On Picket Duty.

It is not generally known that the new anti-Anarchist law not only authorizes the deportation of aliens disbelieving in organized government, but provides long terms of imprisonment for American citizens inviting such aliens to these shores. If I were to invite my friend John Henry Mackay to this country to pay me a social visit, I could be imprisoned for years under this law. But John Henry Mackay, residing in Berlin, can invite me to visit him there without danger of interference on the part of Emperor William, provided always that during my sojourn I do not speak with unseemly levity of the emperor's moustache. Which is the freer country, the United States or Germany?

It seems probable at the present writing that, as a result of the attempt of the government to deport John Turner, the constitutionality of the law under which the attempt is made will be passed upon by the supreme court of the United States. It is to be hoped that the case of the defence will be adequately presented. In my view the only hope of overturning the law lies in the argument that it is in conflict with the spirit of the constitution, for I consider it almost certain that the higher court will decide, as did the lower court, that it does not conflict with the letter. As it could not in any case be in the power of Congress to pass effective laws limiting the freedom of speech of persons not residing within the jurisdiction of the United States, it is hardly to be supposed that the framers of the constitution intended to forbid such legislation, of the possibility of which they never could have dreamed. But, on the other hand, it is still less to be supposed that, in framing a constitution for a land whose earliest settlers came here from foreign shores in search of freedom to speak, they intended to make it possible to prevent others from following this example. Turner's lawyers should build their case on this contention.

The court of appeals of this State lately rendered a self-contradictory decision, in a faith-healing case, which would be amusing if it were not outrageous. A Dr. W. had been found guilty of neglecting an adopted child, sixteen months old, in not calling a physician to treat her for catarhal pneumonia. The New York penal code makes it a misdemeanor to omit, without lawful excuse, to perform the duty to furnish food, shelter, medical attendance, etc., to minors. It is this provision the court of appeals had to pass upon, construe, and apply. The defendant contended that he had provided medical attendance—of the kind he believed and had faith in. The court rejected this plea. It admitted that many sincere and intelligent persons believed in faith-healing, and even received the benefits from those credulous and belief in the saving efficacy of mental healing, Christian Science, or the various offshoots of those creeds, and went on to say: "But, sitting as a court of law for the purpose of considering and determining the meaning of statutes, we have nothing to do with these variousities in religious beliefs, and have no power to determine which is correct. We place no limitations upon the power of the mind over the body, the power of faith to dispel disease, or the power of the supreme being to heal the sick. We merely declare the law as given by the legislature. We have considered the legal proposition raised by the record, and have—had no error on the part of the trial court not called for a reversal." The court did not merely declare the law; it also upheld its constitutionality, and decided that it involved no violation of personal liberty. In doing this it did place limitations upon the power of mind over body, the power of faith to dispel disease, and so on. Did it not decide that the defendant had omitted to perform his duty in failing to provide medical attendance? Did not this amount to saying that faith cure was no cure at all, and that men must provide, not the medical attendance they believe in, but the sort the legislature and the majority prescribe? Certainly did and to say this is to limit the power of mind and of faith. The law as interpreted and sustained compels a father to do for his child something he would not do for himself, something he considers dangerous, wrong, and fatal. It does this because the majority believes in that mode of treatment, and because the majority's will is law. If the court cannot see that this is the only logical ground for its decision, it can see nothing.

Apropos of the New York faith-cure case, dealt with in another paragraph, the following from the Springfield "Republican" will be read with interest: "Simultaneously with the New York decision comes one from the New Hampshire supreme court maintaining entirely opposite conclusions from those upon which the New York law and courts proceed. Rev. Irving T. Tomlinson, first-reader in the Christian Science church at Concord, undertook to treat a case of appendicitis by Christian Science meth-

ols. He was prosecuted for malpractice, and the lower court decided for the defendant. The State supreme court now follows in overruling the exceptions to the other's findings—thus maintaining the right of Christian Science 'physicians' to practise in New Hampshire on a footing of equality with regular medical practitioners. Apparently, therefore, if Mr. Prinsep lived in New Hampshire, he would have been held to have employed medical attendance in resorting to the faith cure for his sick child. The New Hampshire supreme court is to be congratulated both on its logic and its respect for liberty. Some sham individualists on the New York press commend the New York decision and condemn that of New Hampshire as one legalizing murder! Yet Croly says there is too much logic in the world.

Necessary Evils Only Aged Abuses.

[Henry Morley]

It is the characteristic of an abuse that has perpetuated itself to appear as a necessity.

De Profundis.

"Considerationes a mortuariis, at viventibus: non est qui cognoscit malum . . . Non est qui requirit animam . . . Ps. 14." when the clouds' solemn bowers echo back the shouts of the many and strong.

That things are all as they best may be, save a few to be right ere long.

And my eyes have not the vision in them to discern what to them is so clear.

The blot seems straightway in me alone; one better he were not here.

The stout upstanders say, All's well with us; ruers have sought to rue! And what the potent say so oft, can it fail to be somewhat true? Briefly go they, briefely come; their dust smokes around their career.

Till I think I am one born out of due time who has no calling here.

Their daws bring busy joys, it seems; their eyes exultance sweet.

Our times are blessed times, they cry; Life shapes it as is most meet,

And nothing is much the matter; there are many smiles to a tear;

Then what is the matter is I say. Why should such one be here? . . .

Let him to whose ears the low-voiced Best seems stilled by the clash of the First, Who holds that, if to the Better there be, it exists a fall like at the Worst, Who feels that delight is a delicate growth stunted by crookedness, custom, and fear, Get him up and become as one shaped away; he disturbs the order here.

Thomas Hardy.
Liberty.
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A Logician to Crosby's Rescue.

Ernest Crosby, though devoting some five pages in the latest number of the "Whim" to a further discussion of "logic and common sense," touches scarcely a point made by me in my rejoinder in the November number of Liberty. He comes nearest to doing so in the following sentences:

"To sail by chart and compass is the best way, if your chart is perfect, but, when you see breakers ahead where your chart shows no reef, you must fall back upon your father-line. Sounding is slow and prosaic work, and it is much pleasanter to steer by the constellations, but, human "science" being as imperfect as it is and as it needs must be, we must often have recourse to our instincts as a corrective for our calculations.

As if sounding were not as scientific a method as steering by the constellations, and as if the father-line were not a logical and scientific instrument equally with the chart and compass! In making recourse to the father-line equivalent to recourse to instinct Crosby is as illogical as usual. When Crosby comes in sight of an unexpected reef, he doesn't sound; he guesses.

But what does Crosby do when instinct fails him? Back he goes to logic. And so, perceiving that any attempt to answer my latest arguments by the method of feeling would be a sorry job, he grasps eagerly at a helping hand extended him by a logician. It appears that some person more logical than himself has offered aid, the following syllogism with which to tell me to the earth:

Major premise, I do not believe in violence, and desire to abide by the State;
Minor premise, I can best promote my ideal by using some of the means (those least obnoxious in practice) afforded by the State;
Conclusion, I may, nay, must, vote for all progressive measures in order to serve my ideal.

First stepping to note that this argument does not justify Crosby in voting for non-progressive measures, as he did when he voted for the platform on which Bryan stood, I point out that the gentleman who offers this perfectly logical syllogism is clearly unfamiliar with the controversy upon which he has intruded himself. The origin of this controversy was a complaint on my part that Crosby, while voting for invasion himself, is continually assailing others for resort to invasive methods even for good motives. In other words, Crosby, in his criticisms of others, has taken a position distinctly antagonistic to the minor premise of the syllogism quoted. He is barred, therefore, from answering me by a syllogism based on that which he originally denied. In this syllogism the conclusion follows from the premises, but the minor premise is unsound. I am ready to main ain this when occasion offers. But first Crosby, or his friendly correspondent, must find some means of justifying Crosby for invasion by good motives that will not at the same time justify others whom he criticizes for doing the same thing.

The "Sun" and the Boycott.

Notwithstanding the successful usurpation of the revolutionary judges, which has made legislation a farce and an idle form, certain State legislatures have undertaken to suppress boycotting by statute. Wisconsin has some sort of an anti-combination and anti-conspiracy act which includes a prohibition of boycott agreements. Alabama has passed a special anti-boycotting and anti-blacklisting act, which all the platonic eclectors have praised with much warmth and the usual lack of intelligence and fairness.

The New York "Sun," a paper which plumes itself on its firm and constant adherence to first principles (and which, it must be admitted, is more radical and clear-sighted than the average organ of plutocracy in respect of labor-and-capital questions), rejoices that the "good sense of the American people will make the use of this iniquitous instrument of coercion a legal offense." Let us see what the Alabama statute provides, and why the "Sun" approves and hails it as a sign of progress. Here is a summary of the law:

It is declared unlawful not only for two or more persons to conspire together for the purpose of preventing any person or persons, firm, or corporation, from carrying on any lawful business, or for the purpose of interfering with the same, but also for any person or persons to go near or loiter about the premises of any person, firm, or corporation engaged in a lawful business for the purpose of influencing or inducing others not to trade with, buy from, sell to, or have business dealings with, such person, firm, or corporation; or to print or circulate any notice of boycott, boycott cards, stickers, 'dodgers,' or 'unfair lists,' publishing or declaring that a boycott or ban exists, or has existed, on, or is contemplated against any person, firm, or corporation engaged in a lawful business.

The maintenance and circulation of employers' blacklist is also forbidden under penalties of the same degree of severity as those attached to boycotting by labor.

The "Sun" comment on this act is as follows:

Now, to all clear-headed and right-feeling men it is obvious that the boycott is an outrage levied at a freeman's fundamental right to work where, when, and at what wage he chooses and to manage his own business according to his own judgment, so long as he obeys the law. Nothing could be more preposterous than the attempt of Messrs. Mitchell and Gompers to confuse the public mind by asserting that the application of the boycott to employers or non-unionist workers is as defensible as the course pursued by Christian churches in refusing membership to those persons who fail to comply with certain prescribed conditions. A church by withholding membership as an applicant does not frustrate or trammel his exercise of the fundamental right to work for self-support and the support of his family. No such absurd analogy as Mr. Mitchell attempts to draw will be conceded in a court of justice or by intelligent lawmakers. It is well known that boycotters have been repeatedly adjudged by jurists to be a violation of the common law.

The first sentence of this passage is a reckless assertion. It is not true that all clear-headed and right-feeling men look upon the boycott as an outrage levied either at the right to work or at the right to manage one's business according to his own judgment. The "Sun" recognizes the right of any number of men to strike as a body; but what difference is there between an agreement to quit a man's service and an agreement to withdraw custom from him? Any argument that justifies individual strikes justifies individual boycotts, and every argument in defense of a concerted strike is an argument in favor of a concerted boycott.

I may strike, because no man has any right to compel me to work for him or with him. I may boycott, because no man has a right to my custom. My boycott may deprive a man of work, but so may my striking. In neither case have I done anything wrong. I owe no man either work or wages. I owe all men respect of their equal liberty, and neither the strike nor the boycott violates this liberty.

Is an agreement to boycott a conspiracy because it contemplates injury? So does an agreement to strike. The object in either case is compulsion by passive and perfectly legitimate means—economic compulsion.

Messrs. Gompers and Mitchell did not attempt to confuse the public mind by their analogy, and there was nothing preposterous in their comparison. A church does not restrict the right to work by boycotting obnoxious religiousists, but is there one principle for the needs of the body and another for the needs of the soul? To many the spiritual life (so called) is infinitely more important than the material one. Rights are rights, and, if one may not combine to deprive a man of dollars and cents we may have to bestow, we should not be permitted to combine to deprive him of the consolations of church-going.

Courts of justice and intelligent (?) law-makers may not countenance this analogy, but this does not prove the unsoundness of the analogy. Courts of justice and legislatures for many decades denied the right to strike, the right to combine, or the purpose of securing higher wages by peaceful and economic means. The courts have changed their mind on the question of strikes, and they will have to change it on the boycott question. A few have already performed and undergone the operation.

Will the "Sun" consider the pro-boycott arguments of Liberty, or of Judge Rogers in the St. Louis telegraphers' case, and try to refute
A Communist’s Communism.

"Free Society" is trying to raise money to get a linotype; and Jay Fox is helping the movement along by bringing out a "long-cherished idea." Here are some of the conspicuous parts of his idea:

I am not one of those who think a hide-bound organization necessary, to the proper conduct of any enterprise; but I do maintain that some voluntary arrangement, that may in some respects take on the color of organization, is absolutely necessary to carry out any set line of action. While living under the present system, we are forced, to a large extent, to use its methods, them or not.

It is left to us, then, to organize a group having for its purpose the inauguration of the matter under consideration. Let this group formulate some plans for raising the necessary funds, publishing a prospectus of the use it intends to make of the funds and the manner in which it proposes to administer its trust. It should be organized in such a way that all the property accumulated would at all times be administered in the interest of the movement and under the immediate jurisdiction of the group. More than that: it should be so arranged that subscribing comrades in distant parts have a voice in the conduct of affairs. Such a group would insure the confidence of all that their hard-earned dollars would be used in perpetuity for the advancement of the cause they hold dear; making each one feel a personal responsibility for the conduct of the propaganda, and casting over the whole the sweet flavor of Anarchist Communism.

I cannot imagine how the necessary funds could be raised and the work suggested carried on otherwise than by a group of trustworthy comrades associated together in the manner outlined above, or on some similar plan. But such an enterprise, to arrest the general interest of the comrades, must be conducted on a basis in harmony with the ideal of Anarchist Communism. We may have the greatest amount of confidence in the honesty and integrity of certain individual comrades—which we certainly have, and they have well earned it,—yet not many of us can ever get ourselves to feel it to be consistent, with our ideal, or with ordinary common sense, to place it in the absolute power of any one person to oversee, administer, and hold in private ownership the property of the propaganda.

We may have the most excellent comrade at the head of a literary bureau, or whatever else it may be, and such comrade may be giving good satisfaction, yet there will be, none the less, a feeling that such comrade should not be in such a position, but subject to the movement, through a group holding in trust the machinery of the propaganda. The propaganda has outgrown its individual stage. Formerly we had only a few strong individuals, strong in their faith in the ideal, strong in their adhesions to the ideal, strong in their devotion to the propaganda, and strong, doubtless, in their devotion to the dissemination of our ideas. These were the sturdy pioneers who planted the seed of liberty anew in our benighted land. These individual propagandists paved the way for the group propagandists, and the time is now ripe for the groups to take up the cause in earnest and carry it on to its final victory.

All this sets me to wondering what Anarchist Communism is. I suppose I am a nuisance with my wondering, but I don't see how I am to stop it till I get more light. Now, this letter of Mr. Fox's does not describe the movement as I had imagined it. It is certainly contrary to much that we have heard of as being Anarchist Communism. Not only is the demand for an organization, with words like "jurisdiction" and "subject," contrary to the anti-organization talk that is so familiar (I always did hope that that talk did not really represent the movement), but the plan is in direct disregard of Kropotkine’s well-known fundamental tenet that a business can best be directed by those who are actually doing the work of that business. Yet this is what is now to give a sweet flavor of Anarchist Communism to the dry crust of voluntary cooperation; and these proposals are becoming a basis of discussion without moving any zealous comrade to protest against them as misrepresenting the ideal.

I always regret to see Anarchist Communists talking about the necessity of conforming to the present society till we can quite upset it. I see some reason for such words, indeed. If you buy one linotype and make the privilege of using it free to every Anarchist Communist, or even to every contributor to the linotype fund, Malthus takes charge at once; the material is not sufficient for the people. This would be somewhat different if all the linotypes on the continent, together with the rest of the capital, were similarly free. Nevertheless, I hold that the way to establish the new society is by living according to it, and not according to the old, and that Anarchist Communism, if it be anything better than moonshine, has a distinct tactical advantage over the rest of us in having an ideal that can be so easily practiced whilst the surrounding world still clings to its ideals. Anarchist Communists have often agreed with me and started voluntary Communist industries, and have reported some success; there, then, is a good argument for their method,—for Communism, I mean. Then they have sooner or later petered out, so far as I know; and that seems to me a clear proof of some weakness in Communism. The various explanations for the reason, why it must be so bear the familiar stamp of proof, why their enterprises fail. There are always plenty of such reasons, after the failure. There were the same sort of reasons, usually, for the failure of the other enterprise that didn’t fail; but it had strength to conquer them. Every man, the doctors tell us, is taking into his system germs fit to kill him in a very short time; the test of a healthy man is that his system kills the germs. Just so with industries. The fact that you were smitten with a deadly disease is in one sense a reason for your death, but it happened equally to the successful industries; if you did not get rid of your disease as they did, you were weaker than they. I only hope six Anarchist Communists will at once rebuke me for all this, and show why their reasons for failure are very good, that I may see whether their very good reasons will not be as different, one man’s from another’s, as those of six municipal Socialists explaining why the western mails couldn’t compete with Wells, Fargo & Co. a while ago.

If a man believes the world is going to be saved by something which the law prohbits, like the Mutual Bank, he has a delightfully good ex-

* Speaking for myself, I would not go into the banking business, even if the law happened to restrictions on it. Consequently these restrictions supply me with no excuse, delight' or other reason. I want Anarchists in finance, not that I may become a banker, but that bankers may find themselves under the necessity of competing for business. —Strum.
that their voice is a sham, because they have no real control. Then they are going to feel twice as cross as if they had put the whole definitely out of their hands and saw it being managed in a way that they found fault with. No, gentlemen: if you want peace and quietness and propaganda, the way is to give your Chicago man or your Chicago group a vote of confidence and a linotype and your blessing; and then watch the thing sink or swim in the hands of those who can touch the machinery.

Tell them to present an annual report of treasury and of work done; appoint an auditor if you think best; that is as much oversight as you can afford. If you really want to keep all your hands on the helm, the only way is to give the money for the first payment on the machine and tell the editor that you will furnish the next year’s payment if the thing is run to suit you; that is a genuine and practical control. The end of that, though, will be that some year the payment won’t be made; unless the editor makes most of it. But, whatever you do, don’t take F. E. Coon’s advice. If you adopt any essential part of his plan as I have quoted it, there will be a demand for an Anarchist-Communist paper to take “Free Society’s” place.

STEVEN T. BYINGTON

Loria and Economic Interpretation.*

Among the original thinkers of the nineteenth century Karl Marx will probably find a place, not as the law-giver of Socialism, but as the chief founder of the economic interpretation of history. His contribution to political science through the materialistic conception of history is steadily gaining a wider acceptance from scholars of the most divergent views. Historic and sociological study has undoubtedly received a powerful impulse from Marx’s theory, which, in the hands of succeeding writers, increases our knowledge of social institutions. By many of his admirers Loria has been hailed as the originator of the theory, though he himself makes no such claim. True, he almost ignores the efforts of those who preceded him in this field. In one place he does admit that the economic basis of politics was “set forth very freely by Jones, Proudhon, Marx (who throws much light on the question), Engels, Lasalle,” and others. But we must go back to James Harrington’s “Oceana,” about the middle of the seventeenth century, for the earliest statement of historic materialism.

Buckley broke ground in tracing the effects of physical conditions, such as soil, climate, and food supply, upon human progress. Lewis H. Morgan, in his profound and masterly work, pointed out the prime importance of economic factors in the early stages of society, though it was beyond his sphere to apply the principle to succeeding civilization. Yet Morgan’s most important contribution to sociology received scant recognition until Engels followed it up with his “Origin of the Family,” in which he combined the historic theories of Marx with the researches of Morgan. Engels, who had already done so much to establish Marx’s economic view of history, was the first to supplement and confirm Morgan’s conclusions.

It cannot be denied that “economic determinism,” as the French have it, has suffered more from its friends than its opponents. Economic factors have been forced to serve as an adequate explanation of every social and historic event in all ages, to the entire exclusion of other considerations. Its Socialist adherents have also made the mistake of assuming economic interpretation to be a methodive process of confining. Of course it would be unfair to Marx and Engels to make them responsible for the vagaries of present-day disciples, especially as the two Socialist leaders had already worked out the theory in its widest applications as early as 1847.

“It is not,” wrote Engels, as quoted by Prof. Seligman,—“it is not that the economic situation is the cause in the sense of being the only active agent, and that everything else is only a passive result. It is, on the contrary, a case of mutual action on the basis of the economic necessity which in last instance works itself out.”

The fear of antagonizing established institutions or conflicting with existing interests has not deterred Loria from pushing the economic point of view to its logical conclusion. “The State,” says he, “is the political expression of the existing economic system, and is always composed therefore of the economically dominant class.” Indeed, the State was created in the interests of the proprietors. One has only to read Morgan’s account of the rise of political authority in Greece and Rome, or Fustel de Coulanges’ description of “The Ancient City,” to find abundant proof of Loria’s contention. The State, he tells us, “became in the hands of a rapacious minority a terrible engine of defensive and offensive warfare against the exploited majority.” The supreme purpose of government is to guarantee and augment the income from capital.

Proudhon, more than sixty years ago, by some what different reasoning, arrived at conclusions almost identical with those to which Loria is led by his analysis of capitalism and the State. By property Proudhon meant the power of exploitation, of compelling tribute by virtue of the mere fact of ownership. Property he defined as “the exploitation of the weak by the strong.”

It was this process he termed robbery, and, as he is known to professors and writers in encyclopedias mostly at second-hand, he has therefore ever since been misrepresented and maligncd.

Like Proudhon, Loria holds that the basis of economic exploitation is the appropriation of the land. When all opportunities to produce an independent living are closed to the propertyless, they become dependent upon the proprietary class. Aided by law and religion, the State is the chief instrument through which the privileged minority maintain their supremacy. By moral suasion, by legal convention and political force, the dominant class overcome the natural reluctance of the dependent majority, gaining their tacit acquiescence in a social condition of which they are the victims.

Economic supremacy necessitates political conquest. The monopolist, whether of land or capital, lives upon unearned income. Proudhon, as we have noted, calls the process robbery; Loria speaks of revenues. “After having possessed himself of the revenues, it is necessary for him to possess political authority in order to make sure of their continuance.” The numerical superiority of the exploited is “neutralized by the moral influence exerted on them by the unproductive laborers who encourage weakness in the lower classes and keep them in a state of ignorance in order to make sure of their acquiescence in the usurpation system.”

Under the forms of slavery and serfdom all the land on which a free man could support himself had not been monopolized; hence the proprietors, in order to secure revenues, were obliged to bring the laborers under bodily subjection. But, as population gradually increased and all available land was appropriated, the master class had no need to hold the producers in bondage.

Economic necessity took the place of personal compulsion. The free laborer was willing to provide a revenue for property in return for the privilege of working to gain subsistence. The appropriation of revenue thus became automatic. Landlordism combined with the wage system forms the simplest and most effectual method of securing a perpetual income to the proprietors.

Cunningham, Rogers, and Ashley had worked out the above conclusions as applied to England, while Inama-Sternegg had achieved like results by investigating economic history in Germany, before Loria formulated his views. But Niebohr’s more recent researches upon the origin of slavery were promptly apparent by Loria’s work.

Political institutions correspond to the prevailing economic conditions. On this subject Loria shows deeper insight than Spencer. Representative government evolved out of the requirements of modern industrialism and the wage system. Under slavery and serfdom the political class had no need for it.

Economic evolution goes incessantly on. The desired change will take place, not through politics, but by the new economic form at length pushing aside and destroying the old.

Inverted Darwinism is the term by which Loria explains the proverbial incompetency of State officials and their methods. In politics the survival of the unfit is the rule. Even as far back as the ancient Greek democracies this fact was known. It is best illustrated in the most advanced modern States. The dominant class, while desiring a government strong enough to hold in check the dependent masses, do not want it so efficient as to curb their own power of exploitation and accumulation. A single instance, out of many that will occur to the reader, is the inability of the Interstate Commerce Commission to prevent discrimination by railroads in favor of large corporations. Certain laws against unequal rates and against the ownership of mines by transportation companies in Pennsylvania, which are never enforced, might also be cited. Laws exist, attesting the extent to which the propertyless participate in their making, which, if carried out, would unquestionably tend to restrict capitalism greatly. But the interests of the revenue-receiving class

---

* Loria and Economic Interpretation, by Achille Loria, Romani, Kornwreich & Co., London; Scribner’s, New York. $1.25.

* Proudhon hardly intended this phrase as a definition. It is rather a characterization of property, by way of contrast with the author’s concept-characterization of communism as “the exploitation of the strong by the weak.”—Editor.
favor public officials who are unwilling or unfit to execute such laws. Hence the time-serving, spineless, narrow, and incapable usually aspire to and obtain the most important offices, while the truly fit either fail to reach the seats of power, or, if they ever attain to them, are speedily "eliminated. Politicians of the Altgold stamp are soon turned down.

There has been little said about Loria’s shortcomings. Where so much is excellent, suggestive, fresh, and brimful of ardent conviction, it seems invincible to speak of the weakness of the method. Even in answering his critics he does not make it clear that the economic method is adequate to explain all the laws of human progress. He succeeds, however, in showing that many important factors, if not the whole environment, are modified and determined by the economic life. Under such industrial conditions as prevail in this country it is plain that his theory lays an altogether disproportionate stress on land monopoly. It can hardly be said that the landlords here form a distinct class. Henry George made the same mistake. Rent of land is still in most European countries a principal means of exploitation. Purely industrial modes of securing revenue prevail in the country which has carried the capitalist system to its highest perfection. Despite remarkable is it not? Aside from some American institutions, Loria suffers from the results of merely second-hand knowledge in treating of the United States.

Opposed alike to collectivism, communism, and monopolistic exploitation, he sees with Proudhon that free spontaneous associations of laborers and unprivileged producers of industrial capital will give us the economic form harmonizing with individual liberty and practical equality of condition. Property shorn of its power of increase, competition between economic equals, and an egalitarian basis of individual conduct, make up a possible, rational, and desirable social ideal, and also the form of society toward which economic evolution is steadily carrying us.

WILLIAM BAILER.

The present wave of reaction toward autocracy in Britain and America is the inevitable aftermath of the late glorious and popular wars with which the ruling classes of both countries entered the war. Revives the military spirit, leads to centralisation of power, and a reassertion of the most reprehensible features of government. While a little more kingly ambition and usurpation of long-expected prerogatives may form the prelude to the overthrow of the throne altogether in England, the weak imitation of a crowned autocrat presented by the redoubtable Teddy in this country will serve only to excite the risibility of the sovereign people. Yet even political reaction may be turned to account by the educational activity of consistent libertarians.

Mr. Crosby advices the betting men on the subscription list of the "Whim" to back the idea of that periodical rather than those of "Liberty," "as the history of the next few centuries is bound to confirm them." Does he know this, or is it a "feeling"? Has he arrived at the conclusion by logical and scientific processes, or do his "bones" tell him so? I cannot argue against feelings, but, if Mr. Crosby has reasons for the faith in him, it would be interesting to inspect them. My study of history does not lead me to the conclusion that Christian communism is making headway and conquering the nations. The world is no more Christian today than it was nine centuries ago. It is certainly less Archistic, but not as the result of preaching love and meekness and non-resistance. By the way, has the "Whim" idea? What business has it with this inferior and untrustworthy guide, and why does it maintain its feelings?

The Jewel Consistency.

"What funny things we see when we don’t have a gun!" For instance, take this Panama business. The other day our stromenous, but motherly, president “received the representative from Panama. The August (not to say September) Theodore extended “the glad hand” with as much apparent eagerness as he concealed when he gripped the presidency; and the representative from Panama was taken into “the gentry of nations.” Why? Avant, fat-head! Did not Panama secede? And does not Theodore love secession when it wins?

But on that same day when Panama was welcomed by our spectacular executive, one Hilt, a representative congress from Illinois, introduced a resolution in “the name of laborers, those poor wretches who had been deprived of the right to vote, in certain States, “except those who had been guilty of rebellion, or other crime.” So, while Panama was being lauded because it refused to submit to slavery, those who had unsuccessfully rebelled were being excepted from among those entitled to vote, because they had been guilty of “crime”! Verily, it is but a step (and a short one, at times) from “crime” to the sublime! In fact, I think, in the very word had better be divided into syllables, and expressed as sub-time—meaning something put under, or below, in company with an effective disinfectant.

When one is convicted of an attempt at burglary, his sentence is usually less severe than would have been passed upon him had he succeeded in his effort to burglarize; but, when one rebels and is convicted, he receives punishment for his “crime” only because he failed in it. The punishment is not for his failure—not for the alleged offence itself. If he had succeeded, he would not only not have been punished, but would have been rewarded. Hence our motheresse president spills his verbal pearls before a successful criminal (rebels) at the same time that Hilt is referring in terms of reproach and contempt to such poor devils as had tried to rebel but had failed! Thus are we taught the noble lesson, by our “uno guido president, that to win his approval one must get away with the goods.” “To oeeve it mak e sme t i red”—which, being freely interpreted, means: “The dog returns to absorb again that which he erstwhile cast aside.”

Under date of “Washington, November 14th,” the “Sun” quotes the president as having incorporated into his annual message to congress a statement on the Panama canal matter, from which I quote the following:

"It seems evident that in a matter such as this we should finally decide which is the best route, and, if the treaty terms of this second acceptable route are sufficiently modified, we should then give notice that we are no longer subject to trifling or insinuating dealing on the part of those whom the accident of position has placed in temporary control of the ground through which the route must pass: that if they will come to an agreement with us, that, if they fail to come to such an agreement with us, we mustforthwith take the matter into our own hands."

The Italis are mine.

Panama having “cried” (rebelled) before the message was issued, the said “statement” was eliminated, having become unnecessary through the recent trend of events; but some portions of the said “statement” are deeply interesting. Those portentous words were not intended to be for general application, but only for the specific purpose of letting Co-lumbia know that, when we wanted any land from her, we should first “decide which is the best route” for the purpose we have in mind, and then we should decide when she (Colombia by any action) had been “trifling or insinuating” beyond our patience, and then we should be first “just” (according to our own idea of the matter), and then “generous” (also according to our own idea of the matter), and then, if she still proved intractable, we should “forthwith take the matter into our own hands.” That’s just what a highwayman does.

The italicised portion of the said quotation from President Roosevelt’s statement (look to me like a somewhat warped excerpt from the platform of the Democratic party in this State in the gubernatorial campaign last year. The latter applied to coal lands while the former applied to canal lands, both are on the same grand principle—namely, “if you see anything that you want, and are strong enough to hold it, why, take it.”

Teddy, oh Teddy, I’m filled with dismay that you can disgrace that you, of all men, should surrender your pen. As an aid to Democracy’s rear! ONLOOKER.

New York News-Factories.

To the Editor of Liberty:

The arrest of John Turner and his threatened deportation under the new Anti-Anarchist law have brought the general subject of Anarchism prominently before the public; and at this time, while a great deal of stuff is being printed in the daily papers on the subject, the following facts, both in the interview with the editor of the New York “Times” may be of interest, as indicating, to some extent, at least, the attitude of the press toward Anarchy.

As the readers of Liberty know, the newspapers accounts of the meeting which Mr. Turner was addressing at the time of his arrest were absolutely false. Therefore, having been present at the meeting and knowing the actual facts of the case, I called on the editor of the “Times,” the principal Harper, with a request that he print a letter of correction in his paper.

When I approached the editor in his sanctum, and stated my errand, he looked up and said: “Well, we don’t care to do anything much for those Anarchists, unless it is to see them all safely to the electric chair.”

When I remonstrated that, regardless of his personal opinion of the Anarchists, he was bound to the public by an obligation to print anything at all about them, common decency and fairness dictated that they should tell the truth, he remarked: “We just consider that these people are entitled to fairness any more than a pack of mad dogs.”

And in the course of his further remarks he volunteered the information that Anarchists were “people banded together for purposes of assassination,” who were “everybody’s enemies.”

In spite of these strong statements, the editor printed my letter, but without comment.

Of course I know there is nothing new in all this. Misrepresentation and calumny, I suppose, are the lot of every radical movement. But, when the editor of so important and influential a newspaper as the “Times,” in an amazing burst of frankness, comes out with statements the only inference from which is that they are “everybody’s enemies,” he assumes to be “everybody’s enemy,” the occasion seems to furnish a good opportunity (which I hope the editor of Liberty will not miss) for someone to follow Dr. Davis’s example and “get after him.”

The following facts may also be of interest to those who are not well acquainted with newspaper methods of getting news. In the course of my investigations of this matter, I traced the responsibility for the original story of the so-called Turner meeting to the New York City News Association, a branch of the Associated Press. From the manager of that association I learned that the story as it appeared in the “Times,” "Press," and "Journal," and from them was copied broadcast over the country, was written by a young “space grabber,” who was “anxious to get on the regular staff,” and therefore,
“in his youthful enthusiasm to please, wrote the story in the manner he thought most likely to please.”

According to the direct admissions of the manager, the reporter was “most likely not in the hall at all, but got his facts from some policeman who took part in the demonstration who wanted to get a little glory for himself by taking out there had been a riot.” (The quotations mark literal statements.)

Thus are our newspapers “made.”

New York, November 10, 1902.

A Triumph of Morality.

[Edmond Tarrouncourt in “Le Journal.”]

M. Benoit, teacher of history in the grammar school, had a deplorable reputation, and his existence was gradually becoming a notorious scandal. He was twenty-eight years old, and wore a gloomy air; he stalked along with little bus with his collar that they might meet the teacher and look him squarely in the face without lifting hand to cap; for all it was a great satisfaction.

Twice a year an agreement—it was unnecessary even to formulate it—prevailed, according to which M. Benoit, when met alone, was to enjoy the honor of a salute, but when appearing in the company of his indisputable companion, was to be stared at unhappily.

This simple decision led soon to consequences still more disgraceful; the children, delighted with the idea of mischief, and in proof of approval of their parents, decided that the opportunities of meeting the vengeful would really be insufficient if they should leave the matter to chance, and, moved by the very legitimate desire of multitudes their insults, began to devise means of aiding chance. For this reason the approaches to the house where M. Benoit lived became the favorite meeting-place; the day-schoolers’ club elected domicile beneath the windows of the teacher of history, whose door they watched; as soon as the double profile of the bearded man and his old mistresses appeared on the threshold, all play ceased, positions were rectified in military fashion, and the law-defying couple defiled before a row of impassible faces.

The parents knew that and scolded for form’s sake, at the same time laughing: “Oh, these rogues!” A censure so gaily pronounced had all the value of denouncing those who were taking the side of the guilty teacher. When the public conscience, in the name of morality, has entered upon some unjust course, the idea of drawing back becomes unacceptable, and mankind sees its civic duty to push the misleading to its last consequences.

“What can you expect? These children are shocked, and show it; one cannot blame them.”

Now the Benoits were called “Philomene and Benoit”; the latter had for his wife a young girl who had won the couple this classic name; behind her and behind him little voices shouted: “Bauvets! Bauvets!” The cry “Bauvets!” was the signal upon to announce the coming of the curé and the cessation of sports. It was lastly changed into “No, M’Vau.” An embryonic man of art, a scholar in the fifth class, drew a beautiful âte (Beau-Six*), with chalk, on the teacher’s door. The monogram received the fortune that it deserved; the school blackboard never failed to be illustrated with a Six when M. Benoit was to give a lesson; sometimes the Six was adorned with an eye, with a beard; again, its round belly, emphasized by a petticoat, gave a hint of pregnancy. They laughed. They shouted. They even went so far as to make fun of the English note tö, to see the joke. He simply thought: “The lads here are very ill bred.”

But the rudeness grew worse. After a short time the pupils were no longer satisfied not to uncover in presence of the teacher. They sharpened the insinuation, their indignity with a mocking laugh, and insisted until the young instructor was forced, in spite of himself, to notice their insolence.

“Well, my boy, you no longer salute!”

“No, M’Vau.”

At last the scandal entered upon its malignant period, too long awaited. The joy was universal. What was going to happen? Bauvets, cornered by rumor, would be obliged to complain to the principal. Then they would see! They were going to see.

“It is high time!”

The principal, received M. Benoitvisited, chilly.

“All this is much to be regretted, much to be regretted; and I regret most thearest embarrassment. To punish the pupil who has been lucky in respect for you is to draw general attention to the irregularity of your . . . what shall I say? . . . of your . . .

I do not understand, Monsieur Benoit.”

“I do not understand, Monsieur Benoit.”

“Well, you know,—and you will do justice to my liberalism,—as long as possible, and perhaps even too long,—yes, I repeat, Monsieur Benoit, too long,—I have tried to close my eyes, and doubtless it has been a mistake on your part.”

“Understand!”

“Sea of the University are bound more than other

* In French Bauvets and Beau-Six are pronounced alike. Transcriber.
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