On Picket Duty.

The next issue of Liberty will appear on or about November 15, and it is the intention that future issues shall appear on the fifteenth of the month. See announcement on second page regarding the change in price and frequency of issue.

"You lie, villain!" said Dana the other day to an editor who had made a certain statement about the ownership of the "Sun." I thank him for the expression; it enables me to fitly characterize the following definition he recently gave of the term Anarchist: "One who believes in knocking everything into confusion, with dynamite or anything else, with the hope of getting more than his share in the scramble. A quick and complete form of repudiation."
You lie, villain! You cannot have forgotten your own articles on Proudhon.

About a fortnight before the Maine election the New York "World," in an editorial headed "Three Predictions," prophesied that the Republicans would carry the State by an increased majority; that, as a result, Sewall would withdraw from the Democratic ticket; and that he would be replaced by Watson. Boasting of its previous successes as a prophet, the "World" added that it staked its entire prophetic reputation on the correctness of this forecast. Well, the Republicans got the increased majority (which everybody foresaw), but Sewall, instead of climbing down, has definitely accepted the Democratic nomination, and of the two, Sewall and Watson, the latter seems much the more likely to retire from the race. Therefore the "World" has lost its entire prophetic reputation. Unfortunately so slight a loss will not drive it into bankruptcy.

The Springfield "Republican" reprints without comment the editorial of the Washington "Post" entitled "Is Mr. Dana an Anarchist?" Dana does not like the "Republican," and ordinarily improves every opportunity to heap ridicule and abuse upon it. The head and front of the "Republican's" offending is its sympathy with the oppressed and fair treatment of the anti-plutocratic movement. If there is one thing Dana cannot forgive, it is a friendly attitude toward social reform. Now, however, when the "Republican" has the audacity to state that Dana himself may be an Anarchist at heart, the old renegade is condemned to silence. He cannot pick up the gauntlet; he must swallow the affront. How galling the situation must be to him! How great his fury and rage!

At last Golkin has discovered a simple test or touchstone for the "honest voter" who cannot understand the intricacies of the financial question and who sincerely desires to do what is right. The reader will remember that Golkin has reversed himself again and again on the question whether the experts or the people at large are the more competent judges of what a sound and safe currency is, and that his latest decision was to the effect that, if it were not for mischievous professors and quibbling economists, the people would stick to the gold standard. His confidence in the people must have received a severe shock, in spite of the crushing failure of Bryan which he and the other truthful New York editors have been so loudly (though not without an undertone of effort) proclaiming. He is not so sure that the people would choose the gold standard, and feels the need of a simplification of the problem. At the end of a column-and-a-half editorial on the "main question," we find this great discovery: "The common sense that has come to prevail concerning eternal salvation may properly be called on to display itself in the solution of our financial problems. Instead of puzzling over ratios and values and appreciation and depreciation, let people ask themselves and ask others which side in the present contest stands more clearly for national honor and good faith and for honest and just dealing between man and man? There is plenty of sophistry to be heard on both sides, we admit; but with this simple touchstone the voter who sincerely desires to do what is right will not find it difficult to select the true course." It is scarcely necessary to point out the lameness, impotence, and paucity of this conclusion. It would disgrace a schoolboy. The "simple question" evolved by Golkin is exactly the question which requires an exhaustive study of "ratios and values and appreciation and depreciation," for it is in the light of these difficult subjects that one can decide whether Golkin or Bryan stands for honest dealing and good faith. Does Golkin imagine that his pharsidial claims and pretensions of virtue and honesty are on a par with demonstrated facts? Does he expect his cant about "sound money" and "honor" to be accepted without a heavy discount? Unfortunately for his cause, his credit has entirely vanished. Even without his admission, most people are aware that he talks "plenty of sophistry." But sophistry is his only refuge; if he really relies on the general faith in his disinterestedness and purity, he is lost.

Dr. Eugène Schmitt, of Budapest, who some years since took the prize of the Berlin Academy for his work on the "Secrets of the Hegelian Dialectic," has just resigned his post in the Hungarian department of justice under peculiar circumstances. His philosophical investigations have brought him to the Tolstoyan conclusion that government by force is inconsistent with Christian love, and he has for some time edited a magazine setting forth these views. The minister of justice requested him, as an office-holder, to refrain from publication of such views. To this Dr. Schmitt has replied by an open letter, under date of September 10, 1896, in which he throws up his office, declaring that he finds it "inconsistent with his honor to serve under an institution which represents the legal oppression and exploitation of mankind, and whose system of violence and slavery, founded on blood and iron, is in radical contradiction with the noble principle of Christian love and with the demands of man's conscience." It seems probable that no action will be taken by the government in the premises. On two occasions, when his writings have been judicially attacked in Prussia, Dr. Schmitt has offered to deliver himself up to the German authorities, but his offer was not accepted.

Still another journal has adopted the new typography, making, in all, six that now regularly use it, whereas there was not one in 1891, when Liberty introduced it. This is a better record than any type-setting machine can point to within so brief a period. The latest accession comes from England. It is "Natural Food," a sixteen-page monthly devoted to hygiene, published by Drs. Emmet and Helen Densmore and edited by Arthur Wastall. In its October issue the type is set without "justification." Curiously, in his announcement of the change, the editor gives the chief credit to the "International Art Printer," never mentioning Liberty, although every person well informed upon this matter knows that the "International Art Printer" was led to adopt the new method through the advocacy of it by the editor of Liberty in signed and unsigned articles contributed by him to various journals. I might suppose the editor of "Natural Food" to be ignorant of this, were it not that I know him to be familiar with "Lucifer" and other American organs of advanced opinion, that his columns contain an advertisement of the "Age of Thought" (which uses the new typography), and that at least once, if not twice, I have mailed him a copy of Liberty. The weak things of this earth may succeed in confounding the mighty, but theirs will never be the glory, if Mr. Wastall can help it.
Mr. Shaw's Defence of Public Enterprise.

Il.

"Now let us talk a little common sense," says Mr. Shaw, after talking a great deal of learned nonsense about public and private enterprise, compulsory levying of tribute by capitalists, and so on. Most willingly; but Mr. Shaw must remember that, even when talking common sense, he is bound by the rules of logical reasoning,—is a slave of logic, in other words.

Describing the present tentative efforts of English municipalities to advance the interests of art, Mr. Shaw asks us to suppose a number of things, as follows:

Suppose they reinforce their staff of attendants and clerks with a staff of stage carpenters, finally with a staff of actors, who could occasionally give a Shakespearian performance parallel to the concerts. Suppose the money paid by the individuals who attended the performances (voluntarily) were sufficient not only to defray the expenses of the municipal theatre, but to lighten the rates of the people who never go to the theatre, and who might perhaps return the compliment by supporting municipal churches and chapels. Suppose the municipal theatre hurt nobody; suppose it made theatrical art, now starved by its more business difficulties, easier; suppose it helped to turn the provincial Englishman from the fast-food, respectively dressed, circulating-library-stuffed, earring, earringless, shameless, mean-spirited, uncreative class into a cultivated human being, and it is on the reasonable probability of these conditions being practically attained, more or less, that I have based my advocacy of municipal activity in this direction;—what objection has Mr. Jarvis to offer?

I am afraid Mr. Shaw is violating our agreement. He is not talking common sense at all. He "supposes" the very things I have questioned or denied, cooly says that he bases his advocacy on the "reasonable probability" of certain "conditions being attained" regardless of my contention that there is no such reasonable probability, and then innocently asks what objections I have to offer? There clearly would be no objections to offer if I granted his suppositions and admitted the "reasonable probability"; and it is because I cannot suppose things contrary to reason and fact that I cannot suppose that municipal theatres would lighten the rates of the people; I cannot suppose that they would hurt nobody; I cannot suppose that they would improve the intellectual status of the English bourgeoisie; I know better; and my whole article was written to show that nothing of this sort could possibly occur. I considered the question from the general political standpoint as well as from the particular dramatic standpoint on which Mr. Shaw laid special stress. Let us see how he meets my objections.

We are at stake, first of all, by a strange and significant omission in Mr. Shaw's defence. One of my most important and pivotal points, which must appeal to him, the most advanced and conscientious dramatic critic in England, with peculiar force, he carefully passes over. I asked him to tell us what reason he had for believing that municipal officials would educate the public by giving them artistic and wholesome plays. "Would municipalities produce Ibsen or Jones (at his best) or Sudermann?" I asked; "would not the rule of the absurd censure be even more arbitrary, 'moral,' and irritating than now?" I find no answer to these queries. Mr. Shaw can give none which would not completely demolish his scheme. He knows that the ideas of municipal rulers about the stage are not such that we can except a progressive policy from them. Mr. Shaw intimates that they might encourage Shakespearian performances. Perhaps so, but (and very fine) article of Mr. Shaw's in the "Saturday Review" leads me to believe that he is not particularly anxious to have more Shakespearian performances than the public now gets. I am not aware that Shakespere is persona non grata with private managers, and, if so elaborate productions as Irving's meet with scant appreciation, I see no reason for expecting great patronage of municipal Shakespearian performances. If private managers are open to criticism, it is on the score of their cowardice and obtuseness in dealing with modern plays; and certainly common sense would laugh at Mr. Shaw if he were to hold out any promise of a more liberal and intelligent policy on the part of municipal theatres.

I might submit the case to the common-sense jury without further argument. Mr. Shaw is already defeated. The incongruity and contradiction are too plain. A lover of the drama, a progressive and competent critic who deplores the decadence of the modern stage, appealing to Philistine and narrow-minded and ignorant municipal rulers to elevate and regenerate dramatic art is indeed a spectacle for gods and men. If Clement Scott, the bitter enemy of modern dramatic tendencies, appealed to municipal rulers to save British morals from the poison of Ibsenism and realism, no one would be astonished, but Mr. Shaw in the role of humble petitioner for municipal salvation is a most puzzling and amazing phenomenon.

Still, let us follow Mr. Shaw's further alleged common-sense arguments. He does not see, he says, why municipal theatres would not be controlled by competition and kept up to the mark. Irving can start a rival house next door and entice away the public by superior performances, and the deficit thus caused could not be bluffed away. This implies that the municipal theatre would be supported by the rich, and not from the middle class, raised by compulsory taxation. If so, I have, indeed, no objection to the experiment being made. If a municipality wishes to start a theatre on purely commercial principles, there is nothing to be said against the scheme. It suggests Mr. Bliss's "Voluntary Socialism through the State," and I have cheerfully conceded that this was a wholly innocent proposal. There would, of course, be the initial difficulty of getting the means to build a suitable theatre and properly equip it; but I imagine Mr. Shaw would suggest the issue of special bonds with the understanding that principal and interest would be paid out of the profits of the theatre. As no one would be willing to advance a single shilling on such terms, Mr. Shaw's scheme would be nipped in the bud.

But Mr. Shaw, it appears, has not really
made up his mind in regard to the incidence of the theatre tax. Although he distinctly says that he has not "propose that anybody shall contribute except the people who go to the theatre to attend," he promptly nullifies this ex osti declaration by saying in his next sentence that, if the majority of the rate-payers should choose to subsidize the theatre for its social effects, they could do so at a trifling annual cost to the people at large. Now, Mr. Shaw does not "propose" to oppose this subsidy, while I am bound to oppose it as a wholly unwarrantable attempt to support, at everybody's expense, an institution which only the majority see fit to maintain. Mr. Shaw, then, calmly contemplates a municipal theatre supported, not by the proceeds, but by compulsory taxation. How can he ask, in the name of common sense, those who are opposed to compulsory taxation to support him in this "reform"?

Moreover, he is now obliged to drop his contention that municipal theatres can be kept up to the mark by competition. The moment they are made independent of receipts and voluntary contributions, competition ceases to have any terror for them. They are not afraid of deficits which are made good by subsidies. That, if municipal theatres were once started, they would become public charges and burdens; that, in other words, the majority would vote to subsidize them as a rate paid into the immortal stage and disseminating of sweetness and light by producing so elevating plays as "The Silver King,"—I have no doubt whatever. Mr. Shaw's proposal is simply an entering wedge.

One remark of Mr. Shaw's is utterly unintelligible to me. He states that "the theatrical manager is not an ordinary man of business following the scent of a market demand, and that no sane capitalist will put a farthing of capital into a good theatre on purely commercial grounds." Does this mean that theatres are unprofitable enterprises, and that they are run from other motives? Does it mean that managers are generally out of pocket and that the deficit has to be made good by a subsidy of some private backer? This is certainly not the case in the United States. Theatrical managers and actors make fortunes here by following the scent of the market, and not a single theatre is subsidized by private or public philanthropists. Still, even if private subsidies were needed to maintain our theatres, just as private subsidies are needed to maintain symphonic orchestras, I fail to see how the case for municipal theatres would be strengthened. The solid fact remains that theatres exist, and that they give pleasure, just as much as they want and is prepared to enjoy. Even if we admit that they do retard dramatic progress, and that they condemn the best productions of the day to obscurity and neglect, it by no means follows that we are committed to the proposition in favor of municipal theatres, since government officials are certain to be more obtuse and reactionary than private managers and their backers. These, at least, do not care for namby-pamby morality and Philistine respectability. Profit is the first consideration with them, and they will give you revolution if they see a chance to swell receipts. Officials, on the other hand, are moralists and consensus first, and lovers of the drama afterward.

I confess that Mr. Shaw's defence of the "respectable public," or what Ibsen would call the "compact majority," is more incomprehensible to me than his original reference to the same. He tells us that we ought to give the devil his due, and that it is necessary to recognize forces and take proper notice of the effects produced by them. Becoming specific, Mr. Shaw tells us that this Philistine majority, this respectable public, which, as Mr. Shaw has insisted in the "Saturday Review" over and over again, cannot distinguish between art and contortions, between acting and going through the prescribed motions, actually secures, through its action upon the county council, greater decency in the music halls than prevails in the lower class of theatres. Mr. Shaw appears to be desiring of the power of the public, and giving them control of the theatres as well. Yet he has been bitterly fighting the absurd censure which still survives in England! Does he want the censorship of the voters in place of that of an obscure clerk? Is he willing to submit Ibsen's "Ghosts" and "Nora" to the judgment of those voters? Or would he be willing to give this censorship to the theatres of the lower class only? If so, why are not the patrons of these theatres the best judges of what is moral and decent for them? And would not this discrimination be utterly unjustifiable and tyrannical? If the music halls are decent, it is because the majority of the council's power over them, but I do not regard such interference as wise or legitimate or necessary. I never questioned the power of the Philistines, but I do question their right to exercise it in this invasive way. The notion that patrons of theatres should be protected from indecency by those who do not go to see the indecent plays itself is so Philistine in its nature that I can hardly believe that Mr. Shaw intends his words in their obvious sense.

We come now to what Mr. Shaw characterizes as my "one really heartfelt objection to municipal theatres,"—the objection, namely, that consistency would compel the application of the same remedy to many other proposed evils. This, Mr. Shaw says, is an irrational objection, due to my failure to take the world really instead of logically. What I call consistency and logic, he tells me, is nothing but irrational association of ideas, and Fabians are equal to any number of inconsistencies of the kind I pointed out. Now, this requires a great deal of elaboration, and I regret that Mr. Shaw has been so parsimonious of argument. The matter-of-fact statement that the Fabian society has expressly placed to its proposal for the collective administration of capital the commonsense limit of sociability, of course, bound to accept, although there seems to be no way of finding out what that limit is. If I understand Mr. Shaw, the Fabian doctrine is this: so far as it is sociably convenient, it is necessary to abolish private enterprise and competition, and place the means of production in the hands of the collectivity. The majority, the respectable voters, are, of course, to be the ultimate court of appeal, and whatever they decide to be convenient will be done. But I am afraid that this elastic doctrine does not altogether escape the trammels of logic and consistency. The question is not what this or that Fabian is inclined to do or refrain from doing, but what his general proposition fairly implies. For instance, if Mr. Shaw should lay down the proposition that "all economic rent must be appropriated by the State," it certainly would not be more irrational association for me to say, remembering the "all," that the profits accruing from a newspaper must be logically confiscated along with those accruing from a corner drugstore. Again, if Mr. Shaw should say that "all means of production must be owned and controlled by the State," it would not be irrational for me to remind him that a sewing machine, being a means of production, comes within the "all." Mr. Shaw can escape only by dropping the all and declaring that certain means of production, or certain unearned increments, should be handed over to the State. When he does that, logic and consistency will debar me from forcing the sewing machine on his attention, because I shall be expected to perceive the qualifying and guarded "certain." When Mr. Shaw says that municipalities must rescue the stage from commercialism, I am entitled to ask him why he does not propose to rescue also the book and newspaper publication business from commercialism. He cannot say: "I don't because I don't," for common sense would at once write him down as an illogical and inconsistent reformer. If I show that the same evils which he proposes to cure in a certain way exist also in certain other spheres, and that the same remedy is needful from his point of view, Mr. Shaw cannot avoid the force of my reasoning by declining to consider it. Mr. Shaw's revolt against logic and consistency is a revolt against the necessity of correspondence between premises and conclusion.

Mr. Shaw realizes, of course, that it is pure caricature for him to say that I regard it as an inconsistency for a Socialist to excavate his egg with his own spoon after having the foundings of his house excavated with a municipal steam navy. Were I to make such an averment, the proper response on Mr. Shaw's part would be, not that he declines to be logical and consistent, but that I am extremely illogical in making demands that do not follow from his premises.

This question of logic and consistency, however, has nothing to do with the question whether liberty is or is not a panacea, a master-key for the million locks. The latter is simply a question of fact. Here Mr. Shaw himself is guilty of the a priori reasoning which he deems so vicious. It is he who tells me that there is no such thing as a panacea, without proving proof. I simply and calmly insist that, in a certain sense, liberty is a panacea, or, rather, as I prefer to put it, a condition, essential and precedent, to normal and rational progress. Apart from all a priori reasons, I offer to prove that, in any given case, liberty works better than regulation, provided that we take into account indirect as well as direct effects. In the particular case of municipal theatres, I have not contended myself with arguing that the proposal is in contradiction of the principle of liberty, but have endeavored to show that the very interests Mr. Shaw wishes to promote would suffer grievously at the hands of the new patrons. Still, I willingly admit that I should not favor municipal theatres even if I were convinced that dramatic progress would be furthered by them, because man does not
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live by the drama alone, and the tendency and indirect effects of municipal theatres could not fail to be reactionary and fatal to general progress. And this is no mere irrational association of ideas, but an induction from the facts of legislative and governmental history.

But the masses do not want your liberty! say Mr. Dana and his associates. Rather than liberty they want order and a strong central government. This is too sweeping. They certainly want prosperity, comfort, and happiness, and, in trying to show them that liberty is the mother of these things, we are giving them exactly what they want. As for the assertion that many have now more liberty and opportunity for happiness than we are able to use, I do not, unfortunately, find myself among these rare mortals. There are a number of freedoms and opportunities I am obliged to go without and yet crave. I do many things which I would rather leave undone, and I abstain from doing many things which I should much like to do. I have no liberty; he is lucky today to be under Socialism, and it is entirely for the sake of others that he advocates a change. Although a good deal of an altruist, I do not claim to have reached Mr. Shaw's attitude. Liberty, I feel, would be a benefit not only to the masses, but to me individually. But how can I get rid of this selfishness, when liberty insists on making me happy along with the rest? V.v.

While sympathizing in no small measure with the Labor Exchange movement, I cannot take the highly favorable view of it that Mr. Lydig, does, in another column. I will give my reason briefly at a later date. Mr. Lydig's, whose Single Tax training makes him look to land reform as the sole source of economic good, is interested in money reform, only as a political measure, a means of weakening government. I, to whom money reform is not only this, but an economic reform of the first importance as well, am naturally a little more cautious than he as to the economic soundness of any specific financial measure presented for my approval.

The Washington "Post," a truly independent paper which one can read with pleasure in this campaign of mendacity and pharisism and hypocrisy (on the gold-bug side), had a long editorial on Dana's admirable defence of Proudhon and Anarchism, and wound up with what poor Dana must regard as the "most unkindest cut of all." Here is its language: "Of course we all know by this time that Mr. Dana has changed his language since 1847, but has he ever told us that he has changed his principles? Then he is definitely defending an avowed Anarchist, expounding the beneficent features of Proudhon's scheme, and explaining the improbability of popular progress and advancement under the régime of Wall street. To-day he is consigning to perdition all who rebel against the established order of things—established by Wall street—and proclaiming that honor and patriotism and decency are not to be found among them. Which is the real Dana? Which of these two attitudes represents his conscience and his judgment—"the inner heart and purpose of the man"? But Dana can blame no one but himself for this cruel intimation that he still may be an Anarchist at heart. He never announced his change of opinion, and never gave any reasons for his desertion of the cause of labor and liberty. But I must protest against the gratuitous assumption of the "Post" that the old reprobat and marplot has a heart. His judgment may still be true, but of good feeling there cannot be a trace left in him. He may know that he lived in the thousand years and people he persecuted with such venom, but he cannot be sorry that he lies.

The Boston "Herald" thinks that it is rather unfair to bring up the enthusiasm of Mr. Charles A. Dana's youth against him to prove that he was at that time inclined to favor Anarchism, as is done in a pamphlet recently published. And it goes on to say: "It is nearer fifty than forty years ago since Mr. Dana wrote in that way. He probably looks with much amusement himself upon the queer views that then found judgment in his active brain in the pursuit of early ideas. We hardly think Mr. Dana prides himself upon consistency even in his later life. It is not such a great while ago that he was advocating the election of Gen. B. F. Butler to the presidency, when Gen. Butler's ideas upon the currency were very different from those Mr. Dana now supports." It is true that Dana does not and cannot pride himself upon consistency, but it is not the charge of inconsistency that the Proudhon pamphlet raises against him. The charge is that he is a consecrated and deliberate liar, slanderer, and defamer. He brands every one who holds the views which he so obly expressed in his youth as traitors, criminals, and rioters. He knows that he was honest and sincere in his youth, and he therefore must know that the people who adhere to what he has forsaken and repudiated are neither rascals or fools. If he were an honest man, he would admit that he entertained radical ideas in his youth, and reason with those who entertain such ideas to-day. He would attempt to convince them that they are wrong; he would tell them how and why his own views have undergone a change. He would then, with all the earnestness and nobility of the reformers who arraign modern society precisely as he arraigned it in his early days. It is because he exhibits the malice and venom of the conscious rogue and traitor that I hold him up to the odium and scorn of all fair-minded men.

Read the "Sun" every day, Dana tells a correspondent, and you will understand the issues of the campaign and have a correct, true, and intelligent view of them. It is a pity that Dana fails to recommend also a careful reading of his Proudhon articles. Certainly those who read the "Sun" and the pamphlet will have a correct, true, and intelligent view of the issues of the campaign in a technical sense, then at least of the spirit and general attitude of the opposing sides.

The Labor Exchange.

I find that some of Liberty's readers are interested in the Labor Exchange, and want to know more about it. It seems to me that the relation of this movement to Liberty's principles is such that it ought to be of great interest to all Liberty's readers: and, as Liberty has hitherto printed only a slight notice of it, a rather fuller statement will be well worth the space it occupies.

The Single-Tax movement appears to be the most conspicuous economic product of the panic of 1873, for, though George Henry's famous book was not published in 1871, it is evident that "Progress and Poverty" was inspired by the panic, the thought of which dominates the whole course of its argument. Just so the Labor Exchange movement results, I think, from the panic of 1894; the Labor Exchange Association was incorporated in 1891, I believe, but it was the hard times that brought it forward into the public eye.

But there is this difference in the movement that the Single Tax did not get itself prominently before the people till several years after the panic, while the Labor Exchange began to boom almost as soon as the panic was on, is still booming, and nobody knows when it will stop.

The central idea of the new institution, as it practically works, may be thus expressed. Given a number of laborers who have strength and opportunity for producing with the purchasing power in such articles as are in local demand, but who are hampered by the impossibility of finding anybody with money to hire them or buy their goods. Problem: to employ these men without money. Solution: employ the Labor Exchange. The Labor Exchange is a place selected as a depository, and the most competent member put in charge as manager. Then whatever each man makes is deposited with the Exchange, and paid for by the other wholesale depositors. These checks are receivable, at the Exchange branch which issued them, in payment at retail prices for anything the Exchange has on hand. Out of the profits the manager is paid; if there is any surplus profit, the amount goes to the members, the sum of their deposits and the time they are left on deposit.

The Exchange often establishes a factory and hires its workers as employees, paying them in checks. The labor products received as deposits need not be of any value means freshly produced, or produced by the depositor: anything that a man owns and wants to sell will be received at the Exchange, if the manager thinks it worth having there before manufacturing is begun, the capital necessary for a start may be (and often is) received as a deposit and paid for in checks. Deposits are received only from members, but a non-member can easily deposit his checks. The difference between the two—members of the Exchange is established, its checks are ordinarily receivable at par by the retail stores of the neighborhood. According to the "New Charter" of June 12, quoting from the Tacoma "Sun," they are at a premium of 7½ to 10½ above United States money in Buckley, Wash. Early in 1894 it was reported that they were 10 per cent. above gold in Chastanaooga.

The Labor Exchange is the avowed and vociferous enemy of the legal-tender, especially as a condition of membership, besides the nominal fee of $1.00, that the member shall blind himself never to demand legal tender from the Exchange. Every "balance check" (used to make change) has on the back a stamping picture of a railroad train stopped at the sign "Stop Progress—Legal Tender Toll Gate" and Labor Exchange workmen removing the obstruction. All the literature of the Exchange is full of the continuance that the legal-tender will be the ruin of all our economic evils, and to do away with it is our only hope of salvation. Now, this is very confounding when we remember the character of most recent financial talk in labor circles. The branches can at discretion sell or buy goods for members of the Exchange, though this is regarded as better rather than safe, the Exchange's only cash being its own checks. So, too, branches may give money for their checks, as they would give other commodities, if they have spare money that they want to dispose of.

The checks of one branch are generally received at another branch by courtesy, but is is recognized that, as the Exchange spreads, it will become impossible to do this, except for near neighbors. Southern California, where the Exchange is strongest, begins to feel the need of a more complete provision for exchanges between branches, and to discuss how such provision can best be made. Some branches refuse to take any
Feudalism and Anarchy.

To the Editor of Liberty.

I am old enough to have known Mr. Salter for his historic instances of the unsatisfactoriness of voluntary defensive association, but I must say that he represents things as different from what I supposed them to be. Indeed, his arguments are all so much better than the average sort of what you may call a caricatured or exaggerated way he talks on this subject. He does, however, furnish excellent tracts.

Since the greatest development of the Labor Exchange in California, the experience of to-day throws some light even for other regions, it is not surprising that the California order, the "New Charter," San Jose (weekly, 50 c. a year, 10 c. for three months), is far the best and fullest of all the American modifications. It gives the largest amount of best quality of both news and discussion, not only from California sources, but from elsewhere, including good and frequent letters from Mr. Bower. To which, I can add that one who wishes to understand the movement is to buy a dollar bill to the "New Charter" office for a copy of "Trials and Triumph of Labor" and a year's subscription to the paper. He will lack very little that is worth having.

The Exchange is strong all along the Pacific coast, and the "Utopian," Elensburg, Wash., claims to be the official organ in the northwest. It contains excellent matter, is well printed.

Northern Ohio has an active group of branches, of which the most important is at Erie, Pa. The Ashtabula, O., branch wrote to the national treasury to ask about the State bank tax, and received the reply: "If these obligations are not redeemable in money (as from their face appear to be the fact), by the decision of the supreme court of the United States they are not such notes as are subject of taxation under the internal revenue laws." It would seem possible, so far as national law is concerned, to run almost any kind of bank so long as it let legal tender alone and made commodities its basis.

Some weeks ago the Labor Exchange at being practically identical with the Mutual Bank. I am sure that this is so, but certainly the two seek to meet the same need by closely related methods. The two most important principles, to disregard government in the issuing of notes and to come to positive coin, common to both. There cannot in reason be any antagonism between them, and one may well lead the way to the other. It seems to me that the Mutual Bank would add advantage to simple money and in being less liable to get into serious trouble by bad management. The Labor Exchange has also at the present moment the advantage of being less revolutionary in appearance and of being already in successful operation. Of course I wish all possible success to the attempts that are being made to establish mutual banks, but a bank in the hands of those parties to whose fact that the Labor Exchange is already an established success gives its organizers a tremendous advantage in gathering members.

Mr. Leorns to me that no commercial institution now in operation is doing so much to break the power of government as the Labor Exchange. At a time when working people seem to be more important thing; government alone can furnish money, and our only hope is in government," here comes a movement which makes them see that legal tender is their enemy; that they can furnish themselves with money without government in all the security and feeling of better relief by taking the matter in hand themselves, and not waiting for legislation. It does not only talk to them along these lines; it sets them to doing the things for themselves, and convinces them by their own experience. This is the real propaganda by deed.

Any one who can interest his neighbors in the Labor Exchange will serve the cause of Anarchism well. Any one who can get a breach of the Exchange organized will thereby do more for Anarchism in general, and monetary Anarchism in particular, than he will probably have the chance to do again at a single stroke in a year. Such at least is the mind of STEPHEN T. BRITTON.
The (Alleged) Money Famine.

To the Editor of Liberty:

It is a great pity that Mr. Badock's useful exposition of the actual limitations imposed by British law upon the negotiability of loans, and other modes of contract in terms of money and the prohibition of hirings in terms of commodities or rights other than State-made coins, should be marred by an exaggerated view of the evils resulting from these interferences with liberty, and should, in consequence, be so utterly to point out the nature of the actual evils they produce, or to indicate the true character of the benefits which would result from the complete and final abandonment of these modes of tyranny.

There is no perceptible money family at this moment. If money were either ten times as valuable or ten times as cheap as it now is, there would in either case be no serious alteration in the sufficiency of the circulating medium for the purposes of exchange. Probably (though here, as elsewhere, dogmatic prophecies are risky) there would be much less inconvenience experienced from a currency ten times as portable than from one ten times as divisible as that now employed. Mr. Badock utterly fails in his competent demolition of the argument that there is a wide range of deviation from the existing quantity of money throughout which any particular volume taken at random would answer almost equally well, supposing it to have, and be known to have, a good degree of permanence. Mr. Badock fancies this "don't-matter theory" can be overturned by putting "the argument home to as," if heretofore but one extreme to be considered. If it were true, he imagines, it ought to "make no difference to any one if the total volume of money be reduced to a threepenny bit, and locked up in a museum!" But Mr. Badock and those who regard it as probable that the volume of money should be considerably and permanently increased forget that, upon their own hypothesis, if pushed to its final consequences, it ought to make no matter if money were as cheap as ashes, which can frequently be obtained for a negative payment, as one can see at factory gates the legend: "Sixpence per load given with ashes." Mr. Badock just here is like an advisor who wishes to raise the temperature of our climate, while another argues that it would not matter greatly if it were permanently considerably raised or lowered, if only sudden and frequent fluctuations could be avoided. Mr. Badock might consistently argue: But surely you will admit that a return of the glacial epoch would be fatal to most forms of life," forgetting that it would be equally fatal to revert to a terrestrial surface heat exceeding that of boiling water. If money were ten times as valuable as now, only those people would carry sovereigns who now carry ten pound notes, and purses would be heavily laden with silver. In wholesale and international transactions the increased power of exchange would effect a saving of costs of transport, enumeration. Conversely, if five were ten times as cheap as at present, the sovereign would have the potency only of the florin, and those who desired to carry three or four pounds' worth of change would again be overloaded. Larger gold coins would be introduced, and some saving in proportionate wear and tear would doubtless be observed. Stated in more general terms, the solution of the case is that, within fairly wide limits, reciprocal gains from divisibility and portability nearly balance one another. It is, however, unquestionable that at present on either side of some uncustomed volume the law of divisibility and portability is, or at least in excess of the gain from the increase of the other.

This question of the analysis of the volume of money ought to be recognized as a fundamental position. There are uncounted factors in the problem than the computations of divisibility and portability.

The economic changes which the removals of the treaty restrictions had on the liberty embodied in the bank acts, the colleage acts, and the trunk acts would cause never could be conspicuous.

There are great evils in the restrictions imposed by these acts, but they are wholly of the nature common to all those which result from the sphere of individual and jointly-acted action the remedy of evils with which they are fitted to deal.

The toleration of trucking in wages, of the issue of gold or tokens by all who could induce the public to pass them, and of borrowings by banks or other traders by means of notes of all amounts payable on demand, would tend to rotten civic ethics. The compensations which freedom would bring would undoubtedly unbleach the cells. It is highly improbable that the compensation would come in the form of a considerable expansion of the population. As for the expectation that it would terminate interest, profits, and rents, it is positively puerile.

Under complete monetary freedom the demand for money would vary with a corresponding increase. The benefits to be expected lie in the direction of increased activity, competition, and stability of bankers, money-lenders, and borrowers.

J. GREENE FISHER.

CHAPMAN ALBERTON, July 31, 1893.

In Reply to the Foregoing:

One can but wonder at Mr. Fisher's lack of power to conceive of media of exchange and standards of value separable, as two distinct classes of things. He thinks, or at least writes, as if there is but indubitably bound together, like the late Sisese twins, it is as well to recollect that Mr. Fisher's creed, summed up in his own words, is: "There is truly only, one money, and that is gold." He can be and money are not merely at war. They are "legal and homogeneous." ('Liberty Review,' 1893). From this position one can understand how Mr. Fisher speaks of the "delusion that debts are money," a position that takes all bank notes, checks, and bills of exchange out of the category of money, even those promising to pay gold.

Mr. Fisher's assertion that, "If money were ten times as valuable or ten times as cheap as it now is, there would be no serious alteration in the sufficiency of the circulating medium for exchange purposes," refers, I suppose, to existing monies, or to monies of absolute gold purity, for his terms "valuable" and "clumsy" are shown by the context to have reference only to appreciation and depreciation of the standard commodity itself. But, as I have not argued that cheap gold or cheap any other standard is a radical cure for valuable or cheap silver, I wonder it would not trouble to controvert the assertion in question.

Mr. Fisher's attempt to turn my logic against me is a still-born failure. He asserts that, upon my "own hypothesis, if pushed to its final consequences, it ought to make no matter what were the gold as ashes." This assertion is subject to the same criticism as the other. Besides, the question before us was one of volume, which Mr. Fisher recognized at the beginning of this sentence and suddenly turned it into a question of price! Moreover, it was not my "own hypothesis" that it didn't matter what the volume (or price, if he likes) of money was. That's the theory of the restrictors to excuse their restrictions. On the other hand, it is safe to say, and so I say it, that it cannot be to the detriment of the industrial world, if the market is flooded with good bills of exchange, bank notes, or other media backed by ample security. If one man's property is a good house, under free banking conditions, the only effect of abundance upon it would be in the lowering of the interest or commission chargeable to those who wanted money.

To day banking credits are dependent upon a specie reserve to an extent, and so affected in volume and value by the volume and value of the standard, which they affect in return. But the issue of bank notes, tokens, or other forms of credit directly or indirectly, e.g., such as state banks now lend their specie and credit against could not vary in value, or affect the value of the standard, through variations in their volume; nor could their volume, etc., be regulated by the standard commodity market being rigid or conversely, where the ruling bankers do not undertake to convert into the standard on demand. I could not say that rigging of the standard commodity would not disturb valuations in general; but those operations are not now a valuable property to many times the extent of the stocks of the commodity measure of value, nor should it prevent our issuing certificates of value upon that property,—to be used, if need be, for sale purposes or exchange purposes.
The ideal notes I anticipate will be related to their standard of value in this way: their demand must be so large that it can be easily referred to, and securities realized therein, if need be, in the event of banker's customers falling to redeem their pledged property (standard value due to be held in lieu of the property sold for ultimate payment of the notes out against such property). This contingency is a small matter, not likely to disturb the standard value — I mean, that money value, than all traders run who have to hold to 'cocks.' I mention it here, as elucidating the way in which unprivileged bankers will probably have to keep in touch with the commodity they value their securities and notes by.

Bank notes and tokens, issued in aforesaid manner would form a circulating medium which would give to retailers and consumers generally advantages of a kind comparable to those now enjoyed by wholesale traders and the well-to-do classes by means of their checks, but far cheaper than checks systems are presently available, owing to their independence of gold balances and therefore of interest.

Facilities for paying wages stimulate retail sales and consumption, re-set upon all trade, and increase the demand for labor.

Whatever fall from a privileged position the freeing of the whole of that wealth now held in billions for non-moneyed may bring about will be accepted, not as a cheapening of money, but as a fall in the price of bullion, a fall inevitable, which will put gold and silver on straight. The golden standard can be got rid of, but not by uttering, alteration, up or down, is desired in a standard value by those who want a standard for us as a standard, however difficult or impossible it may be to obtain an approximately invariable standard.

J ohn Badcock, Jr.

The Colonization Folly.

Liberty does not always agree with Mr. J. G. Creve Coeur. But it heartily with him in his attitude toward libertarian colonies, as explained in a letter to "Free Life," from which the following is taken.

It is here breaking to have to oppose a scheme sponsored by such hearty lovers of liberty as Mr. Sydney Beal and "Egologist," but, if truth must be told, it is that nothing but disaster and obloquy is to be anticipated from any attempt to form and found a community upon the base of group interests. Many Voluntaryists take in one locality, either in the limits of the United Kingdom or anywhere else upon the face of the habitable earth. The chances of failure would be greater than those of success, especially in such advocacy of principle would be very low. The structure and administration of such a group, even if a company of the most wise and just people inscrutably could be gathered, would subject the principles of voluntary to a premature strain, for which no mortals are as yet prepared. The collated history of all known instances of such colonies, societies, or groups spells ruin either to the company or to the foundation of principles upon which it was designed.

Such a colony, in order to take the initial steps in its formation, must be either a commercial partnership, or a territorial government, or a nondenominational compound of both. To imagine a colony of any kind hand-crafted, if, in addition to being founded to produce material wealth for its component members, it is required to promulgate and advocate certain political, social, or intellectual theories. When, in further addition to the above, the number of Voluntaryists in a particular strata in view, and sufficiently uncontaminated with predatory, fraudulent, or anti-social tendencies. A successful company will undertake to supply an existing want or to create one which is needed for a definite and closely-limited purpose, — not one diffused, general, and vague. They must know what they aim at, and must be fairly agreed as to the methods of hitting the mark. Thus, for example, a Volunteerist school or college might (when if Voluntaryists were very numerous) be feasible, as, for instance, Methodist colleges exist. Even a life insurance scheme, such as the Quaker "Friends' Provident," might hang together. But what greater prospect of success would a Voluntaryist colony have than a Baptist colony?

By the way, but most of the prominent Voluntaryists would be simply mad to relinquish their present fairly assured vocations in favor of such a venture; and, if formed of those alone who are at present doing a fairly good business, the Voluntaryist colonies are numerous enough, there are practicable courses open to them calculated to promote their principles to a far greater degree. The day will some come, and may not be so distant, when a strike against all kinds of fees may be worth talking about. It might be considered as to whether a free distillery, or a free smuggling port, could not be set up. Till then, the most effective course lies in such propagandistic activity as suits the aptitude of each worker and his means.

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, when possible, a letter every fortnight, on Anarchism or kindred subjects, to one of the "friends" selected, and to notify the secretary promptly in case of any change of address. Therefore Mr. Tucker proposes to print a slip with targets: nothing else, half way between the issues of Liberty, and send it free to members. On behalf of the Corps, I accept with many thanks.

It will now no longer be disputable that Corps members are a little better up to date in matters concerning our movement than any one else. I hope this fact will bring in a few more members. If you are unfortunate to have less of Liberty for a while, you can at least put the price thus saved into writing letters to the Corps. Letters, it is an ill wind that blows no good, and it is a bad squall that does not get out all the better he cut out of an uncomfortable squall.

If, by accident, if it should happen, any member falls to get the slip, I hope to receive his complaint at once. No one who claims to be working with the Corps shall be left out. During the long delays in Liberty's publication, very few targets have been sent me. Just now, owing to those delays, I could not have used a full supply; but henceforward, under the new arrangement, I shall use them as small, and hope to receive plenty.

Conrad Hale, Sec. of the "Proletarian Interest League," of which he is a member, is a sort of secretary, I believe — practical manager, at any rate. In this capacity he controls the insertion of a certain number of Labor and Populist papers. Now he wants us to write him. He says —

It has these advantages over the hitherto "shot." It will surely be printed, and will appear in about fifty papers, and then copied largely. The word "Anarchy" will not be mentioned. None of the different schools will be attacked, as all the rest of the world are to be strengthened the non-intercourse crusade will be done; the money question can be discussed in relation to other parts of the programme; particular talks on mutual booking will be discouraged, because of the uninteresting character of the phrase with outsiders. No article must now come before ten or eight hundred words.

Those who regard the abolition of interest as all-important, must appreciate such an opportunity as they desire, while those who are much interested about the general establishment of freedom may be able to get in a good word for freedom under cover of the Interest question. It seems to me that a programme like this is hardly worth so much of Gumme's time and strength as it is; but, as long as he

it, we may as well take advantage of it to get some of our ideas printed. So I sent him two articles, one of which he accepted and one he rejected (that is what "sundry" meant, you see); but I sent the rejected one to a farmers' paper of large circulation which printed it very promptly. So my writing was not wasted. I recommend a few go and do likewise.

Target, section A.—The "Echo," Near Kan., speaks as follows:

This同盟 is the one organization that is the best posted on questions of to-day of any body of people in the United States, and it has found that "something better" is the Labor Exchange. Which, once thoroughly established, will do away with money to a large extent. There is no reason why they should not go well that under our present system, and until this system is entirely changed, it would only be too easy for monopolists, trusts, or anyone else to corner any amount of money issued by the government, large or small. They know the fact that our whole system is an organized effort whereby two-thirds of the people—non-producers want to, and do, live off the backs of the third—producers, and we are going to counteract it by a system which will make it harder for the drones to live off the workers. It will come when the industrial capitalism is organized above capital; that labor is the only true capital, and that every one has that within himself, and, in place of waiting for some one to hire them, laborers have found a way to hire themselves without the aid of capitalists and therefore the work will be theirs, as by right it ought to be.

The alliance in this first sentence is to the Farmers' Alliance platform at the time of the birth of the People's Party, which for the purpose of getting together something or other, better, or something better. Approve the editor's position; point out more fully the faults of government money and the advantages of voluntary issues.

b.—The "New Charter," 109 W. San Fernando St., Sun. Soc., Cal., a "middle-road," "Populist and Labor Ex."-ing organ. The Populist editor is disgusted with the result of the Populist convention, which he regards as a corrupt deal with the men of August 13; he announced the future policy of the paper as follows:

It will advance from the ground of palliatives to the ground of remedies. Its space will be devoted hereafter to the advocacy of the Labor Exchange and other remedial measures.

And he explained the collapse of the People's Party management in these words:

The leaders of every political party, when within smelling distance of the pie-counter, always take what to them seems the shortest route to get there, regardless of the quality of the product.

On August 13 he came out editorially for the Socialist-Labor Party, though still keeping the Populist national ticket at the head of his columns. The paper is now "in earnest." The Alliance, the Socialist-Labor Party, and the self-political policy of the Labor Exchange, and prints plenty of letters in all three directions. Send in letters showing your views. No fundamental belief could be more personal. The Alliance leaders get near the "pie-counter" of office, they will presumably be no more consistent than the Socialist leaders; and that voluntary combination, in the Labor Exchange and Mutual Banker, is the true remedy. I hope other friends beside Section B will write to this target, as I think it a specially promising one.

W. H. S. Bristow.

A Poem with Notes.

A weapon that comes down as still
As snowflakes fall upon the sod,
[But, like snowflakes, sometimes accompanied by a very noisy display of wind.]

But executes a freshman's will
[That is, he has some other freshman's will executed on him.]

As lightning does the will of God:

Count the time from the moment when the voter will have a law passed to the moment when such a law is passed, and you will get a new idea of the speed of this process.

And from its force nor doom nor locks
Can shield you.

[Amen! this is why we mourn!]

'Tis the ballot-box.

Verse by John G. Neipert.

From Stephen T. Dwight.

The Poem is a Satirical Poem. It is written in a humorous and light vein, but it carries a serious message about the need for political reform and the corruption of the political system. The poem uses imagery and metaphor to convey its message, and it ends with a call for a new system of governance that is fair and just.