied. The majority of the voting population are "toughs" and "clowns," and this is the electorate on which the seesaw of politics is generally fought, and the demagogues seeking their votes (and most of the candidates are demagogues) do boldly tell them that they are perfectly fitted to pass upon the various complex problems of political relations, and need not apprehend any of so sort as to the social effects of their action. Mr. Morley, however, while not categorically affirming the wisdom of the electors, attempts to break the force of Sir Henry Maine's serious charge by claiming that, even if true, it does not affect the essential nature of popular government. "So far from being the least fit for political influences of all classes in the community," he says, "the best part of the working class forms the stouter part of the voter's quota." The result, according to Frederic Harrison's statement, that "electing or giving an indirect approval of government, is another thing [than governing], and demands wholly different qualities. These are moral, not intellectual, practical, not theoretical, and are almost absolutely necessary policies and universal order." But what a lame and impotent apology we have here! Observe, in the first place, that Mr. Morley's estimate of the qualifications of the average voter by no means coincides with that of Mr. Maine. Mr. Morley asks his questions begging when he speaks of the fitness of the "best part" of the working classes. The best part is necessarily insignificant, and Sir Henry Maine might admit that all is said in their behalf without attempting to degrade their degree, by his testimony. Secondly, even assuming that Mr. Morley is prepared to amend his statement and endorse Mr. Harrison's estimate of the qualification of the working people, it is difficult to believe that the kind of democracy Mr. Morley pleasure is his own, which is the only democracy which the people content themselves merely with indirectly approving their government. It is fairly presumable that Mr. Morley's ideal is "a government of the people, by the people, and for the people," a genuine democracy, a real democracy of the people, and morally impossible if the voters are only "morally" fitted to give "indirect approval" of government, for this means, of course, that they vote for men, not for measures, that they select and elect honest and upright representatives, to whom they leave the settlement of those great problems to the comprehension of which they are not intellectually equal. Why, even that form of democracy which we enjoy (?) today is greatly superior to that implied in the Morley-Harrison argument. No, Sir Henry Maine simply falls into an error of true; but when such issues as Home Rule, Tariff, or Church Disestablishment are involved, surely less attention is paid by the average voter to the standard-bearing than to the platforms. And the cry of the over-commercial, political reformer, the independent voter, has long been distinctly, "Measures, not Men," just as the ideal of the most progressive men in the ranks has long been the referendum, which reduces men to nothing and makes measures everything. Now, it is difficult to believe that Mr. Morley, who has, more than any one else, the qualifications admired by Mr. Morley count for very little. To choose between free trade and the tariff intellectual qualities are necessary,—information, logic, insight, discrimination. The same is obviously true in the choice between protection and free trade, and in industrial legislation. It is difficult to believe that Mr. Morley has not thought of all this, and yet Mr. Harrison's position is referred to by him as one in which democracy is fortified by the attacks of Sir Henry Maine.

No, Mr. Morley cannot accept the Harrison view, which, emasculating it as it does from the Comitean source, is intelligible enough and quite consistent with the general tenor of his panegyric of homogentiment, and his democracy must in fairness be taken in the best and most ideal sense. But if so, why does he hesitate to admit the truth of the Maine accusation? Why, instead of begging the question (as in the smaller classes), and inconsistently supporting himself by the distinction between intellectual fitness and moral fitness (in doing which he is unjust to himself as well as to democratic principles), does he not abhor his opponents under the form of "toughs" and "clowns"? It is far from being a pleasant reflection that the thing to criticize is not the admittedly unsatisfactory form of today, but the ideal for which all earnest democrats are working and hoping? Can it be shown that even under the most perfect form of democracy there will be ignorant roughs and clowns on the one hand, and demagogues ready to flatter and pand to them on the other? If not, then Sir Henry Maine's criticism falls to the ground.

That Mr. Morley did not adopt this line of defense must I think, be regarded as an indication of his own uncertainty and troubled state of mind; and the inference is almost inevitable that in his inmost soul as he feels that the vice pointed out by Sir Henry Maine is inherent in democracy,—that "toughs" and "clowns" are the result of that political evolution has reached the highest condition possible and progress in that sphere is at an end. And indeed there is nothing in either the present state or the future prospects of democracy to reassure, inspire, or encourage me. The realization of democracy but the one which leads back into monarchy and despotism. The purest and truest democracy is that by which the majority actually rule. Now, although many of us have long been painfully aware of the fact that the world is governed with very little wisdom, and yet that little wisdom the majority certainly lack. Just at present the demagogue is hesitating between the various forms of State Socialism. Realizing that a stubborn adherence to the present system, with its abuses, is likely to alienate from him the affections of the majority, he is rehearsing the part of State Socialist, and there can be no doubt that he will successfully play it. Nor can there be any doubt that the "roughs" and "clowns" will be his allies and opening of the world to socialism and making the poor and the whole world to be more equal, and would make roughs and clowns of all of us. Hence he cannot congratulate democracy on the tendencies it is beginning to manifest and on the direction it is likely to take.

And this brings us to the second charge against democracy,—the charge, namely, that it is hostile to science. Mr. Morley enters a halting denial of this charge, saying: "Democracy will be against science, in one contingency: if it loses the battle with business and is brought down by the most avowed enemy of science, and is the bitterest enemy of democracy: c'est le cléricialisme. The interest of science and the interest of democracy are one. "Modern politics," said a wise man (Pattison, Serres), "to resolve themselves into the question of how one people is to be dominated and elevated, and would make roughs and clowns of all of us. Hence he cannot congratulate democracy on the tendencies it is beginning to manifest and on the direction it is likely to take.

And this brings us to the second charge against democracy,—the charge, namely, that it is hostile to science. Mr. Morley enters a halting denial of this charge, saying: "Democracy will be against science, in one contingency: if it loses the battle with business and is brought down by the most avowed enemy of science, and is the bitterest enemy of democracy: c'est le cléricialisme. The interest of science and the interest of democracy are one. "Modern politics," said a wise man (Pattison, Serres), "to resolve themselves into the question of how one people is to be dominated and elevated, and would make roughs and clowns of all of us. Hence he cannot congratulate democracy on the tendencies it is beginning to manifest and on the direction it is likely to take.
natural tendency of democracy is toward utopia and away from the middle ground. To say that the interests of democracy (meaning the masses) are identical with the interests of science is as trite as it is irrelevant to any discussion turning on the vital distinction between real interest and fancied interest, true interest and narrow self-interest, and the highest and best interest of any man, whether of the people or the aristocracy, is identical with that of science? Unquestionably; but it is also true that ignorance and bias and passion generally cause men to promote narrower and more selfish interests to the neglect, and often to the "nullius sacri facit of their higher interests. Have, then, the people, who have but lately come into power, so much more discretion and wisdom than the minority, that Mr. Morley may consult his conscience with their ignorance rather than in ignorant and reckless opposition to it?

Another proposition which Sir Henry Maine sought to enforce is that democracy is of all kinds of government by far the most difficult. In response to this, Mr. Morley, besides denying that any such proposition can be established, declares that "it would not be of the first order of importance if it were true." It is clear that from Mr. Morley's point of view no other response could be made. Difficulties, it is agreed on all hands, are greater for a system than for the world. But suppose a new system is presented which, equal in all other respects with democracy, is superior to it in respect of simplicity? The consideration of the difficulty of democracy at once becomes of the first order of importance: for the torpor of the age is not likely to be discovered; the system which supersedes democracy will be superior to it in every respect, and of course in deciding between such a system and democracy the question of simplicity is of the first order of importance. As to the proposition that the proposition that democracy is the most difficult form of government cannot be shown to be true, it is easy to contradict and refute it. No doubt, as Mr. Morley holds, "none of the properties of regular governments are independent of surrounding circumstances, social, economic, religious, and historic," and no doubt "all the conditions are bound up together in a closely interdependent connection, and are not secondary to, or derivable from, the mere form of government." But the truth of this is not true of any government, and this in this respect presents no exception. The important point is that a consensus subsists among these various circumstances and factors, and that the consensus of a given social system may be compared with the consensus of any other social system. Each may be so ground to be comprised in their ensemble, and this makes it possible for us to judge of the merits of political systems as wholes.

But "what is to be of us," asks Mr. Morley in much despondent "what is to be of us, when the devil of mal-ignorance and corruption, and the deep sea of gnatish lethargy and superficiality?" Yes, we invite Mr. Morley to answer in all seriousness, and tell us what it is to become of us, seeing that the present condition of democracy is morally unsatisfactory, and its prospects more deplorable and disappointing still. It is wonderfully easy to see that salvation will come, and that some happy solution will be found. It is easy to express confidence in the future of humanity, to promise a firmer and more substantial democracy. But Mr. Morley is a philosopher and a scientific student of history. We have a right to expect more than these vague and dim prophecies from him. We want guiding principles, definite conclusions, and rational explanations. Can we trust us, he has been willing to the right to expect him to study the modern individualistic movement and give us his opinion on the philosophic merits of the solutions which it offers. We want to know why Mr. Morley is not an individualist in the modern sense of the word, and wherein, in his judgment, individualism is faulty or unjust to democracy which aims to destru

A New Advocate of Free Banking.

In another column appears an interesting account of the Alliances banking scheme about to be inaugurated in Kansas. The plan is a new one; from the description given it appears to be almost identical with the scheme devised by the Galena & Chicago Union Bank, that was shortly before adopted by the Banque Du Peuple. This was an association of twenty thousand laborers who pledged themselves to take the paper money issued by the bank and to speculate on the basis that this, circulating among the people, would take the place of gold and silver coin. The bank advanced to any member, on articles purchased in accordance with the rules of the association, and charged no interest for its own notes; charging no interest for the loan. On security being given, it would advance upon work not yet done. The experiment was not long tried. The government opposed it; and Proudhon and his followers claimed that the experiment was never fairly tried.

The Twin Leeches.

[The unpopularly of Ouida among the purists, and the difficulty to find a critic for her, is not a matter of indifference. After one has read a few of her novels, as with the following excerpts. — E. C. W.]

The worthy doctors summoned to the presence of the heirexostatic state the statements of the major-domo, and lost themselves, as doctors love to do, in endless mazes of technical conjecture and suggestion; they were preoccupied, servile, venal, and so completely deluded that they became madly enthusiastic, impotent, and markless. The loyalists, who were madly enthusiastic, impotent, and markless, were madly enthusiastic, impotent, and markless.