In Defence of Prison Bars.

A gratifying sign of a tendency to esthetic sanity on the part of the public was shown recently in the prompt protests of the readers of the "Age of Thought" against the announced purpose of its editor to abandon the new typography (which he has rather happily named the "end-space style") in order that he might scatter through his columns without loss of typographical uniformity, the patent-medicine puffs which his advertisers send him in the form of "electro's" in the old style.

The gratification is enhanced, too, by the fact that the protest must have possessed sufficient intensity to cause Sullivan to reconsider his error. That they did is shown by his decision to adhere to the end-space style, for he, being, like myself, an editor who aims to suit himself first and his readers afterward, is not a man to yield to the mere insinuation of public opinion. It is clearly established, moreover, that he is of the stuff of which martyrs are made, since no editor who was less than a martyr could possibly bring himself, even to sustain his paper and thereby further the cause, to sacrifice his finer sensibilities to alternate, at three-inch intervals, his wise words of economic and political counsel with advice to the reader to "educate his bowel with Caecarets;" and to "cure his constipation forever by the use of candy cathartic." If I were not convinced that this heroic cause is a deliberate and stolid subordination of the less to the greater; if I thought for a moment that Comrade Fulton was indifferent to the inarticulate inequities which he thus imparts to his editorial pages,—I should be tempted to express my amazement at his presumption in taking the name of art upon his lips to stigmatize the vulgarity inherent in my nature that prevents me from discarding from Liberty the brass rules which serve to separate its columns.

Speaking of his own page, which contains three narrow columns of ledged minion type with no rules between the columns, he pronounces it good, and continues: "While the columns are slightly narrower than Liberty's, the admirable column rules—like prison bars, out of date with high-class periodicals, and out of harmony with the end-space style, being similar to a sewer cover and a chimney-pot lid—do not appear in that paper that what might be an artistic effect. This being the second or third time that Comrade Fulton has referred to this subject, I conclude that he desires a battle over it. In that case I am disposed to accommodate him. Let us consider, then, this vulgarity of mine. It is indicated in three counts. The first is that it is like prison bars. What of it? Prison bars, in themselves, are not necessarily ugly. They are revolting only when they deprive life of liberty. To inanimate things there are no ugly bars. They which has not the power of motion is as free when barred as when unbarred.

When prison bars protect, or guide, or serve a purpose of any sort, without depriving life of liberty, they are useful things; and, in the right hands equipped with the right means, they may be decorative as well. Does Comrade Fulton insist that no pictures shall be framed, because frames are prison bars? Evidently not, for he goes to great pains to put elaborate borders around the advertisements in his paper. I dislike them, but not because they are borders. I dislike them, because they are ugly. When my eyes crave the satisfaction of a border that is a thing of beauty, I open a book issued by William Morris from his Kelmscott Press. But, if I cannot have Morris or the equal of Morris, I want no decoration at all. What Fulton (as artist) offers himself in place of Morris, not only is my eye unsatisfied; it is positively shocked. And I can no more accept Fulton when he tears down prison bars that serve a useful purpose than when for decoration he erects prison bars that do not decorate. The second count is that column rules are "out of date with high-class periodicals." What is a high-class periodical? Comrade Fulton must have a prison bar of his own (for all definitions are prison bars) for the separation of periodicals into classes. According to my prison bar, I make a conservative estimate when I say that nine high-class periodicals retain the column rule for every one that has discarded it. The fact does not prove that the column rule is a good thing, but it does prove that the column rule is not out of date. The third count is that column rules are "out of harmony with the end-space style." I assert, on the contrary, that the absence of column rules is out of harmony with the end-space style. In proof of this one need but look at that strikingly handsome paper, the "Conservator," which "justifies," and note how much less objectionable the absence of the column rule is in its pages than in those of the "Age of Thought," which does not justify.

When the columns on a page present straight edges both right and left, the eye needs the aid of a column rule to prevent it from reading continuously from the line of one column into the opposite line of the column adjoining; for the two straight edges separated by a narrow space serve as a prison bar (or guiding limit), though less efficiently than the column rule would serve. But, when no column presents at one of its sides a rag, ed edge, as in the end-space style, there is a tenacity on the part of the eye, in the case of the longest lines, to read continuously into the column adjoining; and hence the end-space style especially requires the column rule.

The fact is that Comrade Fulton, like some others, has blindly followed a typographical movement which had a raison d'etre at its origin, but which was continued irrationally after its raison d'etre was satisfied. Twenty years ago it was common among printers to overload their pages with various display devices,—ornaments, scrols, heavy borders, and fancy rules and dashes. The effect was "cheap and nasty." With improvement in taste a current set in away from display and in the direction of typographical neatness and modetry, decoration being less and less attempted except in special work where real art could be afforded. Among the first to join in this current, I excluded from Liberty all purely decorative signs, and adopted a style of severe simplicity, reducing all divisional rules and dashes to the single line. But at this point, where I had gotten rid of tawdry ornaments, and at the same time enhanced the usefulness of the divisional marks by making them serve their purpose inconspicuously and with a due sense of their subordination, I stopped. But there were others in this current, w.{...}, never having known at any time the object of these curts, reached the goal all unconscious of it; and, so, with eyes still tightly closed, drifted at right angles, and discarded divisional marks altogether. Or, to change the metaphor, they threw out the baby with the bath. Now, it is their mistake that Comrade Fulton shares. And at what expense he saves it I venture to say that he little dreams. The base of the column rule used in Liberty is ten points in thickness. (Let me explain to the uninstructed that a "point" is a typographical unit.) But Comrade Fulton, not using column rules in the "Age of Thoughts," and feeling perhaps the liability of the eye to read across two columns, increased the space between the columns to twelve points at the start, and has now doubled it to twenty-four points,—fourteen points in excess of the thickness of Liberty's column rule. A little calculation will enable
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In abolishmg all debt and interest, the last vestiges of old-time slavery, is a revolution abolishes at once strikes the root of the cancer. Slavery. - the soul of the society, the whole of property, the government, the state of the courts, the jailer of the state, the master of the night, the true power and authority; the central focus of modern political activity, which makes liberty primary beneath its head. - The Nation.

The appearance in the editorial columns of articles over other signatures than the editor's initial indicates that the editor approves their central purpose and general tenor, though he does not hold himself responsible for every phrase or word. But the appearance in other parts of the paper by names of the same, or similar editors, with no means indicates that they disapprove them in any respect, such disposition of them being governed largely by motives of convenience.

Principle and Finance.

At a recent dinner of the Chicago Iroquois club, a Democratic organization, Mr. E. O. Brown, known to Liberty's readers as a strong individualist Single Taxer, delivered an address on The Future of Democracy. I am not concerned here with the prospects of the Democratic party, or the chances of the remedy. I am concerned with the prospects of the individual party, and the chances of the remedy. Elaborating this suggestion, Mr. Brown expressed himself as follows:

For it seems to me that we Democrats, gold men and silver men alike, ought to recognize that the Democratic principle - the principle, that is, that forms and gives life to the Democratic party wherever and whenever that party has real life and vigor - is something more than a matter of detail or of mere finance. When the financial question means the question of taxation, it is related to the taking of real wealth, to the payment of labor, from a man's hands who has produced it, to apply it at the will of the majority to purposes of which that man may entirely disapprove. But if, so, how can Mr. Brown say that the Democratic principle of liberty is not involved in "mere finance"? How can he say that banking and standards and circulation are matters of detail? The contradiction is so flagrant that Mr. Brown's failure to detect it can be accounted for only by reference to the Single-Tax bias and tendency to treat the financial question with scornful and undisguised contempt. Prejudice is notoriously fatal to logical reasoning and consistency.

But, without dwelling on this characteristic slip, let me examine the strange proposition that the tariff system of the Republicans or other protectionists involves a more serious invasion of individual liberty than the existing one. When Mr. Brown says, "the financial question means the question of taxation; and when it relates to the taking of real wealth", then the financial question is indeed a vital one to the Democratic party. And, p.a.y, how does the government prevent freedom of note-issuing? One of the means is a tax of one per cent. on all circulation not authorized by the banking law. This tax is prohibitive, and does not lead to the direct taking of "real wealth". But surely Mr. Brown will not argue that a prohibitive tariff tax which prevents imports altogether is less objectionable than one which enhances prices and takes "real wealth".

I will not here make any statement which Mr. Brown will question. I will not assert that the restriction on note-issuing takes real wealth by forcing borrowers to pay higher rates of interest than they would have under free banking, since Mr. Brown may dispute this proposition. It is sufficient for my purpose to remind him that free banking is prevented by the tax on unauthorized circulation and by the fines and imprisonment attached to violations of the banking laws. Is not, then, the question of finance vital to Democracy when it means the question of restricting the issue of circulating media by prohibitive taxes and penalties, when it means monopoly secured by legal and arbitrary means?

Perhaps Mr. Brown had this thought in mind: that, since, as a matter of fact, neither the gold Democrats or the silver Democrats stand for the democratic principle in finance; since neither wing advocates cessation of governmental tampering, or proposes to do away with artificial regulations, both might as well drop the subject in favor of one on which they do take a democratic position. From a Single-Tax standpoint such advice would not be unnatural, although every impartial observer knows that the money question is now "up" for settlement, and will not be sidetracked or obscured at the bidding of those who want harmony restored in Democratic councils. But, if Mr. Brown meant to convey the suggestion indicated, his language in no wise expressed it. It expressed something entirely and radically different - and something absolutely and astonishingly wrong.

Anarchy is Order.

[Continued.]

III. - That the Individualist Dogma is the Only Prerental Dogma.

Let me talk to me of revelation, of tradition, of Chinese, Phoenician, Egyptian, Hebraic, Greek, Roman, Tontonie, or French philosophies; outside of my faith or my religion, for which I am accountable to nobody, I have nothing to do with the vagaries of my ancestors; I have no ancestors! For me the creation of the world dates from the day of my birth; for me the end of the world will be accomplished on the day when I shall restore to the elementary mass the apparatus and the abstractions which constitute my individuality. I am the first man, I shall be the last. My history is the complete result of humanity; I know no other, I care to know no other. When I suffer, what good do I get from another's enjoyment? When I enjoy, in what do those who suffer derive from my pleasures? Of what consequence to me is that which happened before me? How am I concerned in what will happen after me? It is not for me to serve as a sacrifice to respect for extinct generations, or as an example to posterity. I confine myself within the circle of my existence, and the only problem that I have to solve is that of my welfare. I have but one doctrine, that doctrine has but one formula, that formula has but one word: EXIST! Sincerely is he who confesses
it; an impostor is he who denies it.

This is bare individualism, native egoism: I do not work to secure it; I do not care to verify it; I boast of it. Show me, that I may question him, the man who would reproach and blame me. Does my egoism do you any harm? If you say no, you have no reason to object to it, for I am free in all that does not injure you. If you say yes, you are a thief, for, my egoism being only the simple appropriation of myself by myself, an appeal to my identity, an affirmation of my individuality, a protest against all supremacy, if you admit that you are damaged by my act in taking possession of myself, by my retention of my own person,—that is, the least disputable of my properties,—you will declare thereby that I belong to you, or, at least, that you have designs on me; you are an owner of men, either established as such or intending to be, a monopolist, a co-winner of another’s goods, a thief.

There is no middle ground; either right lies with egoism, or it lies with theft; either I belong to myself, or I become the possession of some one else. It cannot be said that I should sacrifice myself for the good of all, since, all having to similarly sacrifice themselves, no one would gain more by this stupid game than he had lost, and consequently each would remain quits,—that is, without profit, which clearly would make such sacrifice absurd. If, then, the abnegation of all cannot be profitable to all, it must of necessity be profitable to a few; these few, then, are the possessors of all, and are probably the very ones who will complain of my egoism.

Every man is an egoist; whoever ceases to be one becomes a thing. He who pretends that it is not necessary to be one is a thief.

Oh, yes! "know, the word has an ugly sound; so far you have applied it to those who are not satisfied with what belongs to them, to those who take to themselves what belongs to others; but such people are in the human order; you are not. In complaining of their rapacity, do you know what you do? You establish your own iniquity. Hitherto you have belied that there were tyrants. Well, you are mistaken; there are only slaves. Where nobody obeys nobody commands.

Mark this well; the dogma of resignation, abnegation, self-sacrifice, has been preached to the people. What has been the consequence? Papacy and royalty, by the grace of God, resulting in castes of bishops and monks and princes and nobles. Oh! the people long ago resigned themselves, renounced themselves, annihilated themselves. Did they do well? What do you think about it?

Certainly, the greatest pleasure that you can give to the somewhat discontented bishops, to the assemblies that have replaced the king, to the cabinet ministers who have replaced the princes, to the prelates who have replaced those grand vassals, the dukes, to the sub-prefects who have replaced those petty vassals, the barons, and to the whole series of subordinate functionaries who stand to us in the stead of the knights, or "messieurs, and lordlings of feudalism,—the greatest pleasure, I say, that you can give to all this nobility fattening on the public revenues is to reenter as speedily as possible into the traditional dogma of resignation, abnegation, and self-sacrifice. There you will still find not a few protectors who will tell you to despise riches at the risk of rubbing you of them; there you will find not a few deceivers, who, to save your soul, will tell you to be content, in everything except the protection of your wives, daughters, and sisters from annoyance at their hands. Thanks to God, we are not lacking in devoted friends who would accept damnation for our sake, if we would decide to gain the heavens by the old path of the beatitude, from which they politely step aside, in order doubtless not to bar our passage.

Why do all the perpetrators of the old-time hypocrisy no longer feel at ease on the scaffoldings erected by their predecessors? Why? Because abnegation is declining and individualism is growing; because man is acquiring sufficient confidence in his own good looks to be willing to throw off his mask and show himself at last as he is.

Abnegation is slavery, degradation, abjection; it is the king, it is the government, it is tyranny, it is struggle, it is civil war.

Individualism, on the contrary, is emancipation, grandeur, nobility; it is the man, it is the people, it is liberty, it is fraternity, it is order.

IV.—That the social contract is a monstrosity.

Let each individual in society affirm himself personally, and only himself, and individual sovereignty is founded, there is no more room for government, all supremacy is destroyed, man is the equal of man.

Meanwhile our social life is mortgaged to all by contract.

Rousseau invented the thing, and for sixty years the genius of Rousseau has been dragging in our legislation. It is by virtue of a contract, drawn by our fathers and renewed later by the great citizens of the Constituent, that the government enjoins us to see, hear, speak, write, and do only what it may permit.

Such are the popular prejudices: the alienation of which is the government of men; this government I call in question so far as it concerns me, at the same time leaving to others, if they desire it, the privilege of serving it, of paying it, of loving it, and, finally, of dying for it.

But even though all other Frenchmen should consent to be governed in their education, in their worship, in their credit, in their manufactures, in their art, in their labor, in their affection, in their tastes, in their habits, in their movements, and even in their eating, I declare that in right that their voluntary slavery no more involves my responsibility than their stupidity compromises my intelligence; and, if in fact their servitude makes me in, so that I cannot get away from it; if it is notorious, as I cannot doubt, that the submission of six, seven, or eight millions of individuals to one man or to several men involves my own submission to this same man or to those same men,—I defy any one whomsoever to find in this act anything but a trap, and I declare that at no time has the barbarism of any people practised upon earth a more unmistakable brigandage.

To see, in fact, a moral coalition of eight millions of valets against one free man is to witness a spectacle of cowardice against the savagery of which one cannot invoke civilization without making it either ridiculous or odious in the eyes of cultivated people.

But I cannot believe that all my fellow-citizens deliberately feel the need of serving.

What I feel, everybody must feel; what I think, everybody must think; for I am neither more or less than a man; I am under the same simple and laborious conditions to which the first worker that comes is subject. It astonishes me, it frightens me, to meet with every step that I take in life, with every thought that my brain welcomes, with every enterprise that I begin, with every act that I need to earn, a law or a regulation that says: me: no passage this way; no thought that way; no enterprise in this direction; half of that coin must be left at this gate. Confronted with these manifold obstacles that appear on every hand, my intimidated mind sinks into brutishness; I know not which way to turn; I know not what to do or what to become.

Who, then, has added to the atmospheric scourges, to the decompositions of the air, to the insalubrities of climate, to the lightning which science has learned how to control, this occult and savage power, this maleficent genius, which awaits humanity at the cradle to cause it to be devoured by humanity? Who? Why, men themselves, who, not satisfied with the hostility of the elements, have also made men their enemies.

The masses, still too docile, are innocent of all the brutalities committed in their name and to their detriment; they are innocent of them, but they are not ignorant of them; I believe that, like myself, they feel them and are indignant at them; I believe that, like myself, they are in a hurry to have done with them; only, not clearly distinguishing causes, they know not how to act. It will be my endeavor to teach them something in this direction.

Let us begin by pointing out the guilty.

A. BELLE-D'ARBUZE.

[To be continued.]

II: Literature of Anarchism.

A remarkable volume has recently been issued in the French language, valuable to all students of social questions and of especial interest to Anarchists. It is nothing less than a classified guide to the literature of Anarchism in all countries and tongues, including books, pamphlets, and newspapers, with titles; names of authors, editors, and publishers; and dates of issue. "Probably a little pamphlet of about thirty-two pages," the reader may say to himself before seeing it. But on seeing it he will be as surprised as I was to find it a bulky book of almost three hundred large octavo pages. As Elise Reclus says in the preface: "I confess, for my part, that I did not know we were so rich; the importance that this still-incomplete collection has assumed is a great surprise to me." We are indebted for this work, which must have been one of great labor, to M. Nettau. a Communist living in London. Undoubtedly one of the most puzzling features of the compiler's task was that of evolving a scheme of classification for this "Bibliographie de l'Anarchie." I had forgotten before to give the title) which would properly dispose of the various schools claiming to be Anarchis-
tly, without doing injustice to any. In my judgment, such a task is intrinsically incapable of accomplishment. To compile a consistent bibliography of Anarchism it is necessary first to determine what Anarchism is, after which it will be a comparatively easy matter to catalogue the works representing that which Anarchism has been decided to be. Then geography, language, and chronology will be the sole motives in the scheme of classification, alphabetical indices supplying a key to the whole. But, if the compiler starts, as Mr. Netttau appears to have started, with the theory that all are Anarchists who so or; themselves, he will promptly and continually come upon blendings and shadings and overlappings and contradictions and contrasts which no arrangement of divisions and subdivisions, however minute, and no system of cross-references, however elaborate, can possibly reduce to order, or shape satisfactorily to any, to say nothing of all. Mr. Netttau's book abounds in proofs of this, although containing also plenty of evidence that it was his sincere endeavor to sink his partisanship. Spite of all his efforts to be impartial, the bias of Communism has had its marked effect. In commenting on this, I am moved by the conviction that the man who has not managed to express his convictions, his sin feeling is of one gratitude to Mr. Netttau for the good work he has done. His book in any case is an extremely serviceable one, and the purpose of my criticism is to enable him to make his subsequent editions less imperfect.

At first glance Individualist Anarchism seems to have the place of honor in this compilation, the first thirty or forty pages being devoted to it mainly. But a closer examination shows that Individualist Anarchism is thus placed by the compiler on the theory that it is, or was, one of several precursive influences leading up to what he styles "Modern Anarchism," which had its beginning as a definitive movement in the final congresses of the Jusnarian Federation at the initiatives of Kropotkine and Reclus,—in other words, to "Anarchist Communism," to which the bulk of the volume is given. Of course, under such a scheme, the bulk properly belongs to that school, for Individualist Anarchism hardly exists as a movement outside of the United States and England, in spite of the fact that some of its earliest and most important sources belong to the European continent. But this is no excuse for a scheme of classification which, by implication, if not by direct assertion, treats Individualist Anarchism as a back ramber, and "Communist Anarchism" as the only Anarchism up-to-date. Under this scheme Proudhon, to whom a special chapter is devoted, is counted, of course, only a precursor, though, there is nothing Anarchistic in "Communist Anarchism" that cannot be found in Proudhon's writings, while there is much in it that is authoritarian to which he would have lent no sanction. And even Bakouine, to my surprise, is not numbered among the purely orthodox. It seems that he was a "Collectivist Anarchist," whatever that may be. So that the chapter given to him appears immediately preceding the final refinement in the process which has culminated in "Communist Anarchism." Now, it is almost needless to say that this arrangement is purely factitious, devised and executed for the purpose of sustaining a theory as to the evolution of Communism,—quite honestly, no doubt, but none the less unwarrantably. That theory is that the more or less rebellious spirits who, from the earliest period in the history of Socialism, have exhibited a growing aversion to the formal authoritarianism of State Socialism have after years of groping through a multitude of vagaries and experimental notions, such as Individualist Anarchism and Mutualism and extreme Manchesteart and Collectivist Anarchism, settled down at last with a sort of unaniyness upon Communism as the final and complete expression of the libertarian idea and tendency. Nothing could be farther from the truth is that the early rebellion against State Socialism was not prompted by a hatred of authoritarianism exclusively, but frequently—perhaps in most cases—by a hatred simply of formalism. This rebellion grew sporadically, men of force expressing it here and there in their own way. But, as time went on, the two elements of opposition to State Socialism began to crystallize into two distinct movements, and it was at about the same period that they received clear recognition as such. One crystallized into the revolt of the instinctive men, the anti-formalists, and dates as stated, from the first congress of the National Federation, (1880), at which the Kropotkineans gained definitive ascendency: the other crystallized into the revolt of the rational men, the anti-authoritarians, and dates from the foundation of Liberty at Boston in 1881. Since then "Communist Anarchism" and Individualist Anarchism have commanded the attention of the world, being confused by the ignorant, and diametrically differentiated by the intelligent. Individualist Anarchism, therefore, instead of being one of numerous forerunners of Communism that have finally died away or been merged in it, represents a distinctly opposite tendency to that of Communism, which came into existence before the public contemporaneously with it.

Now, Individualist Anarchism proposing to substitute for the existing order as well as for the order contemplated by a complete State Socialism: a thorough libertarianism, and "Communist Anarchism" proposing to substitute simply a formless and unorganized authoritarianism denying liberty in some of the most important of its applications, it is obvious that the two cannot properly be catalogued in a "Bibliography of Anarchy," for one is Anarchist and the other isn't. Nevertheless, there being those who think that this can be done and who insist upon attempting it, it is incumbent upon us to accord to its methods its proper dignity and treat them in accordance with the lines of evolution upon which they have developed.

That this has not been done in the "Bibliography" in question is my chief criticism upon it. That in dealing with so large a mass of material Mr. Netttau should have made some minor errors is not wonderful. On the contrary, the wonder is that he has done his work so accurately. Some of his errors, however, grow out of his erroneous scheme of classification. For instance, Robert Reutzeel's "Unschuldige Arme Teufel," as well as Bachmann's "Zukunft," which leaned strongly towards Individualist Anarchism, are classed with Most's "Freibert" and the Chicago "Arbeiterzeitung" in order to swell the list of "Communist Anarchist" journals in the German language, while my "Libertas" (the German edition of Liberty, in issuing which the Schumans cooperated with me) and the German translation of my "State Socialism and Anarchism," as well as all the works of our comrades, John Henry Mackay, and of Dr. Arthur Molberg, the German champion of Proudhon, are placed in the early pages of the book under the heading, "German Anarchism from 1840 to 1890," instead of being properly represented as the German precursor, though all of these appeared subsequent to 1890 (excepting one or two of Molberg's) and most of them subsequent to 1890. Again, Lum's "Alarm" is placed in the "Communist Anarchist" section of the book, in a list of journals published in the United States. This list, if somewhat heterogeneous, is awesomely distinguished by Mr. Netttau from Individualist Anarchist journals in the English language; yet Lum's "Alarm," in the main, taught the economics and ultimate politics of Individualist Anarchism. Lum himself, too, though characterized by Mr. Netttau as a Mutualist, appears in the Communist category, and that, I think, is just as wrong as that he is, a Proudhonian,—why is he not classified with Mutualists? The same error is made regarding Voltairine de Cleyre. And to Communism is given the credit of the "Twentieth Century's" economic symposium, "Why I Am's," though of the six contributors to it named by Mr. Netttau only John Most is a Communist,—Tarros, Lum, and Tucker being Individualist Anarchists, Stuart an Individualist, and Holmes a nondescript. And, most astonishing of all, Henrik Ibsen, certainly the most famous of living Individualist Anarchists, is mentioned but once in the book, and then near the end, in a miscellaneous chapter on modern libertarian literature. It is not strange that the Communists are left to concede Ibsen to the Individualist Anarchists, but that he belongs with them nobody can deny. Perhaps we ought to congratulate ourselves that Mr. Netttau does not claim him as a Communist.

Errors of a different sort, such as that which represents Spooner's "Trial by Jury" as an attack on the jury as an institution, I have not time or space for pointing out. Nor have I the disposition to do so, save as an aid to Mr. Netttau in his work. I am sure that all my readers will join me in thanking him for his great service, even though his bias partially thwarted his undoubted desire to be fair.

The price of the "Bibliographie de l'Anarchie" is five francs, and the volume can be obtained of P. V. Stock, 8 Galerie du Théâtre-Français, Paris. The compiler's address is M. Netttau, 36 Fortune Gate "Terrace, Villeslde, London, N. W. 3."

The young and reverend Casson, whom Mr. Byington quotes in his A. L. W. C. department as saying that it "takes less brains to be clever as an individualist than as a Socialist," must, if he shares the view of his fellow Socialist, Mr. Sidney Webb, have a very poor opinion of the intellectual capacity of American Socialists. Mr. Webb, after his visit to America several years ago, announced to his Fabian friends at home that America the
LIBERTY. 353

brains of the labor movement are in the Anarchist camp. Now, if the comparatively feeble brain-power required, in the opinion of the young and revered Casson, for the making of a clever Anarchist is virtually all the brain-power of which the American labor movement can boast, the obvious inference is that American Socialists are tiresome blockheads. Which nobody can deny.

My readers are entitled to an apology for the very objectionable arrangement of matter in this issue of Liberty. The alternative was a still more objectionable delay in publication. The difficulty arose out of a *fimme pas in "make-up," any repetition of which I shall be wise enough to avoid.

A new illustration of the dishonesty to which fanatics will sometimes descend. Funk & Wagnalls, proprietors of the Prohibitionist, "*Voix,*" laterly addressed a series of questions to a list of literary men, in which list I was included. The questions related to the advisability of the use of alcohoic liquors by literary men. I answered them as concisely as I could. The various answers received have been printed in the "*Voix,*" but those which I sent have been so mutilated that I am made to appear as opposed to the use of liquor by literary men, whereas, if the answers had been printed as written, it would have been seen that I am in favor of such use with certain conditions and limitations.

If Funk & Wagnalls lied about the others who responded to their questions as they have lied about me, their symposium is more liable than reliables.

Sexual association with a girl under eighteen by her consent has been made in many States, by legal fiction, an act of rape. Now the cry goes up that rape shall be made a capital offense. *Doux pays!* as Forain would exclaim.

A HIm to Father Confessors.

A young French priest, being overwhelmed by the number of people coming to confess, announced from his pulpit that thereafter, in order to prevent the crush and confusion, he would hear the confessions of his flock in categories, and in the following order: Wednesdays, Thursdays; Tuesdays, murders; Fridays, forgers; Saturdays, women of light character. The plan worked to perfection. From that moment the young priest's confession box was completely deserted.

Interest.

Interest is what is paid for the use of money. Undoubtedly interest is paid for the use of other things than money, as when a house or a piano is rented; but other things command a price for the use of them only because restrictions upon the issue and loan of money make it impossible, except by paying a price for its use, to borrow money with which these other things might be bought.

So it is that the question of interest hangs upon the money question; and whoever would understand how it is that large part of the produce of labor is taken from us produces by those who do not labor must have some idea of money and finance.

Money and finance! Oh, horrible! exclaims the reader; I never could understand anything about finance.

Nevertheless, it is a matter of life and death. We are in misery now, because we don't understand finance; we shall be destroyed, unless we set about understanding it. The people that grasp clear ideas on the money question will be the people best adapted to its environment, and will survive; should no people prove capable, as a people, of grasping clear ideas on the question, there can be no doubt that the whole of the nineteenth-century civilization, such as it is, will perish.

For we are past the stage where it was possible for individual adaptation to secure the survival of the Individual in the midst of a hostile society. We are so far developed socially that the new conceptions required for further social advance must be received by a part of all the people. We have been enough to determine the opinion of the whole, before they can have any influence in improving the material prosperity of the social whole. Otherwise the individual of highly developed ideas would be living in a type of more-barbarous society, which he alone is unable to enlighten.

Moreover, we have reached a point in social development where the social assimilation of correct ideas among a large portion of the people, is the state of affairs with which we now find ourselves unexpectedly confronted in these last days of the century which is wholly a problem of distribution. Things enough, in all conceptions, we have had the outlined power of making more things,—enough for everybody to have plenty; but, strange to say, for some hitherto unperceived cause, the people who want to go to work to make things cannot, and the people who want things cannot get them, and everything is in an economic muddle.

As I said, it is a problem of more skilfully dividing up what we have produced, or what we can produce,—a problem of distribution. This problem of distribution is a money problem, because money, after all, is but a tool to accomplish distribution.

In trying to get light on this paramount question, begin by discriminating everything that is usually read or talked about.

On general principles, when we are looking for a solution of a social problem, we must expect to reach conclusions quite opposed to the usual opinions on the subject; other opinions, we must expect to have to attack, not what is commonly regarded as objectionable, but what is commonly regarded as entirely proper and normal.

Therefore, begin by disbelieving all the usual talk, and till that is impossible, consider the regular run of books upon money. A good deal of what they say is true, but it is so mixed with what is false that, until you have your fundamental ideas straightened out, by which to discriminate for yourself, you will be as much misled by what is true as by what is false.

As for incomprehensibility, don't for a moment imagine that these money and finance questions are as complicated as the people who write about them make them out to be. The fact is, these writers do not in the least understand the matters they write about, and they inevitably jumble the mere accidents of the practical workings with the essential principles of the theory.

In the concrete money is complicated enough; in the abstract it is simplicity itself. Let me try to give you some clear idea of the simple bottom principle.

In the first place they tell you, with a profound air of wisdom, that the only real money is gold and silver. Money-metals they call them, in their supercilious, round-eyed superiority, as if there could be any unwavering value in gold and silver, rather than in any other metal, or in any other substance, which must forever maintain them the only possible money! That is the first falsity that you will have to deny to yourself in your own mind, irrespective of my denial of it here.

For in the first place I would think for myself. Believe nothing on the authority of others. Weigh and understand and decide for yourself.

True enough it is that gold and silver have been most used for money, and I am not adverse to use a good purpose; but it is also true that these gold and silver coins are but a sort of merchandise themselves, and to exchange other merchandise for them is, after all, nothing but a kind of barter.

Besides this gold and silver were not the only money. For many years now paper documents of various kinds have been used as money,—have been paid out and received for goods and services in final settlement. So that gold and silver are not evidently not the only money. Paper promises, we see with our eyes, are just as good as gold and silver themselves as a machine for exchanging the real things, the bread and meat and clothes and houses, which are what we really want. Better, in fact, because, if we could use paper documents only, we might use the gold and silver for making and bricks for burning and flogging them in pockets and passing them from hand to hand, from purse to till and from till to purse, until they are worn to dust again. Sheer waste, that is of good gold and silver, useful as they might be in their incomprehensible state of barter for such things as space-sacks, fly-screens, and many other purposes.

If paper will do, why, in common sense, use paper?

Yet here our wiseraces will step forward, put on their spectacles, and solemnly announce that, as long as there is gold and silver to pay off the paper promises with, the paper promises are all right, but—and so on.

True enough, in a sense, too, this is, and once upon a time there was a choice between a paper and a silver as to security, the exchanges of the world increased so vastly that now there is not enough gold and silver in the world even for security for the paper promises that are required as money in commerce and things.

Consequently the paper money of to-day, in spite of the demonstrations of the wiseaces, is not secure.

There is three or four or eight or ten times as much paper as there is coin which the paper promises to pay, so that if the paper money were every little while, when there is more coin wanted than can be had for redeeming the promises, and one of the financial crises, or panics, causes,—one of those panics that are becoming continually frequent and fatal.

Still, up to panic price-sees for ourselves that paper promises serve sufficiently well. Were it not that they promise to do what it is well known to be impossible, to do, they might serve even better. But, notwithstanding this drawback, paper is now a days, and paper of some sort apparently must be. Let us drop then, this word money, along with the old conception of gold as the only money. What we want to do is to trade, to exchange, by the most sensible means. Paper so far is the most sensible means. Call it no longer money; call it currency, simply for convenience of nomenclature. Paper currency we know is possible; it seems to be inevitable; as a fact, it is almost the only means.

Consider now the fact that a certain quantity of this paper or other currency is needed to carry on the horse trades and immovable other trades in these wide-spread United States, in a wider-spread globe surface. As things are at present, what currency we have is restricted in quantity in two ways. The first of these restrictions is the surviv ing belief that gold or silver is the only possible commodity; that can redeem paper currency. To say that a currency is safe when there is enough gold and silver to redeem a part of the currency, yet the superstition survives that a certain proportion. must be maintained, and that, although we may require normally much paper currency of our devices, and will urge that currency is really a trivial matter, almost a superfluity.

Anybody who has passed through a financial crisis of the last order can see that this matter of currency is. During the height of the panic no currency could be obtained. The consequence was that business almost stopped.

Other devices were used as far as possible, especially credit; but they could not be used as far as they were needed. Although it is absurd to suppose that currency is a money to have more than twice as much. The second restriction is the method by which alone more currency can be obtained when it is needed. Moreover, all kinds of devices for securing paper documents, destitute of value in themselves, but necessary to keep the running accounts straight between men. Statisticians will point out that by far the greater part of the business of the world is done by drafts and such comme plania, and devices, and will urge that currency is really a trivial matter, almost a superfluity.
put off the payment of wages for week after week. In every way people tried to get along without currency. Nevertheless it was only demonstrated how fallacious and hollow such a semblance of prosperity, except the deposit, not of any good security, but of government bonds which practically cannot be had.

In the second place, there is about as much paper currency already in existence as for a time longer in existence will be needed. As long as gold and silver are the only legal currency for currency, there cannot be much more currency.

But why not, you will ask, leave other things for security, leave gold and silver if there is not enough of these? Here is precisely the trouble. There is a United States law heavily taxing any such issue of currency, and there are separate State laws making it a criminal offense to issue or pass any other currency than that authorized by the government.

So that the monopoly of the banks, although not a formal monopoly, is maintained by so many legal restrictions that it is a justly a monopoly really as if it were formally so constituted.

Were it not so, in crises like the present business concerns of high standing would pay off their employees in small due tickets, which the employees in turn could pay to the coal dealers and bakers, who would receive them on the credit of the standing of the issuing concern. Shortly institutions would spring up of even wider connections, to make a business of lending their own in place of them, and a currency system would grow up, undefended by law, dependent on its merits for its existence, and furnishing a method of exchange without any interest charge at all.

This is what is meant by free banking. The old State banks were not free at all, but subject as to many restrictions as banks now are, with the same result of making their services expensive and inefficient, or very dear indeed.

Really free currency means, in the first place, no legal-tender laws.

Why? Because a really sound currency people will advance on its merits. Only an unsound currency is pressed into the service of the money people take it.

Our present currency needs it because it is necessarily sound; there is supposed to be enough gold to redeem it, but everybody knows that there is not; consequently it requires law to compel people to receive it.

Take away the law, and the fact that a currency command makes confidence is assurance of the sufficiency of its security.

Really free currency means, in the second place, no legal requirement of any particular kind of wealth to redeem it—no gold or silver or anything else, leaving that to the judgment of those who are to receive it, but who cannot be compelled to receive it, in the absence of any ordinary legal tender laws, if they do not like the security.

Really free currency means, in the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth places, the removal of all other taxes, inspections, certifications, and restrictions of every kind.

In the absence of such restrictions, imagine the rapid growth of wealth, and the equity in its distribution, that would result. Thus, for a supposition, a nation of comparatively peaceful, industrious, honest, workshy, goods, and chateaux to a sufficient amount.

They would print notes of certain small amounts,—one dollar, two dollars, and so on,—and scrip of even smaller denominations. A farmer needs to stock his farm with seed and tools, as alsoCh. 9. The money problem. Ten per cent. Then he would go to the free bank and pledge his farm, and receive the use of its notes, a handful of them, to the amount of half the value of his farm, and pay not six, or four, or even two per cent. These securities of one or one per cent. would be all he would have to pay.

Why. Because there would be other free banks compete with this bank, so that the price of currency would be as much as the banks could make it useless to borrow. On loans for a definite period not less than five per cent.—for the most part six—will satisfy their demand. In other kinds of business, when they cannot make a sale, they know the price is too high, and put it down. The banks do not put the price down, but will not. Why? Because the banks have a monopoly.
another point of view, quite absurd and impossible.

We all know the astonishing stories of the accumu-

libertarian power of compound interest,—how a dollar, set to grow in the year one, would owe outvalue several

wars,—and we can figure for ourselves that these

statements are substantially true. When we consider,

however, that a good deal of this has been for the

interest, because many people who receive interest do

not spend it all, but invest some of it to draw more in-

terest, we see that it is impossible; that at a certain

point the rate of increase becomes greater than the whole

product of the globe could pay.

It is only when we begin to understand that the bor-

rower does not really pay freely,—that he is compelled by a monopoly, backed by rifles, to pay what he

must,—that we begin to see the cause of inequality, and to understand the remedy.

Imagine, then, a society in which equality prev.

era. Does it seem absurd to fancy a hod-carrier as learned and as powerful, or a street sweeper as a com-

panion of a college professor? It does seem a mere fantastic flight of fancy; it is really the goal to-

ward which society is tending.

For there is nothing intrinsically degrading in the

work of a hod-carrier. There is no reason why the

college student, who has deceived in rowing and has

been a fair student besides, should not choose hod-

carrying as a congenial athletic occupation, and

continue a cultivator. The excessive amount of labor

which now bends the backs and breaks the hearts of the

hand-workers is quite unnecessary, the free society of the future will need but one or one hundred

hod carriers.

Besides, when the just and substantial equality of reward will come equal power to secure the advantages of

education and leisure. The hod carrier will have money and leisure enough for self-cultivation, enough for

his son's and daughters' college-going and European

travel, and all the refinements that anybody else has.

Then, too, will vanish the odious "social distinc-
tions" that now sinck. He's only this, and she's only that, quite distinct to associate with our superfinel selves, whom scientists make us believe to be different to an end; and in mere arithmetical and financial truth and

justice will be laid a foundation for the brother-

hood of man which sentiment alone can never

establish.

JOHN BEVERLEY JOHNSON.

A New Departure.

The Legitimacy League, of London, which has had so remarkable a vince since the formation four years ago, has now entered upon an "new crusade," as some writer put it,—i.e., the advocacy of the principle of sexual freedom, or freedom in sexual rela-
tionships. If the League carries on its suggested public prophecies, it will in a few years be as energetically as some of its present members have done recently in

magazines, pamphlets, and papers, we may look for-

ward to some interesting developments.

The adoption of new principles in a movement has its

consequences, and the "result of the addition of the

eone given above is that Mr. Wordsworth Donisthorpe, Mr. Grevz Fisher, and others, have left the League.

On the other hand, there has been an infusion of new

blood. Such men as Wells, Dawson, George Bedborough, Louie Bedborough, Seymour, Laddoc, Rockell, and Wastall are still within its

ranks, there is no immediate cause for concluding that the

world will lag for lack of ability, energy, and

enthusiasm.

I therewith append the objects of the League as now

amended:

1. To create public opinion in the direction of freedom in sexual relationships.

2. To create a machinery for acknowledging off-
spring born out of wedlock, and to secure for them

equal rights with legitimate children.

3. To do away, so far as possible, with all

laws, which are open to anyone who subscribes in writing to its objects, and contributes

not less than thirty cents per annum to its funds.

The second object, as I have remarked elsewhere,

may be much of the parliamentary, but from the

broad legal standpoint that there will be little

stir in such a direction (indeed, the tendency of

most of the members now is against it).

It is earnestly desired that all interested parties, of

true sexes, should lend assistance in this very im-

portant matter, and, with a view of bringing the

leagued objects and the correlative teachings before

the ablest public mind of the silver standard of com-

mad, or as both, it will be adopted by those who can

afford to have the best; but others will not be forced

to stand idle for want of money, if they choose to ac-

quire silver and use it that pay silver, and by resist-

ing such a solution the party in power in the United

States is tempting a forced conversion of debts to

silver standard at a future date in some turn of pol-

tics. As for free banking, the idea, we are sorry to

see, has not been far enough considered by the politi-

cal parties of all states. If ten thousand producers wish
to make paper issues, based on their mutual credit,

content to have them circulate among them-

selves, free of all means of external control, and tell

of usury, they are not permitted to carry out any such

plan, however solvent they may be, and whatever

guarantees they offer that every note issued will be re-

\deced by acceptance for merchandise or services by

the government, it is quite clear that a massive de-

feasible solvent, at par with gold; because the

idea prevails, both among the financiers and the

masses, that nobody should be allowed to do what

everybody else does not perceive the wisdom or nec-

essity of doing. This species of prohibition is decided-

ly against the method of industrial evolution. The

rule as to such progress is improvement by trial and selec-
tion of the most effective economic forms. Under free

choice any error in method is an immediate instruction to the observers, and the end as- 

once; but, when legislation steps in to prescribe and

proscribe beyond its proper province, which is to pre-

vent fraud and robbery, the inevitable errors of the

legislative are riveted in, and the evil may be of long duration before a repeal can be had.

Even then some other ill-fitting provisions are the

most probable sequence, and there are leaders and a

party best upon resisting the evidence that they

had perpetrated a mischief worse than their per-

sonal interests are concerned,—assuming that the

lawmakers are honest and not mercenary,—pride has

play and renders them stubborn, in grievous contrast to the mediocrity and the beneficence as

what he finds working ill in his business.

There are millions of dollars' worth of wealth in ev-

er State, which could be made available for the

ultimate redemption of backslades, and the owners of the

very manufacturers' wages which were their wages

could escape such interest charges as paralyzed in-

dustry in the western States, if they were free to or-

ganize their credits; but this must not be done, for

parties, however moderate their tendencies, agree to.

Bryan, are agreed that there shall be no contribution permitted in the nature of currency that does not eman-

ate from the government. But not to digress further from the purpose at present to notice what is proposed

Facts from Denver."

As the State government, say of Colorado, shall receive and store silver bullion and issue for each ounce a certificate and a note, the latter receivable for taxes for fifty cents; the certificate entitling the owner of one ounce of bullion on payment of fifty cents. Thus every ounce would be monetized at fifty cents, and the variable excess value would be the market value of the certificates.

This plan appears to promise entire safety, and puts no

pressure upon the owner to redeem his marginal property in the bullion. As the notes would be a clear additional to the circulating medium, they would not be able to bear any high rate of charge for the issu-

ance, and are likely enough to cover the expenses of ware-

housing the silver, and the certificate duties. 2.

Important, as this plan may be for the western States, it should set men thinking that the more im-

portant and the more necessary is the establishment of which many other excellent expedients, to some persons per-haps less clear, but in principle the same, could be made available to release industry from onerous trib-

ute. The raw material is not sold, for the value of the utility of silver or of paper that could be based upon the

value of plantations and that stores of insured goods, with ample margin of security, because, they

say, the laboring man gets nothing without working for it; hence it is a fallacy. The raw materials the man stands on is a visible connection between his enforced idleness and the price some men of property would have to pay for the hire of money to set that laborer at work. The property-owner may
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