On Picket Duty.

A theory has been advanced as to what the matter is with Mr. Bellamy and the Nationalists. The New York "People," the organ of the State Socialists, claims that it is plain that, in trying to divorce himself and following from the State Socialists, Mr. Bellamy's object is to appear respectable and make converts to the so-called "People's party." "Der Loyalist" says that he objects to the term Socialism because of its definiteness; but this is preposterous. Mr. Bellamy's system is far more destructive than that of the Social Democrats. Equal rewards for unequal services is much more simple than unequal rewards for unequal services.

A French economist, in writing about the decadence of the precious metals, says: "The attributes which raised them to their exalted station seem to be dropping off, one by one, like the jewels from off a diadem. Supplemented as instruments of exchange by the improvements effected in commerce and in credit, applied as articles of luxury by the fashion of our day, it may be that, having been so long the very life, wealth, gold and silver are destined to be one day erased from the catalogue of riches!" The reviewer of the "Nation" thinks that this is speculation almost puerile in its character; but what the average reviewer thinks or says has long ceased to be of any consequence.

Russell Sage evidently supposes that his life is of a great deal of consequence to us, so much that his recent miraculous escape from death does cause us to "increase our faith, our love, our trust in the God that created us, the God of our salvation and redemption." The same bomb from which the notorious stock-gambler escaped killed an honest, hard-working man, the gambler's private secretary. This, we suppose, was providential too. But the increase of faith, love, trust, and so on, in the God that created stock-gamblers, the God of their salvation and redemption, might be greater if in this case the gambler had been blown to atoms and his secretary saved. Really the lesson to be drawn is that stock-gamblers and other charlatans are not the Sun, the Saviour, the Archangel Michael, or the Archangel Gabriel, but the charlatans and the charlatans.

The Chicago "Herald" says: "The writers of the New York "Sun" are very able and always entertaining. They furnish their readers the only newspaper in the city States which is patronized toady for its style. It is not a detriment to the fullest success of that journal that its expressions of opinion are absolutely without intrinsic value; indeed, the consistent vacillation, perversity, and fallacy of the "Sun" in opinion and argument force the conviction that its unreliability is a deliberate policy, adopted for the purpose of securing a unique and spectacular position, and because it offers a larger field for the exercise of artistic talent in composition than honesty and practical honesty would afford. The "Sun," a Maaschaeill of modern journalism, and the "Herald" congratulates it upon the fact that its devotion to dishonesty has been so lucidly demonstrated through the many years of its existence that the veriest dobit who reads the paper never for an instant believes it to be in earnest." Liberty sympathizes with this pronouncement, but protests against the notion that honesty and practical honesty does not offer as large a field for artistic talent in composition as hypocrisy or Maaschaeillanism does. The "Herald" forgets that honesty has not merely to promulgate its own faith, but to fight and overcome the false gospel of its foes. This negative part of the work certainly offers a wide field for the most brilliant powers. The "Herald" itself illustrates the truth of this statement. It is doubtless a bright paper, but it is bright only because it is always engaged in a fight with somebody. When it does not fight the tariff, the Chicago mayor, or the Chicago chief of police, it is exceedingly dull. If the "Herald" knew more, it would have more enemies to fight, and it would be a much brighter paper.

The "New Nation" offers a plea for greater cleanliness in the use of language and recommends the use of specific instead of generic terms. When a man says he is a Socialist, the "New Nation" says he does not tell us that he is all, and a cross examination is necessary to ascertain to which of the component parts of the Socialist body he belongs. Liberty agrees with the "New Nation" in this, although that paper no sooner undertakes a classification of these parts than it commits a grave blunder. It states that "on the extreme left wing we find the Anarchists, who disbelieve in government pretty much altogether, and look askance even at any sort of general industrial organization. This wing of the Socialists, which is represented in England by William Morris, on the continent of Europe, and especially in the Latin countries, is altogether the largest element of the Socialist party. Not only does this class of Socialists aim at an Anarchic or unorganized social state as the ultimate ideal, but it is also anxious to attain it by violent and revolutionary methods. This is the form of Socialism which in Europe has undertaken not only a social but a religious revolution by making Atheism almost an obligatory plank in its platform. This is the sort of Socialism which the Pope is attacking in his numerous condemnatory encyclicals; it is the kind that is most largely represented in Europe, and is probably the only sort he really knows anything about. So much for the Anarchistic Socialists."

The people here spoken of are not Anarchistic Socialists at all, but revolutionary Communitists. They form the largest element of the Socialist party is news to me; I had thought that the Marxites truthfully claim superiority of numbers. I think so still. The Anarchistic Socialists are those who, in this country, call themselves mutualists, and who belong to the body of philosophical Anarchists. These aim at an Anarchic and (in a drill-sergeant's sense) unorganized social state, but for violent methods they have no use.

**Faith in the People.**

(Read by Mr. Bruce.)

"What I admire in the American people is their liberal treatment of office holders. I was in office once myself, and I remember that a grateful nation gave me the salary, and then paid a lot of deputies to do any work. My office was by appointment, but if it had been elective I have no doubt the government would not only have given me my salary, but have allowed me to steal enough money to pay my election expenses too. I remember when "Doc" Rid- ley was elected Treasurer of Marbletown, the City Council fixed his salary at one thousand dollars a year. A partisan friend who had hustled for "Doc" at the polls, complained of the Council, saying, "That reduces the salary to four hundred dollars, for 'Doc' had to pay six hundred dollars to be elected, and the Council ought to have considered that." This story has always been received with a snicker of incredulity whenever I have told it, as if it were one of those dull sections which try to pass current American humor; but what will the sceptical critics say to that identical claim now set up by the Treasurer of Chicago, as appears by an interview reported in this morning's paper? Being asked if he intended to apply a certain part of the interest on the city funds to his own use, he said: "Why, certainly, I did not ask for office for fun. I have my election expenses to pay, and my lawyer's fees—they were six thousand dollars." This testifies to the gencrosity of the American people. Probably no other people in the world can be so liberal as to allow the winning candidate to take his election expenses in that way. The losing candidate pays his own bills. He gets no rebate whatever.

What Woman's Freedom Means.

(Gertrude Atherton.)

What will be the result when women get the bit fairly between their teeth is unsafe of prediction. That is in time it will alter the very features on the face of the earth can hardly be doubted. The moral code will be the first to feel the shock, and then government. Women having the refinement of centuries in their blood will never care to adopt the utmost license of men, but they will arrange their lives to please themselves, and their pleasure interferes with our own, they will pay the latter sides. Matrimony is pretty sure to go by the board. Human nature in its perpetual changes was never intended to endure the varying phases which have recognized this, and calmly recluse his ideal wherever the fancy suits him. Woman will not be long embracing the same privilege.

Why Storm Follows Sattle.

(Ambrose Bierce.)

Professor Simon Newcomb, it appears, does not believe that rain can be made to fall upon either the just or the unjust by explosion, or other concussion. He says that, if great rains follow great battles, they are caused by the smoke. But he doubts that they do follow. I know from observation that they do not always follow, or did not in our civil war; they did follow so frequently that it seemed to me, and so most of those engaged, that there was more than a coincidental relation between battle and storm. I thought then that concussion might have something to do with it, but have now for many years been persuaded that the great rains caused by the efforts of the angel to drown our whole assassin crowd,—the victors, the vanquished, and the generals.—
personal idiosyncracies, - in a word, that they are Socialists not in spite of, but in consequence of, their regard for the individual? To Mr. Salt, the essential question seems to be this, - in what spirit do Socialists advocate the principle of individual liberty? 

Mr. Salt's answer is, that Socialists are convinced of the sacredness of liberty, and that they are convinced that the real welfare of society can only be promoted, by the recognition of the right of individuals to pursue happiness as they understand it. They are convinced of the necessity of individual liberty in a system of industry and society.

Mr. Salt continues: 

It will be said, no doubt, that like beggars like, and that, however gross the intentions of the present generation of the working classes may be, the result must inevitably be disastrous, for individual liberty cannot, in the nature of things, be proceeded by a course of State interference. It is, he thinks, a maxim that our whole social system is conditioned by the fact that the passions of the people are not so received as to be compatible with the development of any system of genuine individual liberty. The true Socialist formula is, - From unjust laws to just laws, from just laws to no laws.

Mr. Salt is a friend of the idea of individual liberty. He believes that the ideal state of society is one in which the least possible amount of law or coercion is necessary. He abhors the idea of a State that would be necessary, would only make matters worse. It is only when laws become obsolete because the necessity of which they existed has disappeared that the true Socialist would object to them. He believes that the true way to reach a state of liberty is by doing away with laws which the "best way round is the shortest way there."

Now this Salt-Bellamy plea would be simply irresistible if, firstly, Anarchism were what they conceived it to be, and, secondly, if State Socialism were what was needed to secure the ends of peace, we might readily accept the meaning which our gentle, woe's attach to our distinctive party name, and firmly deny their allegations as to what Socialism implies and involves. They assume that the true Socialist desires to see a state of "no laws," and desire it here and now, - that Anarchism signifies the absence of all restraints and laws, and that "no government" means simply and exactly no coercion. It is further assumed that State Socialism is opposed to just laws and government, and that the object of the Anarchists is precisely from their opposition to law, irrespective of its relation to justice. The truth, however, is, as has been pointed out in these columns a thousand times, that Anarchism signifies a state of equal freedom, which is not incompatible with a state of equal liberty, which is not incompatible with a state of equal rights, which is not incompatible with a state of equal duties. The "no laws" of the Anarchists does not mean no government, but it does not mean no laws and no coercion. This may seem paradoxical, but the paradox vanishes when the Anarchist definition of government is kept in view. Anarchists oppose government because they believe in the right of individuals to pursue happiness as they understand it, not because they disbelieve in punishment of crime and resistance to aggression, but because they disbelieve in compulsory protection. Protection and taxation without consent is itself a violation of the rights of property and of the individual. Did State Socialism contemplate merely the substitution of just laws for the prevailing unjust laws, Anarchism would not antagonize it, for there would then be no difference between the two. Anarchists, work, directly, not for a perfect social state, but for a perfect political system. A perfect social state is a state totally free from sin or crime or folly; a perfect political system is merely a system in which nothing is punished and crime and folly are considered but Invaders. We oppose the present political system for the reason that most of the laws, and the methods of enforcing them, are subversive of justice or the law of equal
freedom; and the same objection applies to State Socialism. There are methods and methods which it proposes are equally wrong in principle.

Whether State Socialism, in operation, would bear more heavily on the individual than the present system, or not, is a question not of the first order of importance. The doctrine of more crushing tyranny and more galling slavery than the semi-individualism of today. Mr. Salt assures us that for every new law which the State Socialists would pass they would abolish a dozen, but we cannot accept a statement so strongly at variance with the facts. Indeed, if our forefathers ever bowed to the repeal of laws, brief, few, and far between in Socialist platforms and expositions, the lists of new laws to be enacted are long and strong. In the second place the injurious consequences of a system do not vary as the square of the number of laws, but depend on quality as well as on quantity, in so far as the quality and character of the laws which the Socialists seek to destroy are the most precious and important kind.

It follows from what has been said that the quarrel between Socialists and Anarchists is emphatically not one of time, but of principle. The situation between them is simply as to what justice is, as to what just laws are.

Having pointed out the error of defining Anarchism as no law, and the correlative error of assuming that we are opposed to all laws, we now proceed to point out that the freedom which Socialists seek to destroy is the freedom of men by voluntary associations for the promotion of the noble freedom of man-making. Out of the commercial freedom, he says, has grown a system of commercial wage slavery worse than real personal slavery; and he demands the freedom of man-making while renouncing without regret the commercial liberty which is only an abuse, a mere fraud and delusion.

The Anarchists are unable to accept Mr. Salt's distinction. Freedom of man-making is impossible without freedom of money-making, which is the most fundamental and essential freedom. The present system is not one of commercial freedom, and the wage slavery complained of is not the result of the money-making freedom. It is the lack of commercial freedom that we hold responsible for the wage slavery, and our strongest objection to the present system is that the freedom of men, making, is infringed in numerous ways. The first plank in our platform is free commercial freedom, and, so far from being impotent and de- sirous of being at once at our goal (as Mr. Bellamy imagines), we are ready to devote all our energies to the obtaining of as much of it as all the individualists, in the temporary exclusion of the other elements of the program. The State Socialists are led astray by some of those who defend this system on the ground that it is individualistic; but the Anarchists never miss an opportunity of proving how deeply individualistic, how deeply selfish and bad logic. The true individualists are not satisfied with the present system, and those who think that we enjoy commercial freedom today are ignorant of the principles of individualism. Individualism does not mean every man for himself; it includes all the vital principles which the State Socialists are supposed to ignore, and it is the lack of one of these principles that makes the Anarchists and the individualists different.

There are many minor errors in the Salt-Bellamy argument, but they may be passed over. One word in conclusion is suggested in Mr. Salt's inquiring whether it is reasonable to suppose that the men who so fully appreciate such intensely individualistic writers as Ibsen and Thoreau and Whitman should espouse a system so fatal to individuality. By way of answering the apparent paradox let us consider Mr. Salt's own case. He certainly appreciates the author, but he certainly does not appreciate a system so fatal to individuality. He does not shrink from the horror and disgust. How does he stomach the contradiction? Why, simply by shutting his mental eye to the true meaning and inevitable consequences of Socialism, and by drawing an arbitrary distinction between man-making and money-making, and permitting the former to be submerged as a mere fraud and abuse, and encourages his imagination to dwell only on the beauties of man-making freedom which he assumes to be the essence of Socialism. He absolves himself from proving his proposition, that the State Socialists and Socialism, as a whole, are an absolute and total failure. Contradictions and inconsistency in reasoning are, no doubt, the real secrets of propagandists at present as much as in the intellectual men of former days. The presence of such men, whose impudence does not subordinating his judgment to his feelings.

Of Our Day It might be said that the pen is mightier than the sword. . . . Thought and investigation have since firmly established the truth that the heroism measures favored by the revolutionists are not necessary, and that there are other, simpler, wiser methods through which the goal may be reached.

For us to make Anarchism is the business of the present, and the means that cannot fail to be success of social business. Therefore, I say, make Anarchists. We can do nothing else that is useful, and preaching and teaching is not out of date for that purpose; but rather for those who, like ourselves, do not believe in State Socialism, it is the only means of attaining to the new order of things.

The means of attaining Socialism may or may not assume a millennial form, but I believe that, so far as is practicable, both the means and the end should be non-militant.

Then literature, always says, the Anarchists. No use of force, exasperation of the invader; in the case where it is difficult to tell whether the alleged offender is an invader or not, still no use of force except where the necessity of immediate solution so imperative that we must use it to save ourselves.

Anarchism is simply liberty, the absence of arbitrary and forced self-control of one person over another person or set of people. It does what no other law does: it allows you to make your own plans.

There is one liberty, and that is the liberty of the sovereignry of each individual. The so-called sovereignty of the people kills individual liberty as much as does divine right, and it is no better.

The lawyer is not to be feared into us, but must come from out us.

Nothing can be progressive and desirable that obstructs, or interferes with, the progress of individual freedom; nothing is wrong, dangerous, or reprehensible that is in keeping with the progress of individual freedom. If in contradiction to free relations; free contract and unrestricted competition between men enjoying equal opportunities and equal social chances will constitute the ruling principle of the coming age of reason and conscious and voluntary cooperation will be exclusively re- treated to for purposes of economy and convenience.

The Socialist Anarchists mean to be led, and not led, that the obtaining by labor of its natural wages — its entire product — is not incompatible with, or possible under, a system of free contract and free exchange. They prove that labor exchange not the result of liberty is production and exchange.

It shows, on the contrary, that such liberty is the only sure remedy for this exploitation, and that it is the al- lusion to the former, its insufficiency, that begot the latter.

The State Socialists fail to comprehend the difference be- tween the present commercial system and free competition. The difference between them is the difference that distinguishes an honest man from a thief.

It is not interested in the establishment of all moddle- some and class legislation, of all ,rigid and monopsonies artifically created for the exploitation of a few to the detriment of the many.

What Hurley has really weakened is the case of the Anarchists who build a baseless assumption and fanciful supposition. He justly rules out of court those who dream of a system of liberty and equality in exchange and commerce, and then charge society with violating the rules and laws of their invention. If all Anarchists were guilty of such folly, and expected every one to act as they would never have been expected to have respect for them. But the professor has yet to learn that there are Anarchists who proceed in a way that he cannot appreciate, or even understand; that he takes no argument for granting and vitiating their arguments by no assumptions, but who study the facts of social life and from them derive the right to liberty by order of the people, and that the happiest and most stable society would be a society living, moving, and having its being in Anarchic principle.

The assumption of a state of Anarchia superposed upon a sudden collapse of Archia is absurd. Anarchists work for the abolition of the State, but by this means they not its utter destruction. They would allow for a certain time, in fact, so put it, its dissolusion in the economic organism. . . .

Modern believers in industrial freedoms do not necessarily imply that the absence of coercion man know and follow their interest in the highest and best sense; what they
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