On Picket Duty.

Bernard Shaw's "Arms and the Man" is the new treat which Mr. Mansfield is now affording New York theatre audiences. Go and see, and humbling mercilessly exposed.

Mona Caird has written a novel, "The Daughters of Danan," which is said to be an attack on the modern marriage system. Her "Wing of Azrael" warrantees the anticipation of a work of art, while her sound political and ethical doctrines ought to invest the novel with considerable educational value.

That scientific crank, Lombroso, has written another book on Anarchists. A newspaper reviewer states that Lombroso tries to show that Anarchy "is the coherent consequence of what was prepared before." Everybody will concur, for this is true of everything under the sky, except, possibly, newspaper opinions and order. They are too incoherent to be the result of anything. In their case we witness the miracle of something made out of nothing. Confirmed skeptics, however, might question the ad mission that newspaper opinions are "something."

The British trades-union congress recently in session at Norwich declared itself in favor of State Socialism pure and simple. The "conservation" of the British labor unions, which endorsed them to the plutocratic press, is a thing of the past. Liberty is satisfied with the result. The sooner labor organizations perceive the inadequacy of their present indefinite programs and choose between State Socialism and Anarchism, the better for all of us. It is better to have consistent and conscious State Socialists as opponents than unconscious and unintelligent State Socialists who are blind to the logic of their own position and incapable of grasping your objections to the foundations of their system.

In the recent trial of the Thirty at Paris there was one phase of the defence that is anything but pleasant to contemplate. The most conspicuous of the defendants, M. Jean Grave, was the editor of "La Révolte," in which journal, while often repudiating the anti-governmental writings of Proudhon, he rarely missed an opportunity of condemning Proudhon's belief in private possession of wealth and of expressing his contempt for the bourgeoisie economies of Proudhon and his disciples. How surprising, then, to find M. Jean Grave, when arraigned in court for his opinions, closing his address to the jury with the words: "My conception is that of Proudhon." But the motive is apparent. Proudhon, it is known, although his doctrines are but little understood in France, at the present day commands the highest respect of the entire nation as a man and as a writer. Any one who should today suggest that Proudhon was ever a fit subject for imprisonment would be looked upon by all Frenchmen with feelings of repugnance. It was clearly, therefore, to the interests of M. Jean Grave, in this critical moment of his life, to make himself appear to the jury and the world as another Proudhon, and in the effort to do so he cared not that he lied the jury and the world to believe that Proudhon, the bitterest enemy that communism has ever known, was instead an advocate of communism. I am not disposed, on account of this, to brand M. Jean Grave as a coward and a rascal. In estimating a man's character we must weigh the noble with the ignoble, and there is certainly much in the career and character of M. Grave that deserves warm admiration even from those whom he has treated with contempt. I therefore content myself with saying that on this particular occasion M. Jean Grave acted as a coward and a rascal would have acted under the same circumstances.

"The Waco, Texas, "Evening News" having been driven into a corner on some political question by the Galveston "News," it determined to get even with the "News," and startled Texas and the entire country by the following revelation: "We charge," it said with due solemnity, "that in its editorial columns it has for years advocated the principles of Proudhon, the ciner of the word Anarchy, as applied to the school of agitators who claim that government by man in every form is oppression, and that the highest perfection of society is found in the union of order and Anarchy." We further charge that an Anarchist of national reputation did for years write articles for the Galveston "News" on economic subjects, which articles have received the editorial endorsement of the Galveston "News." We have copies of that paper at hand on which we base these charges; but ask access to the files of the Galveston "News" in case they are denied.

The country is wondering what the answer of the Galveston "News" will be. Will it plead guilty? Is it possible that a great paper can be Anarchist without the fact being known to the thousands of its "intelligent readers," the hundreds of its exchanges, the politicians who regard it as a powerful organ of the Cleveland Democracy, and last, but by no means least, the New York "Evening Post," which has been copying into its own columns, with evident relish, some of the best and soundest sermons of the Galveston "News," always speaking of it as a most influential paper. The opinions carry weight? Has the Galveston "News" been cruelly deceiving the innocent Goulkin, who has been maintaining that there are no native-born Anarchists in this country? Liberty is estopped from going into the matter more fully, as it expects to be asked to give expert testimony when the case of the "News" comes to trial.

The charges which were made in the "Evening Post" against Prof. Richard T. Ely, and upon which that paper based an accusation of Anarchism, did not lead to the arrest and imprisonment of the professor, but they were not without consequences. The board of regents of the university with which he is connected felt called upon to take cognizance of the terrible arraignment of the professor and appointed a committee to try him for economic and sociological heresy. A certain E. O. Wells appeared as prosecutor, and he attempted to show that Ely's books were Socialist and revolutionary, and that he sympathized with strikers, boycot ters, walking delegates, and other traitors and criminals. The committee has just submitted its report, and Ely is found not guilty and "vindicated." There is poetic justice in this appearance of Ely, whom Liberty convicted some years ago of falsehood, shadiness, and misrepresentation of Anarchism, in the role of a culprit charged with inciting to violence and poisoning the minds of students and readers by his "Anarchist" assaults upon modern society. More damaging to Ely's reputation than the charges of his enemies was his own line of defence. He admitted that the charges were "grave," and denied that he had ever expressed sympathy for strikers or boycotters. That he is neither a State Socialist nor an Anarchist he had no difficulty in proving. No one who has looked into his mystic and compartmental productions can suspect him of possessing positive convictions. But the grievance of the propitiously against him, as charmingly stated in a "swapper" editorial, is that he finds too much to criticise in the present order of things and plans doubts in youthful minds. Instead of teaching "fixed" propositions, instead of proving that this is the best of all possible worlds, he dwells on the darker sides of our glorious civilization and everywhere vaguely suggests the need of reform. All this is intolerable, of course; followers who hint at rottenness and injustice in our order are but little better than bomb-throwers,—in fact, they are responsible for bomb-throwing. To prison with all disturbers and cranks!
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"In abiding rest and interest, the last salutation of old time duty, the Revolution bids at one—the sound of the execu-
tion is a roll for the race. The statesmen, the statesmanship, the spirit of the country, the main effort of the department, all those
legislation of Polity, which young Liberty bids farewell to her host."—PUBLIUS.

The appearance in the editorial column of articles over other signatures than the editor's initials indicates that the editor approves their central purposes and general tenor, but the literature which he thus disposes of is not responsible for every phrase or word. But the appearance in other parts of the paper of articles by the same or other writers by no means indicates that he disapproves them in any respect, such disposition of them being governed largely by motives of convenience.

Liberty and Literature.

Thinkers and reformers who ought to know better have hailed with joy the decision of Justice O'Brien, of the New York supreme court, in the application made some time ago by Receiver Little, of the Worthington Publishing Company, for instructions concerning the disposition of certain books which Anthony Comstock sought to suppress as indecent and immoral. The court overruled Comstock in the following very interesting opinion:

After consultation with some of my brethren, we have concluded that the following views should be expressed concerning the merits of this motion: That these books constitute valuable assets of this receiver's estate cannot be doubted, and the question before the court for decision on this motion is whether or not they are of such a character that they should be condemned and their sale prohibited. The books in question are Payne's edition of "The Arabian Nights," Fielding's "Joseph Jones" and works of Voltaire, Ovid's "Art of Love," the "Decameron" of Boccaccio, the "Histoires" of Queen Margaret of Navarre, the "Emile" of J. Rousseau, "Tales from the Arabian," and "Aldus.

Most of the volumes that have been submitted to the inspection of the court are of choice editions, both as to the better paper, better print and bindings, and are high, both as to their commercial value and subject matter, as to prevent their being generally sold or purchased, except by those who would desire them for literary merriment or for their worth as specimens of fine bookmaking. It is very difficult to see upon what theory these world-renowned classics can be regarded as specimens of that literature which it is the office of the Society for the Suppression of Vice to suppress; or how they can come under any stronger condemnation than that high standard literature which consists of the works of Shakspeare, of Chaucer and Laurence Sterne, and of other great English writers, without making reference to many parts of the Old Testament, which are to be found in almost every household in the land. The very artistic character, the high qualities of style, the absence of those glaring and crude pictures, scenes, and descriptions which are the common and vulgar mind, make a place for books of the character in question entirely apart from such gross and obscene writings as it is the duty of the authorities to suppress. It would be quite as unjustifiable to condemn the writings of Shakspeare and Chaucer and Laurence Sterne, the early English novelists, the playwrights of the Restoration, and the dramatic literature which has so much enriched the English language, as to place an interdict upon those volumes which have received the admiration of literary men for so many years. What has become standard literature of the English language—has been wrought into the very structure of our splendid English literature—is not to be pronounced at once for publication or circulation, and stamped with judicial disapprobation as hurtful to the community. The works under consideration are the product of the greatest literary genius.

Payne's "Arabian Nights" is a wonderful exhibition of Oriental scholarship, and the other volumes have so long held a supreme rank in literature that it would be absurd to call them now foul and uncleane. A seeker after the sensual and degrading, parts of a narrative may find in all these works, as in those of other great authors, something to satisfy his pernicious vice. But to condemn a standard literary work because of a few of its episodes would compel the exclusion from circulation of a very large proportion of the works of fiction of the most famous writers of the English language. There is no such evil to be feared from the sale of these rare and costly books as the imagination of many even well-disposed people might apprehend. They rank with the higher literature, and would not be bought nor appreciated by the class of people from whom obscene publications ought to be withheld. They are not commercially gainful to the young, for they are not likely to reach them. I am satisfied that it would be a wanton destruction of property to order the receiver of these works, for if their sale ought to be prohibited, the books should be burned, but I find no reason in law, morals, or expediency why they should not be sold for the benefit of the necessitous receiver. The receiver is therefore allowed to sell these volumes.

Judge O'Brien praised as a wise and enlightened judge, and even our friend Traubel, of the "Conservator," eulogized him as "most just." I cannot swell the volume of praise, the decision appearing to me essentially reactionary and dangerous. Doubtless under the language of the statute covering the subject the court was as liberal as it is possible to be without nullifying the intent and purpose of the statute, but to suppose that the decision will encourage literature or promote any progressive tendencies in it to take an erroneous and superficial view of things. Judge O'Brien is less objectionable as a censor than the vulgar and obtuse, but the cause of literature and liberty demands freer from such censorship. To allow anybody to divide literature into classes is to open the door to the gravest abuses and most outrageous discrimination. The rule by which our courts are guided is well stated in the "Evening Post's" comment upon this Comstock assault upon Fielding and other classical authors: "It is as literature, says the "Post," "that all such books should be weighed. If the literary element is by far the predominating one, and the indecency is only an incident, or an expression of the manners of the time of publication, letting Anthony Comstock pass on their merits would make us very ridiculous. His proper field is books in which the pornographic purpose is the main or only one, but he ought to be assumed to ask any tribunal to suppress a classic. He may depend upon it that works which five or six generations have admired are out of his bailiwick." Under this rule, the judges are to determine whether the literary or pornographic element predominates in the work, and whether any alleged indecency is an expression of the manners of the time or a deliberate pandering to depraved taste. Is literature safe under such censorship? Our judges are not distinguished for literary culture and critical acumen, and it is by no means certain that even the classical authors would be uniformly held to be outside the Comstock bailiwick (think of a Maine judge "weighing" books as literature!), but all doubt as to the pernicious and reactionary character of the rule must be dispelled by a reference to the treatment of the great modern master, Zola, by the courts and the followers of Mrs. Grundy. There are few judges in America who, even if they had the literary qualifications, would have the courage to protect the right of publishers to put on the market complete, unabridged translations of Zola's masterpieces. Is there any question that the literary element predominates in Zola's books, and that their "indecency" is an expression of the manners of the time? The hypocrisies and the bigots care nothing about the interests of literature, and judges are apt to give effect (even if they do not share the sentiments) to the notions of the hypocrisies and bigots in the community. A judge might shrink from ordering the suppression of a work which "five or six generations have admired," but experience has taught us to expect very little consideration and appreciation of works admired by the educated and progressive elements of one generation only. And what is the effect of such ignorant treatment of modern writers? Even Mr. Conway, whose libertarianism is far from the unformed and consistent kind, tells us that "half the poetic genius of our century has been crushed by legality or social censorship," and that "perfect intellectual and moral freedom would surely give us Shakespeares and Goethes again." A rule whose operation kills genius is not one that lovers of literature can rejoice over. Far better the temporary away of the fool, Comstock, whose very unattractiveness, born as it is of vulgarity and ignorance, would matter for our literature emancipation.

Reformers should demand the utter abolition of Comstockism, not in the name of classical literature, but in the name of liberty, which is higher than any literature. Just as in the administration of justice the powerful can protect themselves and the poorest and most innocent citizen from the onerous requiring vigilant defense, so, in literature, that which we shall all never suffer for lack of friends, while in the so-called indecent and pornographic authors liberty is in danger of being crushed out. It is the extreme cases which need the aid and support of the fearless and logical advocates of fundamental principles.

Will Liberty alone Bring Equality? It is only about fifteen years since the word Socialism first began to be familiarly heard here in America. Before that it was known as a distant theory of certain impractical Germans, of no immediate interest, scarcely more than a new outburst of the old anarchy. Since then Socialism has become quite acclimated. With the word at least we are familiar; it no longer excites fear and hatred; on the contrary, it is quite safe and almost respectable to call one's self a Socialist. Even more astonishing has been the rapid growth of Anarchism, both the name and the thing. Without a founder, for it has half a dozen founders; without a leader, for each in his own order, the Anarchistic idea, the denial of all authority, has within a short time, ten years at the most, grown from a thing unheard of to the most conspicuous and most progressive movement in this Nineteenth-century
world of changes, progress, and movements.

By Anarchism I mean, of course, Anarchism of all varieties, including the broad ranks of Anarchistic Communism, and not merely the small group of plumb-liners, which is indeed the only school that can clearly explain what constitutes liberty, but by no means the only one that is filled with the sentiment of liberty and the desire for it.

Why is it that Communist Anarchism grows up while Philosophical Anarchism buds so slowly? The reason, it seems to me, at least one reason, is this: that Philosophical Anarchism lays too little stress on the object of liberty, the equality.

Will liberty bring equality? How will liberty bring equality? These are the questions to which Philosophical Anarchism must make clear answers: for without equality, as well as liberty, we feel there can be no fraternity.

It is to achieve this very condition of equality that Communist Anarchism has thought it necessary to take up with Communism. Let there be liberty; these two concepts, the solution of all economic problems show that equality will result from liberty, —show it distinctly and unmistakably in language that may be "comprehended by the people," and it will not lack for recruits from the very ranks of Communism.

That Proudhon at least regarded equality as correlated with liberty is evident in his writings. "Men, equal in the dignity of their persons and equal before the law, should be equal in their conditions." Such is the thesis which I maintained. . . . So writes he in his "Letter to M. Blanqui," and throughout those of his books which I have read runs the same strain,—equality, always equality; liberty as a means to equality, but equality as the end.

Why should I give you more than my day's work will produce of corn in exchange for less than your day's work will produce of beans? That is the commercial principle which Proudhon promulgates; liberty he incantates because, according to him, it will lead to this equitable exchange of day's work's worth for day's work's worth.

But that such a state of affairs will supervene is not evident at first glance. On the contrary, quite the opposite would seem to be evident. Although, with the abolition of rent and interest, the present arrangement by which the idler receives the product of the worker would cease, and inequality in its most marked and offensive form would disappear, would there not always remain a much higher reward for some who, by preeminent talent or by advantage of preoccupied opportunity, would be able to demand and secure it?

Such is the question which is raised in a little range, "The Impossibility of Anarchism," by Bernard Shaw, which I have but recently read, although it was published long ago.

It is impossible, is the gist of his argument, that free exchange of products can lead to equality, because by a more favorable situation one man may, with equal labor, produce twice as much as his neighbor who is compelled to put up with a less favorable situation. That is to say, it is on the question of economic rent that Mr. Shaw shines. Strange to say, neither he nor any of the other critics of economic rent

that I know of pay much attention to the differences in personal talent and skill which ought also, it would seem, to command corresponding differences in reward. An interesting case I heard of recently of a man who, by a mere bent or fancy which peculiarly adapted him to such work (as one man can rhyme verses almost without thought, while another, perhaps even of the same age and the same creek hammer out a quatrain) was able to command a wage of ten thousand dollars a year; not much, perhaps, for a leading divine, or doctor, or singer, but for a simple handworky extraordinary. He was a carver of original type, which from the matrices are made for new fonts.

Clearly special taste is required to make such an occupation remunerative. To sit day after day, designing and cutting alphabets with a minute accuracy compared with which a hair's breadth would be coarseness, is not a job that many men would find attractive, nor that many men could do at all. Surely such a man, even under freedom, would get higher wages than the ordinary wage.

I do not think so. I have myself a strong conviction that liberty alone would bring equality: that both the rent of ability and the rent of opportunity — the economic rent — would by liberty alone be equally distributed. That Proudhon thought so, he everywhere unmistakably asserts. Liberty, equality, society, justice, all these are synonymous in his position.

Let it be remembered, in the first place, that it is exceedingly difficult, in a lower stage of social development, to picture the precise working of the next higher phase of development. What man in feudal times, who might have been able to foresee the mechanical and commercial progress of today, could have also predicted that, for a time at least, misery and not happiness would come of it; that with the power to produce more in a day than a man then could in a year, men would not be allowed to produce at all, and would pine and starve for want?

Or who could have predicted the fungous growth of classes and the depopulation of the country, so marked a phenomenon, from a book acquaintance only with the principles of capitalism?

As matters are now, there is no such thing as exchange of services. The only human beings that exist economically, under the present system, are the monopolists, the proprietors, the owners of opportunities. All other men are merely cattle, their labor is bought and sold by the proprietors as any other animal's labor is bought and sold. There is nothing like even an inequitable exchange of labor for labor, let alone an equitable.

That after all, labor receives much less than its product is well known; it is reasonable then, at first blush, to think it probable that the rewards paid by the proprietors to those whose special skill is indispensable to them, will often exceed their natural product. Besides this I have not been able to convince myself that excessive wages are often given by genius under the present system. For the most part I find, upon digging for it, a substructure of monopoly,—a little nest egg of stocks, or bonds or mortgages, on which genius securely builds.

Picture for a moment the society of the future. Monopoly gone, there remains a number of individuals producing what is wanted in such proportion as is wanted. Any disturbance of the proportion causes a change in the proportional value of some products; yet, although daily and even momentarily fluctuating, the proportion produced of each product tends to a normal level and the value to a normal point.

Men increasing continually in skill, there is continually a surplus of products, which permits some to withdraw from prevailing pursuits and seek out new ones to gratify the new desires which also continually are developed. Thus at a certain point the farmers and herdmen of an early stage find it to their advantage to use their surplus product to hire a poet, a bard, a piper, or minnesinger, just as sailors find it to their actual material, economic advantage to get apart one of their number to sing to them,—the shanty man, as he is called.

But there is no reason why they should pay their singer a better living than they themselves enjoy. Should they do so competitors will come who will be willing to pay less. No sooner does an Edison appear than a Tesla eclipses him.

When all opportunities are open there will be a chance for everybody who chooses to make ordinary wages; that is to say, his equal share of the general normal product. Besides this, when all opportunities are open, it will be impossible for anybody to make very much in excess of the wage level, for the same reason that, opportunities being open, even genius will feel a competition that it does not now feel, for everybody knows that at present genius must have enough commercial instinct to make terms with monopoly, or it will have no chance at all of being recognized.

Then, as for opportunities, will not the genius of one, you may ask, monopolize some opportunity? No; and for this reason, that even in producing geniuses, nature produces variety. Tesla outshines Edison, but in a different sphere; the opportunity of one is not the opportunity of the other.

But, laying aside geniuses, take ordinary economic transactions; such, for instance, as Mr. Shaw speaks of. A coal mine, producing first quality of coal, of easy access; another, poorer coal with far more difficulty in extraction. How can the workers in these obtain equal products? Will not the half work upon the best coal bring twice the amount of other products in exchange?

Undoubtedly it will, and for that reason wages will be equal in both mines.

Consider. At the present time all sorts of mines are worked; to make a mine workable is only necessary under capitalism that the owner should relax his demands, that labor should receive a minimum. Anything that is left, if it will pay current interest, or even offer the hope of paying current interest, will authorize the capitalist to work the mine. It is characteristic of monopoly that it forces labor to exert itself on inferior opportunities, while holding the best opportunities out of use.

But under liberty such would not be the case. The best coal, the easiest of access, would be used up first, as long as—note this well—as long as there was enough to be obtained to supply the proportion required by society.

If, on the contrary, the vein were very small,
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in the last issue of Liberty. But whether the prophet is glad of this disciple’s support, is at least doubtful. Henry Holt professes to make some regard for “luminous principles,” while Bierce has no use for “private tradition or precedent.” He glories in his absolute freedom from the legal and ethical “superstitions” which impede and hamper the rest of civilized humanity. “Free speech!” he cries; “nonsense; there is no reason why those who disagree with me, Ambrose Bierce, should be allowed to express their opinions. I am general, virtuous, and useful, and therefore free speech is my right. But the fellows who talk what I call mischievous nonsense have a right to free speech.” Bierce does not use precisely these phrases, but here is what he does say:

It is with a song in the soul that one observes Congress cast a considering eye in the direction of exclusion and deportation. It really begins to look as if we have about done with the delusion that an enemy of the race is least mischievous when thrusting his blazin’ tongue into ears of combustible idiots. The infantile meteor to press six in a man will contentedly refrain from committing what is apparently doomed to a leasing domination, and some of us surviving victims of “free speech” may not unreasonably suppose that “a man may speak the thing he will” only if he will speak the thing he may. Whether freedom of speech is or is not a good thing depends on what is going to be said.

Of course, to reason with a swaggering ignoramus, who mistakes epithet-hurling for reasoning and irrapportable assertions born of brutality and fanaticism for philosophy, is futile; but his rant, and the rant of others of his ilk, should be forced upon the attention of all who still cherish the delusion that the tyrannical measures proposed for dealing with revolutionists are conceived in regard for liberty and civilization. The decent men in the community should be confronted with the savagery and ferocity of the Bierces and Holts whenever they challenge us to state what we think of the “monstrous” doctrines of the propagandists by deed. I think all fair men who appreciate the motives of the Vaillants and Henrys will at least admit that they are far better and finer men than such law-and-order champions as Bierce.

It is one thing to explain, and to refrain from denouncing as malevolent, those acts of violence which the victims of violence commit; it is quite another thing to covertly encourage such acts by preaching the doctrine of despair of reason and proclaiming that, until the millennium shall have arrived, it will be impossible for any peaceful thing to be born except out of force. The conflict between these two things is strikingly exemplified by certain editorials on this subject lately contributed to Liberty by Mr. Yarros and the anything but excellent communication from Lizzie M. Holmes which appeared in Liberty of August 11. The articles of Mr. Yarros fix responsibilities mercilessly, but contain nothing to inflame the inflammable and much of the policy of violence on all persons in the least amenable to reason. The letter of Lizzie M. Holmes, on the other hand, is a veiled glorification of dynamite, and plainly reveals, to those who can read between the lines, one of those persons who, while besetting to openly reject in force through fear of appearing too devilish in the eyes of people more reasonable than themselves, nevertheless spend most of their breath in talk calculated to leave the impression that the age of reason lies in a hopscotch distant future and that on the whole they are damned glad of it. With this self-deceiving and semi-hypocritical attitude Liberty has nothing in common. As Anarchists our sympathies are with the oppressed, and we refuse to characterize their ill-directed efforts to free themselves as having anything dearer than a superficial resemblance to the acts of law-abiding criminals; but we equally deplore and condemn the folly of supposing that social injustice resulting from economic ignorance can be abolished by the bomb, — a folly which Lizzie M. Holmes does not join us in exposing, for the very good reason that she shares it. There is no essential intellectual difference between the actual authorities who think that they can drive an idea out of the human mind by force, and the would-be authorities who think that an idea can be driven into the human mind by force.

A most astonishing letter is that from Mr. Bilgram, with Liberty printed elsewhere. In it he indirectly attempts to meet the criticisms I made upon his def-mess of legal tender laws and directly to show that the system of issue money in competition, with private agencies. And what is his argument? Why, he tells us that his “ideal government is a non-invasive defensive organization, having no other function than the enforcement of equal freedom, and that such a government’s laws and undertakings do not render free competition an absurdity.” Now this I cheerfully admit, but the government which Mr. Bilgram had in mind when he took the position I criticised was not his ideal government, but the “real” government with which we are all so familiar to-day. When I asserted that legal tender laws were tyrannical and government competition an outrage and a sham, I had reference to the laws and actions of the invasive, compulsory, criminal institution under which we live. When government becomes a voluntary institution, supported by the contributions of its policy-holders, and uses no force against the non-aggressive, its competition will be legitimate and rightful as that of private individuals. Does Mr. Bilgram who, I understand as admitting my contention that free competition is an absurdity in any market in which the present or any other invasive government is a competitor? His argument distinctly implies this admission, but it is well to be more explicit. Surely he cannot be guilty of the silliness of maintaining that it is irrational to object to laws and actions of the invasive, compulsory government because he hopes that some day, in the remote future, the aggressive features of government will be eliminated? Mr. Bilgram is right in saying — to come to the minor question of terms — that we use the word government in a sense differing from its popular acceptance, but since Mr. Bilgram is aware of this fact, he cannot complain. We have greatest reason for insisting, in scientific discussions, upon our strict definition of government, and what the masses do or do not know about government is immaterial. Thinkers do not go to the ignorant for definitions; they provide them, and the ignorant slowly learn to think logically by studying the methods and formulas of the
In his essay, Mr. Biglan really under the impression that "his use of the term government more nearly agrees with the popularly accepted meaning of the word. The popular mind does not even dream of a government that is not invasive, that is not supported by compulsory taxation, that confines itself to the enforcement of equal freedom. It would be a far simpler task to convince the average man of the correcness and propriety of the Anarchist definition of government than to bring him to a realizing sense of Mr. Biglan's "ideal" government.

Mr. Biglan falls into several strange errors in his individual criterion of the Anarchists' atitude towards government. Thus he wrongly assumes that Anarchists object to "government" (defined as invasion) because their doctrine "promises a non-invading man." Anarchist insists that the existence of invasion does not render government indispensable. Government means enforced cooperation, the eviction of "socially hurtful," the punishment of legitimate actions. Anarchism means the use of force only against actual invaders and the absolute non-interference with those who do not overstep the bounds of equal freedom. To abolish government means simply and solely to abolish the perversion of the innocent. A society that uses only aggressors in perfectly Anarchistic, and such a society we contemplate and work for. Mr. Biglan thinks that Anarchists ignore the legitimate acts of government, and "fails to see that anything can be caused by urging the abolition of that part of the present government which performs a legitimate function." The Anarchists do not admit that such acts of government are legitimate. It is an organization begotten of aggression and maintained by aggression, and the good that it accomplishes is no more legitimate than the good accomplished by an unofficial highwayman. In talking about legitimate acts of government, Mr. Biglan means no more than the work done by it needs to be done, and would, in its absence, have to be done by some other organization. This is true; so long as men invade, it will be necessary to maintain some defensive or protective organization. But this organization will not destroy more liberty than it saves, and therein will differ from government, which, pretending to resist aggression, is itself the worst aggressor of all. Charity is a good thing, but not the charity of a highwayman, whose only method of acquiring funds is robbery. Protection of liberty is legitimate and desirable, but not the sham protection of an institution which forces everybody to accept its alleged services and causes more mischief than it prevents.

Mr. Ballon's argument in support of his endorsement of Mr. Biglan on the point of government "competition" is, if possible, even more astonishing than Mr. Biglan's curious defense. He says, he says, that the very existence of government is a denial of equal liberty, for the reason that men differ as to what government really is. Is Mr. Ballon ignorant of Lib. y's definition and conception of government? Liberty reasons from its own premises, not from those of anybody else. Accepting Liberty's definition of government, doesn't Mr. Ballon admit that the existence of government (enforced cooperation) is a denial of equal liberty? Those who think that a voluntary association is a form of government will, logically enough, deny that the very existence of government is inconsistent with equal freedom, but nobody can hesitate to admit that the existence of a compulsory organization which coerces the non-aggressive into cooperation is a denial of equal freedom. Now, to deny such an organization the right to compete is not destructive of equal freedom, it is clearly demanding its abolition as a condition precedent to the establishment of equitable relations. Liberty does not quarrel with names, but with things. Things, however, must have names, and the confusion in Mr. Ballon's letter is due to his failure to bear in mind the names and definitions consistently used by Liberty in discussion. The reason why Liberty objects to "government" is precisely because it defines government as an invasive institution doing business on tyrannical and inequitable terms. To apply other people's definitions to Liberty's arguments, to accuse it of inconsistency or inaccuracy because its conclusions do not follow from those premises, is absurd in the extreme. Yet this is what Mr. Ballon does in his letter. I am surprised and painsl, but I console myself with the reflection that Mr. Ballon will be still more surprised at his performance when he sees it in its true light.

The editor of the "Review of Reviews" and some other fair-minded writers protest against the application of "Anarchist" (in the sense of revolutionist) to strikers, boycotter, reformers who denounce existing evils and favor measures not inconsistent with the fundamental principles of our government and social system. They justly ascribe the indiscriminate use of the epithet to maleness and hatred of labor. The malvolent plutocratic organs imagine they can silence all opposition to the brotherhood of thieves and its practices by threatening agitators with the name "Anarchist," knowing as they do that the average newspaper reader is too ignorant to perceive that bomb-throwing, arson, and other forms of crime have nothing to do with Anarchism. The motives and condemn their vicious doings is proper and commendable, but it is useless to deny the fact that they base their main charges on indisputable truths. Apart from their epistles, it is true that no reformer, however law-abiding and innocent, can escape his share of responsibility for the violent demonstrations of the revolutionists. The socially and dry German bimetallist, who traces all modern maladjustments to the gold standard, the Socialist of the chair, who expounds State Socialism in metaphysical jargon; the Christian Socialist, the land-nationalizationist, in short, everybody who admits that things are rotten and in need of overhaul, is the New York "Sun" and "Evening Post" have been accusing, morally responsible for the dynamiter, who thinks that a little force applied where it will do the most good will prove more efficacious than the methods of his more patient friends. Those who denounce society do afford a "sort of moral justification" to dynamite, and those who quarrel with this premise of the plutocrats are doomed to defeat. The vulnerable point is the plutocratic syllogism is the conclusion, not the premise. Granted that denunciation of evil engenders bomb-throwing: does it follow that the former ought to be suppressed as a means of preventing the latter? The philosophy of liberal has certainly been at variance with this view; for the evils of liberty it has prescribed greater liberty; and the aggression of private individuals has never been admitted by it to constitute a justification for official tyranny. Let us now ask a plain question. For what violence and crime say to their accusers: "Yes, our teachings do tend to encourage revolutionary assaults upon modern society, but that is no reason why we should refrain from telling the truth. The remedy lies in the abolition of the evils which we are forced to expose and denounce. It is not our teaching that is the evil cause of the iniquity, but our teaching is the evil against which our teaching is directed."

Nothing can be more absurd and self-contradictory than young Emperor William's speech on agrarianism to the East Prussian nobles. He told them that he would not give a civil right and that that there is no nobility to be suppressed as a menace to peace and tranquility. It so happens that William's pet scheme, which the nobility of East Prussia has fought, is in the direction of progress and popular rights; he favors a treaty with Russia which gives the country freer trade, while the nobility are as firm in their protectionism as the patricians of our own McKinleys and Reeds. But whether the eccentric William is accidentally right or not, his mediaval conceptions have a strange sound in these days. What he seems to have overlooked is that the nobles, like himself, claim to rule over the plebeians by divine right, and that their defeat would speedily bring about the downfall of his authority. It seems to imply further that it is monstrous for the other classes of the country to resist his divine-right pretensions. What is a divine sanction worth which millions of voters disregard with perfect impunity?

It is reported that the free-silver people of a certain congressional district in Tennessee have decided to appeal the boycott to the business of those who support gold-bugs for congress. A Memphis paper is so alarmed at this that it appeals to the boycotters to abandon their plan for the sake of the district, which would be hopelessly discredited by the issue of "vicious foreignism," which is only "less heinous than Anarchism." I suppose the district would not be in danger of losing credit if the good Americans confined themselves to the strictly American methods of lynching, fraud, and bribery. But it is gratifying to observe the growing popularity of the b-yetz among the people. Whatever the editors might say, the man of common sense cannot believe that it is vicious to prefer passive resistance to direct aggression.

The Bugleom Policy a Boomerang.

The new policy, for which the "Evening Post" of this city is most to blame, and which may be called the bugleom policy of rebellion, but all free discussions looking to juster relations between labor and capital, would have been very fitting in the sixteenth century, but it will work like a boomerang ag 13 year.
The Beauteous of Government

...
Anarchist Letter-Writing Corps.

The Secretary wants every reader of Liberty to send in to him as many as possible. Those who do so may help themselves to write, which possible, a letter every fortnight, on Anarchism or kindred subjects, to the agent of the corporation in Liberty for this purpose. All, whether members or not, are asked to lose no op- portunity of addressing the secretary of suitable targets. Address THOMAS A. BYRNE, Ohiore, Ohio.

I am glad that the membership of the Corps is also increasing, although I wish it was increasing more. Those who are distrustful of their own abilities do not sufficiently realize how the combination of effort through the Corps will enable writers of moderate ability to do something worth who could not when working alone.

Yet small bits of work commonly have more effect than is expected, even without cooperation. You remem- ber, about the time the A. L. W. C. was started, Mr. Tucker wrote an article describing the effects of a short letter on the difference between Anarchism and dynamism, which he wrote to the "Outlook." There is a sequel. Soon after that, the "Outlook" had to re- view Tunk & Wagner's New Standard Dictionary. The reviewer, having without doubt had his attention drawn to the matter by Mr. Tucker's letter, looked up "Anarchist," and in his review specially praised "- book for distinguishing between millitant and..." carful Anarchists. Tunk & Wagner have made that "Out- look" review one of their leading advertising devices, so that now, in all the circulars and periodicals of every enterprising advertiser the public has its atten- tion drawn to the article containing the definition emphasizing the fact that Anarchism does not necessarily mean dynamite. - timely information just now, and a very good return for one short letter.

Now, I do not think it took much of Mr. Tucker's genius to write that letter. There was nothing in it that might not have been written by any reasonably clever person who had the time and the opportunity for the effort which Mr. Tucker did.

With three sections I shall sometimes be able to use targets more promptly; but there is a great deal of de- lay in the "Outlook." The Boston "Pilot," for instance, which of course should have been used at once, reached me Aug. 31, and was too late for the last issue. If I had been present then in Liberty's office I could have just "made connections," but not with much margin. Of course, such delays are harmful, but they can't be helped.

I think Mr. T's ideas on sending me samples of cheap literature, and hope they will let Liberty's readers know what they have printed and at what price they will sell copies. Some of it is very good, but too many are cheap and independent, so-called "literary" and "ad- vance." Two of the writers of the "sane- in- view of individual." I feel sure that the average man will not under the mean of the word "in- vasive," but if he has given me an idea which is so much study as to be past the need of an elementary exposition. Neither will dictionary make it clear to him. But there is much good to be done by those least of letters and cards, and they ought to be made accessible to one who will use them.

Target, Section A. The Boston "Pilot," in its issue of Aug. 31, says: "What is Anarchists? Will of some of our readers inform us?"

The Philadelphia "Post" of July 15 says: "There can be no such thing as compulsory arbitration on the question of wages in a free country. To compel workers to work for less wages than they are willing to accept is to enslave them. To compel employers to pay more wages than they are willing to or can afford to pay is to confiscate their property and perhaps to bankrupt them."

Section G. H. L. Wayland, D.D., Philadelphia, Pa., has an article entitled "The Conservative's Ser- mon" in the "Sunday School Times" of Aug. 28. He describes that as "the nature of all An- archists, he says among other things: "If a man ex- pressions of the present condition of the workers and the press in regard to property by which a certain men get control of one of the necessities of life, and pile up the price until they are gorged with plunder, at the same time oppressing those who work for them to the very point of starvation and death, how easy and how con- vincing to turn upon the man who is dissatisfied, and to say to him, "You are a proletaire, you are a Com- munist, you are a Red Republican, you are an An- archist, and he has nothing to lose, but himself."

Stephen T. Byrnes.

"Government" an Ambiguous Term.

To the Editor of Liberty:

In Liberty of Aug. 28 the quasi endorsement of "government," as a means of curing any of my many has been criti- cized by me. Permit me to reply.

It is my opinion that Anarchists use this word in a false and misleading sense. There is no term which is not a combination of the popularly accepted meaning.

Were government abolished, it seems natural to me that long as there are men who either intentionally or thoughtlessly, infringe the equal freedom of others, those whose freedom is endangered will combine and form an organization which, if strong enough, will prevent the infringement. I should claim that this organization has no jurisdiction over him, he being no man. I speak of what I think na- turally happen, independent of what would be desir- able, or more, or less, or even, for preventing infringements of equal freedom, which is my ideal of a "government." It is true, the present governments by no means come up to this ideal. Many re- spects they do infringe, or at least a class of men to infringe, the equal freedom of the people generally. But while Anarchists take cognizance of nothing but these abuses, the people generally endorse the govern- ment because it restrains infringers, and in doing so performs its proper function. Anarchists ignore the legitimate acts of government, the defenders of gov- ernment have thus far been few.

Since Anarchism promises a non-invasive man, An- archists may find comfort in the admission that an organiza- tion invested with the function of preventing all infractions of equal freedom, and deprived of every other power, would naturally die of inanition if man kind would ever attain such a state of perfection that every man would ever seek to enfranchise the line of equal freedom.

Viewing "government" in this sense, a "law" is nothing more nor less than a mutual agreement. The "legal" leader of society by the agree- ment fixing the meaning of the word "dollar," and the abrogation of this law would be synonymous with the abrogation of the agreement on which contracts of payment exist, and are based.

Being convinced that "government," in the sense in which I conceive its idea, will be necessary so long as infringement is committed, I fail to see that anything can be gained by urging the abolition of that part of the present government which performs a legitimate function. All that can be done is to correct in that which legitimate bounds by correcting the present abuses.

Hugo Bilgram.

"Government" and "Government.

To the Editor of Liberty:

In a recent issue the editor, commenting on Mr. Bil- gram's "A Study of the Money Question," and my re- view of this question, and the solution of it, said: "I am aware of the absurdity in any market in which government is a competitor." This is true if government is regarded as simply a competitor. But, strictly speaking, gov- ernment is not a competitor, but a monopoly. In this respect Mr. Bilgram's conception of government is faulty, and he is really, in my opinion, a utilitarian who pays the commonest of the sovereign authorities. I admit the right of government to issue money on condition that the individual enjoy equal liberty. It seems to me as destructive of equal liberty to deny government a right to enjoy individual a right. I cannot admit that the "very existence of government is a denial of equal liberty," for the reason that men differ as to what term馍馍 mean.

A large proportion of our liberal friends with Anarchist tendencies, as well as those who unreasonably blame the government, hold that a vote for a radical is more or less than a form of government. I cannot but sympathize with a certain extent with these, for, although it seems plain to me now, when I look back, that I am in a difficult position.

I would not war upon a name. Whatever govern- ment may mean, there is no difference of opinion in regard to its use. Let us draw the line here. Any institution, individual, or organization, which has a power to do whatsoever it wills; invasion alone may be redressed. If our principles are ever introduced, it must be in such a connection with government with government, that it may say in spite of the governmental restrictions, especially in the issue of money. And, although government has the power of compulsory taxation, it could never succeed in preventing the activity of some. A sufficient number became interested and determined to succeed. It only requires a few determined souls to demonstrate how important it really is. Our city has on several occasions determined to stop the traffic in intoxicating liquor on Sundays, and I have no doubt that a referendum vote would have sanctioned the law. Yet the politicians, with very little influence to aid them, successfully resisted the invasion. The intrinsic merits of the law may be utilized to bolster and confound the invader as well as the victim. While I am not always in accord with the "terms on which government does business," I will, when an advocate of government proposes to alter those terms, I am willing to concede the right of his gov- ernment, or altered, "terms on which government does business," I will, when an advocate of government proposes to alter those terms, to concede the right of his gov- ernment. If I am not in accord with the "terms on which government does business," I will, when an advocate of government proposes to alter those terms, I am willing to concede the right of his gov- ernment. If I am not in accord with the "terms on which government does business," I will, when an advocate of government proposes to alter those terms, I am willing to concede the right of his gov- ernment.

A. L. Ballou.

Qualifications of a Leader-Writer.

[Mr. Lum's Report.]

As for the special qualifications of the ideal "leader-writer," there never was a situation, says Carl. (This, not his ideals,) "we must admit that as the people are all negative and formless, the absence of a sense of humanismo, and leader writer perceives how he is to use his influence and inoffensiveness, he may be seriously ham- pered in his work. If he lacks too much while he is putting an aged statesman on the back or taking an archbishop severely to task, he must waste time; if his fancy is outrageously tickled by the contrast between the emptiness of his statements and the inadequacy of his convictions, he may be tempted into dangerous compromise. A man must not let himself be cajoled by the perception of the ideal, nor must he allow himself to be bullied by the vain abuse of conscience. And on this latter point one word may be necessary and sufficient. Let the leader writer be as imaginative as he pleases. Let him write what he must remember, if he is to succeed, that inside the office his business is that of an advocate only; if he remembers this, he will be saved much humiliation. Some people cast the word of principle in the form of a ridiculous. We prefer to regard it as a kindness to the public, and set it down as the second great qualifi- cation for the ideal leader writer. He ought to be able to write with equal ability on either side of any subject, remembering always that he is merely there to give the best expression he can to his editor's policy, which policy is in line shaped in accordance with what is believed to be the wish of the bulk of the regular subscribers. Hence the leader-writer en- dorses only what the average reader will say and not what he could; and this is as it should be. The average reader pays for it. A third qualification, closely akin to the last, is freedom from long-sightedness. For the people have lost faith in its physical form, and wear refracting glasses to rec- tify it. We cannot suggest an analogous remedy to the leader-writer, and we congratulate him who is so constituted for this task. This spirit of going blindly to anything that tells against his case and to everything that is too far ahead to interest the readers does not serve. We wish to see an American in the capacity of reaching this happy state, but it is much when Nature spares a man laborious effort. Let the novice remem- ber that tomorrow and his party's nearest object should in the rank to the leader writer. There needs little warning against depth of thought and the habit of careful literary work; these are so easy-万一 and naturally saided in most instances. Nobody can be far too fitted for leader writers. The im-
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