On Picket Duty.

Col. Ingeroll's latest inconsistency is recorded by a correspondent of the "Twentieth Century." It seems that the prohibition of pierce-flight in Minnesota has elicited from this enemy of liquor-traffic prohibition a strong expression of condemnation. The correspondent named "Ingeroll" has denounced "unsound" and "unscientific" in its application to the liquor traffic, is right and wise when directed against pierce-flight. Perhaps Mr. Macdonald will enlighten us on this point.

In England it seems to be generally held that gambling is bad when indulged in by those who cannot afford to lose money, but that if the well-to-do gamble, there is nothing in the proceeding that calls for reprobation. American papers tell us that such a distinction cannot be entertained from the superior American point of view. Gambling is bad in all cases because it is a species of robbery. But familiarity with the dictionary will be fatal to this superior American point of view. Robbery is the taking away by violence or threat, and the question whether the gambler who wins gives a fair consideration for his prize is entirely irrelevant.

Mr. Sidney Webb writes to the London "Times" that "women composers who are not trade-unionists habitually receive in Edinburgh and Paris as well as in London, not only lower wages than men, but also distinctly lower piece work rates for work of exactly equal quality." The moral drawn by Mr. Webb is that "women must act together if they would receive fair pay. Now I am as anxious as Mr. Webb to secure fair play to workingwomen, and have no objection to their acting together, but a knowledge of the printing business (which Mr. Webb lacks) prevents me from accepting his conclusion. As a rule, women printers' work is not of "exactly equal quality" with that of men, and even where it is, there are many other valid reasons for making them accept lower rates than those paid to men. If employes were forced to pay the same rates to women as they pay to men, they simply would not employ the former to "pretend that the average woman is as good, steady, and reliable a worker as the average man is to be either ignorant or reckless of the most patent facts."
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"In abiding true and naval, the last vestige of old-time slav- ery, the redemption of the New England town, the role of the loyal, the cloth of the policeman, the grapple of the ex-communication, the closing-bells of the department clerks, all to the round of the benighted, which young Liberty grinds beneath her heel." — F. M. P.

THE APPEARANCE in the editorial column of articles by other signatories than the editor’s initial indicates that the editor approves their central purpose and general tenor, though he does not hold himself responsible for every phrase or word. But the appearance in other parts of the paper of articles by the same or other writers by no means indicates that he approves them in any respect, such disposition of them being governed largely by motives of convenience.

A NEW BOOK GIVEN AWAY WITH EACH RENEWAL.

Payment of a year’s subscriptions and of renewal is required in advance. The names of subscribers not heard from within two weeks after publication of a number shall be struck from the list. But to every subscriber who sends his renewal for one year, accompanied by his subscription, so that it reaches the publisher not later than two weeks after it is due, he shall be entitled to receive as a present a copy of "The Economic Man", contributed by the editor of the "Nation", E. L. Godkin, while not intended as a reply to Prof. Smart, very successfully exposes the fundamental fallacies of the new school and disposal of the claims made by its latest advocate.

In his criticisms and comments upon the method of the old school, its theory of price, its belief of the market, Leslie, Ingram, and other critics, he points out the uncertain character of the postulates of the old economy, its dependence upon exploded theological and philosophical doctrines, and the insappability of its alleged laws of social economy from that of any other science. The chief interest attaches to his attempt to interpret the general drift of the new economy which, he avers, is being written, and to his conception of the "safer foundation" upon which the whole fabric of political economy requires to be re-established.

The new economy is not so timid and apologetic as the old economy is in the exhortations of the latter day champions. It boldly proclaims that it deals with things as they are, and, far from being content with the analysis of existing factors, it affords industry the laws of its safe guidance.

In its principle is that political economy is not the science of wealth, but the science of man in relation to wealth, — a proposition given originally by Mr. Edward array, 50 years ago, and now quoted as a key-note in the opening sentence of his system, "The scarcity-point and the object-of the science is an end." — The great word of the new economy is utility, which, in the new system, is not that which can be bought or sold, but a man’s life.

What we are now called on to do is to write the political economy of a rich nation, which will lead all men to use and, and where the masses of the people are, if not so poor as they were, still far from what we might have expected. The thing to make has taken a new form. — That in great Britain thousands of people are now starting up, whose first idea is not how to get more wealth, but how to make the wealth. The thing to make has indeed increased. The highest vocation is open to the urgent cry of which the cry of the people can call them, that of employing labor in the true interests of the laborer.

In fine, the new economy is based on the "Platonic idea that the king of man is not divided," and that man’s work must be consciously dominated by a special purpose, that purpose being the rise of all men to similar chances of true life in labor.

Man should devote the whole of his life to work, unless on account of a sacrifice for the life of the next day. But that "should" involves that the work of the day is something more than making an income. The working of the life is a sacrifice for the life of the next day, but because, and in the measure that, it is a life of congenial work, — work in which a man may realize his powers of body and mind, and realize that the social ideal of the new economy, this work must not be selfish, — even regarding a man’s family and his friends as part of the self: it must not be an erroneous conclusion of the self-centeredness of the old economy.

"In abiding true and naval, the last vestige of old-time slavery, the redemption of the New England town, the role of the loyal, the cloth of the policeman, the grapple of the excommunication, the closing-bells of the department clerks, all to the round of the benighted, which young Liberty grinds beneath her heel." — F. M. P.

The appearance in the editorial column of articles by other signatories than the editor’s initial indicates that the editor approves their central purpose and general tenor, though he does not hold himself responsible for every phrase or word. But the appearance in other parts of the paper of articles by the same or other writers by no means indicates that he approves them in any respect, such disposition of them being governed largely by motives of convenience.

The August "Fortnightly Review" contained a nota de aliento of the new economy. In the pen of one of the new economists, Prof. Snart, in the "North American Review" for October we find an article on "The Economic Man," contributed by the editor of the "Nation," E. L. Godkin, which, while not intended as a reply to Prof. Smart, very successfully exposes the fundamental fallacies of the new school and disposal of the claims made by its latest advocate. In his criticisms and comments upon the method of the old school, its theory of price, its belief of the market, Leslie, Ingram, and other critics, he points out the uncertain character of the postulates of the old economy, its dependence upon exploded theological and philosophical doctrines, and the insappability of its alleged laws of social economy from that of any other science. The chief interest attaches to his attempt to interpret the general drift of the new economy which, he avers, is being written, and to his conception of the "safer foundation" upon which the whole fabric of political economy requires to be re-established.

The new economy is not so timid and apologetic as the old economy is in the exhortations of the latter day champions. It boldly proclaims that it deals with things as they are, and, far from being content with the analysis of existing factors, it affords industry the laws of its safe guidance.

In its principle is that political economy is not the science of wealth, but the science of man in relation to wealth, — a proposition given originally by Mr. Edward array, 50 years ago, and now quoted as a key-note in the opening sentence of his system, "The scarcity-point and the object-of the science is an end." — The great word of the new economy is utility, which, in the new system, is not that which can be bought or sold, but a man’s life.

What we are now called on to do is to write the political economy of a rich nation, which will lead all men to use and, and where the masses of the people are, if not so poor as they were, still far from what we might have expected. The thing to make has taken a new form. — That in great Britain thousands of people are now starting up, whose first idea is not how to get more wealth, but how to make the wealth. The thing to make has indeed increased. The highest vocation is open to the urgent cry of which the cry of the people can call them, that of employing labor in the true interests of the laborer.

In fine, the new economy is based on the "Platonic idea that the king of man is not divided," and that man’s work must be consciously dominated by a special purpose, that purpose being the rise of all men to similar chances of true life in labor.
One word more. "Just as it is only necessary," says Mr. Tucker, "in order to controvert Mr. Spencer's latter-day views, to point to the fact that 100 years before him they had his old chapter on "The Right of the Individual to take the State," so, to overthrow the Mr. Yarros of today, it is a sufficient answer to say, in the words of Mr. Yarros of 1807, "This proposition is to be amended in order to make Mr. Spencer's present views successfully it is necessary to refute his new arguments (if any are advanced) or, even if there be any favor of the moral views, they have not been met. Where there is a question of new evidence, the "evidently parallel column" is impotent and worthless."

For my part I attempt to show that the new evidence upon which he bases his modified judgment does not alter the original situation, and it is not enough to print extracts from former articles. The new evidence—of which there is an overwhelming amount—has not as yet come up to the standard that Mr. Yarros knows what the new evidence is and that he finds it valueless; but it is open to me to make the rejoinder that, like Mr. Yarros, it has only conclusively conducted a long controversy on the subject of rights and obligations, but we are prejudiced to appreciate the strength of the new evidence.

I shall answer the first half of Mr. Yarros' explanatory article by a simple narration of facts. These facts will show sufficiently whether I insisted upon Mr. Yarros unjustifiably and gratuitously, and against which if, against either, the charge of dishonesty in discussion, preferred parenthetically by Mr. Yarros against me, may properly be brought.

In No. 104 of Liberty, Mr. Yarros gathered the first of that admirable series of articles on Spencer's "Justice" which Mr. Yarros lately wrote for those columns,—articles unequalled, on the whole, for ability and insight by any reviewer on this side of the water or this side of the Atlantic sanctions of the law. On visiting the compositing-room, a short time later, I was met by a suggestion from Mr. Yarros that I should either omit or alter my paragraph, inasmuch as it seemed to him to attribute to Spencer the view that rights are the result of contract. I answered that my paragraph did not attribute to Mr. Spencer anything of the kind, and I told Mr. Yarros distinctly that I was not discussing the question whether Spencer's use of the word rights was justified from his (Spencer's) standpoint, but whether a man is liable from my own standpoint, having occasion to discuss this latter point because Spencer's use of the word had been put in my month by Mr. Yarros' editorial sanction thereof. Furthermore, I then and there, to please Mr. Yarros, inserted the entire clause and made it clearer than before that I was not attributing my views to Spencer, and in this amended form the paragraph appeared in No. 104.

Here it should be noted and carefully remembered that this conversation, which was of Mr. Yarros' own seeking, must have been looked upon by him as of some importance and must have left an impression on his mind. In No. 107, three weeks later, appeared the letter from Mr. Simpson called out by my paragraph, accompanied by my comments. In these comments I mentioned the fact that the language of my paragraph excluded any implication that I agree with Spencer's position. This, one would think, should have tended to deepen the impression made on Mr. Yarros' mind by our conversation.

And in the same article I expressly distinguished a "pragmatical" use of the word rights from a "privilege resulting from contract." It was clear that I meant to contrast pragmatical with privileges, because if I had desired to contrast simply the phrases "superior" to and "resulting from," I should have laid the emphasis on the word "resulting," leaving the wrong pragmatical in both clauses. Notwithstanding this, in No. 108 Mr. Yarros, commenting on my declaration that "the word right, except in the strictly legal sense, conveys the idea of a high pragmatical independent of contract and superior to the legal practical as meaning privilege (not even hinting at any other possible definition), and thereby convoked me, supposing the interpretation correct, of uttering ridiculous nonsense. I answered that the dictionary also defined pragmatical as "prior and indefeasible right," in which sense I used the word, and I characterized the attempt of Mr. Yarros to make it appear otherwise as one of those tricks of controversy to which "smart" people are prone. Mr. Yarros defends himself in the present issue by saying that he supposed me to mean privilege because he thought I was criticizing Spencer's use of the term rights from a standpoint of agreement with Spencer's philosophy. Mr. Yarros' article stating this, I sent a note to Mr. Yarros asking him if he had forgotten our conversation in the printing-office, and whether a reminder of it inspired him with any desire to change his article in the proof. He refers to the previous article in No. 108, he had forgotten the conversation, and that everything in his present article, regarding the dictionary, etc., is absolutely true.

Max: is a credulous animal, we know; but I hope Mr. Yarros' memory serves him, perhaps I may be as much as Mr. Yarros in rushing into things.

It is at least refreshing, if not entirely agreeable, to turn from these debits and dubitable ways to the directness with which Mr. Yarrosrepudiates his past. True, the action comes a little late. It would have been better if he had let it to be forced upon him by a confrontation with his old articles in black and white. It would have been fairer if he had not misled his comradely by professing a harmony between views which he now admits to irreconcilable. His admission to new views without the renunciation of the old has been too much after the fashion of Mr. Pentecost. Indeed, Mr. Pentecost has the advantage of him; for, while Mr. Pentecost makes no formal announcements or acknowledgments, his changes are absolutely consistent, and even counseled by no effort to blur the old with the new.

But better late than never. At least there is no shuffling now. The plunge is direct, though into the dark. Yes, into the dark, unless I am blind. For to me the right is in the direction. When he says that our doctrines are revolutionary and metaphysical, I don't know at what he means, and I don't think he knows himself. In fact, he sneers at light, at lucidity, at clearness. A clear idea, he says after Burke, is the enemy of reason. But look at the logic of this view. All ideas are, of course, equally confused; but every clear idea is a little idea; then, by logical necessity, all ideas, including those now held by Mr. Yarros, are either little or confused or both. There is no denying the conclusion, but it shows the utter absurdity of the comparison. And yet it is such absurdity that fills Mr. Yarros with pleasure as his present and amusement at his past. He should remember that he was as top-airy then from the standpoint which amuses him now, as he is now from the top-airy standpoint which amuses himself. It will become his lot to be hereafter to be a very modest man. But he will not be. Pride not only goeth before a fall, but continueth after it.

It dawns on me at this point that I have given Mr. Yarros more credit than he is worth, in spite of a shuffle, after all. He still calls himself a "rationalist." But I do not consider him an egoist at all. He repudiates, as monstrous nonsense, his old assertion, that "apart from self-interest, there is absolutely nothing by which an individual can show any deference for the rules of conduct which others adopt for themselves." His present position, then, is that some such induce- ment, other than self-interest, exists. This inducement he calls an obligation and says that it is binding. —Dr. But self-controlling, as I think, he would compel deference for common standards, even if self-interest should point in the other direction; and where self-interest is violated, there is no egotism, rational or otherwise.

The sudden change in Mr. Yarros comes to me as no surprise. Not, as he may think, because I have seen a special sign of its approach, but, as he will be astonished to hear, because of my general belief in his men-
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