On Picket Duty.

After ten years of persistent agitation, the "gamblers" of the Chicago board of trade have succeeded in getting a number of bucket-shop proprietors indicted by a grand jury. Perhaps it is needless to add that this exceptionally virtuous jury is now openly accused of soliciting bribes and blackmailing.

The stupid press is again congratulating itself on an alleged success of a government loan. The people, especially the bankers and capitalists, have demonstrated their confidence in the stability and stability of the government by their eagerness to buy the bonds. Well, let us see. So far as the government's skill and success as a banker are concerned, it is rather difficult to see where the confidence has been shown. Everybody is aware that the reserve is but temporarily restored, and that there is nothing whatever to prevent an immediate withdrawal, by the same or other capitalists, of the gold secured by this loan. The government buys gold and pays a higher rate of interest than even the city of New York has to pay in the market. This gold can be taken out again and again, the government being compelled each time to issue new bonds and pay interest on them. Whatever confidence there may have been shown is simply confidence in the ability of the government to tax the country more heavily and contract the currency by locking up its notes and other flat money.

As such action directly injures the people, their confidence means confidence in the ability of the government to tax the country more heavily and contract the currency by locking up its notes and other flat money. But the people have been deceived.

The editor of the "Voice," whose tendency to "smartness," in the newspaper sense, leads him to offend against common sense, abuses the Germans to the popular Sunday laws. "Little Germany," he says, threatens "us" with war, meaning by "little Germany," as he explains, those Germans who have left their fatherland and come to this country to instruct us in 'der principles' of personal liberty." He is very indignant over the success of the Germans in obtaining legislation, and uses this rather inconsiderate and coarse (even for a Prohibitionist) language: "If a lot of beer-swilling tanks from across the sea can come here and enforce their demand that communities must be compelled to have gummilins whether they want them or not, is it not about time for American citizens to rise up in defence of civic liberty as opposed to so-called personal liberty? . . . When, oh, when, shall we have political leaders, editors of metropolitan dailies, and chieftains of congress firing the American heart against the insolent threats of the unterrified and unwashed Anarchists from foreign lands who can hardly read the English language?" In the name of sense, excited "Voice," what are you talking about? You show more ignorance and insolence and stupidity in these mouthings than do those you denounce as beer-swilling tanks.

This is a country where the majority is said to rule. The Germans are "American citizens," and have as much right as you have to dictate legislation. They threaten no war except "political war,"—exactly what you are threatening the old parties with. They have votes, and the politicians need them. The fact that they have more votes than you, and therefore more political power, is very unfortunate for you, but you must submit and "jump it," if you are loyal to American principles. Your pretence of upholding the American principle is humbug pure and simple. The American principle is government by the majority, and, if you don't like the ways and ideas of the Germans, Irish, French, Scandinavians, and others who constitute the majority, you can "leave the country." You must swallow a dose of the medicine you are so anxious to force down other people's throats. Do it gracefully, then.

The attitude of the New York "Sun" and "Commercial Advertiser" toward the Loyalists in the court of the reformers among the newspaper publishers is very surprising. While the "Sun" pretends to doubt the fact that the post office loses money on newspapers, it declares that, assuming this to be true, rates should promptly be raised to the point where the publishers would cease to be beneficiaries of the government. If a paper cannot afford to pay for carriage, it should wind up and go out of business, says the "Commercial Advertiser." This is in striking contrast with the rot of the majority of newspapers, which decry the bill as an attempt to restrict the dissemination of intelligence and to attack the freedom of the press.

If postal rates should be raised on newspapers, the postal monopoly would soon itself without ardent supporters, and the demand for competition in the carrying of letters would receive new support in many quarters. Business men would perceive the folly of a government monopoly of the letter-carrying business, and the newspapers would attack the abuses and absurdities of governmental management with greater vigor and freedom. At present gratitude restrains them somewhat. The justice of the "Sun's" position is not impaired by the probability that it is inspired solely by spite against the "World," which favors the newspaper privilege and greatly benefits by it in the circulation of its bulky almanac and sundry special issues.
Liberty.

Issued Fortnightly at Two Dollars A Year; Single Copy, Eight Cents.

DR. J. E. TUCKER, Editor and Publisher.

Office of Publication, 21 Gold Street.
Post Office Address: Liberty, P. O. Box No. 1182, New York, N. Y.

Rented at New York as Second-Class Mail Matter.

NEW YORK, N. Y., FEBRUARY 22, 1856.

L I B E R T Y. 333

The appearance in the editorial column of articles over other signatures than the editor’s initial indicates that the editor approves their central purpose and general tenor, though he does not hold himself responsible for every phrase or word. But the appearance in other parts of the paper of articles by the same or other writers by no means indicates that he disapproves them in their general tenor, or disposes of them being governed largely by motives of convenience.

Mr. Salter’s “Anarchy or Government.”

It is a pleasure to review such a book as Mr. Salter’s, to which reference has already been made in Liberty. Mr. Salter is fair-minded and clear. He endeavors to be scientific and to rest his case on rational grounds. He is neither sentimental or metaphysically transcendental. Relying on logical weapons, he will doubtless be glad to be attacked with similar weapons.

Mr. Salter attempts to refute the position of philosophical, individualist Anarchism. While he says much that appears to be extremely favorable to it, the critical reader perceives nevertheless that he considers that social philosophy to be wholly unsound from the true ethical or sociological point of view. It will be my aim to establish, in this review, that Mr. Salter totally fails to make out his case. His argument is most weak where it should be most strongly supported, and he not only fails to state correctly the side against which he argues, but allows himself to ignore facts of the most potent character. Moreover, he makes several fundamental assumptions without the slightest logical warrant, and expects us to accept deductions based solely on these question-begging propositions.

Having said so much by way of indicating my judgment of the matter, I proceed to consider Mr. Salter’s argument, chapter by chapter and section by section.

In his opening chapter Mr. Salter states “the idea of Anarchy and the idea of government.” He is logical enough to admit that government necessarily implies the idea of aggression, enforced cooperation. Government, he says, is “not only for those who voluntarily submit themselves to it, but for all the members of a community or society.” Anarchy, on the other hand, “is synonymous with liberty.” It is not, says Mr. Salter correctly, “inauspicious with association, but only with enforced association.” Unfortunately, in his next two sections Mr. Salter falls into a grave error, misrepresenting the Anarchistic position with regard to the question of aggression. He does it indirectly, by saying that Anarchy means “a state of society in which no one is bound or obliged to do anything (whether to associate with others or anything else),” and, further, that under Anarchy “individuals would simply be left free to do as they choose”; that “compulsion would disappear”; and that “the bonds in society would be moral bonds.” This describes, not Anarchism, but Tolstoiism, so-called Christian Anarchism or non-resistance.

How Mr. Salter, who has manifestly fitted himself for his task by a careful study of the literature of philosophical Anarchism, could have completely overlooked a point thoroughly elucidated and frequently discussed, I am unable to explain. Let him consult “Instead of a Book,” and he will find that Anarchism is defined, not as absence of all physical compulsion, but absence of physical compulsion of the non-aggressive. Individuals would not be left to do as they choose. They would be left only to do as they choose only within certain limits, those of equal freedom. Criminals or invaders would be the objects of the voluntary organizations for defense, and only non-aggressive persons would be exempt from interference.

In other words, Anarchy is synonymous with liberty for all, not with liberty for some; and non-resistance would mean a state in which some could aggress upon others without any danger of physical punishment.

Mr. Salter will doubtless perceive the distinction without difficulty, and admit that his definition is radically defective. "Owing to this defect, almost the whole of the second chapter, entitled "Relations of Liberty to Anarchy," is essentially irrelevant to the discussion. Mr. Salter shows that people with good morals can dispense with government, and that all of our best thinkers have freely admitted that government is unnecessary to men who spontaneously do justice. "Since, however, the real question is whether government is necessary for imperfect societies, in which crime does exist, this kind of evidence is immaterial. It is true that, towards the end of the chapter, Mr. Salter refers to a number of cases where voluntary organization proved sufficient to punish crime and prevent aggression, and speaks of these cases as illustrative of Anarchy. But this is clearly inconsistent with the definition of Anarchism given by him in the first chapter, as well as with the implication of the illustrations involving the condition of absolute goodness and order.

Mr. Salter refers with mild approval to the suggestion "of competition between governments" and the abolition of police monopolies. I daresay that it "might be a good arrangement if, in the same territory, we could have a choice of governments" and "were bound to none of them," but is inclined to regard the idea as somewhat fantastic. "Voluntary government may be even a contradiction in terms," he remarks. Yes, it certainly is a contradiction in terms, but the difficulty is of Mr. Salter’s own making. The organizations in question would not be voluntary governments (since government is an organization which coerce the non-invasive into membership and allegiance), but simply voluntary associations for purposes of defense.

Between these and liberty there is certainly no incongruity, always remembering that by liberty is meant equal liberty, liberty for all.

In the third chapter Mr. Salter states "the problem of government." Restraint being an evil at best, he thinks that the abstract presumption may be said to be in favor of liberty and against the method of government. Since government coerces all, regardless of whether they have aggressed or not, the question is: "How far may a community or society use force in attaining its objects?" As Mr. Salter is a governmentalist himself, we may expect that his discussion will supply a definite answer to the question from his own point of view. He does, indeed, proceed to discuss and balance the advantages and disadvantages of government and Anarchy in a variety of situations and relations. The method may properly be called in question. It seems to me that Mr. Salter ought to have dealt first with the theoretical bases of the two systems. The important question is whether Anarchy is just and possible, and a priori considerations should precede the presentation of agnostic arguments to throw light upon it. But let us follow Mr. Salter.

In the fourth chapter he takes up the question of "Anarchy or Government in Defeasive War," and arrives at the conclusion that it is not ethically wrong for the community (or, logically speaking, for the majority) to coerce individuals into cooperation for defense against external enemies. He supposes that one tribe attacks another, and that resistance is necessary for the preservation of the aggressed-upon. How shall they resist? He asks: "Shall the reluctant and unwilling be forced to join the majority and make a fight, or must we say, on the contrary, that every individual’s freedom is so sacred that it is wrong to do violence to it, and that non-interference must be practised, even if it leads to the ruin of the tribe?"

His answer is: I think every one would feel that a claim in behalf of freedom like the one just mentioned is strangled and exaggerated, and that an individual could not really ask to do as he likes, save as he was ready to act in a way not inconsistent with the interests of his tribe. Probably consists of itself, in one who was thus cowardly and unwilling, as of those who forced him into the ranks (or to labor, at home), at least it would not be strongly against them.

The reader is doubtless aman to observe that this is an absolutely all Mr. Salter has to say in support of his view that Anarchy fails in defensive war and that coercion of the unwilling—government, in short—is justifiable under the condition supposed. That a philosophical writer and ethical teacher should be satisfied with such pseudo-reasoning is really astounding. In the first place, it is not every one who would feel "is not an absolute and invariable criterion of soundness. To appeal to the feelings of "every one" is to abridge the function of philosopher and logical truth-seeker. Mr. Salter’s book was not written to inform us what "every one feels," but to solve, in a scientific manner, without assuming anything, certain fundamental questions. Why does "every one" feel as Mr. Salter says he does? Is this feeling right, rational, or is it the product of past practices and false teachings? We expect Mr. Salter to answer this by going back of the fact itself and accounting for its existence. In the second place, I emphatically deny that "every one would feel" as Mr. Salter
sides of this question.

Why, then, should it be a reproach to one side only in this dispute that we have no experimental foundation for our beliefs as to the probable working of Anarchism? Where one of two propositions has long been tried, and its all-pervasive results are in the presumption of the old system strong enough to make us quite certain that the new ought not to be introduced, however superior it may seem in theory. Surely not, for we have examples of absolutely new social theories which were tried at last and immediately won general approval where they were tried. It is no disgrace to any movement to be condemned by a test that also, in their day, condemned the movements for the abolition of slavery and the separation of church and State. If the tree of theoretical innovation, having borne such fruits as these, is now found corrupt at the root, it must have rotted very lately.

Some do try to make out an argument from experience against Anarchism by saying that men originally lived without government, and the fact that they have now adopted government proves that they must originally have found it advantageous. I wish these historians of the prehistoric time could receive a little attention from those who are so fond of belittling Anarchists for "looking back to an imaginary ideal past." Herbert Spencer says that government was originally a temporary war measure, like the Roman dictatorship, and that its extension to times of peace is the result of usurpations—embellishments of power—by the war-chiefs. This may be a bold attempt to reconstruct an inaccessible past with scanty materials, but at least it is based on a good deal of study and thought. Can the same be claimed for the theory that government originates from experience proving it to be an essential condition of prosperity?

We have reports of Anarchic savage tribes at the present day, the Eskimos being best known; but these reports furnish little material for generalization. One fact only is conspicuous—that these tribes either will not fight or are unable to hold their own against neighboring tribes; therefore they have been driven out of the most desirable territory into such as is not worth stealing, and consequently they are poor. It seems a safe inference that in the savage state government is necessary to military success, and military success is necessary to economic prosperity. Yet we may say here that the term "savage state" connotes inability to form a permanent voluntary defensive association as well as inability to build a railroad. I know of no evidence that the permanent voluntary defensive association was ever invented among savages; therefore I do not see how savage experience can be quoted to show that it would not be an adequate substitute for government in foreign war.

As to the supposed necessity of government to maintain internal order, it does not appear to be so among savage tribes almost unknown among many of the Anarchist tribes; and, even where this is not so, the people seem to get along with each other as well as in governed tribes of similar criminal propensities.

Beyond this there seems to be no safe generalization regarding the Anarchic races. Furthermore, the accounts of such races deserve entirely upon whether or not they want and ask such blessings. If Mr. Salter, in pursuit of his own happiness and without any negotiations with his neighbors, builds a beautiful residence, he cannot rightfully ask his neighbors to pay him something for the blessing he confers on them. They enjoy his residence, and derive economic and moral advantages from its presence "in their midst," but they claim them gratis, simply because they had not entered into any contract with Mr. Salter, and had not agreed to pay for the blessing. He built his residence for his own needs and comfort, not for those of his neighbors and for the indirect benefits conferred upon them he can expect no compensation.

Mr. Salter will assent to this, I have no doubt. But, if he does, he is also bound to conclude that "continued security" may be in- nocently and properly enjoyed by persons who have done nothing to bring it about. Those who fight invaders fight for their own lives, liberties, and possessions, and success means to them the attainment of desired results. Indirectly they may benefit others, but for such indirect benefit no return can be legitimately demanded.

There is nothing "wrong" in our enjoying benefits which indirectly flow from actions or things which were never designed for or solicited by us.

We thus see that Mr. Salter has totally failed to prove that government is justified in defensive warfare. In fact, he has not even stopped to consider the Anarchistic position on this point. He has assumed something which is not true, and which would be irrelevant even if it were true. He has not established the right of government to coerce men for purposes of defensive war.

The next subject taken up by Mr. Salter is "Anarchy or Government in Protecting Life and Property." Most writers, he says, have no reason to offer to prove the proposition that government may, and ought to, protect life and property from internal aggression; they take it for granted. This is unquestionably true, but Mr. Salter errs greatly when he goes on to say that even Spencer "seems almost as - it spicily as any schoolboy to take for granted that government should protect life and property." Spencer has not omitted to adduce evidence and reasons for his position.

We may deem them manifest and weak, but we cannot justly allege that he has assumed the point in question. In his own part, believes that here, too, government is necessary and justified. We shall see what his reasons are, and what their degree of cogency is, in another article.

v. y.

Is Government Justified by Experience? They say that Anarchism is an impractical theory, because it lacks the confirmation of experience; it has not been tried. What is it not obvious that opposition to Anarchism rests on the same purely theoretical basis? If there is no known instance of Anarchic work going well in a civilized community, neither is there any instance of its working badly. Those who assert that it would work badly are compelled to base their arguments merely upon their abstract ideas of what is to be expected from human nature, simply because civilized history affords no other foundation for an argument on either
that are conclusive as to its working in civilized society, if tried. We are left to theoretical considerations for our arguments both for and against the idea, unless civilized experience can help us out.

Now, is it true that the civilized world has experience of Anarchy? But it has more recorded experience of government than of anything else on earth; and this experience allows of certain generalizations. As to what these generalizations are, hear the words of Prof. Albion W. Small, of the University of Chicago. He cannot be charged with a fanatical bias in favor of individualism, for he writes:

The town which does not do to-day own or control its gas, electric lights, water supply, and street "allway" rights, is presumably dows of low grade, both in economic intelligence and in civic virtue.

Yet, on another page of the same number of his magazine, criticizing an argument on the relative advantages of Anarchy—real Anarchy—and government, he sums up the results of our experience in those words:

The conclusion properly to be drawn from a survey of present conditions is, then, that this system of anarchy—government—cannot be said to work well, but that the world somehow gets along under it.

I have copied itallies and all. In its original context the proposition is given a broad application, covering the entire field of the effect of government on industry. The only modification it needs is to give it a broader application, covering every other field on which government lays its hand; for it is just as universally obvious that "government does not work well" in religion or morality as in industry. And it is most obvious of all in the working of the great machine of government itself.

No other great interest in the country can even approach it in badness of management, unless it be the railroads; and the greatest scandals even of the railroads commonly relate to the interference of the government. Furthermore, though railroads seem always to have existed, because they have existed since we were born, they are in fact so very new an invention that the facts give a complete excuse for our not yet having learned to manage our business. But government is run on the basis of an experience as old as history, during all which time it has remained the greatest scandal in the world. Two other scandals have perhaps temporarily passed it, the church during a part of the Middle Ages, and the Arab slave-trade of our own day; but I do not think so in either case. The slave-trade of pass times was altogether the creature of settled government. With these two exceptions, each for a comparatively short time, I am not much afraid that many sober people will deny the correctness of my statement that government has always been the greatest scandal in the world.

As to the statement that "the world somehow gets along under it," we have to acknowledge, not only that most exist under it, but that most know as civilization (so called because we never saw anything more civilized) exists under it.

If, then, according to notorious facts, government is and has always been the greatest scandal of the world at large and of each nation in particular, with scattered temporary exceptions, and the greatest other scandals have commonly been closely connected with government, and have been most scandalous as they were most closely connected with it, and yet civilized society (according to the present standard of civilization) exists under it, do these facts give us an empirical basis for any conclusions as to the desirability of abolishing government?

Certainly they give one strong presumption, —that, if civilized men continued to exist after the abolition of government, they would supply its place (so far as that seemed necessary) with something less scandalous. They have proved themselves able to manage everything else better than they manage government. If experience can prove any such thing, it proves that we cannot permanently manage government. It is sometimes said to be well managed during a short spurt of reform; yet even then, in many cases at least, the management only seems good by contrast with the abuses which precede and follow. In the face of all this experience, it is the most unreasonable optimism to expect that good government (by which I here mean government as well managed as the principal private businesses of the same country at the same time) will ever be established and maintained anywhere on earth. This experience covers almost all imaginable forms of government,—all have been tried, and all have failed, some worse than others, but none good,—but it covers no attempt by civilized men to provide without government for those social needs which are so poorly met by government. Such an attempt will some day be made; and then, as all our other works have succeeded better than government, so will this. At least, this is the reasonable presumption. It may turn out that the impracticability is not in the machine, but in the workers or in the work to be done. But, if we assume this before trying every experiment that could lead to a different conclusion, we are confessing failure before we have exhausted the possibilities of success.

There remains one other point of experience,—that civilized society can exist under government. We know from savage experience that industrial society can exist without government; but as to whether civilized society can exist without government, experience says neither yes or no. That is where the shoe pinches,—the dreadful possibility that civilized men might become uncivilized if they were left without government. It is ridiculously improbable, to be sure; yet, so long as the experiment has never been tried, this remains among the possibilities of the unknown world into which Anarchists ask society to rush. Golden, glorious possibilities are there in measureless abundance,—and this one black one, which we are barely enabled to prove impossible except by theory. Therefore society jerks her hand away, when we offer to lead her to the gate.

Nothing venture, nothing have, gentlemen! And if the one black bean does turn out to be the topmost one in the jar,—if the new life is a failure, after all,—the road back is not impassable or even difficult.

STEPHEN T. BYINGTON.

Zangwill is growing more and more indiscreet and audacious. He knows something about literature, but, when he sits in judgment

* The expansion of the Mormons from Missouri and Illinois, fifty-two years ago, by small civil wars, is hardly a bully enough in itself to justify its own mention. And it did not prevent the Mormons from prospering.
upon philosophical and sociological systems, he betrays woful ignorance. He tells Grant Allen, for instance, that his observation of human life and character is "as free from subtlety as the Spencerian philosophy which is Mr. Allen's fetish." Here we have two statements, that Grant Allen is a blind worshipper of Spencerian philosophy, and that the Spencerian philosophy is superficial. Now, everybody who knows what is going on in the reform world has at least heard that Grant Allen has joined the Fabians and become a State Socialist. His views on economics, politics, and marriage are in direct opposition to those of Spencer, and there is hardly anything in Spencer's philosophy which Grant Allen now accepts. Here Zangwill is guilty of ignorance of notorious facts. As for the alleged absence of subtlety in Spencerian philosophy, it would be absurd for anybody familiar with the same to stop to argue with Zangwill. He is out of court. There is nothing to show that he has any notion of what he is talking about.

John Morley, Sir William Vernon Harcourt, and H. M. Stanley are some of the latest additions to the number of Englishmen who counsel their country to do what Mr. Varros says it cannot do consistently with self-respect,—viz., submit the Venezuelan question in its entirety to arbitration,—and T. B. Wakenan, Van Buren Denslow, and William M. Salter are among the progressive elements on this side of the ocean now camping on the ground where I, it has been said, was without progressive company.

Another Bad Citizen.

To the Editor of "Liberty."

You may be interested to know that I was yesterday excused, or rather "disqualified," from acting as a juror in a court of common pleas No. 1 of this city on grounds not new to you, but doubtless new to the Philadelphia courts.

I was summoned before Judges Biddle and Beilet to serve as a jurman, I respectfully informed them that I must have the privilege of construing for myself, not only the facts, but the law as well, and also that I would not accede to any request or suggestion as to enforecing any law which I should consider unjust.

Judge Biddle, remarking on the strangeness of a citizen's setting himself up to be wiser than the law, and intimating that I was not a good citizen, then consulted with Judge Beilet.

I was then informed that, holding the opinions which I professed conscientiously, I was certainly "disqualified from serving as jurman." Without my to this unjust awe, I took my departure. Yours truly,

SAMUEL MILLER.

PHILADELPHIA, February 18, 1896.

Scrapes.

[Extract from Letter in The Epochal.]

Last night I was sleeping soundly, when I was suddenly awakened, several times, by the fall of a piece of furniture in the next room. At the same time the clock struck four, and my cat began to mew pitifully. I sprang out of bed, and quickly, without explanations, with a courage explained only by the ardor of my conservative convictions, I opened the door and entered the room. It was lighted, and the first thing that I saw was a very elegant gentleman, in evening dress, as well dressed as the man who was sitting by the bag value articles into a pretty bag made of yellow leather. The bag did not belong to me, but the valuable articles were my own; so that this seemed to me a contradictory and unnecessary operation against which I was disposed to protest. Although I did not know this gentleman at all, he had a face which was familiar to me,—such a face as one meets on the boulevards, at the theatre, in the night

troublesome times in which we live, it is the fairest, fairest, most honest of all. Bobbsey, sir,—and I say Bobbsey, sir,—I would say the same thing. Medicine,—has been a decried career, because all those who have followed it have been simply odious brutes, disgusting vagabonds, people without elegance or education. I hope the law will be haste to which it is entitled, and make of robbery a liberal, honorable, and enviable career. Let us not confine ourselves with words, sir, and let us view life as it is among Mr. Allen's polemics. One changes this profession,—whatever it may be, observe,—only because it enables him to steal—more or less—but at any rate to steal something from somebody. You have too thoughtful a mind, you know, to wonder at the desire of the innate rapturism of our virtues and our honor, to make it necessary for me to support my statement by convincing examples and conclusive examinations."

These words were so flattering to me in my pretensions—justified, by the way—to psychology and to acquaintance with the social sciences that I could not help receiving them with a peremptory and superior "Evidently!" The elegant burlag, thus encouraged, continued with more confident gestures: "I desire to speak only of that which concerns me. Moreover, I shall be very brief. I began in commerce. But the rise of the arts and the rise of the base dicals, the false weights, quick revolted my instinctive delicacy, my frank nature, so strongly marked by conflagration and scrip. I left commerce for finance. Finance disgusted itself to itself to have the name of finance, to issue false papers and false metals, to organize false mines, false istanuim, false coal fields. To think perpetually of diverting others' money to my causes, to enrich it by the shoal and grandul of my customers, thanks to the virtute of dazzling prospectuses and to the legality of marvellous combinations, was to me an unacceptable operation, which my mind, so scrupulous and so hostile to dishonesty, could not perform. Then I thought of journalism. It did not take me a month to convince myself that, unless one is willing to engage in painful and complicated black-mailing schemes, journalism does not feel its man. I tried to do it."

At this point I could not help bursting into a loud laugh which threatened never to stop.

"That's right!" approved the seductive gentleman. "Evidently we need no more on that head. In brief, I thus exhausted all that public or private life can offer in the way of suitable professions and noble careers to an active, intelligent, and delicate young man like myself. I saw clearly that whatever name it be disdained—was the sole object and motive of all activities, but how greatly deformed and dissembled, and therefore how much more dangerous I reasoned in my soul. Nobody cannot escape this 'fatal law of robbery,' it would be much more honorable for him to practice it frankly, and not surround his natural desire to appropriate the goods of others with parasitic excuses, illusory qualities, and redundant titles, whose ephemeral fame no longer decides anybody."

Accordingly, every day I rob; I break into rich interiors at night; I take outright from another's vaults what I deem necessary to the expansion of my peculiar development of my human personality. It takes a few hours every night, between a conversation at the club and a flirtation in the ball-room. At all other times I live as other people do. I belong to no political connections. Very recently I was decorated by the Ministry. And when I have made a lucky stroke, I am capable of any generosity. In short, I do frankly and boldly what everybody preciously and with a thousand turnings and ways that are the more ignominious because... Well, my emancipated conscience no longer reproaches me with anything, for, of all the beings whom I know, I am the only one to have accurately conformed his acts to his ideas and hermatically adapted his nature to the mysterious signification of Life..."

The candles were flickering; the daylight was coming between the lattice of the blinds. I insisted the elegant stranger to share my morning breakfast; but he objected that he was in evening dress, and did not wish to offend me by such a violation of the proprieties.
The Conditions of Greatest Happiness.

Mr. Bellon Hall says that he "could not show that it is more important, or better, or more probable that two persons should have a certain amount of happiness rather than have the less developed one killed and the other have three times as much happiness developed." This is, I think, precisely what Anarchism does pretend to show, and without any appeal to sympathetic.

The idea of inequality of happiness is preferable based upon the aristocratic feeling mingled with religious principle that some men are "more developed" than others, and that it is the function of the more developed (which is the scientific term for the rightness) to kill off the undeveloped.—that is to say, the wickedness must be removed.

And they have been at it, too; now these many years,—Britons against Austrians; Catholic against heathen; Christian against Jew, Turk, and infidel; Pagan against Christian,—so few the memories of man runnels not to the contrary, each trying to kill off the undeveloped.

At last Anarchism has come forward, saying: My dear fellows, this is an endless waste of energy and, if you are so awkwardly developed as you think yourselves to be, can hardly be conducive to your happiness, either to that of the killer or killed. You will find, if you think it over, that it is vain to talk of your happiness as long as there is a chance to settle it by trying to kill each other. The only kind of development you settle in that way is development of fighting capacity, valuable enough in its way, but not at all comprehending all possible development, as I think you will be the first to admit.

Now, if you do admit it, you, the superior classes, the more developed you know,—that is to say, both of you,—will realize how much happiness each, if you stop trying to emulate the Kilkenny cats, and devote yourselves each to achieving as much development as possible in the way that gives him most pleasure.

Surely you can see that, if you arrange a compact between you not to interfere with each other at all as long as each pursues his own course of developing, reserving the right of pitching in with might and main if either attempts to limit the development of the other, you have a better chance of obtaining pleasurable development for both than in any other way.

All this, I repeat, providing that killing is not the most pleasurable conceivable development for you.

But, before you enter upon this, you must take to heart that such a compact would include for each the clear right to sell his vote or his body, providing the other was as free from selling to you. You may also take to heart the fact that such a compact would take away from the few the power that they now have to live the lives, the kind of life, as they may, and would make it unnecessary for the many to sell either their votes or their persons.

John Beverley Robinson.

Anarchism in Detroit.

"Yes, your theory of Anarchism is a very beautiful one, but it is not likely to be adopted for thousands of years yet, and I don't care to waste any time over theories that are not practical as far as I can see." I meet this remark frequently, and it is usually said in such a kind, cordially making, as you would address a lunatic to combat whom seriously and logically would make a song longer and longer. When you meet such a fellow, don't spare him. Before you let up on him, make him wish that he had taken seriously at first.

Some three or four years ago I was invited to address the Wittenamute club, of Detroit, a body composed of artists, architects, lawyers, and professional men generally.—as a means of provoking, as a means of making the subject of union a subject of discussion at the table of the club. I was accepted with a discussion. I was told that I answered as best I could. Occasionally since, I have heard of my visit to the club, and it was pleasant to learn that a monograph of mine had been read before the club with a good deal of favor upon the ideas presented during the two hours and a half of informal talk,—notably among them a Democratic judge of one of our leading courts. This club has no written rules, no officers, no constitution. A steward is appointed by the club, and he does the rest,—collects the dues, buys the whiskey, tobacco, pipes, etc., and does the best he can. A few evenings ago Chauncey Hooper, through the courtesy of Judge Hamner, read a paper on Anarchism before the same club. There were four recognized Anarchists present. After the paper, each one of us had a group about him in informal answering of questions and discussing arguments. I was pleased to learn from myself that Capt. Gardner, of the regular army, stationed at Fort Wayne, just below this city, dated his interest in the social-economic movement from the evening I visited the club. He has been a great reader of the subject since, and was of valuable assistance to me in answering questions at the last meeting.

It has got to be somewhat of a fad in Detroit for the exclusive and aristocratic clubs, as well as thebolian clubs, to have Anarchists expound their doctrine to them. The men in front of the Bohemian club, which meets in the Unitarian church parlor, a few months ago. Fully half of those present were ladies, many of them the most prominent in society and intellectual circles. The reports from these meetings are encouraging, indeed.

On the evening of December 23 I read a paper on Anarchism before the Onondaga club. This club is composed of the teachers of that city, a Congregational church under the pastorate of Morgan Wood, a progressive young minister who is doing much to liberalize the thousands who flock to his service. The author was present and more than a dozen of our society met in the church parlor, and on the evening of my talk a banquet was had. The following is what Prof. Raymond had to say about it in "The Kingdom," a paper published in the North Yankton of the S-th school of the Kingdom, Christian social sciences.

Plymouth church, Detroit, has recently entertained two gatherings of the very great significance, as indicating a tendency toward the obliteration of class distinctions. The second was the regular monthly banquet of the Onondaga club, held Monday, December 23. This club is an organization of teachers, comprising over six hundred members of the church. The sessions are held every three weeks and are open to all members of the church. The club during the coming winter is to be addressed by some of the leading ministers of different denominations of the city, Congregational, Episcopal, Episcopal, Unitarian, and Jewish, and by some of the leaders in missionary work in Detroit. On the evening in question the after-dinner address was made by Mr. Joseph A. Labadie, who is known as one of the most intelligent philosophers of anarchism in the country. He discussed at some length the question: "What is philosophical Anarchism?" It is difficult to see how more could have been made of this subject, which was clearly and fairly presented. At the close of Mr. Labadie's address and the leading discussion, lasting over an hour, was introduced by the members present, the subject of Anarchism and organized discussion. A gathering must be rare in the annals of the modern Christian church, as an analysis of its personnel will show. There were, for instance, several representatives of the school of philosophical Anarchism; a number of the older and more extreme forms of Anarchism's antithesis, among whom was the Socialist candidate for mayor at the last municipal election; the orthodox Calvinists, among whom was the leader of the Coxe movement, who piloted two hundred horsemen from Spokane Falls to Washington, D. C., the lawyers in leading representative of the Detroit press; the Christian Socialists; the temperance leaders, and a number of the labor leaders.

The significance of such a gathering in such a place and at such a time cannot be measured. An Anarchist in a Christian church receiving a respectful and attentive hearing from largely of Christian men, and his views meeting with such intelligent and tolerant discussion, surely constituted an event in the history of let or organized Christianity. While it is not known that the meeting resulted in any conversion to Anarchism, still the latter result was attained that not a few in either side of the question were convinced of the justice of the argument. Members of the church expressed surprise at the presence of some of the sentiments of the speaker, and Mr. Labadie himself selected his propositions so as to avoid any unequal terms that the, have been wont to use. Expression took the place of eloquence, tolerance of misunderstanding, and admission of mutual suspicion; and another was added to the signs of the approaching Kingdom.

Nowhere I go, there is a desire to know what we want and how we propose to get it, and nowhere else have I met anything but the most respectful hearing and cordial treatment. I have made a point to insist that Anarchism is purely negative in its philosophy, that it lays down no arbitrary rules for the lives of the free, who may act as per the dictates of those who come after us. Anarchism begins and ends in liberty. I might say that Anarchism is the science of liberty, as well as its practice. What people should do with their liberty they get by the actions of others. They shall produce wealth, how they shall exchange wealth, how they shall protect their lives and property, what they shall do with their children, whether religious or moral or political, shall be decided by others. How they shall produce wealth, how they shall exchange wealth, how they shall protect their lives and property, what they shall do with their children, whether religious or moral or political, shall be decided by others. How they shall produce wealth, how they shall exchange wealth, how they shall protect their lives and property, what they shall do with their children, whether religious or moral or political, shall be decided by others. How they shall produce wealth, how they shall exchange wealth, how they shall protect their lives and property, what they shall do with their children, whether religious or moral or political, shall be decided by others. How they shall produce wealth, how they shall exchange wealth, how they shall protect their lives and property, what they shall do with their children, whether religious or moral or political, shall be decided by others. How they shall produce wealth, how they shall exchange wealth, how they shall protect their lives and property, what they shall do with their children, whether religious or moral or political, shall be decided by others. How they shall produce wealth, how they shall exchange wealth, how they shall protect their lives and property, what they shall do with their children, whether religious or moral or political, shall be decided by others. How they shall produce wealth, how they shall exchange wealth, how they shall protect their lives and property, what they shall do with their children, whether religious or moral or political, shall be decided by others. How they shall produce wealth, how they shall exchange wealth, how they shall protect their lives and property, what they shall do with their children, whether religious or moral or political, shall be decided by others.

Why Pentecost is Not in Sing Sing.

Some months ago I printed in Liberty the simple statement that Hugo O. Pentecost had been indicted for grand larceny. A subscriber to Liberty, to whom I wrote for a copy of the number, told me that, although he could not find any evidence of the charge, he had never seen a magazine, the Illinois edition of Epoch, that was not devoted to the cause of heroic worship. He wrote me, demanding that I print the evidence. As there was no evidence to print, I could not well comply. But since that time the case has taken its legal course and is now closed. Accordingly I print an account of the fact from beginning to end, given in the New York "Herald" recently, and trust that it may remove from the mind of my correspondent any lingering illusion that Pentecost differs materially from other common criminals. It should be remembered, in reading the account, that Pentecost, as a member of Tammany, is apologizing for his action, and that, so far as the district attorney's office is concerned, Tammany is still in power.

The recent acquittal of Nicolai Weiss by a jury in the court of general sessions was the closing incident in one of the most remarkable events in the history of the district attorney's office.

Weiss has pleaded not guilty to six charges of securities fraud involving over $50,000. The charges were dismissed by the court. Weiss is a wealthy man and was not surprised by the acquittal. Some of his friends have been involved in similar cases, but Weiss was the first to be tried for securities fraud. His defense was based on the claim that he had never sold any securities except for $10,000 worth of property. Weiss was the last to be tried, and the court was not impressed by his claim. The court ruled that Weiss had sold securities for over $50,000, and sentenced him to ten years in Sing Sing.
Schultz. Both men were triumpantly acquitted. Meanwhile, while Weisz lay in the Tombs awaiting trial, the indictments for larceny against Pentecost and Gatling had been dismissed.

Weisz was formerly a watchmaker and repairer for Tiffany & Co. He is a Russian of German extraction, and he has much difficulty in speaking English. His wife was sick, and he was short of money about two years ago. He pawned a watch belonging to Tiffany & Co., and he thought that he would be called for it, that he redeemed it and pawned another.

He was detected shortly after he had redeemed the second watch, and pawned a third. Weisz was arrested, and subsequently indicted for larceny.

He wrote to Hugh O. Petticoat asking him to act as his counsel. Richard T. Gatling called, instead of his partner, Mr. Pentecost, and consulted with the prisoner. The counsel told him that he learned that Weisz was not a German citizen, as he believed he was Pentecost. As the proof against Weisz was very clear, his counsel advised him to plead guilty. Weisz says that Mr. Pentecost promised to have sentence suspended, if he would promise to leave this country.

Having no money, Weisz refused to make the promise. He pleaded guilty, and Judge Martine sentenced him to one year in the penitentiary.

Tiffany & Co. learned the whole story of Weisz's difficulties, after he had served six months of his term. Members of the firm intervened with Governor Morton, and the watchmaker was soon paroled. Upon being released, Weisz returned to Petticoat & Gatling, in ever as he later testified, offered to pay part of their fee for acting as their counsel.

While in prison awaiting trial, he had signed some sort of paper, giving the law years of pending taking the watch, which he testified, cost him $80, and of his furniture, which cost $300.

The lawyers told him they would sell all the property, claiming that the paper he signed was a bill of sale, giving them absolute ownership of it. Weisz said then, the money was repaid to him, and he paid various examinations, that, when he signed the paper, Petticoat told him it was merely a chattell mortgage, and that they would use the tools and furniture to raise money, and let him go. He told them he would see what could be done for him.

Weisz swears that he called twenty times at the office of Petticoat & Gatling within three weeks, but failed to get any answer of Mr. Petticoat. He went with him to the shop of various dealers in watchmaking tools, and learned that the outfit Weisz owned was worth between $250 and $1,000. The watchmaker at last wrote the court giving the fact that a false settlement was not made. He would complete judgment against the grand jury. Shortly after this, the two men met in the criminal court building, and Mr. Petticoat accused Weisz of trying to blackmail him. Weisz denied the charge, and Petticoat accused District Attorney Allen, who presides cases to the grand jury for its investigation and action. Mr. Allen told him he had no case, and sent him away.

By A. W. Harrington, of the Charles Jacques Clock Company. He borrowed money from Charles A. Schultz, who had a private detective bureau at No. 121 Hudson street. Weisz undertook to collect what he could from Petticoat & Gatling. He wrote a letter to Mr. Petticoat, and made arrangements for an interview.

They had several meetings. Mr. Petticoat says that Schultz of the National clock company offered a bribe of $250. Schultz says that Mr. Petticoat offered to pay him $250 for Weisz as Weisz's "equity" in the missing tools.

Many people interviewed Assistant District Attorney Battle, who sent him to Acting Captain O'Brien, at police headquarters, and he detailed Detective Sergeant McNaght and Policeman Rynders and Farley as to the facts of the case. Mr. Petticoat called at Schultz's house, No. 124 Hudson street, at five o'clock on Saturday afternoon, October 19 last. Weisz came in for a few minutes. He signed his name to a list in which Mr. Petticoat handed him:

To the Honorable District Attorney—I deem it my duty to inform you that a dishonest business concern has committed a raid upon my house, which I trust shall be brought to justice. Weisz the gentleman if the result should not terminate satisfactorily.

Weisz returned to the room, said something to Schultz in German, pounced on the letter and the receipt, and with the aid of an interpreter, we were a scuffle, and Detective McNaght rushed in.

"What's the trouble here?" he exclaimed. Schultz threw part of the $250 on the floor, and the detective found out the whole.

"What did you take this money from Mr. Pentecost for?" asked the detective.

"I took it to pay for Weisz's tools," answered Schultz.

Nevertheless both Schultz and Weisz were arrested and taken to the police station. They were released as indicated above, because there being three counts against each of them,—namely, for compounding a felony, for bribery of a witness, and for attempted extortion.

They lay in the Tombs until Tuesday, January 21 last, when they were brought up for trial. But in the meantime Pentecost and Gatling had a windfall. The indictments against them were dismissed. The manner of that dismissal is worth telling in a separate paragraph.

Judge Allison served his last two days on the bench of the court prior to his death, the 30th of December last. During that time several indictments were dismissed. Assistant District Attorney Stephen J. O'Hare informed Judge Allison that Weisz, the complainant against Pentecost and Gatling, was arrested and committed for trial. During the course of the trial, the charge of trying to extort money from Pentecost and Gatling. Weisz's testimony, therefore, could not be relied upon to sustain the prosecution of his charge of larceny, his former counsel; so Mr. O'Hare moved that the indictment be dismissed.

Judge Allison accordingly dismissed it.

Then, after three months' delay, Weisz and Schultz were brought up for trial on Tuesday, January 31, before Recorder Goff. They elected to be tried separately, and Schultz's trial was taken up first. He was defended by C. Gottschalk, of No. 375 Fulton street, and was acquitted. He was prosecuted by Assistant District Attorney Robert Townsend. The history of the case was recited on the witness stand as it has been told above.

Pentecost could not remember whether his firm charged a fee of $300 or $500 for defending Weisz when he pleaded guilty. Two bills of sale—one for the furniture and the other for the watchmaking tools—were put into evidence. They were in favor of Hugh O. Petticoat. Petticoat testified positively, and explained to him that the papers he signed were only chattel mortgages, so that money could be raised on the stuff; that Gottschalk said that he (Weisz) could redeem it all when he paid the money which was raised on them, together with the interest. Furthermore, he declared, Mr. More, his landlady, at No. 129 Waterbury place, told him in the Tombs that she had bought the furniture, and he might have it back by repaying her the price, with interest. Weisz said he was in a prison cell when he signed the papers, and

It was very evident that he knew very little about the English language until they returned with the verdict that Schultz was not guilty.

Mr. Townsend then asked to have Weisz discharged on his own recognizance, saying he had no evidence against him, and the court did so. Weisz was discharged under a warrant from the police of the States, with an order of the police of the States, directing him to deliver the money to the person entitled to it.

When Mr. Gottschalk arrived at police headquarters, he found that Mr. Gottings had just lost his $250, showing Mr. Harriett an order from Mr. Petticoat. Mr. Gottings spent two days in vain effort to whistle the money back. He will apply to Recorder Goff, for an order to show cause directing Property Clerk Harriett to pay him $250, as a verdict of the jury, the money belongs to Schultz, as agent for Weisz.

Anarchist Letter-Writing Corps.

The Secretary wants every reader of Liberty to send in his name for enrolment. Those who do so thereby pledge themselves to write, every fortnight, on anarchist or kindred subjects, to the "target" assigned in Liberty for that fortnight, and to notify the secretary promptly in case of any failure to write to a target (which it is hoped will not occur) or in case of permanent withdrawal from the work of the Corps. All who are definitely interested are invited to send in application, addressed, STEPHEN T. HYDEGARD, Publishing Institution, 307 Dearborn street, Chicago, Ill., on or before October 30th.

Target, section A.—The "Farmers' Voice," No. 31, Dearborn street, Chicago, III., said on October 1st:

"The congressman whose vote and influence is against the people, against justice, against the best interests of the country, is a traitor to the principles of true freedom."
We prate about stopping foreign immigration in order that we may not overcrowd the country, but there is no land under the sun that has so many anarchists as our own. Every man who participates in a lynching is an anarchist; every man who, by fraudulent practices at the ballot-box, falsifies election returns is an anarchist; every man who is cognizant of such practices, but winks at the same because he or his party does not suffer thereby, is an anarchist; every man holding office who fails to enforce the laws as they exist on the statutes, or who does not vigorously pursue the delinquents into their secret hiding-places, is an anarchist; every judge, who, in a buggy-like manner, was able to make and break a law as he pleased, is an anarchist; every person who is a member of the people is an anarchist, and, coming right down to our own community, every person who does not demand a registration law and every man who seizes the second party in the State for representing in the election officers, without raising in his mind and indignantly demanding the same justice he demanded for himself, is an anarchist.

Our daily masters who, with fragile detachment, make a pretense of preaching reform, are discreetly silent on the subject of honest elections and a fair count; it would be almost unfair to call them anarchists. It takes some nerve to be an anarchist, and our masters seem to be so utterly passive and passive that it is difficult to find a place for them in the classification of social delinquents; but, if they must be classed, it can only be as anarchists, for, if they honestly believed in a government of the majority, they would thunder for honest elections instead of dialing up weak generalities to a drowsy congregating every Sunday.

There is no class in the country containing more anarchists than the working boys of Chicago. The leaders of the Labor Movement in the City, as well as the leaders of the Labor Movement in the Union of the City, have fought the fight for equal rights. The boys of Chicago sized them up so well, in a speech before the Commercial Club of that city recently, that I quote what he said to them:

"How many of you, boys, have been sick and afraid to come into the comfort of the Union and ask for such privileges? Who is it that are accused of being anarchists? It is the same—no matter what the position of the charges. Talk about anarchy! Talk about breaching the spirit of communism; what does it mean to the representative citizens of Chicago?

Tell this editor that despots are not anarchists, even if they do break the law. Show how the adoption of real Anarchism would be the salvation of all of us."

STEPHEN T. BYRON.

MUTUAL BANKING.

By WILLIAM B. GREENE.

Showing the radical deficiency of the existing circulating medium and the advantages of a free currency; a plan whereby to abolish interest, not by State intervention, but by first abolishing State intervention.

One of the most important works on finance in the English language.
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