On Picket Duty.

Mr. Lloyd's article in this issue will be dealt with hereafter. And I have not forgotten that I still owe an answer to Mr. Badeck on this question of the children.

The writer of the tribute to Mr. Lloyd's poems which appears upon another page seems to me a little forgetful of the English poets of the past, in saying that their combined first books do not contain more thought than "Wind-Harp Songs." What about Shelley's "Queen Mab"? And think, too, of the thoughtful works with which he followed it when yet, one might say, a mere boy! We are reminded that Mr. Lloyd is still a young man. Well, he is not an old one, surely; but at Lloyd's age Shelley was dead. I admire Lloyd's poems enthusiastically, and have often turned back in the files of Liberty to read them again and again. But—

Judge Payne, of Cook county, Illinois, has stated before a meeting of the bar association that there is no such thing as justice in the county named. "No man who has sufficient influence to see the county commissioners," he declared, "can be brought to trial for any crime on earth." He has, in response to a demand for definite charges, openly accused one commissioner of having accepted a bribe from the friends of an indicted criminal. Interesting developments are expected, as newspaper correspondents would say. Judge Payne further states that grand juries in Illinois are generally corrupt, and that they ought to be abolished. Extreme, indeed, must be the situation when judges are impelled to denounce it and to call for radical reforms, and when leading newspapers, in summarizing the evidence of wholesale corruption in all departments, intimate that the Anarchists are "almost justified" in their repudiation of government.

We have seen what Edgar Fawcett's opinions of Whitman and Ibsen are, and also how much his profound sympathy with Spencerian individualism is worth. He now adds to the stock of knowledge concerning his critical qualifications by expressing his opinion of Meredith and abusing American magazine editors for neglecting native genius and pitting English authors. "Such a mass of pompous affectation," he says, "as Mr. Meredith's 'Amazing Marriage' has been chosen as a serial in 'Scriber's,' merely because certain London ciphers have puffed the alleged genius of its author." Now, even Mr. Fawcett might realize that people do not puff old writers who have a literary past extending over several decades. Log-rolling is confined to the young gentlemen whose fame rests on freshness and eccentricity, and whose output offers no promise of enduring merit. Meredith is above modern criticism; his faults are greater than the virtues of an average novelist. As one writer in the "Academy" well says, the only man who can adequately criticize Meredith is Meredith himself. There are enough ideas, wit, wisdom, philosophy, and art in one of Meredith's books to make the reputation of the ordinary writers of fiction.

The recent national manufacturers' convention in Chicago was a protectionist reunion. The nation, it is thought, is weary of Democratic tariff reform and ready to revert to "protection and reciprocity." Resolutions were accordingly passed by the manufacturers calling for a higher tariff and suppression of foreign competition. It is rather remarkable, however, that most of these clamors for government aid are very conspicuous in the movement in favor of retiring the government from the banking business. Theoretically these two positions cannot be reconciled, but it is clear that these gentry favor private control of the currency simply because they expect to gain by the change, and not in consequence of any general political principle. They want freedom wherever they imagine that it will prove more profitable to themselves, while paternalism suits them very well indeed, provided it means money in their pockets. One of the delegates, more consistent from a theoretical point of view, drew attention to the contradiction, and offered a resolution in favor of a general divorce of the State and business, in order that the latter "may not be made to fluctuate with the breath of public opinion, but may be solidly founded on honesty, skill, industry, and natural resources." It is unnecessary to add that this resolution was tabled without any discussion. These people, however, do not really want free banking. They want private banking, "regulated" in their interest.

Protectionists have never been very respectable, but their latest antics render them un- speakably contemptible. The infant industry argument, the European pauper labor plea, the home market pretense, and all the other worn-out subterfuges have manifestly become unfit for further duty, and we are treated to long articles, under scare headlines, about a new and terrible danger, the invasion of our markets by Japanese and Chinese products. Here, about the patriotic editors, is a menace to which even the most confirmed tariff reformers cannot remain indifferent. Prompt action must be had; let us straightway raise our tariff and protect American capital and labor from the hordes of the yellows with their low standard of living. The whole scare is based on some consular reports in which it is gravely asserted that China and Japan are about to enter upon a period of great industrial development, and that these powerful future rivals have their eyes on our markets. Everybody knows, of course, that but a short time is required to place a backward country on a level with the most advanced and active; hence it is positively criminal to allow China and Japan to overtake us and challenge our supremacy. This silly dodge may deceive the fools who do the bidding of their protectionist patrons, but it is doubtful whether it will make an impression on the average reader. Fortunately, the latter has not enough imagination to represent Japan and China to himself as dangerous industrial rivals of England and the United States.

At Mr. Yarros's request I state that he disclaims any intention of applying the term "irresponsible" to me in his recent reply to me on the Venezuelan question. He meant it, he declares, only for those clamorers for a vigorous foreign policy who base their demands on the Monroe doctrine. While noting his disclaimer with gratification, I remind him of his actual words: "Fortunately all responsible writers and teachers have already condemned this [Clevelander's] attempt to distort and stretch the Monroe doctrine." One naturally interprets this as meaning that all responsible writers consider Cleveland's attitude an attempt to distort and stretch the Monroe doctrine, and so condemn it. As I do not so consider it, I was justified in the clear inference that Mr. Yarros classed me among irresponsible writers. Mr. Yarros reminds me that he heard me say in private that I care nothing about consistency with the Monroe doctrine. But this remark was made by me apropos of those persons who inquire, not whether Cleveland's attitude is rational, but whether it is consistent with the Monroe doctrine,—those persons, that is to say, who accept the Monroe doctrine because it is established rather than because it rests on a rational foundation. My own view is that the Monroe doctrine is sound in its purpose and equal to the attainment thereof. And, far from believing that Cleveland has stretched it, I consider that, in stating it, he has unwittingly narrowed it, for which I condemn him. But in declaring that it covers the present status of the Venezuelan case, he neither stretches nor narrows it, and for this I approve him.
On the other hand, the Anarchists, and the Singletaxians (and Russell's individualism is even more a sort of sub­terrestrialism), are other corollaries of the same fundamental principle of the individual freedom. There are other corollaries just as important in a theoretical sense. Mr. Russell proceeds to deduce government from his premises, as follows:

The rights and aptitude of the individual are the basis and source of government. They also define its proper scope.

Successful government then recognizes:
1. The individual right.
2. The protection of this right.
3. In protecting it, the necessity of limiting individual action by others, and, because the power is given to others, to the people, of determining the limits and restraints.
4. The necessity of providing proper institutions for the education and development of the people, that they may make an intelligent and just exercise of their right.

Mr. Russell's premises warrant a greater degree of aggression, but not government or taxation of all indiscriminately. How does he deduce the right of some to form a government for the coercion of the not-invasive? It is pre­positional for him to say (as he does) that he ignores the Anarchists and deals only with those who recognize the State as a permanent fact, for this hogs the whole question. It is the Anarchists who fully accept his principles, and yet deny the legitimacy of his government. If he assumes government without question, regardless of his own principle, how can he ask others to respect the limits at which he arrives by applying this same neglected principle?

If he created government out of nothing, logically speaking, Mr. Russell asserts that, in addition to the protective function, it is bound to provide education in order that the people may exercise their power intelligently. No fault can be found with this. Since we do not know the source of governmental authority, we cannot confidently enquire any claim it may advance. If it is imposed from above for our good, it is not inconsistent for it to prescribe education for us for our own good. But the trouble is that the same thing would be true of any other "service" government chose to render. Whatever it might deem good for us, we should have to accept. Who can decide whether her government has overstepped its proper bounds? Mr. Russell indeed lays down the rule that "the government can undertake only that which is essential to its safety, but how is that test to be applied? Is the government to pass upon its own conduct? If not, then who is to be the court of appeal? Not the majority, for Mr. Russell's first principles do not in any way warrant the assumption of the right to rule by the majority. Not the individual, for, if the individual can overrule the government, he can abolish it entirely.

On the consent theory, it is clear that government can undertake anything its own citizens are willing to trust it with. There is no difference between education and food, or clothing, or paper money. An agent can do everything he is authorized to do by the principal. On the theory that government exists only to protect individual rights, enforce equality of freedom;—it is clear that education is as foreign to its sphere as free speech. The notion that its "safety" depends on education is absurd. Think of an agent complying his principal or master to receive education from him in order to give him the means of doing so.

Of course Mr. Russell's individualism is even more strong than that of the Spen­carians, for they oppose public education. But, so far as the question of the warrant for government is concerned, the same fallacy is apparent in both positions.

Mr. Russell "arraigned" State Socialism, while admitting that there were force and significance in its criticisms upon the present society. He omitted, however, to point out what remedy his individualism provides for the evils now existing. Trusts, he thought, might properly be restrained, and he pointed with approval to such laws as those regulating inter­state commerce and preventing cornering and monopoly. Unfortunately these laws utterly fail of effect, and hence, from his own point of view, there is abundant justification for con­demning the present system. State Socialism triumphs easily over such defenses, and men like Mr. Howells, impressed by the pitiful weakness of what they fain to be individualism, proclaim liberty to be an antique notion and empty affair. Chicago University has several semi-collectivists as professors, and they must have rejoiced in the bankruptcy of the individualist champion. Mr. Russell is bright enough to be governor of Massachusetts, but he is not fitted by nature or education to make a convincing plea for liberty.

Howells on Liberty.

William Dean Howells's collectivist proclivities are well known, and the Socialist view of liberty is equally well known. There was no particular reason, therefore, why the recent "Forum" article by Mr. Howells (on the "Nature of Liberty") should have awakened any surprise, and yet several reform papers have commented upon it if for no other special significance. What is still more strange is that one or two of the more individualistic of the Single Tax organs approvingly quoted Mr. Howells. Let us see what the gist of his argument is.

The antique ideal of liberty, says Mr. Howells, still holds sway in our political speculation, and it is time a rational, scientific, and practical view of it were taken. In his opening paragraph he says:

"Liberty is never good in itself, and is never final; it is a means to something good, and a way to the end where the means are really good. Liberty is provisionally a blessing, but it is purely provisional; it is self-limited, and is forever merging into some sort of subjection. It no sooner establishes itself than it begins to control itself. The dream of infinite and constant liberty is the hallucination of the Anarchist,—that is, of the individualist gone mad. The moment liberty in this meaning was achieved, we should have the rule, not of the wisest, not of the best, not even of the most, but of the strongest, and no liberty at all."

This is so loose and vague that one who was not familiar with Mr. Howells's philosophy might put upon it a construction not necessarily inconsistent with the true conception of liberty. To say that liberty is not a good in itself, but only a means to some good, is, in one sense, truis­matic. Liberty is a means to happiness, and, if happiness were possible without it, nobody would care anything about it. If, however, Mr. Howells means that we are always necessarily conscious that, in struggling for liberty, we are trying to get a means to something else, he speaks sense. We are, in fact, is the point, nearer and nearer to our ultimate ends, and in striving to obtain them we generally lose sight of the ultimate end. This is a psychological necessity, and implies no lack of rationality. It is true that we desire liberty because it is a condition of happiness, but it is also true that we are not in the habit of representing liberty to ourselves as a means. Our
liberty is natural and fundamental. The Anarchistic conception of liberty involves no such qualities. It is, of course, utterly impossible to say what would follow the realization of such an unintelligible thing as infinite and immutable liberty; but it is quite possible to say what a condition of equal freedom would entail. If equal freedom were achieved, we should certainly have stronger tendencies towards the rule of the strongest than at present. If Mr. Howells takes the contrary view, he is bound to prove that the strongest individual or group would find it easier to overcome the resistance of private defensive associations—of the entire community seeking to preserve freedom—that of an unorganized and unintelligent mass which trusts blindly to government. After a good deal of metaphysical talk about liberty, Mr. Howells proceeds to define the nature of liberty as he conceives it.

Liberty and poverty are incompatible; and, if the poverty is not possible to it. How to secure every man in the means of livelihood, and so guarantee equal freedom to all, is the great problem for statesmanship to solve. The fact remains that liberty is for those who have the means of livelihood. With them, however, it is always in danger of ceasing to be liberty and becoming tyranny.

Opportunity is one phase of liberty, safety is another. The safe man, the only free man; and it is not enough not to be in danger, one must not be in fear of danger. When we have liberty in the form of opportunity, we must have it in the form of safety, or we have it in vain to keep it slow as opportunity, we should lose it, for there is nothing vital, nothing lasting, in opportunity. We can enjoy liberty only in its ultimate form of safety, and we cannot, any one of us, or any part of us, be safe, unless all the rest are safe, for the insecurity of others is the perpetual menace of our own security. We must somehow be equals in opportunity.

In a word, to be free, one must be economically independent and assured of the means of livelihood. This is the Howells conception of liberty.

The exception is entirely fallacious. Mr. Howells puts the cart before the horse when he talks about securing "every man in the means of livelihood and so guarantee equal freedom to all," and he is superficial when he talks about safety in general. The only safety essential to liberty is safety from infringements on the part of others. The man who is infringed upon is not free, and the man who is perpetually threatened with infringements is also to a great extent deprived of his full freedom of action. Any other safety is no part of the proper definition of liberty. Metaphysics aside, is it not the man who, under freedom, neglects to use his opportunities and, through vice of some kind, fails to preserve his economic independence, a free man? If not, who has enslaved him? The shallow would say that such a man is a slave to his own vices, but that is irrelevant to a discussion of social or political relations.

It is not true that social liberty and poverty are incompatible. What is true (and it is probably this fact that Mr. Howells has dimly perceived) is that under real liberty there would be much less poverty than now, and that the cause of much existing poverty is found in infringements upon liberty. In other words, under liberty men would generally be economically independent and in "safe" possession of the means of livelihood. This safety would directly result from opportunity, and would not be something independent and additional to it. True liberty does not exist to-day, the economic sphere being less free than any other. Economic well-being; it is true, is important that the lack of it detracts greatly from the value of such liberty as men do possess, but it is irrational to deny (as Mr. Howells most absolutely does) that political and religious liberty has always been highly valued by mankind. History replete with evidence to the contrary.

Poverty is a great evil, and its removal is the problem of this historical period; but it can be removed only by liberty. "We must be equals in opportunity," but not "somehow." Economic liberty alone can give us this equality. The difference between Mr. Howells's view and our view is this: He says: "Secure every man in the means of livelihood and so guarantee equal freedom to all." How we are to secure this alleged condition of equal freedom he does not indicate, except in his concluding sentence, which is an indirect endorsement of State Socialism. We say: "Give men equal freedom, and so allow each to secure himself in the means of livelihood," equal freedom being the condition and the manner of this security. There is nothing astonishing in Mr. Howells's confusion, but that the individualistically-inclined Single Taxers should have failed to detect the fallacy of his argument is somewhat surprising.

Mr. Howells concludes as follows:

Some say that those things which are essential to liberty cannot safely be trusted in private hands; for the individual may use them not only to assure himself of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, but he may use them to jeopardize another in life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. These philosophers have imagined that all should own the means which form the opportunity and safety of each, and so far no one else has imagined any other way out of the trouble, though few are ready to take this way.

The division of things into those essential to liberty and those not essential to liberty is, of course, a corollary from the collectivist view of capital. Mr. Howells's remark that no other way out of the trouble has been suggested is a very ignorant one. A man of his fairness ought to inform himself before making such statements. There are at least three other ways before the world to-day,—the Anarchistic way of equal freedom, the Single Tax way, and the so-called Anarchist-Communist way. To write intelligently about the connection between liberty and poverty, it is necessary to know what these different schools have to say by way of criticism as well as by way of construction.

The Value of Liberty.

Had Mr. Bolton Hall read "Instead of a Book" from end to end, he would not have found in it complete answers to the important questions which he puts to me in another column. Nevertheless I am disposed to pick a few passages out of his book which I believe may be included in this volume as which would be equivalent to writing the history of human life on this planet. It is a task which I respectfully decline. I remind Mr. Hall that Mr. Herbert Spencer once set two or three able lieutenants to tabulating the history of English legislation during the last five centuries or so, and that the time and money spent in the preparation of the next few tables, covering a small portion of the fourteenth century, so frightened the millionaire who was furnishing
the means that he concluded that philanthropy's usual methods, such as the founding of libraries, hospitals, and universities, would be a less drain upon his resources than the continuance of Mr. Spencer's undertaking. Where a Spencer and a Crousè fall, am I expected to succeed?

Still, if Mr. Hall can spare the time to examine, not Spencer's "Social Status" merely, but that philosopher's entire works (I ought to warn him that they are longer than all his bibles together), he will find marshalled in their pages a not inconceivable mass of facts tending specifically to show that aggression is inexpedient. Scores and hundreds of them, have been cited, first and last, in the columns of Liberty. So that the arguments of the Anarchists are not "purely a priori." It is true, nevertheless, that they are largely so. But this does not discredit Anarchism. The arguments of Euclid are strictly a priori. Fancy Mr. Hall calling on Euclid to prove indubitably that the three angles of a triangle are equal to two right angles! The fact is that an a priori argument in which no flaw can be pointed out is presumptively sound until contradicted by an a posteriori argument. And when the latter is not to be accepted in preference to the former, unless the conclusion most positively appears to be a correct generalization, not only from unquestioned facts, but from the totality of such facts. Facts that are not facts, or that may not be facts, or that may appear in quite a new light if accompanied by all the other facts, are not sufficient to discredit a deduction which has withstood all the assaults of the human mind. The situation seems to be this. The Anarchists present certain a priori arguments. Mr. Hall has not answered them, and presumably cannot answer them, by a priori methods. If, now, the a posteriori test is to be applied, the burden falls upon Mr. Hall. It is for him, not for us, to write the universal history. Let him gather his facts, tabulate them, and pour them at us in a broadside. Then we will endeavor to estimate how much damage we have suffered, and to determine "where we are at."

To Mr. Hall's second question I answer that I know of no reason why any one should subordinate the gratification of his present desires to the good of the race. Indeed, I deny that such subordination is possible. A man's action must always be determined by his present desires and powers, and by the effect that their gratification and exercise are likely to have upon his future desires and powers. Whenever a man acts for the good of the race, he is gratifying his greatest present desires.

Coming now to the third question propounded, I answer that equanimity, honesty, and sympathy are undoubtedly among the qualities which have enabled the race to prevail, but that they alone have not been sufficient. I would enumerate also the capacity to digest food, the capacity to breathe, physical strength, industry, ingenuity, invention, liberty, and many others. Which of these has been the main factor in the progress of the race I do not consider it possible to determine. In fact, the phrase seems to me rather an absurd one: in this connection. Nearly all of these qualities have been essential to progress. Perhaps, if any one of them had been totally lacking, all the others would have been of no avail. Now, when two things are essential, neither can be properly said to be more important than the other.

When I am apt to think of steam as the main factor in effecting my transportation. But I see that my notion is inaccurate, as soon as I reflect that, at the present stage of invention, steam could not have carried me without a railway track, and that therefore the latter is as important as the former. So, as Mr. Hall anticipates, I am unable to affirm that liberty has been the main factor in enabling the race to prevail.

Nevertheless, I think there is a marked distinction between the influence of liberty and the influence of all the other qualities mentioned. In fact, properly speaking, liberty is not a personal quality at all, but a condition. Honesty, courage, sympathy, ingenuity, etc., are personal qualities inhering in the individual and not derived by him from those with whom he has to deal. But liberty is a condition conferred upon or allowed to the individual by his fellows, since, however weaker they are, cannot extract it from them. It is a quality, not of the individual himself, but of his environment. Now, since individual qualities are greatly in the proportion of their modification to an extent that their influence will follow that honesty, courage, etc., will vary to a large extent as the environment varies, and that, if they are increased and developed (as I hold that they are) in an environment of liberty, then much of their direct influence upon the prevalence of the race is really an influence exercised indirectly by liberty and properly to be credited to it. It seeming to me that a condition of slavery and aggression tends strongly to prevent the oppressed in habits of cowardice, lying, and brutality, it must also seem to me that to say that courage, honesty, and sympathy have been prominent factors in enabling the race to prevail is but another way of saying that liberty has been a prominent factor therein.

And, when Mr. Hall begins his writing of universal history by declaring that the Russians, Germans, Turks, and Egyptians have shown courage, independence, honesty, and sympathy in a high degree, while possessing almost no liberty at all, and at the same time have attained the very highest phases of civilization, I must impeach his reliability as a historian. I deny that these nations have attained the very highest phases of civilization, and I assert that they are conspicuous rather by lack than by possession of the qualities cited. Of the great nations long in existence I think it cannot be denied that England and France are the most highly civilized, and as certainly are they more advanced than the other great nations in the degree of individual liberty maintained. I think, too, that each combines qualities of courage, honesty, and sympathy to a greater extent than that to which they are combined by the nations enumerated by Mr. Hall. Of the four nations which he names Germany most nearly approaches England and France in point of civilization, and of these four Germany is certainly the most libertarian even now, when passing through a reactionary stage of imperial absolutism that contrasts sharply with the greater freedom which prevailed within her States before the days of Bismarckian consolidation, and which doubtless helped to lay the foundation for the power which she now possesses. Honesty is well developed among Germans, and courage moderately; in sympathy they seem to me somewhat lacking. On the other hand, there is a much stronger conviction of liberty, honesty, courage, and sympathy than have the Russians or the Turks, and a weaker one than have the English or the French,—a combination, in short, proportionate to their degree of civilization. As for the Russians, while we may credit them with some degree of sympathy, they are, instead of courageous and independent, hopelessly fatalistic and supine, and are so far from being honest that their own best writers pronounce them a nation of notorious liars. The Turks, on the other hand, may be allowed to be courageous, but their brutality has rendered them unspeakable, and their fame for honesty does not extend to the uttermost parts of the earth.

These nations, then, by their characteristics and conditions, sustain my theory rather than Mr. Hall's. He does not see facts as they are, and his arguments well illustrate the dangers of the a posteriori method. (I say nothing of the Egyptians, because I know less of them than of the other nations, but I have little doubt that Mr. Hall is wrong regarding them also.)

"But it is a moment to me," says Mr. Hall, "that, if universal experience showed that non-aggression resulted in more pleasure to the individual than aggression, men would have become non-aggressive." The fallacy here may be easily perceived by substituting for non-aggression one of Mr. Hall's other definitions,—say, honesty. The sentence then will read: "If universal experience showed that honesty resulted in more pleasure to the individual than dishonesty, men would have become honest." But all men have not become honest, and yet Mr. Hall continues to believe that honesty contributes to individual welfare. Similarly, all men have not become non-aggressive, and I continue to believe that non-aggression contributes to individual welfare. There are no plainer "facts" than that men are very slow to learn the lessons of universal experience, and that, after learning them, they are frequently prevented by their passions from profiting by them.

Regarding the fourth question propounded, which I thus restate: Given two persons, can you prove that the equal distribution of a certain sum of happiness between them is better than an unequal distribution of a greater sum of happiness that one of the two is less happy than in the former case? I am obliged to ask for information concerning the two persons. Are they supposed to be economically dependent upon one another in the sense that members of a highly-organized community are, and are they supposed to be sympathetic? If not, then it seems perfectly clear that an unequal distribution whether of a greater or of the same or of a less aggregate of happiness would be the better scheme for the two persons whose happiness it would increase, and the worse scheme for the other one. But, if these two persons are economically dependent on each other in the social sense, then it seems perfectly clear that an equal distribution of happiness is better for both parties, since the economic conditions that tend to distribute happiness equally are identical (and this is laid down in the Gospel of St. Henry) with those that tend to increase productive power and
It is with some humiliation that I note that the "Arena" is with Liberty in approving Cleveland's message. Endorsement by Flower tends to destroy the paper's case. Nevertheless it is not to be denied that the "Arena" is one of the advocates to the liberal element in the community, and must be classed among progressive periodicals. Its approval of Cleveland, therefore, may properly be called to the attention of Mr. Yarro, who has declared that Liberty stands alone among progressive papers in its attitude toward England on the Venetian question. There are four of us now,—Liberty, the "Open Court," "Paragraphs," and the "Arena." And very likely there are others; I do not find time to read all my exchanges. An additional fact to be noted is that the "Open Court" now testifies to receiving a storm of indignant letters from its subscribers (surely in the progressive camp) condemning Mr. Dyer to the same ostracism in England and the United States. Will some one provide my friend Yarro with a hermitage?

Here is how the "People" meets the statement of Joseph A. Labadie that of late there has been a reaction in labor organizations against State Socialism: "Not one of the men Mr. Labadie mentions, and not one of the longer list he might have mentioned, himself included, but is, and was, and, as long as let alone, will be, a labor fakir, a fellow ignorant of the Labor Question, without trust in the capacity of the workers to emancipate themselves, egoistic, vain, corrupt, who seeks to feather his own nest at the expense of the workers, a-d who knows that to do that he must keep the rank and file in ignorance of Socialism." The "fellow" who writes this is, of course, a gentleman, scholar, altruist, and true leader. His words clearly imply it, and he ought to know. But the charge that Labadie, McOraft, Cohen, and others whom the fellow names are "corrupt" is a serious one, and, while everybody knows that it is a malicious and ridiculous falsehood, many will doubtless be indignant enough to demand some action on the part of the maligned. Fortunately, nothing that could be said or done would in any way increase the disgust and contempt which are generally felt for the editor of the "People." An irresponsible clown has absolute freedom of speech; to stop to contradict him is humiliating and futile, for his foul mouth can be closed by no evidence or argument of any kind.

Comrade Cohen at last has triumphed over all his difficulties, and his new edition of "Mutual Banking" is on the market. I supply it at ten cents a copy. It is a pity that, mechanically, it is not better. However, I suppose it is necessary to bow to the demands of this age of cheapness. Let us do all in our power to second Cohen in his enthusiastic effort to make Col. Greene's great work as well known as it deserves to be.

A subscriber writes me that Flower's "Anarchist, Dr. Rodolf, lives in Ohio," it was cruel of me not to be able to supply him with this information. I think it is necessary to bow to the demands of this age of cheapness. Let us do all in our power to second Cohen in his enthusiastic effort to make Col. Greene's great work as well known as it deserves to be.

Anarchist Letter-Writing Corps.

The secretary of the "Open Court" asks me to send word to Mr. Yarro to send his name to the "Arena" for his address. Nevertheless it is not to be denied that the "Arena" is one of the advocates to the liberal element in the community, and must be classed among progressive periodicals. Its approval of Cleveland, therefore, may properly be called to the attention of Mr. Yarro, who has declared that Liberty stands alone among progressive papers in its attitude toward England on the Venetian question. There are four of us now,—Liberty, the "Open Court," "Paragraphs," and the "Arena." And very likely there are others; I do not find time to read all my exchanges. An additional fact to be noted is that the "Open Court" now testifies to receiving a storm of indignant letters from its subscribers (surely in the progressive camp) condemning Mr. Dyer to the same ostracism in England and the United States. Will some one provide my friend Yarro with a hermitage?

Here is how the "People" meets the statement of Joseph A. Labadie that of late there has been a reaction in labor organizations against State Socialism: "Not one of the men Mr. Labadie mentions, and not one of the longer list he might have mentioned, himself included, but is, and was, and, as long as let alone, will be, a labor fakir, a fellow ignorant of the Labor Question, without trust in the capacity of the workers to emancipate themselves, egoistic, vain, corrupt, who seeks to feather his own nest at the expense of the workers, a-d who knows that to do that he must keep the rank and file in ignorance of Socialism." The "fellow" who writes this is, of course, a gentleman, scholar, altruist, and true leader. His words clearly imply it, and he ought to know. But the charge that Labadie, McOraft, Cohen, and others whom the fellow names are "corrupt" is a serious one, and, while everybody knows that it is a malicious and ridiculous falsehood, many will doubtless be indignant enough to demand some action on the part of the maligned. Fortunately, nothing that could be said or done would in any way increase the disgust and contempt which are generally felt for the editor of the "People." An irresponsible clown has absolute freedom of speech; to stop to contradict him is humiliating and futile, for his foul mouth can be closed by no evidence or argument of any kind.

Comrade Cohen at last has triumphed over all his difficulties, and his new edition of "Mutual Banking" is on the market. I supply it at ten cents a copy. It is a pity that, mechanically, it is not better. However, I suppose it is necessary to bow to the demands of this age of cheapness. Let us do all in our power to second Cohen in his enthusiastic effort to make Col. Greene's great work as well known as it deserves to be.

A subscriber writes me that Flower's "Anarchist, Dr. Rodolf, lives in Ohio," it was cruel of me not to be able to supply him with this information. I think it is necessary to bow to the demands of this age of cheapness. Let us do all in our power to second Cohen in his enthusiastic effort to make Col. Greene's great work as well known as it deserves to be.
Psyche. [Transcribed from the German by Stephen T. Newbold.]

With her little lamp in hand
And the great fire in her breast,
Psyche creeps up to the bed
Where the sleeper dear doth rest.

And she blushes and she quakes
As she makes her way to her place.

Then the unveiled God of Love
Is awakened—and he flies.

Nineteen hundred years of pain!
Almost dead, poor thing, is she;
Facts and smites herself, because
Naked Love she dared to see.

Histories, Histories.

Happiness and Aggression.

To the Editor of Liberty:

Although, as I understand, you do not believe in a God or in anything corresponding to the idea of a God, I have much respect for your opinions, and therefore ask the following questions. It may be that the answers could be gleaned from "Instead of a Book," but that is too long for me, though I have read much of it. I suppose the you had not time to make shorter.

(1) What evidence is there that aggression is inexorable, and that the law of liberty will result in the greatest happiness?

(2) Even if it is in the long run, inexpedient, why, if there is no power that "makes for righteousness," should we subordinate the gratification of his present desires to... good of the race by refraining from coercing an individual? I am familiar with Spencer's line of reasoning, and personally I attach much weight to it, but it appears to me that all the discussions as to whether liberty is ethically right or not are begging the question, at least from your point of view. And perhaps it is to be one of evolution.—yes, how did the race come to its present stage of development, and what are the qualities that have enabled certain types to survive and to prevail? I do not think that the most ardent supporter of liberty will say that devotion to freedom has been the main factor. At least, if so, the argument here should be the synthetic one of tabulating facts and considering them historically. If universal experience showed that non-aggression resulted in more pleasure to the individual than aggression, it seems to me that men would have become non-aggressive. The complaint of the ages, from Job down, is that the wicked and violent prospered and had eyes standing out with fatness. Your arguments, I think, are purely a priori.

(3) Are not the qualities which have enabled this race to prevail, to punish anything short of aggression, and personally I attach much weight to it, but it appears to me that all the discussions as to whether liberty is ethically right or not are begging the question, at least from your point of view. And perhaps it is to be one of evolution.—yes, how did the race come to its present stage of development, and what are the qualities that have enabled certain types to survive and to prevail? I do not think that the most ardent supporter of liberty will say that devotion to freedom has been the main factor. At least, if so, the argument here should be the synthetic one of tabulating facts and considering them historically. If universal experience showed that non-aggression resulted in more pleasure to the individual than aggression, it seems to me that men would have become non-aggressive. The complaint of the ages, from Job down, is that the wicked and violent prospered and had eyes standing out with fatness. Your arguments, I think, are purely a priori.

(4) It is by no means clear to me that aggression upon the individual and the utter sacrifice of the exercise of faculty by some individuals has not resulted, and may not result in the greatest sum of human happiness, and I do not think that I could show, without calling upon a "God," that it is more important or better or more moral that two persons should have a certain amount of liberty rather than have the loss developed one killed and the other have three times as much happiness. Could you?

While I think it is true that society had better not attempt to prove that the life and liberty of all individuals is just the same, even though a hundred men would be better or more moral that two persons should have a certain amount of liberty rather than have the loss developed one killed and the other have three times as much happiness. Could you?

The average savage sees this, at least in regard to his relations with his fellows, much more clearly and instinctively, for his "God," his sense of justice, his feelings, his happiness and his thoughts are based on nature in man and the nature of society. He has no theory of rights primitive and inherent; and for this rebellion and this appeal I stand.

The average savage sees this, at least in regard to his relations with his fellows, much more clearly and instinctively, for his "God," his sense of justice, his feelings, his happiness and his thoughts are based on nature in man and the nature of society. He has no theory of rights primitive and inherent; and for this rebellion and this appeal I stand.

It is thus written because it is thus in life. Our action is overmastered and characterized above all by the law of nature. We aim at a petty end, quite aside from the public good, but our action arranges itself by irresistible magnetism in a line with the polities.
How the Devil Became Bald.

[Cartulle in the La Journal.]

Everybody knows that man is the most intellectual animal; and, logically, he had to be. For the worst of vulgarians [all old je suis enferm(e)] could not be spared the abominable author of every human ill.

But it is less generally known how Lucifer, whom some call Filos and others Beelzebuth, lost his hair.

I shall tell the story as it was told me by a barber of Pampelune, whose door was the sign, "The Wig of Satan."

On the morning of the world, the red as flames of hell, black as a delirious angel’s hair was so prodigiously bushy and bristly that it outspread over the earth and the sea like a huge umbel of tubers and looks. And Our Lord was much chagrined therewith. For, when appearing on his spectacular stage, which are made, as everybody knows, of the last star of the South and the last star of September joined by a comet’s tail, he could not distinguish, through the veils which his dark and flaxen mass of hair, the beautiful world that he had crossed. Now, when one has invented roses, the least that he can ask is the pleasure of looking at them. Furthermore, the Lord, according to the most authentic pews, that we have of him, has more beard than hair; and he felt, perhaps, a little jealous.

Of course, nothing would have been easier for him than to shed them all. All infections of love and equity in our social relations are scandalously punished. They are punished by Peur. While I stand in simple relations to my fellow man, I have no right to shame him. We meet as water meets water, or as two currents of air mix, with perfect diffusion and interpenetration of nature. But, as soon as there is any departure from simplicity and humanity as to your friend who is in the right, and for him, my neighbor feels the wrong: he shrinks from me as I shrink from him; his eyes no longer seek mine; there is war between us; there is hate in him and fear in me."

My position that man should maintain the equal liberty of man as against all other animals, that it is human equal liberty that we want and that an inoffensive man should be sacred to his fellow, excites Mr. Tucker. He explains me as if it were what we want, and asserts that my remarks are "superstitious," "absurd," "sheer nonsense," "lie(s) of religion," etc., perhaps, but to my own mind they are a reasonable conclusion drawn from much observation of nature.

I observe that individuals of a species are naturally inclined to cooperate against individuals of other species and for mutual defence and benefit. In proportion as they shall lose their own independence, and as the cooperation increases is the security, power, and happiness of the species and of its individuals increased. It appears to be a rule of nature to which there are few exceptions that each species is latent or actively at war with all other species. And a recognition of equal liberty among individuals of a species brings cooperation up to its highest spontaneous limit. If all this is true,—and I think every naturalist will endorse it,—my distinction between man and the other animals is not "arbitrary," but reasonable and natural, and there is no "more reason" for a human being’s "saying that he should not be property because he is human than there would be in saying that dogs should not be property because they are canine." The natural order is cooperation and commissary to all with all! This species, in battle to all without, and we disregard to this our law.

I shall not refer to the arguments made by Mr. Tucker on minor points, for I do not see that they either strengthen his position or weaken mine. Leave those to the jury.

I have a hope of a free society in which no man shall claim, or of having admitted, any right to injure or own another of the human race. And, unless there is neither safety or happiness or fulness of life.

By J. W. Lloyd.
He is comparatively a young man and may do greater things. Is not this a "plant" to be cultivated.

The professor may declare that "Wind-Harp Songs" is not a "worthy contribution to the poetry of the age." They may say that or what they please. But I will say to them and to the world: It is a "topaz hearted," and beautiful, and it will be not alone for the "immoral" gods, but for moral men with all his fleet joys and tender sorrows.

Solutions.
How will you explain the tightened times, O free old—etc.—It will be by the
And let it go at that.
How will you solve the problem, Sir, you call—It will be all to Grover.
And let it go at that.
And what remark have you to make, My soul-sitting page—It will be all to the street named Wall, and let it go at that.
One more I glanced to interview—The blind religio-Bat.
He laid it to the Devil, and I let it go at that.
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