On Picket Duty.

"Solidarity," the organ of the Communists, has reappeared under the editorship of J. H. Edelmann, who expects to issue it semi-monthly.

Government, says the Augusta "Chronicle," is about the most expensive luxury that our people enjoy. A luxury is easily dispensed with, especially if it ceases to be enjoyable. Of late the most loyal governmentalists have had their enjoyment of the institution reduced to nil, if not changed to suffering. Will the "Chronicle" advise them to give up this "luxury"?

In a lecture on journalism, the editor of the "Sun" referred to the two kinds of newspapers between which every man must choose: "one a newspaper for sensible people; the other a newspaper for fools." Such a division, if it really existed, would simplify matters amazingly. Unfortunately, Mr. Dana was very inaccurate. He failed to mention the newspapers for knaves, those for knaves and fools, and those for foolish knaves and knavish fools. Newspapers for sensible and honest people are very few, and Mr. Dana is not the editor of one of them.

Mr. William W. Gorshak, a comrade living at North Scituate, Mass., has written and published an eight-page pamphlet entitled "Adaptability to Environment." Though written with no pretense at style and evidently not the product of a practised literary workman, it is something much better than that, — a pungent achievement of uncommon force, wit, and originality. It offers an explanation of the existing order which, if not entirely new, is at least presented in a novel fashion, and it is well calculated to start the unruly in a course of thinking along Anarchistic lines. Send four cents in postage stamps to Mr. Gorshak, and get a copy of his pamphlet.

The London "Saturday Review," that bulwark of Toryism and concentration of philistinism, has passed into progressive hands, and will abandon its traditions. Mr. Frank Harris, until lately in charge of the "Fortnightly Review," is its editor, and its politics will be somewhat more rational. The greatest gain, however, will be in the literary and dramatic departments, to which men of modern tendencies have been called. I find a review of Mr. Granby's new play in a recent issue signed "G. B. S.," and the first few lines make it morally certain that our friend Bernard Shaw is the writer of the review. It goes without saying that the worship of dramatic ghosts is repudiated, and a healthy and sane criticism raised. Thus does the revolution of the nineteenth century make such old things as the "Saturday Review" new and useful.

I have imported a considerable number of copies of the new pamphlet written by an English fellow-worker, John Badeock, Jr., and offer them for sale in the advertising columns. It is entitled "Slaves to Duty," and has already received favorable notice at Liberty's hands. But again I take pleasure in cordially recommending it to my readers. Mr. Badeock has presented the dogma of Anarchism with the only English pamphlet that it possesses which makes uncompromising assault upon morality as the strongest bulwark of monopoly, — as the chief means by which the exploiters secure the ascent of the exploited to their exploitation. May it have a wide circulation in the United States, pending the time when some friend of the movement shall present it with a translation of Max Stirner's immortal "Einziges!"

The funny paragraphers of the New York dailies have been saying that Chicago is envious and jealous of New York's great police scandal. It is probable that the paragraphers are totally ignorant of the local situation in Chicago. The crusaders of that "pocket edition of hell" have, as a matter of fact, made charges against their police which nobody here ever thought of bringing even against Clubber Williams. It is believed there that the police farm out to pickpockets and thugs territory in the most crowded districts, and allow the highest bidders to ply their vocations without fear of molestation. It is also charged that, in addition to the regular system of blackmailing criminals and outlaws who are not criminals, the police officers have tried direct robbery. A member of a certain "preserving committee" states that "robbing has been done right and left for some time by a good many officers." Now what will New York do next?

Paul Bourget having in his "Outre-Mer" stamped certain characteristics of the people of this continent as "American," Mark Twain tells him that he is talking through his hat. "There isn't a single human characteristic that can be safely labelled 'American.' There isn't a single human ambition, or religious trend, or drift of thought, or peculiarity of education, or code of principles, or breed of folly, or style of conversation, or preference for a particular subject for discussion, or form of legs or trunk or head or face or expression or complexion, or gait, or dress, or manners, or disposition, or any other human detail, inside or outside, that can be reasonably be generalized as 'American.'" As even Dana will admit that Mark Twain is an authority on this subject, the crestfallen appearance of our "good Americans," after reading these comments, may be imagined. The stock-in-trade of a good many jingoists must go down dismally.

Prof. John B. Clark, in the theory of wages commented on in another column by Mr. Yarros, adds 100 men and no capital to 1,000 men working with capital, puts them all at work as an organized body, and then declares that the extra product obtained by this addition represents the productive power of labor apart from capital. Any child would know better. Suppose the 1,000 men to produce 100 each in a given time, or 100,000 in all. Then add 100 men, and suppose that the 1,100 men produce 95 each in the given time, or 104,500 in all. Does Prof. Clark mean to say that this extra product of 4,500 is the amount that 100 men could produce with no capital at all? This is as much as to say that 100 compositors could set 4,500 pages of type in a month, even if they had no type with which to do it. The way to find out what labor can do without capital is to set it to work without capital. It never can be found out by setting it to work with capital which other labor is using at the same time.

Arthur Brisbane (a swaggering and shallow clown in the hire of the "World") and the book-reviewer of the "Tribune" have "protested" against the arrival and lecture-tour in this country of Catulle Mendès, a brilliant French man-of-letters, on the ground of his "immorality" as a man and author. Brisbane actually hinted at the desirability of an order preventing Mendès from landing here as being more dangerous than an "Anarchist." It is not for Liberty to waste words over the impotent rage of such despicable hypocrites, but it is good to see them relented by such a conservative paper as the "Reformer," whose dramatic critic refers to this incident, and makes the following reflection: "This moral spam is very funny, especially for New York. Mendès is a most brilliant writer, a poet, and personally a gentleman. His writings are for Paris, not for the jeune fille of America. But to take exception to him on the lecture platform because of his books is as provincial, as parochial, as the people who won't go to see Sarah Bernhardt because of her private life. What hypocritical fudge! Little wonder we are laughed at for our vulgar pretensions, the vulgarities of which is: 'Thank God, we are not as other peoples!" — i. e., the French."
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In emulating cost and benefit, the first seductiveness of old-time dues, the revolution evolves the sound of the new benefactor, the call of the people; the chorus of the nation, the coming of the department clerk, all these tenants of public, which youn liberty grinds beneath her heel. —Anonymous.

"Our Financial Muddle."

The people are certainly reaping precious little advantage from the present discussion of financial questions by politicians, bankers, and reformers of the flat-money type. The opportunity for a real educational campaign is great, but the trouble is that the educators need the education fully as much as the to-be-educated. No day passes without new plans for the solution of our monetary problem. We have had the Baltimore plan, the Carlisle scheme No. 1, the Carlisle scheme No. 2, the Walker plan, and a number of others. Every day new financial bills are offered in congress, and we are assured that the house is determined to take some kind of action on them.

This, however, will signify very little, as the tariff struggle has demonstrated. Congress will probably fail to agree on any measure of relief more substantial than a popular loan or a new issue of loans to another rich syndicate. Mark how the more fundamental questions are being relegated to the rear, and how the question of retiring or funding the greenbacks is more and more monopolizing attention.

Through the greenbacks the treasury is being drained of its gold reserve, a number of absurd statutes conspiring to bring about this result. As a consequence, a government promise to pay gold on demand, but there is not enough gold in the treasury to redeem one-fourth of those promises, while the law compels the secretary of the treasury to issue them as fast as they are presented. Our financiers, with their usual depth and keenness, trace all of our present difficulties to the greenbacks, and have raised the cry, "down with the source and parent of the mischief!"; but, when we recollect that a year ago they were equally emphatic in their assurances that the Sherman silver-purchase law was the sole cause of the hard times and panic, their confidence in their diagnosis is considerably shaken. In fact, it is clear that the funding of the greenbacks will bring the question of currency reform still more prominently to the front, for to retire them is equivalent to contracting the currency to an intolerable degree, and for this reason it is to be hoped that congress will decide on this step. Something will be required to take the place of the greenbacks, and what will it be? This cannot be answered without an overvaluing of the whole subject of bank circulation, standard of value, security, etc.

While the self-styled honest-money men cannot talk of the greenbacks without gnawing their teeth, the flatists, on the other hand, are ready to lay down their lives for the sacred greenback. Possibly the destruction of the greenback would render life not worth living to them. Is it not the grand object-lesson in flat, inconceivable money? Does it not prove their claim that government can retire the bankers having special privileges, and itself assume the whole task of supplying currency based on the faith and credit of the taxpayers? I wonder if a government that relinquished the function of issuing flat money would at all possess the affection of these reformers.

But, whether the flatists or "honest-money" men carry the day, the financial problem will be as far from settlement as ever. The bankers prate about the security of their circulation, and the flatists about the power of the banks to manipulate the currency in their own interest. But the real source of the trouble is completely overlooked by both parties and their ranking parties. True reform involves the creation of a safe, abundant, and convertible currency. All three elements are indispensable, and the absence of any one is subversive of financial stability and orderly industrial progress. So long as the fiction of a gold button is adhered to, these three elements cannot coexist. There may be a safe currency redeemable in gold, but it will be totally inadequate for the business of the world, and a money fabric will be the chronic condition of industrial life. There may be an abundant currency, but it will not necessarily be convertible. If not, it will breed companies and stifle credit. If there is no alternative but to abandon that mischievous delusion, that relic of ignorance, the gold basis, and give a new meaning to the term convertibility, — by substituting products for gold in the implied formula. By all means insist on the certainty of redemption of every note issued, but on redemption in things actually needed and used in exchange, — industrial products. In other words, let currency be based on, or secured by, products, and let it be redeemable in products.

The standard of value may still be gold, or it may be anything else that satisfies the requirements of a standard as absolutely as possible; but let it be understood that the thing serving as a standard need not necessarily be a basis, and that the basis need not be a standard. Gold can serve as a standard, but it cannot continue to serve as an exclusive basis. It never has so served, in point of fact. The recognition of these facts would deprive the flatists of their occupation, and the monopolists of their illegitimate power of taxation. The government could not issue currency redeemable in products, since it hasn't any products. Whatever it grabs, it consumes. On the other hand, contraction of the currency by a privileged confraternity would be impossible, there being no restraint on the issue of currency by anyone having marketable values.

At present, however, we are between the devil and the deep sea,—the deluded flatists standing for government money, and the monopolists seeking to perpetuate their power.

V. T.

Currency and Its Convertibility.

To avoid misunderstanding, it should be stated that, when Mr. Yarro, in the preceding article, urges the substitution of convertibility into products for convertibility into gold as a quality of the circulating medium, he does not refer at all to that convertibility in point of fact which is guaranteed by the issuer of a note, but simply to that convertibility in point of fact which exists when a note finds ready circulation. He means to say that the currency of a mutual bank, while not redeemable in gold on demand at the bank, will be to all intents and purposes redeemable in products on demand at the store of every dealer.

His position is correct, but his new use of the words "convertibility" and "redeemability" will lead to much misunderstanding when not accompanied by such an explanation as that which I have just given.

A similar use of these terms in a previous article by Mr. Yarro led a Philadelphia correspondent to ask me what, even supposing that gold were retained as a standard of value, would maintain the equality of a paper dollar with a gold dollar if the paper dollar were redeemable, not in gold, but in commodities. The gentleman evidently meant that Mr. Yarro meant that mutual currency would be redeemed in commodities by the bank. If such were the case, then, to be sure, the value of the mutual money would be measured, not by gold, but by the commodities in which the bank agreed to redeem it. Gold in that case would no longer be the standard of value, its function as such being performed instead by the commodity chosen by the bank for redemption purposes.

My correspondent was guilty of an absurdity in supposing gold to be still the standard in such a case, but he was led into this absurdity by Mr. Yarro's use of the term "convertibility," which was not easily intelligible to one not perfectly familiar with the mutual banking idea.

Mutual money will be expressed in terms of some chosen standard of value; if gold be chosen, then in terms of gold. It will be based, not necessarily or probably on gold, but on notes given by the borrowers and secured by mortgage on the borrowers' property. It will not be redeemable in gold on demand at the bank. It will circulate readily, and without depreciation, if the bank has a good standing with the community and with the clearing house. It will be redeemed, in the vast majorities of cases, by a re-exchange of it for the borrowers' notes against which it was originally issued. That is, the borrower himself will present at the bank notes equivalent to those which he received from the bank, and will get in exchange the notes which he gave to the bank and a cancellation of the mortgage on his property. If he does not do this, the mortgage on his property will be foreclosed, and the property will be sold at auction. It will be sold for gold, if gold is what the holders of the bank's notes desire. And it is this fact that such a sale of the property insures an ultimate
redemption in gold if demanded— which will maintain the equality of mutual money with gold. The liability to misinterpretation is increased by Mr. Yarros’s statement that “the government could not issue currency redeemable in products, since it hasn’t any products.” The implication here is that a mutual bank issuing currency redeemable in products must have products. But this is contrary to the mutual banking idea, and equally contrary, I am sure, to the meaning that Mr. Yarros intended to convey,—namely, that the government could not issue currency that would circulate to borrowers mortgaging no property for its security. The Anarchists maintain that government should not engage in the business of issuing money, but there is nothing in the nature of mutual banking that makes it impossible for the government to carry it on; and, if it decided to carry it on, it would not need products (beyond those mortgaged by borrowers) in order to issue a circulating currency any more than a private banking enterprise would need them. The statement of Mr. Yarros tends to confirm the reader in the mistaken idea that under mutual banking the bank notes will be redeemed in products at and by the bank.

Progress of College Professors.

To the student of professional human nature the movement of the American Economic Association is a source of considerable encouragemen. College “economists”—for the moving spirits of this mutual admiration society invariably refer to each other as economist so-and-so,—although the “economists’s” name and fame may be limited by the geography of the village within which the little college harboring him is situated—cannot rationally be expected to keep fully abreast of the times, but the logie of events undoubtedly does affect them somewhat. As the years roll by; as events, pregnant with significance and results, succeed each other; as economic and social forces arise and grow,—the slow and unconscious modification of their very nebulous opinions and adapt themselves to the new conditions. It thus comes to pass that you find them expressing ideas at one time which a few years previously they repudiated with scorn and impatience as the concentration of ignorance and imbecility. Always successful in maintaining a characteristic vagneness about their creeds, they nevertheless exhibit unmistakable symptoms of progress. They are bound to remain behind, but they try to be not too far behind.

Everybody who has watched the proceedings of the sympotic economists of the Association knows that they are ever on the fence. They are not brazen advocates of the existing industrial system; they do not ignore unpleasant facts altogether; but they never have anything definite to say in regard to imperative reforms either in the direction of State Socialism or in that of liberty. They make suggestions, to be sure, but of such an intangible nature that nobody can be blamed for declining to attempt to reduce them to definite. It is simple truth to say that the college economists, whether as individuals or in associations organized for the very purpose of leading and guiding the active men of the world, have the least influence of any force in the community. The resolution of a board of trade, of a local trades union, of a public meeting, counts for more than the elaborate, solemn, and impressive outgoings of professional associations. Can it be that the world is perversely and ignorantly unjust to them? No, they are not needed, because what they offer is not wanted. Their bits and ifs and perhapses and yet’s are not calculated to inspire confidence.

Now, if men thus freed from the compulsion of sharing in the battle of interests and ideas nevertheless reflect the progressive changes of society, the fact is peculiarly interesting to those who do play some part in the human social drama, and who never dreamed of eliciting the commendation of the severe philosophers living in a world of their own. To reformers and to labor generally the addresses delivered before the recent meeting of the American Economic Association are full of significance from this point of view. The presidential address of “Economist John B. Clark” of Amherst dealt with the question of the relation of law to economics, and formulated the latest view of the Association on the whole labor movement. In a general way the position was taken that the trouble with present arrangements lies, not in the element of competition, but in the restrictions hedging tree industry. Not State control, we were told, was needed, but the elimination of monopoly and privilege. If free competition prevailed, labor would obtain its normal rate of wages. But the trusts successfully keep down the rate of wages by dislocating labor, and the State should suppress the trusts and rescue the unorganized employees now at the mercy of the powerful combinations. The conditions under which trusts thrive were not inquired into, nor was the precise method indicated whereby trusts might be rendered harmless. Although Prof. Clark talked a great deal about monopoly, it does not appear that he distinguishes between the scientific definition of the term and that erroneously used in popular denunciation of trusts. Of course “trusts by legislation” smacks of invasive regulation, which is of course worse than futile. It is something, however, to get an admission from the Association that the trusts are not benefactors of the race, who flourish because their economy and skill diffuse comfort and raise the standard of living, but merely and arrogantly tolerate profititers, who, under present conditions, are a menace to the community. The attention of such faikirs as Dana and Gantt should be directed to these hereies of the Economic Association.

Still more remarkable was the treatment of labor organization by Prof. Clark. It is natural that he should have condemned violence in strikes, but, unlike such pseudo-individualists as Godkin, he thoroughly justified the method of the strike without drawing any fallacious distinctions between local and sympathetic strikes. He deplored labor’s short-sightedness in not regulating its demands by the scientific standard of wages, and regretted that it is not more thoroughly and efficiently organized.

Think of all this from the Economic Association! A few years ago the economists scoffed at the idea of labor organizing, and learnedly argued that it was a plain negation of the most central principles of economics, a gross absurdity. The notion that you could raise wages by organizing and striking was utterly wild and vicious, contrary to the instincts of a sturdy freeman. The intelligent American workman saw clearly that nature regulated wages, andorganizations were signs of later barbarity. Now the Association tells us that organized labor is an Economic Force (note the capital letters),—indeed the only Economic Force of any importance,—and regrets only the fact that, through insufficient economic knowledge, labor is often led to commit blunders and fail in its worthiest efforts. What a pity it is that the approval of the Association is of as little consequence as its displeasure! Otherwise, organized labor might anticipate a great boom.

In its suggestions to labor, advanced with the kind intention of enabling it to achieve greater success on legitimate lines, the Association was as uncertain and unsatisfactory as in its directions to the State regarding the suppression of trusts. Prof. Clark presented an argument that was meant to be very profound and it is impossible for labor to carry the day when it arbitrarily seeks to compel the payment of a higher rate. Let labor learn what the standard rate is and always insist on it; more it cannot get, less it ought not to receive. And what is that normal rate known to the Association? Prof. Clark enumerated a brand-new theory of wages, containing no trace of the theories once in vogue. He stated it thus in substance:

In a factory that earns a thousand men let us leave the amount of capital unchanged, but add one hundred men to the working force. The men thus added represent a definite increase, say, 5, in the output of the mill. It produces a yards of cloth per day in addition to its former output: the value of this extra product measures the productive power of labor apart from capital. More than the value of a yards of cloth the employer cannot pay to the new men as wages; if he pays more, he suffers as much as this he is obliged to pay if competition exists.

The hundred men thus must, under free competition, get the value of a yards of cloth, and each of these men will have one hundredth part of a. The standard rate of wages, therefore, is the value of a divided by a hundred. Let labor, by organization, peaceful strikes, etc., enforce this rate, and justice will be done. It is evident that, if we assume this theory to be true, Prof. Clark’s suggestion amounts to the putting of the cart before the horse. In a complex industrial system it is impossible to determine the rate by the method indicated. There is one only way to determine it, and that is by securing and enforcing free competition. Under free competition the laborer would command the normal rate, because things would automatically adjust themselves. Without free competition, as Prof. Clark admits, the rate cannot be enforced. The real inference from the propositions is that labor’s salvation lies in free competition, and that a condition precedent to strikes against employers is a general strike against legal privilege and monopoly. I wonder if the Association intended this, and if it is prepared to accept the inevitable conclusion from Prof. Clark’s premises.

As to the scientific value of the new theory
of wages, it cannot be fairly discussed at present. We should require its full and accurate statement, and that will appear in the published report of the proceedings. The inadequate statement above, taken from a newspaper report, is obscure and incomplete. According to it, the hundred men added to the force get as wages the full product of their labor; and, since each of them gets the standard rate, we are bound to infer that the other workmen—that all workmen—also get the full value of their product. Yet Prof. Clark hardly intended that, not in his illustration, have introduced the condition of “keeping the amount of capital unchanged.” This condition would seem to imply that capital divides the product with labor. But if so, the wages of the men added to the force without an increase of capital will be regulated by the wages of those already employed, and they will get less than the full product of their labor. There cannot be two rates. This, however, is merely in passing. The printed page of the report is necessary for intelligent discussion of this wage theory. This article is based on the assumption that even the college economists are learning some things and hearing witness to the silent revolution going on in society. These economists profess to guide, but no one should be decided into listening to them. In reality they are mere fellows, and the only way to compel them to advance is to pursue the even tenor of our way and proceed along the line already chosen. Who will the Association stand ten years hence?

V. Y.

Narrowing the Interest Issue.

To the Editor of Liberty:

To the three questions proposed to me in your issue of December 15 I make answer and say:

To the first: That the loans of the banks supposed would cost them nothing but running expenses and incidental outlays and losses. But such banks are only possible under the three conditions mentioned, neither of which we have. It is possible to derive some profit or advantage therefrom; unless indeed they were compelled by penalty, which is in accordance neither with economy or equal freedom.

To the second: That a discount of one-half of one per cent. per annum would meet the cost of such banking. But why should bankers, or their employees, be expected to work for bare support, while producers should have, when in excess of such support, the whole product of such excess added to their capital the interest, not of the capital, but of their labor?

To the third: In the absence of State or collective nailing competition would tend unquestionably to reduce discount to its lowest term, which would ordinarily be something above cost. Otherwise if the vanishing point the banks also would disappear, though under a case of free competition they might sometimes discount, "sporadically," at cost, or even at a loss. The editor's words on economic rent seem appropriate here: "I believe that economic rent exists now, and may or may not be under freedom, but then with a tendency to disappear." Substitute interest for rent, and you have the case of economic interest, as distinguished from phrenetic interest.

The land is a natural term capital, no man can show a distinction between interest and rent; nor where interest is paid on mortgaged premises. The measure of both is the same. This measure, as given by economists, is highly misleading. Superior and inferior soils have very little to do with it. One man will starve on land of the same quality and quality as those of the land from which another will obtain an increase over his support. Rent from urban and suburban places, and even much into rent, has absolutely nothing whatever to do with the quality of land. In the latter case, it is largely owing

me, then, only to supply the motive. The task is easy. The thousand business men of my hypothesis would unite to form a bank of issue, and would connect this bank of issue with other similar banks for clearing purposes, because thereby they could establish a collective credit having circulating power, which each of them could obtain in exchange for his equally good but less reputable individual credit, having to pay therefor nothing but the cost of this exchange of credits. In other words, these business men would form such a bank as I describe in order to borrow money at less than one per cent. instead of paying, as they do now, from four to fifteen per cent. Is the motive sufficient?

"May I ask the question Mr. Ingalls answers that the cost above referred to would probably be met by a discount of one-half of one per cent. Sustained again. I have not to discuss here why bank employees "should be expected to work for bare support." It suffices for the argument to know that what these employees are now willing to accept for their services can be paid to them out of funds provided by a discount of one-half of one cent. And this Mr. Ingalls admits. When we have exhausted the present issue, then I will consider with him how many tears I can afford to shed over the sad fate of the bank presidents for whom a discount of one-half of one cent. provides salaries of only ten, fifteen, and twenty thousand dollars.

To my third question Mr. Ingalls answers that under free conditions competition would tend to reduce discount to its lowest term, — ordinarily something above cost. I take it that Mr. Ingalls means by this that in banking — a business which under freedom is accompanied by no physical conditions that place a natural limit upon competition — the force of competition would have a tendency of the same strength as that which it has in other businesses to pull down interest, and as a result prevent the growth of a good and stable business. But I am sure that the tendency, though not strong enough to cause the price to be below the cost, now rising a little above it, now falling a little below it, but averaging cost, or perhaps a shade more. If this is its meaning, then I am sustained again.

The discussion now centres, therefore, upon the following question, which I put to Mr. Ingalls:

Is the desire to borrow money at less than one per cent., instead of four at per cent, more a sufficient consideration to induce business men to form such banks as I have described?

If Mr. Ingalls answers that it is not, he must show why it is not. If he answers that it is, then the proposition which, according to Mr. Ingalls, has never been demonstrated, will have received its demonstration, — the proposition, namely, that free and mutual banking will make it possible to procure capital without paying for its use (the discount being charged, not for the use of capital, but to meet expenses incidental to the transfer of capital).

A Political Confession. — To the Editor of Liberty:

1st that which I have said before does not fully define my political standpoint, I fear it is not well possible to comply with your request of December 29.

My ideal of "government" is a social organization
whose functions are strictly confined to the prevention of infringement of equal freedoms. I am opposed to any
pulmonary taxation, except when a delinquent demands and receives a social service and then refuses to pay its
proper value. In a few details my opinion differs from yours as to the line that separates proper acts
from those that infringe equal freedom. It is my conviction that there will always be men who will infringe
equal freedom. In the absence of restraint, and that for reasons a protective organization will always
be necessary; that upon the same territory only a such organization can be maintained; that
this organization must possess, at least physically, the power to invoke, and that for this reason the
temperament to avail will always exist, on the part of the officers of that organization. The present govern-
ment is such an organization, in which, however, the abuse of power is very prominent; but, so long as the
majority of people are as ignorant upon social topics as they show themselves to be, it is my opinion that,
were the present government abolished and a pro-
ective organization established on the basis of the law of equal freedom, it would in a short time assume
a form not unlike the present organization. Of
course, the invasive feature of the present State is as
ahorrent to me as it is to you; but, since the State
must exist, a question of many respects presents
itself with which a purely protective organization
ought to do, it appears to me incomparably easier to
remove the invasive factors from the existing organi-
zation than to begin experimenting on your plan, and
you will find full accord with the conviction of this
conviction.
The end I wish to attain is identical with yours. Apart from a few debatable differences of
opinion on details, we only differ in the method we
consider best for attaining the end.

Hugo Bilgram

[Mr. Bilgram has misunderstood my request.
I did not ask him for a generalization of
his political aims and methods. I asked him
to state specifically what function he wishes
government to perform in the matter of bank-
ing. And he gives me no answer. I await
one.]

Meantime I may say to Mr. Bilgram
that I also am working to "remove the invasive
dactors from the existing organization." What
I want to find out is whether Mr. Bilgram
wishes to add any invasive factors to it. About
that I shall know more when he has answered
my question.

Logic from the Bench

The example set by S. H. Randall in Cin-
cinnati, in refusing to serve as a juror, was fol-
lowed lately by a citizen of Brooklyn, whose
little passage with the court is thus narrated by
a New York daily newspaper:

Judge Henry A. Moore, who had been ill for a
month, resumed his place yesterday on the bench in
the court of sessions in Brooklyn, and swore in the
grand jury. Eanes was asked to be excused from
serving on the jury, explaining that he had reli-
gious scruples against sitting in judgment on his
fellow men.

"I can't help it," said Judge Moore, "if all men were like
you, the criminals would have a high carnival."

"I can't help it," Mr. Eaton replied. "If others wish to
do so, they may, but I won't. My conscience
won't allow me."

It's only a matter of time when
all persons will come around to my way of thinking." Mr.
Eaton was excused.

Evidently Judge Moore arose from his bed of
sickness before he had fully recovered that
logical acumen which is supposed to be a man's
characteristic of those who sit upon the bench.
For he could hardly have meant to insinuate
either that Mr. Eaton is a criminal, or that the
high carnival, in the case supposed, would be
held by the criminal women and children.
And yet no other hypothesis leaves any logie in the

newark that, if all men were like Mr. Eaton, the
criminals would hold high carnival. To the
intellect of the layman it would seem that, if all
men were like Mr. Eaton, there would be no
criminals to hold high carnival.

For a time the anti-press laws passed by the
parly-strikeen French parliament after the
Carnot assassination were enforced with
extreme and unrelenting rigor. Now, accord-
ing to Harold Frederic, who is the keenest and
most cultivated American correspondent abroad,
they are virtually dead letters. Their effect, he
has been said, is "only to aggravate the abuses at
which they are directed." It is possible for the
courts to take cognizance of a hundredth
part of the insults and libels daily hurled at the
president, the premier, and everybody else in
authority. The old era of denunciation is in
full swing again." But such lessons do not
prevent half-crazy Emperor Williams from
pushing similar bills and expecting to get rid of
revolutionary agitation and criticism by
restricting free speech and press.

Anarchist Letter-Writing Corps.
The Secretary wants every reader of Liberty to send
in his name for enrollment of those who do thereby
pledge themselves to write, when possible, a letter
against Anarchism. Address Liberty, 38 Council
Hall, Oberlin, Ohio.

The "Good Citizen," to which Section B wrote in
September to answer the question, "Who is the Anar-
chist?" announces this as one of the subjects of
articles to be published during the February number.
Large boxes move slowly.

A letter of mine, written to the same address
that I gave the C.r.p, comes back through the Dead Letter Office.
I have heard of one similar case in another
section. Therefore those who send P.O. targets with
the address not fully given must not bear malice if
I prefer to use others. I may sometimes give targets
with scatty addresses, but not if I can get equally
good ones.

The editor of the "Single Tax Courier" knows all
about us. He announces the utter failure of the
A. L. W. C. tells the news about Bolton Hall as a
target, and adds that Single Taxers have
recently been made targets, and have yet heard
only from Byington himself. I can see a reason,
though not an especially probable one, why Mr. Horr,
the target of Section C (to which I now belong), may
have escaped a letter but mine. Of the two others
who seem to be referred to, Mr. Groh says he heard
from at least two of Section A, and I would rather
have the news in more definite form before believing
that none of Section B wrote to Mr. Coeheal.
I shall not order a hearse for the funeral of the A. L. W. C.
still we have tried the new blood that has lately come
in; but I do not think that even our old members are
anywhere near so "orthodox" as the "relationship" to
the man who doesn't join the A. L. W. C.

It is an article worth reading and considering.

It strikes me that the editor means to say, in terms
clear enough to a careful reader, that she is an Anar-
chist; but she might print letters calling her so.

Command her position, and carry out in your own way
the ideas she expresses.

Anarchist in the Denver Convention.
The correspondent who reported the recent con-
vention of the American Federation of Labor for the
Voice recognized the influence of the Anarchists.
In the following paragraph:

An anarchist, which though not wholly new in Fede-
rations, has made itself effective in this one, is that
which demands extension of economic liberty
instead of the usual restrictions, with State
management of industries and services of specialists.
The active men of this new wing, McNab,
Cooke, Greenhalgh, Linear, O'Sullivan, Weissman,
and Sullivan, are this evening enjoying, on the one
hand, congratulations as promoters of the old-time ideas
of American liberty, and, on the other, denunciations
from the Socialists as advocates of Anarchism.
THE BEAUTIES OF LIBERTY.

The Beauties of Liberty are usually invited to contribute to this department. It is open to any open statement of facts which exhibit the State in any phase of its fourfold capacity of beauty, resources, and interests. Brief and feeble accounts based upon the writer's own knowledge, or apparently reliable accounts clipped from recent publications, are welcome.

JUDICIAL ENCROACHMENT.

To the Editor of Liberty.

There is in the State of New York a law that the board of supervisors of any county shall provide rooms, properly lighted and heated, for the use of the county court, with a proviso that, in case such board shall neglect to do so, the court may order it done and make it a charge to the county.

Yates county has a court house, not of modern style, which has served the purpose for a generation or two. Repairs and improvements have been made from time to time, but the services of the present building are imperfect. The heating is not efficient in the severest cold weather, and that the ventilation is poor, but that it cannot be said that the board have at any time neglected to do what had been required of them.

Now comes Justice Day of the circuit court, and, without notice to the board of supervisors, makes peremptory order that the court-house shall be repaired, after certain plans and specifications by a high-toned architect of New York, who submitted them to the board, but to a commission appointed by the court and consisting of three lawyers who practise at the bar. The order is, however, to assess the taxpayers of the county for the repair. It is supposed that the expense of such repairs will amount to some $50,000, — more than one-fourth of the whole county having to build a court-house of modern style, such as the supervisors were preparing to erect the coming spring.

A general impression has heretofore prevailed that our government was divided into three collie-mate branches, distinct and specialized in their functions. In this case, however, we have manufactured the law, cried and given judgment for the diligence, and appointed the executor of the decree. The courts, having virtually abolished jury, especially in cases where a fine is sought and an individual, may assume the functions of the legislature and direct the action of the executive, either of which, by the way, they get piles in their hands, are slow to recognize any power but their own. Although looking at what they regard an absurd power, the county papers seem at a loss whether to denounce the order as a judicial outrage or to demand a reposi from the legislature. They should do both.

In a public the functions of a monarch are discharged by the judiciary.

NO WONDER THERE IS A DEFICIT.

New Brunswick, Jan. 8. — At the investigation today of the methods of the board of freemenholders, Capt. Joseph Castner, who has been a member of the board from the fifth ward, this city, for several terms, admitted that he had discovered that on the county 301 days out of 365 for work that sometimes involved more labor than walking across a bridge and "as long that the grass was kept green." Castner wondered that on the way to and from the city there were no fixed lines.

Freemenholder Kelly said that he had charged the county $30 for writing an order for a pair of shoes for a jail prisoner, and had often charged $10 for simply walking over the County street, although the work of the air after 4 p.m. had been completed and there were bridge tenders to do.

It was likewise shown that the county records committee had put in a total of 414 days as $3 a day supervising the work of 50 men and a man: who bound the records. The binding cost about $50, and the superintendence was on $100.

And why shouldn't it? Does not Mr. Mallock tell us that it is the ability to boss a job that creates artistry all the wealth?

ANOTHER OF THE SAME SORT.

Paterson, Jan. 9. — The members of the Passaic County board of freeholders, who vacated their places a few years ago in accordance with the new freemenholder law, are charged with malfeasance in office by the Passaic County Board of Freeholders for neglecting to proceed to make bridge repairs, and that bridges not in need of repairs were reported to be defective. A plank was nailed over a small hole in the floor, or a few shingles of those of a broomed street were misplaced.

A SALARY FOR DOING NOTHING.

New York Evening Post.

A man has been on the city payroll for six years, drawing a salary of $2,500 in pun, half monthly stipends, who lives outside the city and does not perform any of the work of his office. Thun visit the scene of his nominal duties. He has done this by

farming out the work to a substitute who content with the incidental perquisites.

Charles B. Collar, one of the official supreme court stenographers, is the man, and his name has been on the city's civil list for years. Yet he has not been more than $2,500 a year for which he is assigned — Part II. of the circuit — for more than four years. People who do not know that Mr. Collar has been lame from his birth are apt to address as Mr. Collar the young man who has done Mr. Collar's work in Part II. to the satisfaction of the judges, but once or twice,

Rawlin by name — was employed by Collar half a dozen years ago to "check notes," etc., on notes of the testimony at the same time with Collar, — in order to prevent the public from knowing that the official stenographer's notes might be verified. Rawlin proved accurate, and Collar, who was getting old, fell gradually into the habit of absconding himself from his post in court, while Rawlin did the work. To make the story short, a transplant was made finally by which Rawlin was to do the official reporting, while Collar kept on drawing the salary. Rawlin was to collect and keep for himself the fees collected from lawyers for transcriptions of the trial notes to be used in preparing cases on appeal, the legal charge for which in ten cents per one hundred words. Whether he gets all this money is not known.

The justice of the court, however, have the appointment of the court stenographers, have not, so far as is known, forbidden Collar to draw a salary without working for it, or considered whether the substitute is competent to assume all the responsibility, honor, and earnings of the position that practically fills. The question is asked why a salary should be paid by the city at all, if a competent man can be induced to do the work for the incidental perquisites.

[One wonders why this question is asked, since it can be so easily answered. The reason that the city does this is that the doing of such things as this is the main purpose of the city's existence. Some people foolishly suppose that the city exists to maintain order and cleanliness and health. Nothing of the kind. These things are only pretenses behind which to maintain parsnips.]

A PLEA OF OFFENSE REQUIRED BY LAW.

[New York Sun.]

Worcester, Mass., Jan. 13.— A force of men set to work at 11 o'clock last night building a fence around the Union Buildings, in compliance with the law which specifies that, to maintain title to land, individuals and corporations must enclose their holdings at least once in twenty years.

Inmates of the institution were ordered to work. The episode occurred last week, when the fence, which must remain standing twenty-four hours to meet the requirements of the statute.

The street-car business is impeded.

[New York Sun.]

The street-car business has 1,600 men out at work yesterday and last night, shoveling and carting away the snow on the streets. In addition to these, 1,600 men, 800 cars were employed in the work, and 1,6000 yards of railroad track were made.

"I tell you," he said, "this is getting disheartening. It is the first time that we have had to work three days getting the snow from the brook, and then I have the job only half done. It is all on account of the law compelling us to hire none but American citizens. Why, the class of workmen, who apply here are no good. They are mostly all Bowery bums who haven't had a square meal in a week, and are physically unable to work any length of time in the cold. Last night, when I was up on Broadway, it was all I
Pittsburgh, woul be lie able if he accepted it?

Justice Park in, in the test case at Kingston, rules that the propriety of the constitution must be "congruous to the common law of the country". Isn't this only the third or fourth time the department has been called upon to work on this case? They simply want us to give them a new bill, and, as soon as our books are turned, they will steal off, sell the stock for a quarter, and go from those who have paid the price of this labor and the department made in former years before this "American citizen law" was in existence. For instance, look how we handled the streets after the blizzard. In those days we couldn't afford to pay our men to work at short notice, and the streets would be cleaned up in little or no time. Nowadays we have to take each applicant's history and age, and examine into his claim to citizenship. So far it has cost the city $6,000 extra over the regular pay-roll of our department."

[Guard the gates, Mr. T. B. Aldrich, guard the gates.]

THE STATE AS BLACKMAILER.

CHICAGO, Jan. 12. — When the police were withdrawn from the Pennsylvania road at all crossings and stations yesterday, it was much gossip as to the reason. This morning the mayor, in closing his remarks, said: "I wanted transportation for the committee being sent to Washington tonight to work for the new post office," said the Mayor, "and I asked the Pennsylvania Company to help me out. They sent me back word that they would not do it because the Chicago company who had the authority to issue passes, and that they would have to wire East for them. I thereupon returned answer that it was too late for this company had some responsible Chinese agents, and I forthwith deprived them of the privileges they were enjoying through the use of the police. I withdrew every officer working along their line, and it did not take the company long to find some responsible man here in Chicago to empower to set the committee on their way."

"Did you get your passes?"

"I certainly did."

"Are the police going back now?"

"Yes," said the mayor, with a laugh. "The company has seen fit to accommodate the city, and I am going to let them have the police again."

[Police, Captain Schmittberger of New York, exacted five hundred dollars from the French steamship line in return for furnishing police protection to the company's dock. If he escapes imprisonment, it will be for the reason that he consented to confess and expose others. In what respect does Mayor Hopkins differ from Captain Schmittberger? And why should he not go to prison?]

OPENINGS FOR THE COACH AND FOUR.

"[Anilin] in New York Sun.

Article XIII, section 5, of the new constitution reads as follows:

No public officer or person elected or appointed to a public office, under the laws of the State shall, directly or indirectly, demand, accept, receive, or consent to receive for his own use or benefit, or for the use or benefit of another, any free or for a price, free transportation, franking privilege, or discrimination in passenger, telegraph, or mail rates, from any person, corporation, or make use of the same himself or in combination with another.

At under the spirit, but under the letter of the constitution, co-operation is given to a ticket to any point, meaning that the bill for the same be sent to him, the railroad company thereafter making no very strenuous effort to collect the amount?

Again, as customary with railroads, a free excursion is given to some point, and one or more State officers are invited, could they under the letter of this section accept?

Still again, could any State officer, being a personal friend of the railroad company, accept an invitation to travel with him in his private car?

Furthermore, if any, an editor with a pass for himself and one should ask a State officer to go on a trip with him, could the officer accept?

Still further, if a State officer were in Pittsburgh, Pa., and some railroad friend should give him a pass to Chicago, or to China, for that matter, and return to
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WASHINGTON, Jan. 8. — Secretary Morton is going to grapple with Congress again on the garden-seeqt question. On the table is the report of the representatives of one of those most sacred pavilions. A war of this kind has been going on ever since he entered the cabinet. He has insisted in all his reports that the free-seed distribution is a burning evil and a woe. I have today been approached by part of the oath of office. Then, if an official violated it, he would stand a chance of going to the Sing Sing or other conservatory of official immorals.

FOSTERING AGRICULTURE.

WASHINGION, Jan. 8. — Secretary Morton is going to grapple with Congress again on the garden-seeqt question. On the table is the report of the representatives of one of those most sacred pavilions. A war of this kind has been going on ever since he entered the cabinet. He has insisted in all his reports that the free-seed distribution is a burning evil and a woe. I have today been approached by part of the oath of office. Then, if an official violated it, he would stand a chance of going to the Sing Sing or other conservatory of official immorals.

One of the first cases brought before Judge Tainter yesterday was that of two women who had been arrested for soliciting in West Third street. One of them was Jennifer Dyer, of 60, No. 90 West Third street. She and Laura White, twenty-two years old, of No. 40 West Third street, were arrested on Saturday night for soliciting a policeman, who was out in citizens' dress. White died, when she was brought before Judge Tainter, was all smiles. She laughed in a suggestive measured manner, she was asked what she had to say to the charge, and said: "My dear boy, I've got nothing to say to you." Justice Tainter blushed and looked awkward. He fined the young woman $10.

Laura White, the next prisoner, was a quiet-looking woman. She was not prepared to say for herself further than that she had been driven to the streets by hunger. Justice Tainter looked stern, and sent the young woman to the island for four months. The woman gasped with astonishment when she was sentenced.

"Why is it," she cried, "that I get four months when my companion gets only $10 fine?"

"Take that woman away," shouted the justice. And the White woman back to the prison and locked up. The Dien woman paid her fine and went away.

NOT ONE OF THEM DARLIT LITERARY PUBLISHERS.

PHILADELPHIA, Jan. 6. — The "Record" tomorrow will devote its Dear Delaware, to Governor today that can neither read nor write. For the first time in the history of the State there was no inaugural address, and this set people inquiring. Joshua Marvil was the Republican candidate last fall, and was elected. He is a business man of good repute, and worth at least $100,000, which he made by hard work and shrewd investments. Marvil can sign his name. Knowing his weakness, he secured the services of N. P. Smithers, a leading lawyer of the state, and Smithers will virtually be the governor.

[If Governor Marvil understands "addition, division, and silence," he is sufficiently qualified for his office.]

AN ASTONISHING ALDERMAN.

PATERSON, Dec. 21. — The members of the police department were denounced yesterday by Alderman John Boyanin, of the eighth ward, at a public meeting the American police during the year. He accused me, one member of the force of extortuon, and another of conduct unbecoming an officer. One of the officers had threatened "to punch his head" because he hadn't voted for free rubber costs for the police, and another had in fact punched his head when charged with a 

PROTECTING THE SACRED HOME.

[Draft Dispatch from London.]

The agitation against the modern society drama, which swells aloft in high life a leading feature, is beginning to have some effect on the Lord Chamberlain, who, within a few days, has refused to license three new plays.
SLAVES TO DUTY.
By John Badcock, Jr.
A unique addition to the pamphlet literature of Anarchism, in that it
shows the moral and social relations as the foundation of the various
situations. It is, however, unique in the social sense, and thus
shows how the public mind is influenced. It can be recommended.
Price, 15 cents.
Mailed, post-paid, by
BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 102, New York City.

MODERN MARRIAGE.
BY EMILE ZOLLA.
Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker.
In this little story Zola takes four typical in marriage—one from
the middle class, one from the bourgeoisie, one from the poor,
and one from the working people—and describes all with a
brilliant pen and illuminates the world of marriage and love with a
new vision. It is, however, recommended, as it is, for
Price, 15 cents.
Mailed, post-paid, by
BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 102, New York City.

INSTEAD OF A BOOK:
BY A MAN too BUSY TO WRITE ONE.
A PROFESSIONAL EXPOSITION OF
PHILOSOPHICAL ANARCHISM.
By Henry S. Sargent.
With a Full-Page Half-Tone Portrait of the Author.
Price, 50 cents.
Mailed, post-paid, by
BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 102, New York City.

WIND-HURPS SONGS—One Dollar.
If you will take a copy of my book of poems when printed, please
write to me.
J. W. Lloyed, Westfield, New Jersey.

LIBERTY'S LIBRARY.
For any of the following Works, address
BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 102, New York, N. Y.

ARCHITECTURE: ITS AIMS AND METHODS. An addi-
tional chapter on the designs of the American School of
Arts, by Mr. R. Tucker, and adopted by that organization as its authorized
expression. The book contains 150 illustrations and a
price of 12 cents.
BENJ. R. TUCKER, 102, New York City.

A LETTER TO THOMAS E. BAYARD. A letter to the
other side of the Atlantic, on the conditions in the United
States, by Mr. R. Tucker, and adopted by the American
Liberty, and the National Union, and adopted by the American
Liberty, and the National Union, and adopted by the American
Liberty, and the National Union, and adopted by the American
National Union.
PHILOSOPHICAL UNION.
For any of the following works, address
BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 102, New York, N. Y.

WHAT IS PROPERTY? An essay on the principle of
Milton's "Areopagitica." By Mr. R. Tucker, and adopted by
the American Liberty, and the National Union, and adopted by the American
Liberty, and the National Union, and adopted by the American
National Union.

TEACHING THE INCONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE
LAW TO THE PEOPLE. A pamphlet on the
principles of the American Liberty, and the National Union, and adopted by the American
Liberty, and the National Union, and adopted by the American
National Union.

THE LIBERTY LIBRARY.
For any of the following works, address
BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 102, New York, N. Y.

ARCHITECTURE: ITS AIMS AND METHODS. An addi-
tional chapter on the designs of the American School of
Arts, by Mr. R. Tucker, and adopted by that organization as its authorized
expression. The book contains 150 illustrations and a
price of 12 cents.
BENJ. R. TUCKER, 102, New York City.

A LETTER TO THOMAS E. BAYARD. A letter to the
other side of the Atlantic, on the conditions in the United
States, by Mr. R. Tucker, and adopted by the American
Liberty, and the National Union, and adopted by the American
Liberty, and the National Union, and adopted by the American
National Union.

WHAT IS PROPERTY? An essay on the principle of
Milton's "Areopagitica." By Mr. R. Tucker, and adopted by
the American Liberty, and the National Union, and adopted by the American
Liberty, and the National Union, and adopted by the American
National Union.

TEACHING THE INCONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE
LAW TO THE PEOPLE. A pamphlet on the
principles of the American Liberty, and the National Union, and adopted by the American
Liberty, and the National Union, and adopted by the American
National Union.