On Picket Duty.

Mr. Yarros's article on "Trusts and Democratic Doctrine," printed in this issue, was written months ago, but the lesson which it teaches has lost little of its timeliness.

The other day a friend of mine walked into the book department of one of the largest department stores in New York, and asked the young woman behind the counter: "Have you 'A Chambermaid's Diary' ?" "Yes," she answered, "you can get it over there," pointing across the store. My friend went "over there," and found nothing but the stationery department. Going back to the young woman, he said: "I don't find any books over there.'" "Oh!" she exclaimed, "is it a book?" "Yes," said he. And the young woman replied: "Why I thought you wanted a diary for a chambermaid."

Bishop Potter is opposed to compulsory arbitration because it "embraces an element of coercion that weakens the whole fabric." But he prefers compulsory arbitration to a strike. He "would willingly acquiesce in compulsory arbitration if by that means" he "could aver the suffering, starvation, and strife attendant upon the usual strike." In other words, Bishop Potter would rather weaken the whole fabric by coercion, and thus induce continual and universal suffering and ultimate ruin, than allow laborers their right of choice between temporary suffering and submission to an employer's exactions. However, it is of little consequence what Bishop Potter thinks. The belief that he is more worthy of trust than most of his fel lowsclergy was shattered when a few days in the Philippines made the bishop an imperialist.

G. Bernard Shaw and E. Belfort Bax have been discussing, in the "Saturday Review," the question whether State Socialism is essentially republican. The affirmative is held by Bax, who believes that State Socialism means liberty, and that there is no liberty outside of republicanism. The negative is held by Shaw, who knows that State Socialism is tyranny but favors it nevertheless, and that it is consistent with any form of government, all forms being tyrannical. Of course Shaw is right. He has no illusions; he is not to be taken in by the theory that majority rule means liberty; he frankly espouses tyranny, because, mistakenly supposing that men cannot be both free and well-fed, he would rather have them well-fed than free. Since Anarchists cannot have Shaw for a champion, the next best thing for the cause is to have him as a conspicuous foe. For there are still some men who would rather be free than well-fed, and these will be saved to Anarchy by Shaw's exhibition of State Socialism as tyranny.

Mr. Albert F. Davis, 181 Weybosset street, Providence, R. I., is the proprietor of a book store and a circulating library of seven thousand volumes, and fully realizes his responsibility. Being visited by my travelling salesman in advance of the publication of "A Chambermaid's Diary," and having read the circular descriptive of the book, he ordered a copy. Afterward he returned the book without paying for it, sending with the following letter: "My librarian denounced your book 'The Chambermaid's Diary' as being a book we do not want for library; or it is not fit to put in hands of a customer. Therefore I return the one copy you sent me in paper by same mail this goes by. I do not wish to lose the standard of morality. A man of giant intellect may be very weak in orthography and syntax. Nevertheless, observation of such lapses as this letter reveals in one who, by his position at the head of a circulating library, assumes the attitude of moral and literary mentor to a university town compels the reflection that 'noblesse oblige.'"

Mr. Binyon's views of the marriage contract, expressed in this issue, seem to me sound, and their promulgation is useful in helping, by one more application, to an understanding of Anarchism. I take exception only to Mr. Binyon's idea that the subject is one of immediate practical importance. This idea grows out of his general conception of Anarchist society as something yet to be started. The fact is that Anarchist society was started thousands of years ago, when the first glimmer of the idea of liberty dawned upon the human mind, and has been advancing ever since,—not steadily advancing, to be sure, but fitfully, with occasional reversal of the current. Mr. Binyon looks upon the time when a jury of Anarchists shall sit, as a point not far from the beginning of the history of Anarchy's growth, whereas I look upon that time as a point very near the end of that history. The introduction of more Anarchism into our economic life will have made marriage a thing of the past long before the first drawing of a jury of Anarchists to pass upon any contract whatsoever.

In "Justice," the Single Tax organ published at Wilmington, Del., Mr. Edward T. Burleigh has lately been guilty of a singular solecism. He conducts a department in that paper under the heading of "Sayings and Doings," and in the issue of December 7 he began it with this sentence: "Last August, in 'Equity,' Mr. Josiah Warren had an article entitled 'Cost and Value.'" "Then Mr. Burleigh proceeded to give extracts from the article, interspersing them with criticisms. This is very much as if I were to say: "Last August, in 'Nature,' Mr. Charles Darwin had an article entitled 'The Origin of Species,'" and were then to publish, as extracts from this article, voluminous citations from Darwin's book, "The Origin of Species," and criticise them. In other words, Mr. Burleigh supposes himself to be debating with an obscure individual living in the present, instead of with one of the world's great men, who laid the foundations of an enduring fame more than half a century ago. Astounding as it may seem, Mr. Burleigh, an eminent Single Taxer of high Abolition lineage, is so unfamiliar with the history of the labor movement and the liberty movement that he does not know that Josiah Warren was the first man to express and formulate the doctrine now known as Anarchism; the first man to clearly state the theory of individual sovereignty and equal liberty; the author of a work, entitled "True Civilization," published sixty years ago or more, which contains, in rather clumsy arrangement but very accurately thought out, nearly all the truths of importance now to be found in advanced modern works on politics and economics; and the "remarkable American" whom John Stuart Mill, in his autobiography, couples with Wilhelm von Humboldt in an acknowledgment of indebtedness for his views of liberty. And, as a result of this historical ignorance, we find Mr. Burleigh in the ridiculous position of assuring his readers that "Mr. Warren's heart seems to be in the right place," and of attempting to teach the doctrine of equal freedom to its author.
obligations on both sides that bear purely on the person: "love, honor, and obey." "for- saking all others, keep you only to her so long as you both shall live." There are others of property: with all my worldly goods I thee endow," and all that body of property-determinations that is implied in the words "to take, to be my lawfully-wedded wife or husb--." The latter blanket-clause also purports to establish the joint control of the children.

Now, I see no difficulty in the way of acknowledging all claims of property based on the marriage partnership, just as in the case of any other partnership. However the jury men may hate the institution of marriage, they cannot, as Anarchists, assume to declare the contract void as being contra bonos mores or opposed to public policy. If it were a bare question of this contract alone, they might, if they chose, refuse to be concerned in enforcing any part of it. But, if there is some other issue which they cannot afford to leave undecided, and their decision must in part depend on whether this rabbit is the property of A or of B, I do not see how the jury can declare it the property of A when the case contract of A's, which the jury may or may not like, has declared it B's. The contract as to property is sometimes more favorable to the husband, sometimes to the wife; but it is every one's business to look out for himself whether he gets bitten in a voluntary contract.

The same principles hold with regard to the children,—at least for us emulators of Zeno's, who count babies as property. The Co- operatives of Free Socialists may answer that part of the question for themselves. When the children are old enough to make a promise, we agree, they choose their own protectors and directors.

The hitch comes in the personal obligations of marriage. The most orthodox courts have always felt that there was great hardship in enforcing these obligations on those who found them intolerable. Can we treat this part of the contract just as we do other contracts?

The question is, rather, whether we shall treat it just as we do other contracts that bind the person.

Take a showful of personal contracts, and look at them toge her. A agrees, for no matter what consideration, not to leave his bed as long as he lives; not to leave his house within twenty years: not to go outside Rhode Island within three years: never in his life to set foot in Rhode Island: to be found in Rhode Island within c. w. week; to do carpenter's w. yr in B's house Tuesdayeforeon: to work his life long at carpentering for B, B's heirs and assigns: to obey all orders whatsoever which he may ever receive from B, B's heirs and assigns: not to have sexual connection with any one but B, till death or divorce has parted him from B. Is there reason for treating one of these contracts differently from another?

I answer, there is not. An essential part of liberty is that one shall not be subject to the decrees of his past. I have nothing against keeping good resolutions, but one must not force me to keep them, even if he is an interested party. To enforce against the person the worst of the contracts in that list would be absolute slavery. To enforce against the person the lightest of them might involve all that is most intolerable of slavery.

I hold that there s no contract in which the personal performance of an obligation can properly be compelled by force applied to the person.

On the other hand, title to property passes by contract. If a man binds himself to forfeit certain property to me if he crosses the boundaries of Rhode Island,—or c. wedlock,—then, as soon as the bond is executed, and thereafter, I have a conditional title to that property. If he exercises his right to change his mind, that does not make void the partial title I have already acquired to what are already, to the extent of that title, my goods.

Now, a contract for personal service might expressly provide that, in case of non-performance, the delinquent should forfeit a certain specified property, or should be liable to no penalty at all, or should forfeit an amount to be determined by damage sustained, ability to pay, or other circumstances. If no such provision is expressed, but it is a uniform custom that a certain one of these principles is followed in a certain class of contracts, then that custom is part of the meaning of such a contract. If the man who promises to mend my door Tuesday receives his pay and does not come, custom makes him liable to me for the damages I may thereby suffer.

Well, then, when he tells me that he will come, it is part of the natural meaning of his language that he will pay such damages in such case. In like manner the words "I take thee to be my lawfully-wedded wife" have, as part of their meaning, "I will pay thee alimony if thou gettest a divorce from me for adultery," and are always understood so to mean. And in claiming alimony she is only claiming her own, provided that the alimony is paid out of property which (or whose equivalent) the husband held while the marriage contract was still accepted on both sides, and has held ever since. But I do not see what claim she has on pr. c. w. acquired by her husband's industry or luck since he has notified her that he will have no more of that marriage, or since she has shown that she has regarded the marriage tie as broken.

My conclusion is, then, that the marriage contract is exactly as valid as any other contract; that those parts which relate to property are to be treated like any other contract of property; that those parts which impose a personal obligation are to be treated like any other contract of personal obligation; that the interpretation of this last is, it is
crime to enforce them against the person, but property damages may be claimed for their breach, provided these damages do not draw upon the increment of the payer's estate since a date later than the breaking off of the contract. I do not see in what form to draw up the papers for proceeding before an Anarchist jury against one who has persuaded another to break a contract of personal service, although I could not, in general, commend his action.

I would not be understood as having argued in favor of the collection of debts by force. It is one thing to decide that a disputed claim is valid, and another thing is to set about enforcing it.

STEPHEN T. BYINGTON.

W. D. HOWELLS ON LIBERTY.

"Liberty and Equity" was the subject of a lecture delivered at Boston some time ago by the distinguished novelist and humanitarian, William D. Howells. Evidently Mr. Howells has learned nothing and forgotten nothing with reference to the meaning of liberty since 1896, when a magazine article of his, dealing with the same questions, was criticized and corrected in these columns. But, as Mr. Howells is essentially fair-minded and open to correction, it may be profitable to subject his ideas to another examination.

Liberty, declares Mr. Howells, "is never good in itself. It is a means to something good. It is forever merging into something else." This statement may be granted. Liberty is a means to happiness, to the free exercise of one's faculties. Liberty is absence of restraint, and restraint is interference with actions that give pleasure or avert pain. The man who is placed behind prison bars sighs and longs for freedom, because freedom means satisfaction, the doing of agreeable things. It is not true, however, that, in the struggle or ardent wish for freedom, the end is always clearly kept in view. It is a familiar psychological fact that the means to an end become a medium end. It is sufficient to mention money—a mere means to an end, but generally thought of as an end in itself.

But what follows from the definition given by Mr. Howells? Certainly not that freedom is unnecessary or superfluous or useless. Mr. Howells continues:

"We are all deluded by the rhetorical idea of liberty—largely political. The dream of infinite and immutable liberty is the hallucination of the Anarchist—that is, the individualist—gone mad. The moment liberty in this meaning is achieved, we should have a rule, not of the wisest, but of the strongest, and so no liberty at all. So far as we can see, liberty is merely choice, and, as such, is the power of self-sacrifice, for this is the act only of those who are free. It is really inexcusable in Mr. Howells to misconceive the "dream of the Anarchist" so absurdly. Infinite and immutable liberty for all is impossible. Such liberty for some would naturally imply slavery for others. But the Anarchist does not demand infinite liberty for himself or anybody. He demands equal liberty. Does Mr. Howells perceive the distinction? Under equal liberty—that is, under the highest liberty of each compatible with the equal liberty of all—there can be no rule of the strongest. Aggression by strong (or weak, for that matter) would violate equality of liberty, and would be Archey, not Anarchy. Mr. Howells is a strenuous advocate of equality. He will be glad to know that the Anarchists whom he affects to abhor sum up the law and the prophets in the demand for equality of liberty.

With regard to self-sacrifice, liberty is undoubtedly, among other things, the power of self-sacrifice, for it is choice, as Mr. Howells says, and a free man may choose to sacrifice himself, if that is possible, which it is in a superficial sense. A profound study of the things behind words would open Mr. Howells's eyes to the fact that the man who sacrifices himself asserts himself. And under equal liberty it will be unnecessary for any individual to "give up some part of his freedom for the common good." The common good requires no such surrender. It is subserved by the enjoyment of equal freedom. A man will be able to give up a part of his property to an unfortunate fellow-man, but that will involve no sacrifice of liberty.

Mr. Howells is very much concerned about freedom from want. But political liberty in the wide sense of the term (not in the sense of a change of rulers or of substitution of many despotism), if a few is a means to economic opportunity, to freedom from want for all who are able and willing to use opportunity. The end to which liberty is a means includes equality of opportunity. Indeed, there can be no monopoly under equal liberty, for privilege not freely conferred is aggression, a denial of liberty to those aggrieved upon.

I hope Mr. Howells will revise his lecture in the light of these simple explanations.

V. Y.

POINTS FROM A PRINTER.

"How is it?" I queried of a typo, "that Tammany and its chief have such power?"

"I've been with Tammany for years," he replied, "and I must say it has a most effective machine. Its members are absolutely whipped into line. They have got to do what they are told."

"Why so?"

"Well, take the immense influence of political jobs,—street, dock, sewer, water, police, etc., the holders of which must line up with Tammany, pay assessments, attend meetings, and go on parade. They, again, have their friends and relatives, who, it is expected, will be kept in harmony. Then there is the free and easy element, who do not want to be pestered with the petty actions of the "reformers."

"What of the Republican party? Has it no machine?"

"Oh, yes. And a good one,"

"Where does its support come from?"

"From the army, navy, postal, and customs departments, immigration bureaus, and various commissions appointed by the State and nation."

"By the way, what do you think of the municipal printing office project?"

"Good idea. I see Coler is favoring it."

Thus our printer friend, though adorning the very best reasons why government should not be increased, advocates it. And why? First, because the government is an easy taxmaster, and, second, because a small portion of the city printing is done in a "rat" office. As to the first, it may be well said that no position is good in any sense, if it take from the holder his freedom as above described. The printer who accepts such conditions is a political rat, far more dangerous than the industrial rat. As to the second, it is just possible that the city printing now done in the various offices keeps some of them under the union fold. Boston has a municipal printing plant. Up to last election in that city it was a part of the Democratic machine; now it is Republican. Formerly the printers paid assessments to Mayor Josiah Quincy's gang; now, no doubt, they will contribute to Mayor Hart's. But the city saved money by the change, we are told. Possibly; it was an experiment. But the government printing office at Washington is no experiment. As a sample only of its success, when Public Printer Benedict took charge, under Cleveland, he found printers standing in each other's way. All good Republicans. He reduced the force by wholesale. Recently a printer employed there, appointed by Democratic influence, met the writer, when it was learned that he had gone into the McKinley camp, just as Ed McSweeney, of the Immigration Bureau at New York, found it convenient to do. Or Terence V. Powderly, or John McMackin, once the Single Tax leader under George, but now chief of the Bureau or Labor Statistics under Roosevelt. Then we have the Industrial Commission, another wing of the Republican machine, and upon which the printers are represented by an ex-rat. Or the Bureau of Labor at Washington, whose chief, Carroll D. Wright, has been recently treating as to prosperity statistics and trust rot. Cover himself is a victim of the machine, and yet he would enlarge it.

Imperialism impelled the writer to vote, for the first time in seven years. It is true, various increase of government was favored by certain allies of Bryan, such as nationalization of banking, railways, telegraph, telephone; yet the danger thereof was remote, and could be forgot later, while the evils of Republicanism—standing army, suppression of strikers, conquest, foreign alliances, injunc-
tion, tariffs, the money power—r are immediately.
It was certainly a contest of the oppressed against their oppressors, with possibility of the latter becoming more arrogant. It meant not only murder in the Philippines, but at home as well. Striking miners now parade the highways with hands overhead to give no plausible excuse for shooting, while deputies glare upon them savagely. "Where are the damned strikers?" asked the voting militia, as they came into a Pennsylvania town recently, insulting women right and left. Whether Anarchists sympathize with trade unions or not, they do not question one’s right to quit work, assemble, discuss, and publish. It was, then, a question of self-defense to-day—for some, at least, with their chances considerably lessened if McKinleyism won.

Voting is not right, 'tis true; but the evil of it in this instance was not to be compared to the evils it was directed against. That's the way it looked.

* * *

Ordinarily trade unions cannot raise wages by prevailing methods, it is agreed by economic students. They may do so in some places and trades, but it is done at the expense of all other tradesmen, who must pay the increased prices that follow. But are there not many industries of a monopolistic character in which an increase of wages does not mean increase of prices,—such as newspaper, magazine, and book publishing, which frequently get returns out of all proportion to the labor expended? Also, railway, telegraph, telephone, upsetting machines, bicycles, automobiles, presses, all these: or machinery, and coal and iron mining. And may not it be said that the rentals of buildings are not fixed by the wages paid to the carpenters, masons, painters, plasterers? How many industries are there in which a natural or monopolistic advantage exists, and in the field of which trade unions may legitimately contend and make actual gains?

* * *

All government is imperialism, whether in the Philippines or in America. Our consent is not required here any more than there. Edward Atkinson figures that the cost of expansion, when taxed upon our products, will prevent us from competing with England, Germany, and France, thus losing us a larger market than could possibly be gained.

The New York "Press" (November 6) had a long editorial on Anarchy, which showed a better grasp of the subject than usually is found, although we learned that Anarchy’s leader is a Quaker who would erect men above God. Rather a strange disciple of the fanatic Fox.

The "Commercial Advertiser" also had an interesting article on the same subject, by Dr.

The "Typographical Journal," of October 15, contained: "What Is Anarchy?"

by the writer, which has been surprisingly well received.

To hear such printers as Boulton, Quihby, and Williams shouting that trade unions must go into politics, and ridiculing those printers who placed their principles ahead of trade unions, was a surprise at this late day. A moment’s reflection must convince them that they are the rankest kind of imperialists, while they denounce imperialism in others.

To answer to Miss Atherton’s plea that a law be enacted excluding Anarchists, the Brook, a "Eagle" replied that it was the absence of law that discouraged Anarchy, and it was just such laws as she proposed that would make all of us Anarchists.

Since the lockdown the New York "Sun" is set up on a piece system, whereby the lean, or reading matter, goes to the piece-hand, and the news, advertisements, goes to a few time-hands. The "rats" can now work any number of hours they please, and are doing it seven days a week, thirteen hours a day.

AUG. McCraith.

Anarchistic Hennessays.

There are people who, though in theory violently hostile to all religion and especially to the Catholic religion, cannot be induced to eat meat on Friday. I am reminded of these on election day when: "An Anarchist going to the ballot-box. The unbeliever who one day in the week changes his diet, thinking that there is just a chance, after all, that he may save his soul thereby, does not differ much from my Anarchist friend McCraithi, who one day in the year, or even one day in seven years, grapps at a ghost of a chance to save his country. And what difference there is in favor of the unbeliever; for eating fish is an innocent ac, while voting is a criminal one. I am willing to be a criminal when the excuse is sufficient. But, if I have in view an end so important as to justify, say, the commission of murder, I at any rate, before acting, must first be satisfied beyond a doubt that the murder will achieve the end in view. One must feel unprecedently at having been a criminal in vain. I do not envy my friend McCraithi’s state of mind when, on the morning after election, he realizes that, as Mr. Dooley predicted, America is ‘no better off Wendish than it was Choosad,’ and that, while he has not freed his fellow-laborers from the burdens of a standing army, he himself must bear henceforth the uncomfortable consciousness of the stain of blood upon his hands.

I used to be connected with a newspaper that went to press every Tuesday night, and the blunders that were sure to be conspicuous in the printed sheet were known in the office as "Wednesday morning surprises." Very painful indeed must be the Wednesday morning surprises (the voting Anarchists, who, in spite of their Anarchist faith, are, after all, but so many Mr. Hennessays taking Mr. Dooley all too seriously when he says: "It is for ye to decide whether Choosad whether the right in this country shall be dragged in the mire or left to lay there; whether this country shall take its place among th’ nations iv’ th’ earth, or somewan else’s; whether ye shall wurrak at a dollar an’ a half a day f’r’ th’ threats or f’r’ the men composin’ th’ threats. When ye go into th’ sacred temple iv’ American patriotism in Mulligan’s barber shop, an’ th’ high priest iv constitutionals, rights, Sacrifice Darsey, that was took’ up last year f’r’ stealin’ coal, hands ye in’ ballot that makes all men free, I bid ye thrust aside with invisible hands th’ currians iv’ th’ holy cell on ye’r right, near th’ cigar case, utter a brief prayer, an’ find th’ lead pencil. It’s up to ye. To settle this question want an’ f’r’ all again. Poor, poor Hinnisy, what a weight is on ye’r bowed shoulders; what circnries to come must be guided by ye’r ability to make a mark in the dark with th’ stub iv a pencil in Mulligan’s barber shop. Countless generations yet unbro, as they pick’ up th’ morun’ paaper an’ road it another battle in th’ Philibbeans, or dig down in their pockets an’ find naws’thin’ but silver there at thirty cints a bushel, may curse or bless ye’r name. Little do ye reckon or even think iv th’ consequences. If ye don’t splice ye’r election, ye may be condemnin’ the ages to servichood."

Gertrude Atherton’s Mistakes.

When the unique proposition of Gertrude Atherton that all persons suspected of being Anarchists be imprisoned until proved not to be, and that all persons pretending or proved to be Anarchists be imprisoned for life either in jails or insane asylums, appeared in the New York "Jo. Mal." I, in common with many other Anarchists of my acquaintance who had admired Mrs. Atherton’s previous contributions to that disreputable newspaper, was amazed beyond measure. Having written so much that is Anarchistic herself, it was hard to understand why she should be so eager to be placed in duration vile. Some of us thought that she was disjionest; for my part, I was convinced that she was in utter ignorance of the Anarchistic doctrine. The one fact that she classed as Anarchist Ex-Governor Altgeld, whose tendencies are strongly in the direction of State Socialism and who, on the whole, is more Archisthan than either Wm. J. Bryan or Grover Cleveland, showed clearly that she was writing at random.

My theory was vindicated a few weeks later, when Mrs. Atherton (see her two articles on another page) reestablished her reputation for honesty and candor by taking it all back. Her correspondence with a western Anarchist (I guessed his identity at once; he has done good work before, by similar methods) had shown her that she was far astray. But her correspondent has not finished his task. Mrs. Atherton still has much to learn about Anarchy. Anarchy is some-
to make common cause with him and his associates, and work for the application of the remedies recommended by the resolution. The object, he averred, was the removal of barriers and obstacles, and surely the most consistent individualist might co-operate in such an enterprise. Mr. Williams's challenge deserves some attention. He spoke earnestly, and evidently thought that he was defending human liberty!

The question as to whether trusts can or should be dealt with as a separate problem may be passed over. Let us assume that the conference was right in the main in considering trusts as something irredeemably vicious, to be abolished at all hazards. What are the methods suggested? The resolution demands four things, namely:

1. Nationalization of the railways and the telegraphs.
2. The placing upon the free list of all raw materials that enter into the production of any trust-controlled article.
3. The adoption of the referendum, or the system of direct legislation by the people.
4. The second plank need not detain us. It is weak, lame, and halting, but it is at least libertarian in nature and direction. Considering the growth of trusts and the absorption by them of nearly ninety per cent of the manufacturing industries, a Democratic conference might be expected to demand complete freedom of trade.

Taking the first plank, what connection is there between the trusts and the telegraph? How does private control and operation of the telegraph lines promote monopoly in production? Would men really desirous of maintaining the greatest amount of industrial liberty go out of their way to demand the substitution of a government telegraph monopoly for a private monopoly which, bad and oppressive as it is, is not without redeeming traits which no government enterprise ever presents?

For the nationalization of the railroads there is offered a reason or an excuse. It is said that, despite the interstate commerce law, there is secret discrimination in rates in favor of large shippers and powerful combinations. Railroads, as common carriers with special privileges from government, are required to treat all customers alike, and, if they violate this condition of the grant and give rebates or make special rates to the trusts, an illegitimate advantage is thus conferred upon the latter,—an advantage which must be accounted no inconsiderable factor in fostering the multiplication and strengthening the grip of the combinations. Government ownership and operation would remove this factor.

This is the argument. It is plausible, but scarcely one that genuine lovers of freedom would advance. Consider the gaps and jumps. In the first place, no one knows the extent of the secret rebates and favors. They are doubtless extended, but what ground has anybody for supposing that they constitute an important favoring condition of trust development? Does any one assert that trusts would not exist but for railroad discrimination? Yet on mere and sheer conjecture there is based a demand for the nationalization of the railroads! In the second place, the secret and illicit rebates are not granted to trusts alone. The weaker railroads make special rates to the small shippers, whom they are glad to attract, the competition for traffic being notoriously desperate. Indeed, the cutting of rates usually proceeds from the struggling and semi-bankrupt lines. If the trusts are aided by the big railroads, their competitors are helped by the small. Quite likely the balance is on the side of the trusts, but is it heavy enough to warrant the drastic measure of nationalization?

Finally, it is pure assumption that the abuse complained of, illegal favoritism, cannot be eradicated otherwise. Certainly true Jeffersonians would first exhaust all methods compatible with the principle of minimum government and maximum liberty, and would try to do away with an evil of unknown proportions by some other means than an enormous increase of the sphere of government monopoly and activity. The readiness, the eagerness, to resort to nationalization does not argue any faith in or devotion to liberty, any distrust and jealousy of the State.

I come to the third plank,—the referendum. Untrammeled majority rule is democracy, but not Jeffersonian Democracy. The latter recognizes the necessity of shielding minorities and individuals from the tyranny of the majority. All the restrictions upon the power of the people imbedded in the constitution were conceived in and prompted by the desire to protect individual freedom. If these restrictions are swept out of existence, and the majority is to rule absolutely, there will be established a democracy radically different from that contemplated by Jefferson.

How, then, can honest and consistent individualists respond to Mr. Williams's appeal, and co-operate with him and his party? To them, indeed, the conference was a disheartening, painful, and sickening spectacle. Not one of the substantial proposals for the destruction of alleged monopoly libertarian in character! All, all the speakers, without exception, who professed to represent Democracy were prepared for a vast installment of State Socialism, and not one even remembered the fundamental doctrine of original and genuine democracy, which was not far removed from the doctrines of those Mr. Williams appeals to, in the name of liberty and individualism.

Why do the present-day Democrats take the name of Jefferson in vain? Jefferson was really a philosophical Anarchist, while Mr. Williams and Bryan are Patriarchalists and half-State Socialists. How can they expect liberty-loving and logical people to co-operate with them?
Irrelevancies.

For the saying that "a man is as old as he feels," but a woman is never as young as she seems," there is, perhaps, a more profound raisonne d'être than one's first feeling observers. It may be accepted as a pleasureously designed to certify that the world has no use for a woman who doesn't "look young enough to her husband," it would be necessary for the woman of twenty-one to have one of twenty-five. For, as it is, in this century, we are all the people who have "come to be at a say," it would have not always been a step farther from conscious, deliberate egotism than mine. The world has a place for a man, however he looks,—for him, for a sphere, for him, and, in his separate attention, he has a separate sphere. Isn't it usually the first question asked about the woman: "Is she good-looking?" Mrs. Whitney has a character who was never called pretty, as a child, but of her as a woman it is said, she is "beautiful, but never stopped to be pretty." Women usually stop to be pretty—if they can. They lose time, stumping. And they may fall,—are sure to fall at last,—for no beauty that cannot be seen in the mirror, trouble, or be long delayed. If women were once betise themselves to realizing life—feeling it—with less care about their external presentation—and let themselves look to the world as they chanced to, would they not, perhaps, come in forty square feet? He is in which box, to those who take part in it,—to the actors on the stage, not the divabette audience in the boxes who are there to be fascinated with the opera-glasses.

It often seems as if there were no as few satisfying books to read. In my people to know, one has learned to take books as one takes each new acquaintance, as one takes each new Monday and Tuesday and Wednesday and Thursday, looking, not for satisfaction, but for moments of good understanding, or some assurance, or breathing-times of rest or stimulus, then one can find books to read. With conflicting feelings—as the and the new conflict—we leave George Sand's "Jacques." The hero is a very human man, with much about him that one loves not to see—certain conventions and ideas, among other things. But, as sometimes happens in this queer mixed world of queer mixed men, he has also good qualities very startling in their rarity. He is not a marish type of hero or in his actions, but, because he is the only way by which he can possess her and the only way by which he can free her from a bad womand, her mother. His decline. Fernande is young, timid, self-distrustful, lovable, and her life is her past to a large part. He is which box, to those who behind him, which if a woman had lived it, would have secured for the designation of "a woman with a Past" —"a woman with a History"—venomously capitalized. He has loved others, alas—frequently, sometimes desperately. But these loves are all of the past,—burned out. He has, he believes, discovered un pardable faults in each of the women once loved. He is a DRY young man. It is a young man who has been effectually shielded from any knowledge of life, and who will dream herself away—the romantic fervors of a passion that is content to look at life through her lover's eyes,—no, not that, through her lover's portr of life to her. Accidentally she learns that he has loved her, but her mourning over the fact is quieted by his assurance that now he loves only her. Quieted for the time. But all through her married life the shadow of the only woman she ever loved, her has glory, he is thinking of some woman once loved,—so her tormenting thoughts possess her. In truth, he is sometimes reminded by a song, an incident, a scene, of this outlawed past: but it is not the cause of his gloom, nor are his present miseries born from seeing her as his confidante, Clemence, a foolish woman, taught in a knowledge of the world, but all the more ignorant of this man's heart. She gives her a sympathy that is the fruit of her innocence; she widens the growing distance between them. He has his confidante, Sylvie, a wise, and sweet, and dear woman, who is, he believe, his half-sister. Full knowledge of this fact can never come, nor will a child born from seeing that he loves her. At last, into their lives, grown sad and dull for Fernande by the torments of her imagination, grown heavy and hard for Jacques through the impossibility of making a child, come Octave, a weak, commonplace, but sufficiently ardent youth, who once old Sylvie. He becomes enamored of Fernande. When he comes to this of her, she resists the situa-
It is putting men to sleep in order to make them instruments of murder. And those who do it, who direct these preparations, and who are proud of it, are the kings, the emperors, the potentates. Those who, though making a specialty of murder and always wearing military uniforms and instruments of murder, sabres and swords, at their sides, revolt and become ignominious when the peace is over.

If the assassinations of kings in general, like that of Humbert in particular, are terrible, it is not because they are cruel and undeserved. The acts executed by the order of King Humbert, are murder, not war. Saint Bartholomew, the religious persecutions, the terrible repugnance of the revolts of peasants, and the massacres committed by the Vendéen troops,—but also in the present,—with the guillotine, the executions, the slow death in prison cells and disciplinary repression, the pillage, the guillotine, the volleys and massacres in war,—are incommensurable more cruel than the assassinations committed by the Archbishops. It is not then, because they are undeserved, that they prove the condition of man to be incapable of understanding that in their place, every man would act the same.

What, indeed, must be the effect upon the mind of a man, like William of Germany, contracted, insufficiently educated, who, for not having enough, that of German "Junker," when he sees that there is no word so stupid or revolting that it fails, when uttered by him, to arouse an enthusiastic "Bravo," be welcomed as something on the same steps of the press of the entire universe. He says that at his command the soldiers must kill even their fathers; they shout: "Hurrah!" He says that the Goethe must be introduced by an iron hand: "Hurrah!" He says that the troops who are going to China must not take any pinchot, but must kill everybody, and, instead of putting him in an "asane" asylum, they start the China to execute his orders. Or take Nicholas II, who, though modest by nature, begins his reign with a declaration that they must "seriously discuss their own affairs," "self-government," is a senseless dream, and the press of the press, at least all that sees and unites in praising him. He proposes a plan of general peace,—a childish, stupendous, and lying plan, while at the same time he increases the number of his effective troops, and there is no limit to the praises that they sing to his wisdom and his virtue. He insults and torments an entire people, the Finns, unnecessarily, cruelly, and pitilessly, and he hears nothing but approval. And finally he organizes the Chinese massacre, revolting in its injustice, in its cruelty, and in the contradiction that it offers to the plan of general peace, and from all sides they praise at the same time his victories and his diplomacy. They say, he continues the peaceful policy of his father.

Under these conditions what must go on in the brains and hearts of these men? The responsibility for the oppression of peoples and for massacres in war falls consequently, not on Alexander or on Humbert, not on William or Nicholas or Chamberlain, the directors of these oppressions and these massacres, but on the people, on the nation, that is, on all the people, on all who are masters of the lives of other men,—on those who maintain them in this position. What is needed, then, is not the killing of the Alexanders, the Nicholases, the William, and the Humberts, but a disencourage, the suppression of the supposed masters.

And what sustains the existing social order is the egotism and blindness of those men who sell their honor and their pride for material advantages. Men placed at the feet of the social ladder, brutalized, as they are by a patriotic and pseudo-religious education and moved on the other hand by their personal interest, give up their liberty and their human dignity in favor of those who are placed higher than they and who offer them material advantages. Those who are placed on a little higher round find themselves in the same situation: under the influence of their brutalization, and especially in view of material advantages, they likewise give up to others their lives, their freedom, with those who are placed still higher, and this continues up to the highest rounds, until the persons are persons at the top are reached. Those at the top have nothing left to acquire, nothing to lose, nothing to gain, and love of power; they are generally so demoralized and brutalized by the power of life and death given them over other men, and by the flattery and platitudes with which, for this reason, they are surrounded, that, though doing evil continually, they are persuaded that they are benefiting humanity.

It is the peoples themselves, in sacrificing their dignity to material advantages, produce these men incapable of acting otherwise than they do, and these men give up their people get angry when these men do stupid or wicked things. To kill them is like first spoiling children and then whipping them. To prevent further oppression or useless war, or to prevent anyone from becoming indignant and killing the parties seemingly responsible, a very little thing would suffice,—namely, that men should understand things as they are and call them by their real names; that they should distinguish between real and fancied enemies, and that the act of assembling and directing it—performed with so much assurance by kings, emperors, and presidents—for preparation for murder. If it would suffice were each emperor or each president to have the honor and the courage to say that his post as commander of troops is not an important and honorable post, as his flatterers would have him believe, but that such command is a base and shameful act of preparation for murder; it would suffice were each commander of troops to understand that all the other taxes, all the other payments of taxes to be used in maintaining soldiers, and all the other men, military service, are not indifferent acts, but bad and shameful acts, for whom he performs them not to defend against murder, but participates in it itself. Then the power of kings, emperors, presidents,—a power which makes us indignant and on account of which we kill them,—would fall of itself.

What is necessary, then, is not to kill the Alexanders, the Carrossi, the Humberts, and the others, but to obtain from them that they are assassins themselves; it is necessary especially to prevent them from killing men at their command.

And if hitherto men have not acted in this way, it is due solely to the sort of hypnotized state in which governments, by an instinct of self-preservation, carefully keep them. To help to bring about a state of things in which men shall neither kill each other or kill, it is necessary, not to kill, but, on the contrary, can only deepen this hypnotism,—but to awaken.

That is what I have tried to do in this short article.

A Condemnable Confession of Error.

Some weeks ago the following article, signed by Ger-trude Atbeuth, appeared in The New York "Journal" under the title, "The Assassination of Archbishops."

We have reached an extraordinarily high degree of civilization, a degree which includes sound and effective legislation. How is it possible, then, that the hatch- ing and educating of Archbishops in our midst? The prosperity of a century hence will read history with a disgusted amazement at our inability to cope with what was to them a simple question of repressing. Morals hold that it is as impossible to sin as (as in a sense, and as is civil law is necessarily founded on the moral precepts, why should it not be a crime to be an Archabiit, whatever the perverted wretch has killed a king for? The reality facts that he is continually imposing his principles to others, that his passionate idea of fame is to have his wax effigy in Mme. Tussaud's, makes him a pestilential microbe in the world's civilization, which should be boated for an alby any means. There is more than one way of getting rid of him. If the temperate and human law-givers of this country and England cannot bring themselves to pass a bill unequivocally stating that any man suspected of being an Anarchist shall be imprisoned until he proves himself innocent, and any proved Archabist shall be imprisoned for life, surely they need not hesitate to assume that the Anarchist is a lunatic, and, as such, should not be permitted to remain at large.

These poor fools whose twisted brains cannot see that the whole world's tendency is toward law and order, and a higher and higher civilization, which neither their crimes nor their plots can ever change, is the wildest anomaly of the nineteenth century. It is incredible that they should be allowed to flourish with no worse punishment than police surveillance and the occasion once a lunatic of one or master criminals. Their reward would appear to be a newspaper notoriety which has no virtues section of the community ever attains, and in which they don't deserve. When one reflects that these material spots could be as thoroughly disinfect as a cholera ship, one wonders how there are any at all, and why no senator of the United States, at all events, is not far-sighted enough to seize the chance to immortalize himself, to say nothing of that sense of duty to himself and to his countrymen, so often. It is all very well to talk about a free press.

What about the freedom of the millions who are law-abiding, and who will indubitably suffer if the Archbists come strong in numbers — as, indeed, they did suffer during the great Pullman strike of 1894, when there was
the Anarchist in the governor's mansion of Illinois. What of the "greatest good of the greatest number"? What of that other popular maxim: "Self-protection is the first law of nature"?

Those who are chosen by the people to make the laws are often powerful men who give them office, and yet they read the sensational accounts of Anarchist crimes and crimes of every kind, and elevate above the heads of the masses. Kings and presidents are slain, and only the European States make an attempt to cope with the evil. The two great Anglo-Saxon races are not in the least civilized on earth, wish to prove their superior humanity and broad-mindedness by the conspicuous encouragement of insane criminals.

Police surveillance is not enough, for not only are police officers known to be vicious and venal, but such restraint upon a great evil is too negative in its moral effect. Once let these lunatics know that they are all in danger of becoming martyrs immediately, and that if they are not they will be hanged as lunatics, or shut up, sold or insane, unless they are wearing stripes and a sort hair. Unless this comes to pass and quickly, England and the United States will go down to posterity as two overgrown babies, incapable of self-protection.

Some time later there appeared in the "Journals" a second article from the same pen, which is also reproduced here to bring the writer's change of view into bold relief:

I have received quite a number of letters from unknown correspondents since I began to write for the "Journals." As a rule I do not read them, for they are almost invariably from Socialists, and ill-epidled. The first one, I have inferred, was a type of the rest; it consisted of a single sheet, and included the following:

"But, as I suppose it is not useful to cast my pearls before swine, I will now stop." Of course, such effusions are merely intended as safety-valves for the writer, and, being of no earthy use to the recipient, are not worth reading.

The other day, however, I received a typewritten letter from a western city, and I saw at a glance that it was from a gentleman. Consequently I read it through. It took me to task for using the word Anarchist, for applying it to the poor, deluded fools who assassinate rulers out of what they have persuaded themselves is a desire for a Utopian civilization, but which is merely a shrieking person of their own convictions. I included that:

"But as I suppose it is not useful to cast my pearls before swine, I will now stop." Of course, such effusions are merely intended as safety-valves for the writer, and, being of no earthy use to the recipient, are not worth reading.

This, however, my correspondent will not have. He is an Anarchist in the great and philosophical sense himself, and, while he can stand the perversion of the word by the ignorant, holds any intelligent person to account for perpetuating the misuse of a word that the best intellects carefully preserve in all the greatness of its first meaning. But it is extraordinary how few, even among the clever and educated people, who are so much thicker in this country than in France and other countries with a self-government, means but the government of self by self, the training of the human character and mind to such a state of moral perfection that there will be no inclination to break the laws, which have been thought to protect society from the selfish and half-civilized tendencies of man; consequently that the laws themselves must become obsolete as unnecessary.

I welcome far from this ideal condition of things as may be imagined, for thousands of the higher civilization are now so well trained that no more occurs to them to break the laws than to remember there are laws to break, and, as my Anarchist points out, all churches are run on purely religious principles, and they who violate their own conscience are turned out, nobody to remain against his will, every pays what he can. And so it is of clubs, with the exception of fixed dues, which to all intents. It is the highest one that the more an Anarchist regards the more flexible are the laws, and the more highly are honor and veracity held in esteem. On the other hand, there is no question that the more highly civilized man becomes, the more important he is of restraint. The highest intelligences are Anarchistic, and, when a man knows that what he has inherited from law-abiding ancestors, and what his own wise knowledge of the world has taught him, have made him a well-balanced individual, it is not laws made for the mob, who would be the first to rebel if it suddenly transgressed to a community still governed by a network of vigilant and intrusive laws. But such men—in the Anglo-Saxon race, at all events—live in their individual communities, and are rarely sensible of the yoke—except, perhaps, when they drive a "bubble" more rapidly than the law allows, or drink too much in the wrong place. They may break other laws, but these are high not as controls, but as a recognition of the improvement movement, to teach them to avoid publicity, and that is all the law asks of them. The law of large communities is no intrusive; it makes all allowances for human nature, and it only necessary to avoid the infraction of it. Our laws are a practical education for that final Anarchy to which the thousands of thoughtful Anarchists now in the world look forward. Surely, therefore, this fine word should be wrested from the brute for which reasons, in which the Paxton gang are eloquent examples. Would not the word "Anarchist" do? Thence these people should be swept off the face of the earth like noisome vermin I still maintain. They are the plague-laden rats, poisoning and robbing the cells of society. It is for such that the law was made, and should be exerted in its full force.

The Really Dangerous Anarchist.

(From the "Journals.")

The Anarchistic dynamist is foolish in his inefficiency compared to his more robust accomplice who does nothing criminal. The kind of enemy to government which every State, church, political organization, or Ethical Union has been naturally in guard against is the demoral, alert, quiet young man or woman who pushes his or her way to the front in the government of any society, in order, from this vantage-ground, to check at every turn, in a thousand scarcely noticeable ways, the orderly development, and to arrest the growth of any organization beyond the narrowest local extent. The non-dynamite-throwing Anarchist is the most dangerous of all enemies to the State. But in the highest degree those who maintain that democracy is the highest degree those who maintain that every private organization where a membership is voted to control the new thing. Submissive methods give the peaceful Anarchist his chance, his democratic looks more demure and faithful than with the average sheep's clothing. He—or she—never misses a meeting. He always is ready to spend any amount of valuable time in private conversation on the ever the hundred, and especially the petition of all government, and reversal of majority-organizations. He—although he generally—seems to himself as Anarchist; he is at most an "Individualist," and is a champion of "Individualism" against the wish and purpose of every majority. As he flatters individuals,—especially insignificant units,—so he panders to all narrow, merely local, interests as opposed to wide and national concerns. He feeds sectional pride at the expense of national; national at the cost of the world-wide federation.

A Chambermaid's Diary.

By OCTAVE MINHEAU.

Translated from the French by BENJ. R. TUCKER.

A French chambermaid, who has served in the houses of the nobility of Paris, speaks out. It is her position in a country denoue, and there begins the description of her life. The people about her, she is often reminded of epicus, "in her fashion, and thus to her own entire satisfaction. She mercilessly tears away the veils that conceal all sorts of odors and unhealthy habits in the various strata of society, so that her social becomes a delirious comedy of manners, crammed with the more or less refined chicanery of the world. The author describes her book as filled with "the revolting that makes folly souls laugh, the comical that makes from weep." A French critic says that the work's seems to be to show that nearly all the mists are lower bed, and that the person who allows life them as they know how to be.
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