On Picket Duty.

The Spanish government is exhibiting an interest in Anarchism even beyond the limits of its Archy. I lately received from Canovas del Castillo a request for a catalogue of my publications.

The subscription rates for Liberty to subscribers in Great Britain are: three months, nine pence; six months, eighteen pence; one year, three shillings. Remittances may be made directly to this office, or to Murdoch & Co., 26 Paternoster Square, London.

Our poets are multiplying. A new and very promising one is William Francis Barnard, one of a Chicago group of young men of artistic temperament who have lately become adherents of Anarchism. His first contribution to Liberty, "Waiting," is remarkably fine production,—will not, I hope, be his last.

The translation of M. Arsené Alexandre's admirable article on "The Thirty-Six Trades of the State" is put in editorial type in the present issue, because it is my intention to issue it as a pamphlet, for which purpose the smaller type would have been less suitable. I hope to do a good deal in future in the way of circulating leaflets, tracts, and tiny pamphlets at a very low price, and shall be able to, if my readers give me the necessary encouragement by their cooperation. There is many an article in the early issues of Liberty that might profitably be reproduced. As each pamphlet will carry advertisements of Liberty and its literature, not a few readers will be induced to pursue the study of Anarchism.

On the day of the appearance of the November number of Liberty I chanced to meet a gentleman whose name, were I to give it, would instantly be recognized by all Single Taxers as that of one of the keenest, ablest, staunchest, and most trusted of their leaders. "Well," said he, "I see that you've roasted Mr. George." "Yes," said I. And his only comment was: "Well, he deserves it." It is a pity that all Single Taxers are not as well informed regarding the real character of their teacher, and it shall not be my fault if they remain in ignorance. I have reprinted my articles, "Henry George, Traitor," in the form of a small sixteen-page pamphlet, upon which I have placed a merely nominal price, in order that lovers of free speech and haters of hypocrisy may be able to circulate it freely among all who, not knowing Henry George, give him their esteem and admiration. One hundred copies will be sent to any address, carriage paid, on receipt of eighty cents. I hope that many of Liberty's readers will take advantage of the opportunity.

An English comrade has hit upon a good idea. Paired upon one side of the envelope that contained a recent letter from him was a copy of Gorky's effective poem, "The Ballot," the margins having been trimmed to fit the envelope. By this method a leaflet may be brought to the attention, not only of the addressee, but also of all those through whose hands the letter may pass en route. While the State forces us to employ it as our letter-carrier, what could be more fitting than to thus improve the opportunity to plant the seeds of rebellion in the hearts and heads of its hirelings?

Anarchists will appreciate the following anecdote related of Madame Grassini, who was in succession the mistress of Napoleon and the duke of Wellington. Having been stopped near Naples by banditti, who proceeded to plunder her, she at first attempted an appeal to their humanity; but, finding that they continued to search every corner of her carriage, she said to them: "My dear robbers, you may take everything I possess, but do not deprive me, I beseech you, of one thing which I value more than you possibly can; I mean the portrait of our dear government. I care not for the diamonds, but pray leave me the portrait." They accordingly broke off the mounting of Napoleon's portrait, and restored to her the beloved picture.

Those Anarchists and libertarians that mourn the loss of a man who, though seeking their fellowship in private, shamelessly abused their cause in public doubts understand their grief, but to me it is incomprehensible. The editor of Liberty at least has no tears to shed over the death of the false Freethinker who, shortly after the Chicago tragedy, hypocritically attacked Anarchy in the columns of his paper, and then became responsible for the following outrageous utterance (contained in a letter addressed to him) by publicly accepting it as a compliment: "You certainly take the right view of that pernicious creed [Anarchy]. The advocates of that murderous doctrine ought to have the heavy hand of good law and good government placed with a squeezing force upon them. There is only one way to deal with those who advocate Anarchy, and those who try to practically carry it out; and that is to make an example of its agitators. Hang every one of them, and expose their carcasses to view, as a warning to others who are so inclined." No man seeking his intimacies among Anarchistic agitators (his very death occurred in the apartment of one of the most prominent Anarchists in the United States) could at the same time have fathered that sentiment concerning them, unless he was essentially necessary to the gunpowder; and I am glad that I did not wait until he was dead to say so. Now that he is gone, let him be forgotten.

Because an English actor is giving public readings for the benefit of privately-managed hospitals my friend Bernard Shaw breaks out in the "Saturday Review" in denunciation of this "enrichment of the rate-payers of the towns the actor visits at the expense of the people who pay for tickets to hear him read." The reason of these tears is that the conduct of the actor tends to thwart Mr. Shaw and his Fabian friends, with their municipal theatres, etc., in the prosecution of their determination to impoverish rate-payers in order to enrich the people who desire to hear actors read. Whenever one man voluntarily gives something to others, Mr. Shaw is wild with grief, but, when one man, if he be a policeman, forcibly takes something from other men, he thinks the millennium is nigh. Could there be a more amusing inversion of common sense and common honesty? Of course I quite agree with Mr. Shaw that the actor whose policy he criticizes had much better devote the proceeds of his readings to the furtherance of some high artistic or philosophic interest than to the support of hospitals. In my view it will prove of little moment in the long run whether the world has one hospital more or less, whereas one theatre is one pernicious, if of the right sort, might so radically change the future of mankind as to permanently lessen the necessity of hospitals. But this is not the consideration that influences Mr. Shaw. He asks individuals not to give for the support of hospitals, because, if they do not give, the people will no longer be robbed for the support of hospitals, and, on the other hand, he urges individuals to give for the support of a rational drama, because he has little hope that, if they do not so give, the people will ever be robbed for the support of a rational drama. We have heard of the father who gave the parting advice to his son: "Get money; get it honestly if you can, but get money." If we cannot altogether separate the two, we may at least contrast it favorably with the Fabian advice to hospitals and theatres: "Get money; get it dishonestly if you can, but get money."
Strikers and Picket Duty.

Two interesting labor cases have lately been decided,—one in an English court, the other in an American. The question involved is the right of strikers to organize and maintain a patrol. In the American case the facts are as follows. The striking employees of a Boston manufacturing firm detailed several of their members to patrol the street in front of the factory and accost would-be applicants for the vacant places for the purpose of persuading them to keep away. The employers, alleging that the picketing strikers interfered with their business and prevented them from hiring new men, applied for an injunction restraining them from maintaining the patrol. The injunction was granted, and the supreme court, on appeal, upheld the issuance of the order.

It was not shown that the patrol used any force or indulged in any threats of violence, but the court holds that proof of this is unnecessary. It says that the employees and the would-be applicants were entitled to be protected even against such disturbance and interference as resulted from the employment of persuasion and social pressure. The head and front of the patrol's offending was the successful attempt to secure workmen not on union men, inform them of the situation, and peacefully persuade them to make no application for the vacant places, in contrast to authority as well as principle. If it is admitted, says Judge Holmes, that the sots complained of would be legitimate in the case of a single individual, they cannot possibly become unlawful when committed by several persons acting together. In taking this ground, Judge Holmes not only departs from the old and established legal view, but actually advances beyond the position of the author of the essay "On Liberty," John Stuart Mill, who maintained and defended the contrary doctrine. Mill, so progressive for his time, opposed boycotting as an aggression, and the implication of his argument would have led him to endorse a decision like that of the Boston court. That two judges should rise to a higher and more scientific conception of liberty than even Mill's is certainly a gratifying sign of the times. Judge Holmes deserves to be quoted:

"If it be true that workingmen may combine with a view, among other things, to getting as much as they can for their labor, just as capital may combine with a view to getting the greatest possible return, it must be true that, when combined, they have the same liberty that combined capital has to support their interests by argument, persuasion, and the bestowal or refusal of those advantages which they otherwise lawfully control.

"I can remember when many people thought that, apart from violence or 'deed of contract, strikes were wicked, as organized refusals to work. I suppose that intelligent economists and legislators have given up that notion today. I feel pretty confident that they equally will abandon the idea that an organized refusal of social or workmen of society by a man who shall enter their antagonist's employ is unlawful, if it is dissociated from any threat of violence, and is made for the sole object of prevailing, if possible, in a contest with their employer about the rate of wages."

The prospects would be much brighter, however, if the trade-unionists themselves entertained more sound notions on the subject. They are everywhere agitating for laws against blacklisting, and hailing with delight legislation restricting the right of railroads and other corporations to boycott discharged employees. Doubtless they fail to perceive that blacklisting is a form of boycotting, and that they are palpably inconsistent between their objection to blacklisting and their criticism of the Massachusetts decision. The leaders who have denounced the latter as a dangerous invasion of labor's rights would not stultify themselves by applauding anti-blacklist laws did they even dimly discern the identity of the principle involved. Fortunately, a few of the more intelligent of them are beginning to realize the unSoundness of their attitude. It gives me pleasure to state that "The Federalist," an official organ of the Federation of Labor, recently announced an article of mine in which the right of capitalists to boycott and blacklist was openly and unequivocally upheld. That this view has elicited no remonstrances or protests is without significance.

In the English case above referred to the facts were similar to those of the Boston case. And what was the ruling of the court? Strange as it may seem, the decision was that, while a patrol could be legitimately maintained, the strikers doing picket duty must limit themselves to the imparting of information and stop short of giving advice or attempting to persuade. In other words, the patrol might approach any would-be applicant and lay the exact facts before him, but it must not use "persuasion" or "social pressure" to induce him to refrain from applying. Perhaps we ought to be thankful for the concession, and recognize it as a step forward in the advancement of the Boston position, but it is certainly a lame, illogical, silly, absurd distinction which is sought to be made. Information, but not appeal! As if any court could draw a line between giving information and making an appeal; as if an indirect appeal could not be made in the form of information, and as if any substantial difference existed between direct and indirect appeals! Whose right is infringed by appeal or persuasion? Certainly not the intending applicant's, since he is not compelled to stay and listen, and, if he were compelled, the aggression would be in the compulsion, in the improper imprisonment, rather than in the appeal. So far as the employer is concerned, he may be "injured" as much by the imparting of information and maintenance of a patrol as by persuasion and social pressure. Yet, if injury is not the test, what other test is applied by the court?

Courts are slow and by no means sure, but they cannot long resist the tendencies and influences to which Judge Holmes refers,—the increasing and unconscious recognition of the principle of equal liberty.

The Thirty-Six Trades of the State.
Nevertheless, though we know nothing at all as to the nature and form of the personage, and though we are no farther advanced than the peasant ejected from the Greek temple which he supposed to be the residence of the big beast, at least we are informed as to its occupations and its appetites.

The State possesses the talent, the privilege, or the impulse to undertake at least thirty-six trades. As it is supposed to work at them for our benefit, whether it please us or not, we are obliged to pay for its work, even when it is spoiled, but we have the satisfaction of laughing at it.

The State is extremely well known, in the first place, as a dealer in matches. It sells them at higher prices than matches command elsewhere, but we know that they will not light, and in this fact we have material for gagery of which it would grieve us to be deprived. When Swedish matches came from Sweden, they burned admirably; now that they are made in France on any refuse, but it is the fault of these—who is a Norwegian.

But we should not judge the State by the quality of its matches. If you knew how well it works at the rest of its trades! It is a theatrical manager, or an investor in theatrical enterprises. It supplies four theatres with funds,—one more than Cadet-Roussel; i.e., so for music and two for literature; but, as they cost a great deal and cannot, after paying the expense of scenery and company, afford the luxury of producing original works, these are played at Bruselles.

Nevertheless, do not judge the State by the quality of its matches and the novelty of its répertoire. If you know how skilful it is in every other industry! It is a dealer in tobacco. Its tobacco is like other tobaccos; only it is high in price. You can get it in Belgium, under the name of Belgian tobacco, for half the money. But, Great God! do not go to the length of condemning the State because it manages its theatres shabbily, charges too much for its tobacco, and manufactures harmless matches. It has so many other strings to its bow!

It is a collector of pictures and of objects of ancient art. But, as one can never be sure about these satanic antiques, for some years it has bought nothing but ancient objects manufactured by moderns. With the living there is at least security against deception.

Moreover, as among its trades figures that of Meecenas, and as it directs the fine arts, it believes it well to buy also of the moderns modern works. Only, to be sure, that these works shall be really French, it buys them only of the painters whom it sends to Rome. Then it has some little preferences of its own. One may be sure, for example, that it gives no orders to those who are not known in the administrative bureaus; but how can you expect the bureaus to know people whom they do not know?

The State is an architect. Ah! but here no one can give it lessons. In order to be very sure of escaping the critics, it erects nothing but beautiful Renaissance edifices with Greek pediments and Louis XIV masks. These are models, it seems, which have stood their tests. Sometime it forgets the staircase or the windows, but one cannot think of anything. When it builds a hospital, it draws the plans according to the continuous air-current system. That sweeps away the patients in the twinkling of an eye, but this makes room for others.

Do not place too much stress, therefore, on the criticisms applicable to the State's architecture. Judge it rather by its other trades, in which it is without rival. It is certain, for instance, that no matter where the universe do they make porcelains as expensive as that of Sèvres, for a soup-plate costs the State, and us to an extent, some fifty francs. On the other hand, it has not its like for the glare of its gilt and the dazzle of its enamel; it is necessary to put on skates when eating from a Sèvres service.

However, no one ever eats from a Sèvres service, and the ugliest—that is, the most important—pieces do not remain in France. It is consoling to reflect that they are given to foreign sovereigns.

Yes . . . but . . . the State makes tapestry too. It costs twenty-five thousand francs a yard; but it imitates painting, which is much less expensive, but much more beautiful. Besides, a thing that is not an imitation of another thing has no value in our eyes. But, if the State tapestries cost a great deal, it must be remembered that they are very pretty—when rolled up!

The State is also a printer. It prints magnificently works that nobody reads, because they interest nobody except the author, and it is doubtful if they interest even him. Then it prints blanks and forms that can be had for one-tenth the money from any little printer in the neighborhood. But the voting and tax-paying grocers can proudly deliver their pepper in envelopes coming from the national printing-office.

It is engaged in transportation enterprises, and, while its railway carriages are anything but comfortable, railway journeys are more expensive and railway officials less polite here than anywhere else.

It is a colonist, and in its colonies, instead of cultivating cotton, cocoa, caoutchouc, and precious woods, it cultivates office-holders. Of all its thirty-six trades this is the one at which it is best; nowhere else do they cultivate office-holders as well.

The State also follows many other trades: if you only knew how well it follows them! So do not stop with its matches, its tobacco, its porcelain, its tapestry, its printing-office, and its theatres. The State is also an expert in literature. When it awards a prize to a work, or, by competition, command, or choice, causes one to be brought forth, one may be sure that, once having its prize, it will never more be heard of.

But it is a schoolmaster! It creates Babylonian universities, gigantic faculties, and schools beyond the limits of one's vision. And in these universities and schools it makes bachelors, and these bachelors are absolutely incapable of guiding their own lives and earning their own bread with the knowledge that they have gained. I believe too that among its thirty-six trades the State is a philosopher. It teaches little citizens how they should think; consequently it is delightful to see how they do think! It is true that official ways of thinking change every ten years; but, that there may be no jealous rivalry, all these ways are as good as the matches.

And now, O honest peasant who the other day bought the State a goose, you know what the State is. It has thirty-six trades, and even more, but it is good at none. It is a do-all and a spoil-all. The day when it shall manufacture alcohol we shall drink rotgut, and the day it shall bake bread our diet will be what it was when Paris was under siege.

And to think that there are honest fellows who wish to present to us as a most seductive future the State entrusted with yet other missions, the State doing everything, managing everything, fostering everything, monopolizing everything!

We are only too ready to refrain from wiping our noses without the authorization of the State, to admire only what the State patronizes, to turn imploringly to State boards of charity instead of using our own arms and heads.

And yet it would be so easy to lose the habit! Ah! if papas and mammas were not stupid, how readily little boys would learn to do without the State and no longer rely on it, and how quickly it would become what it ought solely to be,—a simple policeman, a good police-man, and not a pretentious butcher of all jobs, even of those which it does not do!

ABBÉE ALEXANDRE.

Aggression and the Ballot.

The preliminaries and incidents in Mr. Yarros's answer to my criticism upon his political attitude as stated in the November issue are matters to be neglected. I might rejoin, to be sure, that ethical discussion with Mr. Yarros is unprofitable because he is joined to his moralistic idea; that ethics is not a prelude to other topics that have sometimes been illuminated by polemical treatment; that, if Stirner has failed to impress Mr. Yarros with the truth of egoism, it would be absurd for me to imagine that I could succeed where Stirner has failed; that Mr. Yarros is guilty of a comical lapse, and will be amazed when he realizes it; and that only haste and carelessness can account for his oversight. But all such talk, whether put forward by Mr. Yarros in the form of assertion or by myself in the form of counter-assertion, is more dogmatic surmise, which will be heeded only by partisans, who will accept or reject it according to their party lines.

Let us have done with it, then, and proceed straight to the essence of our difference. My criticism was that Mr. Yarros, though admitting that the use of the ballot is an invasive act, tended to make light of its invasive quality by neglecting to consider that aspect of it when weighing the question whether he should ever resort to it. His answer is that the use of the ballot, though generally an aggression, is not always such, and specifically that it is not an aggression when resorted to for the purpose of preventing aggression.

In rejoinder I point out, in the first place, that Mr. Yarros's answer is a comment on the position taken by Mr. Yarros in his first article. In that article he declared that Anarchists "would not deem it ethically improper to use the ballot (which means aggression) for the purpose of furthering the cause of freedom." Now, the logical inference from this form of statement is that the word aggression, which in Mr. Yarros's parenthesis is made the equivalent of use of the ballot, may be substituted for its equivalent in the sentence proper without dis-
turbung the meaning. Making this substitution, we find Mr. Yarros saying that Anarchists "would not deem it ethically improper to assert that a vote for Mr. Yarros will protect a man who would not do so could not be selected, for the majority are in favor of invasion in most matters. And every vote for the librethe hypothesis, for Mr. Yarros proposes to vote only when it seems probable that his vote will be decisive, and no vote can be decisive that is cast for a man who has no chance of success," his candidate, if elected, would necessarily draw a salary out of a fund gathered by compulsory taxation. If this candidate were not elected, still Mr. Yarros' ballot for him would be counted and, probably, printed out of this same robbers' fund. And the same would be true, were this ballot cast for a constitutional amendment or for a special measure submitted directly to popular vote. In any and all these cases there would be aggression, and Mr. Yarros, by participating, would make himself an accomplice in aggression. The responsibility for the consequences he would share equally with all other voters. These consequences include the destruction of life and limb as truly (though generally not as directly) as do those of "propaganda de ex." Thus Mr. Yarros' claim that by voting he would commit no violation of equal liberty and would injure nobody is shown to be without foundation. In the above analysis, his entire case falls to the ground, and my criticism remains absolutely unimpeached.

A Cry and a Lie.

In the November issue of Liberty there was one article that especially concerned Mr. George Macdonald, besides several that did not. Finding it rather awkward to make answer to the former, he naturally preserves silence concerning it, and tries to drown his silence, so to speak, by making a great noise about one of the latter. Unable to defend himself, he attempts a defence of Henry George, and, presumably, if the defense of George is possible, he makes me the object of a wild attack. He says that, even if my charge against George is well-founded, still he (Macdonald), in my place, would have written the article on George's treachery to relieve his feelings and then refrained from printing it; the insincerity of which affectation of Christian spirit he pro- ceeds to exhibit by indicting me, at some length and with more than some bitterness, for an act of faithlessness parallel and equal to that which I charge upon George. Why did not Macdonald, in the abundance of his forgiving love, relieve his feelings by simply penning, instead of wasting his time in pestering me by admitting that I am a traitor, and an ill-natured one at that, does that base treachery which in Mr. George is a trivial matter deserving to go scot- free become in my case, simply by the supplement of a little ill-nature, an offence too heinous for any but vitriolic punishment?

You do not believe it, Macdonald. You are not filled with that spirit of charity for wrong-doers which it suits you on occasion to profess. It is the principal business of your life, considered solely in its public aspect, to hold up humbugs or ridicule and scorn. You show no charity. If you cry out when I lash Henry George, it is simply because that particular form of humbuggery which consists in believing one thing while saying another is more attractive to you than to me. It is not because you are especially chaste, or chaste, that you do not like to have your pets chastised. For one who continually chastises others to put in a plea of no-chastisement when his friends, or people who are like his friends, are chastised, is the act of a cry-baby,—a rôle, Macdonald, in which I had not before observed you. I assure you that it is not a pretty spectacle.

When you chastise me, Macdonald, I do not play the cry-baby. I do not cry out because it hurts. I am willing to accept all the hurt that I deserve. Whip me when I deserve it, and I will strive not only to take it stoically, but also to profit by it. I ask not your mercy, your forgiveness, or your love. I ask only justice, and I ask simply that you will not lie. And in this case you have lied. You charge that my attitude on the Venezuelan question was an act of faithlessness to my principles, and in proof of this you offer the utterly false statement that I said a war with England just at that time would be a good thing. It is true that you qualify by remarking that, in quoting me, you are depending on a fallible memory. But this qualification is wholly nullified by the piously with which you state, basing yourself on this false quotation, that you "could prove me as faithless as it is possible that Henry George, war and treachery, is one of your paragraphs throughout. If you had any doubt as to the reliability of your memory, you should have been cautious in building upon it; in failing of this caution, you have fathered your statement as absolutely as if you had made no qualification whatever; and, in thus fathering it, you have lied.

Let me see, whether I said that war with England would be a good thing. Here are my actual words:

The least evil that can come out of it [the Venezue- al situation], now that matters have gone so far, is the substitution and postponement of those problems in which Anarchists are interested, the intensification of the difficulties of those problems by a large addition to the tax payer's burden in conse- quence of the enormous expenditure for military pur- poses which is now inevitable, whether war shall follow or not.

If war follows, there will be added to this the greater evils of a tremendous indebtedness incurred for the prosecution of the war, an extension and a tightening of the money power's grip, another generation of pensioners to support, and a pervasion of all our institu- tions by that spirit of militancy and tendency to Ar- chistic centralization which is always to be found at the heels of war and which we have had bitter ex- perience for the last thirty years.

If, with or without war, Great Britain succeeds in extending her possessions upon the American contin- ent, it will, as is well known, be a change, at least, of a very fundamental nature in the relation of our institutions and interests. The contracting for the benefit of the few and the sacrifice of the many is the mark of a system and the curse of a people. Having said, namely, the ultimate partition of this continent among the great European powers, and the consequent trans- fer, for a period without visible limit, of one half of America's energies and resources from productive purposes to purposes that are at best defensive and at worst destructive. Then the curse of militancy will be upon us in its direct form.

Now, my position on the Venezuelan question was, and is, that, if we should be forced to a choice between these horrible evils, it would be advisable to prefer the second to the third. The declaration that this is equivalent to saying that war with England would be a good thing, or that it is parallel, as an act of conscious infi- dility to principle, with Henry George's hiding behind the plea of a court's infallibility, is as
foolish as false, and as impudent as foolish.

If, as Macaulay says, monumental gall must always receive the tribute of his admiration, the bouquets that incessantly shower at himself and the florists to look upon him as their "angel."

**Principle and Method.**

In his comments on my article on political action, it is the last issue of Liberty. Mr. Tucker makes the following charges against me: that the tendency of my reasoning is to make light of the aggregate aspect and characteristics of Mr. Tucker instead of regarding myself on the "excellent doctrine" that the end justifies the means—a doctrine which my argument implicitly asserts. In Mr. Tucker's judgment, I resort to euphemisms, or try to deceive myself with vain phrases. "I find to the doctrine of exceptions cases"; and, finally, I unwittingly confess that in practice I would find exceptions cases oftenier than Mr. Tucker. On the general question of ethics for my views of justice, the cause I know that Mr. Tucker is joined in his egotistic idol, and because the subject is too vast for polemical treatment. If Darwin and Spencer have failed to impress Mr. Tucker with the scientific importance of evolution, it is a defect in the work, not in my argument, that my chances of success better be. But the points raised against the above-mentioned statement are relatively small, and I am tempted to enter upon an examination of the charges.

Do I make light of the aggregate aspect of the ballot? I deny this. I depart from my present position to the aggregate principle, because I know that special emphasis or amplification was necessary. To argue in Liberty that majority rule is aggression is to burst an open door. I passed over the question as too well settled by many previous writers.

But, says Mr. Tucker, the tendency of the whole article is in conflict with this position. I deny it, and I am really surprised that so keen and logical a thinker as Mr. Tucker should have fallen into an aggregate blunder as that which prompted his criticism. He lost sight of a most vital and important distinction—of the essential difference between form or appearance and actual substance. I distinctly stated that I should not use the ballot and the machinery of government except for the purpose of enlarging liberty and diminishing aggression, and Mr. Tucker accuses me of favoring aggression, of violating equal freedom! Here is his own statement with a justifying.

In declaring that he would vote if absolutely sure that his vote would decide the fate of a libertarian measure—that is, would commit an aggression—that is, would violate equal liberty, he surely acts upon the doctrine of "exceptions cases," etc.

Now this is a most comical lapsus, and Mr. Tucker will be amazed to feel himself guilty of it. Only hauteur and self-righteousness can account for the oversight. A vote for any measure by the direction of equal liberty cannot be a violation of equal liberty. The form is the same, the content different. The ballot is generally employed for purposes of aggression, but those who should employ it for the purpose of preventing the perpetuation of aggression and securing an extension of personal liberty could not possibly become guilty of aggression. Suppose the issue is free trade versus protection; for the sake of argument, suppose a majority senators a majority and thus the securing of the free trade. If my use of the ballot has been aggressive, some person must exist whose rights, whose legitimate freedom, whose inability to engage in the business of free trade, by my vote for free trade. But, since free trade is a corollary to freedom, no one's rights are violated by the entire set of free trade. If no one is hurt by his vote for free trade are not guilty of any offence. When there are no aggressors, there are no aggressors.

It is true that the majority, by voting for free trade, force, or 'create' to force, free trade upon the minority. Be it remembered that the absence of restatement upon one, the majority has a perfect right, under equal freedom, to prevent the minority from imposing restrictions—that is, from attempting to limit the action of the majorities who vote for free trade. In other words, the majority has a perfect right to use equal freedom to prevent the minority from building customs houses and taxing themselves, but a vote for free trade does not necessarily interfere with the minority's right to tax and fetter themselves. Doubtless the majority of those who vote for free trade would also vote to protect the minority from maintaining a protective system for themselves, but that does not necessarily interfere with the use of equal freedom to aggregate. What I did was to vote for freedom, for the absence of restrictions. I injured nobody and hence have not transgressed the limits of equal liberty.

How absurd, therefore, is the argument that there is no difference in principle between using the ballot to secure greater freedom and using dynamite! Dynamite deprives men of life and limb; the use of the ballot for the purpose of securing freedom interferes with no one's exercise of his faculties, and, while it removes existing restraints and interferes in the interest of the majority. It does not necessarily impose any restraints upon the minority.

In folow, there is no objection whatever, from the standpoint of equal freedom, to the employment of the ballot for the aggressive purposes. The only objection is from the point of view of the process of securing freedom. When one man's freedom is in immediate danger, we cannot accept his sacrifice without a just claim. But to the ballot for the purposes mentioned, to secure freedom. When one man's freedom is in immediate danger, we cannot accept his sacrifice without a just claim. But to the ballot for the purposes mentioned, to secure freedom.

Need I say anything about the other counts of the indictment? After the above elusiveness, it must be clear to any logical mind that I am not guilty of letting in the doctrine of exceptional cases in the manner alleged. Mr. Tucker saw my "exceptions cases" we mean violations of equal liberty, my cases are not violations of any principle, but departures from a chosen policy. It follows likewise that I cannot be fairly charged with "aggregatorism" on the ground that I Iam doubtful better to refuse recognition of the government's idea, but instead, the man who goes to the ballot box will doubtless be represented by some, in spite of the most explicit and reiterated denials, as counteracting the idea of the equal principle. These are important considerations, and should ordinarilly be decisive and controlling. But the fact remains that a vote for any free measure, for any law in the direction of equal freedom, is not a threat of aggression, since the enforcement of the law itself would not be an aggression. I fear Mr. Tucker will have to sustain my demurrer to his complaint and acknowledge himself defeated. He has the conviction of knowing that only one vote occasionally.

**The Right to Peddle.**

To the Editor of Liberty:

Part of this speech was made by me at our City Hall almost a year ago. Other parts I have added from time to time, as I agitate the question involved continually at my store.

"The defendant, named of having peddled in Red Bud without paying therefor the license required by city ordinance. I move to dismiss the case because the license ordinance in question conflicts with the first paragraph of the constitution of Illinois, which says that all men are born equal in rights to life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness. If we have to pay a license before we can peddle, our inalienable right to that pursuit of happiness is a qualified one, and not an inalienable one. Besides, nobody has a right to take this man's money for a fine, or to deprive him of his liberty for a moment. I call that stealing under city ordinance. We are not so hard up in Red Bud that we will let Red Bud myself, I do not want to stand idle by, when such wrongs are perpetrated upon anybody, no matter how humble he may be."

The Magistrate—"Do you want this man to pay his $5 fine?

An answer—"Because you rob me by taxation, must I help you rob this man?"

Magistrate—"That amounts to making our fines too high. Make it five dollars, or go to jail."

Defendant paid cost and fine, and I declared that this ordinance does not necessarily settle the right. And I continue to discuss it, saying to all my neighbors that I will help them keep out peddlers where they are not wanted, but that if a single individual wants to buy from a peddler, I have no right to lay my hands on him. If he does not buy anything, we owe them justice, fairness, equal liberty. More than once similar acts of injustice have fanned the passions of men who were maltreated into terrible acts of violence, such as setting the town on fire. Fair treatment would never have given them even the thought to get revenge. All people have not the good nature and wisdom to return good for evil; it is certainly not a wise course to encourage them to restrict their constitutional right by unnecessary laws.

Louis Rusbizer.


**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 the "target" assigned in Liberty for that fortnight, and to notify the secretary promptly in case of any failure to write to a target (which is hoped will not often occur), or in case of temporary or permanent withdrawal of any writer. Address, Stephen T. Bloxom, Belvidere, N. J. [55] For the present the fortnightly supply of targets will be maintained by sending out a special monthly circular, alternating with the issue of Liberty.

Friends will remember that, although only two targets a month now appear in Liberty, I am still using four a month, and need to be supplied accordingly. Target, section A.—The Detroit, Mich., "Long-shoremen's" letter on topics of interest in the following words:

Make your letters short and to the point, and mail them so that they will reach us not later than Thursday, when your next letter is to be written. Send your address, whether members or not, to be asked to lose no opportunity to write to one of the suitable targets. Address, Stephen T. Bloxom, Belvidere, N. J. [55] For the present the fortnightly supply of targets will be maintained by sending out a special monthly circular, alternating with the issue of Liberty.

**Waiting.**

Like something carried in chameleons stone, she walks outside the city's barred and locked gates; the men who come and go pass idly by, no design or turn up their noses at an ease.

In painted face and borrowed trappings, face Black Falsehood peers, and looks upon her there; and murmurs low: "Nay, none shall know her, none; For all their gold well I my work have done."

The generaiton rase, and pause, and go; And still the stream of life flows to and fro. Unmoving, mighty, still her figure stands; With vast, calm brow, and patient folded hands. 'Tis Freedom, the great mother. She is strong, and long can wait, for she has waited long. There is the light of knowledge in her look; She reads the future as an open book.

She knows, where'er their will the tyrants break, That slow their power from day to day grows weak; That slow the people learn to stand upon organization, remedies, or any subject of social reform, or comments upon things done and undone by others. Write only upon one side of the paper and sign your name, not necessarily for publication, but as a matter of good faith.

Section B.—The "Industrial Advocate," 311 Barclay Block, Denver, Col., edited by Wm. Holmes, is hospitable to letters showing how laborers should distrust government.

**Torches.**

Like something carried in chameleons stone, she walks outside the city's barred and locked gates; the men who come and go pass idly by, no design or turn up their noses at an ease.

In painted face and borrowed trappings, face Black Falsehood peers, and looks upon her there; and murmurs low: "Nay, none shall know her, none; For all their gold well I my work have done."

The generation rise, and pause, and go; And still the stream of life flows to and fro. Unmoving, mighty, still her figure stands; With vast, calm brow, and patient folded hands. 'Tis Freedom, the great mother. She is strong, and long can wait, for she has waited long. There is the light of knowledge in her look; She reads the future as an open book.

She knows, where'er their will the tyrants break, That slow their power from day to day grows weak; That slow the people learn to stand upon organization, remedies, or any subject of social reform, or comments upon things done and undone by others. Write only upon one side of the paper and sign your name, not necessarily for publication, but as a matter of good faith.

Section B.—The "Industrial Advocate," 311 Barclay Block, Denver, Col., edited by Wm. Holmes, is hospitable to letters showing how laborers should distrust government.

**Stevens.**
Consolation.

Wake me with love and watch with me, 
Friend whose soul is yearning 
For the future great and free, 
For the lovely Spring returning.

Fair as Spring returning.

Hope with me, exult with me, 
Hearts in bonds meliorating: 
For the hours of thraldom flee, 
And the dawn of Anarchy

In man's mind is breaking.

Man shall serve and kneel no more, 
Sighs and weep no longer; 
And the world it doth deplore 
The diminution, Indicating, Bitterness, stronger.

Hearts of hearts shall etch in love; 
None shall friendships mellow; 
Naught below nor aught above 
Shall the human spirit move 
To subdue each other.

Glorious shall be the day 
Of emancipation.

Then shall nature have full sway, 
And the laws their young and gay, 
As a new creation.

Basil Dahl.

Municipal Book-keeping.

[Newcastle Chronicle.]

If, as some people would have us believe, England is slowly exchanging its complicated system of book-keeping for the doctrines of the collectivist, her conversion can certainly not be attributed to any lack of objection less in the merits or demerits of the system she is now adhering to. She has been able to justify her adherence to it, as the result of a great deal of calculation, more or less successful, and the outcome of a great deal of argument, more or less convincing.

The main objections to the present system have been: First, that it tends to accumulate wealth in the hands of a few, thereby creating class distinctions and inequalities; secondly, that it involves a great deal of labor and expense in the maintenance of a book-keeping system, which is both burdensome and expensive; thirdly, that it is not sufficiently flexible to meet the needs of the community; and, finally, that it is not sufficiently reliable to ensure the accuracy of the accounts kept.

On the other hand, there are many who believe that the present system is the best that has ever been devised, and that it is essential to the maintenance of a stable and efficient government.

The question of municipal book-keeping is a complex one, and one that cannot be answered without careful consideration of all the factors involved. It is not something that can be decided by a simple majority vote, but requires a thorough study of the needs of the community, the cost of the system, and the benefits that can be derived from it.

London county council is a fair sample of municipal book-keeping in certain e conditions, what are the value of municipal statistics having reference to muni- cialized undertakings?

"Truth" That is Not a Truth.

To the Editor of Liberty:

By way of postscript to Bolton Hall's letter in the Number number of your paper, you say that "the Single Tax has received much attention in Liberty, which cannot spare quite the whole of its space to that subject, very." But, I think, at least one of Mr. Hall's doctrines deserves a challenge. "Wherever population is increasing," he says, "rents advance." This is a favorite dictum of our Single Tax friends, but Mr. Hall, quoting it to-day with so much confidence, indicates that he draws from within a rather narrow circle. What may be more or less true within his immediate vision may not be true universally. Out west, for instance, that is contrary to the rule. Rent has been rising twenty or more years. A steady shrinkage of rents and values is the prevalent order of things in the very face of a constant increase of population. It is not the landlord who dictates to the tenant. Along with the tenant, the tenant (or buyer) has become master of the situation, and it is he who now rules it into the landlord according to his will. In the eyes of the average peanut-vendor or other loyal citizen it may appear as a mere coincidence (provided he is aware of the fact at all) that, since the money monopoly ascended to and is occupying the throne, land monopoly has gathered more power than it ever had before. Rather a sign of the times, however, to the thinker on in Venetia. Hence, under this new dispensation, one at least of the standing texts of the Single Tax gospel will have to be revised.

Burlington, Iowa.

Whoso bore Belknap.

Rent.

"What is a landlord, Johnny?"

"A landlord is a man that pays rent to, sir."

"What does the landlord do for a living, Johnny?"

"He don't do nothing, sir; he lives on the rent that people what pays it, and gives it to the landlord, sir."

"Why do they pay him, Johnny?"

"Cause he wouldn't let them work on his land, if they didn't, sir."

Rent is money paid for the privilege of going to work.

In common talk rent means many things. We speak of the rent of a house as well as of the rent of land; of the rent of the furniture in the house, of the rent of the rent of a person, of the rent of a water course, or to some other advantages, not conferred upon it by labor or removed by use. So that, after the tenant has finished using it and returned it to the landlord, nothing has been conveyed to the tenant, in return for the rent that he has paid, but permission to use the land; not has the landlord given anything in return for the rent he has received; he has simply compelled the tenant to divide up, by force, supported by the ignorance and pusillanimity of the tenant himself.

Picture the position of a community in which the land is unowned. Imagine, if you will, the Piteaean islanders upon their first landing, or the Swiss family of one hundred souls, starting a farm on a bare, or, knock oysters off the rocks; they pick the fruit that happens to grow wild, and dig edible roots. The clams and oysters and the rest are their natural wages, the vons are the reward of their labor in obtaining them. Presently, these being done, they clear the land and gather crops; they cut trees and build houses; and still the whole product of their labor is their reward.

Suppose now the land to be owned. The island, we may imagine, is claimed by England. Some one solitary Englishman is cast sail from a wreck.
"This is my island," he explains; "I was just coming to occupy it, when I was shipwrecked. Beside my documents, constituting me lawful owner! Leave the island at once!"

"But," they reply, "we shall have to walk into the sea."

"What does that matter to me?" replies the owner; "I go and draw. It is my land, and you must leave it, but if you do not, you may be hanged for a pirate."

This is an illustration: you must divide with me all you produce; you must give me a quarter of every bushel of oysters you gather, and a quarter of every crop you make."

"Why should I?" reply the people.

"Lend a hand and help us, and we will give you your share cheerfully; but, as for maintaining you in idleness, that we will not do."

"Do I have to work, this land," the owner says; "I have paid good money to the English government for it.

If the landlords are blinded by the popular respect for existing institutions, they will deferentially admit his claim, but they will not listen to any reason which may hold him back. Sir Robert Peel, Lord Melbourne, and others, may have grievances; but they are not landlords, and they may be mistaken."

Rent and interest are the alike which mistaken laws, supported by a mistaken sense of justice, permit to be clipped from the earnings of workers by those who, as far as they are rent and in rent-takers, do no productive work. Rent is paid by the worker to the idle for the privilege of going to work; interest, we may note incidentally, although this is not the time to elaborate on it, is paid to others by the workers for the privilege of changing the products of their labor. Landlord and money lender, as such, are idle, although they may have occupations in which they are producers along with the rest.

The whole of our present social reform is to secure to the producer the entire product of his labor, and to make it impossible for anybody to forcibly take from a producer any part of his earnings.

Once conceived as an evil by which idle people destroy industry, the destructive effects of rent are seen at every turn.

Go through any of our great cities, and examine the houses where the workers live. You will find them piled up side by side, so closely that the very air which intervenes is foul with their exhalations; you will find floors carpeted, beds without covering, cupboards without food, all stripped to satisfy the monthly demand for them to divide up their earnings which do not speak now except by extortions, when sickness or hard times cut off the supply and there is nothing left to pawn; when the devilry of the law legally the victims upon the sidewalk, and calls it just in its title for their own personal use.

The laborer living under the conditions of the poor, the custodians of the sick and of the aged, the ordinary conditions of the workers, when so large a proportion of their earnings must be handed over to the landlord that their life is reduced to the barest existence."

Let us note the superabundance of the rich, the continual round of pleasure that they enjoy. Houses filled with trash upon which thousands have been spent in the meanest wantonness. Ornamental cabinets littered with little wagons and houses and topknots of gold and jewels, neither beautiful nor useful, simply an avenue for squandering. Decorations that do not decorate; retinues of servants for ostentation, not aid; breakfasts and luncheons and dinner-parties, that are only food but the food freely counters the vapidity of the feeders.

People talk of abolishing the tenant-house. All the wealth and display and fashion, together with all the real refreshment and satisfaction of the day, rest upon the tenant-house, that the landlord may have his pleasure.

"Go to work," roughly says the man in the thousand-dollar sealskin overcoat, as some poor wretch sells alms. He does not know himself the extent of his crime. He does not know, even to think that anybody can go to work that wants to. Soon the poor devil will learn that the reason why he can't go to work is that the opportunities to work are held out of his reach by Sorklin, and his like, and he, in turn, will say to them: "Go to work!"

Observe, too, the desolation of the rural places by rent. Why don't people occupy the land that is vacant? Is it the frequent question. There are deserted farms in every state, where land is for cultivators. Investigate it for yourself, and you will find it is not true. Everywhere the tenant may have gone, but the landlord holds on. His price is always a little higher, and more often than not, he can really cause it. Under the use of the land for nothing, the tenant would know very well that the improvements which he would have to make would shortly belong to the landlord.

People crowd into the cities, not because they prefer the normal city to the country, but because, in the first place, poor as it is, the living that the city offers is better than that which can be earned in the country; in the second place, because the city with its greater density of population is able to absorb the entire of the land a tolerable, which would be intolerable in the loneliness of the country, depopulated by landlordism.

For the most part, throughout the farming country the landlord takes the form of the holder of the mortgage, who becomes the owner of the farm, and who collects his six, seven, or eight per cent. of what is really rent, until the steady drain, or some untoward accident of a bad season, makes it the owner of his livelihood. The landlord as the owner of the land, in which we find the whole population of the country eagerly handing over a fifth part of their income in return for the landlord's gracious permission to work.

Enormous as this sum thus taken as rent from the products of the workers is compared with the vastly greater amount which might be produced, and which would be produced, were it not for the prohibition to produce which the power of demanding rent and interest presupposes. What a monstrous work it would be impossible to calculate, but na mission ever be formed from a consideration of the vast numbers of people who are unable to obtain even the means of living of the world, while it is a small, is this the present, the army of the unemployed is estimated at a million in the United States alone, throughout the world, where modern industrial conditions prevail, perhaps ten million.

This unproductive use of the land is, too, the reply to those who point out, correctly enough, that the riches of the rich, if divided up equally, would not suffice to appreciably improve the condition of the poor. It is not a division that justice demands; it is the free opportunity to go to work to produce what shall suffice.

Nor is it any reply to say that there is still plenty of cheap land to be had, because it is not cheap—that is so. Land is out of use, but also the most valuable and most desirable land. I have in my mind a water-power in a populous State, which at any moment could be sold for five thousand thousand dollars, or could be leased at a corresponding price. Sub such prices by no means suit the owners, they are holding it until they can get fifty, or perhaps a hundred, thousand; but the damage they do to the community is not merely the value of the land that they will eventually obtain for removing their embargos, but by the many more thousands in value that would be continually produced were the water-power free to any who would use it.

In just such a way is the whole country held out, the more desirable parts at a high price, the less desirable at a lower price, but each at a higher price than can be immediately obtained. Such a proceeding results in just the same thing as the size of the continent would act; it makes it appear crowded, when it is really sparsely filled.

We have here in these United States a piece of land some twenty-seven thousand to perhaps twenty thousand north and south. It contains two thousand, four million acres of land. Some of this may be accounted uninhabitable,—desert and so on,—but despised by some as worthless, to a person who may own an inch of the rest, it may be the only available object of mercantile traffic the small, the less intellectual, and respectable, is at last discredited, so the indirect ownership of men which ownership of the land gives will also be discredited.

It may be possible for any improvement through legislation; indeed, it is through legislation, and the superstitious deference paid to legislation, that the trouble has arisen. Remedies have been proposed through laws, and these would, they either fall far short of accomplishment, or accomplish it in a clumsy and roundabout fashion, and with indirect evils involved that would more than counterbalance possible benefits.

For instance, it has been proposed to put all taxation, making it unprofitable to hold land without using it, and enabling the government to ban.
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