On Pick Duty.

My apologies to Com. de Small, of Provincetown, for so long dehavng his forcible exposure of the inefficiency of the government in its vaunted life-saving service.

Lombroso has been studying Lucchenti, and finds in him all the signs of the criminal. A wag once sent a collection of photographs to Lombroso as material for his studies in criminology. The doctor had no difficulty in demonstrating that the originals were criminals of the worst type. Yet they were the most honest women in the world.

Mr. George E. Macdonald is requested not to be funny at my expense, unless he can either so clarify his wit as to make it transparent to his readers, or else educate his readers up to the level of his opaque humor. It appears that some weeks ago he launched a shaft at me, in consequence of which sordid "Truthseeker" devotees have been soberly circulating a report of my death, thereby causing no slight agitation to friends of mine living at a distance. It is well to be funny, but it is hardly safe to be too funny in the presence of a reader of the "Truthseeker."

A primrose by the river's brim
A yellow primrose is to him,
And it is nothing more.

To those Archists who oppose imperialism on the ground that it violates the doctrine that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed" the imperialists point out that we already govern Indians, women, Chinese, and children without their consent. To any governmentalist assequing in government of these classes this ought to be a convincing answer. But the New York "World" tries to crawl out by claiming that Jefferson, when he wrote the phrase quoted, had in mind peoples, not persons, and that it is perfectly right to govern individuals without their consent so long as nations are not thus governed. It follows from this position that if, in the process of evolution to a higher condition, the people of the United States should develop coincidently the love of liberty and the love of order to such an extent as to warrant them in allowing their national existence to lapse, and should thereafter presume to sustain, as individuals, the voluntary, complex, and harmonious relations that characterize a highly-developed civilization, it would then be perfectly right, and perfectly in accord with the Declaration of Independence, for an association of inferior beings, not yet developed out of the national stage,—the people of Spain, for instance,—to pounce upon the superior Americans, who had outgrown nationalism, and govern them without their consent. Is the "World" ready to face this logic? Imperialism or Anarchism,—that is the alternative. The Archists are the only foe of imperialism who has firm ground to stand on.

"The great aim of every man," says Tolstoi, "should be to serve by others as little as possible, and to serve others as much as possible." It cannot be inadvisable to accept service from others, unless service is an evil thing. But, if service be an evil thing, it must be quite as objectionable to encourage others to accept it from us as to accept it ourselves from them. There is no sophistry that can enable Altruism to escape this logic. The truth is that measured exchange of service is the most beneficial thing in the world, but that unmeasured and unreciprocal gift of service, except those services current among equals as acts of courtesy, implies a condition of deplorable dependence. The great aim of every man should be, not to give as much service as possible, but to make it unnecessary to give any at all. The Tolstoiennes ethics are rooted in a false conception, unintelligently entertained, of inequality and dependence as permanent and desirable.

I have just published as a pamphlet of about forty-eight pages my argument against the New York special jury law, under the title "A Blow at Trial by Jury." Though not specifically Archistic, it is an effective document for general circulation, and will be found especially useful in awakening the interest of lawyers. My second pamphlet, now on the press and soon to be ready for delivery, will consist of the opening essay in "Instead of a Book," entitled "State Socialism and Anarchism: How Far They Agree, and Wherein They Differ." Sold at a low price in lots of one hundred copies and carrying advertisements of Archistic literature, it is expected that henceforth it will be the principal factor in inducing thinkers to study the more elaborate expositions of the libertarian philosophy. Its publication will be followed, in January or February, by that of a third pamphlet, entitled "Are Anarchists Thugs?" to consist of "Ex-Attaché's" recent letter to the New York "Tribune" and my answer thereto, the latter being reprinted from the "Tribune" in this issue of Liberty. It will prove an eye-opener to those misinformed persons who suppose Anarchists to be madmen, and will be valuable for circulation among congressmen whenever legislation for the suppression of Anarchism shall be proposed.

No definite choice for the fourth pamphlet has yet been made; perhaps it will be Bellamy's admirable "Anarchy is Order," already begun, and yet to be finished, in Liberty.

The first edition of "Der Einzige und sein Eigenthum," published in 1845 by Otto Wigand, appeared in an exceptionally fine shape; typography, paper, presswork, and binding were in the best style of the bookmaker's art. Copies of this edition are very rare and costly. Two subsequent editions now in the market have fallen below the excellence of the first. It is now proposed to get out an edition de luxe (in German) of this masterpiece of revolutionary and philosophical literature, limited and numbered, the price not to fall below twenty marks (five dollars) or to exceed twenty-five marks. The enterprise will depend on the number of friends it may enlist in the coming two years. Those wishing to subscribe are requested to address John Henry Mackay, Pestalozza 4, Saarbrücken, Rheinprovinz, Germany. It is greatly to be wished that the enterprise may be crowned with success long before the term set for it. Let those readers of Liberty, therefore, who intend to become subscribers to the edition de luxe of "Der Einzige und sein Eigenthum" communicate with Mackay at once.

The shortest title on record may be justly claimed by Mr. C. L. Swartz, who has started a monthly periodical under the name "I." As may be inferred, it is an organ of Epic. It is published at Wellesley, Mass., at fifty cents a year. In its make-up it is a succession of the editor's thoughts, strung without regard to subject, in which respect it reminds one of the sometime defunct "Paragraphs," differing honorably, however, in being thoughtful and earnest where its unlamented model was merely flippant and insincere. "I" is interesting (the reader must excuse this descertainment of the memory of Lindley Murray; it is Mr. Swartz's fault) because its editor has something to say, is not afraid to say it, and generally says it well. The ground of my chief objection to it is its "improvement" on my end-space typography. Mr. S. utz gives the ragged edge to the left side of one column and to the right side of the next. To his eye this is beautiful (at least he says so with a sober face); to mine it is ugly in the extreme, merely a freakish burlesque of a new and good idea. And, as any printer will see at a glance, nearly all the labor-saving quality of my invention vanishes in this "improvement." Still, good luck to "I" (overboard goes the grammar again), in spite of its one folly.
Liberty.
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In the editorial column of arti-
cles of this number, the editor 
cates that the editor approves their general purpose and 
not general tenor, though he does not hold himself respon-
sible for every phrase or word. But the appearance in 
other parts of the paper of articles by the same or other 
several columns by the same or other 
authors notes that he disapproves them in any respect, such disposition of them being 
governed largely by motives of convenience.

A New Book on Anarchism.

"Anarchism: A Criticism and History of the Anarchist Theory," is the title of a work just published by the Panuns. The author is E. V. Zecker, but there is no publishers' note to enlighten us as to nationality and personality of the man bearing this name. The book is doubtless a true attempt, but even this is not stated. The work is without and without the author has a comprehensible conception of the scope, importance, and significance of the movement described. There is a long and discriminating chapter on Proudhon, another on Stirner and the German Proudhonists, including Mackay and Müllerburger, another on Bakouine and Russian influences, and a review of the present condition of Anarchism in Europe and America. Communist Anarchism is carefully distinguished from Individualist Anarchism, and the individualism of the Spencerian school is likewise differently dealt with.

The critical portion of the book is, in the main, fair and philosophical, while the critical portion is utterly without force or point. The stand-point of the author is that of a liberal and moderate individualist,—of a believer in political empiricism. He charges Anarchists with idealism and social mysticism, with making a number of arbitrary assumptions regarding man and the social organism. It is but just to say, however, that his knowledge of Individualist Anarchism is derived exclusively from Mackay and Müllerburger. He says: "I have been quite unable to procure any book on 'individual Anarchism, the copy of his journal, Liberty, although several booksellers did their best to help me, and although I applied personally to Mr. Tucker at Boston."

When these efforts were made, we were not informed, but, had Mr. Zecker examined Foele's Index, he would have found references to several magazine articles on Anarchism, notably that of Prof. Osgood in the "Political Science Quarterly."

I shall here animadvert upon but a few of Mr. Zecker's statements and criticisms. Take, for example, his concluding paragraph:

Anarchism may be defined etiologically as a selfish hold-up in the suitability of constituted society. With such views there would be only one way in which we could get the approval from under the Anarchists' feet. Society must absolutely watch that no one should have reason to doubt its intention of letting justice have free sway, but must raise up the despising and, by all means in its power, lead them back to their lost faith in society. A movement like Anarchism cannot be conquered by force, but only by justice and freedom.

This, of course, is loose and empty talk. It is exensible in the average journalist, but not in the painstaking student. How can Anarchism be curbed by justice and freedom, when, according to the Anarchist philosophy, neither justice or freedom is compatible with government? By freedom the Anarchist means the liberty to do everything not invasive of the equal rights of others, and by justice the observance and enforcement of this equality of freedom. Since government, as a principle, involves the denial of justice, it is evident that there can be no such conditions as Mr. Zecker pictures—of justice under government. The object of Anarchism is to abolish not certain particular abuses of government, but the institution itself, in place of which may be erected, for as long a time as necessary, a voluntary organization for the protection of all legitimate interests. Mr. Zecker may say that, if the greater abuses of government were eliminated, Anarchism would make no converts and be a voice crying in the wilderness, for the majority of men would be content to live under a government practising the minimum of invasion. This, however, is a totally fallacious position, which requires nothing more than a flat contradiction. What Mr. Zecker does say is simply meaningless or self-contradictory.

The author's lack of insight and acumen is also shown in his failure to grasp the essential difference between the Individualist Anarchists and the so-called Anarchist Communists. That there is a vital difference, relying emphasis, he is aware, but he is unable to define it. That the anti-State Communists who prefer Anarchist principles are fundamentally inconsistent; that their belief in small despotisms, in "groups," founded on compulsory cooperation, is such that they can no more harmonize than the followers of Karl Marx themselves.—does not seem to have dawned on Mr. Zecker. Yet he has read Mackay's novel and his analysis of the points at issue between the Anarchists, on the one hand, and, on the other, the Communists who follow Bakouine and Kropotkine.

The chapter on "Anarchism and Sociology" sets forth the "wide differences which separate the purely sociological standpoint of Spencer from the unsound standpoint of the Anarchists." Mr. Zecker is right in reproving those who call Spencer an Anarchist, and he has no difficulty in showing that the Spencerian belief in the compulsory protection of the State violates the very essence of Anarchistic teaching; but, when he undertakes to set up alleged "irreconcilable divergencies between Social Realists (the sociologists) and social Idealists (the Anarchists)," he draws upon his imagination alone. He says that those who speak of the State as a fact, a reality, only recognize an evolution which excludes any sudden leap, and that the view of Anarchism lies in the "idealist assumptions with reference to man and society,—assumptions that lead to an exaggerated and naive faith in more intellectual teaching. He is generous enough to admit that Proudhon was an exception; that he grasped the evolutionary conception, and was free from the besetting sins of priors philsophers. But he facetiously he is laying down a proposition absolutely fatal to Anarchism when he repeats the Spencerian declaration that, until men acquire that strong sense of justice which lies at the root of social activity, greater personal freedom is impossible. It is evident that a closer acquaintance with modern Anarchism would have shown Mr. Zecker the utter inapplicability of his criticisms. Since he has no other, we are driven to the conclusion that, if he really understood Anarchism, he would find himself in accord with its cardinal doctrines.

Mr. Zecker is very just and severe in his strictures upon Dühring, who tries to belittle Proudhon and to claim an originality for his own alleged improvements upon Proudhon to which he is not entitled. Dühring is opposed to the State founded in justice, and, in the principles of Anarchism, he calls up Anti-Anarchism, which, without overthrowing direction and organization, aims merely to do away with all unjust force. Upon this Mr. Zecker very peremptorily observes: "We who know what is right are just what Proudhon taught as "no government."" Auburn Herbert's "Voluntarism" is similarly shown to be indistinguishable from Anarchism. Speaking of Herbert's contention that the use of force even for defensive purposes by voluntary associations is inconsistent with Anarchism, Mr. Zecker says:

Practically, Auburn Herbert's distinction of terms is merely playing with words, for the "voluntary State" which I can leave at any moment, from which I can withdraw my financial support if I do not approve of its actions, is Proudhon's federation of groups in its strictest form; perhaps it is even Stirner's "Union of Eagles." At any rate, Herbert, like Stirner, prefers the unconditional acceptance of the principle of "mutually face... Carried into practice, Voluntarism would be as like Anarchism as two peas.

The English of the last sentence is rather defective, but the remark is sound and unanswerable. I am sorry that the very next sentence mars the above criticism, and betrays Mr. Zecker into a self-contradiction. He says: "Now the less, we must not undervalue the theoretical progress shown in the distinction. Herbert approaches within a hair's-breadth of the standpoint of sociology [meaning Spencerianism], and what separates it from it is not so much the logical accentuation of the social-contract theory as the indirect assumption of it."

How, pray, can Mr. Herbert be, at the same time, within a hair's-breadth of Spencerianism and within a hair's-breadth of Anarchism, when, as Mr. Zecker strenuously insists,—with
truth,—there is a great gulf between Individualism and Anarchism. If Voluntarism is merely another name for Anarchism, then Herbert is no nearer the "standpoint of sociology" than Anarchism is, and his distinction, far from having theoretical value, is pure juggling with words.

Besides, if Mr. Herbert is a Voluntarist simply because he believes in some sort of organization, and rejects Anarchism for the sole reason that it is opposed to any force whatsoever, then Individualist Anarchists are Voluntarists, and not Anarchists at all, from the Herbert point of view, for they all believe, with him, in some organization for some purposes. Mr. Herbert insists on giving the term Anarchism a definition wholly original with him, which no Anarchist accepts. This is absurd and gratuitous, of course, and, when the confusion resulting from this arbitrary construction is dissipated, Mr. Herbert is seen to be an Anarchist. Mr. Zdenker has hit his finger on the source of Mr. Herbert's strange persistence in disclaiming fellowship with the Anarchists.

What is interesting to ask, would happen if Mr. Zdenker should read "Instead of a Boy" and subsequently be called upon to revise his work for a second edition? Not a single criticism could he honestly suffer to remain standing. It is not surprising that he has fallen into some errors; the surprise is rather that his errors are so few. He deserves commendation and congratulation on his partial success.

V. Y.

Are Anarchists Thugs?*

To the Editor of the Tribune.

Sir,—I note in your issue of November 25 a letter on "Suppression of Anarchism," from an individual who signs himself "Ex-Attachée." After outlining the points to be considered by the international congress now in session at Rome, he goes on to deal with the so-called "Anarchistic peril," he declares that the most vital question to come before it is the question whether people may be punished for "merely professing Anarchism," and he gives it as his view that they may. He tells us that "Anarchism is not a political creed, but a cult of crime, an association formed with the avowed object of outrage and murder;" that "there is no politics about Anarchism, but that it is solely and entirely criminal;" that, once this is unanimously allowed to be a fact, "Anarchists can be hunted down, wherever found, and placed under lock and key," that "the mere fact of belonging to the cult of Anarchism constitutes a crime," just as "the mere fact of belonging to the cult of Trougery" in India "constituted a crime;" and that, just as "the English authorities either hanged or imprisoned for life every native that could be judicially proved to be a Thug, irrespective of the question whether he had committed any definite murder or not," so "it has now become the duty of the various govern-ments, in their role of the responsible protectors of the people subject to their control, to shield them from the Anarchists, who are merely white Thugs, precisely in the same way as the English did in India."

In view of this extraordinary promulgation, I ask you and your readers to consider calmly with me for a few moments the two principal questions involved in it:

First—Is it true that "Anarchism is not a political creed, but a cult of crime," having only and real disposed to its "philosophical objects?"

Second—Who, in the United States, are the "white Thugs" whom it will be necessary, in case the execution of "Ex-Attachée's" plan is decided upon, to either hang or imprison for life?

But it is proper that, before dealing with these two questions, I should show my qualifications to answer them with some authority, on the strength of knowledge gained by experience and accurate information.

I am an Anarchist. I was the first American—I may say the first Anglo-Saxon—to start (in 1872) an American Anarchist newspaper printed in the English language. I am still the editor, publisher, and proprietor of that paper. It is everywhere regarded as the pioneer and principal organ of modern individualist Anarchism. I either am, or have been, the publisher of the chief Anarchist works in the English language. I am the author of the most widely-accepted English text-book of Anarchism. I have enjoyed the friendship, had the benefit of the instruction, and have carefully studied the works, of these Americans from whom the Anarchists have largely derived their beliefs—Josiah Warren, Stephen Pearl Andrews,Lyman Spooner, and Colonel William B. Gannaway, who was the first writer in any language to declare himself an Anarchist. I am acquainted, perhaps better than any other man, with the English-speaking Anarchists of the United States. It will be admitted then, I hope, that I speak by the ear.

Now, to the first question. What is Anarchism—a political creed or a creed of crime? Anarchism, as defined by Anarchists, is the belief in the greatest amount of liberty compatible with equality of liberty. In other words, the belief in every liberty except the liberty to invade. It is an implication of this definition that Anarchism means the abolition of government and the State; for government and the State, as defined by Anarchists, are debased, by their very nature, from allowing the greatest amount of liberty compatible with equality of liberty, and are necessarily invasive, government being defined as the subjection of the non-invasive individual to an external will, and the State being defined as the embodiment of the principle of invasion in an individual, a band of individuals, assuming to act as representatives or masters of the entire people within a given area. All the foregoing definitions are taken from the text-books. The purpose of Anarchism, then, is to put an end to every form of invasion, and to establish a condition of equal liberty.

The truth or falsity of this position is not now in question. The point at issue is: Is it a political creed? Certainly no sane man can answer that question in the negative. True or false, sound or unsound, it unquestionably is a belief, and a political belief. And it is this, even if it be a "cult of crime" also. Whether or not Anarchism is a cult of crime will depend, in the view of the believer in government,—and it is to him that I am now addressing myself,—on the means which Anarchists intend to employ for the abolition of the invasive State. If those means include violence and murder, then the believer in government is hereby entirely justified, from his point of view, to consider Anarchism a cult of crime. But, if the means proposed are strictly peaceful, specifically excluding violence and murder as dangerous, futile, inexpedient, and absurd, then the believer in government, from his professed point of view, is bound to regard Anarchism not as only a political creed, but as an orderly and legitimate political creed, which every one believing it is entitled to expound without endangering thereby his life or his liberty.

What, then, are these means? Again I quote from the text-books, not giving chapter and verse, but I may be suspected of making the "Tribune"'s hospitality a means of advertising my wares.

The right to resist oppression by violence is beyond doubt. Only one thing, however, can justify its exercise on any large scale—namely, the denial of free thought, free speech, and a free press. Even then its exercise would be unwise, unless suppression were enforced with the utmost violence and with no other means than bloodshed. But it should be clearly understood that it can never accomplish the social revolution proper; that it can never be accomplished except by means of agitation, investigation, experiment, and passive resistance; and that, after all, the bloodshed, we shall be exactly where we were before, except in our possession of power to use these means.

And still again:

The idea that Anarchy can be inaugurated by force is as fallacious as the idea that it can be sustained by force. Force cannot preserve Anarchy; neither can it bring it. In fact, one of the inevitable influences of the use of force is to postpone Anarchy. The only thing that force can ever do is to save us from extinction, to give us a longer lease of life in which to try to secure Anarchy by the only methods that can ever bring it. But this advantage is always purchased at immense cost, and its attainment is always attended by frightful risk. The attempt should be made only when the risk of any other course is greater.

When a physician sees that his patient's strength is being exhausted so rapidly that the intensity of his disease is about to become too terrific for the medical processes inaugurated to have a chance to do their curative work, he administers an opiate. But a good physician is always ready to do so, knowing that one of the principal duties of the physician is to cut through the medical processes themselves. He never does it except as a choice of evils. It is the same with the use of force, whether of the mob or of the State, upon diseased society; and not only those who propose to use the opiate of extermination before it is remedied and a permanent tonic, but all who ever propose it as a cure, and even all who would lightly and unnecessarily resort to it, not as a cure, but as an expedient, are weak.

These quotations abundantly show that Anarchist, far from having outrage and murder as its object, deplores the use of force against the State in any form or at any time, and sanctions it only when freedom of the press has been absolutely suppressed and all peaceful means of restoring it have failed. This is the view taken by nearly all real Anarchists. If here and
there a single individual takes another view and acts upon it, he finds no encouragement thereto in the creed of Anarchism, and he acts against the counsel and the judgment of nearly all his fellows. And, if any section of the party to which the slayer of the Austrian emperor belongs—a party of Communists who incoherently style themselves Anarchists—favors a policy of forcible revolution, this fact does not make it a criminal offence to belong to the totally distinct party of real Anarchists, who were the first to adopt the name, who descend from Proudhon in France and from Warren in America, and who are trying to achieve by peaceful means a condition of equal liberty.

The real Anarchist, try not to become a party of violence until! "Ex-Atchae" plan for its suppression shall be put into operation; in fact, it is he and such as he who are doing their best to transform a thoroughly peaceful movement into an organization for forcible resistance to oppression. Until he shall succeed, the means and methods of Anarchism will remain what they have been from the beginning,—namely, (1) education of the people to an understanding of the principle of equal liberty and its various applications; (2) peaceful combination of the people so educated, for the fullest exercise of their liberties in the spheres of industry, commerce, and finance—and exercise sure to result, in their view, in better economic and social conditions, in gradual removal of the causes of crime, and in what Proudhon happily called "the dissolution of government in the economic organism.

It is not true, then, that Anarchism is not a political creed, but a cult of crime. The truth is that Anarchism is not a cult of crime, but a political creed.

The first question answered, let us proceed to the second. Who are the active and avowed Anarchists of the United States? Who are the "white Thugs" whom "Ex-Atchae" would have the United States government either hang or imprison for life? I will tell him.

The Anarchists of the United States include:

First—Scores of lawyers. One is the active member of perhaps the leading law firm of the third city of the United States. Another was formerly the chosen legal adviser of the second city of the United States. These members of the bar would have to be transferred to the prisoner's dock, there to plead to a charge of Thuggery.

Second—Scores of physicians, of both sexes, most of them representing the so-called "regular" schools of medicine. One of them holds a high place in a New York hospital. These would have to expect from sheriff or jailer a bitter pill than any they ever administered.

Third—At least three professional librarians, presiding over three libraries of large proportions—two public libraries and one university library. Their duties would presently be confined to the distribution of Sunday-school books to their fellow-communists.

Fourth—Numerous teachers in public and private schools. One has been for years an instructor in one of the most prominent public schools in New England. Another, now teaching in a private school, had the reputation at his university of eclipsing in scholarship any member of the faculty. These, instead of bringing up more Anarchists, would find themselves brought up with a jerk at the end of a rope.

Fifth—One or two college professors. One, who occupies the chair of electric engineering in a well-known university, would perhaps be placed in an electric chair of another sort.

Sixth—A large number of journalists, filling high positions on the "drills," weeklies, and monthlies, from B.B.s to San Francisco. Most of them, it is painful to admit, would rather write lies than live on bread and water. "Ex-Atchae" hopes to deprive them of their choice.

Seventh—Perhaps a dozen inventors of mechanical and industrial processes now in use, the patents on which are worth many thousands of dollars. These will probably escape the gallows, if they will consent to exercise their ingenuity, within prison walls, in devising means of subjecting a peculiarly Thuggish Thug, like myself, to the torture of an exquisitely hetertofore undreamt of.

Eighth—A considerable number of engineers, civil, mechanical, and electrical; some of them of high rank in their profession, and deriving from its practice correspondingly high incomes. The noose awaits these dangerous men of science.

Ninth—Half a dozen architects of no mean repute. One of them was recently declared in writing by Professor Ware, of Columbia,—the highest American authority in this matter,—to be one of the only two available men within his knowledge competent to take charge of the design of architecture in one of the first universities of America. Another, though still young, has made a great name in his profession, his buildings being noted for originality and beauty. It is to be hoped that "Ex-Atchae" will allow each of these to design the gallows on which he is to be hanged.

Tenth—Several bankers, brokers, and operators in the market. One of these recently wound up the affairs of a national bank of which he had been appointed receiver by the government. The stock transactions of two others amount to hundreds of thousands of dollars. Between these men and the hereafter there is a very narrow margin, which, if "Ex-Atchae" has his way, will soon be exhausted.

Eleventh—Very many manufacturers and merchants, employing large numbers of men and rated A No. 1 by "Broadstreet's." One of these, a self-made man, who in a quarter of a century has risen from nothing to affluence, not only pays the highest wages, but gives half his profits to his employees; furthermore, he is engaged in the nefarious practice of teaching Anarchism to his employees, trying to make "white Thugs" out of them, and is much disapproved at the slow progress he is making in this direction. Fortunately, these men of standing and credit in their respective communities are presently to take a sudden drop.

Twelfth—Farmers by the score, among them fruit-growers in California and Florida. One of them occasionally sends me a box of oranges. Consequently I especially regret to learn of the harvest of wrath in store for him.

Thirteenth—Government clerks. If these were hanged or sent to prison, their posts will be filled by others, who may become Anarchists in turn. Nothing so inspires dignity with government as an opportunity to closely view its working.

Fourteenth—At least one policeman. This Anarchistic anomaly, in the prosecution of his duties as a member of "the force" in one of the largest of our cities, has arrived at a bad opinion of the law, which, as the poet assures us, will not become a good opinion when he "feels the halter draw."

Fifteenth—Artists of every sort—painters in oil, engravers, designers, musicians, composers, and poets; poets especially. "Ex-Atchae" will find it necessary to hang the poets. For them

Some walls do not a prison make, Nor iron bars a cage.

Sixteenth—Workers in every craft—printers, plasters, carpenters, machinists, etc. Generally the best in their craft and an honor to it. Some of them are of prominence and influence in their trades unions. These, too, will keep the hangman busy.

And, lastly, one or two millionaires. Ah! that will be a novel spectacle, O "Ex-Atchae"—a millionaire on the gallows! Truly, you are a masterhand at "propaganda by deed."

I would undertake to call, on occasion, in New York, from all parts of the United States, a delegate convention of five hundred representative Anarchists, which should be not only a perfectly orderly assemblage, but a gathering unsurpassed in point of character, and probably unequalled in point of intelligence, by any gathering of similar size ever seen in a public building on Manhattan island.

Serious, does any man of sober judgment believe it possible either to hang or to imprison so many such men as these?

New York, November 27, 1898.

BENJ. R. TUCKER.
tence as a paragraph with a "hanging indenta-
tion." So, with two or three exceptions, I
should have liked Mr. Crosby's "War Echoes"
better, had they been offered in the dress of
prose. One of the exceptions is "Woman and
War," which seems to me the best piece in the
little collection. It has method, meaning, sug-
gestion; it is picturesque; and, by effective
symbolism it constructs an effective climax.
Liking this most, I like least "Russia and
America," beginning "God bless the ear!"
The ear with his peace-offering is as aly as a
green-goods operator, and Mr. Crosby, in
stretching out his hand for it, is as nàive as a
Kentucky "come-on." Much as I hate Rud-
yard Kipling's nationalism, I confess that I find
it refreshing to turn from "Russia and
America" to "The Trace of the Bear." But,
after all this is said, I find much to admire in
these "War Echoes." While unable to de-
nounce war as absolutely as Mr. Crosby does,
I long with him for that time when war shall
be no more; and these "Echoes" are resonant
with a magnificence born of this aspiration.
I pray Mr. Crosby the results will be as
superb as it is sincerely when I say that it is with
his personality a little as it was with that of
Wendell Phillips,—one cannot meet him on the
street, or hear his rich and earnest voice upon
the platform, without saying to himself: Here
is a real man, a splendid specimen of the genus
homo. And these "War Echoes" give one
something of the impression which one receives
from their author's personality.

After the election of Roosevelt to the gov-
ernorship, Henry Weissman, who had sup-
ported him, was the favorite in the race for the
commissionership of labor statistics. But it is
evident that at the finish he will be classed with
those who "also ran." Mr. Roosevelt, on being
informed of his Anarchist record, dropped
him as fast as he would a hot potato. And yet he's not so warm. I
first met Weissman at Justus Schwab's salon.
Then he was talking Anarchism. He was
editor of the organ of the bakers' unions; and in
its columns advocated Anarchism as far as he
dared to. He became a delegate of the bakers
to the Denver convention of the American
Federation of Labor, and there he lined up with
Cohen, Mcnaught, and the other Anarchistic
delegates, to defeat State Socialism, and place
Anarchistic planks in the Federation's platform.
But, though we had hopes of him, he never was a "plumb-line." He quickly he began to try
law,—usually, though not always, the first
step in an Anarchist's decline. Next he was con-eating with the Mugwumps, and stumping for
Seth Low for the mayoralty. And last fall we
found him a full-fledged Republican, out for
Roosevelt and the stuff. Naturally Roosevelt
slated him for an office, and it appears that,
though he dropped him quickly, he did so with
great reluctance. The "Sun" tells us that
"Roosevelt liked Weissman because he had
common sense, and had not the narrow view of
labor questions that most walking delegates are
possessed of." In fact, he used conversations
with Roosevelt to decamp that capitalists and em-
ployees have some rights." But, in spite of
this, Roosevelt had to drop Weissman, because
he was, or had been, an Anarchist, and take up,
in his stead, some labor politician as ignorant
and narrow-minded as Roosevelt himself, and
as ardent in chasing the dollar as Roosevelt in
hunting fame. Were not Roosevelt essentially
the shallow-pate that he is, he would not have
been surprised to hear of Weissman's Anarch-
ism, but would have seen at once that his
Anarchistic schooling was the very thing that
accounted for his philosophical breadth of view.
But I am shedding no tears over Weissman. I
am glad that we have lost him, and that he has
lost the coveted office. Let would-be politicians
take warning from his fate. They are not
wont in the Anarchists' movement, and it is
not for their interest to join it.

Since the appearance of the November num-
ber of Liberty I have received pledges in aid of
the pamphlet work as follows: Andrew Hogg,
Cincinnati, $15 a year; H. Walter Dörken,
Montreal, $50 a year for five years; E. B.
McKenzie, Boston, $10 for 1899. In addition
I have received the following contributions:
W. A. Smith, Boston, $5; James Robb, Bos-
ton, $2. This showing is encouraging, but I
have not yet to show that the prospects would
have been much greater, had not the post office,
with its usual inefficiency, played havoc with the
November issue. No previous issue had
been as carefully wrapped and mailed; yet
many subscribers never received the November
number, and scarcely one received it promptly.
For the information of those who failed to see
it, I announce again that an Anarchistic fellow-
worker has voluntarily offered and agreed to
give me $500 annually, to be expended for the
cause at my discretion, and that in consequence
I shall be able to publish each year six eight-
page issues of Liberty and a minimum of six
pamphlets. All receipts through subscriptions,
sales, and additional pledges will be devoted to
additional book and pamphlet work. Thus
now in press has been given to the Anarchistic
movement, and it is hoped that all who can will
carve a quietening hand.

G. P. Putnam's Sons, the publishers of Dr.
Zenker's book, did not send a copy for review
of Liberty, the paper of all others to which this
book should have been supplied. Moreover,
when Liberty requested a copy for review, the
request was refused. I regard this refusal as the
tribute of niggardliness to honesty. The
Putnamks knew that Liberty wished to review
the book. They knew that, so wishing, it
would review it in a fair and square
without ulterior motive. They knew that a free
copy of the book would not buy Liberty's good
opinion, and that a refusal would not excite
Liberty to an adverse opinion. They prudently
saved their money, sold me a copy of the book,
and have received the best review of it that has
yet appeared. The Putnams are great business
men, and I beg them to accept the assurance of
my most distinguished consideration.

Tolstoi declares that he will "never have
faith in the sincerity of the Christian and
humanitarian views of a person who has his
chamber-vessel emptied by a servant." There
are well-known disciples of Tolstoi in New
York who are able to keep servants, and who, I
presume, do keep servants and have their
chamber-vessels emptied by them. I know
them to be perfectly sincere people, and, if
they adopt a line of conduct not at all points in
keeping with their belief, they doubtless have
good reasons for it. At any rate, I shall be
the last to arraign anybody for inconsistency of
private conduct with professed belief. But I
much desire to know what these well-to-do
Toletians, who surely are conscious of the sin-
cerity with which they hold their beliefs, think
of the charge of insincerity which their master
prefers against them in a manner as amusing as
unique.

While I agree almost entirely with Mr.
Yarros searching criticism of Dr. Zenker's
book on Anarchism, it seems to me that he does
that author too much honor. Around every
movement there always hovers a swarm of back-
writers on the lookout for material from which
to manufature "copy." In impudence, laziness,
recklessness, and dishonesty they differ widely
in degree. Dr. Zenker doubtless is one of
the best of his class. He will be fair, when it
is not too difficult to be unfair. But the
class is, to my mind, a very unworthy one. To
attack such writers respectfully requires more
patience than I possess. A trifling instance of
Dr. Zenker's carelessness is seen in his repre-
sentation of John Henry Mackay as a million-
aire,—the truth, easily ascertainable by Dr.
Zenker, being that Mackay has no fortune at
all, and lives most modestly and inexpensively.

"The Eagle and the Serpent," whose sym-
bolic title is suggested by Nietzsche's statement
that "the proudest animal among the animals
is the wisest animal under the sun have set out
to reconcile," has gone bravely on during the
period of Liberty's subsistence, and is now at its
sixth issue. My general criticism upon it
may be summarized in the remark that, while it
gratifies my ears with an incessant repetition
of the eagle's scream, it too seldom affords me
the still greater pleasure of listening to the ser-
pent's hiss.

"To believe that the trust can permanently
exist in the United States," says Wan. J.
Bryan, "is to believe that wrong committed
indirectly and upon a large scale is less objec-
tionable than wrong committed directly." On
the contrary, Mr. Bryan: to claim that the trust
should be suppressed by law is to claim that
that which is right when done by a single per-
son becomes wrong when done by two or more
persons in voluntary combination.

The Ohio law giving the jury the right to
decide whether a convicted murderer shall suffer
the death penalty or be imprisoned for life,
recently declared constitutional in the common
pleas court, is a step in the right direction. In
all trials the jury should fix the penalty as well
as decide the question of guilt.

A New Industry in New York State.

According to the Cayuga "Chief," the enterprising
village of Montezuma is growing rich out of the burn-
ing of fish nets, in accordance with the new game
law, which provides for the burning of nets before
justices of the peace and gives the person taking them from the
river a county order for five dollars. Nets are made
of cheap mosquito-netting, costing fifty cents. They
are placed in the river, then "captured," and taken
to Justice Higgins, by whose directions they are burned.
The caper gets his five dollars, and then more mos-
quitos-nets are put in.
They Are So Dev'lish Sly.

Why lait the people found them out? Why?

The reason is, without no doubt, they are so dev'lish sly.

They wasn't born yesterday: They're never blood and tears;

They isn't never been this way For twice five thousand years.

To hear 'em talk of God and Christ
You'd think they angels was;

But all this slobber, I've surmised,
Is jest to burl their laws.
And the talk they make such ol'keys, now;
And so pro-raps and spy, and go to them and 'acket—Whew! They are so dev'lish sly!

Monopoly of money
By chattel's money own;
'Ve're gut: and, talkin' money,
Total almoin the town.
Monopoly of land they her,
Till liberty's most gone,
By gittin' yer'v false and have
To vote the mvler on.

Monopoly of goods they've struck
By de traction of all public livery
By hoggin' other stuff;
Monopoly of lies to tell
They alders hell, Gorr'y, ye!
They'll git monopoly of hell,
And they are also dev'lish sly.

"Uncle Sam" as Life-Saver.

To the Editors of Liberty:
Liberty now has a home in the Provincetown public library, so that the people of this town may learn what Anarchism actually is and what it propounds to do. If the town will establish a public library to post themselves on the subject. The latter part of last winter I addressed a notice to one of the trustees of the library, requesting permission to place a copy of Liberty therein, and, after waiting several weeks, I received the following reply:

PRINCETOWN, April 29, 1897.

DEAR SIR,—Your letter, with copy of Liberty, received.

Hoping that you will be followed by others public spirited citizens. I remain,
Yours very truly,
A. P. HANSEN.

The readers of this note will rightly judge that Mr. Hansteen must be a liberal and liberal-minded man. While not an advocate of Anarchist, he does not fail to see the destructive tendency of the legislation of these days.

His position is in marked contrast to that of the Rev. J. R. Biggs, who proposed in the New York Tribune that the Anarchists might see him, and, if he is one of the trustees, would have used all his little influence against having Liberty placed in our library. It is to be hoped that this exact same legislation, which is here recorded, will have the effect of opening the doors of like institutions in many other towns to this mighty advocate of Anarchism.

But the United States Life-Saver, Service is an institution which gets a vast deal of praise from the governmentalists. Once a year a long report is issued from the superintendent's office at Washington, telling how many millions of dollars' worth of property has been important or imperiled, and what a small percentage was actually lost; how many thousands of men were aboard the vessels, and how few of them were allowed to find a watery grave, etc.

But some things have happened to excite the suspicion of the mariners that everything is not as right, and I will relate a couple of incidents that have occurred in this vicinity during the past year. During the fearful blizzard that swept this coast on Dec. 23, 1890, the four-masted schooner, Calvitt B. Orett, Captain Pratt, bound from Portland to Baltimore, in ballast, was caught by a force of the gale, with the capt. vessel was lost in the storm, and the entire crew of nine men, was left to tell the story of their awful struggle.

The vessel was first sighted about 3:30 in the after the gale from St. Vincent, by two men not ever met with the crew. who on a vessel the Chatham station of her dangerous position. The schooner, however, could not be reached by the crew of the new vessel. The captain of the vessel was so rough that they could not cross the New Harbor in their boat. Such being the case, the next thing to do was to notify the crew of the station north (Orleans) and have them proceed as soon as the vessel's assistance, if perchance possible, might reach them. The cable, carrying a two-hour, is supposed to connect the two stations, but it had been broken for a week, so that it was necessary to send the message by a steamer to the nearest station, which was n'toc-kock-seven and one half hours after the vessel was first discovered when it was delivered. The men at once took their apparatus, and started for the wreck, but, when they reached a point on the beach about three miles from it, it was too late to notify any service, for the crew had all been swept away.

A few days afterwards a government official was sent down to investigate the affair, but it was not until June 15 that the report was given to the public in one of the newspapers. Tis the gist of this report was that, "if all the life-saving crews in the United States had been on Orleans beach that night, nothing could have been done towards saving the Orett crew."

But there is another side to the story. At the solicitation of many of his neighbors, Mr. George Eldridge, the veteran hydrographer whose marine charts are in universal use, and the making of which he is supposed to have given him a minute examination of the wreck and the causes that led to it. The results of his labors were published in the Boston "Globe" of June 17. According to this letter, Mr. Eldridge found that the probable cause of the vessel getting ashore was the fact that the whistling buoy of New Harbor was a mile from its right position, and had been so for some two months; that, instead of pounding herself to pieces at her anchors on the bar, a long distance from the shore, the discovery of her anchors and chains proved that she must have broken up on the beach; and that, if the Orleans patrol had gone over their best as they should, they could have seen that the vessel had broken up on the beach. Mr. Eldridge closed his letter with the following four pertinent questions: "Why did not the Orleans patrol cover his best on the evening of December 23? Why was the telephone cable connecting the Orleans and Chatham-life-saving stations allowed to remain broken nearly a month? Why was there no telephone in the patrol house on Nourset beach, as there is in each patrol house on Chatham beach? Why was the station at the junction of Chatham, New Harbor bus, allowed to be more than a mile out of position for about two weeks?"

He asked for "satisfactory answers" to these questions, and those who have up to date some have been given to the public. In the "Globe" of July 16 appeared letters from the captain and tw0 of the surfmen of the Orleans station, in which they assert that they did all that they could do on that fatal night to save the vessel.

"Well, what, for the sake of argument, that they did; we then have the affair of the whistling buoy out of its proper position for two weeks, and the telephone cable too broke at a time of the year when wrecks at this point of the coast are of frequent occurrence. Speaks real, doesn't it, for government management of our coast stations? No exclusive communication.

As to be wondered at that our mariners are getting a little shaky about the beauties of this institution, when they call to mind the fate of the Orett and her crew."

During the summer of 1995 a new station was erected on one of the Provincetown beaches, and it was ready for the crew by the last of November, 1890. The captain was on duty, and the men who were to go there had been examined, and were waiting for orders to enter the station and assume their duties.

Days passed away, however, and no orders came; so finally, a couple of the lieutenants wrote to Congressman John Stimpson, at Washington, to find out, if possible, what was the trouble. Pickles at once called on Superintendent Kimball, who is the head of the department, and that gentleman was greatly surprised but the crew was not on duty. Within twenty four hours instructions came from headquarters for the men to take their place immediately. Fine state of things, wasn't it, when the men who were detailed for service for many days in the month of December,—the same month in which the Orett was lost,—and the chief of the organization didn't know that the men were not at their post. Perhaps it will be well for our State superintendent of schools to give some heed to such warnings as these.

After being advertised for many months, a fine house, and land connected with it, were sold at auction the other day for $700. The price is taxed by our assessors for $1,000,—more than double what it brought at a public auction.

This is but one of many cases that I might cite to prove that real estate in this town is taxed far above its value, and due to the notion of "prosperity." No doubt this state of affairs will somewhat surprise a man who is continually asserting that real estate does not get taxed for its market value in any locality.

Only a few years ago Provincetown was the bustling port of a large fleet of vessels that were engaged in the cod, mackerel, and whaling industries. To day, however, it exists only for tourism, for, while the prices of oil and fish ever tended downward, taxes, interest, and insurance travelled in the other direction, until at last the gap became so wide and deep that owners of the craft were forced into bankruptcy, and the vessels were sold for a mere song in many instances and carried to other ports. During the past two years many of the old whalers and decaying buildings have been torn down by their owners, in order to lessen their taxes, and the once celebrated beach has already been purchased by city residents, with the intention of erecting thereon summer estates, and the prospect now is that in a few years the town will be known as a famous watering place. As this movement progresses, the places of the brave and hardy mariners will be filled with those who, in order to live, must sell their services to the wealthy, until our free and independent producers shall have vanished like the magnificent vessels of old.

J. T. SMALL.
PROCTETOWN, June 29, 1897.

The Power of Will."

[Camille Masseur in "L'Assassine."]

While Paris is restless; while feverish groups gather about the doorways of public halls at the conclusion of meetings; while anxious public opinion questions the newspapers; while an upperproceeds from the populous suburban districts; and while in the streets, at night, the phantom of angry Justice is seen to ride slowly behind the massacre, the path of the patrol,—in a lonely cell, perhaps beyond the reach of the murmurs of the masses, Colini Pieganti, tranquil, quiet, single, silent, listens only to the counsels of his repeatedly wifeful soul.

He has been placed alone with his conscience; and there the two converse, sufficient unto themselves. They are unaware of the train of powder which has been lighted behind them, and which extends to the excitement of the crowd. They do not foresee the rising and that the clamor of the proletariat is calling for their release. They hear in the darkness only the steps of the sentinel and perhaps the more fervent affirmations of those interested associates. He speaks to his conscience and his conscience looks each other in the face, and are not afraid.

Yonder, at the end of the world, on the inalurrochable, the despairing passenger on Deril's Island also talks nothing, bears nothing, is simple. He is unaware of the Immense tumult that his name has awakened in the world. But he is innocent; his stern

* Written after the Incastration of Colonel Pieganti and before the decision of the court of ream to reopen the Drury case.
that one need not be affiliated to a party in order to prosper.

M. de Quivert is neither a Socialist, nor an anarchist, nor a revolutionary, nor a prophet, or an arbiter, or an astronomical mathematician, or a member of the upper house. He was an officer who loved his work and did it faithfully. What he saw he did not cry upon the house-tops, but, on the day when it became obligatory upon him to tell the truth, he told the whole world the pressure in the air could not alter his decision. Is it thought that he has known no inner struggles,—this man of cold exterior? Surely he has known them. He saw where all this would lead him, from the day when he was asked to deliver the speech he delivered, from the hope that he would meet his death. But it was his duty to go on; he did not recognize his right to have inner struggles. And, with eyes fixed tranquilly on the façade of Champs Elysées under which he saw half open, as for him long ago, he advanced. In this, more than in all else, he is admirable. An unprecedented drama forces us, and all Europe, to centre attention on two little jails containing two prisoners; yet we are not much concerned with them, for it is one there is the whole of human despair and in all the other the beauty of character. And around them gather and grow the passions and all the phantoms that pervert in compromise, even by silence.

To "Napoleon, professor of energy," whose malevolent cult the Cisrarians and the sceptics are restoring, we will oppose Quivert, professor of will, as an exemplary civic figure in democracy. He shows us that there is no master of the master of his brain, his heart, and his nerves. He shows us that a man worthy of the name can be neither praised or insulted. Carlyle would have loved him with enthusiasm, Victor Hugo with Vigny would have shaken his hand in silence. He is truly the modern hero, the being steadily in accord with himself. And, when he meditates far from our agitations, he is happy, because he sees within him only thoughts that are pure. He will never be so much at peace in that cell, to which his presence lends honor, and in which he sits in judgment on himself.

Above Social Forces.

(Henry Loyet in "L'Adven."

I hate society. It is the triumph of hypocrisy, of violence, of falsehood, of crime. The plagues and the persecutors direct it against all justice, against all truth. It puts Jesus on the cross every day. It must be destroyed.

Society takes everything from us, owes everything to us. The social compact is a lie. It is imposed upon us from our first wall to our last sigh. We have never signed it. We accept it through ignorance. We endure it through cowardice. It must be torn up.

No more than the fees payable for our fathers' errors are we responsible for their submission to the spirit of slavery. Beyond affection,—if they succeed in deserving it,—we have not to retain any feeling for them which would change or diminish us. To profess such and such opinions, to practise such or such a religion, because these were the opinions and the religion of our fathers,—that is simply ridiculous; it is a more serious matter to bend our necks to the social yoke because they accepted it with resignation. It must be shaken off.

Born free, we must live as freemen. Laws are chains. There would be some excuse for them if they guaranteed the development of an independent and opulent society. But, from the cabinet minister to the humblest laborer, they defraud them with impunity, and no magistrate has the courage to enforce them against them. They must be altered or abolished.

The free man is a serious citizen. The individual who is virtuous only through fear of the policeman is the worst of criminals. To obey only one's conscience, paying no heed to society's commands, is the sublime role of a solitary reviver of some of the acts. It weakens under the weight of traditions, prejudices, of sociologies. It must be freed and enlightened.

Traditions, religions,—sources of error; schools of slavery. Adoration of the God discloses people to respect for ephemeral l'id. Respect for the past binds them in the present. The reason subjected to dogma, the individual is fashioned for servitude.

Traditions, religions,—if they are free are lost. They must be rejected.

Society, the Carlyan, teaches love of truth. It takes all human actions back to the laws of nature. It denounces the folly of societies organized for the triumph of the strongest. It is the torch that pours light into savaged minds.

The idea is sovereign. It makes the most miserable man the equal of the proudest among the powerful. Neither wealth or Power is worth the joy of thought. Mind defies tyranny. It examines it, criticizes it, it lofts it, it erodes it. If society should impose itself, it must be either by violence, in contempt of the rights which ought to make the individual inviolable, sacred. Force is Crime itself. It must be fought to the death.

Though it adorn itself with glittering tinsel, plumes, crosses, and stripes, Force remains contemptible. Service of the country is scarcely an excuse. To employ one's life in preparing to murder one's fellows is an outrage on humanity. It is the executioner's trade. What would it feel to have the condemnation of "Country" is not elevated by haccumia. It derives its true glory from eranoss, thinkers, artists, educators of youth. The smallest discovery has more effect on the most terrible battles. The conqueror is less estimable than the observant worker.

The military spirit is fatal to progress, to public tranquility, to liberty. It must be annihilated.

To reject neither the sword nor the gun more than the president's swallow tail or the parliamentarian's Prince Albert; to respect only Reason, Conscience, the idea,—this is the price of deliverance. The soldier is the servant of Force; we despise him. The magistrate is in charge of society's vengeful anger and has the right to judge his fellow. The parliamentarian is the follower of the blind passions of the crowd; we cannot put up with these cowards. The president is the domestic of the politicians; representing them while serving them, he embodies their basest passions at the same time that, placed at the summit of the social hierarchy, he personifies social crime. These people must be despised that we may learn to don without them.

These people are the profit-makers, the exploiters, the oppressors. They deceive us, rob us, murder us. Their arbitrary power is the product of society. They are what they make. As it can live only in injustice and falsehood, it is necessary to fight against it in league against justice and truth. For this reason, to combat them is to make war on the society of which they are the direct instruments; the gain is two fold. Independently men, therefore, if they perceive the danger when it comes to a conflict between free spirits and the pillars of authority. Rebels by reason or by temperament, they must take their position with the free spirits above social forces; thereby they may be certain of saving humanity, justice, revolutionary force.

The Apostle of the Free Spirit.

Conrad George Schum, in sending me the following translation made by him from Nietzsche's "Morgenröthe," I apropos presumably of my attitude toward the Pentecosts and the Georges,—truly remarks that in a stone that will hit many birds!'

Who has any aversion against the priests and the strong in faith? On the contrary, do we not regard them with a quiet respect and a feeling of joy, and deeply regret that these excellent people are not of our race?... Be he born to him a profound, sudden, groundless conviction of feeling against the man who once had all the freedom of spirit and who in the end became a "believer"? When we consider the matter, we feel as if a revolting spectacle had been enacted before our eyes which we must quickly wipe from the soul! Would we not turn our back upon the most venerable man, if in this respect he became suspicious to us? And this indeed not from
a moral condemnation, but from a sudden disgust and shudder of fearful insight into the depth of life. What shall we be told that at bottom we are not quite sure of ourselves? That we act about us betimes through the edges of the sharpest contempt, in order to make it impossible for us to lope over our own contempt in the decisive moment when old age makes us weak and forgetful? In all sincerity, this supposition is false, and he who makes it knows nothing of what moves and determines the free spirit; how little to him does the change of opinion in itself appear as contemptible! On the contrary, he reveres in the ability to change one's opinion a rare and high distinction, especially if it continues unto old age! And his ambition (and not his pusillanimity) aspire even to the forbidden fruins of the openers in spiritual and the openers in spiritual; while the fear inspired thereby in the vain and the comfort-loving is with him entirely out of the question.

In addition to all this, the thesis of the inexorability of all actions is as unseasonable as the innocence of all actions; how could he turn judge and executioner before the apostate of intellectual liberty! The aspect of this apostate rather affects him as one afflicted with some loathsome disease affecting the physician; the physical disgust engendered by the spongy, soft, overgrowing, festering masses dominion for a moment the reason and the will to help.

Thus our good will is increased by the thought of the enormous din of which which must have operated in the apostate of the free spirit,—by the thought of a general degeneration affecting the very framework of the character.

An Undelivered Speech.

The following correspondence explains itself:

NEW YORK, DECEMBER 7, 1898.

Dear Mr. Tucker:—

The Alexander Berkman Defence Association is making an attempt and moving heaven and earth to have my friend, Alexander Berkman, put away.

It becomes necessary to plead with Mr. Carnegie, and solicit his aid for that purpose. Mr. Carnegie is reported to be in New York at present.

Will you kindly do me the favor to select other you may choose, and act as spokesman?

If so, we will ever pray, etc.

Sincerely yours, for the committee,

JUSTUS SCHWAR.
ED. BRADY.
EMMA GOLDMAN.

NEW YORK, DECEMBER 11, 1898.

To Justin Schnur, E.d. Brady, and Emma Goldman,

representing the committee of the Alexander Berkman Defence Association.

FREEMAN—Answering your letter of December 7, honoring me with an invitation to act as your spokesman on the occasion of a proposed visit to Mr. Andrew Carnegie to solicit his aid in securing the release of Mr. Alexander Berkman, I hereby gratefully accept your trust, and I submit herewith a draft of the remarks which I believe are necessary to my intention to make to Mr. Carnegie, should the plan be carried out in the manner proposed.

I beg to add that, should the tenor of these remarks prove unacceptable to you, a withdrawal of your invitation would be received by me in perfect good part.

Awaiting your pleasure, I am yours sincerely,

BENZ. R. TUCKER.

Mr. Carnegie:—

Mr. Alexander Berkman, who is now serving a sentence in a Pennsylvania prison for an attempt to kill your business partner, C. F. Brush, is beginning to fast, and the Alexander Berkman Defence Association, which is seeking to shorten that sentence, has asked me to solicit, on their behalf, the exercise of your influence with the Pennsylvania pardoning power, to the end that Mr. Berkman may be freed. In compliance with their request I come to you.

You, in considering this petition, will be largely influenced, and very probably, by the attitude of your petitioner; in determining what the attitude is, you surely will take it for granted, as I take it for granted, that they approach you as penniless sinners, asking for forgiveness and seeking remission of penalty. Their very appearance before you, in person or by proxy, on such an errand, must be taken to indicate that what they once regarded as a wise act of boldness they now regard as a foolish act of barbarism; that the method of reform by violence which they once thought efficacious they now think futile; that they keenly regret the attempt upon the life of Mr. Frick; that the six years of Mr. Berkman’s imprisonment have convinced them of the error of their ways; and that henceforth they will neither commit, counsel, or approve any acts of violence whatsoever. Any other explanation of the prays of these petitioners is in conflict with their lofty character. Certainl it is not to be supposed for a moment that men and women of their courage and dignity, after showing a man down deliberately and in blood, would turn desist to the absurd and basely humiliating course of beggaring their victims and his friends to leave them the freedom to assault him again. It is obvious, then, that they come here to-day in an attitude of sincere repentance,—no longer as reformers, but as reformed, and asking for liberty as a reward of their reformation. Now, sir, you are too close a student of social problems to need any argument of mine to convince you that punishment of the truly penitent is not politic on the part of society. In thus establishing the reality of their contrition, I am sure that I have commanded your assent to their petition.

But I cannot close without saying either word, no longer as their spokesman, but for myself. My own attitude in asking you to favor mercy for Alexander Berkman is not that of these petitioners. I do not appear here to-day as a repentant sinner. In my record on this matter there is nothing for which I have occasion to apologize. I reserve all my rights. In the past, in the exercise of my liberty, I have refused to commit, counsel, or sanction violence, but, since circumstances made it impossible, I have never so much opposed force as to attempt assassination, and I have never so much opposed force as to be willing to pledge myself never to resort to violence, in my judgment, in favor of Mr. Berkman, I do so without occasion for penitence or promise, and less to his interest (although I shall be glad to see him free again) than in your own and that of good order, hoping that such a concession on the part of those who now have in their power will lessen the temptation to a renewal of the policy of violence, and will induce a state of public feeling that will insure enlarged opportunity for that peaceful evolution of opinion which alone can arrest the apoplectic and all its attendant terrors. And, each in his respective way, your petitioners will ever pray.

NEW YORK, DECEMBER 13, 1898.

Mr. Benj. Tucker:—

DEAR SIR,—Prompted by humane feelings, we may perhaps have gone too far to invite you to so excite the sympathy of Mr. Carnegie in an act of justice,—the pardon of Mr. Alexander Berkman.

We will by no means enshroud the aid of Mr. Carnegie, the author of "Triumph of Democracy," from your point of view, and respectfully beg to withdraw the invitation sent you.

Sincerely yours, for the committee,

JUSTUS H. SCHWAR.
ED. BRADY.
EMMA GOLDMAN.

It should be stated that my representation of the attitude of the petitioners does not justly apply to all of us, but I have steadily disavowed propaganda by direct action on the part of the Berkman defense association, and I have been the voice of reason and kindness in my attempts to preserve the peaceful evolution of opinion which alone can arrest the apoplectic and all its attendant terrors. And, each in his respective way, your petitioners will ever pray.

Sincerely yours, for the committee,

JUSTUS H. SCHWAR.
ED. BRADY.
EMMA GOLDMAN.
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