On Picket Duty.

Henry George's "Standard" has reluctantly given up the ghost. For some years it has been a very wheezy organ of a most asthmatic cause.

"The class of 'protected gentlemen' to which Messrs. Carnegie and Frick belong appear to be, of all human beings, the most impressed with the awful sanctity of their individual right to 'do as they please with their own.'" Though finding it in an authoritative article utterly unworthy of a Democrat and a son of a Democrat, I must credit Chauncey F. Black with this pithy and pointed sentence. It expresses very neatly and forcibly the truth that I have lately been trying to drive home,—that the Fricks and the Carnegies seek to enjoy property and liberty by depriving others of liberty and property.

Evidently the scientists do not propose to allow the Spiritualists, Theosophists, and Occultists a monopoly of the privilege of talking nonsense. I notice that men of established scientific reputation, in speculating upon the nature of the ether, announce their conception of it as a continuous body filling all space and in a state of vibration. It would be impossible to give utterance to a more patent absurdity, to frame a more glaring contradiction in terms. How is it possible for a body filling all space to vibrate? Where would it find room to do so? A body filling all space would be absolutely motionless, as a matter of necessity. Is science to be discredited by its devotees?

The capitalist newspapers are very fond of telling us that there are no class distinctions in this country; that here there is no cause for complaint, because all are equal before the law. I call the attention of the evil who edit these papers to the course of the health authorities of New York in regard to the passengers on the vessels now in quarantine on account of the cholera. The frantic request of the cabin passengers to be placed on a separate vessel has been granted.

Now, this action either increases or diminishes the chances of an epidemic. In the former case, of course it is utterly unjustifiable. In the latter case, it is justifiable and commendable; but the fact is thereby established that it would equally contribute to safety to place the well stevedore passengers on a separate vessel also. Yet not a word do we hear about them and their possible fate. They are left in the thick of the danger, to die of fright if not of the pest. Why? Simply and solely because they are poor, while the cabin passengers are rich. No class distinction.

tions, indeed! There are plenty of them on every hand, easily visible to all but the wide-awake, who can see only at night, when, before sleep if not before the law, all men are more or less equal.

The New York "Sun" has no sympathy with the optimism frequently passed upon Congress that it debates and deliberates eternally but rarely legislates. This, in the "Sun's" eyes, is a congressional virtue. It regards Congress as properly a great talking-machine, where all sorts of opinions may be ventilated, and when it sees these clashing opinions neutralize each other and then result in non-action, it is inclined to applaud rather than condemn. Congress is useful only as a safety-valve; as a law factory it is a nuisance. So far, so good; the "Sun" here, as in the Homestead matter, takes Anarchistic ground up to a certain point. But also, as in the Homestead matter, it does not take such ground until after the part of the mischief has been done which favors the interests of the brotherhood of thieves. As long as Congress devoted itself to the enactment of statutes bestowing privileges on capital, the "Sun" did not depreciate its legislative function. But when labor, instead of demanding the destruction of these privileges as it ought, foolishly calls for the enactment of new statutes giving it privileges also, the "Sun" straightway discovers that the sole duty of Congress is to talk. It is a discovery that would have been timelier at an earlier date. Nevertheless it is indisputably Anarchistic, and as such the Anarchists rejoice at it, while viewing the discoverer's motives with something more than suspicion. From this distrust of its sincerity the "Sun" can relieve itself only by taking the single consistent course that lies open to it, namely, by insisting that it is the duty of Congress, not only to make new laws, but to repeal all the laws that it has made hitherto. After which Liberty will unite with the "Sun" in championship of Congress against those who complain of it for talking only, always provided that it does talking at its own expense instead of taxing working-people to pay for its expenditure of wind.

Liberty once had occasion to hold up to some what merciless ridicule the etymology insisted upon by Mr. C. S. Griffin, a Communist-Anarchist who, desiring to wed Anarchy to force, declared that the term was derived from the words *ovul* and *arceh* and therefore meant "against government." He observed that it was derived from *ovul* and *arceh*, because, he said, "as means one," and therefore Anarchy, so derived, would mean Monarchy. At that time I thought it scarcely possible that Mr. Griffin's luminous learning could ever be paralleled. I was mistaken. The editor of the "Colliery Engineer" of Scranton, Pa., a rather pretentious technical journal devoted to mining engineering, must be accorded philosophic regard beside Mr. Griffin. In an editorial berating Anarchists in the usual slashing style, he too sheds the light of his vast research upon the vexed linguistic problem to which the political use of the word Anarchy has given rise. "The name given to the doctrines of this worse than criminal class," he writes, "is derived from the Greek, — a private, or ownership, or government, and its literal meaning is private government. This shows its direct opposition to our American popular government ideas. But the term Anarchist is in a sense a misnomer, for the followers of the doctrines of Anarchy profess to believe in no government. Isn't this delicious? The ignoramuss had probably heard at some time that the word Anarchy was built by prefixing the Greek *ovul* privative to *arceh*, and, supposing privative to mean private, he reached the conclusion that Anarchy literally meant private government and stored up this precious bit of science for future use. Opportunity arriving, he has brought it forth. The name of this scholar ought to be given to the world. I find from the pages of the "Colliery Engineer" that it is edited by Thomas J. Foster, Rufus J. Foster, and Alexander Dick. Of this trio the two who are not guilty should hasten to put in a disclaimer freeing them from the immortality which Liberty hopes to fasten upon this exhibition of asininity.

In Robes of Anarchy.

Truth come to me full oft in varying dress, And still she stood revealed in loveliness; To her alone I bowed; we two were wed; I vowed to love her living, aye, or dead.

Ah, great pure Soul! O Sun to which I turn, With hair of dazzling gold and eyes that burn! I knew you ever in each fresh disguise; Betrayed you were by splendor of those eyes. At last, not trim and as your wars, I see You in wind-driven robes of Anarchy. Men sneer and scorn, "Is this your Spouse?" but I am proud to be your Mate, though all deny.

Shame with her paint-pots white and red may take The cheeks of those for canvas who unmake Their vows; not mine on this score. Lead on; I follow fast, yea, if it be alone.

No blue-leaved laurel round a man's vain head You bind, Truth, if his fleet feet win with speed; Of all, you reward with cold embrace; Death crowns the Racer who outruns the Race.
regarded by the editor of the "Journal," who can see nothing in an except but "an arbitrary and dogmatic attempt to exclude principle from some particular nook or corner in which an institution of privilege has been lodged." Can he, then, blame us for suspecting the gravity and declining to recognize any force in his plea for an exception? His principle is, "no force save against force"; and we are bound to charge him with inconsistency when he declares in favor of invading the liberty of the non-aggressive person by his scheme of compulsory protection, — bound to pronounce him guilty of an "arbitrary and dogmatic attempt to exclude principle" from the corner in question. For, surely, it words carry any meaning at all, the formula, "no force save against force," is, and ought to be, the non-invasive person to ignore the State and set about protecting his legitimate freedoms in any way consistent with the general freedom.

Will the editor of the "Journal" allege that I beg the question in assuming that the individual who refuses to recognize the State is non-aggressive, ineffective? To anticipate this possible line of defence, it is but needful to adduce the consideration that, in relations between man and man, which the non-aggressive person is necessarily active. The man who remains passive is necessarily non-aggressive; to say that a passive man aggrades, or uses force, is an absurd contradiction in terms. The law, I am well aware, repudiates this distinction, and punishes purely passive men for failure to resist criminal acts of others; but it hardly needs pointing out that this is done in consequence and furtherance of the very principle the validity of which we call in question. The law does not recognize the right to ignore the State, and the consent of every individual to discharge the "duties of citizenship." Hence it will be manifestly improper to appeal to the law for a decision on a question relating to first principles of social coexistence. What the law does, is one thing; what it ought to do, and what we ought to get it to do, is quite another thing.

Perhaps, to eliminate chances of misinterpretation, it may be well to explain that, in calling upon the editor of the "Personal Rights Journal" to relinquish the principle of "no force save against force," I only join the ranks of avowed empirics, or else to retract his "except" and determine to take no further interest in "arbitrary and dogmatic attempts to exclude principle" from this or that corner, I do not intend to prescribe any definite and fixed line of immediate political action. Whether he deems it wise to put forth voluntary taxation as a practical issue or not, is immaterial. With his idea of political and social existence, the question is not one of practical politics, but of philosophical and scientific politics, or rather of ethical and social science. What the Anarchists are after is an unimpeachable declaration from the individualists that the right to ignore the State is a logical deduction from the law of equal freedom, from the principle of no force save against force. Those who subscribe to this position are Anarchists, philosophical Anarchists; while those who withhold their assent are clearly not Anarchists; and the interesting point to settle is whether they are philosophical and consistent, or otherwise.

I cannot do better than conclude by quoting the sentence following the one I have used as a text for the above. "For our own part," the editor of the "Personal Rights Journal" goes on to say, "we have an unwavering faith in the French proverb which may be roughly Englished: 'It is but the first step which costs anything'; and, in other words, it requires but a single contradictory instance to destroy, and individual proposition. Admirable, but strange and incongruous on the lips of a believer in equal liberty who yet claims to find a theoretical justification for compulsory membership in the political body.

v. y.

An Ignorant Cobdenite.

A writer in the August "Westminster Review," in referring to that truly marvellous discovery of certain "scientific" protectionists that "trade between nations is illegitimate if it runs along parallels of latitude, but legitimate along any meridians of longitude," remarks that "we seem to be listening to economical absurdities worthy of Ruskin himself." The writer is as ungrateful as he is ignorant. Ruskin is to be debited with many fallacies and absurdities, but to the critical student of his thought it is easy to prove that Ruskin's fallacies spring from religious, political, or ethical prejudices and fancies. So far as economic principles are concerned, Ruskin's grasp and penetration are perhaps unequalled. He is certainly misled by pet notions into vehement advocacy of unscientific as well as unnatural arrangements or institutions; but the superstructure is not the foundation. It is perfectly safe to challenge the writer, or any other detractor of Ruskin, to adduce a single instance of his fallacies amongst economic principles on the part of the latter. It is to this particular case of free-trade versus tariffs, no writer can be mentioned who has done more valiant service for the cause of common sense and freedom than Ruskin. His defence of free trade, far more brilliant in style than Bastiat's, has the additional merit of being profound and utterly free from such shallow assumptions as vitiate the "Economic Harmonies." Nothing can be found in the extensive literature on the subject to match the "dialogue" which Ruskin appeals to one of his critics, and which, if men were rational, would be regarded as the final settlement of the controversy. It is impossible to express in polite language the feelings aroused by the spectacle of an author of an indifferent piece of writing in favor of free trade presuming to assign Ruskin's rank in economical discussion and to sneer at his "absurdities." v. y.

A Singular Misunderstanding.

I have been shown a postal card from an English Socialist, who, though he claims to have read Liberty a long time, writes as follows regarding it: "I cannot understand Liberty. How can they reconcile the fact of private ownership and perfect freedom? It seems to me that, if a section monopolize land and means of production, the remainder cannot be free. I read Mackay's 'Anarchists' some months ago and derived a great deal of good from its scathing criticism of modern society, but could not agree with the conclusions he drew. They are an unwarrantable attack. Mackay's ideal seems to be complete laissez-faire and the gospel of getting on at all costs." I am reluctant to believe that this gentleman, who, I am told, is very intelligent, "cannot understand Liberty," but
youth of to-day. But if I must defend myself from you, a giant, sir, let me hide behind a giant, and bid you fight a man your own size. Michael Field, the poet, has said: "It is important to defend and preserve enthusiasm that he has written a long classic drama of the entitled "Callirhoë." Proverbs approved by centuries have gained a pass- word through generations, and suddenly it seems to cry, "Halt! and examine the credentials of illustrious sayings; nevertheless I have a suspicion that folly speaks into many an ear arrayed in robes of wisdom. "Still waters run deep," but not always, since deep waters run still; also, deep waters are not always still, Niagara makes a little sound, we are told; and we must compel the saying to back from its universal statement. The" still waters run deep." When it loses its previsions, we reply: Very good, some deep waters are noisy and turbulent with superabundant energy. Wasted force, my utilitarian friends might say,—planes run deep," plate-like; for to see children playing and set the wind to grind their flour. To some of us there is joy in the sound of the strength of Idle waters, pleasure in looking at the child's idle play and in hearing fence which, lapid total and dauntless, laughed my agent inexcusable to man? Energy cannot be wasted. There is a circle of economy about which we cannot escape. "Hell is paved with good intentions." True again, but so also is Hell then look further for the difference in the ways. Hell is paved with discarded good intentions or with those crushed by adverse forces. Heaven is paved with good intentions which developed into good action or at any rate molded the life with great love into good of itself. This saying, however, does not seem to me to bear immediately on enthusiasm. Intentions, good or ill, are not necessarily enthusiastic; a horse cannot yet carry the evil springs from lack of imagination and poverty of reason, one is drifting away from the matter in hand. The enthusiasm which must not foam and bubble, the flat beverage which you prefer because you have noticed its sobriety, does not seem interesting, and its use may also work for coercion or abet and is not good in itself. If life is intense and healthy, it can afford to be exuberant, and yet can accomplish more than the "partially alive." A student crowd his books with concentration towards a prize, alternating his study with regular sport in the gymnasium, but he came out second to the danger from enthusiasm. Each possesses poor Humanity by his own method. Again, this determination you speak of is by no means invariably admirable. If there is, on the hand, a risk of feeble folly in one species of enthusiasm, the men who abandon any mine before exhausting it, there is, on the other hand, an equally disastrous possibility of your quiet persistent man of the deep currents continuing to mine in a hopeless groove. Perhaps on the whole there is more to be said for the person who shows a capacity for growth and progress in leaving standpoint after standpoint than for the man who does not progress, but clinging to a reason that he has been disproved, as Prof. Owen, for example, clung to his scientific fallacy in classification. In regard to the needlessness of the praises of enthusiasm I may point out that Mr. Bulloch in his re- cent article, "Hurting a Bubble," appeared to think that enthusiasm must be discarded (instead of being ill- rected) in order to work well. Enthusiasm, or force, as he termed it, is not opposed to truth, and cannot be discarded, though it may be transmuted. If it is to be discarded, there is but one means to that end, scepticism, which I can scarcely think Mr. Bulloch really possesses. Recently it has become fashionable for young gentle- men to be "blow up." This the New York "Sun" stated in bold terms a few days ago: "The enthusiasm is seldom a real enthusiasm, but a nervous excitement which expresses and helps to mold the enervated

A Defender of Capital.

[Henry Maine in the Radical]

In an interview related by the "Figaro," M. Schen- der [the Carnegie of France], who seems not to know about industrial philosophy, has said that society is possible without interest on money. It is curious to see how easily people believe in the necessity of things to which they are accustomed. I once knew a young per- son who had been living for a long time on a sum due, not to his labor, but to his money, and was never having been outside Montmartre, had the greatest difficulty in the world in accepting the idea that the houses of Paris do not continue to the end of the earth.

Numerous societies have existed in which money did not bear interest. In these societies any interest what- ever was called usury. And, when M. Schender gets indulgent at this word, I confess that I scarcely understand his indignation. Where does usury begin? At what rate do I cease to be a honest man and become a usurer? Does nobody try to get the meat that he can for his money? Then one man is as good as another, and whoever has a sum due, not to his labor, but to his money, is a usurer.

M. Schender imagines that, if money did not bear interest, its possessors would put it in their safes and go to look at it every morning. I do not believe anything of the sort. I suppose it is the reason that they would be obliged to spend it in order to live. Immense fortunes are made solely and precisely because money bears interest, and, if money did not bear interest, there would be (I will leave it to the bankers) no fortunes large enough to permit any one to fold his arms and contemplate them. Then, when, M. Schender points us to the rajas piling up gold and precious stones, he forgets that these kings have had their day, and these precious stones only because they have ground down laborers, and not because they have labored. Therefore the com- parison is not at all applicable to a society in which all men labor.

But then, just as my young person, who had always seen houses, could not believe that there were fields without houses, so M. Schender cannot conceive of a society without immense fortunes. "There is no difference," he says, "between private capital and what you call social capital. Here is a million, I build a factory, my million passes from my hands, I have used it to pay my laborers; my private capital has become social capital."

"No," they answer him, "for you still have it in the form of your factory; that factory, built by your laborers, will, in the end, belong to all.

M. Schender admits this, but it is this that he calls the life of capital. It seems to me especially the easy life of the capitalist. "But," he exclames, "let one of my workmen take away twenty sons every day; he will derive his income from the sons who are left. There will be a capital,
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