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NOT THE DAUGHTER BUT THE MOTHER OF ORDER.

"For always in the eyes, O Liberty!" "Shake that high light where'er the world is astir; And though they say we, we will fight in this." —JOHN BAY.

A Concept of Political Justice.

Mr. J. W. Sullivan of the "Twentieth Century" has put in pamphlet form an article written for his paper with the above title. In the front-note he expresses the hope that his essay will serve 'as a means of guiding the national mind toward Anarchist fire. But let the dissolving hosts who might have assailed it passed around it eyes shut, singing loosely poems to liberty. It rejokes that many "society that is separate and the nation looks up embryonic creatures; he watches in silence their development, hoping that, if not they, whose thoughts they help to awaken will advance to the higher plane of pure Anarchism. Mr. Sullivan would not expect criticism from these, for, while they approve of his ultimate aim, they hold his methods in abhorrence. Yet for fear Mr. Sullivan should "conceive" that his argument is unanswerable, I shall venture a few remarks. Had he entitled his essay "A Concept of Social Justice" and refrained from any attempt to base political government upon this principle, it would have been sound Anarchist argument. Here is where his "concept" proved an abdication; there are no facts in the origin or history of government showing that such a conception ever was or ever could be a reality. He fails to see that the very essence of government is diametrically opposed to each one of these. Now the fact that Mr. Sullivan, being well acquainted with the writings of Anarchists, ignores this fundamental position, gives rise to a suspicion that he hopes to receive distinction by occupying a neutral ground which his fears would be denied him in the camp of the politician or Anarchist. Mr. Sullivan begins his "concept" with the predicate that man's freedom must of necessity be limited in society to prevent others from perfect isolation. When two come together, the liberty of each is abridged. Inasmuch as the two could not occupy the same space at once. Passing the absurdity of such a desire on the part of each, I contend that such a conception is fallacy. Society has no need or right to invade or curtail man's liberty unless it can be shown that its crowded condition, monopolized wealth, and monopolized ideas are necessary to the freedom. This idea, I believe, arise from a misconception of the term liberty. Mr. Sullivan seems to regard it as including the right to invade the equal freedom of another, or, as is commonly said, the liberty to do wrong. But any definition of liberty not entirely consistent with equal freedom is wrong and not to be entertained. Mr. Sullivan's conception of liberty is equated by his conception of politics. He defines politics as "having reference to the general and permanent relations between man and man." While this was necessary for the purposes of his "concept," it is utterly false in point of fact. Politics has "reference to the general and permanent relations between man and government," and government is the only authority that can make this "reference." Mr. Sullivan might as well have used the term religion as politics; the social relations between man and man are as foreign to one as the other. The political "concept" is nothing but a thing of words. It is superior, stronger, rectitude, and superior power, in a word, supreme authority; and it is simply impossible to reconcile it with any conception of justice or of right and wrong. "In the light of the idea of society and commerce of men. Mr. Sullivan says: "In applying this principle of equal freedom to civilize society as it exists to-day, we have established the most bases of a democratic State." But the "character of the character of the justice to be attained" makes this "democratic State" a different thing from government, and he practically nullifies his principle when he makes the individuals of his democratic State" the majority through taxation or otherwise, as a majority might deem necessary to preserve the conditions of justice, that is, to preserve the State. Wherein does this lead us? The real problem in the premise of all government. The trouble is that his "democratic State," like the State and government of reformers generally, is purely a conception of his own brain and never did and never can exist as a fact. Numerous critics in the "Twentieth Century" and other periodicals are continually striving to convince Mr. Sullivan of the mythical character of government. Illustrating in various ways that it is a sovereignty that exists only in name, while others plainly state their belief that the brother man's. It is a parasite upon the body of society, and can no more be utilized than these pests which invest the human form and which have been supposed to subdue man because they are. Mr. Sullivan cannot or will not see the point which the Anarchist strives to concentrate his attention upon: this sovereignty behind government or God, and which is immemorial, he wholly ignores, making it synonymous with society, public opinion, majority-rule, and civilization. It cannot be ignored, he says, it must be reformed. "Observing the evolution of man in various parts of the world," and the man who is flat and uninteresting, he can believe that the government is reformed, the more it is spread out as to include in its machinery a greater number of people, the more liberty is evolved and the less the individual the happier man becomes. One of his critics observed that government is undergoing de-generation, and in answer Mr. Sullivan acknowledged the truth of the observation and thought that government will become extinct. In the mean time he "sees a political party largely united with its own sentiment, and really looking to his own first of practical aims; he accepts the idea that the basis of that party, and of that party's superstitions, retaining his right of criticism," etc. To enter upon an argument showing the absurdity of prolonging Anarchist sentiment by joining a political party would be an insult to the intelligence of Liberty's readers. Just imagine the wondrous influence a man must possess who, "half sea over," and with the neck of a whisky bottle projecting from his coat tails, holds forth to an audience on the beauties of temperance and total abstinence. The moment a man steps into the ranks of a political party, he must follow the fife and drum of that party; he cannot reject its superstitions, but must instead give aid and comfort to them. He may retain his right of criticism, but it avails him nothing. He has no more right to protest than the gambler who stakes his money on the turning of the cards. "He must abide the hazard of the die." In conclusion, let me say as an apology for occupying Liberty a valuable space with so idle a criticism, it is really no subject for "Anarchist fire." The point I wished to emphasize was the misconception of the term government. While Mr. Sullivan has a perfect right to "conceive" any state or condition of society that his prolific brain may give birth to, he has no right to call it government unless he invests it with that sovereign authority which all governments possess. Chambers' Encyclopaedia says: "It is of the essence of every government that it shall represent the supreme power of the State, and that it shall thus be capable of subjecting every other will in the community, whether that of an individual or of a body of individuals, to its own will. It is implied in the idea of a government that it shall be politically responsible to no human power. Government possesses a right which politically is also unlimited, — the right, namely, of injuring the relations between citizen and citizen. It is of its essence that its scrutiny should be as irresistible as the execution of its decrees." Realizing the importance of this point in the controversy between the "Twentieth Century," I sought in a short essay to place it before the readers of that paper, but was informed that it could not be admitted unless "cut down to a correspondence," — in other words, cut out so that it was not a reprint of the obituary of the waste basket. A. L. BALLOU.

BUFFALO, N. Y.

To Any Natural Child.

Sweat, labor, when the ignoble scorn and blame They for thy birth, and cry: "Thou hast no name; Thou art the child of vice and of shame." Ignite them, walking on the world's highway Full of great purpose; or, if thou shouldst stay To answer such poor Custom's whippings, say: "A name is but a sound to mark a thing Conventionally for thought; can it make sing? The silent snake or give the worm a wing?" The only name of worth is that I make By my own kindly deeds for my soul's sake: Illustrative men have walked the path I take.

Who reads the verses of Boccaccio And then reviles him as a base of woe, Or taunts him as a bastard base and low? Who looks at Filippo Lippi's saint With grateful heart forgets that he was Wrought by a hand men say had a birth taint. And who are those, children of sires unwed, Born of delirious Love the world wished dead, About whose forehead fame is girded?" Catherine the First, De Castro, and Carbury, James Berwick and John Burgoyne, Athetan, And Archelaus the Macedonian.

Abamat, and too many more of fire And force, for me to name, since I desire Neither your foolish favor nor mad love.

Rev. Par. (New).
Liberty.
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From One of the Old Guard.

Dear Mr. Tucker:

Of course I shall want your book. I hope you will publish it as a separate volume. It will prove of great value, I am sure. As one of the old guard, I anticipate great pleasure in re-reading previous memorials, as I pore over your pages, while many of those who will read the book for the first time will receive new light, and so help hasten the better day. Put me down for two copies. Yours sincerely,

GEORGE S. SICKM.

Shall Specks Shelter Scamps?

It has long been admitted by common minds, and (it is necessary to confess) by most minds above the common, that a man may record upon paper the most villainous intentions, inscribe across this record a letters, s, i, p, r, t, v, arranged in the following order, p, r, i, v, s, t, e, and this record to another unsuspected, and thereby, under the shield of the obligation which this mystic combination of letters is supposed to enforce upon the recipient of the document, perpetrate with the latter's connivance, immunity and impunity, the very villanies to the plotting of which he has confessed. I am glad the opportunity has come to me to strike this superstition in the face.

In Liberty of September 15 I printed an editorial in which I expressed my gratification at the appearance in the Democratic platform of an unequivocal declaration in favor of free banking, but at the same time proved by indisputable evidence taken from the Democratic campaign literature that the majority of the declarations was not to be trusted, and that it would be extremely unwise to confide the experiment of free money to Democratic hands. The publication of this article brought me a letter from the author of the campaign literature, Mr. J. Whidden Graham, which concluded thus:

"I am beginning to doubt whether you are really more anxious for the spread of scientific principles of government than to air your own anarchistic formulas. You must not despise something without examining it, even if we Democrats do take up our free trade, free money, and — many of us — free land.

"In the middle of the letter was imbedded this precious bit of advice:

"Don't be so silly as to kick against a step in the direction of freedom because we fail to see it as to a lot of rubbish about the revolutions which States may impose on their banks.

"The letter was marked "Private." After its receipt I at once wrote to Mr. Graham, informing him that I considered the closing paragraph of his letter a personal insult and terminating my acquaintance with him; which declaration occasioned a further interchange of letters, in which he vainly endeavored to explain away his impudence and his dishonesty.

Next, reflecting that I now had in my possession an explicit and authoritative confession of the fraudulent political scheme in which the Democrats were about to get out a fine edition. It will prove of great value, I am sure. As one of the old guard, I anticipate great pleasure in re-reading precious memorials, as I pore over your pages, while many of those who will read the book for the first time will receive new light, and so help hasten the better day. Put me down for two copies. Yours sincerely,

GEORGE SICKM.

Shall Specks Shelter Scamps?

It has long been admitted by common minds, and (it is necessary to confess) by most minds above the common, that a man may record upon paper the most villainous intentions, inscribe across this record a letters, s, i, p, r, t, v, arranged in the following order, p, r, i, v, s, t, e, and this record to another unsuspected, and
In concluding my comments upon this blackguard's letter, I have only to say that I await with no trepidation the results of his declared effort to change the opinions of my friends regarding my personal character. I venture to think that not one of his涨价ed statements and mine, would hesitate to make his confidant or to send me a "private" letter. But though there should be a thousand such, I should still pursue the even tenor of my way.

Ben. R. Tucker.

Class Distinctions.

To the Editor of Liberty:

It appears to me on charge of class distinction, growing out of the cholera panic, so far as Islip and Fire Island are concerned, is not well taken. New York has not put on the Islip more than she would be willing to bear herself, rather less. Fire Island, eight or more miles removed from the mainland, is set apart for sick passengers on — i.e., for a class of passengers amongst whom the cholera has not appeared; while the Islands in the bay, such as New York, Brooklyn, and Staten Island than Fire Island is to Islip, receive the mass of dirty and poorly-fed passengers amongst whom the cholera is a fact. Another point. Surely, you cannot pretend to a medical face that the disease has made every cabin of light passengers in the matter of compulsory bathing is other than one of dirt I arrived in port on the Gullin on the first of September. We had 600 steamer passengers, but no cholera. The Islands have been deserted, and this for the purpose of giving them a scrubbing; and, if I am bound to say, they would have received it as a defensive measure even under Anarchistic conditions, for a dirtier class of human beings than the Polish and Russian Jews, I never saw in my life. They simply reeked with filth. Whatever else first-class passengers may or may not be, they are at any rate, clean people physically.

E. E. Cook.

But as long as the clean poor are bathed and the dirty rich are not interfered with, there is a class distinction based on wealth. — Editor Liberty.

Government Assailed by a Bishop.

To the readers of Liberty the novelty of the following sentiments is not intrinsic, but arises from the significant fact that they were uttered in the wealthiest church in the United States, on the eve of Labor Day, by Right Reverend Hugh Miller Thompson, in a sermon entitled "Work and Pay," written and delivered at the request of the Church Association for the Advancement of the Interests of Labor, and now published as a pamphlet by Thomas Whittaker, 2 and 3 Bible House, New York.

"Labor, as such, has no rights. Capital, as such, has no right to take others' earnings, as such, has no rights, but also the millionaire, as such, has no rights.

Each side appeals to what is called "Government." I am sorry to see the use of that word in the Chilse way. It is so often used as a synonym for "advising" the people in the United States, that once I do not believe in "Governments." "The best government is that which goest least. As "one of your own poets," in quite another connection, "has said": "Government is the management of a community for its own order and peace, that each member of the community may be protected in his life, property, and good name. That absolutely is all that any government is needed for, — purely for the police duty internally among its own citizens. And outwardly as a protection against possible enemies. The first part of this duty has never been and is not now perfectly performed in any part of the United States. No community indeed in any part or age of the World has ever entirely performed the ordinary police duty of making life, property, and honor safe.

Governments have taxed, tariffed, and duties and duties and duties, to make war on other people, and have never succeeded in making life quite safe at home. More lives have been sacrificed in the United States by murder, homicide, or preventable accident five-fold than in all our foreign wars.

More property has been destroyed by arson, riot, or robbery ten-fold than by foreign enemies.

And yet we are taxed, and our patriotism appeals to our ships, and our "defences" against an imaginary foreign enemy, when for eighty years we could find no enemy in the world, and so turned to cutting each other's throats as an expression of Northern or Southern principle.

One might think the Anarchists half right! The governments of the earth are without sense, principle, or reason, as soon as you take them far away from the free and healthy homes where we have based ourselves on the notion — the old diabolic notion — that men were by nature the enemies of men, and therefore that each must stand armed and bristling against other people.

So Europe is to-day an armed camp, and every German, French, Russian, and Italian burns his poor patch of ground with a soldier on his back.

For the solution of the difference between labor and capital, for the solution of any other differences or difficulties, the last place to look for help is to the thing you call "Government."

"I see it, as Democracy at its best, is only the expression of the average good sense and honesty of the people. But no Government ever succeeded in being at one-tenth of its best. Certainly the government of the United States has never in your memory or mine expresséd the best intelligence or honesty of those it representeth."

For you and me, and most men trying to make our honest livings on the earth, Government, Federal or State, stands for a thing that we hate from us.

It does not protect our lives from violence, our houses from burglary, or our own good names from slander. In its Federal form it taxes everything we eat, wear, or use. In its own name it support two or three hundred thousand patroon, and build cruisers, to be ready to fight Chial or the Principality of Monaco some coming century.

The United States has contrived to invent in one century of existence the most expensive government by