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On Picket Duty.

An excellent editorial in the Boston "Herald" explains the difference between genuine reciprocity and sham reciprocity. The position of the constantly shifting duty on protection is now that fairly trade is a good thing and ought to be encouraged, but that, in fixing what articles shall participate in free trade, we must go to the politicians in Congress, instead of to the business of the country, for a decision. The protectionists are merely calling the name of reciprocity to betray its principles. "Real reciprocity," says the "Herald," is "a condition in which all business is on equal terms, and in which it is settled what business ought to have part in it by the survival of the fittest." The same difference subsists between State currency and free currency; yet the "Herald" is willing to let the politicians in Congress regulate our currency and obstruct the process of natural selection in this and numerous other matters.

The English courts have held in a recent case that a combination to trade and offer in respect of prices, discounts, and other facilities such terms as will win so large an amount of custom as to render it unsupportable for rival customers to pursue the same trade, is not illegal. The charge was at a combination of steamship companies was in the habit of allowing a rebate of five per cent on all freight paid by shippers who shipped goods in their vessels alone; and it was also alleged that this was done with the malicious intent of injuring other companies' trade. American judges generally pronounce against the respondents in such cases. The English courts, however, expressly affirmed that there are many things which might be perfectly lawfully done by an individual which, when done by a number of persons, become unlawful. It is much easier to say this than to prove it or to instance a single case in which it is self-evidently true.

A daily paper observes that, while the great political parties are still disposed to allow men to take care of themselves, the Alliance members of Congress make heroic efforts to reform society by statute. The present that the great parties favor non-interference is wildly absurd. The real difference is that the great party politicians rob and oppress the common people in the interest of the plutocrats, while the Alliance politicians contest cynical and ludicrous legislative projects in the interest of the majority. It is, perhaps, a good place to state that, while Liberty expects nothing from the Alliance politicians and regards their schemes and antics with contemptuous amusement, it is glad to see them represented in the halls of legislation. By attacking the monopolists and exposing their conspiracies, the Alliance congressmen can render valuable service. Of course, even this negative work requires intelligence; whether they possess it or not, time will tell.

In a recent issue of the New York "Commercial Advertiser" appeared an article on the "Monocles of Anarchism." The sub-headings were: "Fostering an Order Whose Creed is Murder," and "The Doctrines and Decline of Those Beneficial Cowardly Anarchists." The article was signed "Coincident," but is believed to have been written by a well-known State Socialist. The newspaper organs of Anarchists are numerous, and Liberty is found side by side with the "Freihet," "Vorbote," and other revolutionary sheets. To prove that there is no difference between the teaching of the "Freihet" and Liberty, the writer exhibits the fact that at the latter's head a passage from Proudhon has been put proclaiming that the Revolution abolishes at once the sword of the executioner, the seal of the magistrate, etc., etc. I have no doubt that the writer is more of a knave than a fool, and that he knew very well that the word Revolution in Proudhon's passage means something different from the revolution on the lips of the revolutionary Communists. Such misrepresentations might come—may we hope that the "Herald" will remember a few years ago; but now we can afford to ignore them.

Sidney Olivier, of the Fabian Society, attacked in a letter the Parliamentary Socialism and expressed the opinion that the legislative eight-hours day, factory inspection, and the multiplication of State regulations, if they do not remain a dead letter, may do more to extend the jealousy and antagonism between the public and the officials than to promote the growth of Socialist ideas and tendencies. For his part, he shrinks from the prospect of the enormous army of officials which would have to exist in order to carry out the Legislature's intentions, and favors the return to nature, to simple forms of life. It appears that other Fabians have independently arrived at the same conclusions.

The Boston "Herald" has made the remarkable discovery that there is more than one way to put a stop to the erection of exorbitantly high buildings in great cities. Referring to the failure of the Chicago municipal authorities to come to any definite conclusion on the subject, and to the action of the Chicago Fire Underwriters' Association in putting a prohibitory insurance rate on buildings of more than a certain height, the "Herald" remarks that such action as the company's is likely to be quite as effective as any municipal action. "Socialism" is emphatically a factory and city growth, and we can easily imagine the disgust of such practical politicians as Webb and Hyndman at this revolution to prevent itself. The "Herald" remarks that the question of freemen's rights is the basis of the argument, and that, while it is not so easily decided, it is yet much more important than the question of building height.

The editor of "Today" has grappled with the question of the property taxation. He deals with it in an argument spun out to a great length and stated very bluntly, not to say uninterestingly. After an expenditure of much time and earnest effort in an attempt to understand it, I can get nothing from it but this argument by number to show that I have extracted its sum and substance rightly,—that, while it is contrary to equal freedom to take an individual's property from him without his consent, equal freedom permits the community (whatever that may be) to refuse its protection in the use of natural media to the individual who declines to hand over to the community such portion of his property as it may ask. The editor of "Today" advances this consideration as if it were the only way with which to combat the Anarchists' position. But it does not in the least. Why say an undisputed thing in such a solemn way? To be sure, the editor of "Today," by an assumption that the community's protection is an absolute necessity to the individual, makes the individuals' consent to part with his property a matter of absolute necessity also, and thereby reduces the question of the freemen's rights to that of a question of a position of no importance. But the community's protection is not admitted. The Anarchists maintain, on the contrary, that it is quite within the bounds of possibility for a non-consenting minority to protect itself in the use of natural media without the aid of the consenting majority, provided the majority consents itself with a simple refusal of such aid. If it were granted, it is claimed that equal freedom entitles the majority to go farther than this and dispossesses the minority of its lands as a penalty for not giving up its consent to the ascription. But at present I refuse to believe that the editor of "Today" will follow his master, Spencer, so absurd a conclusion.
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Col. Ingersoll's Antiquarian "Unit." How can a Free-thinker accept and attempt to propound a principle that has received the unqualified theoretical and practical sanction of the Christian Church, and whose recent inception in every nation, is the destruction and degradation of the half of humankind? Yet the Free-thinker who belaids the principle professed to be, especially those of liberating and elevating society; and, I believe, in marriage, that he who contemns the opinions of long-haired men and short-haired women who comemone the institution of marriage. The opening sentences of the passage quoted I give below, with the "True Seeker's" alterations.

Let me say right here tonight, I regard marriage as the holiest institution among men. Without the freelance there is no man advancement; without the family there is no life worth living, and every government is made up of good families. The unit of the government is the family; anything that tends to destroy the family is perfectly despicable and abominable. I believe in marriage, that he who contemns the opinions of long-haired men and short-haired women who comemone the institution of marriage. The opening sentences of the passage quoted I give below, with the "True Seeker's" alterations.

Does the "True Seeker" subscribe to the dictum that "the unit of government is the family," and does it believe that "every good government is made up of good families?" But what is a "good family?" If the family is the unit of government, if all of its members are but one in the eyes of government, then there must be that family, and when a slave is made to believe that government can take cognizance of the family. To enable the family to act as the "unit," as it is asserted to be there can be permitted no divided counsel; all subordinate persons must be held and questioned, and unqualified obedience to the head thereof. No family can be called a "good family" which lacks this sense of identity, and the family. No law less homogeneous than this can be a "unit," and any government constituted of such units will levy taxes on families only, never on individuals. It will conscript families, not individuals. All its punishments will fall upon families, through their acknowledged heads, never upon the individual wrong-doers.
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The Advizability of Violence.

To the Editor of Liberty.

When you refer to passive resistance, is it not precisely the same thing as what is commonly called non-resistance? William Penn (who was quite willing to take off his hat for the king) was certainly passive resistance; but as he made no attempt to touch the king's head, it is assumed as quite compatible with the Friends' non-resistance tenets. (1)

I do not think that any practical difference exists between passive resistance and non-resistance. Yet you urge that in emergency such must be resorted to. Why? In what emergency? If the first is a matter of principle, the second in cases only. The only condition under which such a course is justifiable is that the principle which is to be followed is one of a higher order than the immediate one.

E. C. WALKER.
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they are not. The considerations upon which he relies may be summed up as follows: they have not been seized for the purpose of suppressing robbery, but will not convince that abolition of the State will obviate the necessity of dealing violely with the other and more ordinary kinds of government of which common robbery is one. For, even when it is supposed that the existence of the robber State must eventually induce the disappearance of all other robbers, they will remember that effects, however certain, are not always immediate. It is true that, by the system of the Linseys, there are often serious difficulties that must be confronted.

(4) If Mr. Robinson still maintains that doing vio-

lence to those who let us alone is precisely parallel to doing violence to those who wish us ill, I can only modestly hint once more that I have a better eye for

an angle than he has.

(6) Not so, by any means. As long as nearly all people are agreed in their identification of the great majority of actions as harmonious with or counter to

equal liberty, and as long as in increasing number of people are extending this agreement in identification over a still larger field of conduct, the definition of the infringement of equal liberty, far from being vain, will remain an important factor in political progress.

(9) Because we see no imperious and overwhelm-

ing necessity for an immediate settlement of the question of the existence of the power......

(7) It seems that there are cases in which, according to the Linseys, we may resort to vio-

lence. It is now my turn to ask, Why? If he favors violence in one case, why not in all? I can see why, but not from his standpoint.

For my part, I don't care a straw whether, when Mr. Robinson sees fit to use violence, he uses it for a good or for a bad purpose. The main question is: Does he think it wise under some cir-

stances to use violence, or is he too much of a prac-

tical Architec that he would not save his child from the clutches of the Public Murderer by splitting the murderer's head.

Plum-Line Pointers.

We see the, unhappy Yankee, and all the rest of the unhappy Yankees! It is against the anti-Lottery law to gamb. So far as I know, Anthony Comstock says so, and who could doubt his word? Rather he says that it is un-

lawful for a merchant to offer a prize to the person who guesses the nearest to the actual number of seeds in a handful. This will not do, because he is not directly forbidding me to guess, but it does so indirectly, for if the government can intercept and con-

fiscate the dollar which Smith sends to the Louisiana Lottery Company, they can intercept and confiscate the game which I try to give into the keeping of the pumpkin-mill-exhibiting merchant. And if the merchant does not venture to offer a prize to the expert guesser, what is the use of my puzzling my brains over the number of seeds in a pumpkin or beans in a jar? By the way, dear Mr. Anthony Comstock, is it not unlawful to attempt to guess what salinity you and the rest of the government will be guilty of next?

The Chimnian is no fool. If he cannot come to this coun-

try as an immigrant, he will not come as an exhibitor.

There are worse people coming from Europe every day than the Chimnian. We give them welcome, and the first we know they turn up as Anarchists, toasting around dynamite boxes. It is to the credit of the Chimnian that he never does this. — Pucktimes.

No, the Chimnian is not a fool; neither is he a

Ricksplitt. His refusal to take part in the World's Fair is easily dignified, and a timely rebuke to our ambition to make everybody think we are the most important people in the world. It is to the credit of the Chimnian that he never does this. — Pucktimes.

Light and Darkness.

GEORGE FOREST.

I sat out on the hurricane deck of the evening boat from Long Branch and watched the gentle rolling of the sea and the slowly falling stars. I saw the stern as it cut heavily through the waves. The sunset colors were deluging the sky andf the ship. The entire scene was a radiant splendor, and through the wave-like flecks of the clouds groups of light, streaming their rainbow colors over the transparent blue of the ocean and bathing the dark-green of the shore with opal tints.

It was beautiful. I turned to see if others were looking also.

I was crowded, and, up close to the pilot's cabin, where I was seated, I noticed a young couple. It was evident they were lovers; and the delicate intoxication which comes over lovers when they are near to each other yet do not speak could be read on their faces. Each knew the other's thoughts, and together they silently watched the sunset.

The colors were changing now, and the rainbow-tinted rays grew dim; but the clouds remained beautiful and tossed the colors about in glorious evolution. I watched the deli-

cete blending of the light till it began to fade, drawn in by its mother, the sun. Then I turned to look at the lovers.

They were still gazing steadily at the sunset, in silence, but a tinge of sweet sadness had come over their faces as the light slowly faded, and I knew that the intoxication of their silent conversation was fading as the color of the evening sky.

Only a long blue of gold now marked where the sun had disappeared, and it was a moment in the soft opal tints which bring the day to a close. The violet colors of night were rapidly effacing the clear outlines of objects on shore, and the moon was half dark.

And I looked at them.

To me they were an ideal picture—a gentle love- poem which I was reading. A man at my side was whispering to a friend, and I heard the sentence: "They are too be married soon." I felt in my own poem was finished. I arose and walked back to the stern.

Before me the ocean spread all in blackness.

A Patriotic Proposal.

[continued]

An exuberant editor in the Lockport "Union," extolling the star spangled banner, ends in the following fashion: "These can be and must be but one flag in this country, and let that flag wave from every schoolhouse in the land." If sufficient private sentiment, or patriotism, or desire for dis-

tinguished, the public body be opened and de-

fested. These showy and noisy and spontaneously patriotic people, who advocate schemes of this sort, generally end up by fighting over their own imaginations into their own pockets. Like-o, not a few papers and individuals that profess to believe in economy favor projects of this nature, because the tax bill is supposed to cover the expenses. When any project involving a superfluous or extravagant outlay is presented, vote it down. Individuals may be as liberal as they please, but when it is attempted to make sentiment the ex-

cuse for enlarging the tax budget, it is time for a popular veto. The theory that a flag over a schoolhouse would au-

thenticate the virtue and patriotism of pupils is exceedingly extravagant. It is the instruction inside instead of the deco-

rations on the top of a schoolhouse that leaves its indelible impress upon a pupil.
Just Published.

THE ANARCHISTS.

A Picture of Civilization at the Close of the Nineteenth Century.

BY JOHN HENRY MACKAY.

Translated from the German by GEORGE SCHMID.

A poet's prose contribution to the literature of philosophical and sociological Anarchism. "A poem that unfolded the 'prophecy' of the future development in London amid the exciting events of 1876... the masterpiece of a poet and a social thinker." - John H. Mackay. Published as a companion volume to "The Anarchist's March," the translation was published at the request of the Anarchist Center in Chicago. The antagonism between Commission and Association sharply brought out. One of the world's great artists places his pen at the service of Anarchism.
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