On Picket Duty.

What a heap of consolation we may derive from the knowledge that, though we dare to be a Daniel, it is not necessary to be a De Leon.

"If you see it in the 'Sun,' it's so. This applies to advertisements as well as to news." How delicately thus is the editorial department, which is neither of advertisement (?) nor of news, made exempt from truthfulness?

"Tremor Waite, in his message to the Colorado legislature, suggests as a substitute for capital punishment "that the most hardened criminals be compelled to run as candidates for some State office." The governor speaks feelingly, but not reasonably. The penalty proposed would not be felt by the criminal as a punishment. Candidacy for office brings disgrace and suffering only upon the honest man.

The editor of the "Twentieth Century" is endorsing Frances E. Willard's suggestion to unite the forces of the Prohibition and People's parties. Two such reactionary movements should certainly unite in the bonds of holy matrimony. The proposition is mainly interesting, however, as showing the caliber of the neo-State Socialists, and as indicating what may be expected from paternalism. The State Socialists have been wont to declare that, as soon as men are sufficiently advanced to advocate their ideas, they will be too liberal to wish to direct each other's private affairs. This looks like it, doesn't it?

A professor of political economy in one of the leading American universities, who is himself neither a State Socialist nor an Anarchist, but something of both, told me the other day that, desiring to ascertain whether the unprejudiced mind tended the more naturally to authoritarian or libertarian solutions of economic problems, he once placed in the hands of a class which had received from him no economic bias his essay on "State Socialism and Anarchism," and had found, as a result, that, judging from this experiment alone, nearly every unprejudiced mind, on being confronted with the two theories, naturally turns to the Anarchistic view.

"It was one of the most interesting facts," he added, "that ever came under my observation."

The New York "Sun," in its editorial review of the year 1894, pretending to great anxiety regarding the welfare of France, declares that it has "deplored the failure to purge the legis-

lature of every person incriminated by the Panama exposure, and to expel from the Legion of Honor the men whose names are synonymous for fraud," and that it "regrets to see a disposition on the part of many deputies to begin the same campaign of personal vindictiveness against their present chief magistrat which was successfully pursued against President Grévy." This poor ignorant "Sun" is evidently unaware that the campaign of vindictiveness against Casimir-Perier is based mainly on the fact that heretics as his intimates and admirers many of the men who were smirched by the Panama exposure, and that the campaign against Grévy grew out of the commercial traffic in the decorations of the Legion of Honor carried on by his son-in-law, Wilson. It would be difficult for a journal to make a greater ass of itself than by placing in juxtaposition two such sentences as those quoted.

"Humbuggery is very conspicuous at the gatherings of particular classes when the eminent are invited to orate. For instance, at a Catholic reunion some humbug or other, who is not a Catholic, and knows nothing of the Catholic religion, arises to talk. He dwells with fatuous adulation upon the greatness of the Catholic church in America. A week later the same humbug will say the same thing to an assemblage of Protestants. Chauncey M. Depew has done this very thing regularly for the past five years. Of course the man is not alone in this development of contemporary humbuggery. Eminent men address organizations diametrically in opposition to each other in terms of equal praise. To some people this seems liberty. It is nothing of the sort. It is a demagogue humbuggery from man who try to keep on the right side of everybody."

Where do you suppose I found these words, dear reader? In the editorial columns of the "Twentieth Century." It is a perfect characterization of that journal's own policy toward schools of reform diametrically opposite in principles and methods. A correspondent of the New York "Sun," writing over the signature of "Low Rate," asks: "Why don't the express companies make a parcel rate for all packages of five pounds or less at, say, twenty-five cents the parcel to all points within a radius of a thousand miles from the office from which the parcel may be sent? I am moved to this inquiry by the fact that not long ago I had occasion to send a parcel weighing fifty-two ounces to a point six hundred miles to the west. The charge was fifty cents, or two cents less than letter postage, which for ordinary distances is supposed to be the very highest rate of trans-

portation. The parcel being a book, nailable at one cent for two ounces, I took it to the post office, thus putting twenty-six cents in the pocket of Uncle Sam, keeping twenty-four cents in my own pocket, and preventing fifty cents from getting into the pocket of the express company." If this shrewd individual keeps on, he will die in the poor-house. If he had told the express company (as he had to tell the postal clerk) that his parcel contained only a book, the company would have carried it for him to any part of the United States or Canada for twenty-four cents, which is two cents less than the amount he is paid by Uncle Sam for the service. Moreover, "Low Rate" is very poor at figures. He thinks that his book, weighing fifty-two ounces, could have gone through the mails as a sealed letter for fifty-two cents. On the contrary, the charge would have been just double that sum.

It is a great pity that no millionaire is likely to have sufficient wisdom to act upon the hint thrown out by Herbert Spencer in the article which I reprint from the London "Times." But if the unexpected should happen (as it often does) and the important work of tabulating statutes and their effects should in consequence be undertaken, the task, so far as the present day is concerned, would be greatly facilitated by the " Beauties of Government " compiled in every number of Liberty. It has often occurred to me that it would be a very useful, though very costly, medley of gadzillion to keep a thorough and systematic search of the world's press continually in progress in order to gather, classify, and publish, say, in quarterly volumes, facts as such that I now secure by chance and print in confusion. The sale of such volumes would be small, but it would be difficult to over-estimate their permanent utility. By the way, when I began the department of " Beauties," one or two readers of Liberty, after examining the first instalment, expressed the opinion that I must have been collecting the items for a long time, and that I would find it impossible to obtain sufficient matter of this nature to fill two pages of each number of the paper. Good Anarchists as these gentlemen were, they had formed no adequate conception of the enormity of the mass of governmental folly. Though I make no special search, I always have more items in my possession than I can find room for. Let not this deter any one from sending me all the items that he meets. Indeed, I wish that my comrades would cooperate with me in this matter to a greater extent than they do. The larger the collection of items, the more effective the selection that can be made therefrom.
Is Stead an Anarchist?

All State institutions bred abuses as carcasses breed maggots. — Stead, "If Christ Came to Chicago," p. 182.

The City Council is the machinery through which the Kingdom of God should be set up in Chicago. — Stead, "If Christ Came to Chicago," p. 182.

If both these statements are true, — and almost any part of Mr. Stead's book may be regarded as expansion and reaffirmation of one or the other, — then, according to the usual way of looking at things, the prospects of the Kingdom of God in Chicago are very blue. Ordinary logic shows no way of getting a Kingdom of God that will not have a constant tendency to breed maggots, except for the City Council to cease being a State institution.

Does Mr. Stead recognize this as a possibility, and is he willing to work toward this way of getting out of the trouble? If not, why not?

STEPHEN T. BYINGTON.

A Quack's Dilemma.

It is perhaps excusable to devote a little space occasionally to exposure of a quack, in order to prevent in some small degree a spread of the mischief. This is the only reason why J. Erickson's article in the September "Arena," which gives an alleged astrological forecast of Cleveland's administration, is worthy of any palse.

In an editorial note appended to the article, Mr. Flower explains that the manuscript was received by him in March, 1893. He refrained from printing it, however, till events had borne out the author's predictions. This is a trick worthy of the "Arena." How many such prophecies have you received, Mr. Flower, which you have not published because they were not fulfilled?

After all, there is nothing extraordinary in this fulfillment, when we consider that all the prophecies simply amount to this, — that the Democratic party will violate its pre-election pledges, and that Cleveland will play autocrat.

Many Anarchists said the same thing, and even the editor of the "Arena" admits that person-
right of way across the cultivated field to the bare rock where a mine was to be opened. (4)

Fifth, you say, "Mining is but one, and the smallest, of the great classes of labor, — agriculture, manufacture, commerce, ordnance service (including housekeeping), — mining is indeed the smallest, but it is also that in which land monopoly has least hold, with the possible exception of agriculture. The proof of the amount of land value, which measures the effect of land monopoly. The value of mining land in the United States is a mere bagatelle beside the value of city land. (5) That is to say, the pressure of the need for special spots for mining is small beside the need for special spots for manufactures, commerce, and personal service. And take notice that city land is precisely that land which will never be freed at all by your system; for you say distinctly that the cultivation of a potato patch would be use enough to secure the tenure of a city corner lot. But no city land will ever be found without so much use, if that is necessary to hold the tenure before no city land will be free under your system.

You end in italics, "Equality if we can get it, but Liberty at any rate!" All right. But I propose to get liberty by getting rid of eminent domain (7) and some of the other tricks of opaqueness and you theory seems to me to involve. My position two years ago was that the occupant of land, however good his faith, is an invader of equal liberty as against any man who wants the land, even if he gets no benefit out of his occupancy. When our discussion was broken off by Liberty's suspension, it had reduced itself to a discussion of the illustrative question whether the man who has to work on a shaft with his body invades the equal liberty of those who wish to pass through, which I affirmed and you denied. I have since noticed that one year earlier, in an answer to Mr. Robinson in "Instead of a Book," p. 77, you wrote: "If the invader is only an occupant of a house, he barricades the street, do I say any less my liberty of locomotion?" I should like to know how to reconcile your answer to me and your answer to Mr. Robinson and learn to know whether some one builds a cage over me while I am asleep on the grass he invades my equal liberty. If so, how does the case differ in principle from that of the man who plans himself in a passage-way? I should like to know whether your logic would require you to answer that he does not invade, but that necessity justifies me in invading his equal liberty by breaking through the cage. I am strong enough, I hope, to become an advocate of the occupany and use doctrine as soon as I see that it offers more liberty than the Single Tax; but hitherto it seems to me that those State Socialists who hold your view are quite within the logic of their principles. In "Instead of a Book," pp. 811-12, you suggest the limitation of area of ownership. With exceptions wherever a court of equity may think the letter of the law conflicts with its spirit you have a possible way of applying your doctrine. It is a proposal usually found in State Socialist company. (10) STEPHEN T. BRYINGTON.

(1) In either case Mr. Byington's figures have force as against the position that there is no such thing as economic rent. But, as against the position that under freedom there is no economic rent at all, work to demand economic rent, his second case is much weaker than his first, for the reason that the hypothesis in figures in the second case are much less probable than in the first. In other words, I compelling him to recognize the law of increasing returns in both mines instead of in one alone, I at the same time compel him to assume, in order to overcome the tendency of this law toward equality, a far greater and more improbable inferiority in the quality of the second mine than he attributed to that mine in his first hypothesis. And, as these sudden drops in quality are not, as a general thing, typical of the actual fact, Mr. Byington's new figures greatly weaken his argument. This error of exaggeration, in my judgment, a prevalent one among Single Taxers, and accounts to a great extent for their delusion. They see their subject on one side only, upon which they throw a blinding light that gives enormous emphasis to everything within its own rays and obscures all the other aspects upon which its own rays do not fall. If I may illustrate by exaggerating their exaggeration, I will say that I hardly ever saw a Single Taxer to whom the world was not fairly tipped by two coal mines, one yielding the best anthracite so readily that the miner need only stand at the shaft and whistle for it, and the other yielding nothing but lignite to the most arduous labor and with great reluctance. The answer to the Single Taxer is that we do not live in that sort of a world.

(2) A case is not altogether a question of how much these laborers are worth to employers engaged in coal-mining. Their worth to employers in other lines must be taken into account. Under freedom, when the availability of capital will furnish new avenues for labor, Mr. Byington's 111th man who goes to work in the second mine for $400 instead of accepting offers of $1000 from men in other lines of business will be a fool who deserves his fate.

(3) But, says Mr. Byington, the demand for coal finally making it worth while to pay the 111th man $1000 to go to work in the second mine, this demand and consequent rise in price to other workers wishing to go; in other cases the operators of the first mine, and the inequality will be as great as ever. Which means, at the worst, that while none pays any less than formerly, some are paid more. Dreadful thing! As Mr. Don.thorpe... "we pointed out in a way that evidently appeals with force to my Christian friend, Mr. Byington, the accidental benefiting of another is, "in the present state of Christian fraterniy, a consummation to be carefully shunned."

(4) Whether the neighboring farmers should sink shafts themselves or part with their land to these small truck farmers, I leave those who would be an introduction of a new competitive factor tending toward equality. The article to which Mr. Byington now refers was one calling his attention to factors in the rent p-r-blem which he seemed to neglect. The liability of access to the first coal vein through a new shaft was one of these factors, and Mr. Byington's answer does not get rid of it. His nearest approach to it is a suggestion of the Malthusian argument, to which I can only respond that, if Malthusianism be true, it militates as strongly against the Single Tax as against any other reformatory proposal. I may add, though this matter is not strictly pertinent to the present discussion, but an engraving upon it of an old discussion— that I would not, under any ordinary circumstances, consent an occupany and user to get either mining land or a right of way thereto. But I can conceive of circumstances, not only in the relations of men to the land, but in the relations of men to each other, where I would, for the moment, trample ruthlessly upon all the principles by which successful society must as a general thing be guided. I would advise Mr. Byington to consider for a while whether he himself is superior to necessity, before too confidently assuming that there is any single rule to which he can always conform his conduct, and hinting a mild scorn for those less confident than he. If he wishes to debate this point, he will find that I too am "no slouch" at propounding puzzles. But let me again remind him that extreme cases are not typical, and that the great emergency is not a factor to be considered in deciding upon a course to be pursued in everyday life.

(5) The value of land under the present system of land tenure has no bearing whatever on my assertion that under freedom the equalizing influence of competition is felt less in mining than in other branches of labor. If A has a mine in which his day's labor will yield him ten per cent. more coal than B's day's labor will yield B in another mine, A will defeat B's remark and more from the sale of his coal than B will derive from the sale of his, because all the coal, assuming it to be of equal quality, will bring the same price per ton, so far as the mine-owner is concerned. But commercial competition in cities is a different matter. In the lower and busy section of New York city there are perhaps a hundred drug-stores occupying sites which may vary slightly in suitability for the drug trade, but all of which are excellent. In the upper parts of the city there are other drug-stores, most of which occupy vastly inferior sites. There is always a stiff competition in progress between the drug-store operators to get the highest rents which they have to pay prevent them from putting their prices much below the prices prevailing up town. Now, if the present system of land tenure should be changed to one of occupancy and use, what would happen? Why, the down-town druggists, relieved of the burden of rent, would lower their prices in competition with each other until all or nearly all the rent which they now pay to landlords would be flowing into the pockets of their customers. The profits of the down-town druggist doing a large business at low prices could be little or no more than normal, in fact, those of the up-town druggist doing a small business at high prices could be little or no less. In this typical commercial example competition under freedom shows a strong tendency to take from the occupants of superior sites their advantage. The occupants of inferior commercial sites can in most cases obtain for their goods prices proportionately higher, but the owner of a mine yielding an inferior quantity of coal can get no more per ton for his product than can his more fortunate rivals. This is the difference that I pointed out to Mr. Byington, and none of these differences the present value of city land is no answer.

(6) Certainly no land, except the very poorest, will be free under the Single Tax, for every occupant of land that is good for anything will have to pay tribute to the State. Evidently free land is one thing to Mr. Byington and another thing to me. I consider a potato patch whose cultivator pays no rent free land, even though it be a city corner lot; and I should consider the same piece of land not free, but monopolized, if it were occupied by a confectioner obliged to pay tribute either to an individual or to the State.
(7) I know of no domain that occupies a higher eminence than that occupied by the domain which says to every user of land:

"Hand over to me all that your land yields you over and above what the most barren of wastes yields to your most unfort..." "human, or else I will throw you neck and heels into the street." The "eminent domain" that I believe in, if Mr. Byington insists on so democraticating it, would amount to confiscation in any land whatsoever, but would simply declare to protect the dominion of any one over land which he was not using.

(8) To block up a narrow passage not regularly occupied and used for purposes of travel is one thing; to barricade an improved, claimed, and constantly used highway is another thing. Admission of the former requires no reconciliation with denial of the latter.

(9) This is another of those impossible nuts which Mr. Byington finds himself unable to crack. I remember that, among the riddles of intricate relationships which make up some people are found of perplexing other people, there is one in which a boy makes wildly extravagant claims regarding his family connections, and that, after due deliberation, the explanation is found in the fact that the boy lied. Now, "the boy lied" is the proper solution of this cage puzzle. It is true that, in a metaphorical, and yet very real, but not a literal, sense, legislators, clergymen, economists, doctors, bankers, landlords, and various other orders of charlatans and tyrants spend their lives in building cages over other people who are asleep; but these cages are like the e'chalk-marks which, to a len, are prison walls, and they lose their substance as soon as the prisoners wake. Literally speaking, however, people are not in the habit of building cages over other people when they are asleep. And even were I to be convinced that the thing has happened, and may yet happen two or three times more, I could not become a Single Taxer on that account, although the occupancy and use theory should prove unable to settle this particular difficulty without violation of equality or liberty. Mr. Byington, I desire to gratify Mr. Byington as far as possible, and am therefore left to further answer as follows. If a man goes to sleep upon his own land and another enters and builds a cage over him, the trespasser invades the cage may rightfully be torn down, and the builder may be punished. The same is true of a man who builds a cage over a trump asleep upon the highway. If a trap goes to sleep upon another's land, and if the owner, without waking him, builds a cage over him, the fact is, in my judgment, presumptive evidence of the owner's-willful intent to use his land for invasive purposes; and for this reason the neighbors would be justified in letting the trap out and putting the cage-builder in.

There would be the same presumption and the same guilt, though no neighbors to do justice, if Robinson Crusoe, cast upon an island and finding Friday (the sole resident) asleep, should build a cage over him. These are all the hypothetical cases of cage-building that occur to me at present. They differ from the case of the man who plants himself in a passage-way, in that he thereby (if I understand the hypothesis) simply takes upon vacant land and becomes an occupant thereof in good faith for ordinary and legitimate purposes, and not with a view to unnecessarily and maliciously embarrassing and crippling others. But, though the intent were not malicious, if the result were not merely inconvenience for others but imprisonment as complete as that of the man within the cage, I should regard the emergency as sufficiently critical to warrant a violation of principle. Not for gods, devils, society, men, or principles would I allow myself to be imprisoned, completely crippled, and virtually killed, if I could in any way avoid it. But I would suffer a great deal of embarrass-ment in order to avoid the violation of a principle the general observance of which I consider essential to the closest possible approximation to that social harmony which I deem of high value to myself.

(10) Mr. Byington's writing generally has the great merit of lucidity, but what this paragraph means I don't know. I suspect that it is another puzzle. In any case, his closing remark is a very single: The Single Taxer who accuses Anarchists of training in State Socialist company forgets that the Single Taxers are dwellers in a house built of excessively fragile glass. As a body they are hand-in-hand with and controlled by State Socialists, Populists, and Nationalists in the country over, despite the efforts of a little band of them who really have a preference for greater liberty. The cardinal doctrine of State Socialism is State ownership of the means of production. Now, no man believes in that believes or can logically believe in an economic system in which so many men who believe in that accept and endorse (at least temporarily) the Single Tax, regarding it (and with much reason) as another form of pretty nearly the same thing so far as land is concerned. I am much pleased to learn from Mr. Byington that the State Socialists agree with the Anarchists in favoring the abolition of written law, and the decision of disputes by the unanimous verdict of juries applied to each case as it arises its own conceptions of justice instead of rigid statutes and mandatory court rulings. If he will give me some evidence in proof of this, my pleasure will be still greater.

Interest is Just.

To the Editor of Liberty:

Mr. Bilgman, writing in Liberty of November 17, 1864, proposes a question where in two separate cases an owner derives himself for a year of the gratification he might have obtained from the use of a horse, but in one of which the owner derives the whole for the privation; and he asks why, if interest is a payment for privation, this should be so. The difference between the two cases is this: in the case when interest is paid to the owner of the horse, he is supposed to lend it upon the stipulation that he is to be paid a sum consisting of two components, (a) a recompense for the deterioration of the horse in a year, and (b) the interest at five per cent. on the value of the horse, while in the other case he is supposed to sell the horse at the beginning of the year for back notes for which he has no present use and which he keeps in his hands during the whole year, when, upon the expiration of the year, he buys back the horse at its reduced value, so that he retains only a recompense for the decrease in the value of the animal, but no payment as interest for the surrender by him of those services and utilities which the horse might have rendered him had it remained in his own possession. The most evident answer to the question why the owner does not obtain any interest in this second case is that the horse is owned by a donkey! (1) Even farmers do not usually buy money for which they have no use. The object which a farmer has in buying money (or credit more marketable than their own, — namely, bank notes) is that they may be in a position to pay (or make credit) to better advantage. If for a year, or two, or ten, no opportunity occurs of advantageously selling, or, as it is called, investing, the money, then this only proves that it was unnecessarily bought, and the farmer could not have used the money with his horse. It is painful to witness the obsequity of mind which can overlook or ignore the absurdity of the assumption that money can reason-ably be held month after month (why not year after year?) unprofitably when it could be transformed by exchange into a necessarily and originally implied useful horse; and it is equally or more lamentable to observe the contemptuous self-abnegation of the editor of Liberty in regarding such a question capable of taxing anybody's natal energies. The question is based upon a transparent error, — that of supposing it likely, need, or money, less by aging (why not?). The fact that the mass of the people hold a great aggregate mass of money—i.e., as another said—are perpetually unemptoed can be seen to be but the inter-pretation of the universal custom of each to transform by exchange a portion of his limitable money into assets available for trade in order to prepare to sell it to the greatest advantage at some later moment and receivably at some other place. The money may be bought with a specific or a less definite purpose, but in every case the pur- pose is to hold such a value by its cognizance and divisibility can in all ordinary circumstances be sold to the greatest advantage. There is no determinable norm rate of interest or absolute price of any capital. During recent years capital has constantly been increasing in its aggregate amount. By its competition its last in-crement is less and less productive. A large number of factories are little henceforth of importance to owners of capital that the operation of those vacant factories would result in gain to themselves. (2) Under competition the value any commodity is the quantity of some other commodity received in exchange for it, so that the discount expected to be endured by the surrender of the first commodity by its owner is not great, and is somewhat less, than the discount expected to be suffered by obtaining the other commodity; and while at the same time the discount to the owner of the second commodity is not increased, but is somewhat decreased, by the exchange. Mr. Bilgman's statement that "value decreases under competition" is logically diutuity is defective and even false. It would be as true to assert that a scales equations a tendency of one end of the beam to the rise with the tendency of the other end of the beam to fall. Economics consists of an equation of like quantities, and says a given weight of comfort or of discomfort. It was well described by Jevons as a calculus of pleasure or pain. The owner of a horse has the value of attention, care, and feeding (*), and obtains in exchange the value of the utility of the horse. He would not continue to make this exchange, unless the utility of the horse to him somewhat exceeded the utility he expects to receive. This is the excess of the utility of the horse over the utility of the commodities expended which forms the native to preserve the horse either production purchase, or borrowing, and this excess is economic interest. A value sometimes * the demand for what is needed by his current interest determined by competition. (3)

A banker who is allowed by government to issue bank-notes may be unable to force as many into circulation as he is authorized to do, from a want of public confidence in him, or from an inability of the exchanges to employ: notes seeking circulation in addition to all the checks and other credits offering for sale, so that these notes can therefore not be money. Interest is paid, not for credit, but for commodities, of which money is only. Borrowers of promises do not pay interest upon the promises, but upon the commodities they buy with these promises. (4) If by these things are a mere trader seeking to sell them again, he must

---

* Mr. Fisher's orthographical point is well taken, and will be heeded. — Edited LIBERTY.
still more or less pay interest to the virtual lenders of the boots or gold, whether he succeeds in selling at the expected or any profit, or whether he loses by the speculation. The hold of the holder of commodities, including money, do obtain a profit in wealth or some increase of convenience by merely buying the gold or other goods and renewing them. Hence it is that every "buying metal," as it has been called, yields a profit to the holder in marginal circumstances. When the buying or selling of gold causes to be profitable, the holder sells or abstains from buying. The effect of the following commodities which merely recovers the holders at a rate equivalent to the current rate of interest which they could obtain by investing it in some other productive operation, instead of holding it for exchange and revaluation. But when any profit does not yield a convenience to the holders equal to the current rate of interest, then this portion of the currency is driven from circulation, and currency shrinks. The reason why a farmer loses interest by holding notes is not because he abstains from utilizing wealth, but because he gratuitously allows the banker to have the interest. (5) Bankers who create a credit so sound that it is a greater convenience to a single gold or other commodities are given this interest by the circulators of their notes in exchange for the convenience. A banker or a private person, either under government or under Anarchy, who induces to the following, gratuitously to lend him money by circulating his notes or checks is entitled to the interest which he is allowed by these people to earn upon the loans they make voluntarily and in exchange for a valuable consideration. The holder of bank notes has delivered wealth, not to society, as Mr. Bilgram declares, but to the banker. (6) Interest is due to the productivity and scarcity of capital. If the productivity of capital, or the productivity of the cob, a precious metal, or precious commodity depends upon that of the last increment and therefore upon the relative scarcity. At the same time it is a payment for a privation and a reward of abstinence because the last increment of capital depends upon abstinence and any privilege to a privation, in marginal cases (which regulate the whole). In some cases it is paid to the lender of superior credit, but it is actually paid upon capital consisting of commodities which are not used alternately. They are mutually explanatory and supplementary. Of course, if Mr. Bilgram fails to understand such comparatively elementary matters, he will find great difficulty in understanding the contradictions that arise in his articles. His "hocus pocus" consist in coming up smiling with the same expoded illustrations again and again. Certain Anarchists may not believe that the laborer wishes or needs to buy back his products. The laborer makes his class that his wealth is not sufficient to do this, they logically imply the absurdity they disclaim. When a person has bought a pair of boots which he wants, the price will not buy them back; it is insufficient to do so. The transaction of the whole of the world's business must employ as many three cent pieces as can profitably be carried by the population for resale.

Modern thought upon economics includes bimetallism, mutual-bankism, and other revanstatist* antiquities.

Mr. Bilgram makes no attempt to show that, in the absence of the monetary costs, this decrease is due to the deprecating influence of a constant, substantial, wealth interest would be high. In exchange by barter a quantity of wealth greater than that now locked up in money would be required for the function of exchange or circulation. With capital wealth interest could not be high. In the problem of interest the aging of the lender has an influence which Mr. Bilgram persisters in ignoring. When one goes a year without precipitation and then again or recover the convenience he has lost. Mr. Bilgram also overlooks the factitious value attached to bank-notes owing to their being by statute placed upon a spurious authority. Under freedom they would be unnecessary.

J. GREEVE FISHER.

CHAPEL ALBERTON, November 26, 1894.

Rejoinder.

(1) Mr. Fisher has obviously entered, heart and soul, into the spirit of my question, in which F repress

sent the one among whom the notes are circulating, S the borrowers, and B the banking and note-issuing fraternity. If being the prototype of the present, and money lending fraternity there are no men who are not donkeys.

(2) Why not attribute to those who keep idle their actual and real capital the quality attributed to the farmers for lack of hard work? I am glad to learn that two of things equal to the marginal utility of each exceds that of the other, and that these reciprocal excesses constitute interest.

(4) In this country it is the man who has furnished the promises,—the bank, —and not the man who has furnished commodities in exchange for promises,—the holder of bank notes,—who gets the interest. I was not aware that the reverse is the case in England. I beg pardon for my ignorance.

(5) Perfectly true. The people, who in my illustration were represented by the farmer whom Mr. Fisher considers as the people, invests the banks and enable the money issuers and money-lenders to rob them right and left.

(6) I presume this accounts for the fact that in England the bankers pay interest to the holders of their bank notes.

HUGO BILGRAM.

Anarchist Letter-Writing Corps.

The Secretary wants every reader of Liberty to send in his name for enrolment. Those who do so thereby pledge themselves to write, when possible, a letter every fortnight, on any kind of topics, to the "target" assigned in Liberty for that fortnight. All replies will be printed. I hope no one will make the mistake of supposing that the generosity of informing the secretary of suitable targets is the motive. Address, STEPHEN T. BYINGTON, 38 Council Hall, Oberlin, Ohio.

To the man who does not join the A. L. W. C. for few his neighbors will find out that he is an Anarchist.

DEAR SIR,—I sympathize with you. I have been there myself. In fact, I am there now to a certain extent. There are circon in which, partly out of regard for the feelings of my friends and partly out of regard for the possibly excellent little pocket-book, I never refer to myself as an Anarchist.

But I do not find myself shut out from membership in the Corps, and I do not see why you should. On the contrary, I should think it your natural position. If circumstances compel you to hold your tongue in the sphere of your daily life, you must sometimes feel the pinch and long for a position where you could let yourself loose. Here you have it. No one who has not gone there before will ever know what you wrote. If the target is an editor, so that your letter is presumably for publication, you can see it with your name a pseudonym over which you want your letter printed. Sometimes you never know who wrote it. One of Liberty's best-known contributors, who is a member of the Corps, and sometimes signs his own name to letters in other papers than Liberty, had as target a paper in which, I suppose, he was saying something about the right to the wrong line. So he signed a five-syllable Greek pseudonym, in setting which the intelligent compositor made two distinct mistakes; and I am the one who is the identity of which it was all the more never written the letter. You can easily enough do the same thing. Only remember that, according to the custom of good papers, you must send your own name so that the editor may know who his co-tributor is. If you don't understand how this must be done, or if you don't know in what form to prepare copy so that an editor can use it, write to me, and I'll help you if I can.

If you are afraid to let your name and your ideas be seen together even by a target, since he might know somebody who know you, tell me in what parts of the country you are least known, and I'll make a special arrangement to give you targets only in those parts. I'm sure that ought to be safe enough for anybody. I am the most accommodating man in the world, if only I can get you to write letters for me. I believe that there are among Liberty's subscribers

* Why not revanstatism? Or is this a pun? — EDITION LIBERTY.

many who accept the principles it teaches, but do not, or do not fully, avow them, because of the opprobrium attached to the name of Anarchist. This may be reasonable or unreasonable, commendable or reprehensible; at any rate, we must accept it as a fact. I address this class, who have grown so used to thinking "we are not in the Anarchist movement" that they have not noticed what an opportunity the A. L. W. C. opens to them. Here is a chance to take your place among workers without damage to your reputation; will you do it?

To Mr. T. of Kentucky.

FRIEND,—Mr. T. said in the last number of Liberty some of the things I meant to any here. When I got Mr. Hall's postal, I felt cheap as a representative of the A. L. W. C. It was a paper of such small circulation, so few new ides how inefficient a set we were. I thought it a, of Targets took more interest in our work than writers did. That was the time I changed my tactics and set the targets to bombarding the marksmen. Since then I have received a letter from another Section A target, D. Webster Grosh, who has found that he was made a target on Dec. 1. In writing under date of Dec. 23 to attack Anarchism and me, he incidentally remarks that I am of my corps have written to him. When Mr. Hall was named as target, there were six names on the roll of Section A. One of these with drew within the following two weeks. On the ground that new circumstances made it impossible for him to keep up writing; doubtless that gives his excuse for not writing to Mr. Hall. One of the others had given up writing, when this was written, the other could write only occasionally. One other had not written to me in person, but the name was sent in for him by a friend; possibly 'there may have been some misunderstanding. What was the matter with the other three I can't guess.

Perhaps the fault is all mine, for proposing a pledge with a loophole clause, "who's possible," and then taking no measures to find out how broad the loophole was made. I have thought that the roll would need revising once a year or so, since members might die and the heirs might neglect to tell me. (Of course, I assume that no member would propose to drop his membership without letting me know.) Perhaps once a year is not enough.

Therefore I request every member of the Corps to report to me within the coming fortnight, telling whether he has written to all his targets since joining, and the results of the correspondence. Depriving a person of his discount is but I do not think I can afford to go on, not knowing whether a man writes to nine-tenths of his targets or one-tenth. I further request every member to keep me informed of every new letter written till hereafter, so that future reports of this kind may be more easily and correctly made. I do not doubt that the present report will be more or less inaccurate, because of the absence of such memoranda; but I can at least know what you think you have been doing.

Target, Sections A and B. — "The "Evening News," Indianapolis, Ind., a strong free-trade paper, prints letter addressed to the editor, signed "free trade, free labor." The "Indepen dent" of Tampa, also in free-labor form. "Personal freedom" doubles means opposition to prohibition of the liquor trade, "free land," probably, single tax. Tell what you think is necessary to gain any of these free econinical truths true sense, or to make freedom perfect and universal.

STEPHEN T. BYINGTON.

No Magic in the Multiplication of Fools.

[Hon. E. Trask.]}

It is a current philosophy that thousand fools working in division must always remain a thousand fools, but that a thousand fools cooperating are magically transformed into a thousand-leaved volume of prophecy. It is comfortable self-delusion. But it is the sort of figuring that always winds up in ciphers.
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**THE BEAUTIES OF GOVERNMENT.**

The readers of Liberty are urgently invited to contribute to the funds set up by the State for the support of arts and sciences, so that we may enjoy the blessings of a free and enlightened society. The government is the guardian of the public welfare, and it is through its efforts that we can expect to see progress and prosperity.

---

**LAW'S SEAL ON ITS OWN SLAVERY.**

**[New York Sun]**

A CIVIL RIGHTS CASE.

The first case on record of one labor organization has been decided in favor of four members of the Knights of Labor, employed by the New York Telephone Company, who were discharged for refusing to work on Sunday.

The case is one of the most important in the history of labor, as it will be the first time that a labor organization has been held liable for the acts of its members.

---

**ONE BY ONE THE ROSES FALL.**

**[New York Sun]**

The New York Telephone Company announced today that it has reached an agreement with the Union of Railroad Employees, thereby ending a strike that has lasted for three weeks.

The union has agreed to accept the company's offer of a 10% increase in wages, and the company has agreed to hire new employees and to maintain the existing workforce.

---

**GETTING BACK THE BLOOD MONEY.**

**[New York World]**

The whole of the money taken from the New York hold-up is in the custody of the New York police, who are working with the Foreign Exchange Department to trace the origin of the funds.

---

**THE RED MAN RIPS FOR GOVERNMENT.**

**[New York Sun]**

Washington, D.C., December 13. — The Dawes Indian Commission was abolished by the House Committee on Indian Affairs today, and a new commission has been authorized to deal with the Indian problem.

The new commission is expected to be more effective in handling the affairs of the Indian tribes, and will have the power to make treaties with the Indians and to negotiate for their lands.

---

**FUTILE SIGNIFICANT LAWS.**

**[The Editor of Liberty]**

Concerning the liquor laws in Scotland, I would point out that it is a frequent sight to see policemen bringing a man into a hotel in order to see if he is a bona fide guest, so that the police can keep an eye on him.

---

**HOW THE STATE PROTECTS PROPERTY.**

An extraordinary piece of news was telegraphed from Athens. It is to the effect that, in order to increase the price of currants, whose value has lately been low, the state has decreed that all currants must be stored in special tanks, at a cost of 50 cents per ton.
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-Papier maché instead of oak.

New York Sun.

Albany, Dec. 18. - If the papier maché ceiling in the Assembly chamber has been repaired or replaced by another, it will fall down upon the heads of the assemblymen while they are preparing the statutes of '85. The ceiling is almost as full of holes as a sieve. There was no wood backing placed behind it, and the substance has sunk in some places and spread apart in others. The papier maché which was put in the ceiling instead of oak has proved to be of poor quality. The ceiling is composed of paper maché moulds, three feet long, resting on queer oak and iron girders. Many of the panels have holes in them, one of them being large enough to admit of the passage of a man's body. The fibre in some of the moulds appears to be the papier maché to be gradually crumbling. As viewed from the dark garret above, daylight may be seen through the ceiling, in a hundred places, in the chamber below. The speaker's desk is only visible through one panel. Everywhere daylight could be seen through the substance, which is in a worse condition than is generally supposed.

The door leading up to the garret over the ceiling, which has not been open to the public, has been kept locked for some months, and the private stairway leading thereto from the assembly room has been boarded up. One of the reasons given for this is that, should the narrow walk over the ceiling on to the papier maché, it would mean instant death, as the ceiling is unable to sustain the least weight.

Capitol Commissioner Perry refuses to talk about the condition of the ceiling. The fraud against the State was exposed in 1880. The ceiling was constructed in 1888. The legislature of that year ordered it, and they now are in a position appointing a commission to attend to the preliminaries for the new structure. Charles B. Andrews was the superintendent of public buildings, and had the letting of the contract for the new ceiling. He advertised and got these bids: Basile, $250,485; Stoddard's, $237,562; Sullivan & Elders, $273,360; John H. Mooney, $239,840. The contract was let to Mr. Basile.

The specifications stated that none but first-class mechanics and workmen should be employed, that the work should be done in accordance with the several drawings and that work not well done should be rejected by the superintendent, and must be replaced by the contractor at his own cost. The specifications required that the ceiling should be constructed of first-class kiln-dried quartersawn white oak, 12" in thickness, and finished in accordance with the several drawings, and that it should be done in an artistic and spirited manner by first-rate carvers who fully understood the motif and extent of the design.

The assembly, after the report, appointed a committee to investigate. This committee whitewashed the job. The assembly was not satisfied with this, and appointed what was known as the Fish committee. This committee, after taking testimony, denounced the fraud and called the attention of the district attorney of Albany to the matter. The assembly adopted the Fish committee's report, without censoring the comptroller, as the report did. The report said: "The work is unfinished in its details. Wooden beams have been placed under the iron beams when the delivery arrived at by a small majority..." The minority, representing the disgruntled growers of Corinth and elsewhere, will certainly not submit to have the experiment tried on their vineyards, serious trouble, culminating possibly in civil war, seems inevitable.

[In this country, when the crops are good, the party in power claims the credit. A good crop in Greece seems to be a reason for "turning the rascals out." The writing of a thanksgiving proclamation would evidently be an awkward job for the king of Greece.]

A SOFT THING IN THEM HUGS.

New York Sun.

The annual meeting of the Massachusetts State Board of Agriculture began in Newburyport last Tuesday. In behalf of the Moth Commission, in secret of that body reported that the moth occupies now only that portion of the commonwealth between Lexington and the sea. The commission asks that each town which has not yet succeeded to the work of reeducating moth-eaten Boston and the adjacent territory, and the Board of Agriculture recommends that the appropriation be made. In one of the suburbs of Boston a few days ago a visitor saw a dozen dressed in white exterminators at work, and asked a policeman if he thought they were making much headway. "Why the hell should they?" said the policeman. "They have a soft thing in them hogs."

[The State thrives on evil and plague, as the doctors thrive on disease.]

AN EXCUSE FOR A JUNKET.

New England Chronicle.

In their bucking after interference with systems which work quite satisfactorily at present, the London County Council are about to waste more of the rate-payers' money. They have agreed to expend the sum of one hundred pounds for an inquiry into the operation of the "Mont de Pâté" in France. This outlay is utterly unwarrantable. The "Mont de Pâté" is regulated by the French code, explanatory books relating to which can be obtained for a few shillings. Escalating outlay also can be obtained books giving the whole history of the "Mont de Pâté" established last century, and explaining its working as modified by subsequent laws. Moreover, any officer connected with the "Mont de Pâté" establishments would be glad to commit to paper, for a small sum, all that his knowledge and experience could suggest on the subject of pawnbroking in France. The sum of one hundred pounds would form a commission to enquire into the matter by the London County Council, or possibly to some of its members, to go and take a pleasant trip to Paris in order to obtain information which can be got at an outlay of under five pounds.

[If these London commissioners are like our American city fathers, there will come back from Paris a report replete with much about the "Mont de Pâté" as the young ladies at the Moulin Rouge could tell them.]

VICTORIAN ART.

Opinions differ as to the architectural merit of the great building in which the German Reichstag will henceforth hold its sittings, and which the Emperor William formally opened. That platonic monstrosity, as in Sherlock's phrase, is "nothing if not critical," is said to have dubbed the huge pile "a monument of bad taste." Certainly the alleged artistic failure cannot be attributed to any lack of deliberation or expense. The question was raised in 1971, immediately after the first Reichstag met; the government were thirteen years past it. The assembly adopted the Fish committee's report, without censoring the comptroller, as the report did. The report said: "The work is unfinished in its details. Wooden beams have been placed under the iron beams when the delivery arrived at by a small majority..." The minority, representing the disgruntled growers of Corinth and elsewhere, will certainly not submit to have the experiment tried on their vineyards, serious trouble, culminating possibly in civil war, seems inevitable.

[It is fitting that professional meddlers should live in a house that exemplifies the evil of meddling.]

ANARCHISTS POOR WAR MATERIAL.

New York Sun.

Berlin, Dec. 15. - The "Vorwärts" has again shown its ability to get official documents which are marked "confidential." It has made public the full text of a letter issued from the war office to regulate the acceptance of the munitions of war volunteers. The officers concerned are instructed that Social Democrats and Anarchists must be excluded from the short service.

[Relief from the burden of military service is, in itself, the opposite of oppression, but the obvious motive of the relief reveals the tyrannical purposes for which armies are maintained.]

THEY APPRECIATE AN OPEN MARKET.

Lynceus Matter.

Boston letter carriers are somewhat pleased at the outcome of their opposition to the rule of the postal authorities requiring the men to purchase their uniforms and accessories from the tailoring firm to which a contract was awarded. The men all along felt that they could have bought theirs cheaper, if permitted an option in the selection of a dealer. Accordingly the matter was brought to the attention of the authorities at Washington, and it has been decided that the carriers may buy of any tailor they desire.

BOSTON POLICE WON'T TAKE BACK-TALK.

Boston, Dec. 5. - The police today arrested a negro who was parading the streets with a large placard on his back bearing this: "Girls Cannot Be Angels on a 72 Week." It was discovered that he was in the employ of Carlotta Smith, the Social Purity reformer. On hearing of his arrest Miss Smith secured his release. She promised not to send out any more men without procuring a permit for them to parade.

THE LAW AS A TOOL OF THE THIEVER.

New York Sun.

It was provided in a recent case between a Cincinnati theatre and comic opera company that, if the weekly receipts fell below $3,000, the deficit should be made good by the travelling manager, but he failed to do so, and the company was compelled to pay the deficiency because the agreement covered Sunday performances, which are forbidden by Ohio law.

INDIANAPOLIS, Nov. 22. - A. G. Smith, the retiring Attorney-General of the State, submitted to the Governor yesterday a report on the remuneration of the officers under the new fee and salary law. It appears that in the last two years, in addition to his salary of $3,900, he has had in fees $69,349.11.
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