On Picket Duty.

Nordau’s “Paradoxes,” another heretical and “degenerate” book, is now announced by a London publisher. It is spoken of as a new work, and will probably be new to Nordau’s Philistine admirers. Several years ago a translation of it appeared on this side of the water, and Liberty approvingly quoted some bright passages from its pages. What an audacious fakir Nordau is, and how dense is the stupidity of the “reading public” and the journeymen critics!

Liberty pays considerable attention to Traubel, his “Conservator,” and his contributors. I like Traubel, and I like his “Conservator.” Both are hopelessly illogical, wayward, and uncertain; however, and criticism of them is scarcely avoidable. Traubel, as a rule, does not attempt to meet his critics; he manifestly endorses the view of John Barrow (which he reproduces in italics) that the best writings “are not addressed to the critical judgment, but to the life, the soul,” whatever that means. The trouble, however, is that the critical judgment, not being bulled or hypnotized, persists in putting two and two together and studying the results.

Dr. Isaac Hull Platt argues in the “Conservator” that evil is just as necessary as good, that good is reached only through evil, and that, since the universe is inherently good, not only is murder in the abstract justified, but even concrete individual murderers are necessarily justified. Then Dr. Platt goes on to declare that nothing in his belief touching the necessity of evil has any “bearing upon the question of either individual or State to resist invasion”! No bearing! Have words, then, no meaning? Invasion is manifestly used as synonymous with evil, and evil is said to be just as necessary as good; yet we are to continue to resist evil! It seems that it is for us to resist that which is necessary and justified! Really, Dr. Platt ought to have more consideration for poor human reason. If there is any meaning in his phrases, he ought to help us to grasp it.

Mrs. E. Lynn Linton has an admirable article in the “National Review” on the impermanence and silliness of Christian missions in “heathen” lands. She uses refreshingly plain language with reference to the waste of millions on useless Quixotic crusades in distant countries to the neglect of the outcasts and homeless wanderers at home. She has no patience with the glorification of missionary work as exceptional men and women with enthusiasm for God’s work; she attempts for worldly pleasures, but is inclined to regard them as ordinary mortals governed by ordinary necessities and desires. The love of adventure, the need of cash, thoughtlessness, and similar motives have their influence in the making of missionaries. This does not mean that missionaries are necessarily worse than others, but it is well to impress upon people the prosaic truth that missionaries are not better than others.

Our virtuous editor are showering praise on the governor of Texas for his theatrical efforts to prevent the Corbett-Fitzsimmons prize fight, which it was proposed to hold in that State. First he feared about enforcing the law against fighting; then, having found that the law was in a hopelessly muddled state, he thundered about the original constitution; but he was deprived of that weapon by judicial decisions, and seemed doomed to see the State disgraced and degraded. As a last resort he called a special session of the legislature to pass a new law against prize fighting. The people of Texas are far less moral than their governor, and are understood to have favored the holding of the exhibition, but the governor was bound to protect them against themselves. The hypocritical press is at last to find terms emphatic enough to express its admiration for the pious governor; only a few papers, including the New York “Herald,” have ventured to question the solemnity and value of this zeal and fervor. What a nation of cheap moralists and canting hypocrites this is!

Grant Allen is certainly frank with his readers. He writes stuff, for revenue only, and also things which he is willing to be judged by as artist and thinker. To enable the reader to distinguish between Allen-Jekyll and Allen-Hyde, our friend has devised an original trademark. “I propose,” he says in a published letter, “in future to add the words ‘A Hill-Top Novel’ to each one of my stories which I write of my own accord, simply and solely for the sake of embodying force of my own opinion. Whenever, therefore, in future the words, ‘A Hill-Top Novel,’ appear on the title page of a book by me, the reader who cares for truth and righteousness may take it for granted that the book represents my own original thinking.” Mr. Allen is shortly to publish a new story which will “raise a protest in behalf of purity.” Since there are many others who, like Mr. Allen, are condemned to write more stuff than sense, would it not be a good idea if all should be as frank with the readers as he? Such a course, it is to be feared, would greatly reduce the demand for the hill-top class of productions, for the average reader buys a meritorious book only by accident and through ignorance; but, then, the ordinary course, it must be remembered, is not altogether free from danger. One good book unwittingly bought and read by the average reader may effectually kill an author’s reputation, for he is likely to fall under the suspicion of having become a bore or a crank.

Well may the “Sun” say that, to the Philistine who reads the accounts of the lively discussion, before the British Association, of the relation between so-called Christian civilization and the inferior races, it must seem that “the foundations of law, religion, and morality, as taught to him,” are “crumbling.” Every one who took part in that interesting discussion was a distinguished investigator or experienced traveller, and all agreed that not only are missions a failure, delusion, and snare, but that nearly all the more general efforts to impose our civilization on the inferior races have the most fatal effects on the latter and lead directly to their extinction. One speaker ridiculed our blithely worshipping of the “three Rs,” and pointed out that other races have got along beautifully without them. Another contemptuously referred to the tendency of the average missionary and civilizer to confound clothes with morality, and asked pious Englishmen to be less hypocritical and abandon the pretense of promoting religion when their real purpose was the extension of the market for cotton goods. A third wondered at the impudence of people who dictate to natives generally more temperate than themselves what they shall eat and drink, and exposed the ignorance of those who assume that all institutions and habits which do not resemble those of “civilization” are necessarily inexact and vicious. There was, in a word, general concurrence in the view expressed by Professor Petrie that scarcely a single race can bear the burden of our so-called Christian civilization, and that there is nothing mysterious about the decay of savages before white men. It is natural that these heretical views should have aroused the resentment of the missionaries and their supporters, but the more independent newspapers have applauded the sentiments expressed in this discussion. How pleased Spencer must be to find that the views he has so persistently upheld are at last coming to be appreciated and boldly presented to the public by men commanding general respect even in Philistia!
An Explanation.

A difficulty that has long been encountered in the convict of Liberty is that of prompt attention to the correspondence to which its publication gives rise. During the earlier years of its life I was able to cope with this difficulty, but, as the constituency grew, it became impossible for me to attend to a satisfactory manner to the letters and orders that reach this office. My most immediately imperative tasks are those by which I earn my living, and these occupy more than the ordinary working day. Hence even the editorial work upon Liberty and the supervision of its mechanics; department, both of which are absolutely necessary of the paper’s existence. The patience and consideration that most of the comrades have shown under these trying circumstances are phenomenal, and most warmly do I thank them. But I feel that I should not further tax their tolerant disposition without some general explanation such as that which I now render.

There seems to be no hope of overcoming this difficulty in the near future. The paper, which is largely supported by the aid of its ardent friends, is published very economically, and the employment of a clerk and the rent of extra office-room would add to the regular expenses in a degree unwarrantable. Of course a paper whose aim was profit could not hope to achieve its aim under such circumstances, and would have to give up the ghost. But a paper whose aim is purely educational must pursue its work of education in whatever way it can, unsatisfactory though it may be.

I wish then to apologoetically announce to my correspondents that I shall always do my best to attend to them punctually, and that even and all will finally be heard from. Provided their letters require action or answer. Meanwhile I ask them to remember that it is just as impossible for me to answer a letter of inquiry regarding a neglected letter as to answer the neglected letter itself. But, to relieve the anxieties of those who have omitted sums of money in advance for payment for literature ordered, or for other purposes except subscriptions to the paper, I will undertake to return such sums immediately on receiving a demand therefor. Hereafter, then, any letter demanding the return of sums sent as above specified, or insisting that I either fill the order at once or return the money, will be given precedence over other correspondences; the order will not be filled, but the money will be promptly returned.

Political and Other Tyranny.

Ruskin, in “Fors,” complains somewhere of the tendency of people to argue with him and challenge the most fundamental postulates. They fancy, he says in substance, that I am in the habit of settling down the first thing that comes into my head, and that, therefore, I may be easily made to see my error and to repent of what I have said. Unlike Ruskin’s annoying correspondents, I am always inclined to give a writer the benefit of the doubt, and assume that he not only means what he says, but that he gives us the fruit of due deliberation and mature judgment, and it is with some reluctance that I venture to avow my suspicion that Mr. Traubel, in the last “Conservator,” printed some paragraphs embodying, not reasoned-out conclusions, but “the first thing that came into his head” on the subject involved. I refer to the notes on tyranny in general and the distinctions between political and other tyranny (pp. 293 and 294). I do not here set down the first thing that comes into my head; they are so fallacious and self-contradictory that I cannot refrain from attempting to make Mr. Traubel repent of what he has said. Let me quote the paragraphs:

All around us are leaders, authorities, tyrants, not governmental, the most subtle, the most dangerous, the most inexorable in their demands, and the most unforbearing and relentless in their persecutions. While you are in the courts defending yourself against some trivial invasion, there may be that in your conscience, the issue of the theological or social antecedents, compelling you to most unworthily, however unconscious, persecutors, you, fighting persecution, persecute. It is a case like that of Professor Benis from his chair in Chicago University for simple freedom of speech in social questions, and I say that such an exercise of power is far more grave in its offensiveness and in its results than a thousand and one infractions that occur under the club of political majorities.

If we guarded well the passes of private freedom, the by-ways of social and religious emancipation, the political forces as an immense populace would van- ish for want of sustenance. Political tyranny is nurtured in social intolerance. The passive policy of Tolstoy, as against political restriction, is far more potent for progress than physical revolution or heated verbal controversies.

It is, of course, perfectly true that there are tyrannies all around us, religious and social as well as political; but I understand Mr. Traubel, he lays down, in the above utterance, three distinct and definite propositions: first, that the religious and social tyranny which is not backed by brute force is “graver” in its offensiveness and results than political governmental tyranny; second, that the latter is “birthed in” (or caused by the former; third, that, with regard to resistance to political tyranny, the passive policy, or non-resistance, is far more potent than the more popular forms of resistance. None of these propositions is true, and I am at a loss to understand where Mr. Traubel finds any evidence in support of them.

Why is religious or social tyranny more dangerous than political tyranny? So far as the individual is concerned, it is clearly far less dangerous. How can religious tyranny manifest itself? In boycotting, in abusive epithets, in ridicule. But political tyranny has all of these channels and the additional one of direct physical coercion. I cannot be imprisoned by those who object to my irreligious views or my manners and dress, while any departure from the rule laid down by the political majoritv subjects me to violence and loss of liberty. In my religious and social controversies with the crowd, I can, if I choose, reason with them or treat them with contempt. The weapons of abuse and ridicule are at my disposal as well as theirs. If there is a political majoritv that seem amenable to reason, I can present my side of the case to them with the fullest freedom and have some hope of winning them over. Not so in political “controversies.” Every defensive weapon is taken away from me, and I am brutally silenced and gagged. Which tyranny, in the name of common sense, is more grave and dangerous to me?

Will it be said that political tyranny is less dangerous to society at large? But nothing can be bad for society which is good for each social unit. If the individual’s development and life are hampered less by religious than by political or both, we are at a loss to see how social majorities are more dangerous than political. Of course, it obviously follows that social progress is more menaced by the club of majorities than by the howls and grissing of teeth.

Take Mr. Traubel’s concrete case of Professor Benis. Would not the offensiveness and the result of the persecution be graver if the professor were sent to prison for his heretical teaching? Assuming that he is monoply’s victim, has he not been greatly benefited by the sympathy of the press and public, the opportunity to expose the motives of his persecutors, and the liberty to seek and obtain other employment? Has not society been benefited by all this? To ask these questions is to answer them.

Mr. Traubel’s second proposition is that between “social intolerance” and political tyranny there is the relation of cause and effect. This is true neither historically or statiscally. Originally all tyranny was political; that is to say, the individual was coerced into religious and social conformity as well as into what we now call political conformity by the same despotism and by the same means. In religion and social relations we have secured some freedom, but in political relations the despotism of the majority has supplanted that of kings without much improvement for the individual. The assumed right of a majority to regulate
have previously outlined is that it is the only basis sure to secure the ultimate adhesion of all or nearly all individuals, whether sympathetic or not. I do not deny, of course, that there would be at first a tendency among those of the sympathetic to show a preference for the own. The advantage of the proposed basis to form themselves into innumerable cliques for purposes, not defensive simply, but more or less offensive as well. But this condition of things would have a more powerful influence, through its own impotence and impracticability, in demonstrating the superiority of a purely defensive combination, formed on lines that would make it as simple as possible in its purpose and as inclusive as possible in its conditions of membership, to other combinations characterized by complexity and exclusiveness; and, by the very nature of the case, all persons who would sooner or later perceive the desirability of uniting in one association to secure the single thing which all agree in wanting,—self-liberty,—and of trusting to other than force agencies for the realization of those things which are desired only by single individuals or special classes.

If correctly diagnose Mr. Byington's case, his failure to appreciate this fact arises from a peculiarity of view which no Anarchist of my acquaintance shares with him. He is a man who has reasoned himself out of his element. Mentally converted by the radicalism of political and economic, but temperamentally he is still strongly tinctured with the narrow prejudices with which he was saturated in his boyhood. He has perceived the folly of foraging by invasive methods one class of the community to regulate their lives in conformity to the views of another class, but in his heart he remains a puritan, and has all the puritan's zeal for making other people as puritanical as himself. An index to his general make-up is seen in the fact that, though a sincere Single Taxer, he thinks he has done better work when he has made one Christian mission to the heathen than when he has made a dozen Single Taxis (in which I agree with him to the extent of thinking that he has thereby done less harm); and observation of his writings leads me to believe that one of the main reasons why he is in love with Anarchism is to be found in his confidence that in an Anarchistic society Christian missionaries and other of that ilk, having to abandon invasion, will in consequence the more quickly achieve their puritanical aims by concentrating their energies upon what he deems the more effective plan of competition by non-invasive methods. If I understand him, he is anxious to supplant the boycott upon saloon-keepers, Sabbath-breakers, and everybody and everything that is profane. He values Anarchism as a means of providing a field for a conflict of ostracisms, and to him Anarchistic society presents the attractive aspect of a gigantic Donnybrook fair in which the boycott will replace the shillalah. In this universal shindy he means to do his share of head-breaking. Now, such a man, though he may be an Anarchist in reason, 'nd as such of great value to the cause (as Mr. Byington unquestionably is), is not an Anarchist in heart, soul, and spirit. The Anarchist in spirit, in all effort except that of defence against invasion (and even in that as far as possible), desires to convince, not to compel. To him the boycott is only less objectionable than the ballot, the billy, and the bullet, and, while he will not deny to Mr. Byington or to any one else the liberty to use the boycott as freely as he chooses, he intends to use it himself only in the most sparing manner, in cases of great urgency or gravity. The separation of society into petty cliques which "do not speak as they pass by" is to him a thing abhorrent. But, the reader may ask, what has all this to do with the subject under consideration? Much, good reader. I am not forgetting myself. I have written this long paragraph to lead up to the conclusion that the sectarianism which Mr. Byington favors in the defensive sphere is but one manifestation of that general conflict of cliques which he calls a conflict of effort. This I find to be the explanation of the fact that he is averse to a social union of all classes in which both the sympathetic and the unsympathetic agree to live non-invasively in order to secure self-liberty, preferring instead a sectarian union of the good against the wicked, by which the latter are to be summarily crushed. These two forms of union differ precisely as the narrow, hard, and arbitrary self-righteousness of the puritan differs from the broad, cheerful, and tolerant self-assertion of the Egost. In saying this I do not wish to be understood as implying unpleasant personal reflections upon Mr. Byington. I have an immense respect for him, and should be sorry to have him take these remarks amiss. I say of him only what I would say of myself as I was in those boyhood days when I too was something of a puritan, and no more than Raskin in his riper age says of himself as he was before he had outgrown the narrow limits of Evangelical Protestantism. And I say it only for the purpose of the argument.

After this general introduction I may now proceed to examine in detail Mr. Byington's criticism.

(1) The considerations advanced above are a quite sufficient answer to the question why we should make self-liberty the supreme consideration in combining for defense. I followed, too, the same line of reasoning in my answer to Mr. Badcock in No. 323. There I indicated that, if all persons, in combining for coercive purposes, were to follow their sympathies, the coercive associations would be as numerous and various as the sympathies, resulting not only in tyranny, but in a perpetual conflict of tyrannies. The peaceful pursuit of happiness, which is the common object of all, is not compatible with the combination of tyrants. For this reason it is necessary to seek satisfaction for our sympathies solely in the voluntary, non-coercive realm, and get that freedom under which alone such voluntary sympathetic effort can be powerfully effective by combining coercive combination to the securing of self-liberty. And this would still be advisable even if the entire sympathetic class were aware of the advantages of equal liberty, for a union of the sympathetic against unsympathetic invaders would still involve the preservation of order (or an apology for order) by continual suppression and struggle, which is much less desirable, and much less advantageous even to the sympathetic themselves.
than the reduction of suppression and struggle to a minimum by such a form of defensive association as will tend to enlist all classes in its membership by appealing to the one motive—desire for self-liberty—that is common to them all.

(4) In supposing that in such an association there would be two parties pursuing incompatible policies, Mr. Byington forgets that by the hypothesis those who otherwise would prefer a policy making the sympathies paramount will learn, either through reason or experiment, that such a policy is ineffective and impracticable, and will conclude therefore to abandon it so far as force agencies are concerned, and unite for defence with those whose policy makes self-interest paramount, who are most

Byington will hardly claim that sympathetic persons who have found exclusive association a failure will then join the inclusive association for the purpose of working within it to turn it into an exclusive association and thereby come to grief again. They will join it only because convinced of the necessity of its policy, and thereafter it will be their aim, not to defeat this policy, but to further it. Where, then, will be the warring parties?

That is a queer argument which maintains that an association for defence is weakened by extending its association to include persons who are so commonly attacked. The strength of an associa-
tion seems to me proportionate to its success in accomplishing its object. Now, an associa-
tion formed for the prevention of crime certainly would not be best served in its object by leaving crime alone precisely where it is most

Mr. Byington might as well say that that is the strongest army which never was.

It may be true, but only till the time when the other army gets a whack at it.

I do not agree that men with criminal prop-
erties would be less harmful as outsiders than as members. I think the

most effective way to make a man a desperate criminal is to treat him as an outlaw, and that will

because of the superstitious dread that there is something sacred about human beings, as such, that exempts them from the domain of property. There is really no reason in denying property in human beings because of their humanity. One may as legitimately own beings with two legs and no feathers as any other species of animals; that is, so long as there is no reason in denying property in them being constitutionally capable of dealing with us on an equal footing. If there were any such beings among brutals, it would be necessary to exempt them from the domain of property. And, conversely, such human beings as do not meet this requirement cannot properly be so exempted. As a matter of fact, these two classes, human beings and beings capable of contracting, are nearly coextensive, the latter including the former with the exception of very young children and weak-minded adults; and this has led us to identify the two, substituting in our minds the human form for the power to contract as the distinguishing difference between owners and owned. But this is a superficial and superstition view,—one which ignores essential rea-

son. When it has been discarded, as sooner or later it will be, no spook will remain to deter affectionate mothers from demanding satisfaction of their instinctive desire for absolute control of their babies, and this extremely large class will eagerly join the defensive association which secures them in such a manner that such an association would find strong friends, too, in those persons who would reflect with satisfaction that it secured them in their infantile craving for loving mothers and prevented molestation from persons separating them from their mothers because of the fancied cruelty of some perfectly innocent act or some necessary and beneficent measure of discipline.

Mr. Byington views only the dark side of the picture. An impartial view of both sides indicates that he is seriously mistaken in his estimate of the comparative loss and gain in membership which an inclusive association would experience.

I think there is some force in the contention that protection of property right in a child whose owner had succeeded in so absolutely shutting it off from human association that not the smallest social conception could ever enter its mind would in a slight degree add to the total of possible invasive forces. But I am sure that such cases would be very rare; and, if I am finding with a net the size of whose meshes is best adapted for general reasons to the catching of the largest number of fish, I cannot consent to make it the meshes smaller simply because now and then a minnow escapes. The question of relative values comes in here. Mr. Byington will know that I do not consider this a perfect world, or one that can be made perfect. I doubt the possibility of discovering any means of combating invasion that would not be open to the objection that, because of its invasion, in some special direction and under unusual circumstances, might be worse. True, I should expect such exceptional cases to ultimately succumb to influences other and more powerful than physical force. I am not prepared to such an extent as to meet the evil of wilful isolation of children.

Improved social conditions and a more general diffusion of education will do much; and then, Mr. Byington, there is your beloved benevolence. Even I, who love it less, perhaps would use it with you here.

(5) If the plumb-line policy, as I claim, will attract a membership practically complete, why should I adopt a compromise policy as an attraction? If the desire for self-liberty, as I claim, is sufficient to prompt effective combination, are we in the danger of a real war, defying such means to strengthen it by sympathy, especially if there is the slightest reason to be impelled? Why add fuel to the fire by an association which is expected to succeed, not in proportion to the loyalty of its members, but in proportion to their readiness to accept at the slightest evidence of departure from the original programme? Again I tell you, Mr. Byington, that your puritanism is at the bottom of your trouble. You persist in looking upon this self-defensive union as if it were a crusade.

And why should I submit affectionate mothers to the outrage of absurd persons who fancy that they have proved these mothers cruel? How can I ask these mothers to help in protecting my title to the dollars which I have
second, I must express my admiration for the judicial faculty which enables Mr. Byington to decide in favor of the man, and my regret that he has so little confidence in my own judicial faculty as to entertain the least suspicion that I would decide otherwise. At the same time I admit that in the case cited (which is another of those rare and abnormal cases in which Mr. Byington's imagination revived the woman is in a painful plight. But painful plights not infrequently arise from many other manifestations of the property institution. The case had been a little different; if the mother had borne her child after her emancipation, and had thereby become its owner; if this child had been suffering from a dangerous disease, only to be cured at great expense by a journey to the antipodes; and if the mother had been very poor and the father very rich,—still the father, by virtue of his ownership of his dollars, might, as before, have virtually compelled the mother to return to her slavery and sign away her future children as a condition of receiving the money with which to save her existing child from death. Both of these cases would be as palpable to such an association as advocate that, instead of "undertaking unnecessarily difficult and perplexing duties," it confines itself to the simplest functions. A defensive association would not gain in simplicity by undertaking to do the numerous things that a fact may favor instead of the few things that nearly all can be induced to agree to. As for the particular duty of "drawing the line between infants and social units," it would prove one of the simplest. The reason for this is to be found in the fact that such a question would be so rare, and perhaps not even in the treaty. The proof is found in the claim itself. Any child capable of bearing the association's officers its desire for release from its own, but that it may thereafter receive care for itself or entrust it to the care of persons more agreeable to it than the presence in its mind of the idea of contract. The child who can say, no matter in what childish language: "I wish to leave A and go with B, and, if you are good to me, I will be good to B," has become conscious of the existence of other people and of the necessity of dealing with them. From the moment that a child makes a deliberate declaration of this character it should cease to be property and should pass into the category of owners. Would the registration, in my opinion of such claims be a very perplexing task? It is my opinion that if a few children were able to emancipate themselves, should they do so, as long as they are not old enough to do so at the age of five. But it is on children who have passed these ages that the greater forms of cruelty are often practiced. Every parent is the question of ownership of the products of the child's labor. My statement of the object of the contract would have been more complete if I had worded it as follows: "To secure the contracting parties in the court of their persons and of the results of 240 made by them after being capable of contract." If asked to pass upon the case first cited by Mr. Byington, I should decide that the jewel belonged to the party owning the child at the time that the child was found and the law. In concluding upon the sale of this property, I must say that the instruction for the government, which they cried; an extra session, which happened not, but, if it should happen, it is the proposition of the Philadelphia farmers. -A between a contract and suffering and not, and an issue of bonds and gold reserve of the treasury, and, everything is, in the best and most trusted powers of the authorities of the country, expedient. How beautiful it is! The body elected to rule the press and horror even by conscripted editors, and its services are, in the greatest emergency, the use of having a congress, trusted, and of giving it to those who abuse it.

The post-office department and postmasters are justified in refusing newspapers and other public papers which may deem libellous, obscene or obnoxious. The tyrannical power thus conferred is of the greatest consequence to the intense political excitement which will be exercised for partisan purposes. As the daily press is the organ of the press, the operation of the post-office department and the postmasters must not be permitted to be used for such purposes. The post-office department and postmasters have a duty to perform, and it is the duty of the public to see that it is performed. The post-office department and postmasters are entitled to the respect of the public, and they are entitled to the respect of the public if they perform their duties faithfully. The post-office department and postmasters are entitled to the respect of the public if they perform their duties faithfully. The post-office department and postmasters are entitled to the respect of the public if they perform their duties faithfully. The post-office department and postmasters are entitled to the respect of the public if they perform their duties faithfully. The post-office department and postmasters are entitled to the respect of the public if they perform their duties faithfully. The post-office department and postmasters are entitled to the respect of the public if they perform their duties faithfully. The post-office department and postmasters are entitled to the respect of the public if they perform their duties faithfully. The post-office department and postmasters are entitled to the respect of the public if they perform their duties faithfully. The post-office department and postmasters are entitled to the respect of the public if they perform their duties faithfully. The post-office department and postmasters are entitled to the respect of the public if they perform their duties faithfully.
Waldheim. They who in glory’s name were forward driven, Unlike the ship whose heed was given To mandate rash of their exulted souls. In haste to speed the tide that patient rolls. —Undaunted they by the all-wise albus Still yawning “twist that better world, and this— My thoughts as when a son, and protect my joys: I hear their voice again, I see them die; And thus my soul’s restored to Hope and Time, To all that melancholy, yet sublime.

A. H. Juergen.

The Defensive Contract.

To the Editor of Liberty:

We seem to be getting at the real reason why labor must be owned, and the propositions of the advocates who may be expected to commit crime, or (3) in order to preserve the association as effective as possible: (4) the defensive association will be most effective when most nearly all-embracing: (5) it is more important for this purpose for us to keep the men who are members of the society as free as possible from the influence of the unsympathetic, who naturally tend to crime, than to have that of those whose nature leads them to refrain from crime (Liberty, Oct. 6, p. 4, col. 1, top); (5) we shall, in our argument, and we shall see as we proceed, that the law of the criminal classes, by acknowledging as approvable all the universe except those forces which can interfere with approbation of the approvable, "and who is a scapegrace, a pander, a leman?—I refer to participation in the agreement," which are [all] those, and only those, which are capable of understanding and entering into the agreement; (6) therefore we should accept as members all who have the intelligence of implement them in their liberty to appropriate and use as they please all the approvable universe, as defined, except what is already approbated by others; (7) as to those who are not our members, but who do not come under the definition of the approvable, (a) we need not protect them unless we see fit, (b) we may properly protect them if we do see fit. (Instead of renouncing, p. 36), (c) we should not interfere with each liberty to dispose of approvable objects at will.

Here are nine points, two of which (2 and 3) are not objectionable either for intrinsic unsoundness or for insufficiency with the rest of the argument. The rest I ask leave to look on as one.

(1) Why? —It cannot be maintained that one will do best always to make his own life, liberty, and property the supreme consideration in all matters. He may reasonably risk any of his life for the sake of sympathy, science, art, or anything else that deserves deep interest. Why should he not do this: the management of his defensive association as well as in his choice of a route of travel, making the protection to liberty as free as possible to work for liberty. When the ideas we are preparing to come be put in practice, why should not the same motives, guided by the same knowledge, lead our successors of that time to act in the same spirit as we now think and talk.

(2) I maintain that the association is likely to be weakened by trying to include two parties who aggressively and obstinately support incompatible views of the same proposition. I do not pretend to work for liberty. When the ideas we are preparing to come be put in practice, why should not the same motives, guided by the same knowledge, lead our successors of that time to act in the same spirit as we now think and talk.

(3) That the association is likely to be weakened by trying to include two parties who aggressively and obstinately support incompatible views of the same proposition. I do not pretend to work for liberty. When the ideas we are preparing to come be put in practice, why should not the same motives, guided by the same knowledge, lead our successors of that time to act in the same spirit as we now think and talk.

(4) That the association is likely to be weakened by trying to include two parties who aggressively and obstinately support incompatible views of the same proposition. I do not pretend to work for liberty. When the ideas we are preparing to come be put in practice, why should not the same motives, guided by the same knowledge, lead our successors of that time to act in the same spirit as we now think and talk.

(5) That the association is likely to be weakened by trying to include two parties who aggressively and obstinately support incompatible views of the same proposition. I do not pretend to work for liberty. When the ideas we are preparing to come be put in practice, why should not the same motives, guided by the same knowledge, lead our successors of that time to act in the same spirit as we now think and talk.

(6) That the association is likely to be weakened by trying to include two parties who aggressively and obstinately support incompatible views of the same proposition. I do not pretend to work for liberty. When the ideas we are preparing to come be put in practice, why should not the same motives, guided by the same knowledge, lead our successors of that time to act in the same spirit as we now think and talk.

(7) That the association is likely to be weakened by trying to include two parties who aggressively and obstinately support incompatible views of the same proposition. I do not pretend to work for liberty. When the ideas we are preparing to come be put in practice, why should not the same motives, guided by the same knowledge, lead our successors of that time to act in the same spirit as we now think and talk.

(8) That the association is likely to be weakened by trying to include two parties who aggressively and obstinately support incompatible views of the same proposition. I do not pretend to work for liberty. When the ideas we are preparing to come be put in practice, why should not the same motives, guided by the same knowledge, lead our successors of that time to act in the same spirit as we now think and talk.

(9) That the association is likely to be weakened by trying to include two parties who aggressively and obstinately support incompatible views of the same proposition. I do not pretend to work for liberty. When the ideas we are preparing to come be put in practice, why should not the same motives, guided by the same knowledge, lead our successors of that time to act in the same spirit as we now think and talk.

(10) That the association is likely to be weakened by trying to include two parties who aggressively and obstinately support incompatible views of the same proposition. I do not pretend to work for liberty. When the ideas we are preparing to come be put in practice, why should not the same motives, guided by the same knowledge, lead our successors of that time to act in the same spirit as we now think and talk.
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What I am jealous to establish is the principle that the woman be the friend, the adviser, the cherished and defended again in reason. "It, Tucker makes the point "that a woman shall have a mother's right to commit suicide during pregnancy." Perhaps; but I, who am now a New Anarchist, do deny it after the counter-statement that property can outgrow its condition, and cites the evicted monkey. Of course I am speaking ethically and not legally. The law makes a monkey of it please accept for the moment of night. I am discussing fundamental right.

If I have a jack-knife, it is mine until my property right is voluntarily relinquished. No one has a right to force me to exchange it for anything else. If I lend it to you, you can use it, but I can recover it wherever I find it. I cannot be forced to accept a substitute. But, if this man drops it into the sea, he cannot recover or restore it, and I may not demand an impossibility, but I may justly demand compensation. So it is when my monkey comes. If the monkey was ever mine, he is foregone mine. But, when evolution occurs, what then? My monkey is gone. But a monkey alone has no right to claim of the property. I have no property right in the man, but, as he has taken my monkey and cannot restore my monkey, he must pay me for the monkey, and so will my property right and his liberty both be vindicated.

Apply this to the child. If this human being is my property by real right, then I can hold him forever. No association has a shadow of a right to set up some moral of milk and not be set in accordance with the rights of man and my own possession, nor any butcher or for any other property.

He said: "While basing his own duty in this respect upon his own view of expediency, he cannot refuse to allow others to make their opposite views of expediency the basis of a right to violate. But I do. Certainly in a narrow and proximate sense a man has a right to do what he thinks right because he can do no other. But all the same, if in his ignorance he is doing that which produces unhappiness as, he is doing wrong, and nature proves him wrong by the consequences against him. He is not in harmony with Natural Right, and any one avowed by his ign晚上 the right to a restraint. It must be observed that I do not base any duty in the true sense upon my own view of things, as others do, but my real duty at my real expediency are found in accordance with the natural right. And I must remark, as we go, that I have never seen the case of the right was right. So I am not under the regime of contract.

Let us look into contract for a moment. A man may contract to be my slave for life. But Natural Right declares the man to be entitled to freedom. Therefore this contract can be enforced only by the man who makes it. The instant he takes back his liberty he is free. I have no right to enforce and can delegate to do the right to enforce the cases not

It is the same with a woman who promises to love, honor, and obey. All these promises are empty, except as she performs them. True Society is founded, then, not upon contract, but upon the natural fact that it can only exist where the right of each member to life, liberty, and the enjoyment of the fruits of his inoffensive efforts is acknowledged and defended. Very weak are Mr. Tucker's attempts to make fun of my crippled example. My statement was founded upon the old definition that a man may do as he pleases. Mr. Tucker takes the word "pleases" at the single life at my expense, I have a right to a direct expense that if my expense produces apples and oranges, because I produce the food, and he does not, I have a right to an apple and leave the oranges alone. If I give a free gift, and a free gift takes any form the giver pleases. If he can dictate to me the form of my gift, he becomes a tax-gatherer and a master, and I become his subject and slave. Therefore, because I did not take your thing, and, because I clothe him, I may direct what shall wear. When he gets food and garments elsewhere, I have no jurisdiction.

Equally weak is he when he comes to calves and babies. Certainly the stock-breeder who forces dependent life upon a calf is an evader (from the boreine standpoint) if he refuses support to it. Who denies it? But human equality ends with the child and human beings cannot be extended to non-human animals. Yes, the parent owes support to the child, but it is not true that the child owes nothing in return. As a member of free society the child owes the parent; on the other hand, the parent owes support; but the form of that support is a matter of right parental influence. Whether the child shall have woman's milk, cow's milk, or goat's milk, gives him the same nourishment, and to the one case, is for the parent, not the child, to decide.

Where is the "flagrant contradiction"? Where is the "mental slavery"? "Slavery in Anarchy an absurdity!" cries Mr. Tucker. "I do think it an absurdity, instead of an absurdity, is a necessity." That I should live to hear it! —and from my chief leader and teacher! "Will not the animals be slaves under Anarchy?" Wherein does the undeveloped child differ from the animals? In its possibilities, does Mr. Lloyd answer? But the ovum in a woman's body has the same possibilities. Is it not her property? I had thought to make a passionate, satirical answer to all this. I had thought to assert that Anarchist began and ended with the human; that the animals could indeed be slaves under Anarchy, but not in it. I had thought to assert that no two terms could possibly be used to express the words "slavery under Anarchy," and to inquire: "If the man who utters these two propositions in the same breath is not a medical slave, what is he? But the storm dies on my lips. What do I know about Anarchy! I am standing on my head, and my sun rises in the west and sets in the east. Mr. Tucker certainly knows Anarchy, and an Anarchist has a right to invade, and Slavery is a necessity in Anarchy, —the slavery of babies and fools, the means and most cowardly of all! The undeveloped child differs from the animals in that it is human. Is that a "ghost," a "fetish," a "superstition"? It is enough for me to know that you and I, Mr. Tucker, would never be safe in any society which «'ot hold the life and liberty of every human being sacred.

The ovum in the woman's body is her property. It has not the possibilities of the child. It is not a human being. When the germ of the woman and the sperm of the man have congealed and developed under certain conditions, and the girl comes into being, then they become human. The precise point at which humanity commences is for physiologists to determine. I doubt if any one could say at present. Ev-}
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