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"Social Evolution," a new book by a new English writer, Benjamin Kidd, is pronounced to be a remarkable production by English and American reviewers. The majority of American "reviewers" are, of course, of no consequence whatever, but English reviewers, as a rule, are scholarly and competent. Their praise of the book for philosophical as well as literary merit entitles it to careful consideration, and Liberty hopes to find time to examine the work, which is said to mark a turning point in the great social controversy raging all around us, which, as the London "Spectator" says, is "developing a new series of phenomena in politics, often of a dangerous, and sometimes of an amazing character." But if the "Spectator" borrows the proposition that "reason alone would not have evolved Christianity" from Mr. Kidd, the seed of distrust is at once planted. Such a proposition is either a truism or a piece of nonsense. If the system of superstition known as Christianity is intended, surely reason has not evolved it any more than it has evolved any of the other systems of superstition. If the body of ethical doctrines is meant, our conceptions and sentiments of justice and beneficence, then, in the first place, it is absurd to use the term Christianity as synonymous with this aggregate of ideas and emotions, and, in the second place, no evolutionist, no Darwinian even, has ever affirmed the view that reason alone has evolved our ethical ideas and sentiments.

I am surprised that General Trumbull should go so far astray as to affirm that "there seems to be little moral difference" between an injunction issued by a judge ordering railroad employees to stay at work, and an injunction issued by officers of a labor organization ordering members to quit work. General Trumbull says: "One may be issued by a lawyer judge and the other by a labor judge, but the moral character of both injunctions is the same,—they strike at liberty." This is a superficial view. There is all the difference in the world between these two injunctions; one is drawn from the code of serfdom, the other from the principle of individual freedom, which includes the freedom to combine and submit to officers chosen for certain or uncertain purposes. As long as strikers refrain from aggression, it is outrageous tyranny to "enjoin" them from anything and then punish them by fine and imprisonment for disobedience. But a "labor judge," in issuing an injunction, performs the very function he was elected to perform. The organization having agreed to be grieved by his judgment, it is his business to issue injunctions to stay or quit. Labor organizations are voluntary associations supported by voluntary taxation, and their only punishment is expulsion. Officers and members of unions may be (and generally are) unwise and unreasonable, but men have a right to be foolish and to submit to foolish orders as long as the folly does not lead to invasion of the rights of men outside of the unions.

The municipal council of Paris having stated that the workmen of Paris want work, not alms, the Count de Ketray publishes a letter which the "dynamiteur," Henry, wrote to the council objecting to their statement of the case of the workmen. Henry said that education had opened the minds of the rising generation and proceeded as follows: "Do you imagine that work for the city of Paris will satisfy their needs? Certainly not, and there is no hope for these young men except in a bon Secours complet which will enable them to establish a society that will provide for every one according to his needs. Nor are these needs only those of the stomach. You suppose we have no right to intellectual and artistic enjoyment? Do you imagine that a man who earns four francs a day can buy books out of that sum and go to the theatre, not to mention other things? And how would he get time to enjoy himself if he works all day?" These sentiments the New York "Tribune Post" pretends to see evidence of the fact that Henry and the class he represents scorn honest work, and have their eyes fixed upon the rights of others' labor and saving. The bona fide unemployed are satisfied with any work that can bring a living wage, according to the "Post," while the Henrys insist on the right sort of work and the right rate of wages, or they will none of it. Now it is possible that the "Post" is really stupid, but the probability is that it is deliberately sophistical. It is perfectly clear that Henry, in the above letter, speaks of the aspirations of the workmen in a general way, not of any immediate individual demands. He intends to impress the fact that the question is larger than is implied in the statement that the workmen demand work. That the unemployed want employment to earn their daily bread, that the employed want decent wages, are things which the dullest bourgeois understands. But this is not the sum and substance of the "labor question," of the social problem, and Henry tries to explain the larger and higher aspects of the problem. To say that the unemployed will not consider their case settled when they get work, is not to say that they will refuse work. The "Post" understands this as well as anybody, but it suits its purpose to misinterpret Henry's language.
The appearance in the editorial column of articles over other signatures than the editor's initial indicates that the editor approves their general purpose and general tenor. But 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 approves them in any respect, such disposition of them being governed largely by motives of convenience.

Ambrose Bierce on Anarchism.

Ambrose Bierce, poet, story-writer, critic, and free-lance journalist, has been wrestling with the question of Anarchism. Mr. Bierce is a vigorous writer, but he does not seem to appreciate the fact that vigorous writing is properly but a means to an end, and often sacrifices truth, propriety, sense, and substance in his effort to express himself in vigorous language. Mr. Bierce is doubtless a sincere hater of humbug, hypocrisy, and philanthism, and I believe, from the evidence of the fact that a good deal of his writing is wholesome and sound. It is the pleasure which Anarchists and radicals take in reading it. It is not certain, however, — it is very improbable, in fact, — that Mr. Bierce is fortunate enough to possess clear and scientific ideas on fundamental social, economic, and political questions.

Bierce, the author of "Anarchism," an unscholarly writer and laborer over such difficulties that it would be cruel to subject him to rash criticism for any blunder or injustice resulting from the attempt.

Recently, it seems, a San Francisco Anarchist sent Mr. Bierce a copy of "Instead of a Book" with the view of helping him to a better understanding of the question of the solution of which he had been unsuccessfully trying to contribute something. Mr. Bierce acknowledged the kindness in print (in his own department in the San Francisco "Examiner") as follows:

"Thank you; you are at least civil, and in an Anarchist this is much. Indeed, but the book you send contains nothing new. I detest "Philosophical Anarchism," not because I do not know what it is, but because I do.

We have a right to infer this from the fact that Mr. Bierce considers civility a desirable quality, and that he believes that, as a rule, Anarchists lack that virtue. But in the first place, it is impudent and puerile to assume, a priori, that Anarchists are uncivil. There is nothing in philosophical Anarchism that justifies such an assumption, while there is much that plainly points the other way. Men who insist on absolute respect for equal liberty are apt to be finer than those who either excuse or applaud or practise aggression. To be sure, equal liberty is mere justice, and a just man may be very unloveably; otherwise he may be uncouth, tactless, superficial, cranky, and unavailable. On the other hand, an aggressor and unjust person may be polite, nice, magnetic, charming personally. We have heard of polite, gentlemanly burglars, and among the supporters of the present régime of invasion and violence there are doubtless many amiable and refined persons. Still, those who know something about the scientific classification of feelings, something about their evolution and origin, know that the just man is more apt to be generous and considerate than the unjust.

What warrant is there, then, for Mr. Bierce's assertions that Anarchists are uncivil? In the second place, Mr. Bierce is certainly uncivil to his civil Anarchist correspondent, and for an apostle of civility to set an example of impudence and cheek, is hardly consistent. In the third place, it is not true [this is uncivil, but the interest of a higher principle than civility demands it] that Mr. Bierce detests "philosophical Anarchism" because he knows what it is. It is not true for the simple reason that he does not know what philosophical Anarchism is. This I say with perfect confidence. The man who says that "philosophical Anarchism" is new, is a scientific person, an ignoramus. When Mr. Bierce says it, he not only convicts himself of ignorance of the present state of ethical and political and economic discussion, but exposes the falsehood of his assertion that he knows what Anarchism is, for the man who knows that, knows that "Instead of a Book" contains much that is new to this day and generation.

Further, the man who knows what Anarchism is (and who knows the proper use of terms) does not say that he detests "it". One may disagree with it, but it is absurd to speak of "detecting" it. Mr. Bierce's vehemence is simply ludicrous.

That Mr. Bierce is ignorant of the doctrines and methods of philosophical Anarchism appears also from what he says with regard to the so-called "Anarchism" of the dynamiters and propagandists by deed, in the revolutionary sense. Mr. Bierce's chief complaint is that the bomb-throwers will cause the death of civilization "by making it impossible to meet for discussion and concerted action," that they will deprive us of the "security" we now enjoy by their indiscriminate attacks on the present society, that they do not seek amendment, but destruction. Now, if that is the reason why Mr. Bierce detests the bomb-throwers, then it is manifest that he can have no detestation for the philosophical Anarchists, who do not seek destruction, who would not deprive anybody of any security now enjoyed, who would not restrict in the slightest degree the opportunities for discussion and concerted action.

Listen to Mr. Bierce:

Two human beings cannot live together in peace without laws — laws inapposite. Everything that either in consideration of the other's wish or welfare abstains from, is inhibited by law tacit or expressed. If there were in all the world none but they, if neither had conceived the idea of obstruction toward the other, both clear from creation, with nothing but
gentle, refined, and reflective. Their tactics are the result of an intense desire to achieve something in the line of reform coupled with a false philosophy of history and progress. Now, if this be true, then what is the right and wise course for the present society to adopt with regard to such assailants? Whether society recognizes the reality of their grievances or not, both self-interest and sympathy would seem to counsel moderation and leniency towards them. Men are not a realizing sense of error by torture and mutilation, but by discussion and a general disposition to discover and do the proper thing. Would people continue to throw bombs if legislators, journalists, and men of influence generally displayed anxiety to redress wrongs and prevent injustice? Human nature answers in the negative. In fact, if there is anything in France which may be said to hold out the promise of ending the dynamite campaign, it is the decent and relatively intelligent treatment of the phenomenon by the French press. The beard, the carnets and the judges and executioners are utterly helpless, the journalists have a great opportunity. The pen is truly mightier than the knife. Sympathy for Vaillant, appreciation of his motives and traits, cannot but induce doubt as to the need and wisdom of dynamite, and the propaganda by deed does not flourish on such a soil as doubt and reflection. But the majority of American "newspaper-men" are too corrupt, ignorant, and shallow to deal fairly and philosophically with this problem. They are vulgar prostitutes.

What is Freedom?

"Do you think liberty is good for everybody?" said a thoughtful woman to me; "take the many instances of unbridled power, the Roman emperors, for example; surely they had freedom; was it well that they should?"

So people question before the complete notion of liberty fills their minds. The burglar, is he not free? The wife-beater, is he not free? But how about the other people? we ask in reply. When the Roman emperors ruled, they may have been free, but how about the people whom they wronged free? So the burglar may be free, but those whom he robs surely are coerced. And the wife-beater, he too may be free to beat his wife, by virtue of his physical strength, but is she free? To try to realize as soon as you can that freedom means freedom for all. Not freedom for one to club another, while the other is only free to be clubbed, but freedom for both to lead their lives in peace, without either clubbing the other.

But, you may object, it is not possible for one person, nor for everybody, for that matter, to do as he pleases without interfering with anybody. Suppose two want to do the same thing, how are they to settle it? Suppose I want to build my house on a certain corner lot and another man wants to build his on the same lot, how can we both be free to do as we please?

The reply is simply this: If people once admit the principle that freedom for all is advisable, the cases where the exercise of opposite freedoms clash will easily be settled. The question of the corner lot common sense would settle as the question of the choice of seats at a free show is settled, by priority of occupancy, and so with most of those conundrums which those propound to whom freedom is presented as a solution of pressing problems.

People are all free to walk the streets, but that does not mean freedom to walk into each other. The trouble is that, when we leave this principle of freedom of action for all except where the actions clash, and take up the other, that liberty is not the few, that somebody must coerce somebody else, there is no limit to the coercion process. It extends itself immediately from cases where actions do clash to cases where the action which is supposed to suppress not only clashes with nobody else's action, but even to cases where the actions are agreeable to and approved by all concerned. Sunday laws, forbidding people to buy on one day of the week what they buy freely on others, are clearly tyrannical. If the act of buying does not restrict anybody else's freedom on six days of the week, it is manifestly absurd to suppose that it can on the seventh. Sunday laws are enacted, not in protection of the liberty of those who support them, but in order that they may to that extent force their way of thinking and acting upon others at the expense of the liberty of the latter. They want, and almost all of our legislators want, to force a certain line of action upon everybody, because it is approved by religion, or conventionality, or prejudice. The principle is logically carried out by the bands of masked riff-raff, four hours and five minutes after midnight when in the taverns, who go at midnight and whip or burn a man or woman who may be exemplary in his or her dealings with others, and whose actions clash with the actions of no one else. It is not a question of clashing here, it is a question of making everybody do what we happen to think right. As a matter of fact, these White-caps are usually the most respectable men in the community, the pillars of Church and State.

There was a time when freedom was for one man, to whom all were willing slaves, deferent to his dignity from the hour they were born and forever after; as the time in the Roman emperors. Of this spirit much remains in the deference still shown to the ruling powers, whether in monarchies or democracies. In such times, and toward such a spirit of cramping submission, rebellion by any means was the only remedy to urge upon men's minds. But a different state of affairs is coming and has partly come. The many have the power and are learning to use it. It is no longer necessary to urge the people to assert their liberty against the few. Rather it is for us to impress on the world that liberty means letting others be free as well as exercising our own freedom.

For that is what liberty does mean to one who knows what it is. He who is free will have no desire to make others act according to his own code; he will scarcely even advise or suggest to others what they ought to do.

Upon the opposite spirit, the slave's spirit, that we inherit from the past, to force others to do our way, rests the present power of government, by which those who think they govern are themselves enslaved and plundered.

Truly, the majority has the power, but the blind use of that power will always recur upon the users, by supporting the system of economic slavery which now grinds alike governors and governed.

The majority must learn, what we are trying to teach them, that it is safe and proper to use their power only to protect liberty. And that precludes compulsory taxation.

John Beverley Robinson.

Precedents for Anarchistic Society.

Anarchism has the disadvantage of never having been tried under civilized conditions. It appears to work well in certain savage tribes described in Spencer's "Justice," and in some of the Esquimaux tribes. But the conservative will explain that this is because they are naturally inoffensive, and will not believe that their Anarchy can have helped cause their inoffensiveness. Therefore he will not cease to say that Anarchist cannot effectively repress invasive acts; that the protective associations will spend half their time fighting each other, and the other half chasing criminals whom they cannot catch. It is certainly fair to answer by asking how bad they would have to be to be worse than the State; but it is also worth while to look for what we can find of historical precedent.

In the most ancient social organizations of which we have knowledge, citizenship and jurisdiction depended on family. A man was born into such a tribe; therefore the tribe had a right to command him, and to enforce its commands wherever it could find him, while he had a like right to claim its protection wherever it could find him. In these rights and duties in some cases at least, inalienable. We sometimes find this form of order carried even into city life, as in pre-Mohammedan Arabia. The history of Mohammad's life shows us several instances in which a city is inhabited by two or more independent tribes, and the different sections of the city go to war with each other. But it does not appear that they were more disorderly, or fought more, than the tribes of the same turbulent blood in other circumstances. At least, the system was able to live, and give satisfaction to those who lived under it, till overthrown by a power which also overthrew great empires.

This ought to be an answer to those who think that two police agencies cannot coexist in the same place; for there never was a people who "needed a strong government" more than these Arabs.

But this system has been changed in the direction of greater liberty. A man can now change his citizenship, and the laws to which he is subject, whenever he chooses, — provided he will leave his country. Now, imagine what some fine old Tory of the clan system would have said if this change had been proposed to him. "How Anarchistic! A man would be able to escape from all the laws that bind him by simply running away! Law and order would utterly cease!" But the world has survived it. Anarchism proposes to increase liberty further by removing the condition, that a man must leave his country. This would introduce no difficulty, it seems to me, that the world has not got along with fairly well in one or another of the systems which have existed.

But why go to ancient history? Kansas City is much handier. The State line runs right through the edge of the city, among populous streets. Men who live on the same street are
subject to different laws, and look for protection to different powers. Kansas has prohibition; but where the streets run into Kansas, saloons are built up to the State line. The theoretical difficulties in the way of a Missouri policeman's chasing a man into Kansas are much greater than those in the way of two Anarchistic associations' exercising police power on the same ground. But Kansas City claims to be a highly prosperous place.

When New York and Jersey City are connected by tunnel or bridge, nearly the same predicament will arise. The possibilities of Anarchism are about to be introduced in New York. Why do not the defenders of public order protest against the improvements?

Worse yet. Under Anarchy every man would be subject to his neighbor's association to this extent, that the association could punish him for clearly invincible acts. But today, in every civilized country, there is a large body of men who are under no law whatever. Envous and consuls are responsible to no one but the government which sends them. Amonwell once languished in a Russian prison for murder, but no one ever dared follow the example. If a consul commits a crime here, all we can do is politely to request the consul's royal master to recall him as a persona non grata, and to punish him at home in such a way as may seem adequate. This privilege extends to the foreign representative's retinue also, including, I believe, even household servants.

It is the uniform practice of Christian countries to maintain as against non-Christian countries the ancient principle that their subjects in a foreign country are not subject to the laws of that country. This privilege is always provided for in treaties. Hence the European in such a country is bound by no law but such as his consul will enforce. In places like Cairo and Jerusalem there are considerable colonies of at least half a dozen nationalities, each of which is responsible solely to its consul. I never heard of a proposition to unite all the Europeans, not to say all the city, under a single authority.

But Anarchism — oh, oh!

STEPHEN T. BRIGHTON.

Always the Same.

Many Archistic ideas take root in the belief that the State in a republic is different from that in monarchial countries. It is often asserted that in America the State is the people, because it derives its power directly from them. This is negatively true of every form of State, but only negatively. For what is this mysterious, intangible power? It is not dependent upon the existence, either of any one individual in a monarchy, or of any body of legislators in a republic. When the Czar lies, or when the term of office of every legislator expires, the State still lives. We often find men living under a monarch who condemn most strongly the acts of their sovereign and yet are stout advocates of that form of State. So, in America, we find men who condemn every Congress they know anything about, and yet bow lustily about the sacredness of "our glorious institutions." Often will a man maintain that politics is unclean, that our legislative halls are filled with men whom he heartily despises; he will assert that the protective tariff is a tyrannical imposition on the people, yet he will be willing to punish the smuggler for disobeying a bad law, enacted by a set of disputable politicians, just because it is necessary to obey the mandates of the State.

Strange that these same men, who maintain most stoutly that the people are the State, maintain just as stoutly that it is necessary to have a State to govern the people, because the people are incapable of governing themselves.

The State is the same, no matter what form it may take. It gains its power from the superstition of its subjects, and so is able to exercise tyranny over them in proportion to the depth of this superstition.

P. D. T.

Referring to a series of articles on Socialism contributed by M. Janet to the French "Correspondant," the New York "Nation" says: "M. Janet comforts us all with the belief that the reign of 'collectivism,' or State Socialism, as it was ever tried, would not last long, because 'the day the Collectivists got into power, the Anarchists would be their radicals.' But should we then have to try Anarchism and bombs before discarding their doctrines? The Anarchists are just as sincere as the State Socialists, and their aims are said to be as high, and if we must stand before rejecting it, on the strength of what the prophets tell us about it, the bomb system ought to have a chance. The trouble is that by the time its failure was fully acknowledged, we should all be hiding in the woods, or among the ruins of our houses, in puris naturalibus. Such a manner of speaking about the revolutionary Communists is surprising and gratifying in an American Journal. Instead of the customary denunciation of them as fiends, enemies of the human race, etc., we have here the admission that they are as sincere as the parliamentary State Socialists, and that their aims are as high. This change over the spirit of the 'Nation's' amalgamation is, I believe, directly traceable to the influence of the French press. It is very unfortunate that most of our journalists are ignorant of other languages; familiarity with French and German journalism would open their eyes to their own puerility and baseness and make them ashamed of themselves. The few American journalists who read French, gradually and unconsciously acquire the habit of discussing matters in a liberal and civilized manner.

The London "Law Journal" has been endeavoring to show that the right of asylum is totally inapplicable to the throwers of bombs and believers in propaganda by deed. The "highest authorities," it says, "hold that the right has no application to 'anarchist outrages.' It may not unreasonably be doubted whether the highest authorities are altogether free from bias, whether their wish is entirely divorced from their thought. Still, it would be perfectly natural for constitutional governments to deny the right of asylum to any revolutionists who are out of sympathy with the parliamentary idea of political liberty; the bourgeoisie, society can hardly be expected to show mercy or consideration to its implacable enemies, who announce their intention of making ruthless war upon it. What is significant and suggestive is that, while a professional organ of Individualism, the London "Liberty Review," agrees with the "Law Journal" in denying the right of asylum to bomb-throwers, French journalists of all parties and opinions are willing to recognize that the Vaillants and Henrys are political offenders and not common criminals. To pretend that they are not, is absurd; but the defenders of monoply and legal aggression do not hold themselves bound to be rational or logical in their apology for the prevailing order of things. Violence, fraud, sophistry, lying, — in short, anything to uphold the present regime. But they do not realize that the more brutal, brazen, and unprincipled they are, the more bomb-throwers they will have to reckon with.

In his talk upon bomb-throwing, Ambrose Bierce thus refers to the present State: "Our system of civilization, being the natural outgrowth of our wretched moral and intellectual natures, is open to criticism and subject to revision." Without challenging the correctness of this statement, it is pertinent to ask why Mr. Bierce does not take the same philosophical view on the bomb question. Why doesn't he say that such methods as bomb-throwing, being the natural outgrowth of our wretched moral and intellectual natures, are open to criticism and correction? Why does he condemn the bomb-thrower to mutilation as a wild beast, while finding excuses for the corrupt politician, the exploiter, oppressor, tyrant, and monopolist? One-sided charity is not charity. If Mr. Bierce insists on judging the bomb-thrower only by an act and refuses to ascribe it to honest but erroneous belief, why may not the bomb-thrower similarly judge the politicians and monopolists only by their acts and turn a deaf ear to philosophical considerations?

Emile Henry, the "Anarchist," who threw a bomb in the Cafe Terminus, Paris, has been "tried," convicted on all counts by the bourgeoisie jury, and sentenced to death. Henry's bomb killed no one, but his death-sentence will doubtless serve as a warning to other dynamiters: their bombs will be more fatal probably. Of course, the public prosecutor accused Henry of "robberies" and any number of petty crimes (it is strange that wife-stealing did not figure among the charges against him), but the reports in the American papers were too meagre and scrappy to justify any opinion on the truth or falsity of these accusations. Henry's conduct in court seems to have been admirable. Liberty hopes to publish an elaborate report of his trial.

A correspondent of London "Personal Rights," F. Evershed, having called upon Individualists to subscribe to the proposition that compulsory taxation for any purpose whatever is robbery, the editor tries to convict him of rash generalizing by saying: "Suppose a house-owner distrains the goods of a tenant who would not pay his rent; Suppose a father brutally ill-treated his child; that, as consequence of this, it was removed from his custody; that he declined to pay towards its support; and that his goods were seized to enforce this payment. Both of these cases are ' robbery' according to Mr. Evershed's definition. But would he call them by this name?" This argumentation is astonishingly pointless and fallacious. Assuming that the delinquent tenant and brutal
father are aggressors (and "Personal Rights" manifestly regards them as such), then to seize their goods for the public benefit—be "robbery" according to Mr. Everson's definition," since he clearly had only the non-invasive in mind when he declared that compulsory taxation for any purpose whatever is robbery. Neither the tenant nor the father is, in the cases supposed, can be said to be "taxed," in the scientific sense of the term, any more than a man who is made to pay damages for trespass or conversion is "taxed." To argue that, because the invader is rightfully compelled to pay, it is right to make the non-invader pay, is to beg the question. The reason is that the latter, whether the non-invader owes it to his fellows to pay for anything he never agreed to receive and declines to accept.

The Populist Senator Allen deserves praise for his main defence of the right of Coxe's army to "march on Washington," hold meetings in that city, and make whatever appeal to Congress it may see fit. His attack on the notorious Ordway, on the police officials, and on the brutal editors, who propose to treat the army as a band of criminals, was refreshing and will have a good effect. Senator Hawley's reply has pleased the venoms and unprincipled defenders of monopoly, but it will not influence men of common sense and common humanity. Coxe's scheme is silly, but he should be protected in his liberty to carry it out. As to the charge in procleratic organs that the army is composed of professional tramps, who would not work under any circumstances, it is hardly necessary to say that it is a pure and malicious falsehood. Professional tramps do not organize political demonstrations, and lack the courage necessary to face the opposition of sheriffs, policemen, brutal editors, and other hirelings of monopoly. A dispatch to the New York "Examiner" says, "General Manager St. John, of the Chicago, Rock Island, and Pacific Railway, who passed through this city last night from Council Bluffs, talked differently from some other railway men about the "Commonwealth Army," its purposes, and the alleged menace it is to the country. 'It is made up of sober, intelligent, determined men,' he said. 'They are, nine-tenths of them, American born. They are reliable, honest, and remarkably well organized. There are no bugs among them. The statements that have been sent out about their being tramps and all that sort of thing are utterly untrue. Their leader is a man of brains and character and great determination, and is a religious man, too. He will not permit outrages to be done by any of his men if there should be any inclination in that direction, which there is not now. He will not permit any tramp or disreputable person to enlist in his army, and will remove the first one he can find. He has absolute control over his men, which he could never have over a body of tramps or disreputables. He said to me that his men would not go back under any circumstances. They are going to Washington in some way; of that I am sure." This flatly contradicted the ravings of the editor, but it did not prevent him from reiterating his lying and malicious accusations. Under such provocation, what wonder is it that some are goaded into applying the bomb cure?

Seems to me that some of them will (at least at first) combine other than defensive functions. I gave reasons for this view in my article of April 21: If I did not prove my point, I want it in discussion; the possibility that it may be so. Then we want a name for the State's successors. I have thought of the word "polity," which would do well if we could start it in usage.

Anarchist Letter-Writing Corps.

The Secretary wants every reader of Liberty to send in his name for enrolment. Those who do so thereby pledge themselves to write, when asked, a letter to the Secretary on the subject assigned, and are to have an opportunity of forming the society of suitable targets. Address, STEPHEN T. BYINGTON, Eddystone, Yates Co., N. Y.

There are twelve members enrolled today, and hopes of more. One writes, "I think in this condition, that it will be an Anarchist corps. I would make it a condition of membership that the applicant is in line with Liberty's teachings." Another writes, "I try to mean "any" means endorse I all find in Liberty, and am averse to wearing the tag of any item whatsoever; but I see no objection to joining an association so broad as you propose, wholly voluntary." Both are well known as among Liberty's most valuable supporters. Let the secretaries form a nucleus.

I opened the door wide to let in such men, who are in line, but object to saying so. But I never expected, as a matter of probability, that those who are not fairly in line would be interested; nor do I think the letters are securing anyone who would write. And do not think anyone need fear it. Of the first twelve, eight are already known to me from their writings as up to the standard; two of the others defined their Anarchist position very clearly in writing to me, and I have not the slightest doubt that the other two occupy the same position. Therefore I card my conditional friend as a full member, considering that it is without doubt an Anarchist corps.

It will be seen from the above statement that the great unknown do not realize their opportunity. I am glad of the prominent names, and want more; but I want about fifty more obscure ones.

Suggestion No. 6: Be full and careful in explanations. Remember, your reader doesn't know an Anarchist idea from an exorcist's; he expects people to use language loosely, an expectation which experience abundantly justifies; it is hard for us to guard against ourselves. If you mention a "mutual bank," he will try to invent a mutual bank in his mind; if you demand "voluntary taxation," he will think you mean to support government by passing along some arbitrary distribution of "the monopoly of money-lending," he will think you refer to the national banks, and that your remedy would be to have currency issued by the government exclusively. If you appear for legal tender actions, he will wonder if it is worth while to get down his dictionary to see in what sense you use the word "invasive." If you say anything that can be understood, by any twist of English, as compatible with government-ism, he will so understand it. Of course, you cannot always cover all the ground; but, in what you do cover, aim to make misunderstanding impossible.

Target passing. "The Economist, of Chicago, recently published a string of editorial "beliefs," among them the following: "The present jury system is a humbug," "Every political party should become responsible, and its platform should be in the nature of a contract, and its officers should be held, under penalty of dismissal for failure, to carry out its contract." "District courts should be abolished, and supreme courts as well; an advisory board should be elected for life (and good behavior)." This would do away with all quibbles, and no packed or corrupt "juryman could decide your fate." "Compulsory education throughout the Union." Section B—Joseph H. Storey, 332 W. 220th St., New York, had a letter in the "Morning Advertiser," April 22, headlined "Monopoly the Curse," chiefly on monopoly and the effects of taxation of the currency accordingly. "We need the output of currency that the purchasing power of a dollar shall remain the same forever," and government loans to the people at 5 per cent. on good security.

S. T. B., Secretary.
The Beauties of Government.

[Text content not legible, possibly due to a scan issue or image quality]

Military experts still differ considerably as to the practical value of this body of voluntary citizen soldiers, but they agree absolutely as to the usefulness of such a body of well-drilled and effective citizen as this. The very idea of a force of armed men scattered all over the land, who can be called together at a moment's notice, is a powerful deterrent to would-be aggressors. It is a force that cannot be underestimated.

Reverting to Middle-Ages Legislation.

[Text content not legible, possibly due to a scan issue or image quality]

The State's Attempt at Protection.

[Text content not legible, possibly due to a scan issue or image quality]

Whistling a Chime.

Whether the "fair suflfering," as the American lady was styled who some time ago delighted London with her whistling performances, has ever given a specimen of her talents in a positive way, it is not known. It is true, however, that whistling is not encouraged in that capital. Strange to tell, the hall porter of a hotel has just been fined three marks in a court of his charity for whistling in the streets. It is said that whistling in the streets is illegal in the German capital, on the ground that it disturbs the tranquility of the public. A happy city is Berlin, where the organ grinder is unknown, where the native performances are not so loud as to be heard at a distance, and where even whistling is regarded as a nuisance.

[Text content not legible, possibly due to a scan issue or image quality]

Pur at Taxpayer Expense.

[Text content not legible, possibly due to a scan issue or image quality]

The British volunteer soldiers, a force which numbers over 500,000 men, are engaged in the customary Eastern campaigns, which consist mainly in wasting an immense quantity of powder and executing movements which would be impossible in actual warfare.

Liberty, 717.

A bill entitled "An Act to enable State bill posting and bill distributing" has been introduced in the Legislature by Mr. James M. E. O'Grady, member of Assembly from Monroe county. It is a vicious measure, fit only to be defeated.

Its main purpose is to make bill posting a licensed business under the supervision of the Secretary of State. The license fees payable to that officer are to be regulated according to the size of the town or city in which the bill poster carries on his occupation. In a place having a population of less than 10,000, the charge for a license will be five dollars. From that amount the charges run up in this way:

- License for a town or city with 10,000 to 20,000 population
- License for a town or city with 20,000 to 50,000 population
- License for a town or city with 50,000 to 100,000 population
- License for a town or city with 100,000 to 500,000 population
- License for a town or city with 500,000 to 2,000,000 population
- License for a town or city with 2,000,000 to 5,000,000 population
- License for a town or city with 5,000,000 to 10,000,000 population
- License for a town or city with over 10,000,000 population

Each license is to expire on the first of January of each year, and is not to be capable of transfer to any other bill poster; and every applicant must furnish to the Secretary of State as his or her annual performance of his bill-posting duties, in the form of a bond of $1,000, with at least two sureties.

After a bill poster obtains his license under this ridiculous measure, he is to supply himself with each of his agents with a suitable badge, on which the words "State License Advertiser" shall be stamped or engraved; and this badge the poster must wear in a conspicuous place while engaged in the act of posting, writing, engraving, or distributing any bills, cards, signs, pamphlets, circulars, or advertisements of any kind in any town, village, or city in this State.

Now, if this bill stopped with the folly of making bill posters pay a license fee to the State for the privilege of wearing a statutory badge, it would be merely absurd, but not necessarily harmful. It goes much further, however. It contains a broad and sweeping prohibition against the posting of bills, or the circulation of advertisements among pedestrians, by any persons other than licensees under the act, or their agents employed by them, and a violation of this prohibition of any other provision of the statute is made punishable as a misdemeanor, by fine and imprisonment.

There is no good reason that can possibly be suggested for State interference in the business in the manner proposed by Mr. O'Grady. In the case of a doctor or a lawyer or an engineer in charge of a steam boiler, the State or municipal government may properly take precautions to protect the public from its use in the case of an unqualified person being permitted to undertake such a pursuit, and hence may insist that he shall obtain a license as a prerequisite. In the case of a bill poster, however, there is no conceivable end which can be the outcome of incompetency on his part, and we cannot imagine what public interest demands that a private citizen who has bills to post or advertising notices to circulate should be prohibited by law under pain of fine and imprisonment from posting his bills or circulating his notices himself.

No privileged class of decorated bill posters is desired by the people of this State.

But legislation is not for the people. It is for monopolists, and there is no reason why there should be competition in bill posting.

The Sovereign Voter Exercising his Right.

[Text content not legible, possibly due to a scan issue or image quality]

The Chicago election is over, and it is gratifying to read in the morning papers that it "passed off quietly." There were only about a hundred fights, all told, with a proper proportion of broken heads to each. A goodly number of shots were fired, but as the gunners were full of beer, the bullets went wild. Out of the three men who were shot, all three were "expected to recover." In the first ward it was ballots against ballots, and the bullets won. Much patriotic feeling was exhibited in this ward among the partisans of Mr. Lincoln, Mr. Seward, the opposing candidates for the office of alderman, and they turned the election into a Donnybrook Fair. When the polls closed it was found that Mr. O'Gallana was elected, and that Mr. Shaiken's men were most of them in the hospital, with various degrees of residence under the doctor's care. A large number of colored
men live in the first ward, and they showed as much aptitude for American citizenship as the white men. Two of them—Phillips and Marshall—fought a duel in the crowd of thoroughfare at the corner of Taylor and State streets, but, unfortunately, although they "emptied their revolvers," only one of them was killed, and this was explained as due more to accident than skill, because his feet were "usually large," and one of them stopped a bullet. One of Mr. Sholes’s band-wagons was filled with hiring musicians, playing "Marching Through Georgia," and they had the temerity to blow their trumpets in front of "Hinky Dink’s" saloon, the headquarters of the Congressmen party. As might have been expected, they were welcomed with a volley from the revolvers of the musicians. The musicians were "ducked," and the bullets, passing over them, went into McCloy’s Hotel, but merely breaking the windows and tiling plaster on the inside walls. This election was mere for aldermen and township officers; it did not include within its fortunes the glory and emoluments of national, State, or county candidates, and that’s the reason it “passed off quietly.”

FEDERAL COURTS EFFER.
[New York Herald]

Within a few days two conflicting decisions have come from United States courts in the West touching the power of a federal judge over the employes of a railway in the hands of a receiver. At Milwaukee on Friday Judge Jenkins slightly modified the language of his recent order which attracted a great deal of attention throughout the country and aroused so much in New York among workmen. That order not only enjoined employes of the Northern Pacific from striking, but it forbade every body "from ordering, recommending or advising others to quit the service." These words are now stricken out, but the Judge maintains the right of the Court to enjoin the men from striking orcombining to quit work with or without notice.

On Thursday, before at Omaha Judge Caldwell declared that such injunctions were not only an unwarranted interference with the rights and freedom of workingmen, but that they had an "injurious tendency."

[When it comes to judicial legislation, everything depends on the feelings and notions of the individual judge. Law is what law does. If the judge is an ardent friend of privilege and capitalism, he will shrink from nothing. But some judges sympathize with the people to some extent.]

WAITING FOR THE GOVERNMENT.
[From the Open Court.]

As an additional punishment for our national sins a new post called the Russian thistle is ravaging the fields of the great Northwest. Its capacity for mischief appears to be unlimited, and Mr. Harrisburg, a member of the House, said that every one has come under the necessity of having to have a law passed "for the extermination of the thistle. To that end he has introduced a bill appropriating a million dollars for the purpose of warding out the menace that has been imported free of duty from the Russian plains. As soon as the bill was introduced, patriots willing and strong as the thistle itself sprang up to claim a share of the money under the pretense of "wiping out" the thistle. One of these, a citizen of Iowa, has made application to Mr. Sterling Morton, the Secretary of Agriculture, for the office of chief exterminator of the Russian thistle for the State of Iowa, and the secretary in reply gave the applicant a very good lesson in ethical and political economy. With sarcasm sharper than the sting of a thistle, Mr. Morton said: "I must thank you for the patriotic frankness with which you remark, referring to thistles as spreading fast, but we do not want to kill them out before the Government is ready to pay us for the work, or to send one such to do it for us. Nothing could better demonstrate your peculiar faith in adaptation of the Russian Thistle Exterminator for the Northwest." Such are the benefits of a motherly government. It pampers its children until they lose the spirit of self-reliance, and they would rather let the thistle grow than eat it out without pay from the national treasury. In fact, they are already threaten-

ing to let the thistles spread and then throw the blame for it upon the government.

[The farmers are learning the trick of democratic government, and it is fortunate that they are. The worse, the better. As long as the few use the political machine to exploit the many, democracy is possible; but when the spoliations become general and everybody wants to have a share of the plunder, the whole scheme must fail.]
Legitimacy.

Mr. Fisher is usually clear and intelligible, but I confess I am utterly at a loss to understand his short treatise, entitled "Illegitimacy," and make out the drift of it to have been the adoption of illegitimacy. He seems for once to have completely confounded law and custom. In the belief that he is riding a tilt against the law, he is in reality merely condemning their pretensions in their own day and age.

He complains that certain persons are "stigmatized by opprobrious designations, such as bastard, illegitimate, and the like. They are: similarly, other persons are stigmatized with the odious epithet of 'bastard or of common-sense illegitimacy' among their own families and even 'women.' Whether or not it is a disgrace to be unable to point out one's father, is a matter of opinion; but it does not alter the fact that many persons are in the habit of calling such others than them? Illegitimate? Or bastard? Will the word 'natural' suffice? But it is not the word to which Mr. Fisher objects. It is the unkind thought which usually accompanies its use. And yet no one is bound to think with anger or contempt of a neighbor, merely because he is compelled to call him 'illegitimate' or 'bastard' or of 'natural.' This is a question for the pulpit, and not for the political platform. What I describe a man's mother by, may mean that he dresses and comport himself in the latest fashion and with some exaggeration of expression. I confess I think unkindly of such an one. Some persons hold him in esteem. It is a matter of course. So, again, it may be that the word 'bastard' or of 'natural' designation, because it is pitiable and even contemptible to be far below the average in intelligence and self-control. Is Mr. Fisher going to bring forward a tale of humiliation and ignominy? What many women who wish they had been born men? they regard "woman" as a term of reproach. Will Mr. Fisher get up a crusade for the abolition of femininity? Or will he make it a penal offence for him to talk of the condition of lawless or nameless children? What becomes of him if the number of such children as has become or bastards? Mr. Fisher is no Don Quixote, and there must be some reasonable explanation of his attitude. And I think I have found it. He actually believes that illegitimacy perhaps is a very legitimate legal and political disability. There are several passages in his pamphlet which confirm this conjecture. He proposes (p. 12) "to repeal all laws defining illegitimacy. There are no such laws to repeal. A bastard has not the rights of an ordinary citizen. He exercises the franchise, he can hold land, he can inherit land from his own issue (that is to say, his only possible relations). The word 'bastard' or of 'natural' on the same political level as his legitimate fellows. All the State does is to say to him (and to everybody else), "If you wish to rank us the son of any particular man, you must show that your mother and he were already married at the time of your birth. Then his legal status is one of legal illegitimacy, or a bastard, and he is not entitled to any legal rights whatever. This is the case in most of the civilized countries of the world. The French law does not permit any illegitimate child to inherit the property of his or her parents. The English law will not accept anything less, for purposes of succession, than the marriage of the father himself before the birth of the child, and in the public form known as marriage. It is a cruel and wicked thing to disappoint reasonable expectations, and our humane laws are based on justice. Marriage properly means the acknowledgment of legitimacy before the conception of a child, but in English law it means the acknowledgment of legitimacy before the birth of the child. It is therefore proper by the State upon married persons we are not now concerned. For example, the State says, "Once married, always married." This may be wise or foolish. The State says, "We are not concerned with the debts of the woman, called the wife. Custom expects the woman to adopt the name of the man. The State will not allow the man, in case of the woman's death, at the death of any of her relatives within certain prescribed degrees. Indeed, the regulations concerning married persons are numerous and detailed enough to fill many volumes, and to occupy the time and thought of many lawyers and courts of justice. But this is in no way alter the facts that marriage means, so far as children are concerned, the acknowledgment of legitimacy before the birth of the child, — simply and that nothing more. It is true that our State will accept the birth of a child after the death of the father; and the legist, being not the State, may give the child the acknowledgment of legitimacy. The least of the three children of the marriage expected to inherit father's land and houses; three expected to succeed to a share of his personality as next of kin. This, of course, has been most frequently inferred perhaps in accordance with this expectation. And now all these hopes are dashed to the ground. Surely Mr. Fisher will admit that this is unnecessary and cruel. Does not the law imply a connection between a legitimate by marriage arriving at marriage according to law is that in the case of the parties dying intestate, the survivors is heir to the whole or a part of the personal estate." (P. 32.)

The conclusion is that marriage according to law is an essential condition of legitimacy, and therefore a condition of succession. Under marriage a man's so-called legitimate child becomes his heir, subject to some provision for his wife." (P. 19.)

There are cases of marriage according to law which is in the case of the parties dying intestate, the survivors is heir to the whole or a part of the personal estate." (P. 32.)

The presence of such provisions is virtually equivalent to the provision which the law has made that the child of a marriage according to law is an essential condition of legitimacy, and therefore a condition of succession. Under marriage a man's so-called legitimate child becomes his heir, subject to some provision for his wife. (P. 19.)

I am not going to say one of these unfortunate; and I am charged with having discussed the question of inheritance and succession to the utmost exclusion of all others. I refer to my presidential address to the legitimacy League. I did so; but I had not then a glimmer of suspicion that any one present actually believed in a status of illegitimacy, as a legal status of a special kind. I should have thought of course, that Mr. Fisher, when he is being stigmatized as the non-brother of the 'Son of Russia.' So he is; but does he wish to be called all his relations, or even a legitimate status, as distinguished from a relative or reciprocal one? I fear I must admit having used language in my presidential address which almost justifies the interpretation put upon it by Mr. Fisher, unless carefully construed is the intent of the context. I said, "It seems hard that innocent children should be branded with a life-long taint of bastardy, as the result of folly or impatience, or it may be weakness, over which they had no control." What, in order to be more explicit, I ought to have said, is this: "It seems hard that the State should be held as bastards those whose parents are willing and ready to remove the stain." This is what I understand to be the object of the League; and had it been more than this, I for one could not have joined in its constitution. Nor can I accept Mr. Fisher's amendment of the League's own statement as to its aim. The League, says he, has been established with this object: to create a machinery for acknowledging offspring born out of wedlock, and to secure for them (that is, such acknowledged children) equal rights with children born in wedlock. This is a very different thing from that which Mr. Fisher proposes, namely, that the law shall secure for all bastards equal rights with legitimate children. But they already have equal rights in all respects save one; but this means that the law shall thrust the bastard by force upon the family of the putative father, with or without the consent of such putative father or his kinsfolk. After this, what shall the father do? Shall he acknowledge them? Surely, such a machinery would be a laughingstock. What need would it supply? In other words, Mr. Fisher proposes a compulsory law, and supplements it by an enabling one. As for his quarter century or more of legislative suffrage to say that if even they were dubbed "hero" or "angel," those names would soon degenerate into terms of reproach and insult; but when it is contended that this would not be done, he has not been able to explain how, or why, that the answer is, they are a distinct class of persons and must have a class-name. Having now unraveled the "fixed idea" which underlies Mr. Fisher's peculiar views on illegitimacy, we shall be prepared for the remedy he proposes, viz., "to introduce a law whereby all children not adopted by anyone become legitimate persons without bonds of kinship, and they are mere rebels of the law which establishes illegitimacy. If "bastards" were outlawed, disfavored, or specially taxed, or otherwise ill-treated by the State, there would be force in this proposal; but, seeing that they are all treated equally by those who are legitimate (except as to their claims on the property of particular persons), and that, in short, there are no laws establishing illegitimacy, I fear Mr. Fisher's theory of the "true" will have no success. He is a dreamer, indeed, that he allows himself to glide into so fanciful a position. Don Quixote's windmills were at any rate windmills; Mr. Fisher's are all in their heads. What, then, was the object in forming the Legitimation League? Was it for the purpose of insinuating the principles of charity in all things? Was it intended to teach the people to look upon the legitimacy of the illegitimate, and respect which is accorded to those born in wedlock? One might as well form an association for the purpose of inducing Bostonian ladies to invite negroes to their salon; or for the purpose of disputing the claims of which schoolboys took down on their sisters and girls generally; or for the purpose of filling down the aspirations which embitter the intercourse of Jews and Aryans. No, the only form that such a law can take is the law of separation of Church and State. Only time and culture can affect a change in the feelings with which bastards are usually regarded. But if there is no status of illegitimacy, and if bastards are not held to be less entitled to the same respect, there is no place for the law to reform. I will answer. To begin with, why should the community concern itself at all with the relation of individuals? What business is it of ours whether the relations of father and son, or of husband and wife? The answer is three-fold. Parents being by law, responsible for the care, maintenance, and education of their illegitimate children: An Inquiry Into Their Personal Rights, and a Plea for the Abolition of Illegitimacy. By J. Green Fisher, a View of the Legitimacy Question. London: W. Boone, Lon-
children, it is necessary to know who the parents of a child are, the law has defined, in order thus to think that am-
liation and legitimation have something in common, which
they have not. It would indeed be a strange "reform" to
rent the title to thirty thousand acres and make some
this notion that a stranger in blood to the detriment of
of the lawful heir. But here again this is frequently done under cover
of marriage, and in both cases it merely creates a
precaution, which can be rebutted by the production of
sufficient evidence of the alleged parentage. This
It is an old maxim of English law that God, not
man, makes the heir. In other words, the tenant for
life cannot atoll the heir apparent, except by the
acknowledgment of the paternity of the pretended
father, and the purchase of the title. But does not the
paternity of the family blood considerably tarnished.
seeing, then, that persons with great expectations
may be as easily disappointed by the process of matrim-
one as they are by the clausal purchase. In both cases,
only to consider the probable wishes of the de-
case.

Extracts from Nietzsche's Works.

WHEN THERE IS NEED OF ABUSE.—One cannot bring the
masses to shout honours until one rides into the
city on an ass.

WORKS.—It is nothing against the nature of a
work that it has some flaw.

INSISTENCY OF THE CONDITION OF MASTERSHIP.—It is
inevitable: every master has but one disciple—and he
proves unfaithful,—for he too is destined to become
a master.

SOVEREIGNTY.—To respect also the bad, and to
own it, and to own one's own, is the true conception of how
one can feel ashamed of one's pleasure, is the mark of
sovereignty, in great things and small.

PRACTICAL PEOPLE.—We thinkers must first deter-
mine and, if necessary, the good taste of all
things. The practical people will finally accept it
from us; their dependance on us is incredibly great and
the most laughable spectacle in the world, little as they
know it and haughtily as they love to talk
about it. How else should they regard slightly
practical life if we were to regard it slightly:
—into which a little love of revenge might
now and then tempt us.

IN DOING, WE SUFFER TO BE DONE.—Fundament-
ally all those moralities are repugnant to me which say:
"Do thine! Renounce! Conquer thyself!"

On the other hand, I favor those moralities which
impel me to do a thing, and do it again early and late,
and to the last. I know that that is a notion of nothing but
so that we do it well, as well as it is possible for me alone to do it
Whoever lives so will only by one lose qualities that do
not belong to such a life: without hatred or ill-feeling
he will see departing from him, now this, now that,
like a yellow leaf, his little slice of air
takes from the tree; or he will not see anything de-
parting from him at all, so steadily his -eye gazes upon
him and before him, not sideways, butwards. Our doing shall determine what we suf-
er to be done; in doing we suffer to be done —such is my
pleasure, thus reads my psalms. But I will not
with open eyes aspire after my impoverishment; I dis-
consider all that which makes me de-
and self-renunciation itself.

SELF-CONTROL.—Those moral teachers who first and
last exhort man to get himself into his power, afflic
him with a peculiar disease thereby: namely, a constant
irritation to all matters and things and intentions,
and, as it were, a sort of itching. Whatever may
henceforth push, draw, attract, impel him from with-
in or without, —it will always appear to this irritable
person as if now his self-control were in danger: he
may in no longer enter any instinct, to any free
flight of his fancy, but constantly assumes an atti-
dude of defence, armed against himself, his eye keen
and suspicious, an eternal sentinel of his castle into
which he has made his home, —thus he may be
great! But how insufferable he has now become to
others, how difficult to himself, how impoverished
and cut off from the finest accidents of the world? Yes, he
stands with his further 'for future'. And for one must be
able to lose one's self at times if one wishes to learn
anything of the things which we are not ourselves.

* * * Die philosophische Wissenschaft, Moralphilosophie, Wiss.'
- Unmechanismus.
A Russian View of the American Press.

[1 L. W. Young, in St. Petersburg Vsebuk-Epamy. Condensed for the Liberty Digest.]

While looking over the American daily newspapers, the characteristic of the country is conveyed to you by an English humorist who would constantly recur to my mind. Imagine a miscellaneous gathering of men and women, he says, in a parlor; all six quietly and exchange ordinary phrases. The people are not talking. He then goes on to discuss a recent speech of Gladstone's or a new picture, but you feel that everybody is bored. Suddenly one gentleman mentions the divorce case of a certain lord. All turn their heads at once. This is the new version of another scandal, in which a certain duchess figures. Significant glances, smiles, and ejaculations are to be observed or heard on all sides, and the conversation turns naturally into the scandal. A lie or a scandal has affected this transformation.

What strikes the eye in American papers? Loud, suggestive headlines, extravagantly or doubtful news, stilted phrases, worse than anything, editorials written for advertising purposes and advertisements written in the form of literary or even political essays, an incomprehensible (to the European) superficiality of thought, a sharp criticism of government acts, and merciless partisan polemics. The words are noisy, the reader is not satisfied, and he does not know what to take seriously and what to regard as a mere commercial exploit. At the same time the paper is lively and interesting, and, in spite of one's indignation, one is led to head off another proving alluring and attractive.

The bad moral reputation of the American press dates far back, although only of late have the prejudices and allusions been really branching. A gentleman, in leaving a large sum to a Philadelphia library, stipulated in his will that no daily paper should be found in the library. Thirty years ago Charles Dickens suggested, in one of his novels, that a fit name for the American press is "American paper." And even Americans admit that the papers have deteriorated since Dickens's visit. Compare the American with the English papers, and there is at once perceived to be an immense difference. The daily papers in Europe are larger and have more variety of reading matter, but the importance of the utterance, the serious and dignified tone, and the scholarly character of the English paper is not much sought in the American paper. In the United States, the paper is published for the sake of the news only. The principal aim of the editor is to afford daily as much fresh news in readable shape as possible. If this is done, the editor takes a paper in your hands, a large number of "display heads," meant to be catching, strike your eye. These words and phrases, puerile, offensive to the eye as well as to the mind, yet are deemed of such high importance that every one in every paper there is specially charged with the function of producing them and indicating the type in which they are to be set.

Long articles without a striking head, so frequently found in the American papers, are unknown in America; the editor would be horrified by them. News not of a practical character is not valued. They have a proverb that "good news is no news," and hence the eager hunt for news necessarily resolves itself into preference for sensation, scandal, filthy gossip, and libel, which often entail criminal suits. To some extent, this is due to the isolated position of America, and her lack of nearly every aspect or aspect of European politics. Public opinion in America never occupies itself much with international questions, so important to the English journalist. Being thus one-sided purveyors of sensational news, and ignorant of the larger questions, the papers have very little influence and do not shape the course of events. A paper may have a million readers without being a power in national life.

The great influx of newspapers in America has resulted in attracting into the business a lot of shrewd men who look upon a paper as a business enterprise, and whose skill consists in knowing what and how to bring to the public and to advertise them. They are undiscerning and have no literary talent; but they hire men to write and conduct the paper precisely as they would hire people for other lines of business. There are so many good writers and reporters in America that the publisher could make changes in his personnel every day. There is no question of a tendency or guiding general principle, but simply of selling papers. While there are a few organs representing special classes of readers and of interests, the overwhelming majority of papers have no convictions. Usually the paper adheres to some party platform, which it defends against the other parties, but its real aim is to secure as many votes as possible. It will change its politics at the slightest provocation, or even without any, simply for the sake of profit. It is an ordinary thing for a paper to go over to another party, and its readers to vote into it for a time, but after a little experience everybody who can leave it does so. There is no future for the average journalist. He finds himself reduced to pauperism in old age, and if he is ambitious, he is not organized into a union, and is not in a position to resist the rule of capital. For the sake of bread they have to do most dishonorable acts and suffer indignities. Some become spies or detectives, or others cultivate the secrets with which they are entrusted to disclose the secrets of their employers. In many houses the reporters are despised and looked upon as vulgar and treacherous scamps.

Recent Object Lessons.

[George E. MacDonnel in the Truth Seeker.]

Recent events have given a set-back to the State Socialistic proposition that the general government should own and control railroads and telegraph lines. The ministry now in power in Newfoundland are all in court for bribing voters by hiring them with public funds to do useless work on inferior railway construction, which may be regarded as a fair sample of what is now prevalent in this country is extended to include all the larger industries. Governor Tillman, of South Carolina, by seizing a telegraph line and dictating press dispatches, has further exhibited his contempt for the government control of the means of communication, of which the Comstock censorship of the mails had given us a foreshadow. Religious and scientific investigation, as exemplified in the expurgated reports of the Smithsonian Institution; government railroad building, as exemplified in Newfoundland; governmental control of liquor sales, as illustrated in South Carolina, and government seizure of telegraph lines, as exemplified by Tillman; governmental espionage over the moral qualities of male matter, as exemplified by the Comstock laws, how do the State Socialists like it as far as they have got it?

Ice Treatment Required.

[Asher Herbert in Ice Life.]

The "Hospital" makes a proposal to seize Anarchists and treat them as lunatics. The "Hospital" itself evidently much requires some common-sense treatment. It uses the term Anarchist apparently in perfect ignorance that the term comes almost as many differences as the terms Liberal and Conservative, and without the slightest inkling that the dynamiting Anarchist is a violent reaction from the stupidities of government and not an anarchist at all. News of the "Hospital's" never having thought upon the subject—favors and uphold. A good many people will be of opinion that rash talkers—if they could translate talk into action—the "Hospital" are as great danger and nuisance as the dynamiters.

How We Are Governed.

[New York Evening Post.]

The persons who introduced universal suffrage into the democratic world some fifty years ago had apparently not the smallest anticipation of the trouble it would bring to its adherents, nor could they have supposed it would embroil with politics. The time that this idea that there would be a universal eagerness to vote at least considerable preparation for the work of voting right. Nor did they realize the enormous size of the mass which universal suffrage would create, and which would have to be moved in modern countries with a rapidly growing population like the United States, England, France, and Germany. In other words, they never even dreamed of the machinery which we find necessary for bringing out the vote, as it is called. The creation of that machinery here has seen the most remarkable phase phenomenon of the American scene. It includes a host, a large army of "workers" in small districts, a system of rewards and punishments to keep them to their duties, an immense campaign fund to draw on for expenses, severe conventions for the making of the process, and, on election day, frantic exertions by skilful men to bring the voters to the polls. It is work, too, which never ends, and which absorbs nearly all the time of every one, and that of any one excepting the specialists who have always an immense advantage over those who venture to oppose them as volunteers or amateurs. In fact, skill in this business has come to be far more important than consideration for the party platform. The man who is able to "bring out the vote" stands far higher today than the man who supplies the plans or politics which are to be voted for.

The result is that today every party which makes a figure in politics may be said to be buried under its workers.

All this is what the lawyers call "familiar knowledge." What is not so familiar is a growing terror among men afraid of the size of the vote, the fear that it will everywhere long be so large as to escape completely from all the best moral and intellectual influences of our time. The mass has got to be so tremendous that it seems folly to try to influence it by any species of persuasion. A man almost makes himself ridiculous today by trying to address the people of the State, much more the people of the United States, to provide a body of workmen to work on its opinions seems almost like trying to annoy an elephant with fles. What it thinks or is going to do at any election now, is something on which it hardly anybody's argument is worth listening to. You can safely bet on the influence of fraud and corruption, but you cannot bet on the influence of argument.

Our principal reason for calling attention to this matter is that, as far as our observation has gone, no mention has been made of the mass of female suffrage which have been going on in this city during the past few weeks. Whatever else it may be, it is the proposal to give women the franchise is above all other things, a proposal to double the vote; that is, to double the number of persons to be canvassed, and organized, and "kept in line," and persuaded and brought to the poll. This may cause an increase in the number of votes of Silas Wright, and George William Curtis, and Horace Greeley, and the like. But it is quite certain that it will enormously increase the number of Platts, Crokers, and Hills, and the like. And these workers must not be expected to be the old ones. They must be armed with the same means of reaping their workers, and, to get these means—that is, offices—they must perform dicker a good deal with the other side, and do a great many things not considered respectable in churches and synagogues. This is something to consider, not to pooh-pooh. We know what the getting-out of the vote has led to, and how it is done, and our experience cannot, therefore, be disposed of by simple prophecy. We must have some better reason than prediction for believing that the workers whom the addition of women to our constituencies will bring into the field will be of a finer quality and more admirable. The reason is that in the past we have seen that women will be more manageable and more get-at-able by persuaders than men have thus far proved to be.

[All that the "Post" says with regard to the voting machinery and the factors determining elections is perfectly true, but it is liable to be perverted by the "workers" into "politics" into an argument for restricted suffrage, for minority rule instead of majority rule. With such an inference the tr:e individual has no sympathy. Abundant and despotic as majority rule is, it is less absurd and despicable than the rule of the "cultural" would be. The only remedy is in the abandonment of all attempts at coercing or governing, and the recognition of equal freedom.—Enron Lindner.]
Free Currency Propaganda.

[Henry Seymour in London Brotherhood.]

In the last issue of "Brotherhood," I remarked that something definite might be stated in this, regarding the form of our money. It is the first year of the War, and the people have never been more alive to the importance of the money question. They have been educated to the idea that money must be restored to the people. They will bear the sacrifices of some well-known names. I shall be happy to forward the same to any person interested in our scheme, which promises, in the near future, the establishment of a free currency. The business of the moment is the organization of free exchange. It is now generally conceded by all economic authorities that the great problem of our time is no longer one of production, but rather one of distribution. Products are only too plentiful; the difficulty is to sell them. In the present state of society and consumer face to face, without the necessity of being blackmailed by the money-lords, who not only extort unjust tribute, but systematically paralyze industry in order to make it more profitable to rob.

The minimum subscription of membership to the Free Currency Propaganda is half a crown a year. The headquarters will be at South Place Institute, where all communications should be addressed, a month. "Our programme," as our prospectus declares, "is primarily the development of the principle of economic equality and the mechanism of free exchange, by means of lectures and literature, and the formation of a library for the furthering of these ends."

When, however, a sufficient number of persons follow diverse occupations, as farmers, merchants, manufacturers, traders, are sufficiently imbued with our object, we desire to carry it a step further. We propose the organization of a Bank (or Banks) of Exchange, which will issue to its members at cost, certificates of value, based on deposited products or registered collateral, and negotiated among each and every member of the said bank.

THE PROSPECTUS.

The monopolization of specie as the sole basis of credit, and the realization of general credit by the monetization of all suitable marketable values.

GENERAL STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES.

We affirm that the equitable payment of labor (of whatever character) is its entire product; hence, in the division of labor, that the reward of each in the realm of industry is the equivalent value of its particular contribution to production (usually determined by competition in a free market), and that the prevailing monopsonistic depression of prices is the result of the prevalent principle of justice, the sole and sufficient cause of social discontent and oppression, is due to the monopolies of land and capital.

We affirm that the monopoly of land is chiefly supported by the monopoly of capital; that, when isolated by the abolition of the latter monopoly, and standing in a bare simplicity, its solution will be much easier than is usually supposed, whereas a prior settlement (supposing such to be possible) would afford temporary relief from the tyrannous pressure of capital.

We furthermore affirm that the monopoly of capital is solely due to the monopoly of monetary credit, which necessarily and essentially results from the arbitrary and exclusive adoption of gold — or specie — value as the basis of the circulating medium.

This explains, in one sense, resting mainly on an over-powering tradition, but added by legislation, class interests, and general ignorance, is now becoming intolerable under the enormous development of commercial exchanges, and essential to a necessary constituent of banking-credit. Its power as king — or despot — monopoly is manifold. While other forms of property are expensive to maintain and quick to decay, gold never wanes. It is the women's property, the financial aristocracy, never spend it, never let it go, but retain perpetual lien on it, always lending it at interest, in whatever channel they favor, to the community, which falsely sanctions it. Money, in demand, through the machinery of credit, the trust of its immediate presence, and many times over; which, tribute again, is often heightened to an incredible extent by investment in commercial enterprises organized on a scale too gigantic for the comprehension of the smaller capitalists.

The tyranny of the money monopoly thus operates not only positively by exacting the tribute of interest and monopoly profits, but also negatively, by barring the working classes from self-help and association, and making them dependent for employment on the moneyed classes. Without capital, and therefore unable to employ themselves, the workers are obliged to unemploy others for the privilege of working for the capitalist, thereby lowering the wage-rate to the mere subsistence-level; only able through their trade-unions to stem, often ineffectually, and in any case at a tremendous sacrifice, this inevitable downward pressure.

The result is that the laborer is never able to buy back his product (or the equivalent thereof), through the enhanced prices put upon them in the market to cover interest, rent, and other forms of consumption, therefore, cannot keep pace with production, merchants and manufacturers have periods of idleness, laborers are starving while being only too anxious to produce and exchange those things which would enrich them, credit is deranged, banks fail, and even the original monopolists themselves suffer iniquitous.

But we affirm that with the adoption of a currency based on all suitable marketable values, without arbitrary distinctions or preference, by free association of manufacturers, distributors, and workmen, the rule of interest and monopoly-profits, gluts of commodities and labor, could be impossible. Production would proportionately increase; in other words, the more commodities of one kind were produced, the more of other kinds would be in demand to exchange therefor, the effect being to increase consumption, and not to decrease demand. The workman being in increasing demand, and also in a position, by monetizing his credit, to contract, if necessary, with his employer, and to readily contribute capital to co-operative enterprises, would force up wages until he reached the just limits of his productive efforts, e.g., until he was in equal association with his employer.

Therefore, we appeal most earnestly for popular inquiry and support, for assured that our position is economically sound. We appeal to workmen and employers alike, knowing that when the financier's usurious grip is released from credit, the interests of labor and capital will be identical. Above all, we claim that our movement is eminently practicable and capable of immediate inception, unlike the thousand and one stoppers in the air.

MEMBERSHIP.

Any person, by formal and written agreement with the object and principles of the Propaganda, may become a member, subject to the approval of the Committee. Minimum subscription, half a crown a year.

JOHN ARMSDEN, Chairman.

J. BALDOCK, Jr.

J. AUGUSTUS BARNARDO,

J. MATTHEWSON.

ALFRED PORTER,

J. H. ROBERTSON, Jr.

H. W. MOUR.

J. STEVENS,

HARRY THORNE.

HARRY THORNE, Secretary.

Treasurer, John Baldock, Jr., St. Brede's, Victoria Road, Leyton, E.; Corresponding Secretary, Henry Seymore, St. Arundel Square, London, N.; Recording Secretary, Harry Thorne.

To All Whom It May Concern.

The following Introduction, Preamble, and Resolutions are respectfully submitted to the workmen of the United States for their thoughtful consideration.

WILLIAM HANSON.

7 DECATER STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y.

INTRODUCTION.

There is a prevalent misapprehension on the part of Socialists and others who profess to understand individualism and philosophical anarchism, that their economic principles are immanent to social cooperation in production and exchange. This is a grave mistake. On the contrary, the individualists and philosophical anarchists hold that Socialism can be gained only by Equal freedom and no special privileges for any.

They are therefore opposed to any governmental interference with the equal freedom of the citizen. They maintain that government is not necessary, and is, in fact, an economic hindrance to the highest results of social cooperation. They maintain that building railroads, canals, factories, ships, bridges, telephones, telegraphs, establishing banks, planting gas-works and water-works, running post-offices, establishing schools and means of transportation, insurance companies, and all other social functions, can be done under free competition more economically and satisfactorily than under any system of government now known to mankind.

We therefore publish the following Preamble and Resolutions as our economic doctrine.

PREAMBLE.

Every nation has a specific annual labor-product, which is absorbed by five economic quantities, namely, — rents, profits, interest, taxes, and wages. The higher the rents, profits, interest, taxes, and wages, the less will be the remainder of the annual product for wages, and the less the purchasing power of those wages.

Conversely, the lower the rents, profits, interest, and taxes, the greater will be the remainder of the annual product for wages, and the greater the purchasing power of those wages. Again, if rents were reduced to the wear and tear of the property occupied by the tenant, which equity requires; if profits were reduced to the cost of goods and the service rendered in their distribution, which pure economics require; if interest on loans were reduced to the cost of capital and services rendered, reduced to the simple cost of government in the protection of life, liberty, and property, then wages would be all that the individual worker produced, less the equitable income for the support of government and the prime cost of rents and merchandise consumed. Such a division, or distribution, of the annual labor product nowhere obtains in the commercial world. Hence the irresistible warfare between labor and capitalist, or rather between monopoly and anti-monopoly.

As land monopoly is the cause of rent, patent monopolies and special privileges the cause of profits, monopoly of gold and silver and government bonds the cause of interest, then the only source of what we term adverse government is the cause of taxes, which rob the many for the benefit of the few, since official salaries are monopoly salaries, from the President of the United States down to the humblest doorkeeper in a county court-house, while competition reigns supreme in determining wages, it becomes obvious that so long as these economic conditions prevail, and competition is a one-sided and partial application, there can be no peace or settlement of the labor question. Therefore, be it resolved:

RESOLUTIONS.

(1.) As all generations have an inalienable right of free and gratuitous access to land to the extent of their individual needs, economically used, it is obvious that land monopoly is a great crime against the equal freedom of man. Revenue from land can be rightly put only in two ways, viz., either by a voluntary relinquishment of monopolized vacant land, or by a general refusal to pay rent when it exceeds the wear and tear of property usage by the tenant. We therefore demand the repeal of all laws for the collection of rents created under duress.

(2.) As patents and special privileges are the basis of all manufacturing and commercial monopolies, and as long as they are thus rent-seeking monopolies, which use the only economic force that can reduce products and services to cost and produce justice in commerce, we demand that in the future there shall be no patents and special privileges.

(3.) As gold and silver and government bonds are a stupendous monopoly and the basis of the currency in the United States, and as such a currency is productive of depression, high rates of interest, loss to borrowers, bankruptcy, revolt, and panic, we therefore demand the monetization of all wealth.

(4.) We demand equal freedom and no special privileges for any.

(5.) It is our opinion that the practical application of the economic principles set forth in these resolutions, there will be no need for Communism, State Socialism, the Single Tax, — no need for violent methods, which revolutionize society, but wisely to produce order, which is the bond of peace and prosperity, in order to redress wrongs and obtain rightful which can be gained only by reason and sympathy, education and persuasion.
Liberty's Typography.
The typographical reform adopted by Liberty con-
sists in the abolishing of the process known among
printers as "justification." Under this new system,
by the composer, as he approaches the end of the
line, finds that there is not sufficient room for an addi-
tional character, and instead of filling the line by in-
creasing the size of the spaces between the words,
fills it with little blocks of metal known as quads,
without disturbing the original spacing. In conse-
quence of the large quantity of reading matter does not present as
straight an edge at its right side as at its left.

Esthetically the new method is an improvement,
because all spaces to the spaces in a given line
and in the spacing of two lines in juxtaposition
is eliminated. The spaces between the words remain
equal in all parts of the column, the result being pleasing
to the eye and enabling the reader to facilitate the task of
reading. Commonly the new method is advantageous
because it is much cheaper, nearly thirty per cent.
being saved on the composition, and because it simplifies
the work of composition and enables unskilled
workers to take the place of skilled. Very few
new method is available for book work and requires no capital for its
adoption.
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