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* For always be thine age, O Liberty! And though thou art the mother of order, we will trust in thee.*

JOHN HAY.

On Picket Duty.

I hope the friends of Liberty will encourage Mr. Wyntons's excellent plan of preparing and publishing a series of cheap tracts popularizing the fundamental principles of Anarchism. The tract which he now offers us is in every way admirable and will do much good if properly distributed.

Whenever the pseudo-individualist papers defend government, they talk about the necessity of protecting the right to life and property. But how about those who are prevented from acquiring property by this same protecting government, and whose misery is so great that life has no value to them? What use have they for government? None whatever, and that is why bombs are thrown. As long as government regards itself as a servant of the monopolists, whose lives and plunder it is bound to protect, neither the masters nor the servant will be safe from the attacks of the desperate victims and their friends. What is wanted is a protective organization, or several organizations, that would secure equal liberty and opportunity,—that would protect men in their legitimate freedoms and restrain all aggressions. Such an organization the State never can be.

The newspapers tell us that in the present war between Japan and China the sympathies of Americans are with the former. As a matter of fact, Americans know nothing and care less about Corea or the other alleged issues of the war. But the "good" Americans, the Americanists, the professional patriots, are doubly on the side of Japan, because, unlike China, she is "civilized" and "progressive" enough to appreciate the value of Jingoism in elections. A contemporary writes: "It is evidently fair that the war has been undertaken in a Jingo spirit, to divert attention from the difficulties at home. The government has twice had a deadlock with parliament in the past few months, and has twice dissolved it in the hope of getting a more manageable majority. The elections to the parliament are to be held this month, and the government has obviously been willing to get a pliant majority by appealing to the war spirit and thus overshadowing the immense difficulties of domestic policy which confront the nation." This is a sure sign of a high degree of political prostration.

The fact that the majority of trade-unionists favor compulsory arbitration and similar tyrannical measures shows that the cause of true liberty would gain little from any change that labor, by violence or any other means, could bring about. In referring to the Delhi insurrection the platoocratic press called "law and order." There is indeed plenty of evidence on every hand that the people are in no mood for altenrance to monopoly and its tool, the government. But is there any evidence, any ground for hope, that the system which the people will set up and which they will call and enforce as law and order, will not be one of violence, robbery, and fraud? Dissatisfaction with the present order does not argue readiness for a better order. To be ready to fight is well, but the people neither know what to fight nor what to fight for. Also! between the rich knives and the poor fools there is little to choose. I hate the former as much as I pity the latter, but I fear them both alike.

"Liberty regulated by law" is a favorite phrase of the shallow writers who undertake to instruct the multitude in political philosophy. They tell us further that without law liberty is simply impossible, for the moment law is withdrawn, chaos and conflict ensue. "Liberty does not require regulation. To regulate liberty is to infringe upon it. Among people inclined to invasion, it is necessary to defend or protect liberty; but it is never necessary to regulate liberty. Any law that is not simply an expression of a freedom, a statement of a corollary of the law of equal liberty, is an invasion. To withdraw such law is not to expose liberty to, but to free it from, danger. Those who talk about law regulating liberty are dimly conscious of the fact that there can be no liberty in society unless all are equally free." To express the idea of equal freedom, they use the nonsensical formula of liberty regulated by law. They feel that the liberty of one does not necessarily imply the equality of the others, and that it is necessary to prevent some people from destroying the liberties of their fellows. Such defence of equal freedom is not the function of law, however. Law is the worst aggressor and enemy of liberty. Abolish the invasive law and defend equal freedom both against lawful infringement and lawful assault.

Well, we have at last the Democracy's tariff bill. It is a tariff which everybody is exhorted of, everybody except the few "Sons from Havernauer," the tools of the Sugar Trust, and the Populist congressmen, who are more interested in the income tax than in the principles of free trade. Not only is there no relationship between the tariff plank of the Chicago Democratic platform and the Sugar Trust bill, but even the bill favored by the House and the President in no wise corresponded to the pledges of the national platform. It is true that parties are not expected to carry out their election promises, yet the habit of pointing to progressive declarations in platforms as evidence of merit and superiority persists even among the radical elements. Would the Single Taxers have supported the Democratic party if they had been promised such a bill as is now offered us? Is there anything of free trade in it? It cannot even be proved that the humble and meaningless catch-phrase, "free raw materials." So thoroughly protectionist is the bill that the more sensible Republicans recognize the folly of denouncing it. They regret, of course, that they are deprived of the tariff issue, and are by no means eager to welcome the Democratic converts to protection, but they have ceased to pretend that the bill is any nearer to free trade than McPherson's itself. Republican protection is dead; long live Democratic protection!

The financial authority of the New York Times is usually as shallow in its optimism as Dana himself, but he is evidently beginning to feel that the facts are dead against him, and he seems to be ready to cease hounding his readers. Here is what he says in a recent review of the industrial situation: "It begins to look as if we had come to a halt in this country in the continued expansion of industry and the increasing demand for labor, and that a reverse process was about to commence. A full year has now elapsed since last summer's financial and industrial crisis, and no indications of a recovery from it are yet visible. Should this recovery be delayed, as now seems probable, a year or more longer, Ricardo's iron law must necessarily assert itself, and the market price of labor will not only cease to afford the American laborer a surplus above his customary expenditure, but will fall below it. The result will be a cessation of human ignition, which has already begun, and a decrease in the number of laborers from an excess of deaths over births." What a cheerful prospect: And what do the dear monopolists imagine the laborers will do about it? Of course, violent strikes are not to be thought of, boycotts are criminal, and denunciation of monopoly and capitalism hardly better than bomb-throwing. But tell us, pray, what is the laborer to do? Bow to the inevitable? Ah! you forget, however, that not everything is inevitable which suits you. Labor may yet discover the true solution of its problems, — that of liberty, — and then you will have to bow to the inevitable.
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The Compulsory-Arbitration Menace.

Some say that the railroad strike was started with the intention of creating public sentiment in favor of compulsory arbitration. It has certainly given a great impulse to that movement; but the evil is partly offset by the occasion it has given to some papers, among them the Philadelphia "Press" and the New York "Independent," to say in the most unhesitating phrases our language affords that "there can be no compulsory arbitration in a free country."

I believe this to be the most dangerous idea now before the country. There is no experiment in labor legislation so likely to be tried, for everybody favors compulsory arbitration. Labor unions favor it, apparently believing that the justice of their cause will compel any arbiters to give them what they want. State Socialists favor it, because they know it is a long step toward the government control of all industry. Conservatives, especially religious people, favor it most of all because there is nothing they detest so much as disorder; and strikes are always disorderly, while arbitration, of course, is quite orderly.

No idea prominently before the public, short of the full Socialist programme, would immediately introduce so much odium of State Socialism. Nationalization of railroads and telegraphs would be a log on the fire. It would also be difficult to repeal, for it would diminish the expression of social discontent, and thereby produce the impression of giving general satisfaction. I see only one good thing about the prospect: it might, by blocking much of the fragmentary work of the unions, help force laborers to turn their attention to the problem of monopoly-making laws, as the only remaining way out.

Compulsory arbitration is supported in so many quarters that opposition to it almost anywhere is as unexpected as it is welcome. If conservative organs like the "Independent" can help save labor from its own folly in this matter, conservatism will not have lived in vain.

STEPHEN T. BYINGTON.

Surrendering the Right to Strike.

The railroad strike is, no doubt, a serious blow to labor organizations. But compulsory arbitration would be absolutely disastrous.

If two parties engaged in a dispute, arbitration is a sensible and economical method of settling the difficulty. But if any good is to come of it, both parties must be willing to arbitrate, and must be satisfied with the board of arbitration. If both parties agree beforehand to submit to the decision of the judge, there is no violation of freedom in enforcing the judgment should either party attempt to violate it. Once appoint a board of compulsory arbitration, and its duty will be to compel all parties to submit to its rulings, whether they are just or unjust. It is only in cases where its decree is injurious that we can make two parties, unwilling to arbitrate that compulsion becomes necessary. It matters not who the unwilling party will be. To tyrannize over a capitalist is as bad as to tyrannize over a laborer.

If labor organizations imagine that they will have a better chance under this system, they are deceived. By these means, they had better disabuse their own minds of such ideas at once. It is very pretty to rant about the fair-mindedness of American
citizens, but such talk is only cant. It is to be expected that such a board will be composed of men superior in intelligence or honesty to United States judges, or with any better conception of the rights of labor than congressmen or the president? Surely we may gather from the experience of the last few weeks some idea of what their decisions would be. When judges imprison men for advising others to stop work, what may we not expect from a board of arbitration? To make such a board effective, it must be given power to enforce its commands, and to imprison those who disobey.

We are told that public officers are our servants, yet as soon as we even so much as criticize their acts we are thrust into jail for contempt of court. Contempt of court? Yes, they realize what contempt a fair-minded man must feel for their actions as soon as he subjects them to criticism. But surely it is a little novel for a man's servants to imprison him because he holds them in contempt. Such servants are worse than masters, they are slave drivers. Shall we then place additional powers in their hands? "Get back to work, you common cattle, and feel thankful that we permit you to live at all. We wouldn't if we could get along without you." This will be the substance of the verdicts of the compulsory arbitration committee. For what can labor offer to such men for their favor? Absolutely nothing. Capital, on the other hand, can give them wealth, honor, social position, political preference, and everything their hearts hold dear. They are not such fools as to hesitate over such offers.

The State always has been, and always will be, on the side of organized injustice, because it is itself organized injustice. To give it power to compel arbitration is to sacrifice the greatest victory organized labor has ever gained, — the right to strike.

F. D. Tandy.

The "American Architect" does not go beyond the most patent facts and everyday experience to the question whether the latter-day strikes are almost invariably attended by violence and lawlessness. The old and original idea of a strike, it says, was a peaceful appeal to the facts as regards the labor market. The employer would assert that he could not afford to pay more, and that he could not find men to do the work for the wages; this the employees would deny, and would quit work to see on which side the truth lay. If the master was able to get men for his money, the strike was a failure; if not, it was a success. When the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers first came into prominence by tying up the Eastern Railroad, they won, and won peacefully, because the company of course actually utilized the skilled engineers to take the places of the strikers.

But since that time the supply has so greatly increased, and strike after strike has thrown so many out of work and into other occupations temporarily, that a peaceful strike would now be nonsensical. The same is the case with the skilled and unskilled tradesmen with all unskilled labor. The condition of the labor market is now such that the idea of a peaceful trial of strength between men and employers is completely abandoned. Strikers hope for success as present only as they hope to be allowed to frighten or club away the men who are ready and anxious to take their places. Now, this is a condition, not a theory, and the mere statement of the facts suffices to show how futile and unreasonable it is to condemn the violence of the strikers. It is not choice, but necessity, sheer despair, that their violence is to be ascribed to. The only alternative that remains open to them, in their present state of intelligence, is absolute submission to the tender mercies of capital, non-resistance to its encroachments and aggressions. Doubtless the plutocratic editors would not hesitate to condemn this latter course, but would they ever dream of hoping it themselves? The philosophical observer must perceive that, once the conditions of equitable dealing are broken, ethical principles cannot be strictly applied. The aggrieved-upon will inevitably practice counts-aggression, and one wrong will beget another. If our semi-individualists had any real regard for truth and consistency, or any love for fairness, they would cease to praise free competition, free exchange, and real estate that there is something rotten in an industrial order in which a peaceful strike is impossible and ridiculous. It ought to be obvious à priori that such a condition is utterly inconsistent with the hypothesis that labor has no grievances against society and legislation.

The great trial of the thirty Anarchist-Communists in Paris ended in the acquittal of all the defendants on the charge of inciting to crime. Two or three, or it is stated, were convicted of theft. Sixty questions were submitted to the jury by the judge, but it took them only two hours to arrive at their verdict. It may easily be inferred how weak the prosecution's case was if an ordinary housebound jury could not see their way clear to the infliction of even a mild punishment. As a matter of fact, the defendants had been guilty of nothing except the theoretical propaganda of their views. The French press, without exception, commends the verdict and ridicules the blindness of the government in arraigning journalists and thinkers innocent of actual guilt. In this fiasco it is very amusing to re-read the comments and predictions in which some of our venomous and mendacious newspapers indulged when the first news of the approaching trial reached them. The New York "Times" wrote: "The crimes of the thirty are of very different kinds, and it is creditable to the ingenuity of the French lawmakers that they should have been able to comprehend all these kinds of malefactors in a single statute. The wild and active Anarchist, when he makes an attempt at massacre or plunder, is already sufficiently provided for. The Anarchist who commits ordinary crime belongs to the same class, subject to extraordinary penalties such as that he is opposed to the existing constitution of society, is a new type and deserving of a special punishment. Then there is the third kind, the representatives of which describe themselves as 'publicists' and 'saints of letters,' who are simply undesirable 'newspaper men' anxious to turn a dishonest penny. So succinct was this wretched truism in its political ideas that the thirty would be convicted if he spoke with regret about the expiration of the sentences. It is needless to say that it was struck speechless by the actual verdict. For the prostitutes of American newspapers to talk about "disreputable newspaper men anxious to turn a dishonest penny" is decidedly cool. The whole civilized world knows that the average American newspaper man is the most unprincipled and disreputable "trader" in the capitalist market.

Mr. Walker raises several questions in his communication on the strike. So far as the question of Cleveland's interference in the strike is concerned, it is sufficient to point out that eminent judges and lawyers are not as sure as Mr. Walker that the interference was legal and constitutional. Governor Altgeld is a lawyer and ex-judge, and his long messages to the president made out a strong case. Judge Tuley and several congressmen and governors thoroughly endorsed Governor Altgeld's position. Even Judge Coohey, who came out in support of Cleveland, plainly intimated that the question required settlement and that Cleveland had established a valuable precedent. Where the authorities thus differ, it is rash for Mr. Walker to assume such a positive position. That Cleveland sought to enforce Federal law, everybody knew, but the judges knew it too. Altgeld, in his second protest, elaborately argued that the president could not order troops into a State for any purpose without communication with the governor. With reference to the question of the peculiar sacredness of the mails, it is sickening to see what outrages are committed in the name of the "United States Mail," and it would be a great blessing to degrade them to the level of apples and barge. Liberty did not pronounce the attempt to protect property and the liberty of the seals, but the fleshy pretex under which a military despotism was temporarily established. Cleveland rushed to the aid of monopoly at a time when local authority saw fit to use its own machinery, and was quite willing to afford all due protection to the railroads and their employees; he simply declined to be a tool and lackey of capital. He would make no distinction between letters and apples, and there ought to be none. "There are other things in Mr. Walker's letter calling for comment, but he has made the same point in a letter which has appeared in "Lucifer," and elicited an excellent reply from the editor, Mr. Harman, I content myself with reproducing elsewhere some pertinent passages from the latter's editorial.

Illustrations of the ignorance and puerility of our newspapers are by no means rare, but such a characteristic display of their qualities and properties as that made by them in connection with the French "Anti-Anarchist" law deserves more than the ordinary amount of attention. They could not discover a single weighty objection to the law; everybody who opposed it was a crank and a mischievous conspirator. The government was entirely reasonable in its demands, and there was not the slightest danger of abusing the soothing provisions of the law. All this was contended by gallant and patriotic jingoism revealing a real understanding of French politics. Now it turns out that not only is the entire progressive division of the French press hostile to the new law, but even the more intelligent correspondents of our own newspapers,
and all of the English correspondents in Paris, write of it in terms of severest condemnation and utter contempt. The poor editorials writers realize that they have written themselves down perfect asses, but they hope that the inbred contempt of foreign affairs will protect them from the natural consequence of their stupid blunder. The American press has indeed nothing to lose; no discriminating and educated reader ever turns to a newspaper sermon with the expectation of gaining light or knowledge. Elsewhere in this issue I reprint two interesting extracts from letters of Paris correspondents on the anti-dynastic legislation.

That the plutocratic "Evening Post" should demand the railroad into jail of strikers, boycotters, Coysteens, and other popular agitators, is perfectly natural, but its campaign against the professors, novelists, clergymen, and editors whose crime consists in sympathizing with the victims of the present system and dreaming or hoping for a new and better order of society, is a gratuitous attack upon free speech, a gratuitous policy that even the most bourgeois type of individualist must shrink from. Says this brazen mouthpiece of monopoly: "It is becoming a question whether we shall not have to look up some of the college professors and clergymen who are inciting the ignorant to violence. The Rev. Myron W. Reed, who has been preaching in Denver, Colo., of late years, addressed a letter held by the Delahay and said, among other things, that Jesus Christ was an Anarchist, and so was he (Reed); that a man who does not belong to a union, and stands ready to take another man's place at less wages, is an enemy, a spy, and an obstructor, and ought in some peaceful way to be removed; and that, 'unless something is speedily done for the laboring classes this country will be plunged into one of the greatest revolutions the world has ever seen.' This sort of talk is so near inciting to violence that it is hard to see where it falls short, and the fact that a man professes 'Rev.' or 'Prof.' to his name is no reason why he should not be stopped when he proclaims the masses to be lawless. So the plutocratic "Post" would imprison people for talk that is "near" inciting to violence, and doubts it would not have to be so very near either. Presumably mere dissatisfaction with present conditions is "near" enough to render one liable to imprisonment under "Post" notions of "law and order." If present laws do not provide for the punishment of such enemies of society as the Rev. Mr. Reed, new laws must be enacted, cries the "Post." No offender should be allowed to escape. Besides the Denver clergymen, the "Post's" list of dangerous rebels includes Prof. Richard T. Ely and Prof. George Herron, of Iowa College, Prof. Ely's indictment charges him with justifying boycottings and dynamiting; Prof. Herron's indictment charges him with inscrutable and denouncing "scabs." Surely, this is terrible. Is it wise to have such a man at large? Prof. Herron is equally dangerous. In an address at the commencement exercises of his university he said: "At no time since the age of the Roman State has law received so much attention than at present. Yet all know there is no justice in the courts. If there is Anarchy everywhere, it had its origin in the courts." Truly, it is a real misfortune that, as the "Post" points out, "the framers of our laws did not contemplate the appearance" of such wrecks and did not provide for their punishment. Manifestly "this is one of the reforms which must be taken in hand without delay. Now, will it be near inciting to violence to intimate that such fellows as Godkin are responsible for the blind and brutal repressions which generally attend a revolt of the masses? The most philosophical and calm of lovers of freedom is sometimes tempted to agree with the dynamiters that the only answer to Godkinian unscrupulousness and arrogance is a bomb.

In Liberty of July 14 I emphasized the distinction, which my friend Traubel had seemed to ignore, between the tyranny of government which it is proper to combat by force if we have it and the so-called tyranny of creed and custom which, not imposing itself by force, it would be improper and tyrannical to resist by force even if we had it. I concluded my paragraph with the assertion that "Anarchism does not directly fight folly or vice." This statement it is necessary to explain lest it may bring against from the same complaint which I leveled against Mr. Traubel when I declared that he "invites a suspicion of unSoundness by what he omits to say." Not, indeed, that I have much fear of it, for I have rarely known the fools who criticise Liberty to take advantage of a real opportunity, or even a semblance of one; they generally choose, instead, the more vulnerable points in Liberty's defences against which to butt their stupid heads. But I do not wish to give excuse for misunderstanding, and it has occurred to me that some usually keen critic might claim, with some show of reason, that the statement that "Anarchism does not directly fight folly" is inconsistent with the position, always so prominent, that Anarchism places its chief reliance upon a campaign of education. For what, indeed, is the attempt to educate others to the philosophy of Anarchism but a direct fight with that appalling folly which supports the State to be a necessity of society? I hasten to admit, therefore, that Anarchism does directly and most vigorously fight all that vast mass of folly which consists of political views at variance with the doctrine of equal liberty. Of course it does not fight by physical force; to say nothing of the fact that the Anarchists do not yet possess such force to a degree sufficient for the purpose, it would in any case be Archistic for them to use it against the verbal expression of Archistic ideas. True, the governments of the world are doing their best to justify us in such a course by passing laws which punish more severely those who advocate physical force than those who use it; but we are not in the habit of following Archistic examples.

Free competition is an absurdity in any market in which government is a competitor. I say this in answer to Mr. Bilgram, who in his latest essay on the money question claims that government has a right to engage in the business of issuing money, and to Mr. Ballou, who in his review of this essay admits the claim. Since government, having the power of compulsory taxation, can always afford to carry on at a loss, for an indefinite period, any business in which it may engage, it can crush any competitor simply by selling taking losses from the taxpayer. It is as if Smith were given the privilege of picking Brown's pocket to enable him to sell goods at less cost and thereby drive Jones out of business. On such terms it is ridiculous to talk of free competition between Smith and Jones, even though Jones enjoys equally with the right to engage in business. But these are all the terms on which a government business does. I do not see how Mr. Ballou, who as an Anarchist must consider the very existence of government a denial of equal liberty, can admit that government is entitled to do that which necessarily implies its existence. Until governments are no longer governments, having become purely voluntary associations instead, Mr. Ballou, as an Anarchist, and Mr. Bilgram, as a champion of free competition, are equally bound to deny their right to issue money.

Mr. Bilgram's reference to the "rational object of legal tender laws," in his review of Mr. Brouck's new work on money, is rather vague. Surely he does not wish to be understood as holding that without legal tender laws no popular agreement imparting a definite meaning to the term "dollar" is possible does not depend on government for its facilities and conveniences. The abrogation of legal tender laws need not, and would not, imply an abrogation of the definite agreement without which no contracts could be made and enforced. There are no international legal tender laws, y. international commerce cannot go with them. Nor can Mr. Bilgram mean that the legislators have had the rational object he specifies in view in enacting the various legal tender laws. Even conservative economists recognize that the objects of the legislators have been entirely different. In this connection the editorial from the "Century" on legal tender laws will be read with satisfaction. Surely we are not dealing with rapid improvements as those expressed therein are promulgated in a leading magazine. I commend the "Century's" editorial to the poor and ignorant "Critic," which imagined it had discovered in Mr. Brouck's book an utterly wild and crazy notion of the effect of legal tender laws. Literary ladies will have to beware of rushing into print with their school-text-book knowledge of finance.

Mr. Walker's impressive reference to the "duty" of whatever government happens to be in existence to protect liberty a. property is rather dull. Of course, the existing governments will protect such property and liberty as they graciously allow their subjects to retain in some sort of fashion. The property and liberty of the monopolists naturally have the first line on governmental protection, and no prodding is needed to make government perform its "duty" in the promises. But why Anarchists should be concerned with this protection, passes my comprehension. We do not talk about the highwayman's duty to protect his victim, and there is just as much iniquity in Anarchist talk about the duty of the chief plunderer and invader, the State, to protect its victims. To deserve it for such protection
it does afford would be absurd, but it is equally absurd to praise it for alleged performance of "duty."

The Government and the Strike.

To the Editor of Liberty:

Referring to the relation of the mails to the A. R. U.

"The United States Mail" are, I believe, obstruction to an honest, which pl Ottoman to new fame. In which a mail car is attached, brings the strikers within the jurisdiction of the Federal government. But private mails are no more sacred than private apples or hogs or rails.

Are we to understand from this that whatever govern- ment ownership there is no obligation to all private apples or apples or rails from violence, or that, as a matter of fact, it does not at least amount to pro- tect them now? Suppose that the monopoly of mail carrying is taken from the national government, — as it should be, — will not the national government still be in duty bound to protect the private mail carriers who will have taken the place of the semi-public mail car- riers of the present time? And is it not true that na- tional troops were called out as much to protect rail- roads, their employees, their shippers, and all others whose life or reputation is threatened, as it is for the orderly flow of interstate commerce, as they were to secure the regular transmission of the mails? And all these industries and all these men and women are privy to the same sort of warrant, then, is there for the assumption that the desnationalization of the mail service will: remove either the excuse or the necessity for national troops to protect it? There is no valid reason why the citizens of one State should be de- bted solely upon the inefficient executive of an- other State for protection of his property or his per- son. And the President of the United States should not send national troops into any State to protect the people of that State against domestic violence, or to protect State citizens at all. That he could not constitutionally do without the consent of the governor. He has sent troops into various States to uphold Federal law and to protect United States citizens. To do this he had no occasion to await the invitation of Allengd or Mark- ham. Neither have troops been sent against strikers, as strikers. E. C. WALKER.

"The Natural Law of Money.

Mr. William Brough's work under the above title is in many respects an improvement over most of the modern treatises on money. The author clearly re- cognizes that the true object of the Natural Law is cre- ative only between those issues of money which are legal tender, and that the silver dollar passes current at a value exceeding its metal value only because as yet no other currency is available. It is, he urges, the States Treasury. He rejects the notion that money can be made only by the fiat of the law, and would therefore abolish all legal tender laws, leaving to the people the choice of using either gold or silver as a medium of exchange.

The author evidently overlooks one rational object of legal tender laws. The present unit of account being the "dollar," a mutual agreement as to what shall constitute a dollar is necessary, and the rational object of legal tender laws is to give expression to the popular agreement which imparts a definite meaning to this otherwise meaningless word. Even apart from the confusion which an indeterminate use of several values would produce, an end of trouble would result from an abrogation of a definite agreement that a dollar shall be equal to a definite amount of a certain commodity. It is true, however, that the rational ob- ject of legal tender laws, viz., that a dollar shall mean so many grams of gold, — has been completely obliterated by the dogma of modern political economy, that not only uninstructed legislators, and it is perfectly proper to expose and condemn this abuse.

Mr. Brough's argument is, however, considerably more solid than that of his opponents. But wise monetary legislation, that the country now needs. There is a limit to the amount of money that society can consist of, but it is not to the amount of capital that may be used product- ingly. In lending money, the rate of interest is influenced, first, by the degree of safety with which
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the loan may be made; and, secondly, by the scarcity or abundance of money at the time the loan is made. But underlying these two changing conditions is one relative proportion of opportunities for pro- fitable investment of capital, which is the governing condition in fixing what may appropriately be termed the normal rate of interest. It is very much to mistake that more money is needed where it is really capital that is needed. . . . With- in the twenty years following the close of our Civil War we had seen the effects of the pecuniary ef- fects produced by the introduction of foreign capital into a country.

Three reasons show conclusively that the author is acquainted with the natural laws of money about as well as the modern professors of political economy are with the laws that govern the distribution of wealth. With the new unsound doctrine that capital can be productive and that the money lender receives interest because capital returns a pro- fit. He fails to see that a persistent income can ac- cept a non-producer only through an abuse of the power of the government, and he has yet to learn that under natural laws neither money nor capital can return profitable interest.

H. F. BIRKHAM.

Legal-Tender Money in History.

[The Century, August.

What is the meaning of the term "legal tender," as applied to money? "The Century Dictionary" defines it as "currency which can lawfully be used in paying debts." To avoid confusion it is necessary to distinguish between two things: (1) the "com- mercial circulation," and this is the term applied to such money habitually in most South American coun- tries, curso foro juridico. Edward Atkinson, in a recent and very interesting pamphlet, cites legal tender among some examples of words of which the meaning has been perverted to be vitiation of public thought, and which legal tender means "an act by which it has been forced into use so as to drive good money out of circulation." He has made a search through history for legal-tender acts, and con- cludes from the study that he has made that there is no statute of legal tender ever originated anywhere except for the purpose of forcing a debase coin into circula- tion, or for the purpose of collecting a forced loan by making paper substitutes for coins a legal tender for debt.

This conclusion must be confirmed by everybody else making like research. The first case of legal tender on record, Mr. Atkinson thinks, was in Greece, in the sixth century before Christ, when Solon de- based the coin so that one hundred new drachmæ were worth as many old ones. As another case occurred in Rome, when the Senate reduced the weight of the copper money of the Republic dur- ing the second Punic War. But in both cases, the coinage of Spain, about 600 B.C., debrased the productive capacity, and enforced the circulation of the depreciated money based upon it by decree of legal tender. Prof. James B. Thayer, of the Harvard Law School, says Mr. Atkinson as authority for the statement that the first appear- ance of legal tender in English history was in the time of Edward III. (1312-1377), who debased the coin, and by a decree of the crown made it a penal offence to re- fuse the debased money. A little more than three hundred years later, in 1699, James II. of England made a similar enactment. He was then reigning in Dublin, whither he had returned after abdicating and fleeing to France, and was seeking to regain his throne with the aid of an Irish parliament. "It was convenient at this moment," says Mr. Atkinson, "that he could extir- pate himself from his financial difficulties by the simple process of calling a farthing a shilling." He reasoned that since he was no longer entitled to the royal prerogative, the right of debasing the coinage must also belong to it.

During the Napoleonic war the Continental currency was made a legal tender, and one of the most formidable obstacles with which the patriot cause had to contend was the debased money which was thus given a forcible recognition, as the "Currency's" "Cheap Money" series reminds the disastrous results which followed the efforts of the State govern- ment of 1699 to 1690 to enforce its decrees making the money of the Rhine Island Paper Bank a legal tender. Business of all kinds was paralyzed, money ceased almost entirely to circulate, the State's credit was ruined, and its prosperity dealt a blow from which it did not recover for many years. Professor Thayer shows one instance in which the same experience twice — once with John Law's money, between 1718 and 1720, and again with its assi- gnatas and mercant, between 1799 and 1790. No one doubts with its "wildcat" banks in 1837-39, Mississippi, with its "Plutarch's Bank," in 1838-40, and the Argentine Republic, with its 1815-1820, 1825-1829, and 1829-1830. All these diversified forms of debased money were made legal tender, and their circulation was forced by all the powers of the governments which had issued them. No one can examine upon this point and not be convinced that every act of legal tender has been passed to force into circulation a form of money which is in no way useful. Sometimes this has been the assumed necessity of a great war like that of the Revolution, and later, of the Rebellion, but often it has been the outcome of igno- rance or something worse.

Good money needs no act of legal tender to make it circulate. Mr. Atkinson makes an unanswerable argument on this point by citing the fact that the great in- ternational commerce of the world has gone on from its beginning to the present time without inter- national acts of legal tender.

Anarchist Letter-Writing Corps.

The Serciaty wants every reader of Liberty to run in his name for enrolment. Those who do so thereby place themselves with a better every fortnight, on Anarchism or kindred "skepticism," to be "alienated" assigned to be "alienated." All, whether members or not, are asked to lose no oppor- tunity of informing the secretary of suitable tar- gets. Address, Brunet T. Bixbey, East Hard- wick, Vt.

The "Sunday School Times" did not print any of our letters, but devoted a leading editorial to answer- ing them. It said some excellent things about the danger of assuming that a plea for liberty is the same as a plea against order, and then pointed the moral by saying "it is an unpardonable" crap of that danger. It has seemed to me that the Anarchist movement was the weaker for its lack of cheap tracts. To do so much toward filling the gap I have had my "Lessons in Words of One Syllable," from Nos. 200 and 291 of Liberty, reprinted as a leaflet of the size of a postcard. I will send 100 copies for 25c, 50 for 10c, 5 for 5c. Send in your orders for these prices leave me no margin to pay for a standing advertisement. If I can sell enough of this thousand to 100,000, I shall do it. If not, I will do it at more cheap and short leaflets. We need tracts cheap enough to be scattered broadcast, and short and striking enough to be read through by the casual reader. My tract is not a per- fect work, but it is the best of none in print that goes further toward this ideal.

Suggestion No. 10. — As to that paper that you are writing about capital, I have something that can be made the excuse for a bombardment by the Corps. Give it a start yourself by writing a letter or a letter on the line that will best reach it; then, if that is published, send me the paper containing it, and the Corps will come in to back you.

Target, section A. — The "Shoe and Leather Re- porter," of Nashville, Tenn., had in June an editorial concerning anarchy and strikes and said: "we are very sorry to see the sad condition of the poor, but, after all, nobody can help it." It says, "The Anar- chists, Socialists, Communists, or whatever you choose by all those titles, are — in favor of making sport of the hoards of the rich. If they could succeed in their na- tural desires, the money would be in worse hands than it is now. The extremely wealthy are for the most part narrow-minded, selfish, and parasitical; but they are not coarse, brutal, and vulgar. Con- sequence they are far better than the bomb-thrower and assassins, who occasionally exhibit their ferocity in our populous communities. Money in the pockets of any one of those impoverished revolutionists would only serve as a stimulant to hardness and intemperance."

Section B. — The "Times," Washington, D.C., a daily which takes the side of labor, says we must have "a peaceful method of revolutionizing existing conditions — and what shall it be?"

STEPSH T. BIXBEY.
The Beasts of Government.

The published letters from Superintendent Stump, of the Bureau of Immigration, to the "Advertiser," regarding the case of the anarchist Mowbray have been followed by an introduction of just such a bill as we advocated in connection with that very case. It will be remembered that Mowbray eluded the inspection of the Custom House, and was able to bring his arms and weapons to New York without being detected at the Custom House. The "Advertiser" immediately took the matter before the Treasury Department, and in reply received the following in answer to the question as to whether the bill would be framed to meet the defects of the present law. That promise is now made good in the bill which has been introduced in the Senate by the Committee on Immigration. Senator Hill, of New York, has charge of the measure, but we believe no confidence in saying that this bill will be drawn by officials of the Treasury Department and is Secretary Collis's plan for dealing with such cases as that of Mowbray in the future.

The aim of the treasury bill, as provided in the first section of the bill, is to harmonize American policy with the Bill of Rights and to permit, or admit to the United States, those who have been forbidden to land by any of its great powers. The bill, as far as we are aware, is an attempt to harmonize the provisions of the First Amendment and the Bill of Rights. It is a bill which is intended to prevent the entry into the United States of any alien who is a member of any organization with a definite name, and who is likely to become a citizen of any of the United States.

The bill makes no distinction between citizens and non-citizens. It provides that all aliens shall be prohibited from entering the United States, and that all persons who have been declared to be aliens under the laws of any of the United States, or who are likely to enter the United States, shall be prohibited from entering the United States. The bill makes no provision for the enforcement of these provisions, and the act of Congress which declares the bill to be in force is a mere act of the Congress of the United States, and the act of Congress which declares the bill to be in force is a mere act of the Congress of the United States.
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questions. On the postal card was written a verse from the Hebrew Bible, without comment. In a recent letter Mr. W. Wise explains that he used a card for he had no postage stamp to put on a letter, and that he sent it in order to escape an explanation of allowing the champions of a dead or dying theology to impress their opponents by means of "obscene" laws when no longer able to enforce laws against blasphemy or heresy.

ANOTHER VICTIM OF CONSCRIPT.

Mrs. Louis Walbrooker, editor and publisher of "Foundation Principles," Topeka, Kansas, was arrested on August 24 for the violation of R. M. McKinney, postal inspector and agent of Comstock's society for the alleged suppression of vice. Taken before United States Commissioner Milham, Mrs. Walbrooker waived examination and was released on bonds of $300. We are not advised what the offending publication was in this instance.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM IN AMERICA.

Rev. A. J. Howard, of the Seventh-Day Adventists, and Henry Bullen, a member of his congregation, have been arrested in Ann Arbor, Michigan, county for "sabotaging" post offices. It is probable that they do not deserve hanging, at least, for they were so horribly wicked as to work their geniuses on the first day of the week.

NO THINKING BY SENATORS.

(Chicago Record.)

A certain gentleman went to Senator Daniel, of Virginia, to remonstrate against a paragraph in the tariff bill, which he insisted was not only unconvincing, but absurd and ridiculous, and exclaimed: "Why, Senator, just a moment!" "I shall do nothing of the kind," replied Daniel. "Jones, Oram, and Brice are doing all the thinking for the Senate on the tariff bill."

THE POWER OF JUDGES OVER CITIZENS.

(For New York Post.)

A member of the Committee, named Tourinier, who was condemned at Pergamum, in France, to three months' imprisonment as a vagabond, received the sentence with the words, "The present government is composed only of Jesuits, and you, gentlemen of the court, are the judges. The judge asked him to withdraw the words, but Tourinier repeated them, whereupon his sentence was extended to three years.

GOVERNMENT AS A SCIENTIST.

(Press Dispatch.)

WASHINGTON, July 21. - The Secretary of the Interior has recommended the appointment of the status of certain Alaska Indians. The Secretary quotes the report of the superintendent of the census relating to Alaska, wherein it says that there is room for doubt as to whether the Indians of Alaska may properly be designated as Indians, and arrives at the conclusion that Alaska is not an Indian country within the meaning of the law, and, therefore, what are generally known as the aborigines are not Indians.

(Government is getting scientific. We have known for some time that whites and negroes can be naturalized, other races can't; but I didn't know that it made such a difference in the legal standing of our non-voting subjects which of the subject races they belong to.)

BELIEVING THE PEOPLE BY WANTING THEIR MONEY.

(For New York Post.)

The investigation of the "slums," for which Kys, the late commissioner from South Dakota, has been appointed to appropriate $30,000, is a good illustration of the folly in legislation which are so common nowadays. The matter was turned over to Commissioner Wright of the Department of Statistics, who has done the best he could, but the result is worse than worthless. The money voted sufficed for work in only New York, as the figures were not quite as high as those published that they were attacked by the local press in each place as not trustworthy and misleading. The whole thing to show for it is consequently the loss of $30,000. Nobody knows any more about the slums than was known before.

THE CRIME OF FRESHNESS.

(For New York Sun.)

Justice Feltner in the Yorkville police court yesterday released two men on the East Fifty-seventh street, who were arrested as prisoners of the police. One of the prisoners was found dead, but that he had no right to assault them.

"You're too fresh," retorted the policeman. "I'll run you in:"

"Nobby," said the Justice, "your province is to arrest, not to assault. In this case you have arrested the wrong man. Be more careful in future. Defendant is discharged."

OUR WONDERFUL POSTAL FACILITIES.

(For New York Sun.)

The Post office Department at Washington makes no distinction between suburban towns and rural villages, and it is not a question of business men accustomed to all the promptness of the New York post office, if living only a mile beyond the city limits, must be content at home with the facilities afforded by a first-class post office. There are villages on Long Island, Staten Island, in contiguous parts of New Jersey and in Westchester county, where New York business men reside, whose post offices, must bond twice a day to a post office conducted exactly as is such a post office at all cross-roads in the remote region of the country. Sometimes special delivery letters are held at such post offices until called for, because the postmaster does not understand the full significance of the special-delivery stamp. "I guess he must have it in his pocket," said the wife of a suburban postmaster in Westchester, who was made for a recorded letter, and she turned out. "That's right," said the postmaster, as a resident laid down a stamped letter on the shop counter with a look of some uneasiness. "I don't generally forget 'em when they're put there."

All these things bring, a good many letters of complaint to the New York post office, but as the suburban postmaster recognizes no authority short of Washington, complaints to New York elicit from the postmaster the cautious assurance that he has nothing to do with the case.

WIFE-DENIED PENALTY FINISHED BY A LECTURE.

(For New York Sun.)

Daniel Barnett, who gave his occupation as an "egg handler" and his residence as No. 805 Park avenue, was arrested by the same police court on a charge of beating his wife, and after a lecture was discharged. "So you're an egg handler!" said Justice Neu. "Yes, sir," answered the prisoner. "You should learn to handle your wife as gingerly as you do eggs, or you will go to the penitentiary," retorted Justice Neu.

[Assault upon a stranger will land a man in prison, but it seems that every husband has a right to assault his wife at least once. The penalty for the first offence is a lecture.]

PUNISHED FOR COMMENT.

(For New York Sun.)

ALBUQUERQUE, N. M., July 18. - Charles Wagg, an engineer on the Santa Fe Railroad, who refused to go out on his engine when ordered to do so, was yesterday sent to the county jail for fifteen days by Judge Collins, who held that he was in contempt of court.

A STEEPED EDITOR.

(For New York Sun.)

Pivia billed players are indignant at an edict by the Proctor against the employees on its cafés. French professional billiards rely almost entirely upon the nightly matches for small stakes in the provinces and are supported up by the small number of connoisseurs, and the professionals play for them.

The French "Anti-Anarchist" Law.

[Paris Correspondent Boston Transcript]

This is the most retrograde legislation that the present century has seen. Whether it is justified or not by the extraordinary circumstances of the times, the fact is indisputable that it undercuts all that the great liberal movement has done for the speech and freedom of the press and to shake the police off the back of the individual who may happen to have written or published an amended. There can be no doubt that the present government is going to work in good faith, and that it is only actuated by the strong determination to put down anarchism at any cost, but the fact remains that it is forging with the help of Parliament may be put to very different uses and may become an arm of tyranny and despotism. In the first place, it is one of the first victories obtained by the people in their struggle for justice under the feudal system. It is an amazing fact that the world should see this principle now attacked by the government of the French Republic, and with the approval of a parliamentary majority. But this is not all. The principle of public trial is equally attacked. A journalist who has written an article in which he disapproves of what may be taken to convey an encouragement to some unknown person to commit an act that would be criminal, will be immediately arraigned before a "committee" by judges who will apply the letter of the law to him in all its rigor. They will have the power to send him to New Caledonia or to Cayenne. Moreover, and this is where the principle was saved is, if the police, by no matter what means, come to know the contents of a letter pointing to the conclusion that the writer is an anarchist, or has dealings with anarchists, he may be arrested and treated in the same manner.

Press correspondence London Truth.

Their precious bill makes no provision, or less than the receiving, of a letter from an anarchist penal, and the penalty may be, after a trial with closed doors, transportation for life. The letter may simply be presented to you and you have no chance to show to the tribunal chosen by the framers of the bill is the correction. There are no abier and better judges than the French in civil affair, and no more objectionable judges in all matters with a political trend. The correctional judges are the worst of all. They can be promoted to the highest tribunals, and, as they are ill-payed and ambitions, they hunger for promotion, which the government alone can give. Being called on daily to judge riff-raff, they grow harsh and arrogant. You have nobody in England resembling the correctional judges. MM. Miller and Aglét probably sold the mark when they spoke of this measure as the crown of the Panamist politicians in the chamber were plucking with the press, because it showed them up.

Legalism and the Late Strike.

[Stokes Harris in Lector.

Are we sure that the newspaper reports of the trouble at Chicago give us the facts as they occurred? We all remember how it was in 1866, when the first blood-curdling dispatches reached us of the "Anarchist riot" in Chicago. It took many months to correct the falsehoods and to prove that it was a police riot, and not an Anarchist riot at all. . . . Should we not, then, put a little care in the reports of the Chicago daily? Now the other side is beginning to be heard. In the "State Journal," of Topeka, of August 6, the statement is made that the A. U. U. men "expect to prove in many instances that the destruction of property for which damages are claimed was done by the railroads and General Managers' Association." That is to say, the charge is made that the railroad men have no more to do with it than themselves, in order to bring disgrace upon Deb and the A. R. U. It is also charged that Meyor Hopkins and Honollo Aliglet were not the property of the company; also, that very few, if any, of the A. U. U. strikers were found among the mobs that overthrew cars, impeded traffic, and prevented the proper delivery of the mail. "Our railroad* has ample constitutional and statutory warrant for sending troops into the States which are in a state of insurrection," and that every act of our government officials for which there is "ample constitutional and statutory warrant" is in
danger of finding himself in company not the most desirable for one whose creed is "egal rigueur for all and special privileges for none." It is true that land monopoly, transportation monopoly, monopoly of the fuel of civil war, and monopoly of the means of civil war, are all "causes." The latter-day monopolies are better entrenched, a thousand fold more deeply and strongly entrenched, in law and custom, than was the monopoly that caused our several civil wars, and it is to maintain these monopolies in their power to rob their own will it becomes customary to call upon the army and the navy, and to increase the burden of the tax, and to the people, and the amount levied on behalf of the service of the nation. A new monarch is installed, and he needs no prophet to predict the steady destruction of all that semblance of liberty we now have left us.

Another Work of Tillier in English.

Mr. Benjamin R. Tucker, who introduced the English-speaking world to Claude Tillier's "My Uncle Benjapa," has translated another work of that author, "Pleat-Plante and Cornelius." [Published by Merrill & Co., of St. Paul, which is a story of two brothers, one a plodder and the other a poet, who are as one in their insatiable passion for trees.] As a keen and sympathetic study of the "fair land" and the "wild land," it ranks far above "My Uncle Benjapa," but as a study of the psychology of the Frenchman in the latter, however, that relaxed its rugged style and filled it with attraction, and in this latter book the same humanity appeals to the reader in finer form and shape.

Liberty's Typographic.

The typographical reform adopted by Liberty consists in the abolition of the process known among printers as "justification." Under this new system, the printer approaches the end of the line, finds that there is not sufficient room for an additional word or syllable, instead of filling the line by increasing the size of the spaces between the words, fills it with little blocks of metal known as quaas, without disturbing the original spacing. In consequence of this, the reading matter does not present as sharp an edge at its right side as at its left.

Letter to a Friend in London.
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