On Picket Duty.

The loss of the U. S. S. "Despatch" shows that it is the way of our naval officers, who, like the major-general in the "Pirates of Perseus," are versed in the scientific side of their profession to the detriment of the practical," to steer into instead of out of the way of danger.

A citizen in a small town in this State was robbed, and had the robber arrested. The robber was marched to jail, and his victim, strange to say, accompanied him—against his will, of course. The explanation of this is that the injured citizen could not secure bail, and was detained as a witness. He was handcuffed to the robber and sent to jail. His crime was poverty.

A Philadelphia paper states that the detective force of that city is inefficient and notoriously venal, and that a large proportion of the police force has become debauched by the constant protection of criminals. Recent revelations have shown that there is a similar state of things in this city, and there is no reason to think that Philadelphia and Boston are exceptions in this respect. Police officers and detectives cooperate with the criminals in fleecing the large citizen, and furnish them most of the needed information. The professional criminals have at least the decency not to ask for the "protection" they give them.

Mr. Pentecoast, it seems, has become a lawyer. I cannot share the view of those who condemn him for taking this step. He admits that the practice of law is inconsistent with his ideal, but, finding himself obliged to do violence to his ideal in order to make a living, he thinks the legal profession as well suited to his purpose as any. In this Mr. Pentecoast is behaving like a sensible man, and for one I thoroughly appreciate the bravery which enables him to scorn the mor- alsists who will raise the howl of inconsistence. But I cannot help recalling the time when Mr. Pentecoast raised the same howl against me because I, a disciple in copyright, find it expedient to copyright some of my publications. For his course toward me on that occasion Mr. Pentecoast owes me an apology, for the graceful tender of which he will never find a more fitting opportunity than the present.

In the New York "Sun's" weekly record of Russian news, I find the following interesting statement: "In the Government of Ekaterinovav marriage by contract is now in vogue. A couple desiring to unite in marriage simply promise to be faithful to each other in the presence of witnesses and fortify their promise by giving each other notes on certain amounts of money, mortgages on property, and other such documents to bind them to the conditions upon which they contract the alliance. The dissolution of such marriages is very easy; either by mutual consent the contract is destroyed, or, at the worst, the party desiring to break the contract can be held responsible only for the "financial obligations" so to say, which are set forth in the marriage contract. It is obvious to notice that the first contractors of such marriages were peasants, and that their strongest advocates and supporters are the women. The reporter adds that some of wife-stealing and wife-buying are very fre-quent; but as the women are the strongest supporters of the arrangement that fact must not trouble us.

"Dr. Gesellschaft," a German monthly magazine and perhaps the most significant of all the periodicals which the young man known as the Emperor William is pleased to let live, being the representative organ of whatever is vital and progressive in the German liter-ature of today, does honor to itself and to John Henry Mackay by publishing in a recent issue an extended study of the young poet's works by Gabriele Reuter, a frontispiece portrait of Mackay, two new poems and a prose poem by Mackay himself, and a review of his latest book "Die Anarchisten." This may fairly be called a Mackay number, and is a high tribute to the author whose work I am shortly to have the honor of introducing for the first time to English readers. The publication of "Die Anarchisten" has been delayed, but before the end of the month of October it will be placed upon the American market. It will contain a fine half-tone portrait of the author, and a translation of Gabriele Reuter's study of his works which George Schuman, also the translator of the book proper, has furnished. To size the book will be over three hundred pages, and its price will be fifty cents in paper covers and one dollar in cloth covers. Upon this note-worthy addition to Anarchistic literature I am able to congratulate all Anarchists except Mr. Yarros, who will find in this work of high art and "brutal" egotism little or nothing to admire.

The New York "Times" says: "The figures submitted to the Clearing House Association at its annual meeting were of a magnitude to puzzle even the most active imagination. It is like trying to realize the distance to the moon to try to form a clear conception of clearings for a year amounting to over $54,000,000,000, or even of average daily clearings of over $111,000,000. Wecommuned to the attention of simple-minded people who are wrestling with the question of how much money per capita is needed to "ef- fectualize" the shortage of the average proportion of balances to clearings during the year was but 4.4 per cent. In other words, by this admirable arrangement between the banks $41 did the work of $1,000. And it is to be remarked that the system by which this tremendous work is accomplished is the result of the evolution of business under the guidance of pri- vate citizens, unsaddled and unforced by any legislation, State or national." Why does the "Times" overlook the folly of the simple-minded people who do not wrestle with the question referred to, but allow the government to place arbitrary restrictions upon the volume of currency? If it is absurd to try to discover how much is needed, is it not still more absurd to fix a limit to the amount without any inquiry and inves-tigation? The fact that under the admirable arrange-ment between the banks $41 did the work of $1,000 is the best argument in favor of perfect freedom in banking.

The John Law Scheme.

(St. Louis News.)

If the measures of the sub-treasury plan could be argued from the quality of the arguments, most frequently offered in favor of the "financial obligations," one would immediately have to notice that the first contractors of such marriages were peasants, and that their strongest advocates and supporters are the women. The reporter adds that some of wife-stealing and wife-buying are very frequent; but as the women are the strongest supporters of the arrangement that fact must not trouble us.

"Dr. Gesellschaft," a German monthly magazine and perhaps the most significant of all the periodicals which the young man known as the Emperor William is pleased to let live, being the representative organ of whatever is vital and progressive in the German liter-ature of today, does honor to itself and to John Henry Mackay by publishing in a recent issue an extended study of the young poet's works by Gabriele Reuter, a frontispiece portrait of Mackay, two new poems and a prose poem by Mackay himself, and a review of his latest book "Die Anarchisten." This may fairly be called a Mackay number, and is a high tribute to the author whose work I am shortly to have the honor of introducing for the first time to English readers. The publication of "Die Anarchisten" has been delayed, but before the end of the month of October it will be placed upon the American market. It will contain a fine half-tone portrait of the author, and a translation of Gabriele Reuter's study of his works which George Schuman, also the translator of the book proper, has furnished. To size the book will be over three hundred pages, and its price will be fifty cents in paper covers and one dollar in cloth covers. Upon this note-worthy addition to Anarchistic literature I am able to congratulate all Anarchists except Mr. Yarros, who will find in this work of high art and "brutal" egotism little or nothing to admire.

The New York "Times" says: "The figures submitted to the Clearing House Association at its annual meeting were of a magnitude to puzzle even the most active imagination. It is like trying to realize the distance to the moon to try to form a clear conception of clearings for a year amounting to over $54,000,000,000, or even of average daily clearings of over $111,000,000. We commended to the attention of simple-minded people who are wrestling with the question of how much money per capita is needed to "ef-"
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Direct Legislation and Liberty.

Mr. J. W. Sullivan, replying to my article on the Reformers, Aug. 15, defends direct government from the point of view, not of equal liberty, but of maximum freedom, and naturally finds his sole opposition to me on several points. From those same standpoint he makes some criticisms upon the present system in the executive of the town, in such a way as to throw discredit on the whole system of government, but not on the system of government itself. The effect of this is to throw discredit on the whole system of government, but not on the system of government itself. The effect of this is to throw discredit on the whole system of government, but not on the system of government itself. The effect of this is to throw discredit on the whole system of government, but not on the system of government itself. The effect of this is to throw discredit on the whole system of government, but not on the system of government itself. The effect of this is to throw discredit on the whole system of government, but not on the system of government itself.

In saying the Referendum "has made the public services the post-office, the railroads — the equal of private enterprise;" Mr. Sullivan also states that the telephone, the express and the telegraph are not under the control of the government. Mr. Sullivan refers to this as a fact which is not true, and he further states that the telephone and telegraphs are under the control of the government. Mr. Sullivan's statement that the telephone and telegraphs are under the control of the government is incorrect. The telephone and telegraphs are not under the control of the government. They are private enterprises, and are regulated by the courts. The government has no control over them.

But, what, ask, has all this to do with direct government, with the Referendum? This "consolidation," and these "economies," are certainly not impossible under our system of government; nor are they impossible under the system of government of any European country, or of any other country.

In fact, under a despotic system such things are most easily accomplished, as was demonstrated by Spencer long ago, and as is being more and more recognized by men of experience. Possibly the consolidation is not possible to private enterprise, although there can be no doubt that private enterprise can carry consolidation to the highest point desirable, but are the "other economies" likewise inapplicable to private enterprise? No doubt, in the absence of other forms of competition for the different industries in the country, the tariff or any other piece of legislation could survive to the wishes and opinions of a majority. Or are imperfect institutions very long battle the annexation demanded by majors. Does it long battle the annexation demanded by majors. It is not clear to me that this substantially would can be transplanted to private interest's proper auspices. He will find, besides, much another indiscernible to those who, like him, are engaged in studying the problem of the true political freedom. It would afford me great pleasure to discuss with Mr. Sullivan the subject to which he has referred in the book mentioned.

Mr. Sullivan mistakes the nature of my "opposition" to the Referendum. Theoretically, as a believer in the principle of equal freedom, I am, of course, against opposition to the Referendum. Practically, I am strongly against the Referendum method, which my attitude may be held to be one of opposition. A believer in equal liberty cannot accept, as a finality, ultimate, ideal condition, anything that falls short of equal liberty. There is, however, another kind of opposition to the practical application of the Referendum. Mr. Sullivan considers the Referendum as a necessary stage of development, perhaps as the next step to be taken by nations like this in their gradual progressive advance. It is doubtful from this point of view that he is led to make the following appeal:

"One can be no freer than his fellows — the majority — will let him be. This is the principle of equal liberty. The majority, then, that is to act upon it. Plainly, then, it is good work to bring government down to its unavoidable limits, its simplest terms. Mr. Sullivan himself called direct legislation has "last terms of authority, next to no authority. And late in life Proudhon said: "Reforms always: utopias never." The scientific scientist proved experiment. So the scientific socialist reformer, seeing what direct legislation has done in Switzerland toward reforming the common abuses of government, may look for the same beneficial results in another republic.

All of which is perfectly sound. But did it occur to Mr. Sullivan to ask himself why Proudhon, whose siphon he apparently quotes, failed to exert him-"If in the interest of the Referendum, which he never would have had for himself, a law which a great, a great, a great man might have guided Mr. Sullivan to the perception of the real reasons of our indifference toward the Referendum. Proudhon, it is true, desired reform; but he subordinated political reform to economic reform. He thought he could work with greater advantage and success in a different direction. To him the solution of the labor problem was more important, and he gave it precedence over other political reforms. For the carrying-out of Proudhon's economic measures the Referendum was not needed, and he naturally devoted himself to the furtherance of that which was to be his need.

The lack of interest in the Referendum exhibited by the Anarchists of today is similarly accounted for. While adopting the motto, "Reforms always, utopias never," they differ from Mr. Sullivan as to the particular reforms most needful and the ways and means most promising.

"Before finally deciding to oppose direct legislation," says Mr. Sullivan, the Anarchists will find themselves weighing certain questions, which he proceeds to enumerate. As I have explained, the Anarchists do not (in the practical sense) oppose direct legislation: they merely decline to work for it, attending to needs of a more urgent and imperious character. Mr. Sullivan’s questions are as follows:

If, as Proudhon said and Mr. Yarros and other Anarchists of today themselves admit, that the Referendum is no solution of the economic reform, is it not the part of every lover of freedom to strive for whatever measure of freedom for his fellows he sees possible?

The Anarchists see the possibility of achieving a greater economic freedom of economic freedom without the agency of government. If they believe in their own resources, they must not depend upon the government to help them. They must depend upon their own resources and use them in the interest of the economic reforms.

Is not the peaceful evolution through improvement of institutions sure, better, more profitable, than the risks of revolution? In fact, would not direct legislation carry reforms for this generation to posterity? — the majority being necessary alike in both methods?

No revolution" is contemplated by the Anarchists; hence they are absolutely from answering these two questions.

Mast not trust in mankind be the basis of any movement in this new age?

Yes.

And in any event, will the majority, whether right or wrong, rule?

This betrays distrust of mankind. The majority do not insist upon ruling the minority in all activities and relations of life, but allow a large measure of personal liberty. They may be induced to grant a larger measure of liberty, — to observe the principle of equal
 liberty. It is the part of every believer in equal liberty to reason with them, and to convince them of the superior happiness-producing powers of freedom.

At the goal of progress toward equal freedom, will not new and more questions be raised? Will not the contentions of the pro-Spencer school be answered, and will not the issues of the new conflict be brought to bear with his egotistic notions. Well, sincerely hope he is satisfied with this explanation; I am sure nobody else will be. To be honest (for instance) the clear statement that the "sentiment of justice is the root of all well-organized social action" with the equally clear statement that "the species is not the ultimate end of social justice," etc., which I am sure Mr. Spencer can appreciate would at least influence his mind. Mr. Spencer's insinuations, infections, and abuse do not harm me; but I prefer to submit my ideas to the test of "just and honest" investigation, and to show them by the light of new knowledge and the light of the liberty that is the birthright of all men.

The theory accepted that there should be no government of man by man, is not the question of means toward the end ever open for discussion?

It is. But our proximate end being economic and industrial freedom, the referendum is not our means.

Does not approach to Anarchism necessarily involve, in one form or other, Opposition?

It does, if by Oppositionism is meant willingness to work for parts of the program of Mr. Spencer and to co-operate with all progressive workers in truly progressive work. If Oppositionism means something else, their Anarchism does not involve it.

**V. J.**

**Drops of Cold Water.**

Mr. Tucker is so excited, so angry, so sore, so rattled that it would be rather hard to get him to swallow his own medicine. I may refrain from the employment of invective. I can afford to be pa
tient and calm, and let the facts and probabilities speak for me.

In the wild accusations oflying no one can take any stock.

The resolution of detail, the purity of purpose, the proba
table, and manifestly truthful explanation with Mr. Tucker's reckless charges, will doubtless be able to form a proper counter to any wrong made to name a probable motive for my "touched", which they may be found to be "the desire to be or appear smart and cunning." The absurdity of this is apparent to everybody except Mr. Tucker. I lay emphasis on "everybody except Mr. Tucker." I say that nothing was farther from my thoughts than such an
tempt. The readers know that the article was fair, temperate, sober, and even afterward. And that no freshness of "smartness" was displayed. I would value Mr. Tucker's good opinion, and regret his suspicions more, if he were not so lavish in his accusations.

And the jury will not be taken into consideration the fact that in my discussions I am always fair and just, always willing to give credit where it is due and to treat my opponents with respect and courtesy. After the careful consideration of the facts and of the full and entire story of the matter, it is not surprising that what he unsatisfactorily calls my "redundant claims," "pure
toothless, unadulterated babblings." He actually has the assur ance to tell his reads that "Mr. Parke" is a "very eloquent" and "eulogistic views; and inasmuch as I plainly stated that I had supposed him to have done so, we have another charge of gratuitous lying. But Mr. Tucker is very unfortunate, and that I suppose to be his delight and to reconcile some of the old views with new and thorough philosophical propnsition.

As to his unqualified endorsement of Mr. Fontenot's "admirable " discovery, his especial of what he terms the "would be inspirative piece of evidence," attributed all these bad trends to the incompleteness of his explanation and to his infamous grasp of the "taste". I disagree with it, and I believe the history of its appearance and felt disenchantment, but that they could not and did not sink my belief that Mr. Tucker was gradu
yly yielding to the facts of life, and that Mr. Spencer, at least, even what Mr. Spencer himself, might say, anything with what they say logically follows from the fundamental prin
ciples postulated. It is convenient just at present for Mr. Tucker to cite the conclusions of a non-Anarchist disciple of Mr. Spencer; but he knows that what he has to consider is the inevitable inference from Mr. Spencer's premises. If I decide to discuss egotism, I shall address myself to the readers, not in the sense that there is nothing to show there is something between himself and as well as me. Mr. Tucker's insults, accusations, and abuse do not harm me; but I prefer to submit my ideas to the test of "just and honest" investigation, and to show them by the light of new knowledge and the light of the liberty that is the birthright of all.

The question is an important one, for any Anarchist that is based on what I have called brutal egoism is unwis
ter, and it is important that we are at pains to read Mr. Tucker's article upon a philosophical basis, and to do it from the nonsensical notion of the new metaphysics. As long as the word "social," "comrade," "wrench, hush-bug, combination argument can be carried on.

V. J.

In his previous article Mr. Yarros, after cataloguing my intellectual qualities, closed with the pretenence that he had not done so; in his present article he begins by pretenence to avoid invective, but after he uses invective frequently before he finishes. In both cases the hypocrisy is equally evident, whether the false pre
tence precedes the patent fact or follows it. Mr. Yarros' own record in the matter of invective relieves me of all necessity of defending myself against it. I can hear in advance the laugh that will rise from a thousand throats when that number of readers shall take in the full absurdity of Mr. Yarros' claim that he "treats his opponents with respect and courtesy." If the employment of invective shows that he who uses it, then he has been rattled in nearly every controversy in which he has taken part; but as Mr. Yarros will not accept this conclusion for himself, I shall not allow him to impose the con
csequence of his premise upon me. In written contro
debates I have never been rattled nor though considerably disregarded, I was never cooler in my life. And I am not sure, unless it is soreness to be sorry for Mr. Yarros' folly, and of such soreness one need not feel ashamed.

So I will not object to calling a spade a spade, and cannot consent to change my habit simply because Mr. Yarros is in question. Therefore when in this dis
cussion he departed from the truth, I have not hesi
tated to declare it and to show it. Let us see how he deals with the question of the "righteous" doctrine, and whether he supposed it to be? I have changed my egotistic views. I answered that he supposed nothing of the kind. Whereupon he says that two witnesses testify that he said he supposed so. What of it? I have not denied that he said he supposed so.

In his last article he said he supposed so. What I de

cide, is, not that he did not say he supposed so, but that he did not suppose so. When he can produce witnesses to testify, not as to what he said, but as to what he thought, their testimony will be competent. I will not be concerned in the case whether the number of Liberty and buttrust by undeniable facts, that he could not by any possibility have supposed that I had altered my views, remains unshaken. scarcely need point out the absurdity of characterizing my must positive declarations, in concurrence with and the continuation of my views declared in 1887, as "bad breaks.”

It may be true, as Mr. Yarros says, that I never alter

ted more than one of his signed editorials in the in
terest of Mr. Spencer. But I have been as strongly to the contrary; but at any rate I have very frequently altered in that interest the editorial paragraphs which Mr. Yarros has contributed without signature to the "Picket Duty" department. And if the latter, in
terest the community of thought is strongly to the contrary; but at any rate I have very frequently altered in that interest the editorial paragraphs which Mr. Yarros has contributed without signature to the "Picket Duty" department. And if the latter, in
terest the community of thought is strongly to
Why Not Protection in Home Trade?

(Chicago Herald)

Nations do not trade. They contrive to restrict trade a great deal and to destroy a large part of its profits, but they do not trade with each other. They do not trade with each other because they live in different countries or in the same country. And an American is just as capable of taking care of his own interests as a foreigner is capable of taking care of his own. As compared with a foreigner as we are in trade with one of his own countries. The "vast volume of international trade" has nothing to do with the case. The volume of international trade is compared as compared with the volume of our inter-state trade. If the people need Mr. Blaine or any other politicians to act as their guardians and save them from getting cheated in their international trade, much more do they need a guardian to protect them in their inter-state trade. It may be true that the people of the United States can produce all that the American citizen says they are to produce in every one of everything that they need, and can get along without trading with foreigners at all. But if so, they may be mastered and fooled. They may be treated implicitly not to trade with foreigners or among themselves unless they can gain something by trading, and, if they can gain by trading, they should be permitted to trade. To prevent them from trading is to put them in the condition of a tyrant. The volume of trade, whether domestic or foreign, is just as great as the sum total of individual securities in the society. If we are fools, and, fool, we need not fear that he will trade unless he can gain thereby; and if such trader gains, the aggregate wealth of the country is increased. If he doesn't, he loses, and it is not the fault of the government. He is, and he is, and he will, and he will not, and he will, and it constitutes no ground for an accusation that he is wrong in doing anything for which he is paid. We have heard that he is wrong in doing anything for which he is paid. We have heard that he is wrong in doing anything. He is, and he will, and he will not, and he will, and it constitutes no ground for an accusation that he is wrong in doing anything. We have heard that it is wrong in doing anything. He is, and he will, and he will not, and he will, and it constitutes no ground for an accusation that he is wrong in doing anything.