On Picket Duty.

The "Evening Post" is sometimes remarkably candid. It says, "I pro勾up of the recent elections and Tammany's victory, that there is such a thing as being too logical in politics, and that "logic and ethics and name-like arguments are dangerous things. What is wanted is good, honest stupidity. What has made the English so strong is stupidity and illogicality, and what is making government in France more and more difficult is the determination of the French to be severely logical. It is consoling to know that even governmentals realize that the safety of the State lies in "hot and honest stupidity." It is rather imprudent for them to admit it, instead of boasting of superior intelligence and virtue, especially when there are wicked people at hand to turn it to advantage.

Once more the superiority of the English press to the American is unceasingly exemplified. Had the Lancastrian case occurred in New York would the press have been as mild? The New York "Recorder" says the perfect truth that, while in England the "general sentiment is one of irritation" and indignation at the outrage to which Miss Lancaster was subjected by tyrannical parents and a fossil specialist, in the United States only the few who share her views would have been aroused, while the majority would have looked upon the incarceration with complete indifference, if not with approval. It is also worthy of remark that, whereas in England the law does not interfere with people of age who choose to disregard marriage, in the United States they could be arrested and punished as criminals.

Grant Allen's new novel, "The British Barbarians," is out, and Miss Gilder, the editor of "The Critic," reviews it in the New York "World." The story is intended as a protest against the barbarous notion that a husband may kill a "faithless" wife or a "guilty paramour," and a plea for self-ownership and independence for woman. I have not read the novel, and hence do not know whether it is a work of art or a full farrago. Miss Gilder does not like it, as might have been anticipated. She thinks it immoral, and charges Mr. Allen with having written it for the sake of dollars and cents. What, however, is nauseating in her review is the concluding sentence. "I feel," she says, "that the time that I have spent over it has been worse than thrown away." How about the check Miss Gilder has received for her review? She reviews books regularly for the Sunday "World," and the pretense that she reads because she is really interested in the books is truly. She writes dollars and cents, and her time is not wasted from her own point of view.

At last even the ordinary critics are 'finding Nordin out.' An American publisher has brought out a "job lot" of novels and plays written by the charlatan prior to the appearance of his pious "Degeneration," but the amazed critics find them replete with the dreadful things which he so denounced with so righteous wrath in other authors. These novelists and playwrights are characterized as erotic, egotistic, realistic, and so on. Moreover, they are inarticulate and badly written. Nordau is said to have caught a very bad case of degeneracy himself, but this is clearly inaccurate, since these works antedate his sensational crusade in behalf of morality. No, the explanation is simple. Nordau started out as a degenerate, and failed to attract attention. Then he bethought himself that the reactionists and respectable were in pressing need of a champion, and made a bid for their favor. He succeeded for a while, owing chiefly to the ignorance of the critics. But now he is unmasked and repudiated by all. The enterprising publishers are entitled to our thanks. But for them the critics would still be bowing to Nordau as a prophet and saviour.

What sort of "progress" and "reform" the "Twentieth Century" stands for may be inferred from the fact that it is highly indulgent with Miss Edith Lancaster's attitude towards marriage, and delivers itself of the following exalted sentiments on the subject: "In our opinion the woman is more of a fool than a lunatic. The cause of social reform and Socialism is much injured because of a few people of loose morals and worse principles, and generally known as free lovers, who hang on the outskirts, and, despite their unclean lives and minds, have the cheek to call themselves reformers. It is the old story of the devil in the garb of a saint. What would happen if others were to follow the example of this poor, de- luded woman? Families as such would become non-existent, relations which now arc the tenderest in the world would be broken, and woman, after the first flush of youth, become as a cast- off garment. No, the marriage relation is something which should be sacredly guarded by society, and the woman who seeks to discard it proclaims herself as simply a fool." The time for criticism of the wretched "Twentieth Century" is past, and no one will pay any attention to these laborsations. But, surely, if a few men of intelligence are still left on the fakir's subscription list, their patience must be exhausted now.

"At England" is excited over the "Lancaster case," the facts of which are these: Edith Lancaster, a young woman of education and social position, imbued with Socialist ideas, fell in love with a Socialist named Sullivan and decided to live with him outside of the marriage relation. The parents, shocked and alarmed at the "disgrace" to the family, had their daughter examined by a celebrated alienist, and she was found to be mental. The certificate of insanity, on the strength of which the young girl was confined to a lunatic asylum. She did not remain there long. Her lover, with the aid of John Burns and other prominent men, secured her release. The commissioners in lunacy found her sane, and rebuked the alienist for his countenance of the outrage. The evidence of insanity consisted in her determination to live with a man in a station of life much below her own; in her declaration that marriage is chattel slavery; in her saying that she did not fear desertion or any other consequence, since she could earn her own living in some way or other; and in similar extraordinary things which took away the breath of the alienist. In explanation of his conduct he said subsequently: "She seemed unable to see that the step she was about to take meant utter ruin. If she had said that she contemplated suicide, a certificate might have been signed without question. I considered that I was equally justified in signing one when she expressed her determination to commit 'social suicide.' Most of the English papers were vigorously protesting against the outrage, and denouncing the system under which it can be perpetrated. They are demanding revocation of the lunacy laws and abolition of medical "letters de cachet." The right of Miss Lancaster to dispense with marriage is stoutly defended, even by those who regard her act as a "moral wrong." The "Saturdav Review" and the "Spectator" are among the protesters. The former says: "The notion of equal justice for all, without distinction of sex, seems scarcely to have dawned on a considerable section of the community. A man can deliberately dispense with the ceremony of marriage without the slightest interference; in a woman it seems to be regarded virtually as a madness. According to this reasoning the weakly genius of George Eliot and the strong, clear common sense of Mary Wollstonecraft, would not have sufficed to save them from the charge of insanity, and they would, in Dr. Blandford's opinion, be fit inmates of a lunatic asylum, because they deliberately choose to practise what he calls social suicide."
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"In seeking real and lasting, the last objects of old-time duty, the Revolution demanded of us the record of the executioner, the oak of the constable, the club of the policeman, the cramp-knife of the department clerk, all those insignias of Politics, with which 'liberty proclaims her hood.'"—Puritan.

LESSONS OF THE ALLEGED REACTION.

In politics, religion, and philosophy there is said to be a reaction from the tendencies of the past several decades. Conservatism is alleged to be in the ascendant. The Tories are in power in England. Kitch and Balfour and Drummond are the recognized philosophical leaders, while Spencer and Huxley and Tyndall are being relegated to the rear. Individualism economics is totally out of date, and the governmentalists hold sway. In short, whichever way we turn, we find, it is alleged, a powerful "stream of tendency" towards the recrudescence of pre-evolutionary ideas and doctrines. Are we, then, really entering upon an era of reaction?

Doubtless there are some surface manifestations which biased observers, with foregone conclusions to support, can use as a basis for this "reaction" theory. But the significance of the facts observed is absurdly exaggerated, and several of the supposed reactions are but the direct result of the fact that we have been issuing the same old unchanged material. Indeed, the very men who regale us with vivid explanations of the decadence of realism are often found among the severest critics of the romantic novels, to which they deny all literary value, all claim to enduring worth. The novels that live are all realistic, though, of course, not all realistic novels live. Realism as a principle has never been more firmly established than it is today.

There is considerable truth in the talk about the revolt from bourgeoisie individualism or Manchesterism. This story is not new, however, and there is no occasion to repeat it. State Socialism, Tory "social reform," trade-union politics, and so on, are all manifestations of the revolt against Manchesterism, a revolt which has completely demoralized the surviving adherents of the naive school. The revolt, however, has been barren of positive results, and a reaction from governmental economics is now beginning to be discernible.

Among those who make it requires them to see revolt everywhere is Frederic Harrison, the Positivist. He has been pointing out, in a "Fortnightly Review" article, the "lessons" of the universal reaction. The readers of his article know he finds fault with his lessons are. The adoption of the Relative Synthesis of the Religion of Humanity would dissipate all our philosophical doubts and practical perplexities.

A new religion, a new social order, and a new literature would unite to emancipate us. Now, Positivism has been analyzed in a masterly manner by Spencer and other thinkers, and there is no use in threshing a dead horse; but I must repeat that the demoralizing the farrago of lazy nonsense which Mr. Harrison gives us as a summary of his case.

Here is what he writes:

We believe that we have hold of some cardinal principles of practical value and profound reach. Such is the idea of the relative synthesis, i. e., the religious philosophy which makes this earth its essential centre, and Humanity the true Providence of this earth, real, but limited, and sufficient degree. Next is the idea of a scientific religion, and a religious science, based on that relative synthesis of Nature, Man, his knowledge and his powers. Next come the idea of order, and in the formation of society, as shown in history, to be regarded as the basis of all social property—property, family, sex, marriage, the education of the young, the government of society by trained and competent chiefs, the spiritualization of society by trained and competent teachers, forming a real and organized Church. Lastly, the idea of a social utopia to be achieved, by insurrection and the break up of antiquated institutions, but by uprooting the poisonous material idea of selfishness; the selfishness of the poor as much as the selfishness of the rich; the selfishness of the weak as well as the selfishness of the strong.

The extraordinary thing about this is the calm assumption that the numerous minor "ideas" which the Positivists entertain under the leading four ideas as presented by Mr. Harrison are so absolutely and demonstrably so-niled that, in order to accept them, one has but to learn what they are. As a matter of fact, nothing could be more empty than all this vague and arbitrary division of phenomena into the groups of Progress, Order, etc. Mr. Harrison's emphasis on the formulas Progress and Order is simply droll. Who has ever admitted that his own position excludes either of these "ideas"? The trouble is that there is a hopeless conflict as to the meaning of the terms progress and order, and for anybody to come
Spencer and George.

To the Editor of Liberty:

Liberty of September 21 has just come to hand, and I note your comments upon my article in the \"Westminster Review\" for the same month. From those comments I conclude that you have not read my article with your usual, or even a fair amount of, carefulness. Perhaps this may account for your not finding that clearness and force in it which some of my English friends do find. Anyhow, you have certainly missed the scope of the first part of the article; and that misstatement is not, I think, to be traced to any fault of mine. If, therefore, you can find me space for correction on this matter, your readers may perhaps find the article worth attention; more especially as you consider it \"valuable on account of its emphasis of the distinction between economic rent and monopolistic rent, and for its criticism of the Single Tax.\"

First, however, you are right in supposing that the article is \"omitted from the table of contents on the cover,\"—at least as far as the London edition is concerned,—and it is strange if it is omitted from the New York edition.

Now, by a negative movement of the mind, the Single Tax idea has been much reinforced, and the Anarchistic solution of the social question may be held by one of the philosophical books that every pretense to philosophy.—viz., \"A Perplexed Philosopher,\" by Henry George. This I believe to be only temporary. For the book will eventually be the center of the discussion, in which the power may have had as a philosopher. Its object was to prove Spencer to be \"a conscious and deliberate traitor, who assumes the place of the philosopher, the office of the judge, only to darken truth and destroy; to sell out the right of the wrong and to prostitute his powers in defense of the wrong.\" It also intimates that Spencer has become that traitor and liar, and even something more, as a direct result of abandoning his faith in a secular creed. The defense of Spencer, then, becomes a defense of free thinkers generally against one of the most infamous imputations that pious fraud has been able to launch against the existence of belief in God implies moral and intellectual dishonesty and debasement.

The primary object of the article, then, was to answer the question of whether Spencer's changed attitude on the land question could be accounted for by a corresponding change in his fundamental principles of philosophy, or whether, as Henry George would have it, that change could not be put down to the \"different and conscious treachery, on the part of Spencer, in the interest of \"St John and His Grace.\"

I think I have shown clearly enough that the change of position on the land question is quite in accordance with the development of Spencer's wider philosophical group of later years, and that the cry of \"traitor\" can come only from those who misunderstand the general purport of his philosophy.

But, in deputising, I have made no attempt at defending Spencer against the charge of inconsistency, and your statement to your readers that I have failed in such defense, is, therefore, misleading; unconsciously so, no doubt, but misleading all the same.

No, indeed, I believe him that in several places I have charged him with fundamental inconsistency, and said that, \"largely as a result of this inconsistency, he has not been able to explain his somewhat changed landownership.\" Again, in the first paragraph of the article in question, I say: \"Take Mr. Spencer's utterances on the land question, and compare them with some fundamentals of his philosophy, and you will find him more very consistent in treating them with some other fundamentals of his philosophy, and he will be found to be very inconsistent. Further, where Spencer's philosophy is faulty, there it best supports the arguments of the landowners.\" Where it is found to be thoroughly supports his present position, although, as I shall show, it is almost by so far the matter more squarely from a point of view, although, although tied to an indescribable limit, in order to make it is clear, then, that I have not attempted to defend Spencer against the charge either of inconsistency or of uncorrectness. As regards inconsistencies, I have said, \"in giving the solution of the land question, as somewhat unconsciously, Spencer, we shall have to accuse him of an omission that is only excusable when we remember the huge task he has undertaken and accomplished, and the service he has rendered to the art of sociology.\"

I do not think I am incorrect in saying that Spencer has somewhat unconsciously falsified the true solution of the land question. The fact that he has not retreated from his abstract premise that equity does not permit private property in land shows only that he is inconsistent and confused, and not that he has not unconsciously given us the solution. If you will turn to \"Justice\" (sec. 54), you will see that he gives his orthodox picture of land as used without rent and without ownership other than that of use and possession, and that he says this form of ownership is the only condition under which the rights of property are in accordance with the law of equal freedom. That Mr. Spencer holds other opinions that deny this, and that he does not bear the chaster in his arguments, is not to say that he has not unconsciously indicated the true solution; indeed, \"unconsciously\" implies some such contradictory positions.

Sincerely yours,

J. ARMSDEN.

64 Somerset Road, Southsea, England.

[By all means, let the readers of Liberty procure and peruse Mr. Armsten's article. It is valuable and instructive, in spite of the lack of clearness of expression which makes the reader at times strained, by a careful reading, to delve it. To be specific, Spencer's inconsistencies and perplexity with regard to the land question are not brought out properly, and the case against him is not presented as strongly as Mr. Armsten might (and ought to) have presented it. True, he devotes considerable space to a defence of Spencer's character against George's bilious accusations, and that was worth doing, I dare say; but certainly Mr. Armsten's method does not convey the impression that his primary object was to discuss the question of Spencer's alleged treachery. As for the statement that Spencer has unconsciously indicated the true solution of the land question, I have no exception to take to it in the light of the numerous qualifications and explanations now offered by Mr. Armsten. I cannot agree with him that Spencer has \"given us the true conditions of land usage,\" for nowhere does Spencer, in his \"abstract\" reasoning on the subject, favor anything but community ownership and control. From first to last he has insisted that equity infers private property in land, while in the \"Social Statistic\" he advocated the collection of rent from the community from individual holders. In his constructive portion Mr. Armsten is rather vague, and I regretted that he had not improved his opportunity better. As he called his article \"a liberty search-light on the land question,\" it was natural to expect greater force and clearness in his presentation of the true solution as deduced from fundamental principles. However, my paragraph was not written in any spirit of unfriendliness, and fault-finding is not a pleasant thing. Mr. Armsten's article can do nothing but good, but he is capable of writing one still more productive of desirable results. [EDITOR LIBERTY.]\n
Mr. Lloyd's Departure.

My friend and whiffler comrade, Mr. Wm. Lloyd, has put away the unlearned thing. In the last issue of Liberty but one he solemnly declared to its readers that he was done with Anarchism,—that henceforth he is no Anarchist, but a Free Socialist. And his avowed purpose in taking this step is to distinguish himself from me. Mr. Lloyly, though denying property in babies, evidently believes in property in Anarchism. He regards me as the owner of Anarchism, able to make it and unmake it. In his view I am Anarchism's accredited head, and, if I say that Anarchism means a certain thing, that settles it. Now, it is no new thing for me to be called the pope of the Anarchistic church by Communists, State Socialists, and bigoted persons who find it impossible to conceive of a school of philosophy as the simple intellectual association of a band of students drawn together by the much that they hold in common. These people are so filled with the church idea that they cannot look upon a positive expression of opinion as other than the issue of a papal decree. They make no distinction between Credo and Crede. But I have hitherto regarded Mr. Lloyd as too thorough an individualist to ignore this distinction. It seems that I was mistaken.

I am not the owner of Anarchism. I do not believe in property in ideas. Anarchism existed before me, as it will exist after me. I can interpret it only for myself. No one else can interpret it for me. As the man who, having once adopted the name as expressive of his views, thereafter abandons the name, not because he has abandoned his views, or because he no longer considers the name expressive of them, but because some one else has adopted it as expressive of different views, to that extent denies his own individuality, and recognizes the superior right of another. I neither recognize such superiority in another, or claim it for myself. I consider that Mr. Lloyd is entitled to his interpretation of Anarchism as I am entitled to mine, and that he thereby becomes the owner of a name, no more monopolizable of any portion of the vocabulary than is one (but only one) of the motives that have prompted my refusal to be driven from the name Anarchist by the action of the Communists in adopting it. I have been steadfast in the statement that in my view the Communists are not Anarchists, always acknowledging at the same time their liberty to deny that I am an Anarchist. And it seems to me that Mr. Lloyd would have done better to content himself with maintaining that his own views are Anarchistic and that mine are not than to acknowledge my exclusive right to interpret
Anarchism. I fancy that the criticism I now pass upon him he would have passed upon Mr. Yarros, had that gentleman discarded me and my work because he at one time could not agree with me regarding the bearing of the doctrine of equal liberty on the copyright question. And yet, if the disagreement with me regarding property in babies disqualifies one for Anarchism, I do not see why disagreement with me regarding property in ideas is not a similar disqualification.

I admit, of course, that the difference is radical between Mr. Lloyd's position and mine upon the question whether rights originate in contract. But I cannot understand how my position should at this late day so suddenly turn his stomach. I have been expounding it in these columns for years, and in the baldest terms, and Mr. Lloyd never has he may have disagreed with it, has never on that account shown any disposition to pack up his traps and be off. Yet he admits that my position on the child question is a perfectly logical conclusion from my view of the origin of rights. Why he should have been willing to abide with Anarchism all these years in spite of this general, only to inconveniently flee from it at the first mention of a particular which this general includes, is one of those mysteries which eludes the human understanding. I am reminded by it of a conversation which I had one Saturday night at a soda fountain in New York. It had been rumored that Roosevelt would enforce the next day the law against the sale of soda on Sunday, and the woman who served me broached the subject which everybody was then discussing. As I did not exhibit sufficient indignation to suit her, she asked me with some asperity whether I favored such a law. I assured her that it was quite impossible for me to do so, since I would like to see the statute-books wiped out altogether. Then her curiosity got the better of her indignation, and she asked me, "If there were no laws, what would you do do with yourself?" I told her that I considered law the great manufacturer of criminals, and that in the absence of law crime would eventually disappear. "But," she responded, "it wasn't the law that made that Italian over on the east side stab a woman who refused to marry him." "Certainly it was," said I; "clearly there would have been no stabbing, had there been no marriage law." You should have seen the woman lift her hands in horror. "No marriage law?" she cried; "is it possible that you would have no marriage law?" My unwillingness to have any laws at all had caused her only a mild curiosity, but my unwillingness to have a marriage law shocked her immeasurably. She, like Mr. Lloyd, was lacking in that "almost superstitious reverence for logic" which enables me to see the general as vividly as the particular.

Another criticism to be passed upon Mr. Lloyd's accession is that it fails to accomplish its purpose. It does not distinguish him from me. He has taken the name of Free Socialist. But I took that name long ago, and he will be confounded with me still. And in addition he will be confounded with Socialists of all schools, even State Socialists. The influence which by itself is so anxious to be understood are as incapable of distinguishing between State Socialism and Free Socialism as between Mr. Lloyd's view of contract and my own. The reformer who expects to avoid misunderstanding had better quit the business. Certainly no name will protect him from it. The fact that Mr. Lloyd still agrees with me on nine practical matters out of every ten allied him with me in the public mind in a way which no mere nominal distinction ever did.

Mr. Lloyd protests that he appeals to no one to follow him in his defection; but clearly he expects that there will be a large and general defection on the part of others, else, what meaning is there in his assertion that I have dealt the death-blow to philosophical Anarchism? This assertion is not warranted by the evidence thus far given. Unless my memory errs, the names of those whose criticisms of my position on this question have already appeared in Liberty include all but one of the Anarchists from whom I have received, either by private letter or otherwise, expressions of an adverse view. On the other hand, I have received numerous letters from Anarchists heartily endorsing my position, some of them from men who admitted that at first they were inclined to consider the position an absurd one, but, by reading the controversy, had been convinced of its soundness. Were I to mention the names of these writers, Mr. Lloyd would be forced to admit their weight, and in the writer of one letter, expressing condemnation of Mr. Lloyd's secession, he would recognize one of his close friends. So far as I can now judge, the number of Eugenists and Archists, among Liberty's readers, who do not accept my position is a very small one, perhaps not exceeding half a dozen. Now, Mr. Lloyd surely will agree that the average Anarchist is superior to the average man, and that the tendency of progress is to lift the latter to the level of the former. How, then, can he declare that modern civilization will never accept a doctrine which is already accepted by so large a proportion of the men whom he has been in the habit of considering as in the van of civilization?

But this aspect of the matter is scarcely worthy of attention. I trust that Mr. Lloyd is sufficiently acquainted with the facts to know that, though my comrades were to go with him in a body, the fact, while unquestionably it would greatly diminish my power, would not alter the direction of my course one hair's breadth. When, over fourteen years ago, I began the publication of Liberty, I was almost alone; if necessary, I can begin again quite alone. Though I am older now than I was then, and am beginning to know something of the "weariness" which Nietzsche so forcibly described in a passage that Mr. Schumacher has so tactfully translated for this issue, it is neither a young man yet, still ready to examine anew the results of my intellectual labors, nor do not "find it necessary to make them palatable and attractive and to remove their dryness, coldness, and tastelessness." My spirit has not so far aged as that I seek "stalwart partisans" rather than "genuine disciples," or am unable to "endure the terrible isolation in which every progressive and soaring spirit lives." My tired friend Lloyd may brand me an enemy of the people; I spit upon "the compact majority," and "stand alone, the strongest man." He may "deem my death; I will "prove" that I am just beginning to live.

It was an old rule of law that a man who is assaulted by another must submit to the assault and "retreat to a wall." In a recent Ohio case, Judge Arnold declared that this rule has been superseded by one more consonant with modern views of individual rights. The new rule is stated as follows: "A person who is attacked may oppose force by force and advance in his own defence, if he deems it necessary. Persons are no longer under an obligation to submit to a beating when by defending themselves they may avoid harm.

In my article on Mr. Lloyd in this issue I could deal only with his departure; in my next I will meet his specific arguments on the child question, and probably also those of Mr. Badcock, whose letter in this number will be followed by another two weeks hence.

A School of Liberty.*

[Beginned Laroze in Le Magasim Internationa.]

When, fifty years ago, the Catholic university was founded at Louvain, Belgium, Theodore Verhaegen and a few other advocates moved to the Liberal University of Brussels. The beginnings of this institution were brilliant; learned professors and independent minds composed the faculties; they knew how to live. Unfortunately, the professors were not the directors of the institution; it was administered by a council made up of the most authorized and straight laced doctrinaires. This governing body laid down the primitive ideas of the university, which became in time an institute where the petits bourgeois, whose beliefs could not be troubled, were educated for future bishops. If, for the form and to appear to follow the aims and ideals of the universe, and hence to conciliate the favor of the professors, tolerated some liberals, they suffered them with difficulty, and used their best efforts to prevent adding to the faculties any colleagues imbued with radical or larger doctrines than those already old enough in 1848, which were taught at Brussels. It was the students that first reacted against this state of things; I mean to say, a group of students, for the mass as usual followed where they led. They rebelled several times against some professors, who would have considered M. Guizot a revolutionist. These tumults had their apogee at the suspension of M. Eliee Reclus's lectures. The administrative council of the Brussels university had given a chair of geography to Elise Reclus at the instigation of one of the liberal professors, who, without doubt, never understood why his advice had been followed. But just at this time the Anarchist agitation manifested itself by a series of ostatices at Paris. The council did not hesitate to hold the asylum whom they had called to the professorship responsible for these acts, and the course of M. Reclus was adjourned.

This was the signal for a revolt of the students and some liberals of Brussels. Meetings were held, addresses delivered, manifestoes distributed, and resolutions passed. This movement was terminated by the resignation of the rector (president), who was the proponent of this unorthodox appointment. He was replaced by one of the foremost and most authoritative doctrinaires. The students were summoned to re-enter the pale, but, as the agitation increased on account of this, the university was provisionally closed. Immediately, in the rooms of Masonic lodges and other places, courses were opened, notably that of M. Eliee Reclus. Confronted with these manifestoes, the dispossessed university professors, driven by a patriotic and patriotic attitude; promises were made to the students; the council allowed them to think that reforms would be begun; the university again opened its doors; and everything appeared to be arranged. The crisis seemed to be adjourned. Six weeks passed; it was recognized finally that nothing would be changed in this "citadel of doctrinairism."

There were some men who at last understood that it was necessary to enlarge the question, to neglect petty quarrels, to aim higher, and to erect a school of Lib-

* Translated for Liberty by Belle V. Coale.
Anarchist Letter-Writing Corps.

The Secretary wants every reader of Liberty to send in his name for enrollment. Those who do so thereby commit no breach of faith with the society, and in no way infringe on the liberty for which they stand. And to notify the secretary promptly in case of any failure to write to a target (which is hoped will not occur), and to withdraw from the work of the Corps. All members of the society are the official representatives of the society.

Address: Stephen T. Hirsykon, Flushing Institute, Flushing, N. Y.

It appears, now, that some statesmen of the Corps do not read the heading of this column often enough to keep in mind what is expected of them as members. If they will look up at it for a moment, they will see that they are not pledged to write letters on that particular branch of Anarchism that I may have in any case, or to take the Anarchist side of any question that may be raised, or to write at any length; but they are pledged to write letters to each of the targets of the section, and especially to the people of each of the society.

I, therefore, feel justified in saying that the secretary of the society is not the person to be consulted in this matter, and that he will not have the means of providing the necessary information of the secretary of the corps for any acceptable uses.

It seems to me that the society is a true representative of the people, and that it is not possible for me to say anything that would be of any use.

Section II.-The "Chronicle," Chicago, III., said in an editorial on November 12.
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The Blazing Star.
When men who fight for Freedom gaze
Across the tempest of the days
And view the tumult of the strife
Between them and the Blazing Star,
They reach and clasp each other's hands,
And, gazing on that far rich light
Now shining over distant lands,
They pass into the dangerous light.
And may they conquer! May the peace
They wish to bring be theirs, attained
The triumph of gaunt war's sucession
The earthly paradise regained!
And, cheering them amid the fray,
A bright light beckons them afar,
The herald of the rising day,
The glimmer of the Blazing Star.

No time for dalliance! plung forth
The keen edged knife and stand in front
Of him who strikes the living Truth;
The time has come to heal the brunt.
The boy, the childhood of life,
Let them enjoy who wish or can;
But men must face the raging strife;
The time has come to be a man.

Come down, 0 comrades, from the height,
And you many, did you dare!
For hopped in luxury's delight
Are legions whom the trumpet's blast
Shall call into this holy cause;
For men shall leave the lover's lute
To join the armies of all war,
The fight for Freedom absolute.

To many who in divers ways
Now try with tools the plough grows tame.
The course of Fate for no man stays, And these shall surely see their shame.
The preaching of the common lie,
The teaching of the thing unfair,
Can little serve to satisfy
A spirit of the upper air.

No man can see the light and fail.
To follow; none can look afar,
Beholding where the heavens grow pale.
The glimmer of the Blazing Star.
Save in his heart begins to burn
A reflex of that sternely fire;
He cannot waver, flinch, or turn;
He must advance, he must desire.

They call us dreamers just because
We cannot dream, but needs must see
With sane eyes nature's steadfast laws
That starry fire of celebrity.
The modish triflers, sold and bought.
Can never cleave through our defence;
Their erudite illusions touch us not,
Or their delusive eloquence.

And you, O comrades, who allow
Life with the flags of lust and drink
Now, in a band of rangers, toy
With trifles, lynched on the brink
Of dissolution, lift your eyes
And know your enemies, and strong
With urgent indignation rise,
And burst the bonds enforced so long.

Swarm upward from the swamps of sin.
Whose dread maladriums numbs the brain,
And this new wholesome life begin
Of action on the breezy plain
Of thought where intellect is power.
Gaze onward, eastward, and afar,
And you shall follow from this hour
The red light of the Blazing Star.

What greater life, what grander claim,
Than that which bids you to be just?
What brighter halos, fairer face,
Than shines above the sacred dust
Of him who, formed of finer clay,
Stood firm, a hero of revolt
Against the weakness of his day,
The thief's rose's trick, the panders fault?

O Blazing Star of Liberty!
Ideal of the heart and brain
Of him who battles to be free,
The Vision of the surely sane;
The far "happiness, the life
Of heaven's poetic peace,
The normal desuetude of strife
And servitude—content, release.

In that far country underneath
The influence of Freedom's star
Where Virtue wears the laurel wreath
And ease and sweet contentment are,
Though now the path that brings atone,
Our children's children yet may rest,
And even we this guardian gain;
The thought—the hope itself is best.

As he who wakens in the night
From some dread nightmare, and with joy
Finds himself safe, and all his fright
The fabric of a dream's annoy,
So shall the martyrdomed race
Awake in from its toil and truth
To meet, with rapture, face to face
The blindly present of the Truth.

In that country there will be
No rule of ignorance, no curse
Of malcontents falsely vengeful
Urged on by knaves from bad to worse.
The powerless demagogue will sink,
Fret, broken from the light of day;
For in a land where men can think
No man can make a man's prey.

O glorious Nature! when to you
And your embraces we may turn,—
The green low toy under heaven blue,
And all things for which mortals yearn;
To fountains flashing in the light,
The roses bending in the air,
The splendor of the starryilot,
And grace and beauty everywhere.

How sweet, beneath the blooming trees,
To lie upon the grass grown earth,
To listen among birds and bees
With hearts fulfilled of joy and mirths!
Without a sorrow or a care,
Save those which no lot can ignore;
For peace and justice habit iron
The man-contents are no more.

The man-compeilers! birds of prey
Promethean virtues that must know
The pleasure of the summer's day,
That keep our lives units and raw;
Afronted, our existence flees,
And life and beauty past is gloom;
Robbed of our heritage of peace,
We hasten onward to the tomb.

A life of pleasure? if to be
Pleased in to love the sunshine's flush,
The flashing wilderness of sun,
The midnight moonlight's heavenly hush.
A life of love and beauty is
Is good who loves the beautiful;
A life of beautiful purity
If pure is to be natural.

A life of wisdom: if the wise
Are those who, from illusions free,
Adore no man-made mysteries,
But reason from the things they see;
Who could not, even if they would,
Hug some delusion of desire,
But name the living Truth their good,
And let the lie bid the liar.

This is the Bugle's Blare: it calls
For heroes who can bear the storm
Of men whom novelty appalls,
Of scoffers in the clouds of dawn
Of equity, but love the old,
However vile, and hate the new,
With hearts of custom long grown cold
To what they deem men cannot do.

This is the Trumpet's Call: it sounds
For such as weary of the night,
Of shame, and gaze beyond the bounds
Of habit, and discern the light
Of our Ideal: who can see,
Beyond the realms of old fields of war.
Above the home of Amherst,
The red beams of the Blazing Star.
William Wilfred Gordon

The Philosopher and Old Age.
[Translated from Nietzsche's "Morgenröth" by George Schum.] It is not prudent to permit the evening to sit in judgment on the day: for in that case weariness too often becomes the judge of success, strength, and good will. And likewise the greatest caution ought to be observed in regard to old age and its judgment of life, especially since old age, like the evening, loves to masquerade in the garb of a new and charming moral- lity, and is able to shame the day by the glory of the sunset, the twilight, and peaceful and expectant stillness. The reverse of the region which we treat an old man, especially if he is an old thinker and sage, easily f'ills us to the yoking of his spirit, and it is always necessary to draw from their hiding place the characterisation of such aging and weariness; that is, to draw forth the physiological phenomenon back of the moral and prejudices, in order not to become the foe of reverence and the injurers of knowledge. For of all the old man enters into the illusion of a great moral renewal and rebirth, finds from this experience, and judgments on the work and course of his life as if he had only now become elisoyant; and yet there stands back of this self satisfaction and these confident judgments, as a prompter, not wisdom, but weariness. As the most dangerous characteristic of weariness, we may name the belief in their praise which at this period of life is apt to possess great and meditative intellects—the belief in an exception—position and exceptional rights. The thinker who is thus affected will now regard it as his privilege to take things more easily, and as a man of genius to deride rather than demonstrate; but it is probable that the very desire for rose, which springs from the weariness of spirits, is the most fruitful source of that belief; it precedes the belief in itself, without regarding all appearance to the contrary. Then, at about this period of life, in accordance with the love of enjoyment of the old and weary, one wishes to enjoy the results of one's intellectual labors, instead of examining them anew and again scattering them abroad, and to this end finds it necessary to make them palatable and attractive and to remove their dryness, coldness, and tastelessness, and thus it happens that the old thinker apparently rises above the work of his life, while in reality he is destroying it by mingling it with reveries, daydreams, splendid, poetical figments, and real facts. At the end was the case with Plato: this at the end was deceit with that great and sincere Frenchman who, in comprehensible and masterful grasp of the positive sciences, remains unrivaled by any German or Englishman of this century. It is the third characteristic of weariness: the ambition which stormed in the breast of the great thinker in the days of his youth, and which at that time could not anywhere find contentment and rest, that has now also grown so weak, like one who no longer has any time to lose, sets upon the corner and more readily means of satisfaction,—that is, those of the active, commanding, violent, aggressive nature; from the delightful work forth he desires to found institutions which shall bear his name, and no longer intellectual edifices. What cares he now for the airy victories and honors in the realm of demonstration and refutation? What cares he for the enthusiasm in books, the thinking within the soul of a reader? The institution, on the contrary, is a temple,—he knows this perfectly well,—and a temple of enduring stone will keep his God alive much more certainly than from the sacrificial offerings of rare and tender souls. Perhaps he will also find now for the first time that love which belongs more to a god than a man, and, like the fruit in autumn, his whole nature becomes more mellow under the rays of such a sun. Yes, he grows more godlike and beautiful, the great old man; and nevertheless it is old age and weariness which permit him to thus mature, become still, and, it rest in the radiant identity of a
woman. It is now all over with his former obstinate, self-overpowering desire for genuine disbel—, that is, genuine continuers of his thought,—that is, genuine opponents; that desire grew out of his unbroken struggle, out of the constant pride that he could himself yet become the opponent and inveterate foe of his own teaching; now his call is for stalwart partisanship, unsubduing comedies, auxiliaries, heralds, a pamphlet following. No longer can he now endure the terrible isolation in which every progressive and soaring spirit lives; henceforth he surrounds himself with the objects of reverence, of community, of ten- der unions at all times and at all things. He has come forth, like all religious souls, to be indissolubly united within the community the things of his esteem; yes, he will invent a religion only to have the community. Thus lives the wise old man, and so drifts imperceptibly into some deplorable path of the happiest conditions that one hardly dares recall his wise and serious youth, the then severe integrity of his intellect, his truly manifold thread of fancies and vagaries. If he compared himself to man, in order in so truly matchless weakness against his strength, and to become colder and freer towards himself: now he does it only to intoxicate himself in the comparison with his own decision. Formerly he con- templated with confidence his coming thinkers; it was with rapture that he saw himself disappear in their fuller light; now he is tormented by the thought that he cannot be the last; he meditates on the means of coupling together and all will leave him, and kind with a limitation on their sovereign thought; he fears and shudders the pride and the thirst for liberty of the individual spirits; after him no one shall any more give his intellect for himself wishes forever to remain standing as the bulwark against which alone the breakers of thought may still be; these are his secret, perhaps not always secret, wishes! But the hard fact behind such wishes is that he has called a bolt before his own teaching, and made it of a boundary stone, his "so far and no farther." By thus reviewing himself, he has also cer- tified his own death; henceforth his spirit may no longer desire his work to be his time forever be an end. When a great thinker undertakes to impose himself as a binding institution upon future mankind, one may safely assume that he has passed the summit of his strength, and is very weary, very next to his sunset.

On the Status of the Child.

My dear John.

That you should have taken any language of mine as an attack upon your personality (as you do in Liberty, September 21) disturbs me sorely. I beg you to disbelieve the idea that I would knowingly offend you, to whom I am only thinking of the emotional, educational, political course of politics the press affords. My con- demnatory epithets were not hurled against anyone who merely held to a particular belief, but against those only who acted out the particular belief that was revolting to me. The word "Christian" as a term of abuse is, as a matter of fact, a quite correct description of those human beings who imitated such a god by burning unbelievers at the stake, yet I should not consider I was attacking the "personality" of my reli- gious friends by such language. My weightiest argu- ment could not have been put in so long. Probably many of the inquisitors of the middle ages would have been kind men, but for the badness of their reasoning powers or the hugeness of their ignor- ance which makes it impossible for them to see ings at the detention of their reason. Rome was their reason.

Until I hear that B. R. Tucker has actually, by deed, up to his parent, I consider this thoughtlessly abused child. I do not believe him capable of so doing, any professions of his to the contrary notwithstanding. As a fact, he has acknowledged that, rather than passively see a woman throw her baby into the fire . . . it is highly probable that I would interfere.

In your article of August 24 you wrote: "If we protect the life and liberty of organisms that are outside this limit of [the circle of those who have contract habitually for the advantage of their owners]." Well, without admitting the ownership, it is clear to me also, that, if we grant life and liberty to any persons who are weaker than ourselves, we do not show any respect for our own liberty or autonomy. It is easily seen to be the interest of adults to pro- tect all children and lower animals against equal cruelly, when you deal with adults whose sympathe- tic ignorance or weakness depends upon their combating all gross forms of cru- elty as far as in their power. I do not expect those who have no sympathies to allow any more freedom to others than is necessary to secure their own. If by "sympathy" you are discussing as to whether the Armenians are rightly the property of the Turks, or the Turks of the Armenians, or whether children are rightly the property of their mothers or of their fathers or of the state in which their deci- sions, made on such grounds as they can muster when the feelings—present and possible—of the parties owned or to be owned are left out of account, may be of value to the discussers, but to me are of no more in- terest than the play of "Hamlet" with the chief personage left out.

Your idea that in our political-social relations we should follow rules that could be voluntarily observed—by those who would be the owners of the future, and that therefore we should "inquire what the least sympathetic individuals will insist on as a condition of joining our association," is really a too salariety—"a self-satisfied sympa- thetician of my temper. On the other hand, I would not formulate rules that could only be observed by the most sympathetic people. When the least sympatheti- chie are in the ascendant, all have to knuckle down to the majority. If we reason from these premises, but I see no reason why we should so do when their power has gone. When the much, the more, and the most sympathetic people are in power, their require- ments for the defense of the state will be, that the least sympathetic will have to restrain their despotic in- stincts, or lose some of their liberty. The measure of freedom at any time obtainable is proportioned to the requirements of the lesser people. The unity has changed, and why their masters are not allowed to beat them to death. I look forward to those in power finding their pleasure and interest in maintaining a general policy of live and let live. Only while the central power has no idea of sympathy, and, while the power, the sympathetic need not expect even an approximation to equal liberty.

When my sympathies compel me to seek for means to antagonize atrocities, and I, consequently, go for equal immunity from invasion for all, I cannot possi- bly agree that doubtful cases, to which it is inexcipi- dent to give full liberty, shall therefore be debarred from the state. The true interest of the state is in the "owners" choose to subject them to. The extent to which people's abilities (whether ability to make con- tracts or ability to pick pockets) influence the original treatment of men was no great stage in the development of society forced upon them has nothing to do with the more widely existing statutes of liberty which later generations allow; for we have come to allow immuni- ty from invasion equally to the poor as to the rich (in theory at least), and toward this "to those who take advantage of the non-abilities (i. e., the weak)" of their destitutes. Men are not, nowadays, associate to secure liberty with only its orour ability to control others' liberty in return for having their own secured from them. This is the modern epoch is called "talisman epoch has passed, even for you, by the fact that the equal liberty limit you approve of (although for adults and juveniles who have passed a cer- tain stage in the development of their rights, the in- dependent development) is protective of many incapables, i. e., of many who are wholly unable to assist in securing others' liberty in return for having their own secured from them, you are at once brought to the realization that, of the interests of those who feel assistance (and therefore to give assistance) is dispensed with. The mere fact of an organism being able to represent the idea of a social contract, or any contract, especially when strain to include those with an idea of succession, is a wholly different thing from having the possession . . . of the power to contract; of the power to consciously and deliberately undertake to save another in return for another's promise, or response to another's request, which you said (on August 24) "determines the category in which any given organism belongs." As if a little girl who sobbed from her harsh parent had any power to cutl- tivate personal liberty.

The power to maintain one's liberty differs in degree very considerably—no two persons having equal powers. If individual liberty depended upon the power of the individual, equality of our power would fall in impossibility. Nietzsche's definition of liberty as "the will to power" is not the idea of liberty which An- archists aim at, so far as I know, although they rec-ognize that a state in which liberty is from molestation with liberty can only be maintained through indi- vidual power

The contract basis for equal liberty, as it rests upon the power to contract on an equal footing with others, can only be maintained that basis, and you are committed to Nietzsche's idea of a State in which a powerful aristocracy monopolize all the liberty, and keep in slavery all the proletariat.

However much the reciprocal obligations idea may have been of use in evolving the higher from the lower status, it is dispensed with whenever assistance is given by a strong person to a weak one. Although the sympathetic feelings receive satisfaction by such help, it is regulated by the requirement of wisdom, mili- tary or cruelty, that is only a negative benefit, and can not be construed as a reciprocal benefit by one who wishes the sympathies left out of account in determin- ing the result.

I grant we cannot treat children and the lower ani- mals as on an equal liberty-footing to ourselves. Nor, indeed, can we treat many men on that footing, espe- cially that we also try to claim and be entitled to a common question of expediency as to what measure of freedom we will allow those various classes of chil- dren, criminals, etc., we have in our control. To deny any protection to children would be paralleled by the denial of any protection to the free men. The question of cruel- possible treatment. But as with criminals, our humane instincts lead us to prevent excessive punishment being dealt "to us, and anything beyond what "fits the crime" arouses our indignation and leads us to side with the prisoner, so with children (who also are outside the full liberty status) we require that they be dealt with at least a moderate amount of respect.

You are all the more that "the force realm exists, not to meet the sympathies, but to protect the primary in- terests of those who constitute it," the question arises: what are these primary interests? Are they the same for all? I think they are not. The primary interests all come down to a satisfaction of the senses. The cry of a child who is about to be made into marmalade, is to be a spur to action in a cultured man against the aggressor, while a cannibal would either treat the same cry with indifference, or else in a manner appreciative of the approach of lunch-time. The satisfaction of one's own hunger is a primary interest to pretty well everybody, and to the sensuality of the body, while to the political interests equally, or more so, a primary interest. One of the chief, if not the chief, primary interests of mothers in the whole mammoth creation is the satisfaction of their political feelings in bringing a child young. Yet you ask your readers (mothers included, I pre- sume) to leave their sympathies entirely out of account in discussing the question of care (including owner- ship) of children? Why not leave all other prin- cipal interests out of account? Commit "mental sui- cide," in fact!

I have to thank you for correcting the opening paragraph of my last letter. Concerning protection for theetsy, I may be entirely misin- formed, and I admit my wording was too narrow. I amend the faulty passage thus: "The most reasonable plans for relief against aggressors or accidents find their corollary only in the protection, against the lives of which the sympathetic feelings form a most important quota amongst highly evolved races. Without these stimuli (feelings unaided) no plans would be posted forward. Tho amendment may not be quite as good as it was; for, to support the anti sympathetic.
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