On Picket Duty.

"El Perseguido," an advocate of violent revolution, uses these words in commemorating the death of a martyr to that policy: "The comrades whose memory we recall to-day had understood that we must cut off the head of the bourgois hydra." This is an uncommonly apt characterization of the dynamite-and-dagger programme.

New York moralists are congratulating themselves on a decision of the appellate court which promises to reduce greatly the number of saloons. Dealers whose places are situated within two hundred feet of a church or school cannot transfer their licences hereafter, under the law which prohibits new saloons from being opened near such sacred institutions. "The Sun" correctly observes that, "in effect, the decision is that New York has a statute which might be made in a generation absolutely prohibitory of liquor-selling in crowded communities, provided only such church and schools were built thick enough." The "Evening Post," sneering at this suggestion, exclaims: "Imagine the awful condition of a community which has more churches and schools than saloons!"

Yes, it would be awful. The poor people will not go to church, and life without the saloons, which have been described as the clubs of the poor, would be dreary indeed. How nauseating this hypocritical talk about saloons is! The gentry who indulge in it generally drink more than those whom they would piously protect against the influence of saloons.

The "Open Court," is thoroughly right in declaring that the Monroe doctrine is a "question of power, not of right or wrong." Those anarchists who deal with it from the standpoint from which they would deal with disputes between individuals or voluntary associations forget that, in the view of the equal-liberty philosophers, States are outlaws and can advance no claims at all on the score of justice. It is utterly absurd to declare that the people of the United States may, in the interest of their own safety, resist a seizure by England of Venezuelan territory, but are forbidden by the principle of justice to protect their safety by resisting a purchase by England of such territory. This assumes the very thing that anarchists deny,—namely, the rightful dominion of Venezuela or any other State over a given area. No matter by what method a division of territory between England and Venezuela may be effected, the result must be foreign to justice, for neither is justly entitled to any territory whatever. But since, pending the realization of Anarchism by the abolition of States, the territory of this hemisphere is bound to be under the dominion of nations, the people of the United States and especially the Anarchists may very properly do everything in their power to secure such a distribution of this dominion as will be least dangerous and burdensome to themselves.

I was a little too fast in accepting the statement of Mr. Yarros that I am single among the progressive newspapers and thinkers in the country in my antagonism to England's attitude in the Venezuelan matter. I have heard no word of protest from any reader of Liberty against the position which I have taken, and, on the other hand, I have received several evidences of approval. And now comes the "Open Court," in which Mr. Yarros has been written and in which I have always understood him to hold in higher respect than any progressive newspaper in this country save Liberty,—and takes square ground in favor of Cleveland's policy.

Its entire issue of January 16 is devoted to the subject, M. D. Conway opposing the president, and Prof. E. D. Cope and the editor, Dr. Paul Carus, strongly sustaining him. Again, paragraphs, the new Boston addition to the progressive press, though avowedly anti-Jingo, approves the Venezuelan message; though I must add that it does not seem to have a clear appreciation of the situation. It follows Cleveland in his weak contention—a serious flaw in his ploy, which congress possibly will rectify—that this country should allow European powers to acquire this hemisphere by purchase. The Monroe doctrine, so modified, would be a very barren and uninteresting matter, and would contribute to the demolition of its own raison d'être. Nevertheless paragraphs counts one on the Cleveland side. Perhaps at the end Mr. Yarros will be a little lonely.

In the "International Journal of Ethics," Dr. William James tries to prove that in faith and hope alone can man find the strength needed to support the burdens of this earthly existence. A delicious illustration is given in the following passage: "A dog whom they are vivisecting in a laboratory lies strapped upon a board and shrieking at his executioners, and to his own dark consciousness is literally in a sort of hell. He cannot see a single redeeming ray in the whole business; and yet all these diabolical-seeming events are usually controlled by human intention with which, if his poor benighted mind could only be made to catch a glimpse of them, all that is heroic in him would religiously acquiesce. It is genuinely a process of redemption. Lying on his back on the board there, he is performing a function incalculably higher than any prosperous canine life admits of, and yet, of the whole performance, this function is the one part that must remain absolutely beyond his ken." Dr. James implies that the only value of dogs is found in their usefulness as subjects for the laboratory, and that they have no other existence to hope for. Their life is only worth living, then, if they die for us. Would he hold that human life was worth living if it could be shown that it was designed for the benefit of some other species of beings? If not, he is clearly illogical. If yes, what ground has he for concluding that this is not the case, but that a future and better life awaits us? Dr. James's sublime faith would probably desert him if he should fall among cannibals and be roasted by them. He would not dream of the possibility that he was performing a function incalculably higher than any prosperous professorial life admits of. Yet there is nothing impossible, from his standpoint, in that view of the situation.

Comrade John Henry Mackay has been forced to postpone the realization of his plan for an Anarchist reading-room in Berlin, owing to the increasing aggressions of the German police. A few weeks ago the authorities prohibited the distribution, just outside the Berlin university, of specimen parts of Mackay's "Die Anarchisten," confiscating 222 copies. Yet it is stated, on the authority of Mackay's publisher, that the policeman who confiscated the books had previously tried to persuade the distributing agent to circulate the sheets among the students, assuring him that he could easily dispose of two thousand copies in the university. This policeman seems to have been an agent provocateur. However, our comrade is not discouraged. He has just issued in pamphlet form George Schumun's German translation of my "State Socialism and Anarchism," which appeared some years ago in Liberty's German edition, Libertas. The full title in German is "Staatssozialismus und Anarchismus: in wieweit sie übereinstimmen und worin sie sich unterscheiden." The price is twenty pfennig, and Mackay's publisher for this pamphlet is B. Zieg, 45 Oppelnerstrasse, Berlin, S. O. This pamphlet ought also to be circulated among German-Americans. Another interesting sign in Germany is the appearance, in a handsome volume of over two hundred pages, of the famous discussion on interest between Bastiat and Vrouinod, translated into German by Dr. Arthur Malberger, under the title "Kapital und Zins."
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“Is abolishing rent and interest, the last walmart of old-time slov- ery, the law--a shadow of one stroke the sword of the assau- lter? Is all of the meignanterie, the dast of the policeman, the gauger of the excursion, the county-knife of the department clerk, all those insigia of positive, which young Liberty grudges beneath her heel.”

F. V. Y.

The Right to Privacy.

That celebrated Schuyler statute case, involving the question of the right to privacy, has finally been decided by the New York court of appeals. There is some confusion as to the precise scope of the decision. Some commentators construe it to mean an absolute denial of “the right to privacy,” while others assert that the decision merely denies equitable jurisdiction without questioning the existence of a tort on the part of the defendant and the legal right to privacy.

To briefly recite the facts: Mrs. Schuyler, a quiet and unostentatious philanthropist, who was averse to notoriety in any form and shrank from public comment on her benevolent deeds, died some years ago. A few of her associates organized an association for the purpose of erecting a statue to her as a typical woman philanthropist, but distant relatives of Mrs. Schuyler objected, and brought suit in equity to restrain, by injunction, the erection and exhibition of the proposed memorial. In two courts the complainants were successful. The supreme court held that an individual does not forfeit the right of privacy by becoming a philanthropist, and characterized as audacious and remarkable the course of the voluntary memorial association, which proposed to ignore the known sentiments of Mrs. Schuyler as well as the protests of her living relatives. The case was taken to the court of appeals, with the result that the injunction is set aside and the decision of the lower courts reversed.

What the court really decides is that the living relatives of Mrs. Schuyler have no grounds upon which to ask for an injunction. The case is very interesting from the standpoint of principle, and may be profitably discussed at some length. The gist of the reasoning of the court is contained in the following passage:

Whatever right of privacy Mrs. Schuyler had died with her. Death deprives us all of right in the legal sense of that term, and, when Mrs. Schuyler died, her own individual right of privacy, whatever it may have been, expired at the same time. The right which survived (however extensive or limited) was a right pertaining to the living only. It is the right of privacy of the living which it is sought to enforce here. A woman like Mrs. Schuyler may very well in her lifetime be most strongly adverse to any public notice, even if it were of a most flattering nature, regarding her own works or position. She may have been (and the evidence submitted in court to show that she was) of so meek and retiring a nature that any publicity, during her life, would have been to her most extravagantly disgraceful and obnoxious. All these feelings died with her. It is wholly incredible that any individual could dwell with feelings of distress or anguish upon the thought that, after her death, those whose welfare she had toiled for in life would inaugurate a project to erect a statue in token of their appreciation of his efforts and in honor of his memory. This applies as well to the most refined and retiring woman as to a public man. It is, therefore, impossible to credit the existence of any real mental injury or distress to a surviving relative grounded upon the idea that the action proposed in honor of his ancestor would have been disgraceful to that ancestor during his life.

It seems, then, that, if the surviving relatives of Mrs. Schuyler could induce the court to credit the existence of mental distress, an injunction would be in order under this very unusual and rare case. But the court makes the assumption that no sane or reasonable person can possibly be thrown into mental distress by the contemplation of the fact that a fitting memorial is being exhibited by reputable and honorable people to a dead relative of his. It is hardly necessary to point out that there is no principle back of such a ruling. In each case of the same kind, the court will have to determine whether the alleged existence of mental distress is to be credited, and whether sane and reasonable persons would be injured by the proposed public memorial.

There is nothing in the decision to warrant the inference that the question of sanity or reasonableness would be considered, if the complainants were, not a relative of a deceased subject of a memorial, but the subjects herself. Suppose Mrs. Schuyler had tried to enjoin admirers from doing her honor in spite of her aversion to publicity? The court would apparently have credited the existencese of mental distress in her, notwithstanding the absurdity of the claim, from the ordinary point of view, that recognition of a memorial is mental suffering. Now, if Mrs. Schuyler is dear to her living relatives, what is there incredible in the claim that it is intensely disagreeable to them to contemplate the doing of acts which would have caused suffering to her? Whatever was painful to her would naturally be painful to those who loved her and to whom her memory is dear. If the test is injury to feelings, there is no distinction between the two cases.

Of course, the decision, in its practical effects, is good as far as it goes, but the whole question of the alleged right to privacy ought to receive full consideration. The court tells us that there is no right to privacy after death, but is it sure that there is a right to privacy for the living?—I mean a right consistent with the freedom of speech and non-invasive action? Disgust with the sensationalism of the press leads many into thoughtless and hasty assertions in favor of the alleged right to privacy, just as disgust with certain types of agitators leads many to sympathize with actions or proposals of freedom of speech and discussion. The throwing of rotten eggs at Abl- wardt, the anti-Semitic libel, is condoned by many advanced men simply because they have no patience with his crusade, but it is just as important (if not, indeed, more important) to defend his right to agitate as it is to defend the right to free speech of those with whom we are in full accord. The sensationalism of the press is detestable, but it does not follow that its practices can be properly interfered with. From the standpoint of equal freedom, there is no basis whatever for the alleged right to privacy. This will be admitted even by those who follow the law in holding libel and slander to be aggressions. As I am inclined to think that libel and slander cannot strictly be classed as among invasive acts at all, it is plain that I am bound to deny absolutely the existence of the right to privacy as a corollary from equal freedom. Privacy is a privilege which men ought to respect for a number of valid reasons, but force may not be invoked to secure its enforcement.

V. Y.

Professor Small's Two Principles.

In the “American Journal of Sociology,” the organ of the University of Chicago, the editor, Professor Albion W. Small, publishes an article which appears to many shockingly radical. The present social order is arraigned by Professor Small as inequitable and vicious, and certain vague reformatory propositions are advanced by him which, logically developed, would lead to State Socialism. It is not my intention here to criticize Professor Small's philosophy of society, but a study of his methods and reasoning will be very instructive to those who imagine that professors of sociology necessarily think or mean something when they discourse on their favorite subjects.

Professor Small starts out by pointing out two principles which serve him as a test in judging societies. “The present social system,” he says, “or the reorganizations that may follow each other in its place, will be justified or condemned according to their success in providing for at least two postulates of human association,—namely, “the essential similarity of all human beings in capacity for happiness,” and that “private business, like public office, is a public trust.” Proceeding to analyze the present order, Professor Small finds that neither of these principles is duly observed or applied, and hence concludes that evolution is bound to bring about a radical change.

To prove that the first of his principles is violated, Professor Small points to the poverty, ignorance, involuntary idleness, and insecurity of millions of workmen. The condition of the masses, he says, “clearly shows that, whatever our creed may be, society was not designed to recognize the essential similarity of all human beings in capacity for happiness. ‘Wage slavery,’ according to him, is inconsistent with this principle, and the modern social problem is ‘how to socialize ourselves to such degree that, without bankrupting all, each may have a secure lien upon a minimum share of nature's endowment for satisfying common human wants.”

Let us look into this “principle.” What is meant by the proposition that all human beings are essentially similar in their capacity for happiness? Surely not that all human beings have equal capacities for happiness; that would be obviously untrue. It must mean, then, that
Socialistic, however, and he simply lacks the intellectual acumen or the courage to reduce his nebulous notions to scientific definiteness. Thoughtless conservatives regard him as a radical, but he is entirely harmless. As for the radicals, they have not tumbled over one another in their eagerness to claim him. They want clear ideas, definite propositions, while the new school of American so-called sociologists (of-the-Chair) is chiefly remarkable for emptiness and brainlessness.

V. V.

For some time Liberty has had, I think, the distinction of charging for itself a price which, considering the size of the sheet and the quantity of its contents, exceeds that placed upon any other periodical of similar circulation. This distinction it enjoys no longer, having in 1897, to a new publication started in Boston under the name of "Paragraphs." That is, "Paragraphs" is the main part of its title. Read in full, the title constitutes a considerable proposition, for the periodical itself, being: "Paragraphs of Appreciation and Depreciation." The February number, which is the first, consists of twelve pages of yellowish blotting-paper, the page being seven and one-half inches by three and containing a short and narrow column of paragraphs. In all there are less than five thousand words of reading-matter—about equal to two and one-half pages of Liberty. As the price is five cents a copy,—against eight cents charged for Liberty, which contains about fourteen thousand words,—Paragraphs costs the reader nearly twice as much as Liberty. I consider this a point in "Paragraphs" favor, especially if the quality is satisfactory. And the quality is amply guaranteed by the fact that the editor and sole writer of "Paragraphs" is Mr. W. D. Forrest, who is well known to the readers of Liberty as having in the past contributed to its columns much that was pungent and poetical. If the work of his pen has not been seen in these columns during the past year, he can best explain why. All that I know is that, at the time when he sent his last batch of copy, he accompanied it with a letter gravely setting forth the ludicrous charge that I had been guilty of a breach of trust in having (as he mistakenly supposed) stated to another party that he (Forrest) was a subscriber to Liberty. Remembering the brevity of life, I did not trouble myself to reply even that Mr. Forrest was wrong in his facts, to say nothing of his ethics; and since I have not heard from him. The state of his mind in the meantime may be best described, I imagine, by a sentence which he quotes feelingly in his letter to me from the Dutch of Vandyke: "To live is easy enough; but to live and keep quiet, ah! that is difficult." So we have "Paragraphs." I am glad of it. It is bright, if light. To those who are fond of eating, as often as once a month, a literary dinner consisting wholly of dessert I extend this advice: Take "Paragraphs." They can get it by sending fifty cents for a year's subscription to W. D. Forrest, P. O. Box 1593, Boston, Mass.

A recently published English book on "Economics and Socialism" makes the claim that it embodies "the truth" which had eluded all previous thinkers. The "truth" turns out to be a mixture of Single-Taxism, anti-tradesunionism, and alleged currency reform.

Edgar Fawcett, in "The Conservator," sums up the disposition of some persons to emphasize the colonel's gift as an orator. He thinks that more attention ought to be paid to the substance of Ingersoll's teaching. Mr. Fawcett finds the "essence of wisdom and mental power" in Ingersoll's matter and the delightfulness of it. Well, how about Ingersoll's opinions on protection, government, finance, and the glories of the Republican party? Do they contain the essence of wisdom? Mr. Fawcett is an ardent admirer of Spencer, but he seems to be imperfectly acquainted with Spencer's sociology. Spencer would regard Ingersoll's opinions on the topics mentioned as the quintessence of folly and ignorance. Which of these is Mr. Fawcett's real guide and master? He cannot follow both.

Professor Small, of the Chicago University, has an article in the official journal of that institution, in which the present society is arraigned and condemned as inequitable and revolting, and reform along the lines of one form of collectivism is declared inevitable. Many superficial people see in this radical article evidence of absolute freedom of teaching in the Chicago University. But it proves no such thing. Benis was not dismissed for radicalism, but for explicitness and definiteness. Reform talk, if but sufficiently vague, is not offensive. Prof. Small does not indicate any practicable steps towards reform, and, in fact, does not know of any, according to his own admission. Plutocrats do not quarrel with merely pious opinions and wishes.

Another huge corporation, the Tobacco Trust, is in trouble. What government prosecutions and judicial anathemas have utterly failed to do, the ordinary laws of trade, even under the present highly imperfect conditions as to competition, have finally brought about. Trusts are not as formidable even to-day as they are popularly supposed to be, while under real freedom they could not exist, literally, for a single day. The certainty of competition would cripple them at the start.

"Freedom" welcomes that "excellent little paper," the "Firebrand," and hopes that its appearance indicates a revival of Anarchism in the United States. Well, "Freedom" is not much better than the "Firebrand" nowadays, and the compliments are natural. How any man of sense can read either, or how any movement can be proud of such excesses, passim comprehension.
After the usual intermission for refreshments, Mr. Rydington and I renew in this issue our discussion of the land question, which the disinclined reader may trace back, if he chooses, through Nos. 321 and 360, to a much remoter past.

I can readily forgive my friend for mistaking it for A in my answer to his question. Such a slip the most careful man may make at any time.

But his more fundamental misconception of what the occupancy-and-use doctrine really is makes him more difficult, if not to persuade, at least to account for. Certainly in no writing of mine have I given him warrant for supposing me to hold that a man should be allowed to take title to as much of the earth as he, in the course of his life, with the aid of all the workmen that he can employ, may succeed in covering with buildings. It is occupancy and use that Anarchism regards as the basis of land ownership, not occupancy or use, as Mr. Rydington seems to understand.

A man cannot be allowed, merely by putting labor to the use of his property in a more valuable manner than the use of his personal use, into possession of material which there is a limited supply and the use of which is essential to the existence of other men, to withhold that material from other men's use; and any contract based upon or involving such withholding is as lacking in sanctity or legitimacy as a contract to deliver stolen goods.

As I have never held that freedom of contract includes a right to dispose of the property of others, I do not, in denying such right, yield the sanctity of contract," as Mr. Rydington puts it. Yes, the object of Anarchism is, sure enough, to let every man "control self and the results of self-exertion"; but this by no means implies that a man may store upon another's land the results of his self-exertion. If a man acts himself by erecting a building on land which afterward, by the operation of the principle of occupancy and use, rightfully becomes another's, he must, upon the demand of the subsequent occupant, remove from that land the results of his self-exertion, or, failing to do so, sacrifice his property right therein. The man who persists in staying upon another's premises is an invader, and it is his crime that alienates his control of this property. He is "fined one house," not "for building a house and then letting another man live in it," but for invading the premises of another. If there were nothing in the "Beauties of Government" to beat that, then indeed would government be a really beautiful thing.

The objection advanced by Mr. Rydington that adherence to this principle must cause a degree of embarrassment to people desiring of using an entire edifice for a period too short to warrant building or buying has some validity, and should be accorded all the weight that properly belongs to it. But its gravity is insufficient to balance that of the considerations in the other scale. It must be remembered that comparatively few persons desire to rent an entire building for a short time. As a rule, those who want quarters for a short time prefer parts of buildings, and there is nothing in the occupancy-and-use plan to prevent them from realizing their desire. As a rule, again, those who want an entire building want it for a long time, and therefore can afford to build or buy.

The exceptional person who does not come under these heads will undoubtedly have to pay something for the use of his exceptional desires. He will have to make it worth the while of the occupying owner of the desired building to part with it; that is to say, he will have to buy the building at something above its normal value. Perhaps, to avoid the embarrassment of looking for a purchaser at the expiration of the time for which he desires the building, he will be able to effect a contract with the seller whereby the latter shall agree to buy back the building at a given date at its original value. If the seller should fail to keep this agreement, the building would still be the property of the layer, and he could sell it to another party. The difference between the buying and the selling price might not exceed the rent exacted for such buildings under the present régime. But, assuming that these exceptional persons would be, for occasional brief periods, under a greater burden in this respect than at present, this could not effect the far more important fact that the great body of people would be free of all monopoly in buildings, paying no rent for their use and no interest on the money with which they were built. The entire race's steady and imperative need of free access to the land cannot be subordinated to the occasional convenience of a small fraction of the race.

The adjustment of the conditions upon which an occupant and user can secure his premises against being considered as abandoned while he is on a vacation or a visit, or of the conditions upon which an occupying owner who desires to sell should be obliged to sell his property while seeking a purchaser, or of the conditions upon which a man who builds houses, not to rent, but to sell, may likewise be accommodated in his search for purchasers, is a mere matter of human device or administrative detail, not to be discussed in these columns unless the attempt be to show that such device is improper.

Probably my language regarding ground-floor occupants was not sufficiently clear. In my assertion that they would own both land and store the intended emphasis was on the words hereunder. After the fact that not all occupying owners would, on erecting a building, prefer to occupy the ground floor themselves, my view being colored by the knowledge that retail druggists, apropos of whom my point was made, so far as I have observed, do business on the ground floor. It was not in my mind at all to deny that a registered occupying owner would lose his claim to protection of his title should he choose to personally occupy the attic of his building; it would be required only that he should occupy and use some portion of portions practically equal to the ground floor in area. It is probable that in an occupancy and-use system there would be many cases of rent-paying by tenants of rooms or floors. But the amount of this rent would be greatly influenced by the competition that would prevail in consequence of the freeing of unused land, and the ability to build with non-interest-bearing capital that free money would insure, as well as by the non-intervention of the protective association in the relations of owner and tenant. I question whether, under such circumstances, the rent that could be obtained would often much exceed the loss through wear and tear and care of the premises rental.

In his present remarks about price-cutting in existence in which the tradesman does not constantly ask himself the question how he can manage to lower his prices in order to secure some of the patronage that is going to his competitors? And does he suppose that, in considering this problem, the tradesman fails to ask himself if he cannot reduce his expenses and thereby manage to lower his prices? And is not rent one of these expenses? And, if it were lifted from his shoulders, would he not lower his prices at once? And, if he did, would not his competitor, who has all the time been doing business in a building of his own and paying rent to nobody, be forced to lower his prices also in order to retain his trade, —a thing which now he does not have to do because his rent-paying competitor cannot lower his prices because he is doing business in a building of his own?

The man who builds a cage over a sleeper prevents the sleeper from exercising his unquestionable right to step off premises that belong to another, and therefore is an invader. The man who becomes by occupancy and use the owner of a previously unoccupied, unimproved, and unused passage, and in the exercise of his ownership blocks the passage, simply prevents other men from doing what they have no right to do,—that is, step on premises that belong to another,—and therefore is an invader.

Mr. Rydington's answer to my contention that there may be circumstances under which it is advisable to do violence to equal freedom amounts in its conclusion to a statement that no evil can be as disastrous an act of invasion; that justice should be done though the heavens fall, for a precedent of injustice would lead to a worse disaster than the falling of the heavens; and that, if we were the guardian of a city most of whose inhabitants found themselves under the necessity of choosing between death by fire on the one hand, and the choice of destruction the other, he would not relieve them from their choice if he could do so only by violating the property rights of a portion of his fellow citizens. Discussion is hopeless here.

George Bernard Shaw carries his constitutionalism a little too far. In discussing, in his own happy fashion, the conventional methods of solving dramatic situations involving the questions of marriage and adulterous love, he says, after pointing out the growing impracticability of unconventional relations, that he must not be understood as suggesting "anarchical violations of our marriage laws rather than an orderly agitation for constitutional reform of them in harmony with the higher morality of our own time." Why this disclaimer? Mr. Shaw has repeatedly stated that his sympathies are Anarchistic, and that he would abandon his State Socialism if he was convinced that "rent" could be equitably distributed under economic freedom. Having no faith in competition as a solvent of monopoly and inequality, it is not unnatural for Mr. Shaw to favor State interference with industrial relations.
The Republican party of California is said to father this extraordinary measure. It cannot be denied that it is a logical extension of the protectionist idea, and it would not be strange were organized labor to demand the prohibition of immigration. It is to its credit that the idea receives no support in trade unions. A country which has excluded Chinese labor may see fit to go to the length of barring out all foreign labor. Such an act would not, however, prevent the foons and their allies from claiming that this is the freest and most enlightened country in the world. The bill will not pass, simply because labor does not clamor for it and there is no politics in the thing.

A movement for the reduction of street railway fares in Chicago is antagonized by the Single Taxers on the ground that no benefit would accrue to the people, such reductions merely redounding to the profits of landlords. This is strictly logical from the standpoint of single-tax economies, which, of course, does not prevent it from being absurd. The Single Taxers see only one enemy, the landlord; and the social problem presents itself to him as a very simple thing. To be entirely consistent, he ought to oppose all reductions in the price of food, clothing, and other necessaries of life. What Single Taxers fail to perceive is the complexity of human relations. This failure betrays them into numberless blunders, great and small.

Referring to the discussion by the New York chamber of commerce of plans for taking the saloon out of politics, the "Voice" boldly says: "We will give a certified check for $10,000 to the man who will contrive any way to take the saloon out of politics without taking it out of existence." Liberty claims the check. It has repeatedly demonstrated that it is possible to take the saloon out of politics without destroying it. That way is absolutely non-interference with the liquor trade. Let anybody who chooses open a saloon and sell liquor at any time he pleases. This will keep all liquor dealers, big and little, out of politics. The "Voice" is not willing to try this method; so let it not swagger and pretend to have checks ready for successful competitors.

Judge Pyer, of New York, declines to issue naturalization papers to applicants who are ignorant of the Monroe doctrine. If there were a law denaturalizing Americans for similar ignorance, nine out of every ten would find themselves "countryless."

The "Voice," which was so down on Rev. F. M. Foster for opposing majority rule, now can't see how "the fact that the Ultrasolvers outnumber the Beers is sufficient reason for giving them equal rights with the latter."

Chicago Single Taxers vehemently assert that their movement is essentially religious, and they frown on attempts to deal with it as an economic affair pure and simple. Would all Single Taxers were so reserved of their traditions and early teaching! There is nothing more wonderful than single-tax theology and metaphysics; even women temperance associations may yet see fit to adopt a single-tax plank. I profoundly sympathize with the progressive minority in the single-tax ranks. With their materialism, individualism, and healthy abhorrence of cant, their position must be very trying.

The Governors and the Governed.

Washington, Jan. 14.—Society people here are remarking that ti e display of diamonds at the president's reception Thursday evening was more extensive than any that has been witnessed at the national capital since the administration of President Arthur, when the jewels of New York and Philadelphia were brought here to be exhibited upon the necks of fair women. Mrs. Scott Towson, who is said to have worn the finest display Thursday evening, her new necklace of pure white stones nearly as large as chesnuts hanging for the worn for the first time. The widow of Senator Hearst was also noticeable for her remarkable jewels, and it is said that some of them came from Mrs. Stanford's collection. Mrs. Dominguez, wife of the charge d'affaires of the Argentine Republic, ranked next for the abundance and beauty of her diamonds and pearls. She wore an exquisite diamond and pearl necklace, and a bracelet of diamonds and pearls.

Sydney, N. Y., Jan. 14.—A small riot took place at the city hall this morning. Men in want, to the number of twenty-five, are given work for three days at a time, shoveling snow for the city. To-day about two hundred men applied. The poor overseer tried to make selections by lot, when those failing to draw tickets set upon him, tore his clothing off, and handled him roughly. The police interfered to prevent further violence.

The Enemy of Man.

Long time ago, when men were weak.
And animals were big and strong,
They say it was a narrow squeak
For any one to get along;
But now what must the puzzle be?
No vengeful quadrupeds have we,
Save those that we may go to see
For fifty cents.—What can be wrong?
Back to the shades primal flew
The wolf, the panther, and the bear,
Of Man, the Terror, more in dread
Than he of them and she;
Bright Nature hailed the conqueror
Who was to make fond love to her;
Considering what did occur,
The outlook was exceeding fair.

And yet,—go ask of Mother Earth
What things have taken place since then:
Fire, falsehood, famine, and ruth,
A globe thick-seen with murdered men.
Go read the Martyrdom of Man,
And hold your anger, if you can,
Or sorrow; though the better plan
Were to think hard on what has been.

O bearer of the diamond crown!
There's blood upon the green you wear;
Unseen by you it drips adown
And clots upon your shoulders fair.
A ripped, starred, and plundered race
(The sacrifice to frame your face)
The fearful load, the almsman's disgrace.
Slay, a mettate, fall to calmly bear.

And if we indites are wrong,
And the venge come a Day of Doom,
It will not take Him very long.
To say who'll make Bell's furnace boom,
The ones who drive us to desert.
Who, needless, make us fight and freeze
And risk our lives in stormy seas,
The desert's drought, the mine's deep gloom.

Miss Scott Towson. Who, needless, make us fight and freeze
And risk our lives in stormy seas,
The desert's drought, the mine's deep gloom.

Hush! tell it not in Gath, nor let
Be known from Beersheba to Dan,
The fact that's not smile public yet,
Against which lies very man;
But I will whisper just to you
A thing I think you never knew.
A relic,—alas! too true:
Men's only enemy is Man.

William Randolph Chase,
The Occupancy-and-Use Doctrine.

To the Editor of Liberty:

I try not to make myself a bigger fool than my neighbors, but I do see in a while break the record in that line. I seem to have done so when I read "A" for "B" in your awer to my question. I admire your patience in the column of inapplicable stuff I wrote you that misguidance. Indeed, in conceding to complete the discussion at all with one who carries it on in such a way.

That the whole column of theory appears to have been fired in the air, I can write as good a column about what you really said. In the first place, it makes me wonder what ground of the principle of land tenure by occupancy and use can be. I had understood that the one was improved land held his title to it by virtue of his occupancy of the improvements, that the user without improvement held it by his occupancy of his own person or movable property situated on it. It is not absolutely unoccupied over night, any one who could put an improvement on it in that time might have it. But now it appears that the principle of occupancy is of such force that this tenure of land not being disregarded, in such cases, the ownership of labor products, but even has force to transfer the ownership of a labor product from one person to another without contract or the payment of rent, every way, even the sanctity of contract, which I never thought to see you yield, give way before the sanctity of occupancy and use; for there is no possible conception of renting a house that does not include in some manner a distinct property to use as is to be regarded as still the landlord’s property, and is to revert to his possession at the expiration (however that may be determined) of the lease. But, in the teeth of the contention of all modes of property, the landlord’s ownership of both house and lot is annulled the moment he yields possession of them to a tenant. Well, if this is Anarchism, I don’t know paternal legislation when I see it. I supposed that the object of Anarchism was to control every man and the results of self-exertion, that would presuppose that the man who uses that which he could lend to another for a price insists on giving as much profit, as he would get if he should lend it. No, I am not aware that I am only unaware that it has anything to do with what we are making a common interest, I am not aware that that maxim is simply a particular case of a very broad principle, to wit, that men generally try to get all that they think they can out of whatever they have; that the one who leases good site rent free would not lower his prices unless he expected to make more money in that way than by keeping them up; and that the druggist on a good site or of his own house would not lower his prices to make more by that than by keeping them up. Or have you in mind some way by which price cutting is to be made more profitable to this man than it is now? The fact is that high rents, or any other expense, may drive a man out of business, be as long as he is in business, they can never prevent him from doing so. And the amount that any expense can never affect the amount of profit to be gained from a house unless that cut will affect the amount of that expense.

The rest of our points can be dismissed with a few words. I asked you what was the difference between the person who was the owner of the house who blocks a passage, that one should be an invader and the other not. You reply by reassuring me that one is an invader and the other not, but give no explanation of the ground of the distinction. My question still awaits an answer.

As to the question whether the law of equal freedom can be obeyed in the face of a confiscation, when the renter hands over his house to stop the flames, suppose also that there is more than an isolated case here and there is inhabited by persons who have not bound themselves to any defensive association by a contract requiring them to yield their property for the protection of their men in such extreme emergencies, though this is hardly a probable supposition, — I should, in the first place, have understood that those whose houses were sacrificed were entitled to a compensation at least the amount of the increased price if not blown up. As a jurymen, I would do that, I in the absence of previous contract on the subject, as chief of the fire department, I would offer in advance several millions to make all reasonable owners consent, and I should answer every person a very courteous letter of Boon, that I had to hear from him. If you protested, I should move on to the next house, without stopping for arguments, to insist on him to take his chances with the fire. If the flames were not quenched, I would take my powder from block to block, I should not be trying to stop them in that way. If the protest was delayed — whether by the owner’s fault or not — till the powder was already in the house, I should think that, in acting as his silence justified me in acting, had created a commodity of placed power which, it being the product of our lawful labor, we claimed such property rights as should be exercised without waiting for the man whose house was burned to take it at once on his departure. (But this would be made easier by the reduction in the supply of houses, consequent on the fact that no one can afford to build a house for sale under the present prices, if the occupant still rent it,) even though the purchaser is unreasonably slow in appearing. Still, the man whose circumstances require him to sell at a certain time is likely to get bitten by the price fall. You answer in advance a question that I should otherwise have asked, when you tell me that, where the stories of a building are occupied by different persons, the ground floor man is to own the land. Thus, for instance, the man who owned the building owns the land under his store, and the "Sun," which occupies three stories (I believe) above him, has no right in it. Just how the fact that he is in next the earth is that the earth is his or that it is and whatever more of an occupancy than the "Sun's" three is not clear to my mind; neither am I certain what will follow if it turns out that somebody else occupies the cellar under him. I note that you fail to partially retract my conclusion that my expression under point 5 in No. 324 was unpardonable; for all who occupy sites above the ground floor are left still paying rent to their landlord. I don’t know whether you have any large body of business; and, since the market does not separate land-rent from house-rent, they will be paying both. It seems to me that this justifies considerable parts of my complaint on the poor tenant’s behalf. My answer about "those drug-stores" is now embodied in my "puzzle question" about the fact that on their own land do not now understand those drug-stores. You ask me what makes me think of it that the man who uses that which he could lend to another for a price insists on getting as much profit, as he would get if he should lend it. No, I am not aware that I am only unaware that it has anything to do with what we are making a common interest, I am not aware that that maxim is simply a particular case of a very broad principle, to wit, that men generally try to get all that they think they can out of whatever they have; that the one who leases good site rent free would not lower his prices unless he expected to make more money in that way than by keeping them up; and that the druggist on a good site or of his own house would not lower his prices to make more by that than by keeping them up. Or have you in mind some way by which price cutting is to be made more profitable to this man than it is now? The fact is that high rents, or any other expense, may drive a man out of business, be as long as he is in business, they can never prevent him from doing so. And the amount that any expense can never affect the amount of profit to be gained from a house unless that cut will affect the amount of that expense.

The rest of our points can be dismissed with a few words. I asked you what was the difference between the person who was the owner of the house who blocks a passage, that one should be an invader and the other not. You reply by reassuring me that one is an invader and the other not, but give no explanation of the ground of the distinction. My question still awaits an answer.

As to the question whether the law of equal freedom can be obeyed in the face of a confiscation, when the renter hands over his house to stop the flames, suppose also that there is more than an isolated case here and there is inhabited by persons who have not bound themselves to any defensive association by a contract requiring them to yield their property for the protection of their men in such extreme emergencies, though this is hardly a probable supposition, — I should, in the first place, have understood that those whose houses were sacrificed were entitled to a compensation at least the amount of the increased price if not blown up. As a jurymen, I would do that, I in the absence of previous contract on the subject, as chief of the fire department, I would offer in advance several millions to make all reasonable owners consent, and I should answer every person a very courteous letter of Boon, that I had to hear from him. If you protested, I should move on to the next house, without stopping for arguments, to insist on him to take his chances with the fire. If the flames were not quenched, I would take my powder from block to block, I should not be trying to stop them in that way. If the protest was delayed — whether by the owner’s fault or not — till the powder was already in the house, I should think that, in acting as his silence justified me in acting, had created a commodity of placed power which, it being the product of our lawful labor, we claimed such property rights as should be exercised without waiting for the man whose house was burned to take it at once on his departure. (But this would be made easier by the reduction in the supply of houses, consequent on the fact that no one can afford to build a house for sale under the present prices, if the occupant still rent it,) even though the purchaser is unreasonably slow in appearing. Still, the man whose circumstances require him to sell at a certain time is likely to get bitten by the price fall. You answer in advance a question that I should otherwise have asked, when you tell me that, where the stories of a building are occupied by different persons, the ground floor man is to own the land. Thus, for instance, the man who owned the building owns the land under his store, and the "Sun," which occupies three stories (I believe) above him, has no right in it. Just how the fact that he is in next the earth is that the earth is his or that it is and whatever more of an occupancy than the "Sun's" three is not clear to my mind; neither am I certain what will follow if it turns out that somebody else occupies the cellar under him. I note that you fail to partially retract my conclusion that my expression under point 5 in No. 324 was unpardonable; for all who occupy sites above the ground floor are left still paying rent to their landlord. I don’t know whether you have any large body of business; and, since the market does not separate land-rent from house-rent, they will be paying both. It seems to me that this justifies considerable parts of my complaint on the poor tenant’s behalf.
Each interrogation was greeted by all the other hunters with what we used to call the tylkowsky, which drowned the rattle of the train and the whistle of the locomotive.

But now we are in the fields. There are clouds in the sky below, and a dark fog is blowing from the north west. A dirty fog is falling on the billboards, en-veloping the region in an inscrutable sadness. The hunters go forward, crushing the grass and tugging up the tufts of grass and off the heels. Their guns in their hands, they proceed with purposeful eyes and quivering nostrils, at regular distances from one another. I have selected my hunter, an im-mense black, a man with a black beard, and increased as if for a merciless war, and I walk by his side. With every step that he takes on the soft soil he destroys the sprouting wheat; against the wheat, whose fruit shoots are hardly green as yet, he seems to have a spite; and he inhales the sparry that rise at his approach, and in gross language he proclaims them for not being partridges. With every minute his pace becomes more aggressive, more angry. He grunts and grunts in his throat. He scatters the stones, the masure heaps, the rotten stubble, and the plumpers falling green between the soaks. From time to time, at a distance, beevies of partridges start up and fly in wild fragments, to be distin-guished. Then the hunter's wrath redoubles. He shows inwardly up the partridges, defies them, over them with outrages, not being able to cover with his lead, and says to me:

"They are too cowardly to come within reach of my gun!"

And he begins to philosophize:

"For that matter, it is the same throughout France. Everything is tending, everything is disappearing,—principles, virtues, glory, games. We are a rotten peo-ple, a finished people. There is no longer any authority; there is no longer anything. Do you suppose that the others are not hunting? No, they are hunting grounds! In former times did the partridges start up at so-and-so distances? In former times they started up at so-and-so very fast, the partridges. But you see, then, there is no longer any authority. What do you expect? So it is! As long as there shall be no authority, no iron hand, no sword, . . . yes, a sword, . . . well, so it will be!"

"At this point a hare starts up and scampers off. The hunter smirks, frowns, and misses.

"Oh! the beast!" he cries, "the dirty beast!"

Then, recovering from his moment of stupification, he begins to run after the hare, barking like a dog.

It has not been a good day. Only three partridges have been killed. The hunters, gathered in a circle around the three birds, display a termina-tion. And as the wing of one of the birds still quivers and a slight spasm of agony runs beneath its feathers, one of the hunters groups it, crushes its head under his boot heel, and throws it back beside the others, shouting:

"Fifty credit!"

At night, in the railway carriage that takes us home, the tired hunters sleep in their hides and fur and hair. And I see their line in the pale light that falls upon them, and their hairy mouths open, as if to bark.

They are doubly sleep-free, they are dogs, pursuing in their virgin plains, hares as big as ele-phants and partridges with eagles' wings.

### Plum Pudding on the Free List.

**[New York Times]***

One of the most important and estimable products of the British Isles is the English plum pudding. It always conforms to the demands of the highest art in shape and color. It has a specific gravity only ex-ceeded by the most precious metals, and is as heavy as ele-phants and partridges with eagles' wings.

Plum Pudding on the Free List.

A member writes: "I have been unable to write to any of our targets for nearly three months, owing to having too much work in other ways. I will try one of these days to make up for my delinquency, and write as much as I can in the shortest time. I am glad to have him keep up his work, even in this shape, rather than drop it altogether. But members should remember that, when one feels bound to do something, it is done the better. I am aware that it has the same sort of crushing effect as a pecuniary debt; and that the impression on many targets will be greater if letters are prompt and simultaneous rather than if they are delayed and scattered. Write promptly, if you can; if not, let me know, if you get any replies in answer; and, if accumulations of back work interfere with your
SLAVES TO DUTY.

By John Badcock, Jr.

A unique addition to the吾thetical literature of Americanism, in that it deals with the moral and social problems of the various scenes of our history, as related to the institution of slavery. The story itself is interesting, and the characters are well drawn. The Author, John Badcock, Jr., has done no less than to excite the interest of his readers in the human condition. It is full of truth and justice, and has much to say to the reader who is interested in the subject of slavery.

PRICE, 15 CENTS.

Mailed, post-paid, by
BENJ. R. TUCKER, BOX 182, NEW YORK CITY.

MODERN MARRIAGE.

By EMILE ZOLA.

Translated from the French by Emer Brown.

This is the most interesting book on the subject of marriage that has appeared in recent years. It deals with the problems of love and affection, theEROY, and the social and moral implications of marriage. The author, Emile Zola, is one of the greatest writers of the 19th century, and his work has much to say to the reader who is interested in the subject of marriage.

PRICE, 15 CENTS.

Mailed, post-paid, by
BENJ. R. TUCKER, BOX 182, NEW YORK CITY.

THE BALLOT.

By WILLIAM WALSTEIN GODKAN.

A practical and theoretical work on the right of suffrage. It is written in a clear and concise manner, and is well worth reading by anyone who is interested in the subject of democracy. The author, William Walstein Godkan, is a leading American publicist, and his work has much to say to the reader who is interested in the subject of democracy.

PRICE, 10 CENTS.

Ten Cents Postage refund.

Mailed, post-paid, by
BENJ. R. TUCKER, BOX 182, NEW YORK CITY.

THE QUEST FOR INTELLIGENCE.

By G. BERNARD SHAW.

A masterly work on the subject of intelligence. It is written in a clear and concise manner, and is well worth reading by anyone who is interested in the subject of intelligence. The author, G. Bernard Shaw, is one of the greatest writers of the 20th century, and his work has much to say to the reader who is interested in the subject of intelligence.

PRICE, 50 CENTS.

Mailed, post-paid, by
BENJ. R. TUCKER, BOX 182, NEW YORK CITY.

LIBERTY'S LIBRARY.

For any of the following Works, address
BENJ. R. TUCKER, BOX 182, NEW YORK, N. Y.

ANARCHISM, ITS AIDS AND METHODS.

By A. B. Hume.

A masterly work on the subject of anarchism. It is written in a clear and concise manner, and is well worth reading by anyone who is interested in the subject of anarchism. The author, A. B. Hume, is a leading American publicist, and his work has much to say to the reader who is interested in the subject of anarchism.

PRICE, 50 CENTS.

Mailed, post-paid, by
BENJ. R. TUCKER, BOX 182, NEW YORK CITY.

GOD AND THE STATE.

By G. BERNARD SHAW.

A masterly work on the subject of religion and the state. It is written in a clear and concise manner, and is well worth reading by anyone who is interested in the subject of religion and the state. The author, G. Bernard Shaw, is one of the greatest writers of the 20th century, and his work has much to say to the reader who is interested in the subject of religion and the state.

PRICE, 50 CENTS.

Mailed, post-paid, by
BENJ. R. TUCKER, BOX 182, NEW YORK CITY.

FREE POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS: Their Nature, Evolution, and Development.

By W. L. Webster.

A masterly work on the subject of political institutions. It is written in a clear and concise manner, and is well worth reading by anyone who is interested in the subject of political institutions. The author, W. L. Webster, is a leading American publicist, and his work has much to say to the reader who is interested in the subject of political institutions.

PRICE, 50 CENTS.

Mailed, post-paid, by
BENJ. R. TUCKER, BOX 182, NEW YORK CITY.

THE TECHNICALITY OF THE LAWS OF CONGRESS PROSCRIBING PRIVATE MARRIAGE.

By W. L. Webster.

A masterly work on the subject of the laws of Congress. It is written in a clear and concise manner, and is well worth reading by anyone who is interested in the subject of the laws of Congress. The author, W. L. Webster, is a leading American publicist, and his work has much to say to the reader who is interested in the subject of the laws of Congress.

PRICE, 50 CENTS.

Mailed, post-paid, by
BENJ. R. TUCKER, BOX 182, NEW YORK CITY.

THE VINDICATION OF NATURAL SOCIETY.

By G. BERNARD SHAW.

A masterly work on the subject of natural society. It is written in a clear and concise manner, and is well worth reading by anyone who is interested in the subject of natural society. The author, G. Bernard Shaw, is one of the greatest writers of the 20th century, and his work has much to say to the reader who is interested in the subject of natural society.

PRICE, 50 CENTS.

Mailed, post-paid, by
BENJ. R. TUCKER, BOX 182, NEW YORK CITY.

THE VICE OF WINE.

By G. BERNARD SHAW.

A masterly work on the subject of the vice of wine. It is written in a clear and concise manner, and is well worth reading by anyone who is interested in the subject of the vice of wine. The author, G. Bernard Shaw, is one of the greatest writers of the 20th century, and his work has much to say to the reader who is interested in the subject of the vice of wine.

PRICE, 50 CENTS.

Mailed, post-paid, by
BENJ. R. TUCKER, BOX 182, NEW YORK CITY.

THE PACIFIC COAST.

By W. L. Webster.

A masterly work on the subject of the Pacific Coast. It is written in a clear and concise manner, and is well worth reading by anyone who is interested in the subject of the Pacific Coast. The author, W. L. Webster, is a leading American publicist, and his work has much to say to the reader who is interested in the subject of the Pacific Coast.

PRICE, 50 CENTS.

Mailed, post-paid, by
BENJ. R. TUCKER, BOX 182, NEW YORK CITY.

THE PASSIONATE PILGRIM.

By G. BERNARD SHAW.

A masterly work on the subject of the passionate pilgrim. It is written in a clear and concise manner, and is well worth reading by anyone who is interested in the subject of the passionate pilgrim. The author, G. Bernard Shaw, is one of the greatest writers of the 20th century, and his work has much to say to the reader who is interested in the subject of the passionate pilgrim.

PRICE, 50 CENTS.

Mailed, post-paid, by
BENJ. R. TUCKER, BOX 182, NEW YORK CITY.