On Picket Duty.

The failure of Liberty to make its appearance last week was due to an illness of the editor, from which he has now recovered.

The competition for the files of Liberty resulted as follows: First choice, taking the complete unbound file, $40.25, the bid offered by an Individualist, New York; Second choice, $21, offered by Charles Greenhalgh, Denver, Colo.; Third choice, $16, offered by William Stroud, Sturgis, Mich.

The paragraph which was copied in the last number of Liberty from an article by Hugo Böhm in the "Twentieth Century," though perfectly just in its general arraignment of the unreasonable attitudes and methods assumed by the laborers and their leaders, was utterly unjust. I am now convinced, in its especial application to Burgess McLuckie of Homestead. That this particular labor leader is one of the most open-minded of men I have just had very good evidence. He called on me lately as he was passing through New York, and stated that he was very desirous of becoming acquainted with the principles of Anarchism. He said that his tendencies were strongly in the Anarchist direction, and that he wished to study the Anarchist literature in order that, if finally satisfied of the soundness of the doctrine, he might aid in expanding it among the iron and steel workers. Burgess McLuckie appeared to me a splendid specimen of the sturdy, frank, straightforward workman. He did not seem a man who would be a trick if he had the chance. My interview with him made me sure that my sympathies had not been misplaced.

A Suggestion.

My dear Mr. Tucker,

For a long time it has seemed to me a thing much to be desired that some one should write a book clearly setting forth the body of ideas which most of us have been laboring to place before the public. I know of nothing that does more for the progress of Liberty than a well-written and well-arranged book such as the one you have referred to.

The book should be widely circulated, and it should be read by people who have no sympathy with the ideas it contains. It should be written in a clear and concise style, and it should be free from technical jargon.

Yours truly, your obedient servant,

[Signature]

Compulsory Education and Anarchism.

To the Editor of Liberty.

While reading your latest editorial on the subject of compulsory education in America, I could not help thinking that a book on the subject would be very useful. The arguments used in defense of compulsory education are often weak and unsatisfactory. I believe that a book on the subject would be a valuable addition to the literature of education.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

The Strike is Lost.

The strike is lost, and Dick's the sneak. That sold us for a bribe today,

He got more blood-money this week
Than months of honest pay.

The strike is lost, don't run, boy, don't run!
And scrunch o'er your comrade's head;
Your master's grinning, and I don't blame him, your spunk is dead.

The strike is lost, as strikes must be sometimes, they are no lasting cure
For hunger, slums, monopoly.
The ill which you endure.

The strike is lost; but it been won,
Your pulpit gain with low content
You'd take, and think the battle done.
And sleep within your tent.

The enemy would have you then
As often he has had before,
And he'll pick off your leading men
And show them to the door.

Don't cringe and cower upon your knees
To go to hell in the old mill;
They'll take most of you by degrees:
If not, trait work you will.

The strike is lost, boys, strikes don't hit
The centre of affairs at all;
Rent, usury, interest (will a bit),
Are what oppress you all.

The land they own, boys, such big tomflows,
Bought cheap by Senators and rich;
Built with tall houses, whose foul dump clouds
Are play grounds? - Ask the rich.

The land they own, boys, but isn't fair
That ever the more should hold:
The earth, while workers have no where
To live when they grow old.

The strike is lost, boys, - God! they're gone,
Running like beasts to the mill;
I'm talking to myself alone,
Their folly makes me ill.

Miriam Dammell
Children Under Anarchy.

Nearly the whole of this issue of Liberty is devoted to the important question of the status of the child under Anarchy. The long article by Clara Dixon Pashley has been in my desk, unopened, for several months. On examining it the other day, I was surprised and delighted to find that a woman had written such a bold, unprejudiced, unsentimental, and altogether rational essay on a subject which women are especially prone to treat emotionally. I am even ashamed a little by the hesitating way in which she eliminates from the problem the fancied right of the child to live. My own difficulties, I fear, have been largely due to a lingering trace of this superstition. The fact is that the child, like the adult, has no right to life at all. Under equal freedom, as it develops individuality and independence, it is entitled to immunity from assault or invasion, and that is all. If the parent neglects to supply this, it does a child's right by oblige any one else to support it. If others give it support, they do so voluntarily, as they might give support to a neglected animal; there is no more obligation in the one case than in the other.

I also welcome as important Comrade Bailie's contribution to the discussion. In one view the question of the status of the child under Anarchy is a trivial one, — trivial because the bugbears that surround it are hypothetical monsters, and because such ugly realities as do actually confront us are less formidable than the false social conclusions which Anarchy induces. Even at present comparatively few parents are disposed to abuse or neglect their children, and in the absence of poverty and false notions of virtue their number will be infinitesimal and may be safely neglected. The question is one that vanishes as we approach it.

The chief value of its discussion is found in the light which it throws on the matter of equal freedom. Hence I am glad that it was brought forward by my friend the school-teacher, whose questions I answered in No. 232, and who now rejoins with the following letter:

To the Editor of Liberty:

g. w. e.

My friend misapprehends me. When the interferer of third parties is justifiable, it is not so because of the superior importance of the child's physical integrity as compared with that of the parent who mutilates himself, but because the child is potentially an individual sovereign. The man who mutilates himself does not impair equal freedom in the slightest, but the parent who mutilates his child assaults a being which, though still limited in its freedom by its dependence, is daily growing into an independence which will establish its freedom on an equality with that of others. In this doubtfule stage the advisability of interference is to be decided by necessity, since, so far as we can see at present, it cannot be decided by principle. It is necessary to stop the parent from cutting off his child's finger, because the danger is immediate and the evil certain and irreparable. It is not necessary to prescribe the conditions of virtue with which a parent shall surround his child, because the danger is remote (it being, as I understand, a case of time to induce the child to change his course), the evil is uncertain (the child often proving sufficiently strong in character to rise above its conditions), and the results are not necessarily permanent (as later conditions may largely, if not entirely, counteract them). In the former case, physical force must be met with physical force. In the latter case, it is safer and better to meet moral (or immoral) force with moral force. I am afraid that my friend is not yet a sufficiently good Anarchist to appreciate the full significance of Proudhon's declaration that Liberty is the Mother of Order, and the importance of securing education through liberty wherever practicable instead of through compulsion.

I do not think that my friend's formulars are capable of scientific treatment. When he tells me that "every individual has a right to and must expect the result of his own nature," he lays down a proposition too vague for the purposes of science. I do not know what the words mean, and in any case I deny the alleged right. An individual has a right to the results of his own nature if he can get them; otherwise, no. Apart from this right of migil, no individual has a right to anything, except as he creates his right by contract with his neighbor.

Relations Between Parents and Children.

The wisdom of acts is measured by their consequences. The individual's measure of consequences is proportional to the circle of his outlook. His horizons may lie so near that he can only measure at short range. But, whatever they be near or far, he can only judge of consequences by their influence on himself. The Emancipation of Enslaved Cor. 2 is, as your editorial implies, the fact that its violation will result in shuddering off upon others some unwelcome consequence of the parents' (propagative) conduct.

It is not always possible to apply the theoretical deductions of science; but that need not deter her devotees from trying to state and prove, as completely as possible, the reasons for reform or confront the difficulties involved by the "Cimmerian darkness" of one of the most important problems in social ethics. If the statement of Cor. 2 above, is not accurate, I ask you, as my first instructor in this subject, to tell me where it is inaccurate, and why: if it is accurate, it furnishes a basis for the relation between Family and Society as firm and clear as the Law of Equal Freedom does for Society alone. We must not confine ourselves to a single equation that represents the several phases of child-guardianship.

The law of equal freedom, "Every one is free to do whatsoever he wills," appears to me to be the primary condition to happiness. If I do the remainder of Herbert Spencer's celebrated law of equal freedom, I shall only risk being misrepresented by persons who cannot understand that the opening affirmation includes what follows, since, if any one did infringe upon the freedom of another, all would not be equally free.

Liberty without intelligence rushes toward its own extinction continually, and continually rescues itself by the knowledge born of its own analysis.

Intelligence without liberty is a mere potentiality, a nest-full of unhatched eggs.

Progress, therefore, presupposes the union of intelligence and liberty. Freedom to act, wisdom to guide the action.

Equal freedom is the primary condition to happiness. Intellligence is the primary condition to equality in freedom.

Liberty and intelligence acting and re-acting upon each other produce growth.

Thus growth and happiness are seen to be, if not actually synonymous, almost inseparable companions.

Where equal freedom is rendered impossible by disproportion in degree of development, the hope of the higher units lies in the education of the lower.

Children, because of the negative elements of inharmony, hindrances to equal freedom. To quicken the processes of their growth is to contribute toward the equilibration of social forces.

Then, liberty being essential to growth, they must be left as free as is compatible with their own safety and the freedom of others.

Just here arises my difficulty, which I freely admit. For the foundation of this is the opening of a Pandora's box, from which all things fly excepting adult judgment.

Who shall decide upon the permissible degree of freedom? Who shall adjust the child's freedom to its safety, so that the two shall be delicately, flawlessly balanced? The fecundity of these questions is without limit. Of them are born controversies that plague all the unregenerate alike, whether they be philosophers or the humblest truth-seekers.

Christian escape this toilsome investigation. Their faith in rulership simplifies all the relations of life.
Their conduct must not be consistent with equal freedom, since obedience, not liberty, is the basis of their ideal social welfare.

Reluctantly I admit that during infancy and to some extent in childhood others must decide what is for a child’s welfare.

The mother is a pitifully helpless and lamentably ignorant animal. It does not even know when it is hungry, but seeks the maternal breast as a cure-all for every variety of physical unhealthiness; therefore the mother’s food intake is to be determined by the amount of nourishment which it may safely receive and the length of time that may intervene between the tenders of supplies. That these judgments are far from infallible is very, very well known to the mother of five living children overexposed to that she had lost one child, starved it in the process of learning that her lactation furnished a substance little more nutritious than water.

Grand habe does not know the danger of touching a red-hot stove. How should it know? It is without experience. The mother’s impulse is to rescue the tender, white baby-hand. Is she wise in interposing this restraint? I think she is not. If the child has been made to have bayonet sentries always on guard between it and experience, it can only grow surreptitiously. I say “bayonetted” advisedly, since the hand interposed between the baby’s and the stove not infrequently emphasizes its power with a blow which gives more pain than the burn would have given, while its value as experience may be represented by the minus sign.

The mother is the depository of that power to provide for the needs of young children and of children to obey their parents and, in their age, to support them, so generally accepted that I shall arouse a storm of indignation. While a cursory glance at the subject may seem to show a denial of equal freedom in the refusal of a parent to support his child, a more careful study will reveal the truth that, as long as he does not hinder the activities of any one nor compel any other person to undertake the task which he has relinquished, he cannot be said to violate the law of equal freedom. Therefore his associates may not compel him to provide for his children’s needs any more than they may forbid their friend from deserting them from aggression; upon it. They may prevent acts; they may not compel the performance of actions.

It will, perhaps, be well to anticipate, at this point a question that death is always raised to those who find in life intolerable, and, so long as persons seek to prolong existence, they cannot properly complain of those who thrust it upon them. A young babe does not question, oh, whether it is going to hunger, whether it is going to饿 from the under the of a; and, should it, w’ a dawning intelligence, feel confused in mind or depressed in body by reason of its relations toward its environment, it will, by then, have learned the art of dying.

And now, having opened a gulf which swallows up, duty, shall I be able to aly the consternation of those who have substituted the work of child for their re- pated the doctrine of another substantial God? It has seemed to me, that, generally speaking, people’s love for their children is in inverse proportion to their love of God and duty. However, this may be, — and I will not add that, although parallel and pertinent, it is not directly in line of inquiry I am pursuing, — there is still left to us the certainty that increasing intelligence will more and more incline minds to the favorable consideration of their own acts; for duty’s sake, but in order to help establish and preserve that social harmony which will be necessary to their happiness.

Even in the present semi-barbarous condition of pa- ental relations it is exceptional, unusual, for parents to abandon their children, and the two distinct incen- tives to the abandonment will be removed by social evolution, leaving the discussion of the obligation of parents to care for their children purely abstract and rather unprofitable, since no one will refuse to do so.

The mother, I refer you, is poverty and fear of social obliquity. Married parents sometimes desert their children because they lack abundant means of subsistence; unmarried parents occasionally not only mothers, but fathers also, neglect their infants. In the absence of the nuance of the unintelligent who believe that vice is susceptible of transmutation into virtue by the blessing of a priest, and virtue into vice by the absence of the ministrations of religious works which I refer you to the subject of education.

Recognition of the law of equal freedom would nearly remove the first, render the second more endurable, and finally obliterate both, leaving parents without motive for the abandonment.

That parents usually find happiness in provision for the welfare of their young is well known. Even the habits of the lower animals afford evidence sufficient to establish that principle, which I refer you to the subject of social evolution.

The fee is the first, because the indispensable, requisite to welfare, but unintelligent and indiscriminate feed- ing results in thousands of deaths annually and sows seeds of chronic invalidism in millions of young stom- ache.

Clothing also is considered indispensable, and is so in rigorous climates, but the primary object of covering the body, which is to make it comfortable, is usually attainable in the way of conforming to accepted ideals of beauty, ideals often in- volving peculiar departures from normal forms.

Sleight is a necessity which is often accompanied by such seerous misfortune that fresh air as pure as those between in-door and out-door life is uncertain balance.

But the sturdiest pursuits and the drearest failures and failures are found in educational endeavors.

The blink- ing eyes cannot deceive which is nearer, the lengthier tape on the table or the moon seen through the window. He does not know that a Riverside orange is larger than the pomegranate. The truth was trans- lated by repeated efforts to grasp it. He has all things to learn: ideas of dimension, weight, heat, moisture, density, resistance, gravitation, — all things in their inter-relations and their relations to himself. And what baffling assistance he receives in the bewildering path through this tangle of truth!

He learns that God sends the rain, the hail, and the sunshine. He learns that his little sister was brought from heaven by an angel and deposited in a doctor’s pill-bags. The tie of relationship between her and himself remains a mystery. Anthropomorphism abounds in the truth which children are taught.

He asks many questions which his teachers cannot an- swer, and, unwilling to confess their ignorance, they constantly refer: “God did it,” as if that were an answer.

Turning from unsuccessful inquiries concerning nat- al phenomena, perhaps the child perceives, in a dim way, his relations with the State, and, as God posed it before it, the other persons in the community. He does not do justice to his questioning now in chief- poten government.

“Why does no one prevent the man with a star from clubbing the other man?”

“Because he is a policeman.”

“Who said that a policeman might strike people?”

“The government.”

“What is the government?”

“The government is, — my son, you will learn when you are older.”

“Who pays the policeman for clubbing the other man?”

“The government.”

“Where does the government get the money?”

“You will learn when you are older.”

“Usually a little sooner, or, even earlier, a child’s education is practically abandoned by its insuffi- cient parents and entrusted to the church and the State. The State uses money robbed from the parents to perpetuate its power of robbery by instructing their children to the same end.

The church, also, uses its power to perpetuate its power. And those to whom, as “Olives,” it has ap- ply devoted them to the self-interested robbers and murderers, are the tender minds of babies entrusted for education.

Herbert Spencer has shown that the status of women and child and wife improves in proportion to the decline of militarism and the advance of industrialism. The military spirit is encouraged in multifold ways by both church and State, which contemplate without the brutalities of authority, excepting in some cases of extrac- onal cruelty, and teach the helpless victims that it is their duty to submit.

The next generation of these beings will be seen absurd and outrageous if expropriated an unpre- pared adult mind and stripped of all those devices of language by which the various prominences of shame, guilt, nature, ignorance, or deceit impel us to soften the truth.

Say to such an one:

“Murder by the State is hirable; murder by an indi- vidual is criminal.”

“Robbery by the State is permissible; robbery by an individual is a serious offence against the person robbed and also against public welfare.”

“Murder by the State is justifiable; assault of the child upon the parent is intolerable.”

He would not look upon you with the simple con- fidence of a puzzled child, attributing the apparent disobediences to the feebleness of his own under- standing.

But to the child these bewildering social sophistries, flowing into his mind from sources that appeal to his nature, disorganized the ambiguities of language that serve to increase its difficulties, must appear hopeless verities of the mind.

Thus at every step from infancy to adult life his progress of the child is checked by the incapacity of those who govern him.

Inherited tendencies and the training which they bring forth are still fester. They become inexcusable wrongs in conscience of those who discipline and who for their life.

Parents beat their children, older children beat younger brothers and sisters, and the wee ones nave their wrongs vicariously by beating their dolls or their little brother.

Through individual revolts against the general bar- dards, revolts of increasing frequency and power, hu- manity gradually evolves above actual application of these revolts against savagery, when led by emotion, often result nearly as dis- tinguished as savagery itself.

Reason must be the basis of all enduring social

When reason shall have learned to rebel against in- equalities in liberties, and when this mental rebellion shall have become quite general, then will people have passed beyond danger of relapse into savagery.

Then parent and child shall not be master and slave, a relation distasteful to reasoning people, but they shall be friend and friend. There will be no restrictions as to class, as are absolutely necessary, and these will not take the form as and will be re- moved as early as possible.

Examples of such restrictions as I mean are:

Detention from the brink of a precipice or an open well or the track of a locomotive, or of one child from striking another.

Parents who recognize the fundamental principle of happiness through freedom and intelligence will, gen- erally speaking, achieve results proportionate to the degree of their success in harmonizing their lives with this principle. The greater their intelligence the higher perfection will they reach in the interpretation and application of the law of reason within, and in preparing their children to attain harmonious relations with their environment.

**SUPPLEMENTARY,**

**How to handle children:**

I have said that infants have all things to learn. It would seem, and would be, superficial to repeat a fact so well known, were it not that most people flit
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