Mormosyla.

As I cast my eye across the village
The heavy cloud of the day,

Ere youth had passed away,
I remembered—i remembered—
O Wind of Memory!

Why dost thou sigh the glassy blue
Of a dead and bitter sea?

Ah! it was he—Great Moralia—
Who knew what siren song
It were to forget—

Each dark and deadly wrong,
Each cutting lie, each false reply
Thud. Discord doth let slip
To part the cherished friends of youth
And the bond of Fellowship.

And yet—were better for the race
To suffer and be wise
Than not to still remember well

The test of truth and lies,
Than be the foe and easy prey
Of all the scattered schools,

Nor know where ignorance is bliss
'Tis folly to be fools.

William Walstein Gordon.

On Picket Duty.

If Mr. Greeves Fisher is now allowed to reiterate in Liberty the view of money which he has hitherto received abundant opportunity to express, it is simply that he may serve as a foil to Mr. Wordsworth Donisthorpe. Not at all do I underrate Mr. Fisher's value. He is a sincere libertarian, and does useful work for liberty in many lines, showing as a rule great originality and ability. But concerning questions of finance he is mentally blind. I am tired of repeating my answers to his oft-repeated arguments, but Mr. Donisthorpe, who always has something fresh and brilliant to say, lends so much of new interest to the subject, by his method of meeting Mr. Fisher, that the controversy is of value for these columns.

The Civic Federation of Chicago has issued its report of the proceedings of the Trust Conference held in Chicago last September. It makes a large volume of more than six hundred pages, and is sold both in cloth and in paper. Among the verbatim reports of the numerous addresses is that of the editor of Liberty, information which I give here in response to numerous inquiries. The fact that this address will be published separately some months hence, and at a very low price, should deter no one from purchasing the full report, which is itself a remarkably cheap and a very useful book. The bound book is sold at one dollar, and the paper-covered book at fifty cents. Copies will be mailed from the office of Liberty to any address, post-paid, on receipt of price. It should be added that the work contains portraits of many of the speakers.

By an unhappy oversight Mr. Byington's signature was not appended to the first installment of his article, "What Anarchism Is Not," concluded in the present issue. I supposed that the author's characteristic style, coupled with his quotation from his previous article, "What is Anarchism?" would prevent any regular reader of Liberty from being misled by the omission into an error regarding the article's origin. On the contrary, and much to the gratification of my vanity, I have been congratulated more than once upon the assumed fact that in this article I had surpassed myself. I hasten to restore to Mr. Byington the glory of which I unwittingly robbed him for a moment. He has further cause for complaint in the composer's substitution of "Aeatic" for "Anarchistic" in Mr. Byington's quotation from himself; see September issue, third page, second column. May these errors prove blessings in disguise by inducing readers to begin the article again and follow it to the end at one sitting!

A stock company has been formed, under the title of The Tucker Publishing Company, for the publication of pamphlets and books on a large scale. It will begin its work early in February, under the business management of the editor of Liberty. Each week it will issue ten pamphlets, ranging in size from sixteen to one hundred and fifty pages or more. Most of them will be reprints of the best articles contained in the English and Continental magazines, the Continental articles being translated into English; and the range of subjects will be very wide, including economics, history, travel, biography, science, art, fiction, and belle-lettres. Each pamphlet will contain but a single article or essay, under a single title, and will be complete in itself, and the prices will range between three and twenty-five cents a copy. This enterprise will enable the reader to purchase for three or five cents a single article that interests him; instead of paying twenty-five, fifty, or even seventy-five cents for a magazine containing this article together with eight or nine others not wanted by the reader in question. A considerable percentage of the literature thus published will have a strongly libertarian tendency,—a fact which should stimulate all liberty-lovers to their best efforts in furtherance of the plan. Each can become individually a pronounced factor in the company's success by purchasing every week one or more of the publications through his local book-seller and by making his friends and acquaintances familiar with the company's doings. Advance circulars will be issued weekly, announcing the forthcoming works, which circulars will be mailed regularly to any address on receipt of sixty-five cents a year for weekly service, or of fifteen cents a year for monthly service.

"I am a philosophical Anarchist," said a prominent Single Taxer to me the other day,—presumably I violate no confidence in naming him: Mr. Bolton Hall—"I am even what you would consider an Anarchist on everything but the land question, and, in my own view, even my position on the land question is Anarchistic. Show me that taxation of land values is an aggression, and I will throw over the Single Tax without the slightest hesitation." Similarly, any advocate of compulsory Communism might say to me; "I am what you would consider an Anarchist on everything but the property question, and, in my own view, even my position on the property question is Anarchistic. Show me that universal and permanent expropriation is an aggression, and I will throw over Communism without the slightest hesitation." The trouble with this Single Taxer and this Communist is that neither perceives the correct definition of equal liberty. Both more or less confuse equality of liberty with equality in general. The Communist thinks that equality of liberty gives to each individual, by the mere fact of his individuality, a right in the sum total of brain and muscle acquired in the course of time, by inheritance or development, by all individuals. The Single Taxer thinks that equality of liberty gives to each individual, by the mere fact of his individuality, a right in the sum total of land acquired in the course of time, by occupancy and use, by all individuals. But the truth is that the equality of liberty gives to each individual nothing but security in the exercise of such brain and muscle as, by inheritance or development, he may have individually acquired, upon such raw material as, by occupancy and use, he may have individually acquired. This truth seems to me self-evident. If the Single Taxer does not see it, I cannot equip him, any more than the Communist, with the requisite power of vision. This last remark probably will be viewed by Mr. Hall as another instance of what he terms my "well-meaning absurdity," which at any rate is preferable to well-meaning absurdity.
Here they should remember their own classic experiment of Dr. Rossi’s Anarchist-Communist colony, “Cecilia.” For Rossi said, after the break-up of the colony, that his experience in it left him “as much an Anarchist as ever, but not so much a Communist.”

But be it assumed, for the sake of the argument, that Communism is to be the order of society; I am all right still. I was acknowledging just now that universal Communism would make crimes of property impossible. But the word “universal” makes my acknowledgment worthless.

For you must have a beginning of your Communism. Are you going to let your beginning wait till everybody believes in Communism? Then you may wait till doomsday; some folks will never believe till they see it working. But, if you are made of the stuff I think you are, you will begin your new social order at least as soon as you have a “working majority.” Then one of the principal problems you will have to solve at first is, what to do with a large body of Commercialists scattered in the midst of your Communist society. What will you do? Force them to give up their property and live communally? I think that is your plan of Anarchism, all I have to say now is that it requires a police. Some pig-headed Commercialist malcontents are sure, under the influence of their old prejudices against Communism, to keep trying to hold some things as their property; property-crime exists as much as ever, only it is now the crime of holding property, instead of the crime of violating it; and to keep the wealth all expropriated will require a lively police service, be it regular or irregular.

Then, perhaps, you will simply practise Communism among yourselves, and leave the Commercialists to be commercial till their prejudices have been conquered by the sight of Communism’s beauties in practice. That seems to me more reasonable. But individual initiative will get you into trouble. Here is Cox, a Commercialist farmer who keeps only two hoes in use, but owns three, having bought one at an auction to be used when his oldest is worn out. Here are ten thousand Anarchist-Communists who agree to let him keep his three hoes; but the ten thousand and first man, Knox, is an extremist, who thinks that no man, whatever principles he professes, should be allowed to hold idle hoes as property. One day Knox is working in a Communist field, when a comrade breaks a hoe. Cox’s barn being the nearest place where a hoe can be bought, he goes there, finds no person, and takes the hoe. When Cox finds this out, he, being a quick-tempered man, goes to get his hoe, and says he prefers to wear out his own hoes. Knox replies that Cox has no valid title, and they say disagreeable things before Cox takes the hoe home. On the next convenient occasion Knox takes that hoe again; Cox says he can’t stand this, comes with two fellow Commercialists, and takes Knox and shuts him up in a jail or in a spare bedroom (whichever you like), till he either thinks Knox has had enough or reaches Knox’s assurance that it shan’t happen again.

Unless, of course, Knox is rescued; and that’s the question. What do you Communists do in such a case? If you submit to Cox’s action, you are acquiescing in the enforcement of Commercialist law by Commercialist police against an Anarchist-Communist comrade; the Commercialists have occasion enough for keeping up their police, not only in the cases of Knox and others like him, but in the thieves that may spring up within Commercialist society itself (you mightn’t destroy the ability of Commercialism to breed any required amount of wickedness); and we have all the police I talked about. But I don’t believe you will altogether submit. Individual initiative comes in again. Some of you will think best to keep quiet, but a considerable number will feel bound to rescue Knox. As long as the contest lasts there will be no doubt of the “occasion for police” on both sides. And the contest must end in one of the two conditions already discussed; either the Commercialists coerve the Commercialists, or they admit (in practice) the jurisdiction of the Commercialist police. Or else the Commercialists must forget to get their police machinery, for which they need a Communist police again.

An absurd row over a hoe, of course. But it isn’t only one hoe; it is the whole question of property. If Knox is allowed to prosper peaceably in taking that hoe, and the next similar case and the next are allowed to go the same way, then Communist expropriation will drive Commercialists into Communism by wholesale against their will. At least, such is the belief of enough Commercialists to support a police force; and, as long as they believe this, they will act on it, even if their belief is ill-founded. If time and local experience prove this belief false, we may be on the way to live without police. I never said the police system must be eternal!

Perhaps somebody thinks I did say so. For a Communist paper copies my article, reprints what I said about “police, courts, and jails,” but carefully cancels, as being intolerable where the rest was tolerable, the words “and such continuance is to be expected.” Now, I mean to assert only that more or less of such continuance is to be expected. I take it to be a cardinal principle, in predicting the effects of Anarchy, that at first people in general will go on in the same way of living that they have been used to under government, in every respect in which this is possible under Anarchy. In the second half of the second sentence of the paragraph cited at the beginning of this article I have given the proof that in every Anarchistic society the existence of a police force must be possible; this, joined to the principle that most people will at first keep up every old custom that still is possible, forms a complete syllogism to show that at first the police will be kept up. Nothing but experience of Anarchy will show what changes will become possible when we are used to liberty. The proof that a police is always possible is clear and complete. I should think, in my original statement; but, if in any example will make it clearer, it shall be given. Anarchy will not wait for all the world to give up the institution of marriage; Anarchy will be established while many still cling to the marriage-ideal. This will, of course, give room for jealousy under
Anarchy, even by the most ardent free-lover's showing. Now let Dove, a free-lover, and Sparrow, a matrimonialist, court the same matrimonialist girl. Distrusting all free-lovers, she accepts Sparrow. Dove is no more conciliated by the possibility of getting another girl than he would be under the old order of things; for instance, he has never shot out from the one of his choice, he goes so mad with jealousy as to shoot Sparrow. Now, Sparrow, as a conservative, had naturally been a subscriber to a police agency, which, of course, arrests Dove at once, and hangs him. Dove's friends try to stir up the people against the police as a gang of governmental murderers, who must be put down with a strong hand to realize true Anarchy. The police answer: "Either you think that Anarchism allows us to put murderers to death, or you do not. If it does, you have no cause for firing on us. If it does not, your firing on us would, in your own view, be a putting of murderers to death, and therefore you cannot attack us without, in your own view, giving up your Anarchism." That argument ought to disperse the mob, unless they are prepared to say, by word or deed: "Anarchism be hanged! We are Dove's friends, and will avenge his death," to which the police reply: "All right; we are Sparrow's friends, and will avenge our friend's death; may the best cartridges win!"

So far the police. But possibly police are all right, if they will not use jail. I don't see, though, what better thing they can use. If a man is arrested, he should have a fair trial; then he must be kept at least a few minutes till the trial can be held. He must be either locked up, or tied up, or kept under a guard's eye, for the minutes or months preceding his trial; which will be prefer? If found guilty, something is to be done to prevent a repetition of the offence. If not a term in jail, what shall it be? The whipping-post? Transportation to Africa? Death? Mutilation? Firing is good for Russell Sage, but you can't fine tramps and Communists, who have nothing to pay with.

Or shall the police confine itself to resisting the attempt of crime and recovering the amount of damage actually suffered, but never inflict punishment for a crime after its commission? That theory always attracts me, although the more I study it the flimsier it looks; but it doesn't apply here. For the jail is a means, not only of punishment, but of resistance. Suppose Dove's shot merely breaks Sparrow's rib, and Dove is seized before he can shoot again. Obviously resistance includes holding Dove till Sparrow can be got out of sight. But doesn't it also include holding Dove till he has had more than a few days to cool his passions? What sort of resistance would it be to let Dove go on the streets again next day, attempt to enter Sparrow's house (if shooting the person who opens the door will help him get in, he has no punishment to fear), or watch with another pistol for the first appearance of Sparrow's face at the window? If that is to be the rule, and if the man who seizes Dove takes a strong interest in Sparrow's safety, I think he will be likely to make a hole in Dove's skull, and then say that at the moment he did not see any other way to prevent Dove from shooting again. Men have long agreed that it is bad policy to adopt a rule which makes killing a man safer than leaving him alive.

But I have been assailed with the reproach that, wherever there are police, courts, and jails, there must also be a law for them to enforce. Well! "If this be treason, make the most of it." I can at least save my reputation for consistency, I never professed to be in favor of the abolition of law. All I ask is that the corporation called "State" shall be under exactly the same laws as private corporations and individuals. If the law forbids me to club or jail my neighbor for not conforming to my expressed will or my ideas of propriety, let the same law forbid the State; that's enough. I have read in text books of international law that one of the distinguishing characteristics of a State is having no law over it; what is under the law is no longer a State. I want all persons and corporations to be under the law of equal freedom, at least in their dealings with one another, and to be kept to that law by appropriate force if necessary. And then the law of equal freedom will be a law in every known sense of that word; and the only ones who oppose all law are those who oppose this.

I am also rebuked for talking as if no Commercialist anarchists favored violent revolution; and Dyer D. Lum and Herman Rorer are named as persons who favored violence while following Liberty's principles in other respects. I suppose I ought to have known this about Lum at least; I did not. If I had known it, I should have used different language. Of course, I did not mean to say that the sentiments of all Commercialist anarchists in the world were known.

To sum up my standpoint, it is this: Anarchism is not a reform of people's habits, characters, or opinions in any respect but the single one of government by force. Various such reforms may be helpful to Anarchism, if their success comes first, or may be helped by Anarchism's success, if that comes first; but they are no part of Anarchism. And Anarchists will not directly produce any of these reforms, but will only establish conditions under which the forces that cause reform can work better. In our propaganda it is desirable, in order to secure that enthusiasm which comes from a knowledge of the world we know to be Anarchists will thus indirectly bring about the most sweeping reforms, and will do so with a reliability of belief more than any brain can now plan.

But, if we assert that wherever Anarchism exists it must necessarily be accompanied by some specified new rule of life, we shall frighten away, by misrepresenting Anarchism, every inquirer who is not willing to have that reform applied to his life. The only way to success is to keep this fact at the front: Under Anarchism you do not have to change your accustomed manner of life in any way, unless you choose, except that you must not kick your neighbor into taking care of you when he is unwilling.

STEPHEN T. RIVINGTON

"Dar Eigene," published by Adolf Brand in Berlin Neurathslohr, Germany, has emerged from its late eclipse in a new form and dress, being printed from Roman type and in magazine form, and produces a pleasing effect. It aims to furnish a meeting-ground to original thinkers in the various realms of thought. A pioneer of a neo-Hellenic civilization, the "Eigene" champions a state of society in which Mrs. Grundy and the policeman's club will not suppress and destroy individual peculiarity and character. It stands for the free activity of the individual, unhampered by any authority, because this is the sum of the spontaneous or non-ree, or the spontaneous or non-ree, which will enable each to become happy in his own way. Its aim is the greatest possible welfare of all. The title of the magazine is taken from Stirner's book, and is perhaps best rendered in English by "The Sovereign." (We have no equivalents for der Einzige and der Eigene in English, but the things for which these German terms stand are as much in evidence among Anglo-Saxons as among Germans.) The "... July numbers of the new series of" "Der Eigene," contain poems, short stories, essays on philosophical and economical subjects, and literary and art reviews of a high order, such as are not often found in reform publications. Advanced and enlightened views of love, as well as the love celebrated in Plato's "Banquet," receive artistic treatment in poem and story. In one of the essays the teachings of Stirner and Nietzsche are subjected to criticism and further development. In an essay on "Social Evolution" Hermann Kroecke considers present economical phenomena in the light of evolution, and concludes that the present order, in which the many toil for the benefit of the few, will necessarily be superseded by a cooperative order, in which all will share in the wealth they help to create. The writer of this essay is plainly concerned about individual sovereignty, but gives precedence to society, in the sense of Spencer, though he does not mention the English philosopher. The closing pages of the magazine deal with literary and art matters from the viewpoint of "Der Eigene."

Recently I was telling a friend of the enthusiastic reception of my address before the Chicago Trust Conference. "This simply proves," said he, in comment, the truth of the matter. And Arthur A. Brand, to whom I am related, named, that you may say the most radical things and win eager acceptance, provided you do not label them, but that, the moment you label them with an offensive name like Anarchist, you drive everybody away from you." "Yes?" said I; "well, unhappily for Mr. Appleton's view, Anarchism was the first word of my speech, it was the last word of my speech, and it recurs constantly throughout my speech. Never was doctrine so distinctly
labeled. And it is my opinion that, had it not been so distinctly labeled, it would not have commanded one-tenth the attention that it did."

"Well, then, the facts refute Mr. Appleton's theory," said my friend.

"Exactly," said I. 

"But there is a lesson here for the numerous libertarians who think it unwise to use the term Anarchism. The real trouble with them is that they have not the courage to say, either in public or private: "I am an Anarchist." And it doesn't take much courage either. On the rare occasions when they succeed in screwing up their courage, they look around after the terrible words have fallen from their lips, astonished to find that the planetary orbitals are where they were before.

Mr. E. L. McKenzie, in sending to me lately for some copies of "The Wind and the Whirlwind," joined to his order the following comment: "The whirlwind seems to have struck, not on the fruitful Nile, but on the tearful Moldav and Tagus." This caused me to read afresh Bunt's wonderful poem, and I assure all libertarians that it will pay them to do likewise. I reproduce a few stanzas which, in the light of events now transpiring in South Africa, seem indeed prophetic.

Oh innocence of strength! Oh boast of wisdom! 
Oh poverty in all things truly wise! 
That spoke of heaven, God can be it outwitted
For ever thus by him who sells and buys?

Then select the sad nations to their ruin,
What hast thou bought? The child within the womb,
The son of him thou slayest to thy hurting,
Shall answer thee 'An Empire for thy tomb.'

Then hast joined house to house for thy partition,
Then hast done evil in the name of right,
Then hast made bitter sweet and the sweet bitter,
And called light darkness and the darkness light.

Then art become a low word for dissembling,
A beacon to thy neighbors for all fraud,
Thy deeds of violence men count and reckon
Who takes the sword shall perish by the sword.

Then hast deserved men's hatred. They shall hate thee.
Then hast deserved men's fear. Their fear shall kill thee,
Then hast thy foot upon the weak. The weakest
With his bruised head shall strike thee on the heel.

Then wentest to this Egypt for thy pleasure.
Then shalt remain with her for thy sorrow still,
Then hast possessed her beauty. Thou wouldst have her,
Nay, thou shalt lie with her as thou hast lain.

She shall bring shame upon thy face with all men.
She shall disease thee with thy grief and fear.
She shall grow sick and feeble in her heart.
She shall repay her to the last and tear.

Her kindred shall surround thee with strange clamors,
Desiring thy steps till thou shalt lose their dir.
The friends that at thy side shall watch in anger.
The children shall upbraid thee with thy sin.

All shall be counted thee a crime,—thy patience
With thy impatience. Thy best thought shall wound.
Then shalt grow weary of thy work thus fashion'd,
And walk in fear with eyes upon the ground.

The Empire thou didst build shall be divided.
The wealth shall be weighed in thine own balances
Of usury to peoples and to princes.
And be divided among the world and these.
They shall possess the lands by thee foreseen
And not regret thee. On their seas so more
Thy ships shall bear destruction to the nations,
Or thy guns thunder on a fearless shore.

Then hast not pity in thy day of triumph.
These shall not pity thee. The world shall move
On its high course and leave thee to thy silence,
Scorned by the creatures that thou couldst not love.

Thy Empire shall be parted, and thy kingdom.
At thy own doors a kingdom shall arise,
Where freedom shall be preached and the wrong
Righted.

Which thy unwisdom wrought in days unwise.

Truth yet shall triumph in a world of justice.
This is of faith. I swear it. East and west
The law of Man's progression shall accomplish
Even this last great marvel with the rest.

Thou wouldst not further it. Thou canst not kinder.
If thou shalt learn in time, thou shalt yet live.
But God shall ease thy hand of its dominion,
And give to these the rights thou wouldst not give.

Listen to this "railed" and revolutionary talk from Prof. William G. Sumner, one of the pillars of bourgeois individualism and sham economic liberty: "The great foe of democracy now and in the near future is plutocracy. Every year that passes brings out this antagonism more distinctly. It is to be the social war of the twentieth century. In that war militarism, expansion, and imperialism will all favor plutocracy. In the first place, war and plunder will favor plutocracy, and in the second, the division of the laboring classes and at home. In the second place, they will take away the attention of the people from what the plutocrats are doing. In the third place, they will cause large expenditures of the people's money, the return for which will not go into the treasury, but into the hands of a few schemers. In the fourth place, they will call for a large public debt and taxes, and these things especially tend to make men unequal, because any social burdens bear more heavily on the weak than on the strong, and so make the weak weaker and the strong stronger." This is said apropos of expansion and imperialism, but it is significant that it is said at all. It was true two years ago, when no one dreamed of external depotsism, but Prof. Sumner did not see it, and treated with scorn the men who saw and said it. Verily, recent events have opened the eyes of people in quarters from which the brotherhood of thieves derived aid and support. Prof. J. Laurence Laughlin indulges in expressions identical with those of Sumner. He, too, has discovered the menace of plutocracy, the conspiracy of aggressive monopoly. But how long will they stick to their "un-American" and revolutionary position? How consistent will they be in warring upon plutocracy?

Far from realizing the hope expressed in the last issue that I should be able to make up some of the time lost by the delay in the appearance of that issue, I am much later with the November number than I was with the September. This is due to the unexpected prolongation of a trip through New England and the middle West, undertaken by me in furtherance of an important business project announced in a former paragraph. If the project is fulfilled to the extent of its initiator's expectations, it will contribute powerfully to the more regular publication of Liberty in the near future, as well as to many other useful ends.

After February 1 the office of Liberty will be in the business office of The Tucker Publishing Company, Park Row Building (opposite the post office), Rooms 2128-29-30-31, on the twenty-first floor.

Mr. Auberon Herbert's Feitich.
[Wordsworth Donisthorpe in Free Life.]

Mr. Auberon Herbert insists on the right of self-ownership. He claims the right to own himself. I desire that I cannot see upon this system as based. Of course, if he says it is based on the same grounds as that upon which the right of the English to England is based, I admit his claim. He does own himself, and there the matter ends. But the negroid plantations had no right (no legal right) to self-ownership, nor to any other ownership, as all admit. The aborigines appealed to me—that is, to the community—pointing out that it would be better for me that is, for the general public—that these things should be not free. I saw the force of their arguments, and agreed; not because the negroids had any right to their liberty, but because I thought that in my interest that right should be conferred upon myself. I claim the right then claimed for them, and I am delighted that they enjoy it now. I ask Mr. Herbert not to assume his right to own himself, but to prove that he ought to have it. And the only way to prove this is to show that I shall benefit by conferring the right on him. I believe this proof to be an easy task. But why shirk it? The reason seems to be this: just as munkind is supposed by some to be entitled to greater freedom if it is freed up as the degeneration of a perfect, a perfect pair pitchforked into the planet, rather than as the final outcome of the purifying struggles of evolution, no rights are believed to be more acceptable and more proof against attack if regarded as having dropped from some mysterious astral region rather than as being the products of countless forces contending for countless ages. If evolution cannot carry us on its shoulders right through the cosmos (and I believe it can), let it be released, say, Newton, along with political economy and technology and alchemy and astrology and all the theories of jumps and catastrophes. Mr. Herbert and the Absolutists irrevocably recall to my mind the luminous discourse of St. Augustin on the perfect number. Said he: "Since there are three classes of numbers, the more than perfect, the perfect, and the less than perfect. .... Six is the first perfect number. Whereupon we must not say that Six is a perfect number, because God finished all his works in six days; but that God finished all his works in six days, because six is a perfect number." Exactly. Similarly Mr. Herbert says: "Liberty is not a right because it is good for mankind; it is good for mankind because it is right." Thus we see that fall down and worship either a Right or a Perfect Number, St. Augustin and Mr. Herbert leave us to conjecture.

A Friend of Truth.
[Jean-Jacques L'Arnaud.]

The work of the sculptor Cléron consists of a sort of alto relievo and several groups detached therefrom. In the background, and not very clearly indicated, are enormous factory buildings, and in the foreground, through the wide open gate, rush a furiously-hustling crowd of females,—emaciated girls, young women with hollow cheeks, older women shaven and worn out too hard working, and even pregnant. This swarming of all creatures is called "The Sortie." At the left a group of aged women, shrivered and misshapen, waiting against a wall; at the right an old soldier, also worn and maimed, lounging in a couple,—these complete the ensemble.

The importance of the work attracts the attention in the Salon of the Champ-de-Mars, but they quickly go away, indignant at the bluntness and crudeness well as the idea of revolt which it conveys. They ask themselves how it is that such a horror was accepted; these women are moosers,—enough to give one a nightmare. A certain critic pretended that it modeled so much hideousness was to devote art; and a well known personage cried out that such an exhibit of our social sordid must be the work of some bad Frenchman, some man without a country.

It is not to be denied that the Cézannes family would have shared the averse of the public, but they not been amateurs desirous of being up-to-date; but such people have to smother their personal preferences. It had been whispered to them that Cléron perhaps was a fellow of talent; nothing more was needed to make them go into ecstasies over it. The
Anarchism at the Trust Conference.

The following newspaper comments on the address delivered by the editor of Liberty before the Chicago Trust Conference were crowded out of the last issue:

The splendidly delivered arguments of Benjamin R. Tucker, the New York theoretical Anarchist, furnished the sections an intellectual feast. His address showed the four kinds of special privileges which permitted the development of trusts on such an immense scale. Little changes in words, he argued, could never abolish these privileges. The Anarchistic principle must be applied—the principle of the equality of liberty to all—and by this means competition would be made fair and free, or otherwise the trusts would continue to develop their monstrous system of monopoly.

The world does move. Among the manifestations of its progress furnished by the Central Music Hall conference is the broad spirit of tolerance in which Benjamin R. Tucker's speech was received. Mr. Tucker refrained from the mental tendencies to be described as Anarchistic. His speech was a plea for Anarchism as a solution of current evils. He is an intelligent man, resourceful, well informed, logical in method, and welded to his ideas. A few years ago he could not have been heard in a church as one that has been discussing trusts, but Thursday night people listened with interest to what he had to say. That indicates a healthier condition of the public mind. When such people are in a position to learn and to progress, nobody need accept any more of an Anarchist's views than he likes, but, when men refuse to listen to any person whatever for fear they might hear something disagreeable, or repugnant to some common modes of thought, they are almost certain to cut themselves off from something that is valuable.

There is as much narrowness and bigotry in the field of politics as in the field of religion. Most men inherit a set of political notions from their fathers, and try to make them fit the conditions of their later day. The ancestral tradition is taken as gospel, and repeated twofold, and often worse than that. It usually expresses itself in the shape of adhesion for some political party, and inailing along with it, like a sky-bottomed whale, the usual blather of the pilot may choose to steer for. They may diminish the speed, but they don't change the direction. It is a healthy symptom when men are so interested in knowing where they are being taken that they are willing to listen to others who have told them about it. They may hear a great many false warnings and a great deal of bad advice, but, if they are fit for governing themselves, they must hear for themselves, and do their own judging.

It is unlikely that Mr. Tucker won many adherents to his theses, but the reception of his address denoted the inquiring mind on the part of the audience. There is nothing, not even the doctrine of Anarchists, that reasoning beings can afford to dismiss without investigation, when it comes their way.—Chicago Journal.

The "Commercial" said two weeks ago that it did not believe in any large events at the Civic Federation's Trust Conference. Events have justified us in that conclusion.

The delegates almost immediately got into a wrangle, which neither the eloquence of Mr. Chamberlain nor the oratory of college professors could quench.

This is exactly as we expected it would be, and, moreover, it arises from the very causes which we predicted would create dissension. No assembly in which concentration and Anarchy both have equal representation can possibly be quieted by any programme. It is a long reach from Chauncey Depew, the senator, to Benjamin R. Tucker, the iconoclast, who believes that the salvation of mankind depends upon the destruction of all corporations. However, we might remark that Tucker seemed to have a clearer conception of what he was there for than any other member of the convention. The paper we read was an able one from his standpoint, and some of his utterances, standing alone, would have merited the charge of being a trust emnity. He said that the right to co-operate is, which is but another name for combining, is as unquestionable as the right to compete; that the right to refuse from competition, and competition is always a method of cooperation; that such is a legitimate, orderly exercise of the individual will; and that any man or institution attempting to prohibit or repress either, by legislative enactment or force of invasvie force, is, so far as such attempts go, an enemy of the human race. This is sound doctrine, no less sound coming from an Anarchist, than it would be embodied in a judicial order.—N. Y. Commercial.

Irrelevancies.

I want a vocabulary for the new order of thought. I do not know how to get along without the word "spirit", and yet I don't see that there are souls and spirits apart from the "ensemble" of the beings we call men and women. Large souléd, "whole souléd"—what is to be in place of these? I do not even see how we can escape talking about good men and bad men. In short, I cannot see how any thing is a matter of taste; but I am not quite content with a word used principally to distinguish bread from toast. The German statesmen after the duel bears the name of "outrage", and yet I do not see that there are souls and spirits apart from the "ensemble" of the beings we call men and women. Large souléd, "whole souléd"—what is to be in place of these? I do not even see how we can escape talking about good men and bad men. In short, I cannot see how any thing is a matter of taste; but I am not quite content with a word used principally to distinguish bread from toast. The German statesmen after the duel bears the name of "outrage", and yet I do not see that there are souls and spirits apart from the "ensemble" of the beings we call men and women. Large souléd, "whole souléd"—what is to be in place of these? I do not even see how we can escape talking about good men and bad men. In short, I cannot see how any thing is a matter of taste; but I am not quite content with a word used principally to distinguish bread from toast.
The Home as a Corruptor of Manners.

All who have not read G. Bernard Shaw’s two volumes of “Plays, True and Unpleasant,” should hasten to do so. He has not omitted them not omit the prefaces. The plays are good, but the prefaces are better. Here is a taste of one of them:

If, on any night at the lowest part of the theatrical season in London, the audiences were confounded by the police and excommunicated individually as to their views on the subject, there would probably not be a single house-owning native among them who would not concur in the verdict, that the method is too expensive, absurd, and uncalculated to be successful. There are those who squander, those who assemble, artistic or political, as an exceptional way of spending an evening, the normal English way being to sit in separate families in separate rooms in separate houses, each person silently occupied with a book, a paper, or a cup of coffee, equally free from the blessings of society and solitude. The result is that you may make the acquaintance of a thousand streets of middle-class English families without coming on a trace of any consciousness of citizenship, or any artistic cultivation of the senses. The condition of the mind is bad enough, in spite of their daily escape into the city, because they carry the exclusive and unwieldy habits of life into the wider world of their business. Although they are natural, amiable, and companionable enough, they are, by home training, so incredibly ill-mannered that not even their business interests in welcoming a possible customer in every instance can redeem any respect for anything every body who has not been “introduced” as a stranger and introducer. The women, who have not even to the city to educate them, are much worse; they are positively unfit for civilised intercourse—graceless, ignorant, servile, quite as unappealingly so. Even in public places hobbled people cannot be taught to understand that the right they are themselves exercising is a common right. Whether they are in a large public hall or putting on a show, they receive every additional fellow passenger or worst shipper as a Chinaman receives the “foreign devil” who has forced him to open his ports.

In proportion as this horrible domestic instruction is broken up, broken up into the classes in their own orbit, or its stagnant isolation made impossible by the overcrowding of the working classes, manners improve enormously. In the middle classes themselves we have the revolt of a single clever daughter (nobody yet done justice to the modern clever English woman’s bawling of the very word “home”), and her insistence on qualifying herself for an independent working life, humanizing her whole family. It is an important humanising, and cannot fail to be of advantage to the nation. It is a habit of a nation to go to the suburban theatre once a week, or to the Monday Popular Concerts, or both, very perceptibly ameliorates its manners. But none of these things can be accomplished by being made without a cannonade of books and pleasurable music. The books and music cannot be kept out, because they alone can make the hideous boredom of the best dressed of us who do not live real lives, they may at least read about imaginary ones, and perhaps learn from them to doubt whether a class that not only submits to home life, but actually values itself on it, is really a class worth belonging to.

Mr. Donisthorpe on Currency.*

To the Editor of Liberty:

As usual, Mr. Donisthorpe treats his subject most cleverly, and with a high degree of lucidity, and cannot fail to assist in dissipating some of the fog which in many minds surrounds the question of money. Nothing can be more exhilarating than Mr. Donis- thorpe’s consistent and clear logic of government-meddling with monetary usages, or than his inspiring doctrine of freedom as the best method of regulation of these, as of other, human interactions. It is, nevertheless, allowable to express dissent from some of the views put forward as to the defects and possible remedies in the monetary system.

Mr. Donisthorpe in two places asserts that it would be illegal in England to issue ounces of tin with the name of or device of one of the metals of which they contain a specified quantity of metal they contain stamped upon them. Is it possible for Mr. Donisthorpe to be mistaken upon this point? Cn be, on reference to the statutes, show that the sale of a dollar, described, not as a pound, shilling, or penny, or cents, but as a specific quantity of the metal they contain, is contrary to English law? Any one can weigh up butter, bread, and possibly cloth, leather, etc., with trade marks and other devices stamped upon them upon surfaces, and with the quantity or measurement also specified. This is something more than packing goods in papier and tins trademarked and quantified. Bundles of paper notes are actually sold bearing the vendor’s marks of quantity and quality, and contracts to deliver those at future dates must surely be valid. Can it then be possible

— M. Johnson.

Disresect Criticism.

* This article accompanied the transcript of Mr. Donisthorpe’s article in the September number, but, because of its length, had to be cut back. M. Johnson’s rejoinder will appear in next quarterissue.—Editors’ liberty.

Millionaires who endow aristocratic colleges are eulogized as philanthropists. In such cases the American taxpayers are made to feel that they are doing the deed. Their eyes are dazzled by a gilded generosity that is, however, not very profitable. It is, however, true that each of these dollars so lavishly bestowed was accumulated at the expense of miserable, ill-paid laborers. The gifts may equip laboratories and purchase libraries for a selected few, but in the acquisition of wealth the philanthropic donor may have consigned hundreds of other men to wretchedness and ignorance. Men may purchase knowledge, power, and admiration, but hypocrivol philanthropy can never wash the stain from a dollar coiled in blood.

It is possible that the dollar is accumulated at the expense of a ill-paid toiler, but this does not alter the fact that it is only a dollar. This is common enough for our time, and, now that it is his, he can employ it in either of several ways: He can hoard it, and stink labor of employment. He can engage in productive enterprise, thus adding to the capital of mankind by education. Or he can sink dollar and self respect in merely personal indulgence. When the rich man spends his money wisely and kindly, he should be decently commended, for his money is only a cog on the great wheel of man. He did not invent the inequities and hardships of the social system, but had to choose between pursuing gain by the means indica- ted in his case, and taking up such opportunity, but leaving it to another, who would probably make his million and endow nothing. It is a harsh way that the “Journal” has fallen into this role, qualifying philanthropy and acquisition as it does. Suppose a poor-paid physician in America, who gives large sums to education. He really could not have altered anything by keeping out of Standard Oil, only that he would have lost money and something else which government would be now occupied. There certainly is no more hypocrisy about the very rich man who makes a million at a stroke than there is about the milkman who visits the well before he makes his early morning trip to the city—perhaps had he not been already in condition has been arranged by so many circumstances of ignorance, prejudice, and folly that it would require a book to analyze them. Some writers have the impression that money is a pleasure, a convenience, and an expression of self- in reality; the very thing they do, from individual motives, while conditions are the same; paying higher wages as employers, refraining from speculation, and so on. This is a childish sloppiness. No individual can alter the position of society, but, by leaning against the wheel of the fly wheel, he can possibly do some good by adding education. He has a right to express his nature in human acts in any direction, and such acts as are of the bitter style of comment is likely to prove hurtful to mankind because it makes for armed socialist revolution, an that would obscure the problem and delay the evolution which may bring about a better general understanding.

Mr. Donisthorpe on Currency.*

To the Editor of Liberty:

As usual, Mr. Donisthorpe treats his subject most cleverly, and with a high degree of lucidity, and cannot fail to assist in dissipating some of the fog which in many minds surrounds the question of money. Nothing can be more exhilarating than Mr. Donis- thorpe’s consistent and clear logic of government-meddling with monetary usages, or than his inspiring doctrine of freedom as the best method of regulation of these, as of other, human interactions. It is, nevertheless, allowable to express dissent from some of the views put forward as to the defects and possible remedies in the monetary system. Mr. Donisthorpe in two places asserts that it would be illegal in England to issue ounces of tin with the name of or device of one of the metals of which they contain a specified quantity of metal they contain stamped upon them. Is it possible for Mr. Donisthorpe to be mistaken upon this point? Can he, on reference to the statutes, show that the sale of a dollar, described, not as a pound, shilling, or penny, or cents, but as a specific quantity of the metal they contain, is contrary to English law? Any one can weigh up butter, bread, and possibly cloth, leather, etc., with trade marks and other devices stamped upon them upon surfaces, and with the quantity or measurement also specified. This is something more than packing goods in papier and tins trademarked and quantified. Bundles of paper notes are actually sold bearing the vendor’s marks of quantity and quality, and contracts to deliver those at future dates must surely be valid. Can it then be possible

— M. Johnson.

Disresect Criticism. (Continued.)

The very rapid accumulation by large wealth of larger wealth strikes the public consciousness in a noticeable way. In nothing is this more manifest than in the rise of the monetary system. The quantity of metal they contain stamped upon them. Is it possible for Mr. Donisthorpe to be mistaken upon this point? Can he, on reference to the statutes, show that the sale of a dollar, described, not as a pound, shilling, or penny, or cents, but as a specific quantity of the metal they contain, is contrary to English law? Any one can weigh up butter, bread, and possibly cloth, leather, etc., with trade marks and other devices stamped upon them upon surfaces, and with the quantity or measurement also specified. This is something more than packing goods in papier and tins trademarked and quantified. Bundles of paper notes are actually sold bearing the vendor’s marks of quantity and quality, and contracts to deliver those at future dates must surely be valid. Can it then be possible

— M. Johnson.
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The very rapid accumulation by large wealth of larger wealth strikes the public consciousness in a noticeable way. In nothing is this more manifest than in the rise of the monetary system. The quantity of metal they contain stamped upon them. Is it possible for Mr. Donisthorpe to be mistaken upon this point? Can he, on reference to the statutes, show that the sale of a dollar, described, not as a pound, shilling, or penny, or cents, but as a specific quantity of the metal they contain, is contrary to English law? Any one can weigh up butter, bread, and possibly cloth, leather, etc., with trade marks and other devices stamped upon them upon surfaces, and with the quantity or measurement also specified. This is something more than packing goods in papier and tins trademarked and quantified. Bundles of paper notes are actually sold bearing the vendor’s marks of quantity and quality, and contracts to deliver those at future dates must surely be valid. Can it then be possible

— M. Johnson.
Thus their utility is increased by the act of exchange. But currency may, by a slight, but pardonable, paradox, be said to consist of a mass of valuables whose own utility is least affected by exchange,—a class of valuables which may slightly lose their utility in many exchanges, but whose small loss of value is more than compensated by a largely increased value of the other elements in the exchanges in question. The following is an instance of that—namely, that he is willing to pay a sovereign for so much of beef as the butcher is willing to sell for this quarter-ounce of gold. The hatter has no gold. He has several hats, which he is willing to sell each for this same quarter-ounce of gold, which may slightly lose its utility in many exchanges, but whose small loss of value is more than compensated by a largely increased value of the other elements in the exchanges in question.

The hatter should not be told, therefore, that to say, he is willing to pay a sovereign for so much of beef as the butcher is willing to sell for this quarter-ounce of gold. The hatter has no gold. He has several hats, which he is willing to sell each for this same quarter-ounce of gold, which may slightly lose its utility in many exchanges, but whose small loss of value is more than compensated by a largely increased value of the other elements in the exchanges in question.

The hatter should not be told, therefore, that to say, he is willing to pay a sovereign for so much of beef as the butcher is willing to sell for this quarter-ounce of gold. The hatter has no gold. He has several hats, which he is willing to sell each for this same quarter-ounce of gold, which may slightly lose its utility in many exchanges, but whose small loss of value is more than compensated by a largely increased value of the other elements in the exchanges in question.

The hatter should not be told, therefore, that to say, he is willing to pay a sovereign for so much of beef as the butcher is willing to sell for this quarter-ounce of gold. The hatter has no gold. He has several hats, which he is willing to sell each for this same quarter-ounce of gold, which may slightly lose its utility in many exchanges, but whose small loss of value is more than compensated by a largely increased value of the other elements in the exchanges in question.

The hatter should not be told, therefore, that to say, he is willing to pay a sovereign for so much of beef as the butcher is willing to sell for this quarter-ounce of gold. The hatter has no gold. He has several hats, which he is willing to sell each for this same quarter-ounce of gold, which may slightly lose its utility in many exchanges, but whose small loss of value is more than compensated by a largely increased value of the other elements in the exchanges in question. The hatter should not be told, therefore, that to say, he is willing to pay a sovereign for so much of beef as the butcher is willing to sell for this quarter-ounce of gold. The hatter has no gold. He has several hats, which he is willing to sell each for this same quarter-ounce of gold, which may slightly lose its utility in many exchanges, but whose small loss of value is more than compensated by a largely increased value of the other elements in the exchanges in question.

The hatter should not be told, therefore, that to say, he is willing to pay a sovereign for so much of beef as the butcher is willing to sell for this quarter-ounce of gold. The hatter has no gold. He has several hats, which he is willing to sell each for this same quarter-ounce of gold, which may slightly lose its utility in many exchanges, but whose small loss of value is more than compensated by a largely increased value of the other elements in the exchanges in question.

The hatter should not be told, therefore, that to say, he is willing to pay a sovereign for so much of beef as the butcher is willing to sell for this quarter-ounce of gold. The hatter has no gold. He has several hats, which he is willing to sell each for this same quarter-ounce of gold, which may slightly lose its utility in many exchanges, but whose small loss of value is more than compensated by a largely increased value of the other elements in the exchanges in question.

The hatter should not be told, therefore, that to say, he is willing to pay a sovereign for so much of beef as the butcher is willing to sell for this quarter-ounce of gold. The hatter has no gold. He has several hats, which he is willing to sell each for this same quarter-ounce of gold, which may slightly lose its utility in many exchanges, but whose small loss of value is more than compensated by a largely increased value of the other elements in the exchanges in question.
would not annihilate all the gold above ground. The stock would have to be carried by some one. If its value were greatly reduced, the interest lost would be too great; if it were diminished, but not whatever it was, it would have to be borne by some one. This, I may be supposed, would have to be paid by the users of gold in the arts.

But to perform the monetary operations necessary to production would, as Mr. Dunthorpe properly admits, require the employment of as great an aggregate value, no matter what the material in currency. Up to this point Mr. Dunthorpe apparently relin- quishes his position, and, in fact, leaves it as though it were futile to introduce it.ought he to have done so, or ought he to have returned to his example and detected its fallacy? Let it be supposed that aluminum wheelbarrows are produced as much as wooden ones, but that last they last one hundred times as long. Theavy contractor would have to find more capital before commencing his work, but he would ultimately be well paid for it. The principal element in the actual cost of any form of currency is not the cost of the investment, but is the consumption of the metal by abrasion. The loss of interest is reduced by the mechanism of credit, but is not affected by changing the metal. The wheelbarrow analogy is not very helpful.

No one disputes the necessity for a fractional currency. This, however, hardly touches the question of the effect upon their values of substituting one metal for another in gold and silver currencies which accept gold and gold to pay interest in gold—whether the investment is in their government funds or in industrial enterprises, such as railways, water works, etc.—as to this extent adopt a gold currency. The present location of the English gold bonds probably would not be at all so momentous as it is generally supposed.

If a railway having to pay its interest and dividends is to raise its funds in one of the more frequently used forms of money, the interest and dividends must also be paid in the same. If the railway earns a profit, it probably uses a part of that profit to pay itself and not to pay its dividend. It would be a great mistake to suppose that the company desires to eliminate from its operations the effects of the relative variations of the values it may issue silver coins of full value in terms of gold at present market value. The condition under the last arrangement would be practically identical with the present. Either of the two former, so far as the working of this railway was concerned, would be a complete demoralization of the system. But it would not draw a great quantum of gold from the bullion stores and bring it into circulation. Nor, if all the silver- using nations were to adopt a form of currency based upon silver, would it put 300,000 years of the world's production of silver to the use of the English government.

The very facts which add to the complexity of the situation and the necessity for a fractional currency a very great volume of gold. A voluntary issue of tokens could never be depreciated. Competition among the issuers (bidding both for the capital, which they would obtain free of interest, and for the gains of selling tokens, many of which would never be presented back) would operate to make them as valuable as a coinage of a large living.

The mere demobilization of silver by Germany was not the cause of the breakdown of the gold. It was the disorganization of the Latin Union's powers of maintaining the gold standard. Germany's action had a violent temporary effect, but could not have any permanent effect. The continuity by the Latin countries of free mintage of face of the great silver-flux option would be kept in view by the actual diminution in the amount of silver and gold. There is no resemblance between money and wheelbarrows. The consumption of metals in shop weights and two feet rules is more analogous to the employment of metals as currency. The world's stock of gold and silver has to be maintained as a safeguard against scarcity and a moderator of fluctuations. It might just as well be in purses, safes, and banks as in bullion stores. The tendency does not affect the whole, nor does it diminish the stock. It merely breaks up a part of it into a multitude of small stocks. Neither does circulation of a metal as currency form a demand for which it can affect its value. The employment of any commodity as current money is absolutely dependent upon its being a vital utility, and its value, both in and out of money, is wholly determined by the demand or appetite for it in the arts.

It is true that it wastes slightly in the handling and passing of the coins. This loss does not fall upon the gold consumers, though it does affect its value so far as it goes; being itself a true, but small, consumption, it has its real, though diminutive, effect upon the value. But this consumption by abrasion has to be paid for in the value of the commodities which it wears out, and therefore the price, once produced, by the substitution of gold in the exchange. Exchange necessitates wealth, credit, if perfect and universal, would enable exchanges to be carried on without the substitution of gold in the exchange in any way. The hunter and the weapon maker might exchange their promises in the morning and their products in the evening without any accumulation. But commerce would then be but rudimentary. In order to secure communication in any commodity form, people must be able to attend a market prepared to buy, and have to position to decline to do so if desirable. A farmer who takes his product to market to sell and get it in exchange, has to be compelled to accept a temporarily depressed value owing to a sparse attendance of buyers. Equally the implement dealer may lose heavily if forced to sell.
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