On Picket Duty.

The papers tell us that twenty Wesleyan students and professors "have formed a Citizenship Club, to study practical politics." Liberty suggests Richard Hooker for the position of chief instructor.

So far Liberty's typographical reform has met with no serious adverse criticism. Some have commented upon it without committing themselves, while only one reader has expressed emphatic disapproval. The way of the reformer, in some things at least, is not so hard, after all.

Liberty takes pleasure in reprinting the editorial from the Chicago "Times" in which Professor Sumner is rebuked for his shallow optimism and cavalier treatment of reform. It is hardly necessary to say that for the "Times's" talk about the remorseless laws of trade and competition, Liberty does not assume responsibility. The natural laws of trade and competition are all right; the matter is entirely with the laws of Congress with reference to trade, competition, etc.

Not the least among the debts which England owes to Gladstone, observes the New York "Evening Post," is that he restored a temper of seriousness to Parliament. Whereas Palmerston and Disraeli would indulge in flippancy and mischievous and impertinent jokes, and decline to be serious, Gladstone never could or would laugh a great question away or play politics as a game. "He put an end to government by joke." Well, it is very fortunate for government that he did. In this day and generation it would be rather risky to attempt to govern by joke in the sense intended (for real government by joke merely, without prisons, gallows, and bullets behind the joke, would be a decidedly insufficient institution); the fear of bombs tends to check cynicism in governments. Nobody would dare to say today, "Let the people eat graise."

Our grandmother, the State, has been getting curious and ingenious advice with regard to the solution of the troublesome question of bomb arguments. Elsewhere the original suggestion of the London "Hospital" will be found in a paragraph reproduced from its columns. It would have the State adopt the plan which families have been known to pursue when it was deemed proper to get rid of a recaltrant member. But what would be the result of arresting and locking up all avowed revolutionists and believers in propaganda by deed [the "Hospital" speaks of Anarchists, but it really means dynamiters, of course]? Why, that secret societies and underground organs would take the place of open propaganda. Another result would probably be that the physicians especially identified with the scheme would be given a taste of dynamite. Are those physicians who are "looking for preventive measures" prepared for that?

How robust the "Nation's" profession idealism may be, is gathered from its treatment of the government postal monopoly. The post-office, it tells us, is one of the things which private enterprise would not engage in at all, because it would not be profitable. This is of course a perfectly gratuitous assumption. A real libertarian would demand a competitive postal service even if he had to put up with inferior arrangements than those made by the government; but the semi-individualists ought at least to insist upon some evidence of the incapacity of private enterprise before submitting to the suppression of competition and freedom in this line of activity. As a matter of fact, there is considerable evidence that the postal service would pay in private hands. Besides, it is obvious that a vast business in which the inefficient and unintelligent government loses only $7,000,000 would certainly yield a handsome profit to an enterprising and progressive private undertaker.

Editor Haldeman, of the "Western Laborer," who once attempted to reconcile Populism with the principle of equal freedom (indeed, to base the former upon the latter), has made another great discovery. "The postal question," he tells us, "is settled, because the postal service is run by and for the people. Thus can all other economic questions be settled, the land question included." The postal question is settled only in the sense that it is not a political issue at present. No party sees any political capital in it, and the newspapers have conspired to preserve profound silence upon it because they profit by its present management. In no other sense is it settled. Being run by the government,— "by and for the people,"—it is inefficient, backward, and disorganized. The deficit this year is said to be seven millions. A hundred improvements have been suggested, but no idea of adopting any of them is entertained. I presume it is true that all other economic questions can be settled "thus," but how will the deficit be met then? Now it comes out of the pockets of those who are engaged in private enterprises. But when the government manages and mismanages everything, losing on all its undertakings, "the land question included," who will make good the losses? There's but one way out of the difficulty,—to make us all accept starvation—wages. I was about to say, but there would be no such servile thing as wages under State Socialism; there would be "reward for service"—so, starvation reward for service. Remembering that even now the post-office employees are a hard-working and under-paid class, we may form an idea of what our pay would be under the new order of things.

Certain discriminating observations which "Puck" made editorially some months since on the subject of Anarchism had led me to expect better things from it than are found in its editorial in the issue of March 28. In enumerating the classes of agitators,—the progressive Republican (meaning the legal Republican who, consistently applying the Protectionist principle, becomes a State Socialist), the man disgusted with an idle congress, the man wanting cleaner politics, and the man who reads editorials in daily papers and dispenses with independent thinking,—the writer says: "Thus far, happily, the Socialist-Populist-Nationalist-Anarchist forms a noisy but insignificant minority. But he will continue to exist and to make noise until we stamp out the Republican heresy that the United States government should turn the whole country into one vast almshouse. And this heresy cannot be stamped out until the Democratic party—the only party regarding it as a heresy—comes to a better understanding of its duty and opportunity." Now "Puck" knows better than to believe that the Anarchist proposes to turn the whole country or any part of it into a vast almshouse. Knowing better, why does it darken counsel by lumping the Anarchist with the Populist and Nationalist? Then, as to the Democratic party being the proper and sole opponent of the heresy referred to, pray, who is the Democratic party? Dana, Hill, Gorman, Brice, are Democrats, yet they warmly espouse the "heresy." The younger Democrats (and they are not many or powerful) like Harper, Johnson, and a few others, doubtless believe in free trade, but they are also in favor of the single-tax, as a recent vote indicated, and Single-Taxers must certainly belong in "Puck's" view, to the "noisy but insignificant minority." Who, then, is going to stamp out the heresy of Protection and save the country? "Puck" had better ask for leave to withdraw and reconsider.
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The appearance in the editorial column of articles over other signatures than the editor's initial indicates that the editor approves their central purpose and general tenor, though he does not hold himself responsible for every phrase or word. But the appearance in other parts of the paper of articles by the same or other writers by no means indicates that he disapproves them in any respect, such disposition of them being governed largely by motives of convenience.

Are We Fit for Freedom?

In his "Reminiscences of the Late Professor Tyndall," Spencer, in referring to the former's well known political Toryism and belief in despot government, makes the following statement:

"Divergent as our beliefs and sentiments were in earlier days, there has been in recent days mutual approximation. A conversation with him some years since made it manifest that personal experience had greatly shaken the beliefs he previously had in public administration, and made him look with more favor on the view of State-functions held by me. On the other hand, my faith in free institutions, originally strong (though always joined with the belief that the maintenance of liberty and success of them is a question of popular character), has in these later years been greatly decreased by the conviction that the fit character is not possessed by any people, nor is likely to be possessed for ages to come. Leaving them, we are on the way back to the rule of the strong hand in the shape of the bureaucratic despotism of a socialistic organization, and then of the military despotism which must follow it; if, indeed, some social crash does not bring this last upon us more quickly. Had we reviewed compared notes, I fancy that Tyndall and I should have found ourselves differing but little in our views concerning the proximate social state, if not of the ultimate social state.

With Professor Tyndall's alleged political evolution few will be concerned, but the incidental confession we have from Spencer, — that his faith in free institutions has been greatly diminished, — is so significant that a careful consideration of its implications and source is in order.

Spencer has frequently protested against generalizations based on insufficient data, but a more rash and unscientific generalization than this with reference to the unfitness of the people for liberty, it is difficult to conceive. Though England is what Spencer has more particularly in mind, it is plain that his condemnation involves all the other nations of the world. We are all declared to be unfit for free institutions, and we are told moreover that we are not likely to possess the fit and necessary character for ages to come, for, remembering Spencer's masterly refutation of the "heroic" theory of progress, we cannot admit for a moment that even a small minority is ripe and fit for freedom when the people at large are so backward and inert. Of course, there is nothing inherently improbable in such an assumption. It is not impossible that we are all treated according to our deserts, and that the right work for us is not struggle for society, but to fit ourselves for a better social state by self-criticism and self-improvement. This doctrine is not new, but it has never been countenanced by the scientic sociologist or evolutionary philosopher. After all that we have learned about the value of liberty as a school of preparation for liberty, as a method and means as well as a goal, as a factor in social dynamics as well as a condition in social states, we cannot well reconcile ourselves to the Buddhist doctrine of contemplation, self-perfection, and self-discipline. We know that the care for the evils of liberty is found in greater liberty, that independence cannot be developed under coercion, and that to fit ourselves for liberty we must live and move in it. To be told now that "personal government" is to be our "proximate social state" is tantamount to telling us that we shall be deprived of the opportunity to fit ourselves for liberty. Thus we are in a vicious circle.

Doubtless Spencer's answer would be that facts are facts, and that since we have shown ourselves incapable of maintaining and appreciating the degree of freedom that we have enjoyed; since we have surrendered our privileges, neglected our opportunities, and actually suffered political, economic, and social tyranny to reduce us to utter helplessness, retrogression is inevitable. Assuredly there's no room for liberty where no comprehension of it is manifested and no desire or need for it experienced. Our tame submission to the political boss and to the walking delegate, Spencer asserts, can only end in the triumph of State Socialism or military despotism.

Now Spencer's facts, even if there were really as he represents them, would not warrant his inferences. Assume that in ordinary party politics the voter does submit to the dictates of the boss, and that the legislator is ruled by the caucus instead of by his own ideas of right and wisdom. This would be deplorable, and would naturally make for evil and reaction. But are there no other facts in politics to more than counterbalance these? Is not independence, repudiation of party ties, growing on every side? Is not contempt for politicians increasing, and faith in party promises and legislative wisdom diminishing? Isn't politics rapidly declining in its popular respect and becoming the synonym of trickery, corruption, and fraud? Has not politics become the pursuit of the small, unscrupulous, and insignificant? This fact is now widely recognized by the press and public, and legislative bodies inspire neither confidence nor respect. So far as this goes, the gain is on the side of liberty. The party machine is powerful simply because parties are chiefly maintained for and by spoils, but this very circumstance tends to discredit political machinery with intelligent people. We are all told, from contemporary politics to show one's belief in the fitness of the people for free institutions.

On the other hand, taking an evolutionary view of the matter, how does Spencer account for the existence and growth of the Individualist movement, which, on the whole, is certainly making for progress? (I do not refer to the alleged individualism of Liberty and Property Defence Leagues, which have been aptly described as striving for liberty to maintain their privileges and monopolies, but to the healthy and sincere individualism of men of principle.) What does Spencer think of the rise and development of the Anarchist movement? Does this rejection of all invasive practices point to loss of faith in liberty? Unfortunately, Spencer does not comprehend the philosophical basis of Anarchism, but some of his adherents do, and they know that Anarchism is more Spencerian than Spencer, more consistently libertarian.

But the "working classes," the trades unions, the walking delegates! Aren't the liberties of a nation in danger of total extinction when the "workers" surrender their right of selling their labor as they please"? Yes, indubitably, under certain conceivable conditions this would necessarily follow. Conceivable conditions, but not present and actual. Trades unions are entirely voluntary organizations, and hence it is not even true that they surrender their liberty to sell their labor as they please. Is combination, cooperation, a surrender of individual freedom? The principle of trade unionism is essentially sound, both economically and ethically, and it is astonishing to hear from Spencer that to form a voluntary association to sell labor with the greatest leverage, to surrender the control of liberty. Is it a surrender of liberty for merchants to agree to sell goods to the best advantage? The only element of truth in Spencer's charge is that trades unions are frequently unwise and despotic in their treatment of outsiders (of course, their own internal government may be unwise, but it cannot be "despot," since there is no compulsion in joining or remaining), that they resort to violence and invasive means. This, however, does not argue unfitness for liberty; it only demonstrates that trades unions are human institutions. Having in common interests, they find themselves reduced to the necessity of accepting inequitable terms through prior violations of equal freedom on the part of the governing power, they cannot always exercise sufficient self-restraint to keep within the bounds of legitimate resistance. Instead of indulging in futile denunciation, we ought to labor to remove the factors which render legitimate resistance on the part of trades unions more and more ineffectual and unsuccessful. Labor cannot, merely by refusing to work, compel the payment of equal wages. Owing to monopolies and the capital which has labor at its mercy. Remedy this state of things, give labor opportunity, access to natural media and freedom of credit, and there will be no occasion and no inclination to resort to violence. Legitimate resistance would then be adequate.

There was a time when these truths were clear to Spencer, when even the French terror did not shake his belief in the fitness of the people for freedom, when he realized that monopoly is responsible for the coercive methods of labor organizations. If he now utterly misses the true explanations of many phenomena in the economic world, we must regretfully recognize in the fact the inevitable penalty of ill-health and old age.
Winchesters, revolvers, and dynamite, ready to fight the troops. After three days of excitement it was decided to await the decision of the courts. At length the supreme court decided that the governor had the right to discharge the members of the board, but not to use force to oust them. Further developments are anxiously awaited.

Talk about voluntary protective associations fighting among themselves! What is the matter with this? If it is necessary to call out the army to discharge two dishonest officials now, we may expect a civil war every time a street-car conductor is discharged under State Socialism. The revolutionist might take lessons from the State, and learn how to make "propaganda by deed." Effective.

F. D. T.

Sons of reformatory sink there is a point where all radical schools of average, and many days and nights are spent in trying to discover it. Such a point cannot be found in social reform, but politics has been more fortunate. A citizen of Pennsylvania wrote to a number of government officials at Washington, suggesting to them a reduction of the tax on gasoline, a remedy for the existing depression. Mr. Reed, of Maine, thought it was very cheeky to ask a man to reduce his own pay. Mr. Carlisle said, issuing bonds would make times better, and Mr. Johnson assured the gentleman that the single tax, and not a reduction of salaries, was the remedy for hard times. Whatever difference of opinion there may be between the different politicians, they "can all work together" in drawing their salaries in full.

A weekly paper calling itself "Liberty" has just been started in Worcester, Mass. I would not mind this cribbing of my name, if my ideas had been cribbed along with it. But the paper in question is not only a stupid sheet filled mostly with plate matter, but it takes as a motto: "Obey the law and remember your sacred ballot." It seems to be an organ of authoritarian trade-unionism. In view of this fact; and whereas the Communist periodical, "La Revue Anarchiste," has lately changed its name to "La Revue Libertaire"; and considering that ninety-nine out of every hundred people who pretend to believe in liberty really believe in authority; and further to constantly advocating authoritarian measures, for these reasons, I say, I expect to receive immediately a letter from E. C. Walker counselling me to abandon the name Liberty. Usage has decided that liberty means authority; and therefore the word must straightway be discarded from the vocabulary of—of whom, Mr. Walker? I am at a loss for a designation of ourselves. All the words have been stolen from us, and you want to submit to the steal. Why are you a non-resistant here, and not elsewhere?

An Inspiring Absurdity.

[Office Times.]

Under the title, "The Absurd Attempt to Make the World Over," Prof. W. G. Sumner, of Yale College, contributes to the current "Forum" an article which explains why political economy bears the name of "the dismal science." Sumner's article is prepared to controvert one by Edward Bellamy on the Socialististic system, which the author believes is "the greatest and most important, has done much to popularize. The "Times" does not believe in the Bellamy theory as a whole, but it holds even Bellamy, with his extreme and probably impracticable views, a better citizen, a better friend to humanity, than the well-paid professor of political economy who sits in his cozy study and preaches that it is absurd to try to make the world over. It is folly to struggle against the removal of the greatest evil: the alien and public taxation which are breeding millionaires, criminals, paupers, anarchists, and despair.

Perhaps from the scholarly seclusion of a college it is impossible to divest the tendency of the industrial, social, and economic laws as they stand on the statute books today. The stories of the mines, of the sweat- ers' dens, of the iron mills, do not penetrate this college. A college professor may confine himself to pushing the statement that under existing industrial conditions the chance for any manual laborer to give his children a decent education and a fair start in life, or to acquire independence, is less than it was of old. Nobody will listen to him. His students know that all knowledge is concentrated in the mind of a professor of political economy does others who only know what they see in streets and workshops. Of course, the trouble with the manual laborer is that they want to be fed green-turtle soup with a gold spoon. Mr. Bunderby told us so years ago in one of Dickens's immortal novels. There are many Mr. Bunderby's occupying chairs of political economy in colleges today.

It is absurd to try to elect honest aldermen. So the giver and taker of bribes will say when some particularly heinous case of boodling is in discussion. The indigent is absent; he only wants to secure work for the idle, bread for the hungry, education for the ignorant, justice for all,—for that would be making the world c. v. c. To this cynical doctrine of non-resistance and absolute poverty, Prof. Sumner's answer is: "We are welcome. They—are plenty who will hold with the "Times" that hon.-r., honesty, and justice are not abstractions, and that the power of the current of social and economic reform is only increased by the efforts of mercenaries and conservatives to damn it.

Are Anarchists Lunatics?

[London Hospital.]

That Anarchists as a matter of fact are lunatics, is as obvious to common sense as that a dog is mad when he rushes at friends and foes indiscriminately, and strains his throat to sob. The "Times" is absent to lean and to paint the picture of the Anarchists, who are to blame for revolution in Russia. We refer our readers to any other periodical of his name. The point of our question is this: Are European jurists prepared to pronounce Anarchists technically insane; and will legislatures enact statutes for their certification and restraint? The medical mind foresees an epidemic of Anarchism, and its natural instinct is to look about for preventive measure. The only preventive measures of any avail to avails severe epidemics of contagious diseases in cattle is the killing of cattle infected in the very earliest stages of the malady. In the case of human beings the very early detection of cases and their prompt isolation have alone been efficient. Our first business is to secure the enactment of a statute or statutes declaring Anarchists and inciters to Anarchy "insane." When that has been done, competent investigators must be set to work to find out every possible British or foreign Anarchist or inciter to Anarchist whose own country may harbor. These must then all be locked up in one or more criminal lunatic asylums, and then medically treated until such as are capable of cure are thoroughly cured; the remainder will be set under guard. Can we induce any leading member of Parliament to take this matter up, and to get his bill through before Anarchism attains to epidemic dimensions in our own country? We would fail in the locking of the stable door before the steed is stolen and, not, as in France, after.

The Measure of Influence.

[Paul Morley.]

At the restricted banquet of life individual merit is almost nothing; the individual in himself is too little consequence to be estimated by the plate's so strictly numbered. No one is exhibited except in his capacity as representative. There one represents so many ancestors, so much capital, so many votes, so many admirers, or a certain degree of success.

To Insure Their Dependence.

[Chamber and Votumagessen.]

Women are married before they are anything, in order that they may never be anything.
LIBERTY. 274.

The Beauties of Government.

The praises of Liberty are urgently invited to our tribute to this doctrine. It is open to any statement of facts which exhibit the State in any phase of its foremost requisites, order, health, and growth. Whether original accounts based upon the writer's own knowledge, or apparently reliable accounts clipped from recent publications, are included.

The State Can't Cut Across Lines.

You can find a post-office arrangement very near New York, similar to the English case noted by you under the head of "Beauties of Government.

On Long Island, about six miles from Brooklyn, is a small town called Woodhaven. Adjoining and merging with it is another, still smaller, called by the absurd name of Ozone Park. Each has a separate post-office, but letters from New York intended for people in Park are directed to Woodhaven, are sent back to Brooklyn and thence to Ozone Park, losing twenty-four hours for a distance of half a mile or so.

Another interesting method is this: At a certain suburban hotel, about twenty miles from New York, a message is given at 3 p.m. and rephased at 3 p.m. and delivered at 3 p.m., and sent out by express at 3 p.m. at 3 p.m., and sent out by express at 3 p.m. and delivered at 3 p.m.

[The following is a continuation of the story.]

The Urge a Matter of Course.

COLUMBUS, S. C., March 18. — Governor Tillman and the Internal Revenue Department are clashing on the liquor question. Collector Townes recently notified the governor that whiskey seized by the dispensary was liable to the United States statutes, and Governor Tillman told the collector that, if he attempted to seize liquor confiscated by the dispensary, he would go to the court and, if they decided against him, he would take it and dump it into the streets. The governor declared that Townes, who is known in State politics as a Conservative, or anti-Tillmanite, was acting under instructions from political enemies of Tillman in Washington.

When the courts have decided which thief may steal the liquor, who will protect the owner of the liquor?

ETHICS AS EXPOUNDED FROM THE BENCH.

NEW YORK, March 14. — A few months ago, in proceedings for divorce brought in one of our courts, a young man who had been named as co-respondent took the witness stand and testified that the offence charged, implicating himself and the wife of another, were committed. He was a man who had been accustomed to those social relations which wealth and culture can give in this city. But after he thus testified, he was called in his clubs, the doors of society were closed to him, he was made a disgrace, and he was miserable in the few. Such punishment did not come to him because he had confessed to immorality, but because it was esteemed as despicable a thing as a man could do to protect even by perjury the honor of a woman whose name had been involved with his.

A few weeks ago, in another proceeding for divorce, all the parties being of fairly good standing, the co-respondent, in the face of the most convincing evidence, swore that the charges were untrue, and that he scarcely knew the woman. For doing that he was rebuked by Judge McAdam, who declared from his place on the bench that it was a greater sin to come into the court room with lies to ped in the board to commit perjury than it was to even to commit the sin upon which proceedings for divorce might be justified. Yet that co-respondent, though rebuked by the judge, was forgiven and even praised by his associates and friends, and he was not even, he has not lost caste by reason of it.

Yesterday, before Judge Van Wyck, another di- vice proceeding was brought, and the co-respondent in that case was asked so far as to say that he would not believe under oath a man maintaining such relation to a divorce case as that woman did, who gave such testimony of admittance as he con fessed, and the judge said he would always require more proof than the mere conclusion of a co- respondent.

As it is not to be supposed for a moment that the judicial guardians of the public morals could fundamentally disagree as to the simple matter of lying, it must be assumed hereafter that it is the duty of a co-respondent to tell the truth, and that it is the duty of the jury not to believe him if he says so. However, there is nothing in this apparent contradiction that should induce any jurisprudence to hold that ignorance of the law is no excuse from claiming also that there is no excuse for ignorance of the law.

DESCRIPTION A VIRUS UNKNOWN TO THE STATE.

[New York Sun.]

Three street-sweeping machines caused a lot of discomfort to persons who were in Broadway last night between Twenty-second and thirty-fourth streets. The sweepers drove up and down between 10 and 11 o'clock, when the thoroughfare was crowded with people coming from the theatre, and raised such a cloud of dust that those who saw it in time hastily sought shelter in the side streets.

Those who didn't have a chance to get out of the way frolicously expressed their disapproval of street cleaning Commissioner Andrews' way of doing things.

The drivers of the machines said that they expected to have been preceded by sprinkling carts. The sprinklers failed to appear, but the drivers were obliged to obey orders and sweep the streets.

[When the Six Hundred were ordered to charge at Balaklava, it was "theirs but to do and die." So it is with the New York street-sweepers. As for the pedestrians, it is theirs but to fly or die. Some servants of the State have the semblance of living creatures, but they are really nothing but machines. If one of these should do so unwieldy a thing as to consider conditions, immediate discharge would follow.]

THE STATE A PIMP.

[New York Sun.]

ST. LOUIS, March 8. — A special from the city of Mexico says that a terrible state of affairs has been proved to exist in the public dormitories of that city, provided by the indigent by charity. The police have discovered and raided a disorderly house in which the inmates were kept, and the police said that they had first fallen into vice while receiving shelter at the free lodging houses.

THE POLICE AND THE PUBLICANS.

[London Times Rights.]

The "News of the World," an important article on the working of the present licensing law, from which we make the following extract: — The decision in the case of Sharpe v. Wakefield has put it in the power of a policeman earning a pound or two a week, aided by a sympathetic bench, toaway a licence worth thousands of pounds, on the allegation of a trivial offence or the simple assertion that the house is "not wanted." I am interested," said a gentleman with whom we conversed this matter, "in the inquiries, in a brewery and public houses, and I say to my tenants, 'You must square the police.' I cannot afford to take any risks in connection with premises worth thousands of pounds, on the charge that the men on the beat have not their daily allowance or a present at Christmas. There is," our informant continued, "great apré de sorge among the police, and if they are on a best, packing up and going on a holidays at a stretch, are not treated by the publicans, it is natural that their fellows should make it hot for the stingy people. And they do make it hot for them. Why," he added, "there is a public house in —— [name of place given], the licence of which, worth a couple of thousand pounds, was refused the other day, and the only offence alleged was that the house was not "wanted," and then of such a trivial offence that the magistrates only fixed him 8s. In another case, at F——, which is now the subject of appeal, the policemen asserted that the publican had served a man who was drunk, and several respectable residents swore that he was not drunk. Yet the police-
The following letter from a Paris correspondent was published in the New York "Evening Post" under heading: "Anarchy's Apologist." No comment is needed to impress upon readers the significance of the story told by the not too friendly and impartial observer. The correspondent's estimates upon the merits and tendencies of the works of the author he describes are naturally colored by his own views of things. The sole interest lies in his facts and forced admissions.

A sort of round-robin, protesting in favor of a condemned Anarchist, was signed by some one hundred men of letters and artists in Paris — all more or less young and distinguished. The cable dispatches to America have shown too little understanding of the actual situation in France to suppose they will pay any proper attention to such a fact.

Near two weeks ago Jean Grave was tried, under the new press laws, for circulating his book on "Dying Society and Anarchy," which is charged with containing incitements to murder and revolt. Grave is a self-educated man of undoubted talent, both as a thinker and a writer. He received his literary training on the "Révolute" and other early Anarchist periodicals of Eliee Reclus, and upon whose principles Kropotkin, the subsequent theoretical Anarchist, has gone back, therefore, his career as a theoretical Anarchist goes back, therefore, these years and more, when Anarchy was beginning to appear boldly in Geneva and had already got into hot water with the French courts at Lyons years ago. He has lately been editor of the "Révolute," a serious review, which is supposed to be subsidized by Reclus, and which he bears to reappear soon in spite of recent confiscations.

The book, for which Grave has now been sentenced to two years' imprisonment, is no new production. For over a year it has been axious to get the book, bound up in a vivid red paper cover. The new popular edition, in blue, cheap and small, had been smuggled over from Belgium. The book first came out before it had become so plain as now that criminal Anarchists do nothing but apply brutally the ideas learned from the writings of theorists M. Châmeneau then declared it one of the strongest critical works known to the "JOURNAL DES IDÉES NOUVELLES," which, like most of the old-fashioned newspapers, has quite lost its head in the present conjuncture, spoke of the book in terms of respect. The passage read in court presaged fully the irrepressible crisis, — the violent revolution that must come before the final death-blow can be given to society as it is. It is useless to explain that this does not justify the throwing of bombs among a crowd of innocent people. Practical Anarchists always give the reply of Léautier: "The starving poor are also innocent." I am not sure that this brilliant sophism itself is not from the work of Grave.

During the trial, four large posters prominent in the world of letters came forward to testify to Grave's high character, mental and moral. The first was Prof. Eliee Reclus, who also considers Jean Grave "a man absolutely outside the principles of the Social Democratic and other parties, that testify that Grave is a writer of rare merit, of whom I am proud to be the friend." This fourfold witness did not convince the jury, who are not very good judges of such matters. The signature of the round-robin, referring to the testimonials given in court, now declare that "they unite with all their hearts in these noble words and protest against the country for the time being."

To this Paul Bourget has added that he could be said to have added that "Zola is nowadays regarded of what the Academy will think of him. In 1899, when Lucien Descaves, the author of a fecking military novel, "Sous-Offs," a sign in the most violent protest, was hauled up before the courts, Zola, Bourget, Georges Ohnet, Edmond de Goncourt, and Théodore de Banville got him off by a protestation similar to the one just signed.

The public ignorance of the younger writers (although several are of the generation of Zola) is that the new revolutionary literature cannot be transported decently into the intellectual territory of English readers. Some of these writers, of course, was their laudatory poem in praise of Zola, long before Ibsen was known in France.

Jean Richolle, whose name heads the list (so far as it has a head), is the most striking of a personage and a critic in the French literary world. He is a master of the Song of the Ragamuffins," landed him in prison, and; the title of his chief poem, "Hippocras," hardly prepossesses in his favor. It is he who accompanied Sarah Bernhardt, who was his first biographer. No one doubts his intense literary talent, not even those who most deplore the direction he has chosen to give it. Cuatte Mendoza, a poet of song, who passes through song shows a portrait of Ibsen by Ives, who is perhaps better known in America than the others, and he has talked bravely before now of the defense of honor which even literary men would undertake when the defense of honor is at stake.

He is perhaps better known in America than the others, and he has talked bravely before now of the defense of honor which even literary men would undertake when the defense of honor is at stake. It is a certain fact that, with the idea of Anarchism in its true and freedom from law. An insignificant signature as say, perhaps, are the names of Adolphe Beïtis, the decrepit student whose copy of Anarchie and Jean Carandou, who was wounded in the university riots of last year. It is that the American press finds it difficult to appreciate this educated side, as it may be called, of French Anarchism. The latter which gives the democratic chance to the movement.

The Attitude of Intellectual France.

"The police are adept at getting up evidence, and at giving evidence, and the licensing law is so elastic that the most trivial brays may be magnified into great offences. Besides, the Sharpe v. Waite decision gave the police power to take away a license on the simple ground that the house is "not necessary," or that it is misconducted, and such misconduction may be of the most trivial character. No person is fit to be trusted with such power over a man's livelihood or over property, valued at thousands of pounds, belonging to other people.

The Jails Need Paying.

"The law is its own, its prisons, which are the hells of earth, will soon rival the infernal regions in their pavements of infants' skulls.

VICTIMS OF THE DEAD SET.

PARIS, March 6.—Examining Magistrate Meyer and Judge Rapin completed the examination of the Anarchists yesterday, comprising nearly all the Anarchists who have been arrested recently. Of the whole number examined thirty-four were held for further examination or trial and the others were released for want of evidence sufficient to justify their detention.

But let a bomb, thrown in the Chamber of Deputies, infect the chambers on the spectator, a bomb that will arise against the bomb-thrower for causing the innocent to suffer with the guilty.

The Ideals of Liberty.
The Liberty of Egoism.

[From the German of E. Born in Freie Büchere.]

Liberty is power, says Stirner, is might. But what is might here? Might is faculty, and faculty has its root in the self. That we can self is our liberty; but that we can self we have first to create a self, a liberty. A great deal has been written and said concerning free will; some deny it, some affirm it. It seems to me as if one should speak, for instance, of a rocky cliff. The cliff is rock, and the will is nothing but to ascend that cliff.

To ascend that cliff is the will, to ascend without a rope is the will. But whether the deed succeeds is a matter for itself; it does not affect the will; that remains what it is, and ceases tomorrow the effort in which it failed today. It is not affected by the fact that I am always aware of it, so to say, that I am aware of it. Any other sort of action requires objects and tools; the latter are my physical and mental powers. Failure is explained by the difficulty of the former and the inadequacy of the latter. Here are the barriers of my faculty, not of my volition. If I am conscious of this, I shall not complain of my want of liberty, but, if at all, only of my imperfection. But to complain is unwise, says Epictetus. Rather should I seek to understand the true nature of things and to increase my powers; then the barriers will fall. I shall not, of course, reach the stars or dash my head against the wall; the really impossible is no barrier to me, for I am only aware of it. I feel only when a foreign force compels me and a foreign will seeks to assert itself through my action. Against this I revolt, and only when the foreign will has become my own, and I am conscious of the use of my insight, shall I then shall I not submit myself, but still act in liberty. To do good in consequence of free insight is true virtue, and to act independently true egoism.

Liberty, I say to Tasse, let us admit it! Who shall govern? I. Who am I? And what shall I govern, or rather, what can I govern? That which I know. First of all, I know myself: my own consciousness directs itself to self-control. But myself I know only in antithesis to another: can I govern this also? Yes, if it is not already possessed — that is, as self-conscious as I am. Men, consequently, who are worthy of the name I cannot govern, because above all others this devolves upon each one himself. As I can teach one only through the understanding which is in him, so I could also govern him only through the will which is in him; but then he is nevertheless a sovereign. Besides myself, therefore, I can govern only that which cannot govern itself, — that is, animate and inanimate nature. But every person whose self-consciousness is aroused will devise forms of government.

Liberty is consequently self-government and self-control. The former is the subject, the latter the objective side of sovereignty. Its law-code is very simple: reason represents it, — that is, logical thought. From Ami to Adam, from Adam to the End, from the End to the Ami, we have the same sequence, we have the same egoism. Whoever he is, he would have it to have been the egoism of others; we might parallel it by Verus est per accensus aper, Action according to cause and effect only warrants the coherency of my conduct; in it lies the unity of personality and the security of autonomy.

Others shall not govern me, I will be my own master: for, if I am not, I come under the domination of others. Just get drunk, — that is, relinquish your self control, and you also end to yourself, and all the enjoyment, and boys make sport of you. Only he can be autonomous who bridles himself.

But what do I govern in me? If I am the object, what else is there? Only such a state of affairs is capable of analysis. I govern my myself, — simul titulator, but nevertheless. Consequent is it, it is essential to the ego; it is an accident. I govern my instincts and passions by the exercise of my self-determination; so far as they are rooted in the body, it's self-control of the above. My feelings, that is, I to not allow feelings of pleasure and pain to cause me to act contrary to reason. What can be self governed in me? I am master of my self, I may, for instance: take possession of a rich man's money, so long as I feel that I may. I must of course, not put them on paper. But in itself idea, like feeling, is a passive state; solely active, manifesting my will, realizing my self, and asserting my existence, I am only in violation. What still remains, therefore, of the ego from which I cannot escape? The will. Can I also govern my will? No; for, if I posit as the object, the subject disappears. My will, that is, I — will liberty. — I will — liberty.

The question of free will is futile. The will itself, is that the only liberty of man. In treating of a determinability of the will the will is always confounded with the act of voluntary will. The end at which the will aims and the means by which it is to be determined are determinable by rational means. But that I act and strive after an end is my liberty.

Am I still superior to my will? Can I make it do what I will? No; I act because I am, and I am because I act. Only by I am wholly thrown back on my own resources, where I rest within myself, where I am wholly I, am I free; but this is the self which is transcendent, the end of my life, my liberty, my absoluteness. All else, including also individual aspirations, are relations. But relations bind. My will is the expression of my existence; it becomes visible in the manifestation of being, which is identical with the struggle for existence. The question: Must I act? Is synonymous with: Must I live? The will is always present; — not the will to live, it is rather self-life, — that is, energy. But it requires aims, objects, in order to assert itself, to express its individuality.

I am attracted by some aim. What does that mean? What are final causes to me? My imagination anticipates. In these anticipation I have my perfection, my bliss. But I consider whether and how I can achieve it, then my will appears on the surface or it does not appear: according I act or do not act.

Pleasure is the aim of all men; for the value of every pleasure lies in this, that it maintains and intensifies activity. But activity is will, is life. It is consequently for its own sake that the will seeks pleasure. To the end not only at the end, it goes even with the first step and becomes keener the nearer the end, until it finally reaches its culmination. Then it breaks off, and a new aim allure me.

The will is energy, but strength grows by exercise; consequently, if you want to enrich itself, you want to exert yourself. Richer in what? In will. It never consumes itself, but draws ever anew on itself; it is the perpetuum mobile. Its manifestation is at the same time enjoyment, expenditure and income covertly; the self is self-enjoyment, and to enjoy life is to enjoy one's self. As man has become through birth and education, so must he act; for that is his being, his being, his ego, his individuality. In this manifestation of his egoism, in self-realization and self-revelation, lies his life's pleasure and also his life's task. If we call this egoism, then I believe that egoism is the axis of all ethical current.

I consume myself by realizing myself. Compared with this highest pleasure, all other sensual and spiritual pleasures fade away; they are merely means to an end. For this reason the will remains master of the pleasures. The will, without passing into action, the will dies from excess. Then man no longer lives, but vegetates like the cabbage-head in the field. With the will goes liberty, autonomy, self-determination. In Tolstoy's first step of morality.

Liberty! Do you now know what liberty is? You cannot for it. I tell you: Be free; for you are free! Now live, you do not carry within you. You are you, an ego, a will, wholly for yourselves, resting within yourselves; what more do you want? Is that not liberty enough? Of what sort now comes liberty?

Others shall not govern you. Well, it lies with you. You govern yourselves and be sovereign; no other will then rest in you; in your power, you are nearest to yourselves. But so you are; as against those above you, as against those below you, as against those aside from you. No, this is not to be used of it, Anarchists that you are! and, as against those below you, you exercise force, because you seek liberty in the dominion over others, determination. No, no! This is the will of the self which is sovereign, if it will meets will. And: revenges is the regulator of the conflict of the will. Are the other people of the same kind as I, — that is, free, sovereign? I make a test, and, if it appears to me to be sovereign, I recognize them as myself, and say: We the free.

We pride ourselves on our liberty, and this pride is our morality: we are on -younger side of good and bad.

For morality, what is it? Nothing surely except the mode of living together, of the intercourse of men. There are consequently very many moral systems, and Bastian's Ethnology will surely yet give us the only...
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true 'moral teaching' in George Twilight. How men have acted and what we can act we can only infer from the facts that is, our — character, which is selflessness. But who tells us, and who has a right to tell us, that there is such a thing as 'moral- ity' in this sense? Nietzsche justly makes of this selflessness itself a problem.

Slaves receive a precept of conduct: the free is his own master, and the essence of his action is to become his own free master. To be free is the hallmark of all the philosophers of life. All 'moral systems' presuppose the notion of freedom and be- cause liberty is the hallmark of all the philosophers of life. St. Manchester has betrayed and sold it, — the unbefitting world praises so much about ethics.

We the free have no need of 'moral- ity.' Our mutual respect is the result of our pride — that is, the appreciation of our own — eyes, and the principle of our conduct is selflessness. Of course, not selflessness as commonly understood, which seeks plea- sure at the expense of others: rather the selflessness which aims to realize itself in positive work, or — as Heddah Gabler says — 'to order life according to its laws.' "Each shall do that which he shall and only can do, as a conductor, and only as a doer, in this common of individuals" (Vichter) — with this consciousness the freeman is incarnated. The free is the good, because he is true, brave, high-minded, temperate; for living, con- centratedly, in the moment of life, he is not a bystander. The free owns himself, because each individual is his own sovereign. This does not preclude the election by them of a prince, a chief or a ruler, but they must guard it, and by guarding it they require the government of others. Not overcome are we; we only do not wish to be undermined.

Not all men are free in our sense. For ages slavery has existed on the earth, and may actually do so in the future. It is a secret spirit which transmits itself. But all are destined for liberty. What is the relation of the free to the unf- re? He does not recognize them as his equals; they are beneath him. He uses them, if he does not ignore them; he has no need of them. See, Tolstoi makes his own shoes! He does not share their feelings. They receive from him their "good" and "bad," — a thing unknown to the free. He treats them with pride, as all his subjects. This is what Nietzsche meant by himself: "[Contra Philippu vola et aerus], but he does not say it. For the more he esteems himself as the free, the more he slights those who are not what their human form ought to be, — the slaves, the base. Here meet the great contempt and the great pity.

We the free are the pure egoists, such as St. Ignatius de- mands. And it is precisely this egoism which unites us, just as egoism unites a social group or a social spirit. Our self is only an extended egoism; for what we conceive to be one an- other in the shape of honors and rights returns to each individual (Nietzsche, "Jenestis von Gute und Bose"). We love our neighbors very much as ourselves, is this Christian command not traceable to egoism as the prince of motives?

But what becomes then of the task of humanity? Aye, what becomes of the course of events? How does it set in? his name? We must labor for the common- wealth, we must espouse the cause of progress — who thinks so? Each labor, thinks, and creates as the spirit moves him. "It is essentially the agen of sensations, feelings, and emotions," but essentially activity, will, manifestation of being, self-realization of the individual. Whether this is instinctive or conscious is immaterial; for the unconscious is the conscious. "It is only a part of that force which guarantees the unity of things." This from Dithing is true also of the work of the indivi- dual. "But also in the domain of social forms there are the reasons behind the force of con- scious ends; they are rather efficient causes, which impel the formations whose meaning never groups at once." So the free works in accordance with his na- ture, because he is the same thing with him — because he will. The pressure of life im- parts him, and the will is his life. It is possible that his thoughts and deeds work a benefit to mankind; expe- rience teaches that this has often been the case. But "to espouse the cause of progress" is nevertheless a postulate of posterity and wholly incapable of generali- zation and extension to all men;" says Dithing, "is not my weak; but I want my weak." And so it is with the common- weal. Nevertheless this work will not remain undone; the common egoism of the unfree as well as the nobler egoism of the free will see to that. But the saying: "Nemesis isomeris is fister; if I am not myself benefited thereby. — We the free, — there is still another bond which unites us besides that inner bond of mutual respect and recognition of the common freedom on which we place the struggle for existence, and our common need of it in regard to the manifestation of being.

That dependence we share with all living creatures, but the free, the proud, revolt against it, and in their displeasure consume themselves when sickness compels them to inaction. Therefore all their thinking and striving is directed toward lessening this dependence, that is, toward escaping nature and placing it under their dominion. Science is a matter of free spirits. The food instinct compels indeed also the unf- free to work upon nature, but the free do not aim at their own nature, but are secure in it. To them nature with all its manifestations, including human society, is rather the objective point for the realization of liberty; they work indeed also in order to live, but also because they live; they create an object out of nature which, if it affects them, is itself itself. And the free knows what he wants. So it is not alone the distress of life, but also the joy of creating which unites the free spirits. We the free are the true Aristocrats, and we would be the social problem for everyone. We feel the sense of liberty, our pride, revolts at the sight of social misery and human helplessness, but our love of knowledge and our love of work search for relief. For the misery of an epoch is the essential of a people in the long run it leads to paralysis of the will. But this is to be con- sidered as on a par with death. If we combat misery, we combat the want of liberty and make men of men, that is, toward creating new individuals; we are free because — even as the word implies — they need slaves. But they exist, the free, G. W. Seck's knights of the spirit, scattered among the masses of the unfree. The task is not that they are free, but that the events will bring them to the surface, and they will build the future.

Today — paradoxical as it may sound — there is no liberty in the State; bureaucracy rules, and the bour- geoisie rules, and the money-bags, and the party bosses, and the party bosses. They are the masters of everything: protected by laws in the multiplicity of which wisdom is made foolish. The more laws men give themselves the less free they are, and rise more. The statute- book rules — that is, the dependence of the living on the dead! The money-bag rules — that is, the material sense which seeks the wealth and the worth of life not in a sum of deeds, but in a sum of pleasures. "Wealth," as Von der Linde says, "washes all idealism from Germany." And things threaten to become rather worse than better; for a new despotism is rising with the promeise of superseding the others.

Aestas parentem pater et altius
Non sequestrum, sed deserta

The cause of the free does not prosper today, but they remain quiet and abide their time.

What changes the time? Absolutism. Our bour- geoisie has long deserved it, and the rising elements are not the means to cast out the devil by Beelzebub. All progress hitherto has proceeded from exemplary persons. Of such one there is again need, in order that, by the example of this free spirit, the sages of the nation may guard their own liberty, and become what they must be — the free. —

This will not happen so very soon. It is possible, because better, that the dregs of the prevailing want of liberty will first be destroyed in a forty years' wandering in the wilderness. But then the free will gather, and their number will increase under the influence of the book. To this end the free must take upon them and the evil de- cline: for the evil is the want of liberty. Then a new constitution will appoint the king as prince lateret, prince; and then may those be unfree and slaves who have not in them to be free, — that is, men. But the free will then say:

"Wir haben Recht und Macht allein. Was wir setzen, das gilt grundsätzlich, Wer die uns soll beherrschen?"

A Gratuitous Assumption.

[New York Nation.]

Col. T. W. Higginson, in a recent lecture before the National Club in Boston, is reported by the Boston "Morning Journal" as having said, "now kept up by the New York 'Nation,' " that "what is done by the public is never so well done as by private capi- tal, which has exploded over and over again."

No such claim was ever made by the "Nation." If Col. Higginson had substituted "hardly ever" for "never," he would have come somewhat nearer the truth.

The post-office illustration which he used would do him no good. The "Nation" has always said that self-government is all that our governmentishment than individuals, and especially things which individuals would not do at all because they would not pay; and the post-office is one of these. No private company would ever make the millions of contracts with States with post-offices any more than to maintain military roads, be- cause the returns would not meet the expenses. The Government this year is $7,000,000 out of pocket in carrying on the post-offices in the New York city, how- ever, we could get a much better service from an express company than we get from the Government. All service is apt to be bad in establishments where it is not necessary that the income should meet the salary.

Government Financing.

[General Trubull in the Open Court.]

In the early settlement of Marlborough, old Wash- ington Griggs and his three sons cultivated a farm and a blacksmith's shop, the edge of the timbered village, and whenever any of the neighbors met him and said, "How are you, Uncle Wash?" he candidly replied, "Well, I ain't a com- plaint, me and the boys is makin' money," and this was literally true, but it was counterfeit money they were making, for old Wash had a private mint in the garret, as the officers discovered when they came to search the place. I suspect that Uncle Wash and his sons did not make the money themselves, but gave all the minting over to Nebraska, for I see by the papers that a private mint has been started there, and that the anonymous firm that owns it in some undisclosed place has minted about half a million silver dollars, and put them into "to relieve the tightness of the money market." Whether the Nebraska mint is owned by the firm of Griggs & Sons or not, the partners in the busi- ness are "makin' money" in the plan of Griggs, ex- cluding that they use a different material. The Ne- braska coiners make genuine silver dollars, like those the Government coiners make, and exactly the same in weight, quality, and appearance. They can afford to be as long in business government itself and coin fifty cents' worth of silver into a dollar, taking the other fifty cents for "seigniorage," and making a fair profit. The Government is hunting for the Nebraska coiners to put them in hounding on its exclusive right to make dishonest money, and this illegitimate is borrowed from the ancient practice. For centuries the kings of England were in the habit of adulterating their money by pocketing the "seigniorage" as their own. When a private citizen did the same thing he was hanged, but the king never was.

Some time ago a correspondent wanted me to tell him what the 'seigniorage' was that the Government intended to coin into silver dollars, and I an- swered that in my opinion it was moonbeams, but since then a better definition has been found, and Mr. Hewitt, of New York, describes it as a "vacuum." To coin a vacuum into silver dollars worth fifty cents a piece, and then redeem them in gold dollars worth a hundred cents a piece, is a financial feat never equalled.
since Ahablin's lamp was lost. It is the logical folly of the "legal tender" system. Once allow Government to declare gold, silver, or anything else a legal tender and payment of all legal debts is paid, and the world is open for wildcat finance unlimited. All a man has to do now to win in a trade is to add his loss to what he expected to gain, and coin them both into dollars, for which is the plan of Congress. We bought back round numbers of 200,000,000 dollars of silver, for which we paid 120,000,000,000, and according to the present price of silver, we lost 56,000,000 dollars by the trade; but, if we had coined the silver into dollars of the present weight, it was sold for 280,000,000 dollars, and the difference between the 136 millions that we paid for the silver, and the 980 millions that we might have coined into, makes a vacuum of 54 millions. This would not do to coin into imaginary money, issue it as legal tender, and in this way get back the 56 millions that we lost and something more besides. If the dishonest legal tender principle were abolished altogether, Congress could not perform fantastic tricks with money; the finances of the country would soon be on a natural and scientific foundation, and coinage would be free.
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