On Picket Duty.

"Anarchy or Government?" is the title of a new book written by William M. Salter and published by T. Y. Crowell & Co. Mr. Salter is a fair and catholic writer, an intelligent critic, and a man who tries to understand the position of his opponents. His book is worth reading. It will be reviewed in Liberty with care and fulness by Mr. Yarro.

Comrade Gordak, of North Saltuate, Mass., in writing for some sample copies of Liberty for distribution, says: "The paper improves every year, and I am trying to interest a number of my friends in it. As times grow harder (as they surely will), more men than ever will begin to look around to see what is the matter. The old excuses will not satisfy all men forever. Not one-twentieth of the voters in the part of the town where I live went to the polls this fall. That must mean something." It speaks well for the influence of the author of "The Ballot" that nineteen-twentieths of his immediate neighbors have given up voting.

"Justice," the organ of the English Social Democratic Federation, assumes an attitude towards the Manchester case which, though strange at first sight, is really quite consistent with the fundamental principles of State Socialism. While agreeing in the abstract with Miss Manchester's view of marriage, "Justice" regrets her action, and deprecates all individual Anarchist revolt against any present social institution. Here it is its delicious words: "We are living in the world as it is; and, just as we Socialists cannot effectively enter our protest against capitalism by individual Anarchist action or personal revolt, so neither can we usefully determine that each of us shall go his or her way in business, in pleasure, and particularly in sexual intercourse, regardless of the harm which our behavior may do to others. We ought not to take a serious step of this kind, we say, without considering the injury we may do to our own comrades, to our immediate family connections, or—which is perhaps the most important point of all—to the children which we may bring into the world, who have no say as to the terms on which they shall be begotten." That is to say, until complete Socialism is established, and the whole machine is started by the central authority, no individual should presume to act upon his own judgment. It does not matter whether one is right or wrong; he must do nothing which will in any way tend to prejudice stupid folk against the "cause." He must subordinate himself and live "in the world as it is." He must follow the crowd; "personal revolt" is interdicted. Now, this is exceedingly wise teaching for State Socialism. To encourage any kind of personal initiative or revolt is to undermine the foundation of the future "State." People who will rebel now will rebel later, too. The individual must obey the majority, and, if he happens to disagree with it, he must wait till he converts, by "abstract reasoning" (how thankful we must be that thou is allowed!), this same hostile majority.

Judge Ingraham, of the New York supreme court, has made a striking decision in a case involving the question of a mother's right to her children. "No father," said the judge, "has a right to steal a child from the mother under any circumstances," and he continued as follows: "Modern civilization requires that the right of the mother be recognized. There is no longer that relic of barbarism which holds the wife as the slave of her husband. Marital slavery has been abolished. Who has borne the children and suffered for them?" Judge Ingraham is too sanguine, doubtless. It is true that, as the disposition of children is within the equity powers of courts, progressive judges can ignore the technical questions and decide in accordance with "modern civilization"; but it is equally true that a bigoted and reactionary judge would feel bound to respect "modern civilization"? A few swallows don't make summer, and a few liberal judges don't abolish marital slavery. The equity powers of courts can be, and have been, used as instruments of tyranny and slavery, particularly in industrial relations, and cannot be regarded as an effective shield.

Collectivists have a fine opportunity to expose the inconsistency and superficiality of the alleged individualists of the bourgeoisie press, and they will doubtless improve it. Chicago has, by a popular vote, adopted a modified form of the Australian "Torrens land title system," the essential feature of which consists in registration and guarantee by the State of the title to real estate. Simple registry, for a fee, carries the title under the guarantee of government. The government officials search titles, and once for all determine the question of ownership. The transfer of real estate and passing of title are rendered very easy,—a mere assignment of a certificate issued by the government being sufficient. The point that this arrangement is essentially State Socialist does not seem to have been raised with any clearness or force by any one in or out of Chicago. But the New York "Evening Post," in an editorial commenatory of the reform, dingly perceiving the difficulty, proceeds to explain it away as follows: "There are certain things which have been proved by experience to be what may be called commercial attributes of government. Civilization could not exist unless the centralized power controlled the issue of money; in like manner we expect the government, for the common good of all, to oversee banking and to assure so far as possible the insolvency of insurance companies. If it is granted that the ownership of land is a thing which, in the interest of everybody, ought to be made as easy and as certain as possible, and if it seems practicable to arrive at that desideratum in no other way, it becomes at once a question whether the oversight of government is not as proper as in the case of banking and insurance. This registering of title under government auspices is, as it is easy to see, a very different matter from the active employment of government in manufacturing, with which some would confuse it." Such loose talk about the conditions of civilization is just what State Socialists delight in, and they can make out a very strong case in favor of government control of industry than the "Post" can in favor of supervision of banking, insurance, and transfer of land titles. Note, however, the "Post's" significant "if." "If it seems practicable to arrive at that desideratum in no other way!" Is it not the business of these alleged individualistic organs to answer this very question? It is generally admitted that the title-guarantee companies have proved very successful, and, if their charges are somewhat higher than, perhaps, they ought to be, normal competition is certain to force a reduction in due course of time. Again, if a more perfect and universal system of insurance is desired, there is no obstacle in the way of accomplishing it by a cooperative and mutual system. Even the most confirmed collectivists cannot claim that there is any pressing necessity for government insurance of title; they merely allege general convenience and desirability. The absence of lack of intelligent opposition to this scheme throws light on the character of bourgeoisie individualism in the United States. It is merely another name for defence of privilege. It is only when monopoly is attacked that the cry of "let alone" is raised; when competition is interfered with and the functions of government are enlarged at the expense of genuine voluntarism, they are dumb. They have neither motive or intelligence for effective championship of principles.
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In sabhuling sent and studio, the last reign of old-time slavery, the sabbatical abode at one stroke the sword of the executioner, the soul of the judgment, the club of the policeman, the gage of the raidsmen, the creating-baby of the department clerk, all those ingredients of Liberty which young Liberty grudges beneath her deed. — Tocqueville.

The appearance in the editorial column of articles over some signatures to the editor would indicate that the editor approves their central purpose and general tenor, though he does not hold himself responsible for every phrase or word. But the appearance in other parts of the paper of articles by the same or other writers by no means implies that he disapproves them in any respect, such disposition of them being governed largely by motives of convenience.

A Consistent Christian Reformer.

In these days of triumphant hypocrisy and militant ignorance, when followers of the Prince of peace are shouting for war against the Chinese and the Turks, and ministers of the gospel, like Parkhurst, shrill for the speedy execution of boys accused of train-wrecking, it is refreshing indeed to meet with a true Christian who is intelligent and manly enough to accept the teaching of the gospel without quibbling reservations, and to insist on squaring conduct with the principles supposed to be the standard of our “Christian” civilization. I refer to Ernest H. Crosby, son of the late Dr. Howard Crosby an. president of the New York Social Reform. Tab. Mr. Crosby is a man of ability and earnestness. He has championed the cause of labor against legal usurpation and tyranny, and has advocated certain important constitutional reforms. Of late he has been engaging in the discussion of the principle of non-resistance in the literal and absolute sense in which Tolstoi presents it. He has prepared an exhaustive statement showing that all the recorded sayings and doings of Christ, with possibly one exception of by no means striking significance, on the subjects of life, liberty, property, and law or governmental authority, clearly and irresistibly point to the conclusion that absolute non-resistance to evil, contempt for all worldly interests, and the fullest freedom to do right or wrong are enjoined upon all Christians. No man of logical mind can read Mr. Crosby’s analysis and successively dispose his conclusions. So far as I am aware, no religious editor has attempted to refute Mr. Crosby. It would be extremely interesting to have the bloodthirsty Parkhurst and the jingoistic “Independent” engage in serious controversy with him.

During the late exciting campaign in New York, Mr. Crosby definitely abjured politics in a letter to a newspaper, from which I quote the following with great pleasure:

The fact is—and we shall all learn it some day—that the world will never be improved by ambitious men—that is, by politicians; nor by forces—that is, by governments. Politics is a selfish game, whether it be played at Westminster, St. Petersburg, or New York, and nothing is to be hoped from men engaged in such sport. To enter the field with them you must play their game, and true reformers had better keep out of it. On the other hand, reform by force by law courts and policemen is a long run to do more harm than good. We need a more delicate instrument than the right hand of violence to make the world better.

The perfected state, the kingdom of heaven of the gospels, cannot be manufactured by legislatures; it must be the outgrowth of a new life, and to awaken that life—in other words, to arouse the public conscience and call forth the unselfish devotion of individual men, and, through them, of society—is the proper business of reformers.

This is Tolstoi. It is Christian. It is logical, and follows strictly from the premises accepted by Mr. Crosby.

I hardly need state that I regard non-resistance as wholly unscientific, and Christian ethics as impracticable and undesirable. It has never been demonstrated that restraint and punishment are not a preventive of aggression, and hence loose and sentimental talk about love of one’s enemies and reform solely by moral means can have no effect on minds guided by purely scientific ideas and methods. To insist on equality of freedom, in the right to do “wrong” in non-invasive ways, is one thing; to insist on absolute freedom, on non-resistance to murder, robbery, and any personal violence, is a totally different thing. Scientific men are led to the former conclusion by purely logical processes; of the latter no one would now dream, were it not found in a book believed to be inspired, for there is nothing in experience, societary or individual, to justify it. The millions who profess to follow Christ in spite of their direct and constant disregard of this principle of non-resistance doubtless in some deep instinctive feel the utter impossibility of its application, and are to be blamed, not for this neglect, but for the ignorance or hypocrisy which leads them to pretend to be what they are not. If a man is a Christian, he is bound to be a non-resistance. Those who feel that they cannot accept this principle confess that they distrust Christ and cannot make him their guide. Mr. Crosby is a Christian; hence he is a non-resistance. Convince him that non-resistance is not possible or desirable, and he will renounce ChristianitY. He is not intellectual coward, nor is he a disciple of those transcendental philosophers to whom words mean nothing and everything.

The only attempt to overthrow Mr. Crosby’s position that has been made is found in an editorial in the “Voice,” which perceives that Mr. Crosby’s Christianity would do away with prohibitionism. The arguments of the “Voice” are, however, singularly weak and superficial. In the first place, it says:

The counsel to the disciples not to resist violence with force was undoubtedly a necessary precaution from a worldly standpoint in a handful of weake men, who, like the Christian missionaries in inferior China, were sure to bring about destruction upon themselves by any other than a passive course. And, moreover, the disciples also, we are told, were cowed with supernatural power.

The “Voice” is very religious, yet to what an insignificant place it relegated the Bible in this hypothesis. Instead of being a guide for all men at all times, it makes it a sort of pocket manual for the handful of disciples. What is its authority for this startling decree? All the passages collected by Mr. Crosby are plainly a addressed to all men and are meant for all men. Christ spoke to the disciples, but he laid down the law, not for them alone, but for the whole world. The Voice, ignoring all the evidence, seeks to avoid an inconvenient conclusion by inferring, and inferring gratuitously, that Christ meant the disciples alone instead of the world at large, which he came to redeem and save. To Mr. Crosby’s abundant proofs nothing is opposed by the “Voice” except a gratuitous assumption, an inference for which no ground can be shown! Who will be satisfied with such reasoning?

But the “Voice” tries to demolish Mr. Crosby by submisiong the “supreme test”:

If a man cannot rightly resist with force upon his person, can a woman resist such an assault upon her honor? Is it possible that Christ taught a doctrine that makes it a woman’s Christian duty to submit to any beast of a man that may assail her? Is this practice desirable? And yet, is this absolute non-resistance, as now promulgated, well founded, it must apply to such a case.

The answer to this is two-fold. Mr. Crosby can say to the “Voice”: “My dear fellow-Christian, your great difficulty should be brought, not to me, but to our common master and guide. I can but follow his clear teaching; I must apply common sense and logic to the interpretation of his words, but I cannot presume to challenge his principles. The only question is: am I right in my interpretation? Is it possible, is it reasonable, to interpret him otherwise? I say that it is not. His words and acts mean non-resistance and nothing else. I cannot escape that conclusion, and, if you do escape it, you must show better grounds than the baseless assumption you have just made.

There are, to be sure, difficulties in the way of non-resistance; it may indeed seem an unthinkable doctrine, but what have I to do with that? Christ knew what he was about, and we must believe him. Is non-resistance more unthinkable than the immutable conception, the trinity, the whole plan of redemption by sacrifice, and other Christian mysteries? Yet you profess to accept those, regardless of the protest of reason, simply because you cannot interpret the words relating to them in any other manner. You are bound to accept non-resistance for the same reason.”

In the second place, the “supreme test” is really no test at all. It is a comical illustration of the tendency of the illogical to strain at the particular after swallowing the general of which it is part,—a common occurrence. Tucker has recently had occasion to refer to Mr. Crosby calmly says that he favors absolute non-resistance to evil of any kind, and that he would not protect by force life or liberty or property. The “Voice” ears this without being startled. Suddenly a concrete and particular instance of evil or violence occurs to it, and it exclaims: “Ah! here is a supreme test! Would you have a woman submit to rape?” But isn’t rape merely a form of violence, and didn’t Mr. Crosby explicitly state that he was against resistance to theft or evil? Why is rape a “supreme test”? In view of the “Voice’s” logic, the wonder is that it did not make its test still more “supreme” by asking if, in Mr. Crosby’s view, a husband and wife should
refrain from resisting rape attempted upon the latter in the presence of the former? How unfortunate that the "Voice" did not hit upon this test? It would not have embarrassed Mr. Crosby more, but think of its effects on illogical readers!

An Unconscious Anarchist.

Rev. F. M. Foster, a New York Presbyterian clergyman, explains in the "Voice" a remark he made before the recent election, to the effect that a Christian cannot vote under present conditions. "If you cast a vote," he says, "you thereby declare that the will of the majority shall rule," and, if you are opposed to a certain thing and try to fight it at the polls, you tacitly agree to abide by the result. If you are defeated, you are bound to acquiesce in the decision of the majority, and have no cause for complaint.

This, of course, is eminently sound, but the "Voice" attempts to challenge the reasoning as follows:

It is very true that by voting we have expressed our willingness that the majority shall rule; but we have not expressed any agreement with the way in which it rules. We have agreed to submit to the will of the majority,—that is all,—since we can change it. Has not Mr. Foster done the same thing, even though he did not vote? Is he not submitting to that decree every day? The difference between us is that he submits without using his constitutional privilege to register his protest, while we have registered ours.

The distinction made by the "Voice" is purely verbal. No one implies that voting is equivalent to a final and absolute approval of the majority's way of ruling; the right to agitate further and try to change the opinions of the majority is, of course, not waived or surrendered. But non-voters have the same right; voting adds nothing to it. The voter consents that the majority shall rule him in its own way, until he succeeds in changing its views, and it is this consent which the Rev. Mr. Foster desires to withhold. How can he do it except by abstention? To say that the non-voter consents by his staying away is manifestly absurd, for he would follow that there is no way in which non-consent can be expressed or manifested.

Is it rational to say that the man who protests openly against an act and declines to have anything to do with the political machinery which others see fit to resort to does consent, after all? As for registering one's protest, the "Voice" omits to show that it is of any importance to register it by voting. There are other ways of doing it, and the whole contention is that those ways which do not involve acceptance of the principle of majority are superior.

There is more logic in the remarks next made by the "Voice." It says:

The position which Mr. Foster takes—and he speaks for a religious denomination—would render any system of government impossible. To accept his premises and conclusions is to make all form of social organization impossible, and the only recourse for him is to deny that there should be any government. Without knowing it, he is already a philosophical Anarchist.

Doubtless the "Voice" intended to say that Mr. Foster's position would render any form of compulsory social organization impossible, for it knows that Anarchism is not in-compatible with voluntary organizations of any kind. With this amendment, what it says is true.

Mr. Foster objects to majority rule, and to this rule there are no other alternatives than minority rule and no rule (Anarchy). As he cannot be construed to favor minority rule, he must hold the Anarchistic view of government. He is to be congratulated. It is to be hoped that he is logical and consistent enough to perceive that his warfare upon the saloon (since he wishes to destroy the saloon) must be confined to passive and non-aggressive methods. He may preach against it, denounce it, boycott it, but he may not use any force against it, open or disguised. Is this his real position?

Lloyd vs. Laughlin.

Prof. Laughlin, of the Chicago University, in referring to the charges growing out of the Bennis case, is reported as remarking that "whatever might be charged against some of the founders of the oil monopoly [Mr. Rockefeller], no one could say that he had accumulated his millions in any way that interfered with the accumulation of anybody else." Henry D. Lloyd promptly challenged this assertion in an open letter to the professor, in which he wrote as follows:

In 1885 the supreme court of Ohio found, as reported in volume 43 of the Ohio State reports, that the monopoly had a freight contract with the Lake Shore railroad "to keep the price down for the favored customer," for which he paid $2,000,000. The inevitable tendency and effect of this contract was to enable "this company to ruin all other operators and drive them out of business," and the court annulled the contract as "unlawful."

With the help of such unlawful contracts the capital of the oil monopoly has increased in thirty years from nothing to hundreds of millions of dollars. If this were not a public matter, you would not have discussed it at a public meeting and I therefore, to ask a question of you, as the head of one of the most important departments of political economy in the country.

If this way of accumulating millions by the help of unlawful contracts to ruin all other operators is not an interference with the accumulation of others, what is the "scientific" name for it, and for the kind of political economy which it commends for imitation to the young men and women of the country?

From the standpoint common, in this respect, to challenger and challenged, this question can be answered in but one way. Prof. Laughlin is bound to concur in the court's view, and to retract his assertion regarding the legitimacy of Mr. Rockefeller's methods.

For, while Prof. Laughlin is generally considered an individualist economist, his individualism, like that of so many others who take the name in vain, is confined to opposition to increased State interference in the interest of labor. He is not consistent or thoroughgoing, and would not question the soundness of such legislation as the interstate commerce act and such decisions as have been rendered by a number of judges in cases against trusts. Hence, acquiescing in the view referred to by Mr. Lloyd, he cannot escape the logical conclusion to which it leads.

But, while Mr. Lloyd has silenced Prof. Laughlin, he has not made out his case. He must surely be aware that there are many who reject the court's view, and who hold that contracts with railroads involving "favoritism" and discrimination are entirely legitimate.

There is usually some good business reason for what is loosely denounced as favoritism, and there is no warrant for depriving railroads of the freedom to do that which other traders do regularly and systematically,—"discriminate" in favor of better customers. The interstate commerce law is a piece of demagogic legislation, and decisions rendered under it are theoretically worthless. Hence, even if Mr. Rockefeller has accumulated his millions by the aid of railroad discrimination, there has been no improper interference with the accumulation of others. If that were the only charge, the defendant would have to be acquitted. Of course, the fact is that Mr. Rockefeller's millions have been accumulated under a system which prevents accumulation by all but a few; and, if he has not interfered with others, it is simply because the State has done it for him. But for monopoly and legal privilege with respect to natural opportunities and credit, he could not have accumulated his millions, while many of those who have been ruined or thwarted would be independent and prosperous.

Mr. Rockefeller's millions are not rightfully his, though personally he may be unconscious of wrong, improper direct action of anybody. It is the law which is constantly interfering to protect monopoly and keep down labor and industry, and against which attacks should be directed. Mr. Lloyd ought to see that the consequences of some of Mr. Rockefeller's perfectly legal acts—acts sustained by law, courts, churches, and public opinion—are far worse than the consequences of any of his illegal acts.

Defensive Association in Chicago.

A number of distinguished citizens of Chicago have formed an organization for protection against oppressive taxation. Other means having failed, they intend to appeal to the courts and public opinion for relief of taxpayers from special assessment frauds. They will also attempt to defeat by legal proceedings "ordinances corruptly or inconsistently passed" for alleged street improvements. The "Chronicle" is discredited with what it calls "government by vigilance committees," and says:

If the city government were administered for the benefit and protection of citizens, private organizations for the defense of their rights would be unnecessary. The people do not organize for their own defense, except in cases where the government abdicates its powers and leaves them without the protection of law.

The city administration left the work of street-cleaning for a while to be performed by private hands. The private hands are now idle, and the streets are not cleaned at all. Property owners are not protected from special assessment frauds, and they are compelled to organize for their own protection. The police are worthless, and private detective agencies usurp the duty of protecting the peace. They arrest criminals on doubtful warrants and shoot persons whom they mistake for criminals resisting arrest or escaping from a street hold up. This is about as near a state of anarchy as can be reached under the forms of municipal government.

The solution is worse than a state of Anarchy, for under that condition the taxpayers would not have to pay pretended officials for duties that are not performed. At present the taxpayers pay twice for everything; and the chances are that they will continue doing so, until they make the discovery that the government they still hope to reform must be reformed altogether. By the way, these private societies are all defensive, and hence do not
constitute private "government," such as is found in White Caps, anti-gambling leagues, Good Government clubs, and other meddlin' agencies.

Rights and Contract.

Having considered in the last issue Mr. Lloyd's departure from Anarchism and its motives and bearings, it remains to consider his arguments on the child question and the contrasting fundamental positions in accordance with one of which it must be settled. The reader should refresh his memory by reference to Mr. Lloyd's letter and my comments in No. 322, and his latter letter in No. 325.

The constant difficulty that besets Mr. Lloyd in his political discussions is his inability to distinguish between that which is right to do—that is, that which is necessary to do in order to attain the end in view—and that which one has a right to do—that is, that which one's fellows agree to let him do in peace and undisturbed. Now, the whole matter of scientific politics is a question how far we had better give each other a right to do that which each may think it is right to do. Of course it may be said further, and correctly, that this again is a question of what is right, and that, best or necessary—no other each other a right to do. But, whatever the conclusion that may be reached upon this point, it is clear that it can be put into execution only through contract, agreement, between those undertaking thus to "give each other the right determined upon."

In the absence of such a contract the right to do does not exist at all. It has not been called into existence. Under these non-political conditions a certain course may be right in the sense that it is the straight course to a certain end, but rights in the political sense there then are none. If a man then pursue one course or another, it is solely by virtue of the fact that he has a natural and non-conventional power to pursue it. We may express this loosely, as I often do, by saying that under such conditions might is right; but the phrase is not accurate. It is more accurate, and it is sufficient, to say simply that might is might, and end it there.

Rights begin only with convention. They are not the liberties that exist through natural power, but the liberties that are created by mutual guarantee.

Now, supposing ourselves assembled to establish this guarantee, to make our contract, to determine what it is right, best, necessary, to give one another, Mr. Lloyd may very properly take the floor to maintain that it is not right, best, necessary, to give any human being property in another human being, and that it is right, best, necessary, to guarantee equal liberty to all human beings. But he must prove it. His position is not an axiom; it is open to dispute. Its mere assertion does not establish it; no more is it established by spelling Natural Right with a big N and a big R. Mr. Lloyd must marshal his evidence. If he does not do so, I claim the floor and maintain that it is not right—that is, best—to guarantee equal liberty to all human beings, for the reason that such a guarantee is inconsistent with the one purpose common to all the contracting parties,—namely, the security of each of them in the control of their persons and the results of their efforts,—and that to the accomplishment of this purpose the necessary thing is a guarantee of equal liberty to all persons capable of entertaining the idea of contract. And in support of this contention I offer in due time the various considerations which I have urged in my articles upon this subject.

When Mr. Lloyd shall overthrow the two preceding par., raps, he will be justified in claiming that he is not under the régime of contract; but, until then, he necessarily is under that régime, and bound by his own admissions to accept its logical consequence of property in babies. If he shall attempt to overthrow them, let him not accuse me of abandoning the ground war. The old régime, in discarding the phrases "right of might," "right of invasion," etc. (which I may return to, for convenience, in some future discussion in which it may be less necessary to speak with strict accuracy), I do not change my position at all, but simply so confine my use of the word as to reduce to a minimum the chance of misunderstanding.

So far Mr. Lloyd has backed his denial of the contract régime by only one argument,—that society cannot be founded upon contract because no individual is under any obligation to keep the contract, and, therefore, that society cannot be founded upon his fellows to refrain from enforcing the contract upon him. The final inference is unwarrantable. It is the contrary, rather, that follows. There is no moral obligation upon the individual either to make a contract, or to keep a contract after making it; and, similarly, there is no moral obligation upon his fellows, with whom he may have made a contract, to allow him to repudiate the contract. There is no moral obligation at all on either side. A contract is made voluntarily, for mutual advantage. For its violation, penalties are fixed. If a contracting party chooses to violate, he suffers these penalties, provided the other parties have the desire and power to enforce them. And that is all there is to it. Such an arrangement is shown by experience to be practicable. Therefore a society can be founded upon it. "Not a true society," says Mr. Lloyd. As to that, I don't know. At any rate, a society that accomplishes its purpose.

The makers of a general contract guaranteeing equal liberty to all those capable of contracting would not enforce the particular contract supposed by Mr. Lloyd, whereby a man should agree to be a slave for life, or any other condition upon which he is not willing to enter. Mr. Lloyd's explanation of his child illustration does not establish at all his right to dictate the cripple's manner of living. If there is no agreement between Mr. Lloyd and the cripple whereby the latter agrees to conform to the former's wishes in the matter of diet in return for his food-supply, then, as Mr. Lloyd says, the food furnished the cripple by Mr. Lloyd is a free gift. But such a gift is no justification of authority over the cripple. Mr. Lloyd, producing apples and oranges, can give the cripple apples if he chooses, but it is not by giving him apples that Mr. Lloyd acquires the right to forbid him to touch the oranges. He, as producer of the oranges, has a right, under the general contract, to forbid him to touch the oranges, even though he does not give him apples or anything else. Nor does the "free gift" of apples give Mr. Lloyd a right to tell the cripple to eat apples. The cripple has a perfect right to refuse to eat the apples that Mr. Lloyd gives him. The matter of authority and dictation does no enter into the case at all. The most that can be said is that, if the cripple finds it impossible to obtain food in any other manner, it happens to be in Mr. Lloyd's power to place before the cripple the alternative of eating apples or starving to death. But this is not enough to substantiate Mr. Lloyd's declaration that the cripple is his subject. Dependence and subjection are different things. In the same sense, though not in the same degree, that the cripple is dependent; society is the world dependent one upon another. There is a sense in which no man is free, but in the political sense—and we are now talking politics—Mr. Lloyd's cripple is as free as any man on earth. If the cripple is the subject of those who give him alms, then the storekeeper is the subject of the customers who bestow on him their patronage, and upon whom he is dependent for his livelihood. But to accept that conclusion is to confuse terms and misunderstand politics. As I said in my previous letter, the illusion is that "society is living on the matter in hand; I discuss it only because Mr. Lloyd brought it forward and because it throws light on his peculiar reasoning.

One reason why it has little bearing is that Mr. Lloyd's relation to the cripple, based on the free gift of food, is not at all analogous to the relation of parent to child, if, as Mr. Lloyd declares, the parent owes the child support. Even were it to be admitted (though it cannot be) that the gift to the cripple establishes a degree of authority over him, it could not be allowed for a moment that the payment of a debt to the child establishes the smallest authority over it or claim upon it. The curious notion of debts and credit which Mr. Lloyd showed in recent criticisms on Mr. Badeau are revealed again here. To say that a parent owes support to a child, but may determine the form of that support, is equivalent to saying that the parent owes nothing at all. For there is no legal debt—that is to say, no debt of which third parties may take cognizance—where the determination of the debt belongs exclusively to the debtor. As to the child's debt to the parent, if such indebtedness falls upon the child just as a member of free society (wherein the same way, I deny, for the reason of which I am talking, that a member of society), it differs in no wise from the debt of every other member of free society to this same parent, and is entirely independent of parental support of the child. So the "flagrant contradiction and "mental suicide" which Mr. Lloyd asks me to locate lie precisely where they lay before,—in claiming in the same breath that the parent owes something to the child and yet is entitled to exact something from the child in return for payment of the debt.

Mr. Lloyd, in his first letter, said that "the parent, having forced dependent life upon the child, is an invader, if refusing support to this dependent individual." I answered that the stock-bredor who refuses support to a calf is equally an invader. Yes, rejoins Mr. Lloyd, but what we want is human equal liberty, which begins and ends with human beings. Once more,
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ass-rion without proof. This is the question at issue. I say that what we want is that equal liberty which begins and ends with beings capable of grasping the idea of contract, and I have given proof of this in an elaborate argument which has not been refuted.

From this point Mr. Lloyd proceeds to a succession of exclamatory remarks prompted by my contention that Anarchy does not exclude slavery or ownership of the mentally undeveloped, and indicative, despite the declaration of his perfect calmness at the opening of his article, of a high degree of excitement. And he deplores words that are accurately descriptive of these remarks. They are essentially superstitious. They belong to the lingo of religion. They are base. On the old idea that man is a special creature, for whose benefit the rest of the universe was intended. They are in the last degree absurd. Man is a special being only in the sense that he is, on the whole, the most developed and most powerful being. He is an incident in the universe, and in all probability will some day be summarily extinguished in universal processes. The universe was not intended for his benefit. If he, for instance, were one of a million a thousand years or so, happens to be able to in a degree submit it to his uses, by all means he should do so.

That he should defend himself against the universe is only natural. But that he is sacred is sheer nonsense. There is no more reason in saying that man should not be property because he is human than there would be in saying that dogs should not be property because they are canine. To Mr. Lloyd's arbitrary distinction how much I prefer the attitude of Mr. Badcock, who, in his sympathy with every creature that can feel, is as ready to abolish property in animals as in man. His method of minimizing pain seems to me a mistaken and ineffective one, but at least he bows before no spooks.

"The slavery of babies and fools is the meanest and most cowardly of all," Mr. Lloyd tells us. Why? That he does not tell us. It may be more cowardly to enslave a babe than to enslave a lion, but it is certainly not more so than to enslave a lamb. The sentence quoted is as silly sentimentalism as that which declares it more cowardly to hang a woman than a man. A woman's physical inferiority disappears entirely in the equal helplessness of man and woman when confronted individually by collective power. And similarly babes and domestic animals are alike defenceless against grown men.

"It is enough for me to know that you and I, Mr. Tucker, would never be safe in any society which did not hold the life and liberty of every human being sacred." Yes, I know, Mr. Lloyd, that that is enough for you. Your mind is one that accepts with very little evidence that which it wishes to believe. Mine is more exacting. Your assertion that you know this or that is not enough for me. Tell me how you know it. I insist upon it. For my part, I should feel as easy regarding my own safety, and much easier regarding the safety of my children, in a society afforded protection only to the mentally developed, as persons, and protecting the mentally undeveloped only as property.

Mr. Lloyd's contention that the unimpreg-

nated ovum does not contain the possibilities of the child is of no force. If not be the case, then there are no possibilities in anything, for all new powers are the result of new combinations. So judged, the impregnated ovum has not the possibilities of the child for it will never become a child unless it derives the necessary sustaining forces from the mother's organism. And by the same reasoning the child at birth has not the possibilities of the man, for he will never become a man: less it effects a combination with air and food. But, if we take the other course and, admitting that the child has possibilities, and therefore that if that therefore it cannot be property, we must also for the same reason say that the ovum in a woman's body is not her property,—an absurdity patent even to Mr. Lloyd. It is comforting to know that there are still some things incredible even to one who believes that a woman, when made to conceive by an act of rape, thereby loses her right of suicide, and that a man who has just developed from a monkey is bound to compensate his former owner for the loss of property caused by this development. But such conclusions are calculated to shock the larger part of the public reason that accepts them. Apud eoa, il faut tirer l'échelle.

A fortnight hence we will talk of Mr. Badcock.

Secretary Carlisle recently delivered an address on the currency before the New York chamber of commerce. The "Herald" said he had presented "most intricate questions" with masterly simplicity; the "Evening Post" is ashamed that such a personage should be unable to deliver himself of so "elementary truths and platitude" before such an audience, and thinks the fact a sad commentary on our intelligence; while the "Press" and other Republican sheets describe the secretary's statements as obvious falsehoods and childish perversions of notorious facts. And yet this great American press wishes to solve the financial question:

J. Wm. Lloyd's "Wind-Harp Songs" are ready, and the book can be procured of the author. I am highly pleased with it. It far exceeds my expectations, w'hich, I confess, were not raised by the author's article in Liberty some months ago, written to herald his little volume. We Press Socialists can boast of a pretty poem in our Comrade Lloyd.

Anarchist Letter-Writing Corps.
The Secretary wants every reader of Liberty to send in his name for enrolment. Those who do thus appoint themselves to write, when possible, every fortnight, on Anarchism or kindred subjects, to the "target" assigned in Liberty for that fortnight, and to notify the secretary of the case of any failure to write to a target (which it is hoy-d will not often occur), or in case of temporary or permanent withdrawal from the work of the Corps. All, whether members or not, are asked to lose no opportunity of infusing the spirit of liberty into the letter. Address, Stephen T. Hyatt,on, Flushing Institute, Flushing, N. Y.

I beg pardon of the members of the Corps for a slip of error in the address given. It is my fault that any confusion has occurred. The address is Flushing Institute, Flushing, N. Y.

Having possession of a seditious phonograph is the latest instance of misdemeanor punished by a jealous continental monarch. The authorities at Trieste have seized an Italian guilty of holding a phonograph which played the Italian Royal March. The terrible instrument was accused of having disturbed public order because it also registered sordid demonstrations of applause and enthusiastic cries which accompanied the hymn when it was performed. The musical patron had been obliged to leave the town, and take with him the subversive instrument.
"Search the Scriptures."

[With this, I shall now proceed to the main point of my argument, for it would greatly benefit the reader to search the Scriptures,]

"Search the Scriptures," and you'll find Anything to suit your mind.

If you look 1:2, or search 2:13-16, or would marry two or three,—

You, a thousand, nay or no less,—

"The Book." -" tell you how, I guess.

If unto you were incited, God will have you justified, and

Will save all you do,—

If The Church is in it too, If you'd like to cheat the blind, Roosevelt always compromised, which will show you so well how to do

That God will help you safely through it. Or, if you were forgiving, Kindly, helpful, cheerful, loving, you will find superb example

That will give incentive ample. "Search the Scriptures"! Yes, so do,

But search other books too, and,

And, if you kept good accounts, let impugnate all your mind,

Separating good from evil, Not by aid of "God" or "Devil," But by the judgment of a man Gained by every man and woman.

By prefixing "Do" to "evil" You don't make a sinner Devil, But another "Do" in "good." This

Gives its meaning high and broad.

So, when you "The Scriptures" search, Don't let superstition, "Church," Or any fear of "Holy Wrath" Tempt you out of the straight path, But let reason, sound and true, Guide you in what'er you do.

Here's the menu to my rhyme:

Use your life wise, yet there's time; Enjoy yourself; treat all men well; And then, while here on earth you dwell, You'll know, afterward come what may, You lived for life, and not decay.

W. W. C.

Is the Trade Union Anarchistic?

To the Editor of Liberty:

Just a few words in reply to Mr. Cohen. I will not exploit your space by touching on any of the "ifs" and "may bes" that are not essential to the main point of my argument, but I am sure that the trade union is the most thoroughly Anarchistic organization in our present society?" Mr. Cohen, in his reply, says they are—no, because the men who are in them believe in freedom, but because the states allies with "peculiar institutions," and so it often happens that labor finds itself arrayed against the state. This is a curious bit of reasoning for a plumb-liner. If it is true that the state is not necessary because one believes in something else (religious fanaticism, for instance), is Anarchistic, then the New York saloon keepers are Anarchists, and the Seventh Day Adventists, and the woman suffragists, and the man suffragists, and the corporate monopolists who rest their inter-state commerce and anti-trust laws. Doesn't that prove too much? Besides, it does not even include trade unions when they do not exist as trade unions. This is a curious bit of reasoning for a plumb-liner.

Cohen says that he has had some other union than his in mind, when he asserted the despotic features of unions, and says that he violated his pledge to support boycotts and receive absolution after confession. What does that prove? Either that his union is very weak or undisciplined, or that his fellow-workmen were indulgent because equally or more guilty in some other respect, or that Cohen was a good fellow person, but the trade union is too disorganized to enforce its own rules, or any other reason rather than that his union is very near an Anarchistic organization. If his union does not enforce any despotic laws, then he must be an ardent egotist. Cohen says that it did not mean life union; but, if he denies that unions as a rule embolden despotic rules, then I shall have to encumber your columns with proofs. Meanwhile, here is a gem from the official organ of the Tygographical Union. It is the only piece of reading matter in the union line that I can now lay my hand on, but it is enough:

All the friends of organized labor should keep in mind that there is a tendency in "The Walking Delegate," full of syllables and misrepresentation. . . . Any workingman who would read anything written by this con
culated coarsey, or who would patronize a magazine or paper, who wishes to obtain a picture of the state of his union organization.

That is an editorial utterance in an organ that I am "voluntarily" compelled to support. Of course it is not law, but it is a sentiment that would be enunciated into law by many, if, while a Kipling has been printing this in a labor union dail.

I am afraid I have occupied too much space, and so I will not take up the economic argument, seeing that Cohen has nothing further to say than that trade unionism has raised the wages of labor in some trades. I don't deny it: that is why I am union canil myself. But that they have any effect on the law of rent, or rate of interest, or tend to decrease profits—this I deny. Cohen and his friends, who have organized to republish "Mutual Banking," could, with one year's income of a union like the International "Iguan Makers," do more to improve the condition of the wage workers than all trade unions put together.

With best feelings towards Cohen when plum line, I remain, etc.,

A. H. SIMPSON

BOSTON, NOVEMBER 26.

Propriety, Propriety.

To the Editor of Liberty:

If it is a truth (as you say, and I endorse) that "there is no production whatsoever which is not aided by and absolutely dependent upon the qualities inherent in matter, which the producer did not create," then all those who profits of the Tygographical Unions, is a sort of specious and not give credit to the wrong party. Let us not take it for granted that every labor effort is entitled to all it can get, nor yield rights on account of labor which labor has not earned. But let it be known that we hold in reserve our right or might (it had better be might) to protect the forces of nature from such offensive (to us) mutilations as human labor is capable of. If it's claim over his child, on the sole ground he gives of "having produced my child myself," needs qualification by your own admission as above.

If, when I said: "Parents are not producers of their children in the same sense that they are the producers of their handwork," I had said to the same extent that children have been more accurate, and I apologize for carelessness. If this proves anything, it proves too much and abolishing property altogether, so far as this is possible. It abolishes property ("right of possession")—Waller can be indiscriminantly based upon production, to the exclusion of other considerations.

Man's handiwork cannot be simply demarcated off from nature's handicraft. The attempt to do so is as artificial as the other attempt to sharpen the status of the child from that of the adult. If you persist in upholding the claims of labor before every other consideration, you are not part of your propuganda which claims for all equal access to the raw material of the universe. For this latter established proprietary or unfruitful right, exclusively of production, is the right of the child.

When labor is expended in enclosing and planting large areas of land, for use and occupancy as hunting-preserves, for a comparatively few people, to the effect that others are landless and have to pay a monopoliest rent in order to live, you will not allow that such expenditure of labor makes the land so dealt with the absolute property of the landlord or land laborer. Nor will I. You, who won't grant more than a very partial property to the child, as a child is surely property, as I do a child's labor forces which predominate and force themselves upon our consciousness. Absolute ownership over land we cannot allow when we suffer thereby. Absolute ownership over children we can no more allow
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A Necessity of Life.

[Emile Bergerin in Le Journal]

To Emile Guédeau.

"Really, you see, Guédeau, it is decidedly better to be one."

"One what?"

"I mean, a deputy."

"A millionaire too—that goes without saying, and I agree. But the million is more than the mandate, and I suspect it is less amusing. However, I may be mistaken. Say on."

"There are other reasons. Here is one, which seems to me as convincing as any. The Frenchman, like you and me, with two arms and two legs, can live without the million, and live in true French fashion, looking at all the columns. You go, you come, in your beautiful coat of blue; either you light your pipe (your day being over) is that when Rothschild is not your cousin. . . . Facer a million échappé on your table, in honest two-franc pieces; there it is, yours! In what does it distinguish you from the individual who has two hundred thousand francs? The colorless taxpayer; it is the dower of little Mademoiselle Durand marrying little Monseur Dupont; it is the proper allowance, the day's ration in a besieged city; it is a subvention for the Ondine, it is nothing at all. 「The same for the colorless man, the colorless man is the society in which the million does not count, does not represent, and does not feel: its men, there is nothing left for an intelligent fellow (I tell you what I think) but a share in the management of his estate and resign himself to be—"

"What?"

"A deputy. I am your elder, and so you must believe me, wherever you go, your little million, even when it is a little, was even more stupid, if that is possible. You others, to be sure, have failed, so far, to see that in a democracy like ours, with a passion for levelling, one is equal to all others, is a thing to be—, that which I have just specified. But we were bleaker still; we denied the Deputyship! We were foolish enough to think that it was allowable to be somebody in something, without participating in public matters, and without plung—at least one paw into the mire of universal suffrage. You are canaries. We were goats. In this republic one has nothing, nothing, at all; he has not been—"

"What?"

"A deputy. Mark what I say, and it is set free."

You may be, you may have been, or you may become a cabinet minister, or a judge in the Court. The glory of the cabinet minister is enveloped in mist.

"You may be a member of the Academy without any one knowing it. The immortality sold there does not disgrace the Seine."

"You may endow the world and your country with a sublime invention, with a prodigious discovery, with an unprecedented masterpiece of art, or even with an extraordinary work of charity, and yet not even glimpse the shadow to which democracy conveys such services. Neither science or genius can any longer astonish this people; they are suffocated with them."

You may found a religion, even successfully, without our recognizing it.

"You may strangle your father and your mother, and the encyclopædia makers will not turn to look at you."

And you may do still other things.

"But you cannot be a deputy without becoming on the spot illustrious, popular, historic, documentary, and European. Then you are, and you exist, only you alone exist. Take the name of Power, to use the language of Victor Hugo, who was only a senator, alas! being a prophet in his own country and therefore in something lacking."

"Oh, deputy! Oh, legislator, and representative man! Oh, disinterested individual and living synthesis of the mass! Oh, son, father, and holy ghost of revealed legality! Oh, my brother, ch, my friend, open your arms, Guédeau, be proud and happy, Mar-land is yours!"

"It is a great mistake not to be—"

"What?"

"A deputy. The case of Victor Hugo, who was only a senator, wouldn't have opened our eyes, if we had not been sheer imbeciles, like all the scalds. Victor Hugo began to be really known, 'outside of his special circle,' as the severe critics say, only on the day when he checked the political wench under the eul. This slut, slightly flattered, having named him her dear and first senator, the Bourgeois, till then more than recalcitrant, granted him the benefit of this selection, and the People learned that it had a poet. A work created to become a work, this no more than a work lettered as consecrated, it is voted; thus it discounts the largest circulations. It is impossible to say what fabulous figure the sale of the Master's heavy work would have risen, had he been a deputy. As it is, whatever they may say, they command only a senator's sale."

"Guédeau, my dear Guédeau, profit by this bitter lesson and this unimpeachable example. Let us be deputies, since it is a necessity. Let us break no longer the democratic current. Let us accept life as they live it. Let us enter by way of the republican into paradise, where it becomes its life. Let them lead us to your "No" a "Yes!" "Victor Hugo, Lord only be a senator. Some one had to begin. Let us dare to be representatives of the people! Time flies. Bring me a mandate, two mandates, twenty mandates, and any mandate at all. If you say, 'Guédeau, how I have no reflection!'"

"I was altogether too busy at the last election, when they offered me a chance to symbolize the ar-[

...]

end of the Terme in parliament; for, oh! what is it to me, my dear fellow. I have just re-read my letter of declina-

"It is the letter of a fool. From that moment the theatrical managers have carried their heads high, saying that, for the first time, their plays would be crushed beneath my iron heel. Profit by my folly; accept, make speeches, and be elected. The who—secret lies there, and nowhere else."

No more on the sagacious mind in the modern movement, such as our comrade Maurice Bourre, the king of the young, has opened the way for us and shown us the light. His guidance is too good an one. It understands. Here is a fact that greatly inspires me. A passionate champion of individualism and the leader of the school, Maurice —
A Moral Murderer.

[George E. Mordanell in the Truth Seeker.]

The sneaking assassin Hanigian has been acquitted of the murder of his victim. He had a sister who associated with a man named Maas, and offered her an unborn child as a sacrifice to the moral Jehovah. Before she could recover her health, Hanigian attempted to shoot Maas at her bedside, frightening her so that she died. He was tried and acquitted of the murder.

When the trial for murder began, he conducted himself as a craven. He allowed the plea of insanity to be entered in his behalf, and the jury acquitted him on that ground.

While he was on trial, his old father died, the murderer's father died. At the funeral, which Hanigian was permitted to attend, he was greeted with cheers which showed either that the persons present did not believe he was insane, or that they had no more sense than to applaud the bloody act of a lunatic. Whether the case, no comment is necessary on that point.

In Ozella county, this State, four young men are in jail for wrecking a passenger train and causing the loss of two human lives. Their act is said to have been inspired by the murder of Jesse James, the train robbery.

The case was inspired by Christian morality. The difference between the two inspirations, so far as results are concerned, is not in any degree prejudicial to the ethical system of Mr. James.

SLAVES TO DUTY.

By John Badcock, Jr.

A unique adventure in the pamphlet literature of the American South that it raises the morality question as the foundation of the various schemes for the abolition of slavery. Mr. Turner does not expose the doctrine of Emancipation, but tells the story of the sufferings of mankind. Mr. Turner

Price, 15 cents.
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FRANCIS NOREEN.

A practical tailor catering to the fastidious and eccentric.

At Forty-One Essex Street, Massachusetts.
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By EXILE SOLA.

Translated from the French by Benj. R. Tucker.
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