On Picket Duty.

In the next issue of Liberty, Mr. Salter will reply to Mr. Yarros’s latest series of articles in criticism of his position.

It is very notable when an organ of the typographic art adopts the new typography. See the article from the “International Art Printer” in another column. Its June number has appeared, set without “justification,” and very handsome it is. This reform is a sure winner.

The “Sun” copies from Liberty the statement that Dana will hear from the Anarchists before this campaign is over, and inquires: “When, particularly? When William Jennings Bryan comes to town?” Most present “Sun,” you have hit it very accurately. The thunderbolt will fall at just about that time. But William Jennings Bryan will not launch it. His arrival will be a mere coincidence.

In comment upon a statement that I have rarely, if ever, used the phrase “philosophical Anarchism,” Mr. Hytinger cruelly reminds me that at least I have used it on the title-page of “Instead of a Book.” This is a very good one on me. It is none the less true, however, that I do not like the phrase, and for my defence I must turn to Alexander Pope: “But seen too oft, familiar with its face, we first endure, then pity, then embrace.”

The translation into German, by Alfons Fedor Cobb, of the first memoir of Proudhon’s “What is Property?” is now complete, and has been published by B. Zack, 45 Oppenheimer-strasse, Berlin S. O. 33, Germany, of whom the book may be procured by sending a money order to his address. The price is fifty cents for the paper-cover edition; in cloth, seventy-five cents. The book ought to have a large sale among German-Americans.

It would be superfluous t: invite the reader’s attention to Bernard Shaw’s reply to Mr. Yarros, printed on the sixth and seventh pages; for no one ever fails, on seeing Shaw’s signature, to read the matter over it. He is one of the few writers who absolutely command attention. In the next issue Mr. Yarros, I expect, will have much to say, and I a little, about Mr. Shaw’s arguments. Meanwhile I print in the present issue an editorial from the New-castle “Chronicle,” which shows in a very forcible way how the municipalization which Mr. Shaw advocates works in England. The “Chronicle” is owned by Mr. Joseph Cowen, one of the foremost of England’s old-time radicals and once a picturesque and noble figure in English politics, and is one of the few daily newspapers for which one can entertain respect.

A new organization has been formed in London known as the Individualist Club, and Herbert Spencer has joined it. The New York “Recorder,” with characteristic ignorance, suggests that “a Socialistic hermit” would be the logical counterpart of this connection. It evidently fancies that an Individualist cannot consistently join any organization, and that a Socialist cannot isolate himself from society. Such stupidity and misconception at this late day are strange even in a “great newspaper.”

The Chicago “Chronicle,” an able Democratic gold paper, protests against the haste with which its contemporaries of the same faith are rushing into the arms of McKinleyism. The Republican policy is as criminal as it has ever been, and no Democrat can consistently vote for it on the plea that the Populist infamy is even greater than the Republican; therefore a gold ticket should be nominated by the honest Democrats. “Moral considerations of the most momentous character,” it continues, “demand that honest men shall not be left to the abhorrent alternative of a choice between evils both of them amounting to crime.” Strange that it does not occur to the “Chronicle” that its honest men can stay away from the polls and thus refrain from supporting either infamy. The “Chronicle’s” opposition to Republicanism is more sincere and intelligent than that of the Democratic convert to McKinleyism, but its passion for voting is as great as that of the most irrational political fanatics.

The ablest leader of the Democratic silver forces is unquestionably Governor Altgeld. Were he American-born, he would certainly have received the nomination of the Chicago convention. He was the most forceful, aggressive, and influential personage at that gathering, and even his enemies were forced to pay tributes to his power and shrewdness. But, since the natural and logical candidate was ruled out by the constitution, the convention found itself without commanding personalities. Bland, Boies, Matthews, McLean, Blackburn, and the rest of them could hardly be taken seriously by the delegates. Their names were presented without faith or enthusiasm. This explains the Bryan accident.

Bryan was “made” by a speech. An hour before he spoke on the adoption of the platform no one regarded him as a probable victor. His speech was eloquent, effective, and clever, and his nomination was the prize awarded him for that single effort. It is absurd, of course, to nominate a man for the presidency on the strength of a single speech, but first-rate ability of any kind was so scarce among the available candidates that Bryan’s exceptional oratory appealed to the delegates with peculiar force. Bryan’s success is accidental, and the accident would have been impossible had not accident debarred Altgeld from claiming the prize.

We hear a great deal these days about an “honest dollar”; the gold-bug orators and editors shriek at every opportunity that to pay a hundred-cent debt with a fifty-cent dollar is theft and repudiation, and that therefore the advocates of free silver are thieves and repudiators. If this be true,—a question not discussed in this paragraph,—then, if free coinage of silver becomes a reality, we shall speedily find out how many honest men there are among the gold-bugs. For the fact of free coinage will compel no man to pay his debts in fifty-cent dollars against his will. All debtors will still be at liberty to pay their debts in hundred-cent dollars. Every gold-bug, therefore, who shall take advantage of a free-coingent enactment to pay his creditors in fifty-cent dollars will be, if judged by the gold-bug standard of morality, a thief and a repudiator. And should such a gold-bug attempt to extort himself on the ground that, when his debtors pay him in fifty-cent dollars, it is impossible for him to pay his creditors in hundred-cent dollars, the plea will be of no validity. The highly moral man does not treat Jones dishonestly because he himself has been treated dishonestly by Smith. He may not be able to pay to Jones more than he has received from Smith, but he can at least say to Jones: “Give me a receipt for half of what I owe you, and grant me an extension on the balance, which I will pay as soon as I can earn the money.” Besides, most of the gold-bugs are creditors to a much larger extent than debtors. If Smith owes a gold-bug one hundred dollars and pays him in fifty-cent dollars, this gold-bug, if he owes fifty dollars to Jones, can hand to Jones, in full cancellation of his debt, the hundred fifty-cent dollars received from Smith. And he will do so, if he is an “honest man” and a believer in an “honest dollar.” When free coinage comes, we will set a watch on these gold-bugs. No Diogenes, though equipped, in place of a lantern, with an electric light of a million candle-power, will be able to find an honest man among them.
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 of other parts of the paper by the same or other writers by no means indicates that he disapproves them in any respect, such disposition of them being governed largely by motives of convenience.

Mr. Bolton Hall's Arguments.

Mr. Tucker's comments on Mr. Hall's communication in Liberty of May 30 render it unnecessary for me to make any general reply to his criticisms, while my rejoinder to Mr. E. O. Brown incidentally deals with the more important objections urged by Mr. Hall. If I add anything now to what has already been said, it is simply because Mr. Hall's letter affords a tempting opportunity to point out the truth of the criticism, made long ago by a prominent opponent, that Single Taxers skip from agricultural rents to city rents, from Ricardian to monopolistic rents, from ratios to amounts, with the lightness of an aerobat. It is impossible to match them for shiftiness, confusion, and vagueness. The one thing which the Single-Tax folk will not bear in mind and stick to is the fact that their plan is offered as a solution of the entire social problem, as a remedy for all of the industrial ills of the farmers, laborers, and small bourgeois traders. If they would but stick to their own text, it would be possible to carry on profitable controversy with them.

"How," I asked, "would the Single Tax help labor in England, Scotland, Ireland, Germany, Italy, and France," since there is no land speculation in those countries worth mentioning, and certainly no land speculation. The Single Tax was a method of doing away with such speculation? Mr. Hall's answer to this is that I cannot have heard of the immense fortunes made in Berlin and in Paris on the rise of land values and of the ruin that came to many of the old Italian families from land speculation in Rome, but that I surely must have heard of the duke of Westminster's possession in London and of the coal mines held idle in England.

Now, I have heard of these things, and find them too insignificant to consider in connection with the great problem which Single Taxers claim to have solved. I suspect that Mr. Hall has himself the vaguest notion of the things he refers to; he has just "heard of them," literally speaking, and deems it convenient to drag them into the argument. The story of the reconstruction of Paris, Berlin, and Rome is very interesting, but hardly "worth mentioning" in a discussion of speculating land reforms affecting millions of families. Perhaps Mr. Hall can find a dozen vacant lots in Dublin that are held for speculative purposes, but I am not aware that any of the serious writers who have discussed the Irish land question have thought it necessary to dwell upon that significant factor. No greater contrast can be imagined than that between the French and Irish systems of land tenure. France, Scotland, Germany, and Italy have more or less mixed systems, but in Ireland we find the pure system of great landlords controlling the soil, while in France, thanks to the great Revolution, there is a pure system of small farms and occupying ownership. I ask Mr. Hall, in the first place, what the Single Tax would do for Ireland. Never mind the few vacant lots of Dublin; let us conscientiously inquire into the effect of the Single Tax on the millions of tenants. If they had to pay as much to the State as they now pay to the private landlords, their condition would clearly remain unchanged. Assuming, however, that they pay higher rents than the economic value of their holdings warrants, it must be admitted, of course, that they would be advantaged by a reduction of their burdens. But the real question is why they should pay any rent at all! Occupying ownership would entirely free them from their rent burden, and land reformers who insist on taxing them have to show that taxed land is better for the Irish tenantry than free land. It seems perfectly clear that, if Single Taxers were fair and consistent in their demand for "free natural opportunities," they would admit that in Ireland's case what is wanted is not any kind of tax, but the lifting of all rent burdens from the tenants' backs.

Ireland, by the way, which has known anti-rent agitation and struggles, does not appear to "take much stock" in the Single Tax. Yet in no country is the land question more pressing and vital. Is there no lesson to Single Taxers in this fact?

France has a peasant proprietor, but other than rent burdens have kept the masses poor and miserable. A remedy that would free them from such taxes and burdens as they are compelled to bear would certainly be a blessing to them, but how would a tax on land values help them, as Mr. Hall suggests in proposing such a tax? Again, there is some land speculation in the great cities, but isn't it the height of absurdity to tax the millions of agricultural producers in order to make it necessary for the few city speculators to improve their vacant lots? The Single Taxers would avoid a great source of confusion if they would separate the problem of city land from that of agricultural land. The land question is one of tenure for agricultural producers and such city laborers as wish to make a living by tilling the soil. France and Switzerland, by their system of peasant proprietor, have indicated the true solution of the land question, occupying ownership. To test the value of the Single Tax it is necessary to show that, if applied in those countries, it would lead to the benefit of the masses. Nothing of the kind has ever been attempted.

As for the effects of speculation in land where it exists to any appreciable extent, they have very little to do with the industrial position of the laborer or farmer. As I have already pointed out, it is only in new and sparsely-populated countries that speculation in land rages, and in these there is plenty of free land at the disposal of those who are fit for agricultural labor. Mr. Hall asserts that, wherever "low taxes and rapid advances make it more profitable to keep land vacant or partially improved, such is the practice," and he adds that land is everywhere so held. I do not dispute these statements, but the real and relevant question is how much land is so held. To pretend that in any country in the world this factor is important enough to account for the evils besetting industry and society is to be guilty of the most reckless disregard of everything that has been established by the most competent testimony. There is no proof to sustain the assertion, and it betrays such ignorance of economic literature that one can hardly consider it with any degree of patience. Of the evils which are to be found in this or any other country, land speculation is unquestionably one of the most insignificant, so far as its effects on the rate of wages or the demand for labor is concerned.

But, even if the evil were as grave as Mr. Hall imagines it to be, his remedy would be totally unnecessary. It is strange that he, too, ignores the contention that occupying ownership would free all land held for speculative purposes without injury to any non-speculative holders. Single Taxers dwell on the difficulties of free land by the method so often pointed out in Liberty,—that, namely, of refusing to respect titles not based on actual use and occupation.—but these difficulties really do not concern them at all. They are governmentalists, and, since they propose to adopt the Single Tax by legislation, it is impossible to see why it does not occur to them that a law declaring all vacant land free and giving owners the option of improving it within a short time or losing it would accomplish the purpose in view much more directly and speedily than the Single-Tax method. From their own point of view, speculation can be more effectually suppressed by direct legislation than by taxation of land values generally.

If such legislation against land speculation were advanced, libertarians would naturally oppose it, but not because they believe in freedom to speculate in land. And it would be pertinent for the authoritarians to argue that the alternative of passive resistance or failure to afford protection is less certain than prohibitory legislation. At present this is not the issue. Governmentalists who wish to do away with land speculation are bound to show that they cannot secure their object except by imposing a tax on all land-holders, speculative as well as non-speculative. As to whether a tax would really free vacant land or compel owners to improve it, I refer Mr. Hall to my rejoinder to Mr. Brown, wherein the point has received attention.

V. Y.
The Drowning Man's Contract.

A word or two with reference to Mr. Tucker's comment on my solution of the problem advanced by Mr. Salter for the purpose of discriminating my position on the subject of the enforcement of just contracts.

Should the drowning man and a heartless rescuer involving the transfer of the former's entire property to the latter be enforced in a society which acts upon the principle "that equal liberty must be secured," and that all contracts entered into under a condition of equal freedom must be enforced? I gather from Mr. Salter's remarks on the meaning of justice that he would not enforce such an agreement. Not, however, because he is unwilling to enforce contracts, but because he deems the contract in question an unjust one, justice to him being more than equal freedom. Mr. Tucker is also opposed to the enforcement of the contract, but for a different reason. He admits that the contract is perfectly just, believing, with me, that all contracts made under equal freedom by sane people are necessarily just, because justice and equal liberty are synonymous terms; but he avoids the dilemma by saying that "there is no obligation upon outsiders to enforce any contract, even through it be just, and that, when individuals associate themselves for defective purposes, they will decide at the start what classes of just contracts shall be enforced."

Now, this does not really meet the difficulty. Of course man may agree to enforce something less than justice, just as they may agree to enforce something more than justice. It might be wise, but it certainly would not be necessary to associate to undertake to enforce, not only justice, but negative and positive beneficence as well. Similarly, it might be wise, but it would not be wrong in principle, for a voluntary association to ignore certain classes of harsh though just contracts. But suppose that an outsider, without waiting for the action of the association, goes ahead and succeeds in enforcing a contract against a member which the association, had it been applied to, would not have agreed to enforce. Mr. Tucker has declared (and very consistently in his criticism of Mr. Schilling's objections to Liberty's "extreme deductions") that every man must be allowed to be his own judge, and that the only question which arises when a man has "taken the law into his own hands" is whether he has acted justly or involuntarily. Now, it would be a contradiction in terms to say that the enforcement of a just contract is unjust, and would have to be considered the outsider who had enforced a just contract was innocent of wrong-doing, and that he must be allowed to enjoy the fruits of his summary action. Mr. Tucker says that a voluntary association, would vote against the enforcement of such contracts as that of the drowning man (who, indeed, would not join any association which did not except such contracts from its general rule of action), would, as a juror trying an outsider for enforcing a harsh contract, have to vote for an acquittal. So far, therefore, as Mr. Tucker's position is concerned, Mr. Salter's question simply needs to be slightly modified. Mr. Salter asks whether in equal freedom would enforce the drowning man's contract; he would ask Mr. Tucker if he would allow outsiders to enforce such a contract against members of his association. If the answer were yes, then he enforces contracts which he declares to be remiss from common sense and expediency; if he says "no," he squarely contradicts his own previous declaration.

For my own part, I would enforce any contract entered into by any person capable of contracting. Both as a juror and member of an association I would vote for the enforcement of all just contracts. In the case of the drowning man I held, and still hold, reasonably he would have claimed that he was fit to make a contract. A man struggling in water and about to sink is not a rational and sane person, in my judgment. And I am glad to be able to say that a number of highly intelligent men to whom I mentioned the case have expressed their complete approval of my "line of defense."

Still, it is to be borne in mind that, in making this pelut, I am simply relating a question of fact. I do not reject the principle, but merely ask to have the question of fitness and sanity determined in the ordinary way before proceeding to try the question whether a breach of a valid contract has taken place. As my friend, Mr. A. W. Wright (who, by the way, emphatically holds that the drowning man's agreement should be enforced), suggests, I am demanding two trials instead of one. If the question of fitness and sanity is decided against me, I have no objection to the enforcement of the drowning man's contract. That it would be inexpedient to enforce such a contract, I am by no means convinced. Apart from my conviction that justice is necessarily and always expedient, it seems to me that there are many ways in which the act of the heartless rescuer could be disapproved and condemned without a trace of injustice or of inequity in the process. By a simple example, it is possible to render the enforcement of all harsh and unreasonable contracts utterly impossible. The very end which Mr. Tucker has in view can, therefore, be achieved without any violation of equal freedom and without making any exception of certain classes of just contracts. Society has a perfectly right to say to the heartless rescuer: "Yes, we will enforce your contract, since as a sovereign people (or ordinary intelligent citizens, perhaps) has found that the drowning man was sane and fit to make the contract you sue upon; but we shall certainly decline to associate or trade with you in view of your inhumanity."

I repeat, therefore, that I would enforce the drowning man's contract, provided it can be shown to the satisfaction of a jury that he was fit to make it,—or, in other words, that the contract was a real contract.

V 

... If I were to meet Mr. Yearro's criticism of my position as he has met my criticism of his, I should entirely neglect the grounds of his criticism, and simply declare that I still adhere to my own view, possibly adding that my view is shared by highly intelligent men of my acquaintance. But I prefer to leave that method of debate to Mr. Yearro. When my opponent offers me a difficulty, I cannot content myself with a reiteration of my belief, but must examine, analyze, and meet the considerations urged against me, or, if I cannot meet them fully, at least to show the least knowledge of the difficulty. So I say at once to Mr. Yearro that the difficulty which he offers me is a very real one,—one, indeed, that I duly appreciated before he offered it. To forcibly prevent the rescuer from compelling the rescued to fulfill the contract into which he had voluntarily entered would unquestionably be a violation of equal liberty,—an invasion. But this is simply one phase, one appearance, of a very general difficulty that besets the entire doctrine of Anarchism, or equal liberty, and I have often wondered at the failure of the Archists to advance it and insist upon it. When Mr. Yearro, however, replaced an Anarchist, advances it, and asks me to support it or to contradict it, I have to remind him that it is one which must plague him no less than myself, and that it is incumbent on him to surmount it or, at least, join me in an effort to do so. Mr. Yearro agrees with me that the right to combine for defence is founded on and measured by the individual right of self-defence, and that equal liberty entitles any individual to fall back upon his original right to be his own sheriff and judge. Now, if an individual, in the exercise of this right, sentences to death, or to life imprisonment, a man twice as large from him a loaf of bread, what does Mr. Yearro propose we will suppose, belongs to a defensive association of which this thief is also a member, propose to do about it? Will he and his fellow-members allow the man who has been robbed to impose, in the exercise of his undoubted right of self-defence, so severe a penalty upon their erring associate for an offence of murder gravity than the one supposed? I cannot think that he will say "yes" to this question; and yet, if he says "no," he will as clearly violate the doctrine that each individual may be his own sheriff and judge as I would be to prevent the rescuer of the drowning man from compelling the rescued to fulfill his contract. There is nothing intrinsic in the apportionment of penalty for offence; it is simply a question of what is necessary in order to prevent further offence; and, if the offender is to be allowed to be his own sheriff, a judge, he must be allowed, as one of his judicial functions, to decide the extent and kind of penalty. He may decide by what methods B may defend himself, then the rights of A and B to defend themselves are not equal. But the doctrine of equal rights of self-defense is cardinal in Anarchism. Mr. Yearro will perceive, I think, that the difficulty is not mine alone, but his as well.

However, while acknowledging the reality and importance of this difficulty which we may encounter in the application of the Anarchistic idea, I cannot consider it of enough importance to compel the abandonment of Anarchism, or equal liberty, in favor of Archism, or authority, as a foundation of social life. The Archists are so great and the evils of the latter so enormous that we must put up with any imperfections in the realization of our ideal which exceptional circumstances may force upon us. And so I meet the difficulty in question by falling back upon that good old rule which with me is prior to all other rules: "When an emergency arises, cave in the emergency's head." I think that the two hypothetical situations here involved, being very unusual and almost impossible, are clearly examples of emergency. Either of them is more extreme and unlikely than the situation which I pictured to Mr. Yearro in our previous controversy as to the nature of equal freedom, and regarding which he has remained to this day consiously silent. Therefore, in accordance with my position that there are cases in the experience of individuals and associations when it is advisable and necessary to frankly override the very rule of behavior upon which ordinarily we find it to our advantage to insist, I declare that I, as a member of a defensive association, would not allow my fellow-member to be imprisoned for life or put to death for stealing a loaf of bread, or to be stripped of his entire property in enforcement of his promise, nor part with it on condition of being saved from drowning.

Of course Mr. Yearro will be unable to accept this disposition of the matter, as long as his "evolutionary ethics" compel him to hold that justice is necessarily and always expedient. But on that question I have already driven him to the wall. I criticised his conception of equal freedom as a law; he answered my criticism; I rejoined at greater length and more positively than ever, giving new illustrations not open to the exceptions which he had taken to my previous ones; and since then, though many men have expired, no word has been heard from him. I can account for his silence only on the ground that he could find no answer to me. Certainly, if he has a satisfactory
answer, it is of some importance to make it known, because a change in my view of this matter would modify Liberty's teachings considerably.

This notion that justice and its enforcement are always expedient will lead Mr. Yarros to some queer conclusions. He declares that as a member of an association he would vote for the enforcement of all just contracts. This means that he would not join an association discriminating between different classes of just contracts, but would join only such an association as should be formed to enforce any just contract whatever upon the demand of a party thereto who was at the same time a member of the association. Now, suppose it should be discovered, as many "highly intelligent" men claim that it has already been discovered,—a point upon which I utter no opinion here,—that debts are more uniformly and promptly paid in a community where no attempt is ever made to enforce the payment of debt. In that case Mr. Yarros and his association would be compelled by their principle to accept a debt on demand of a debtor, in the very teeth of the fact that this enforced collection must defeat its own ulterior purpose by leading to a greater disregard of debts than there would otherwise be. They would be compelled to continue to punish murderers, even though it should be demonstrated that such punishment increases the number of murderers. This is resistance on principle,—the reverse of Tolstoiism, and even more absurd than Tolstoiism, which is non-resistance on principle. The position that the enforcement of justice is always expedient compels those who hold it to utterly ignore the indisputable fact that resistance, though generally wise, is sometimes unwise.

Now to come back to the drowning man. Mr. Yarros says that a drowning man is not a sane person. But he had said this before, and by repetition he gains nothing except time. There is no argument in the assertion, and in nothing that he now says is there any attention to my argument regarding the non-existence of--

sanity. And the fact that the drowning man must be judged by his act, and I virtually asked Mr. Yarros if he considers it a sane act to drown rather than promise to give up one's property. Not daring to answer that question, he resorts to that reiteration which is excusable only in a man blind and deaf. And this simply to avoid the unqualified utterance of those unpleasant words with which his squarer friend, Mr. A. W. Wright, faced the muse: "I would enforce the drowning man's contract." True, by these words Mr. Wright shows himself to be a man with justice on the brain, a man who believes that justice though the heavens fall, a man morality-crazed instead of religion-crazed, and every bit as much a spook-worshipper as the uncompromising, unfailing, and crazy Abraham himself. But at least he is not afraid either of man or of logic. Like Abraham, he is afraid only of his god. Yet, after all, that's the worst cowardice, and Mr. Yarros, rather than Mr. Wright, shines by the comparison. It is a little to Mr. Yarros's credit that he seeks an excuse to avoid obeying his god.

But, feeling that the excuse will be of no avail, and that this stern deity will exact obedience from his stern devotees, he tries to com-

fort himself with the reflection that the boy-
cott will give him his revenge. After helping the brute to accomplish his brutality, he will boycott him! Surely nothing could be more dishonorable than to heap upon a man for doing a thing which you have lent him your good right arm to do. The heartless robber would turn upon Mr. Yarros and say: "We are all in the same boat in this matter; we have been fellow-Shylocks to the rescued man; you joined with me to exact the pound of flesh; and now, if you boycott me, you yourself will become an object of contempt: 'the eyes of every man who loves justice instead of worshipping it.' And before this cold blast of truth Mr. Yarros would sink away in shame.

O Evolutionary Ethics! O Almighty and Absolute Morality! What Thou hast shriveled Thy chosen disciple! Canst Thou endure a follower that falters in his admiration of Thy perfect work? Shalt not this doubting doer of Thy will burn in Thy hell forever? We ask it in the name and for the sake of Herbert Spencer, Thy Beloved Son, who came on earth to save—drowning men for a consideration. Amen!

No Reason to Apologize.

Shortly after the appearance of the last issue of LIBERTY, in which I had accused J. H. Most of putting into my mouth, by mistranslation, words exactly the opposite of those that I had used, I received communications from Mr. Rudolf Weyerly and Dr. J. H. Maryson in which it was stated very positively and somewhat triumphantly that the German word in dispute, "Einhaltung," means stopping, checking, terminating, rather than sustaining, and that therefore Most had translated me correctly. Neither Mr. Weyerly or Dr. Maryson are Germans, but I knew that Mr. Weyerly at least had made a special study of languages, and so, despite my confidence in the German friend upon whom I had relied (a well educated man and practices the "theory of the market"), the positive statements of these gentlemen threw me into something of a panic. Wishing to inform Most, before he should answer me, of my intention to treat him honorably, I immediately wrote to him that I was in error, and assured him that, if further investigation should prove this to be the case, I would promptly make him the most humble apology that my pen could frame. This done, I called upon my German friend, whose stout adherence to his own translation served to reassure me. Meantime came a third letter, from no less a linguist than Mr. Byington, telling me that he had laughed on the matter. So, to finally settle the matter, I waited the verdict of Mr. George Schumm, of whom, as a German and a master of both the German and the English languages, I had asked a decision. Mr. Schumm's letter, which came in due time, sustained my German friend completely, as the following extract shows:

"Your correspondents are utterly wrong, and you have no apologies to make to Most. ——'-s rendering is correct, and I am sure Most himself will admit it to be so. The word 'einhalten' means "to stop." It is true: but it also means, according to Fligel's large dictionary, "to observe, follow, continue, adhere to, preserve, to act in pursuance of (a line of policy, &c.), to keep, adhere or stick to . . . to fulfill a promise, &c. (punctually), to be true to (one's word);" and

"Einhaltung, (w.) f. the (act of) keeping in, &c., observance of (adherence to)." The same meaning of these words is also given by my Preuss-Thieme and the large Sanders. I trust this will set you at ease.

On the strength of this I hold the ground taken in my article in the last number, and renew my charge against Most. As yet, he has made no answer in "Freiheit," save to say in his Briefkasten, apparently in answer to my letter, "All right and thank you." This seems to indicate a willingness on his part to grasp at the straw which my correspondents have held out to him. But it will not save him, as Mr. Schumm clearly shows.

Nothing in the foregoing should be construed as a reflection upon the scholarship of Messrs. Maryson, Weyerly, and Byington. They are the best of scholars are liable to an occasional blunder in the interpretation of a foreign tongue, especially over a rarely-used word like "Ein-

haltung," not to be found in German-English dictionaries. But German is Most's native tongue, and I have always been told that he handles it well. For him, then, there is no excuse.

The present issue of Liberty being unavoidably late, it is dated August 1 instead of July 25. The next issue will appear August 22, and bear that date.

Candidate Bryan, in his effective and clever speech at the Chicago convention, adverted to the demand of some eastern Democrats that the greenbacks shall be retired and the government gradually withdrawn from the banking business, said that the true Jeffersonian doctrine was that the issue of money is a function of sovereignty, and that it is as wrong for the government to allow private parties to furnish a medium of exchange to the people as it would be to allow them to furnish private police protection and a private judiciary. The government, he said, is not engaged in the business of business; it is the banks who are in the government's business, and it is they who should be retired from the currency-issuing business. Now, whatever Jefferson may have thought or said on this particular point, his general philosophy is diametrically opposite to that of Mr. Bryan. He believed in a minimum of government, and was virtually an Anarchist. Mr. Bryan, on the other hand, is a Populist and fatist. He believes in enlarging the functions of government and is in favor of authority in every respect save one,—international trade. He advocated free trade when he was a congressman, and probably still believes in it. The Democratic convention may have been the first sign of a great popular uprising, but, if the people are misguided and headed in the wrong direction, no true friend of right and justice can congratulate himself upon the revolt. "It does one's heart good," says Governor Altgeld, "to hear the echo of the people's voice thundering for their rights." Assuredly; but suppose they mistake wrongs for rights, shadows for substances, error for truth? Does it do one's heart good to witness popular delusions?

There are several good planks in the Democratic platform, and rumor credits Altgeld with securing their insertion. One is against
government by injunction," or the usurpation of the judiciary in punishing, without jury trial, persons accused of violating the criminal laws of the United States. Another is against presidential usurpation and invasion of " State rights." Attlee's position on the question of the right to order federal troops into a community without the request and against the express wishes of the local authorities in cases of civil strife is fully endorsed. It is also significant that the incitement plank limits itself to opposing the commission of paupers, and does not favor (as the Republican plank does) the application of an " educational test" to all immigrants. Still, the pretence of some semi-individualist reformers that the platform is progressive on the whole is too absurd for comment. How anybody who believes in free banking or mutual banking can approve of a platform which declares that all money must be issued by the government direct to the people, and that banks must be absolutely deprived of the power to utter circulating mediums, passes comprehension.

What will the Single Taxers do in this campaign? Four years ago a majority of them worked and voted for the Populists for flat money, sub-treasuries, government railroads, and what not, while the minority supported Cleveland on account of his alleged tariff-reform proclivities. The Populist Single Taxers can again join the Populists, but those who made common cause with the Democracy find themselves in a state of political isolation. Will they stay at home on election day, or has the voting habit become second nature with them, so that non-participation in the contest is out of the question? If they were consistent, they would form a new political party. All hope of impressing the farmers with the beauties of the Single Tax and free trade is gone for the present, and the Democratic party is committed to a revenue tariff. Single Tax and a revenue tariff are even more incompatible than Single Tax and a prohibitive protective tariff yielding no revenue at all.

The Municipal Wash-Tub. [Newcastle Chronicle.] There has, during the past five years, been a total falling off in the number of persons using the baths and wash houses of 59,325. Yet the expenditure on these costly and, as the statistics demonstrate, unnecessary institutions has risen by over $500. Salaries which in the March of 1890 stood at $1,677 reached in the March of 1895 a total of $2,028; while that of gas, coal, and water simultaneously increased from $1,571 to $1,837. This brilliant achievement is the more surprising, or, rather, would be if its authors were not so shrewd. The improvement in the public health and sanitary state of the town is a rare instance of municipal management which does not require proof, but is clearly demonstrated by the very statistics of the municipal health officer, and the total absence of the annual report, which would have been manifest had it been written during the past season. The report of the Police Commissioners shows that no individual has been sanctioned, or would have been detected sooner, and that much diseases and misery would have been prevented. To add to the work of a Corporation by compelling or permitting it to become a competitor of the laundresses and 'municipal entrepreneurs,' a purveyor of electricity, and the like, is inevitably to secure that its vitally important duties shall be ill performed. The correspondent to whose communication we have already alluded that trampy's electricity, and, in fact, all necessity, and, therefore, ought to be supplied by the municipality. But surely food and clothing are greater necessities; and, if in desirable that trampy should be municipalized, the transfer of the supply to the Government and clothes' shops to the town council must be a step even more urgently demanded in the interests of the community. We fancy few people outside Bedlin and the Fruit Growers' Society are prepared for such a measure. Yet it is the logical development of the municipalizing schemes now advocated by men who would scorn the title of Socialist; and they should bear in mind that, after all, having set the fashion, they cannot check it just as they please. They might be allowed to build them or themselves in one or more of the trampy for the purpose of red herrings. Either the cost of the necessary of existence will be enhanced, or his wages will be reduced, or, worse still, he will be deprived of his employment. Experience is worthless if it does not prove that experiments in municipal Socialism raise the rates; and to a very large extent the rates are paid by the workmen, directly or indirectly.
To Humanity.

When heavenly music plays,
My sweetest dream art then,
Humanity!
When joy my grief allays,
To serve thee I vow,
Humanity!
When all my hope decays,
With hope for thee I grow,
Humanity!
In these decade it dies,
Why do I love thee so,
Humanity?

Boas Dahl.

"The Municipal Theatre Absurdity."

My dear Tucker:

In your issue of May 2 you permit Mr. Victor Yarros to lecture me on this subject, without contributing anything to its discussion. As far as I gather, that I am a master of logic and consistency, instead of, like Mr. Yarros, a slave to them. Allow me to make a few random observations on his homily.

"Mr. Shaw," says Mr. Yarros, "ought to advocate municipal ownership of all means of production." Why? Simply because it is universal, a zines, and municipal books on philosophy, economics, and politics." Well, I do. I have been in more churches in Italy than in any other country; and the only really good art I have seen was at the State Opera. I guess I have been to a church once, and that was a Unitarian.

"Nothing of the sort has ever occurred!" My dear Tucker, how old is this Mr. Yarros? Where was he born? Where does he live? Is he allowed to read the papers? "Nothing of the sort has ever occurred!" Why, nothing else ever occurs when the question is raised. Let me give you the smallest instance I know. Our State department of education has arranged, at the South Kensington Museum, to procure for any person who wants them the photographs of the masterpieces of Italian art published by Alinari of Florence for the use of art students. If you go to the Museum, you can inspect these photographs for nothing. If you want to get down the numbers on a foreign post card, you then hand over to the State official a penny for the post-card and sixpence apiece for the photographs (less than the private enterprise rate). You go home, and in a few days your photographs are delivered, and you now have the State postman. Private enterprise does not provide you with this accommodation; but private enterprise complains so fiercely of photographers being sold by a kind of State monopoly, if you add that the whole arrangement is a State monopoly, that the latest competition Nothing of the sort has ever occurred!" Mr. Yarros, being an Anarchist, will perhaps not understand this point. Let me then, take the capital stockholder, for the sake of argument. He is a liberal in the present day, and he is the owner of a shipping company. He is a man of average ability, who has, by hard work, made a small fortune. He has the satisfaction of his work, as he, of course, sometimes actually is. What sort of freedom has he? He can choose what company to invest in; but so can a citizen choose what to eat at the State luncheon. He can get a dividend of 3% or 4%, and he can have the satisfaction of his work, as he, of course, sometimes actually is. What sort of freedom has he? He can choose what company to invest in; but so can a citizen choose what to eat at the State luncheon. He has the satisfaction of his work, as he, of course, sometimes actually is.

To Humanity.

When heavenly music plays,
My sweetest dream art then,
Humanity!
When joy my grief allays,
To serve thee I vow,
Humanity!
When all my hope decays,
With hope for thee I grow,
Humanity!
In these decade it dies,
Why do I love thee so,
Humanity?

Boas Dahl.

"The Municipal Theatre Absurdity."

My dear Tucker:

In your issue of May 2 you permit Mr. Victor Yarros to lecture me on this subject, without contributing anything to its discussion. As far as I gather, that I am a master of logic and consistency, instead of, like Mr. Yarros, a slave to them. Allow me to make a few random observations on his homily.

"Mr. Shaw," says Mr. Yarros, "ought to advocate municipal ownership of all means of production." Why? Simply because it is universal, a zines, and municipal books on philosophy, economics, and politics." Well, I do. I have been in more churches in Italy than in any other country; and the only really good art I have seen was at the State Opera. I guess I have been to a church once, and that was a Unitarian.

"Nothing of the sort has ever occurred!" My dear Tucker, how old is this Mr. Yarros? Where was he born? Where does he live? Is he allowed to read the papers? "Nothing of the sort has ever occurred!" Why, nothing else ever occurs when the question is raised. Let me give you the smallest instance I know. Our State department of education has arranged, at the South Kensington Museum, to procure for any person who wants them the photographs of the masterpieces of Italian art published by Alinari of Florence for the use of art students. If you go to the Museum, you can inspect these photographs for nothing. If you want to get down the numbers on a foreign post card, you then hand over to the State official a penny for the post-card and sixpence apiece for the photographs (less than the private enterprise rate). You go home, and in a few days your photographs are delivered, and you now have the State postman. Private enterprise does not provide you with this accommodation; but private enterprise complains so fiercely of photographers being sold by a kind of State monopoly, if you add that the whole arrangement is a State monopoly, that the latest competition Nothing of the sort has ever occurred!" Mr. Yarros, being an Anarchist, will perhaps not understand this point. Let me then, take the cap
Is justification Necessary?

[International Art Printer.]

Much ado is being taken up nowadays by many journals with discussions and arguments as to the question of whether it is necessary and advisable to justify the words of a line of type so as to form all lines flush at both ends to a given measure. The discussion is being carried on by the "Home Journal," the "Paper and Press" of Philadelphia. The "Home Journal" is most persistent in its advocacy of the non-justifying, or monospacing, while "Paper and Press" is equally persistent in its championship of justifying as now in use.

Each may have good arguments to bring to the substantiation of its claim. And, like the present-day paganist, might go on using space unlimited for time dire need. At the end the print would be no nearer a practical solution of the question.

After giving the matter careful consideation, we have decided to devote the pages of the "International Art Printer" to a practical illustration of the subject. Now, we are very well aware of the dangers to be encountered in such a procedure—the criticisms and perhaps abuse that are bound to result. The criticisms are what we are after; the abuse we care nothing about.

As to the merits of the case, we do not care to attempt to decide at present. I cannot say that I am greatly struck with the appearance of pages of matter set in monospacing. But I am not only an opinion, and we don't pretend that our opinions are any less open to question than any other.

To come to our object, however, it is to offer a medium for a fair, impartial, and practical illustrating of the possibilities of monospacing in the straight matter, in book or news work, without justification. To this end, commencing with next issue, all the text of the "International Art Printer" will be set in a justification, which will enable us as much as at the result of the experiment as any of our readers are. At the same time we are just as anxious for the experiment as any can be.

We would suggest that all should follow the course and be as practical as possible in the composition. We will of course keep theexperiment. We think it will hardly be far away from the conclusion, after seeing the new style but once, that it is not as artless as the present justifying; that it is impractical, can never come in general use. It is not reasonable to suppose that, after using the old justifying system all our lives—a system that has been in use practically since the introduction of movable types, the art of printing—printers' grain, is not a thing that should and can be improved upon.

One point in favor of the non-justifying system must be acknowledged at the start—economy. There can be no question as to the saving it would entail, both in setting and distributing. It is estimated that in ordinary book work the justifying consumes one third of the time of setting. Add to this a slight gain in distributing, and we have no small saving in the cost of producing letter-press work. In work on trade journals the saving would, of course, be greater, as there is more attention is there given to spacing. In newspaper work, however, it would not be so great, but this might be balanced by the absolutely even spacing that would result from the new system.

At present before there is much that might be said for and against the innovation; but, when all is said, the fact remains that it is still "all talk."

For what length of time we will continue the non-justifying experiments, we will not be left for circumstances to decide. It will require three or four months' slight, probably, to be used to the appearance of the new style. After that time we will be able to better judge of the merits of the system.

As, of course, we can get up the "Art Printer" at considerably less cost than when the old system of justification was in use, after the new system is adopted the subscription rate will be reduced—to what extent will be announced next issue.

[Washington Star.]

"Mamma, what does "pro" and "con" mean?"

"Two things opposed to each other, my child."

"Oh, that's where the words 'progress' and 'congress' come from, isn't it?"
Anarchist Letter-Writing Corps.
The Secretary wants every reader of Liberty to send in his underwriting for those who, so to speak, plead themselves to write, when possible, a letter every fortnight, on Anarchism or kindred subjéts, to the "tag" assigned in Liberty for that fortnight, and to notify the secretary promptly in case of any failure to write on which he hopes it will not often occur), or in case of temporary withdrawal from the work of the Corps. All, whether of letters or other communications, have an opportunity of informing the secretary of suitable targets. 

Address: STEPHEN T. BIXBY, East Hanover, N. J.

Target, section A.—Under the title, "Reasons for Anarchy," "The Star," a Single Tax paper, of 429 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, says:

That there are persons who hold and vigorously advocate the principle of the self-controlled property would be more secure without any law officials than it is in society, and it is much to be wondered at in view of the following from the San Francisco "Letter":

Then follows a story of blackmail or extortion from a young woman by a policeman, and the subsequent consignment of the courts and district attorney to prevent the issuance of a warrant for the arrest of the offending official.

Show that such things are in the nature of government, and that the whole record of government supports the Anarchist contention.

Section B.—The Cleveland "Citizen" speaks thus of the visit of Turner, the Anarchist-Congressman:

John Turner, the London Anarchist, was in the city this week, where he gave a number of addresses. He had no bombs concealed about his person, and no knife, and thunder sensations accompanied his able speech. Many who heard him wondered how they had become frightened at the lurid headlines in the newspapers. Mr. Turner is certainly a peace-loving, intelligent, and agreeable gentleman, and a good trade unionist. He has made a friend of every one he met while in the city, and we are sure that Cleveland workingmen and reformers will join us in requesting for Mr. Turner a hearty welcome at the hands of unionists.

Price: 1000. Note that there is no good reason why Anarchists be regarded as imaginary violence and outrage; tell something of the real aims.

STEPHENS T. BIXBY.

MUTUAL BANKING.

BY WILLIAM B. GREENE.

Showing the radical validity of the existing circulating medium and the advantages of a free currency; a plain and obvious answer to the State, intervention, but by first abolishing State intervention itself.

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


Price, TEN CENTS.

Mailed, post-paid, by BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 133, New York City.

INSTEAD OF A BOOK: 

BY A MAN TOO BUSY TO WRITE ONE.

A FRAGMENTARY EXPOSITION OF

PHILOSOPHICAL ANARCHISM.

Called From the Writings of BENJ. R. TUCKER,

From the Writings of the Editor.

With a Full-Page Half-Tone Portrait of the Author.


Price, FIFTY CENTS.

Mailed, post-paid, by the Publisher, BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 133, New York City.

THE BALLOT.

BY WILLIAM WALSHORD GORDON.

A short poem, illustrating the absurdity of plurality rule. Printed as a leaflet, with an effective advertisement of Liberty on the back. Excellent for propaganda.

Twenty Cents Per Hundred Copies.

Mailed, post-paid, for LIBERTY, BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 133, New York City.

VOLUNTARY SOCIALISM.

BY F. D. TANDY.

A complete and systematic outline of Anarchist philosophy and economics, written in a clear, concise, and simple style. It is a great boon to the individual who wishes to acquaint himself more deeply, and contains also a complete index. 494 pp. 2s. 6d.

Price, Cloth, $1.00; Paper, 50 Cents.

Mailed, post-paid, by BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 133, New York City.

THE SCIENCE OF SOCIETY.

BY STEPHEN PHELPS AND W. C.

A widely-printed book of 12 large pages, consisting of two essays, one being a short and easy introduction to the science of society, the other an essay on the theory of society. The book is illustrated with a map and a diagram, and is well suited for the common man. It is a clear, concise, and simple style. The book contains also a complete index. 300 pp. 1s. net.

Price, Cloth, $1.00; Paper, 50 Cents.

Mailed, post-paid, by BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 133, New York City.

WIND-HARP SONGS.


Price, $1.00.

Mailed, post-paid, by the author, J. W. MACKENZIE, WESTFIELD, NEW JERSEY.

LIBERTY'S LIBRARY.

For any of the following Works, address, BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 133, New York, N. Y.

SO THE RAILWAY KINGS ITEP FOR AN EMPIRE,


THE SIEGE OF PARIS.

By W. A. Gifford, in "The Spectator," London. A complete and exhaustive exposition of the social and political conditions of the people. 120 pages. Price, $1.00.

THE APOSTLES OF LABOUR.

By H. C. Gifford, in "The Spectator," London. A complete and exhaustive exposition of the social and political conditions of the people. 120 pages. Price, $1.00.

CAPTAIN ROLAND'S VENDUE.

By J. O. Ingalls. 31 pages.

THE WIND AND THE WHIRLWIND.

By Wilfrid Reid, in "The Spectator," London. A complete and exhaustive exposition of the social and political conditions of the people. 120 pages. Price, $1.00.

HEROES OF THE REVOLUTION OF '71.

A complete and exhaustive exposition of the social and political conditions of the people. 120 pages. Price, $1.00.

A VINDICATION OF NATIONAL SOCIETY.

A complete and exhaustive exposition of the social and political conditions of the people. 120 pages. Price, $1.00.

A SHANNON'S CALENDAR.

A complete and exhaustive exposition of the social and political conditions of the people. 120 pages. Price, $1.00.

A COMPLETE INDEX.

A complete and exhaustive exposition of the social and political conditions of the people. 120 pages. Price, $1.00.

THE UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE LAWS.

A complete and exhaustive exposition of the social and political conditions of the people. 120 pages. Price, $1.00.

THE DUTY OF THE STATE.

A complete and exhaustive exposition of the social and political conditions of the people. 120 pages. Price, $1.00.

THE NEW THEOCRACY.

A complete and exhaustive exposition of the social and political conditions of the people. 120 pages. Price, $1.00.

THE LETTER OF THE ARMY.

A complete and exhaustive exposition of the social and political conditions of the people. 120 pages. Price, $1.00.

THE LOYALISTS.

A complete and exhaustive exposition of the social and political conditions of the people. 120 pages. Price, $1.00.

THE CONSTITUTIONAL LAWS.

A complete and exhaustive exposition of the social and political conditions of the people. 120 pages. Price, $1.00.

THE SUPREME COURT.

A complete and exhaustive exposition of the social and political conditions of the people. 120 pages. Price, $1.00.

THE LAW AND THE ECONOMY.

A complete and exhaustive exposition of the social and political conditions of the people. 120 pages. Price, $1.00.

THE COURTS.

A complete and exhaustive exposition of the social and political conditions of the people. 120 pages. Price, $1.00.

THE LAW AND THE ECONOMY.

A complete and exhaustive exposition of the social and political conditions of the people. 120 pages. Price, $1.00.
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THE LAW AND THE ECONOMY.

A complete and exhaustive exposition of the social and political conditions of the people. 120 pages. Price, $1.00.
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