Or: Picket Duty.

The December number of the “Pacific Monthly” contains a long and strong article by C. E. S. Wood, of Portland, Oregon, on “The Suppression of Vice by Law.” Favoring the abolition of laws against vice, it is thoroughly Anarchistic in its tendency. I note with pleasure that this magazine will introduce with its January number a “new department of personal opinion” to be conducted by Mr. Wood under the title of “Impressions.” It is sure to be bold, vigorous, and interesting.

Mr. Eytingon’s good humor over the difficulty with Colombia would be more intelligible to me, if the individual agent of Panama stood in a more libertarian relation to the new government that is over him than that which he held to the old government that has been lifted from him. President Roosevelt’s denial of Colombian sovereignty for the purpose of affirming Panamanian sovereignty seems to me unlikely to arouse Anarchistic enthusiasm, especially as every man of sense knows that Roosevelt never would have dared to deny Colombian sovereignty, had Colombia been as strong as France or England.

It is gratifying to note that some of the more important of the Spencer obituaries recognize the unmistakable Anarchistic trend of the philosopher’s political teaching. The Springfield “Republican,” from whose article a paragraph is reprinted in another column, even goes so far as to declare Spencer an Anarchist. There is some justification for this, for Spencer’s doctrine of equal liberty is Anarchism pure and simple, and his magnificent championship of liberty in so many directions has been and will remain one of the chief influences in the propagation of Anarchism. Nevertheless, so important are the matters in which he denied his fundamental principle in his efforts to apply it that he cannot be adjudged an Anarchist. His theory of communal rights of the land antagonizes the Anarchistic doctrine that occupancy and use alone constitute a just land title; his advocacy of property in ideas is at war with the Anarchistic doctrine of free access to the wealth of the soul; and, above all, his justification of compulsory cooperation for defence almost ruins his otherwise Anarchistic indictment of majority rule over non-invasive minorities. Anarchists recognize in Herbert Spencer a kindred spirit, and offer to his memory their tribute of admiration and gratitude, but they cannot accept him as a trustworthy exponent of their political philosophy.

The only blot on the stirring Turner meeting at Cooper Union was the speech of that sickening windbag, the Rev. Henry Frank. In extending an invitation to him the committee of arrangements was guilty of an egregious blunder, against which I made my individual protest in advance. This muttoning and bombastic ranter deluged the audience with a stream of rodomontage which was finally stopped only by methods that would have been insulting if applied to a less offensive individual. Frank was the only speaker who took pains to explicitly disavow belief in Anarchism, and, when he did so, every Anarchist in the hall heaved a deep sigh of relief.

Liberty desires to call the attention of its friends to the distressing situation of Georgia and Henry Replogle, the former publishers of “Egosism,” than whom there have been no more faithful workers for the cause of Anarchism. For many months Georgia Replogle has been seriously and suffering ill, and her illness has necessitated heavy expenditures, which the arduous toil of Henry Replogle, himself in poor health, has been insufficient to meet. Their present condition is painful and perilous in the extreme. They have not authorized this journal to appeal on their behalf, but it takes the responsibility of doing so. The gratitude that all Anarchists must feel toward these clear-sighted and untiring champions of liberty should find immediate expression in the form of money contributions, which may be sent to Georgia Replogle, Box 1307, Denver, Colorado. And sympathetic letters from earnest friends, whether accompanied by money or not, would surely carry cheer and comfort to a home now buried in the darkness of depression.

Are You You?

[Saturday Evening Post]

Are you a trailer, or are you a trolley? Are you tagged to a leader through wisdom and folly? Are you Somebody Else, or You? Do you work by the pound and swallow it “straight”? Do you pray by the book, do you pay by the rate? Do you tie your cravat by the calendar’s date? Do you follow a cue?

Are you a writer, or that which is worded? Are you a shepherd, or one of the herded? Which are you—a What or a Who? It sounds well to call yourself “one of the Flock.” But a sheep is a sheep after all. At the block You’re nothing but mutton, or possibly steck. Would you flavor a stew?

Are you a being and bone of your soul, or are you a mummery to carry a scroll? Are you Somebody Else, or You? When you finally pass to the heavenly wicket, Where Peter the Scrutinious stands at his pikel, Are you going to give him a blank for a ticket? Do you think it will do?
The Degenerate Republic.

Some persons still keep up appearances and profess to believe that the amount of freedom once possessed and cherished by the United States has not been lost or surrendered through ignorance, greed, commercialism, and recklessness. It is time such ridiculous and nauseating pretensions were abandoned. American liberty is dead. A vulgar, doubly offensive despotism has been permitted to rear and establish itself.

We are behind England, behind Switzerland, behind France, behind Germany even, in several important directions. None of those countries would endure such outrages as the degenerate American classes and masses have acquiesced in, even applauded. The constitution annulled; plutocracy is on the throne, and cheap mountebank moralists carry out its orders while adding hypocrisy to tyranny and crime. The absurd and irresponsible Roosevelt is not merely an individual; he is a type.

When, after dismembering Colombia, he dared profess sentiments of anxiety and regard for her, he unwittingly characterized a spirit, a period, a generation. Machiavellianism is a thousand times more respectable than Hay-Rooseveltism. The most sickening feature of the Panama scandal is the cant, the assumption of virtues, by which it was justified. The highwayman's plea may provoke your indignation; the Rooseveltian appeal to the "duties" and "burdens" imposed on him by the treaty with Colombia that had run with the land makes you ashamed of the species to which you belong. How can such liars look one another in the face? you ask. Has decency departed to the beasts?

But this is a digression. The Panama grab and the idiotic (read Rooseveltian) defence of it require no discussion in these columns. I mean to speak of the monstrous anti-Anarchist provision of the new immigration law, which a federal court has upheld as not inconsistent with the constitution.

The constitution! What is left of it? Have not ingenuous hangers of the brotherhood of th'ee "construed" it out of real and substantial existences? Slavery, oppression, massacre, torture, despotism, every crime and infamy is possible under the charter which was once thought so wonderful and so advanced and libertarian. It does not protect the Filipino victims of plutocratic aggression. It does not apply to Porto Rico, Alaska, and other "possessions" of the so-called n. p. b. and it has been intimated that it may not extend even to the organized territories.

Is it of much protective value at home? The greenback decision, the lottery cases, and a number of less notorious supreme court usurpations suggest the answer. A constitution is worthless, worse than worthless, where the love of liberty is dead and the conception of liberty so ridiculously unintelligent as it is even among the teachers, judges, and editors of the United States.

That the anti-Anarchist section of the immigration act should be held to be constitutional is, therefore, the most natural thing in the world. This section enables the government to do what no European country, Russia alone excepted, would think of doing; but what of that? The fiction that the United States is free and more progressive than Europe might as well be discarded.

One of the provisions of this section provides for the exclusion and deportation of persons who disbelieve in all organized government, even if they do not expound their disbeliefs here. This has been indignantly denounced at a mass meeting and in several liberal papers. But is it more outrageous and impudent than the denial of the freedom to advocate the abolition of the State by peaceful means, the substitution of voluntary cooperation, i.e., a gradual and deliberate way, for the compulsory cooperation of governmentalism, with its inevitable corruption, fraud, waste, and folly? Verily, most of the critics of the law (and how few there are!) understand the principle of liberty as little as do the knives and ignoramuses who defend it.

The comments on Judge Lacombe's decision sustaining the law were unconscious exhibitions of ignorance and superficiality. What did "his honor" say? That the constitutional provisions guaranteeing freedom of speech, press, and publication were not intended to benefit aliens. Any one already in this blessed country enjoys these rights; but he who seeks to join us has no rights that we are bound to respect. Was the absurdity of this position pointed out? Here and there the remark was freely made that the law, if not unconstitutional, ought to be amended, so that men like Tolstoi and Reclus and Kropotkine (and Jesus, if he should be added) might be admitted.

Let us see what this logie would lead us to. If congress may order the deportation of an immigrant within two years (or two months) of his arrival for professing or expressing Anarchistic ideas, it may order his deportation within twenty years for the same offence. Unless he gets himself naturalized, he is without redress or protection. If he may be deported for preaching Anarchism, he may be denied for any and every reason, or on reason, the absolute congressional despotism seems fit to specify. He may be deported for criticizing the president, for telling the truth about humbugs like Roosevelt, for opposing protection, for renouncing the Declaration of Independence, even for advocating democracy! What the citizen can claim as a right congress may make a crime and ground for deportation in an alien irrespective of the length of his sojourn in the country. If the constitution does not apply to him, he is as helpless as the subject of the czar. He need not be granted even a hearing. An "administrative order" will do in his case.

But what does the constitution say? This: "Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech or of the press." It does not say that congress shall not deprive citizens or persons already in the United States of freedom of thought and utterance. The words are, "shall make no law." Is not the provision for the deportation of aliens exercising, or known to have exercised abroad, the right of free speech "a law"?

Judge Lacombe's distinction is baseless. That it has not been universally repudiated is the result of general indifference and contempt for liberty, constitutionalism, and original Americanism. Who cares about rights, liberty, justice, in these days? Blood, spolis, full dinner-pails, and low methods are the needs of the degenerate republicans fitly represented by half-witted buccaneers and vulgar bootlers.

The lengths and depths to which the apologists of capitalism will go in their efforts to bolster the existing order by which they live are strikingly shown in a pamphlet entitled "Anarchy in Cleveland," which the Republicans of Ohio issued and circulated in the last political campaign for the purpose of defeating Tom L. Johnson. The pamphlet bears a red cover decorated with skull and cross-bones, and purports to be a series of excerpts from the minutes of the Franklin Club (afterwards the Liberty Association) of Cleveland, Ohio, which met for many years on Sunday afternoons for the discussion of economic subjects. It is declared in the pamphlet that these minutes were confiscated by the authorities during a search that followed the shooting of McKinley. As a matter of fact, however, no such confiscation occurred. The minutes, instead of being in the possession of the Ohio authorities, are in the possession, according to the editor of the "Ohio State Journal," of the Ohio Republican State Central Committee. How they got there is a mystery. Some think that they were stolen by the janitor of the hall in which the Liberty Association met; others that they were delivered through the treachery of a former secretary. In making the excerpts from the minutes the Republican committee carefully selected every paragraph making any mention of Anarchism, in order to identify the Association with Anarchism in the pub.
The Bright Side of Rough Riding.

It is one of the advantages of not being in politics that one may belong to a party without being obliged to agree with it in their own particular brand of politics. Indeed, in this particular case I have met the party through thick and thin. Now I have supposed myself to be an anti-imperialist. But here are the anti-imperialists walking through the columns of the papers with long faces, and saying this Panama affair, while not a single San Francisco daily finds it amusing. I find myself able to smile as much as the approach of Christmas demands. I don’t like to be gloomy, and I am glad I can part company with them.

Not that I do not object to the expansion of the empire. I wish it understood that I am a little American. I would rather live in a small State west of the large State I have just arrived in than have the name of President Roosevelt.

I am going to leave a few of my words with the President of Panama. I have been told that he has a great many words to say on the subject of Panama. I am going to let him know that I am not a little American, and that I have a great many words to say on the subject of Panama.

President Roosevelt’s comment on this matter has been his disregard of international law. International law is indeed a weapon, and it is a weapon we have over it. It is devoted mainly, and on the whole efficiently, to preventing international war; this surely gives it a fair claim to our respect. But there is a fly in the ointment. International law is all arranged to help keep things as they are, and things must not stay as they are; therefore we have to recognize international law as the enemy of mankind on occasion. It seems to me that President Roosevelt has been guilty of one of the occasions where this is true, and has struck a blow against the law right where the law needed to be struck. The great power of his office makes the blow effective; so I smile.

They are saying that it was a case of robbery; and some Anarchists are echoing the cry. Who was robbed, pray? I should be very sorry to see the Panamanians robbed of their goods. But, so far as I see, the Panamanians have their goods right where they want them, and their land is getting used for precisely what they most want it to be used for—to wit, to eat a canal. If they are in any point dissatisfied with the action of the United States, I have overlooked the reason why. Many people who profess to have a ground of complaint are the Colombians, who don’t live on the isthmus and are not being interfered with to their least whim. As to anything they have any business with; they are complaining because they are robbed of the privilege of oppressing the Panamanians by stopping an important part of commerce on the isthmus.

This is the radical fault of international law, that it is based on the recognition of rights of sovereignty. Owe, in Europe there are a lot of men with a terrible sense of honor and beyond a certain stage, such good people, as to their own protection of the weak against the unrighteous strong; and they let the sultan go right on massacring people as often as he likes it, not because they love him, nor even because he owes them money to pay, but because they have found out much more effective ways of collecting bonds than by leaving the sultan in charge; see, for instance, what they are doing just now at Panama, about the Colombians. They have not been able to agree with each other (though this has something to do with it), but for the sake of preserving the principle that a sovereign must be permitted to retain its sovereignty. If this principle were not to be respected, they do not know what would become of them and their cannon. Nor do I; but then, I don’t care what becomes of them, and they do. So, having international law pretty much back of them, they have settled this principle more firmly in international law than it is settled in any other part of human life at present. But Roosevelt has outpaced this with his bold and strong-handed assertion of the contention that Panama is a slave nation; and if I am to believe a nuisance of itself, it has no rights that need be held sacred. I want to see this principle received everywhere; and I smile.

Now should it be forgotten, that while the United States acquires certain sovereign rights on the isthmus, which will doubtless be enough of a nuisance to some of her fat friends, their suppression, the revolution is distinctly a step toward greater local independence for the Isthmians. The banana plantation is the policeman of the isthmus, for he can stop us at any minute, and for this reason the United States has kept order on the isthmus. It is true, the legal application of this treaty to the present circumstances is so shabby that the administration party may be likely to lay much stress on this in defending its action. Nevertheless, the action itself, even with the analogous case of Hawaii in mind, under such immediate occupation of the isthmus would have been thought decent if there had not been this old and approved habit of handling the Caribbean in time of revolution. The American forces in Brazil did not undertake to protect the revolutionaries; government against a possible counter-revolution. Historians will certainly trace the present intervention in Panama to that old treaty as its source. But the right of the United States in the premises was strictly limited to keeping order. I am proposing to keep the Colombian troops off the isthmus, therefore, the United States and President Roosevelt have committed themselves to this luminous, perhaps even, truth—that, when a territory rebels against the power which controls it, and that power sends in an army to suppress the insurrection, this action on the part of the governing power is a public disorder as much as it is the business of the police to suppress! I only wish they would live up to that; but how can I help smiling?

STEVEN T. BYINGTON.

A Great Speech by Clemenceau.

The question of liberty of education has occupied the French senate considerably of late, the members of the Extreme Left, as a rule, taking the Socialist position of State monopoly of education. M. Georges Clemenceau, however, took issue with his fellow radicals, and on November 17 made a powerful and eloquent plea for liberty. Clemenceau is no Anarchist, he does not follow the logic of liberty to its conclusion; but his arguments before the body of Anarchists in its tendency, and so little has been heard about it in the American press, that large space in this issue of Liberty may be devoted to it with profit.

About three-fourths of the speech is given below, translated from the report in Clemenceau’s paper, “L’Aurore”:

Gentlemen:—vote for liberty is about to be dropped into the urn containing the votes of men who demand liberty only for themselves. I reject the omnipotence of the late state because I see there a tyranny; others reject it because it is not their tyranny.

You wish, my dear friends (addressing the Left), to take away political power from the enemies of the republic; that is something; but it is not enough; for political power is ephemeral and passes away; I wish also to take away their power over souls. And I can do it only through liberty, because the soul

What matters the idol! The main thing is to know. The priest and the altar change, human obedience never.—Henry Moret.
does not surrender to constraint. If constraint had been able to prevail, the church would be mistress of the world. I profit by the lesson... 

In education, as in every other part of the political structure, everything follows from two fundamental principles, liberty and authority. Under the former the same words are employed, but they stand for two absolutely different and absolutely opposite conceptions. Under monarchy authority comes from above; it is a delegation of divine power; for monarchy, liberty is, much embarrassed to define it; it does not exist; let us say, that from time to time the sovereign may take a notion to be tolerant. Under the republic liberty is the condition under which it can be only the guarantee of the liberty of each. Only, a circumstance arises to modify somewhat the position of each. The republicans have overturned the monarchy in the name of liberty; they have, in the name of the country, they have felt some difficulty in divesting themselves of a power which failed to save the monarchy. And, on the other hand, monarchists who had never granted liberty could not, in the opposition, do otherwise than defend it. Hence an interchange of roles; and it is precisely this which has led me to explain to my colleagues how it is that presently my vote is going to be mingled for a brief moment with the votes of the Right.

In spite of the great temptation to not divert ourselves, or to divest ourselves as little as possible, of this authority which our party possessed, we nevertheless have granted liberties which this country had never known, and given liberty of the press such as no régime has known; we have given liberty of assembly such as no former government of France could have lived under. And we are engaged in the struggle (designating the Right), liberty of conscience, by liberating this country from the yoke of the Catholic church. When we gave these liberties, what happened? We mingled our votes with those of the Right, and we did it in the name of liberty which it would have denied us if the roles had been interchanged. Under all circumstances my vote has responded to the appeal of those of our colleagues who ask for liberty. Today my vote, in spite of your request (designating the Right), mingles again with the votes of the Right for the same great cause of republican liberty. Not that I pretend to do a favor to anybody, but I pretend that the republic must give the same right to all without distinction. There is no greater, no favor, no privilege in the republic; there is right; and we must concede the same right to all.

If there is a distinction to be made between the spiritual power and the temporal power, it is certain that the former shall not exist over the latter. That I do not accept the question in this form, and here I regret to find myself a very resolute and determined antagonist of my honorable colleague and friend, M. Litilhac, who asks us to transfer the spiritual power from the pope to the State, from the infallible, unchangeable pope to the fallible and changing State. This means a civil, laic Catholicism, with a university clergy.

M. Litilhac.—I said: "profiting by social experience."

M. Clemencon.—You have offered us a phrase which must be read again from the tribune as the basis of the following phrase of Aristote: "Education should be one and the same for all. We must beware of the belief that a citizen belongs to himself; all belong to the State." Gentleman, you know that this quotation was presented to us in the form of a resolution, and I am to expense to you, if you have ever asked yourselves why and how the Christians, who were a liberty in the arena, came to translate the precept, "Love one another," into tortures, massacres, and burnings? The question is interesting, gentlemen, because it is full of instruction for civil liberty. I will tell you. It was because they were victims of the same illusion as yourselves; they wanted to be the State. They were an admirable thing, one of the finest outbursts of passion ever known, until the day when they thought to find in the State a power for their propaganda. On that day Christianity followed; since then it has been nothing but a corporation of domination by fire and sword; it has been the spirit of oppression over the world; and today, the Catholics, though still murmuring the words that came to them from tradition, aspire to nothing less than the regained political power in order to restore them to the liberties that they ask of us today—that is, to the triumph of the popish religion, to the suppression of former times. M. Litilhac has not seen that.

M. Litilhac.—I must not be made to say what I have not said. Why overwhelm th- ideal democratic State of tomorrow with the crimes of the State of yesterday, of which I have as great a horror as you? It is a solidarity which I reject and which I have never set up.

M. Clemencoun.—One can always reject all solidarity past, but I suggest to you, to your colleague, that it does not at all depend on you, on me, or on any one here, to say what the State of tomorrow will be.

M. Litilhac.—It will be our vice to make it good. M. Clemencoun.—But that will not always depend on you. You will not have the p wer, and what do intentions amount to? This is no a dig: I legue; I you to let me continue. You know my sentiments regarding the existence of the State; they are not a thesis, and I think I have a right to contradict it; you have not yet the monopoly of teaching.

M. Litilhac.—Nevertheless I cannot allow opinions that have not uttered to be attributed to me. Clemencoun.—I have spoken for hours; I show where your thesis leads. In any case let me speak; when I have finished, you can answer me if you like. I have said that the charity of the gospel was legislated by a bloody people, so it was in the first place with our beautiful revolutionatory motto. Our work today is to realize it peacefully. Have a care lest, in seeking this realization in the omnipotence of the State, we lead only to the violence which the omnipotence of the State has always produced.

Gentlemen, in the province from which I come they have an old song of a peasant who comes back from the field and sings impressively. He was unable to see the city; the harvest is over. My honorable colleague, M. Litilhac, has had the opposite experience. The State has prevented him from seeing the citizens, the forest has prevented him from seeing the trees; in fact, man was ignored by entire antityple, which absorbed him in the State. It took the French Revolution to discover him and give him his rights. Through it the knowledge has been forced upon us that in the State there is but one living, concrete reality, with which you have to deal,—man, whom we wish free and just. The State which you invoke I also, but as supreme guarantee of human development through justice and right.

You shall dream of an ideal State, Sod all Plato, so did Aristotle, so did Thomas More, so do other dreamers. You dream of the ideal State. In books you make this State as beautiful as you please; but we are weak, changing men, confronted with realities. Do you think I have never changed in my life? It would be the greatest evil I could say of myself. And you seek a dogma. The church has its dogma; it is a certificate of birth, it must have monopoly of education. It has its own law, it is despotic. It comes to it from heaven; it decades to spread it among us, to impose it upon the recalcitrant. But we? Where is our dogma? What can I impose as absolute truth? Where is the absolute, if I can convince, but I am despondingly weak if I wish to impose, not having the thunderbolts of Providence at my disposition. Where is your dogma? You cannot answer me, because you have none, because you cannot have any.

In your scheme of education the professor will have to say something from his chair. He will have to take some course. He will have to say whether he approves or not the story of Tiberius, and when he has to relate a certain drama of Jules, what opinion will he have? Will Jesus Christ be God, or only a man? And when he teaches that great phenomenon of Christianity which encomp-"
judge, after all the heresies that have died at the stake, the heresiarch reformer who continues his work and carries it to victory?

You cannot maintain silence. You will have to do a duty you wish to say whether they were right or wrong,—whether the church did well in burning Jean Huss, or whether you blame it for doing so. What council of sub-masters will be charged with furnishing information for the day? And by what means will you impose it?

Ah! before the French Revolution the course of the dominators was easy. They had the only power that there was in the world. But our fathers took this power; they reduced it to dust, and scattered it in liberty over all humanity. And now you seek to gather up a few scattered fragments and make of them a minute block of authority, with which you imagine that you will again clash in common. Madness! There is no greater error, no greater fault.

I know that you protest that this is not what you want to do. But what is monoply, if not that? Your intentions are good; but I show you what your acts would lead. Constraint is a terrible wheelwork. You cannot say yourselves where you will be able to stop. And into this adventure that has no issue when you have been unable to apply even your most modest law of compulsion. You have made education compulsory, and you have not been able to enforce it. Every year it is noted that a large number of conspirators are enrolled in the service of the flag who do not know even how to read.

The other day I heard one of my good friends of the Left say: "We are not very revolutionary; we ask only a return to the law of 1808."

Oh, no you are not very revolutionary! I even find you sufficiently reactionary! The law of 1808 is Napoleon's law; it is the law of the time when Napoleon uttered the words which M. Berard has recalled so often; before which one could not do with my police and my priests." For the word "priests" substitute the word "teachers," and you will have the idea that underlies monopoly in the hands of its partisans.

Gentlemen, if you could succeed, you would put into the hands of universal suffrage, into the hands of the changing majorities which succeed each other in the legislatures, the most formidable weapon of reaction ever seen in the world, for the responsibility would be intangible, scattered among the anonymous crowd.

Napoleon had a certain sequence in his ideas. Say what you will. Himself everywhere; liberty nowhere. Where was his interest? Where was his strength? Where was his life? Where was the liberty of assembly? Where was the liberty of conscience? The church had been bought by the Concordat, by the recognition of the Brothers of the Concordat the only barrier against the republicans that the monopoly was constituted. And the wheel has turned, and here you are in possession of power. For thirty years you have been masters, and, under the régime of this bad law, your majorities have steadily increased, so that the other day a monarchist said to you: "We number thirty in this body." You have granted that liberty of the press of which Napoleon was afraid, and you are about to grant the liberty of assembly in defiance of the liberties that you are in the act of building, you would suddenly introduce authority in a form the most violent, the most ambitious, the most shocking for all consciences and all times! It is not possible. You can do it, but for you personally. I am afraid you will make a mistake. The people are too fallible. We have not substituted the people for the pope, and we are all fallible. But, when we have shaped our course toward the liberal ideas, we have no more right to recoily recoil in fear from our work, and appeal like frightened children to a protective authority of which should be the first victims. No; we have put our trust in liberty, and we must continue it.

I appreciate the fact that my own words do not carry here the authority necessary to give pause to some of my best friends. But, in the discussion of this Fallon law itself, the fitting word was spoken by the Frenchman to whom, if my memory serves me, he was addressing his remarks, to the extent of recalling the old Roman law of the censors.

Well, do you not see that there is a danger to be guarded against? You know very well that your majority is not eternal,—that it depends upon consultation of the popular masses, which are the classification of parties in proportions impossible to foresee. What will this monopoly be? No one can say, no one can know. What use will be made of it? That is in the hands of your colleagues: "If the republicans were in a minority, we should have something besides monopoly to cry about!" But I do not want to cry. I do not want to be conquered. I want to place myself in an impregnable position. And you find in the right of the individual, because it is a tangible reality, because the problem of republics is to develop this reality, to make it ever stronger, more effective, make man ever free—

And then there is an argument of more serious than all the others. Your neutral school will necessarily be entangled in Biblical conceptions; it will be unable to prevent questions from framing themselves in the heads of the children: Who are we? What is the earth, the sky, those clouds, those stars? Where did it all come from? Where is it going? Whither is it taking us? Is there an old book which has solved all these questions, this discipline of the outside?

A. P. in the Left.—It is not very scientific.

M. Clément. —I agree with you. It has not solved them in the same way that modern science has. What will you do? Either you will antagonize those schools, or you will not take any say of the questions which besiege the young mind.

There are schools of private initiative which offer children the conceptions of modern science in place of the old legendary conceptions; and these schools of reason you abandon! Can there be a greater aberration! You are afraid of Catholicism which is dying from the blows of reason, and you close the schools of reason! Have we not witnessed lately in France that interesting and illustrious movement of the public school of Rome, which has never been taken in pagan Rome its ambition and its will to rule at any cost.

M. Dominique Deleluge. —What you say is contrary to the categorical declarations of all the parties of the Left.

M. Clément. —My dear colleague, your words prove how much we are in need of liberty of education. You are not in possession of history; no more am I. When you take the floor, you will tell your listeners a little; I tell mine as I can, very badly no doubt; but be good enough to admit that I make a very great effort, since I have the courage to separate from a certain number of my friends in order to seek, as I am, in the intelligence and in the genuine spirit of the people, those who make up the bulk of the people, this public spirit. I always discern the old Roman spirit in the Roman church. The church has taken possession not only of the capital itself, but of the ideas that haunted its old walls. It has made them its own; it is true; but I wish that I too could have the thought, I would demonstrate to you that the real heir of the conceptions of the Roman conquest is no other than the bishop of Rome who has made himself a power in the world of popery. He has taken up again the dream of universal domination.

Gentlemen, we are men of Latin mind. The pursuit of unity through God, through the king, through the State, haunts us; we do not accept diversity in liberty. We escape the church only to fall into the arms of the University. We are not crushed by the one, we must be crushed by the other.

Many thanks to all others,—and it is a very natural one—to believe that they make men,
Gentlemen, in such a matter I am for the classic routine. I believe that: the father and mother still count for something. Every day we hear it said: "The child is a piece of soft wax; we shape it as we will." Sey heredity and environment have determined: that is, that they teach them to learn. Do you really believe that a child on the school benches always bears a necessary relation, determined by his teacher, to the man that he is to be?!

J. Rutledge.—My position is that superior minds resist this malleability.

M. Claiborne.—I am glad of it. You content yourself, then, with determining the inferior minds. I am not satisfied. I wish you to take the average, the mediocris. With these you aim to constitute an average type, to make a republic of good pupils, a republic of good functionaries who will march in the direction in which you have started them. I like Duglesen, but more ambitious; I seek men, and I say that by your own confession you cannot make them. Ah! you will help to make them! I do not mean to protest against the influence of education; quite the contrary. I took upon it as infinitely precious, and one is readier than I do it to homage. But the young who come to you arrive with determined ideas acquired daily in their families. Your brotherhood of teachers, gentlemen, is the bid that you will close the great school of the church; no more can you close the great school of the family. You do not prevent the evening teaching by the fireside; you do not prevent the dropping of the child, who asks nothing better than to trust those who love him, a true or false word that will undo all your efforts of the day.

Gentlemen, as I have said before, all the liberties go together. You have established liberty of the press and liberty of assembly; I am sure you will establish liberty of conscience; then have the courage also to establish liberty of education. When you have begun the work of liberty, it is not in your rights to bar liberty and to make statues to it or give it name to public squares and trees. It must be a living reality, for it alone can win minds and keep them. Seeking to explain how the church monopoly and the State monopoly together produced the two generations that clashed in the bloody tragedy of the Revolution, you have said to us: "There was Condorcet, there was Voltaire, there was Diderot." But do they exist no longer? Or, if they exist, is it not their spirit that must be consecrated to the Statute? I propose, gentlemen, their books were forbidden and burned; today they are everywhere, and with them their sons,—their authentic representatives among us. In this assembly, whose members are a worthy succession, I mean Bertelot. Well, Bertelot has declared himself on this question; a few days ago, in a public meeting, he spoke as those great ancestors would have spoken; he said the word expected of them. Listen: "Nevertheless, gentlemen, our tradition—let us never forget—it is that of free thought. In our enthusiasm for science and reason we must always maintain this fundamental principle that we are not to consider while counting real on their voluntary assent, without persecuting anybody, without even pretending to infallibility, without claiming to possess and without trying to impose in the name of any set of immortal principles."

Well, gentlemen, I am with Bertelot. Who answers him? Where are the authorized counsellors of monopoly? You throw yourselves blindly into a struggle in which your defeat is inevitable. You pretend to oppose sons to fathers. Can you think that the sons will not rebel? Can you think that the fathers, whom you oblige to send their children to a school whose teaching they disapprove will not start a revolution? No, not this teaching, while they will not be alone. The church will come to the aid of the rebellious fathers, and the father and the church will make a joint effort on the child. And this concomitant which liberty would have given you, you will render impossible.

For my part, I would enter with the liberty, doors and windows wide open, and would say to the father: "Here is the history of the church,—a history of massacres, of burnings, of blood, of dragonades, of persecutions, of tyrannies. And here now is the republic, born of liberty. All words can reach you and your child." For I wish to gain the father with the child. And, when I shall have shown him the power of the plane of the Ark of the seat of superior rigour over the régime of coercion, the father will be won over to the régime of free examination. And, when he shall have been won over to free criticism, he will be mine. He will be a father of liberty and a new soldier of the republic. And I shall horty make peace where you organize war.

If you wish to know what this régime can produce, witness the astonishing flourishing of schools in the United States. There you will make a people of automata employing mechanically the gestures of democracy. But meantime the peoples among whom initiative is in honor will take possession of the world.

Gentlemen, I ask your pardon for having spoken so long. In good faith I have tried to follow the path of reason and the republican idea through the uncertainties and confusion of the discussion in which we are engaged. I do not know if I have succeeded; my ambition is simply to make you understand my point of view. I hear many of my friends say to me: "You are an absolute mind." One is always the absolute mind of somebody. The speech which I have just made is one in connection with the planning of my parliamentary career. I have looked about me, I have learned, I have tried to profit by the lessons that have come to me from every side. I will not say that I have absorbed them as in the past; but in one respect I have not changed,—it is impossible to conceive of a man more detached from Rome than I am. I have reached the point where I do not even feel the need of insulating it.

I believe that the only way to secularize my country, to disengage it from the old Roman theocracy, I understand that I can do it only to the extent that I am capable of obtaining the assent of the majority of my fellow-citizens, and I seek to do it in a form that does not give the impression of church and State, which I never expected to see and which I now hope to see realized in my lifetime, I would effect under such conditions of liberalism that no Frenchman who has the talent and means to go to mass would find it impossible to do so. . . .

Gentlemen, the world is given over to force, to conflicts, to struggles of interests; but under these savage struggles of more or less furious appetites, in the Renaissance which moves men and pushes them on to the achievement of a better society; it is the idea of human right, the idea of the right of man, of man grown into a king, into a sovereign who clearly knows no other limits than the sovereignty itself. This is the idea which has changed the society of the old time into the society of today; in it lies the force of the future; it is our palladium, the idea that we must never desert, whatever happens. We have been conquerors because we had it with us; it has been invoked against us, but as it was only a disguise for privilege, power has remained with us.

More than a hundred years ago our fathers made a revolution of right in the world. To continue their work we can only maintain and develop the notion of right which they have left us. And how develop right if not by the development of man which is its substance? The birth of that modern civilization which the Revolution founded and which the Syllabus curses can be, through all the unalterables of a long battle, nothing but the liberation, growth, and development of man.

Spencer Declared an Anarchist.

[Northern Republican.]

In political philosophy there is an individualist of the radical sort,—in fact, an Anarchist. He desires to see the government reduced to its lowest terms. Practically he desires to see the hands of government lifted from education. In this he was himself one of those elements which he himself characterized as conflicting with the universal plan, at least for the time of their action, but which will be found in the ultimate contribution to its working out in a more perfect way the evolution of ideal society.

When the ethical end of this great comprehension of forces shall have developed, the inseparable result is the entire recognition of each individual as an equal plane with the seat of natural right, or Anarchy—that is, society without what is now known as government, the basis of which is limitation, whereas the end of evolved society is liberation. And a liberator is what Spencer has been. He has been the faithful guardian of the gateway of science, the free road to the finest dreams and loftiest longings of the human soul.

Have We Forgotten? [New York Daily News.]

There is something wrong with the American people—Americans of the older stock. They are no longer quick to perceive and keen to recover invasions of the rights of their fellow men which they foresaw and foresaw.

One of the speakers at the Cooper Union meeting on Thursday night said he feared that Americans have forgotten what liberty means. He called attention to the significant absence from the meeting of the clergy, leading merchants, judges, the mayor, the patriotic sons and daughters of that, and other, the representatives of that element of society which calls itself "better" and claims a monopoly of sympathy in the ears of the masses with being recreant to the faith of their fathers.

The indictment was severe, but it was a true bill. Except a few earnest men and women on the platform, there was hardly a sprinkling of old-fashioned Americans in the hall. Addressing the paper, said, with half a sneer, the audience "was recruited mainly from the lower East Side." Perhaps that is why most of them deemed it safe to report the meeting falsely and to set it in a stupid headline that it was a demonstration against, favor, and support of Anarchists and Anarchy.

It was such a meeting as might have been held in New York more than a century ago to protest against alienism and negroism, and to protest against that before to denounce the tyranny of an English king. It was called in defense of the fundamental rights of the American citizen, the rights of free thought, free speech, and public trial by judge and jury under the forms and safeguards of the common law.

It was a meeting called to protest against and demand the repeal of a law so invasive of those American rights as to wring the indignation of John De Witt Warner who expressing this startling challenge to authority: "We will resist to the death our government, or any other government, that attempts to penalize free thought and free speech by enforcing such a law as this."

The meeting was not attended by the people who go to the opera and the Horse Show, nor even by those who make up the audiences at municipal "reform" soirees and political pink teas. It was reported inadequately by most papers, stupidly by several, falsely and malignantly by one, and timidly by the biggest bragget of the lot. It was so treated by the press because the American press has reason to know that the American people do not wish such national coruscation and do not care a rap for the ideas to which their forefathers pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

Anarchoue.com was "recruited mainly from the lower East Side," and in such a fact may be found hope for the future of the republic. It was an earnest, alert, intelligent audience, of much quicker, keener intelligence than could have been found that night in any other place of ours or worse than in all New York. It knew what ideas such names as Guizot, Reclus, Thoreau, Emerson, and Spencer stand for, and quickly appreciated the slightest allusion to them.

More than all, that audience knew the meaning of "administrative process," knew what dangers to the citizen lie in any curtailing of the right of free speech, and had a living, human grasp of those principles and ideals which have become mere womanly platitudes to too many of us. It was an audience composed largely of persons of foreign birth or parentage, and was more truly American in spirit.
than any crowd which has been seen in Cooper Union for some time.

Curious, is it not? While Americans are pesting solanely of the evils of immigration and devising barriers to keep aliens out of the country, the immigrants are defending American principles, keeping alive the American ideal, and jealously guarding American rights from invasion by the perverted machinery of American government.

To the man or woman of Europe who comes to America as to the home of freedom, the land of equal opportunity, the word "liberty" is full of vital meaning and the Declaration of Independence is not an obsolete farrago of fine phrases. It is the victim of oppressive government who knows best what John Hay meant when he spoke long ages ago, it is true. For always in things of human liberty, shines that high light whereby to is saved, and, though they shay us, we will trust in thee.

Americans have forgotten what tyranny is, and they do not realize it has been taken from them. They are too busy just now to take thought of such a trifite as freedom of speech, conscience, perhaps, of being able to recover anything of which they may be robbed whenever they find it convenient or necessary to do so; but it will be seen that the "lower East Side" does not forget so readily.

The Truth about the Venal "Times." [Truth Seeker.]

The "Times" stands for all the opposition to the liberation of Mr. Turner. It does not know, and it does not want to know, the truth, and it would not tell it if it did. It is the advocate of tyranny because it pays. If John Turner could buy its advertising column for six months, the "Times" would find abundant reasons why he should be set free.

The Right to Free Thought. [Springfield Republican.]

The "Independent" is not prone to uphold unpopular causes, and, on that account, its condemnation of the deportation of John Turner, the English labor organizer, because he "disbelieves in government" is the more interesting and significant. Most journalists, daily and weekly, are afraid to discuss the Turner case, lest they get dished somehow with red anarchy. As Turner is acknowledged to be an academic Anarchist, that fact alone seems to condemn him in many minds. It is surprising, however, to find so enlightened a man as Bishop Butler, the chair of Christian Ethics, boasting of the exclusion of men from this country because they hold opinions that he does not like.

If Mr. Turner can be justly excluded, by the same law the government might have deported the late Herbert Spencer, the man that Social Philosophy. For Spencer was also one who, in a philosophical sense, "disbelieved in government." He was an intense individualist, and doubtless regarded theoretical Anarchist as the final ideal state, to which the cosmic process of revolution is slowly taking us. He was, of course, no revolutionist; but neither is John Turner, so far as any one can prove. Turner in England has been allowed perfect freedom to express his views; it was not until he came to America that he was found to be too dangerous to have at large.

It has been urged in some quarters, since the case of Turner began to attract attention, that, if his teachings on government did not involve the use of violence and assassination, they may have bad effects upon weaker minds, and ultimately lead to regrettable episodes. This is inhibiting opinions because of "their possible ulterior effects when passing through untaught and susceptible mediums. Need it be pointed out that reasoning of this sort has in all ages been used to justify the shedding of thought? Russian autocracy to-day fetters the Russian intellect and destroys the liberty of speech and of the press, in order that纪律s great reverence to government, as it exists in Russia may not be overthrown. What has the experience of a thousand years proved to enlightened, self-governing people, if it has not that the man who could not say "no" as the air is made power? Restrictive laws never propagated truth, nor struck down error.

The Turner case involves a very simple issue. Are aliens who happen to "disbelieve in government," and who are guilty of nothing save an opinion, to be outlawed when they reach the shores of this republic? If so, then the United States has begun a reactionary warfare upon freedom of thought, which was supposed to be more secure in America than in any other part of the world.
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A Chambermaid's Diary.

By OCAVE MIRBEAU.

Translated from the French by BENJ. R. TUCKER.

A French chambermaid, who has served in the houses of the nobility of professional people, and of the bourgeoisie, secures a position in a country-house, and there begins the keeping of her diary. In it she describes her life, and the people about her, she is often reminded of episodes in her past, and those, by frequent digression, reviews her entire career. She mercilessly tears away the veil that conceals persons of virtue, fools, pedantic, and sad in the forlorn, and shows the whole of the human condition.

The author describes his book as filled with "the sadness that makes lofty souls humble by making them work.

A French critic declares that "the purpose of the work seems to be to show that nearly all the masters are low-lived wretches, and that nearly all the servants act so near like them as they know how to be.

The French original, published in August, 1906, has already reached its fifth edition.

A handy pocket-sized volume of 196 pages.

C$ 1.50, paper, 50 cents.

Mailed, postpaid, 10 cents, by the Publisher: BENJ. R. TUCKER, P. O. Box 1213, New York City.
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"Read the vital words of this woman." —The Conservator.

WHITMAN'S IDEAL DEMOCRACY, AND OTHER WRITINGS.
By ELENA BORN.

These essays treat not alone of the poets of revolt, but discuss, from the Anarchist point of view, economic questions of the day, such as the ethics of strikes and labor unions, individualism and organization, marriage and sex problems.

"A radical individualist." —Chicago Evening Post.

"In these essays one comes in touch with a rare spirit." —Boston Herald.

"Fine examples of serious writing." —The Socialist Spirit.

A simple volume, beautifully printed. $1.00, boards, 75 cents.

Copies for sale by HELEN TUTTLE, 4 Park Street, Boston, Mass.
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LINOTYPE & HAND COMPOSITION
The Ideophonic Texts are designed to furnish abundant material for forming those myriad associations of mental and organic processes which constitute the acquisition of languages. The ideas are presented by means of the native language of the student, and the sounds of the foreign language by means of the Universal Alphabet of the International Phonetic Association, as shown in the reduced facsimiles below.

**German Texts for English Readers**

SCHILLER’S WILHELM TELL Act 1. Four parallel texts, as shown in the following reduced facsimile of two facing pages. Editorial Critic: George Hempi. Professor of English Philology and General Linguistics in the University of Michigan. 26 × 30 octavo pages. Cloth. $2.00 postpaid to any part of the world.

SCHILLER’S WILHELM TELL Act 2. Same arrangement as that of Act 1. Ed. by Max and Carl Hempi. Cloth. $1.00. (Partly prepared.)

**French Texts for English Readers**

LUDOVIC HALLOY’S L’ABBE CONSTANTIN Part 1. Four parallel texts, similar in arrangement to those shown above. Editorial Critic: Paul Passy. Editor of "Le Matre Phonique." Cloth. $1.00. (Preparation arranged for.)

**Greek Texts for English Readers**

XENOPHON’S ANABASIS Book 1. Four parallel texts, similar in arrangement to those mentioned above. In the phonetic text the attempt is made to represent the actual Athenian pronunciation of the time of Xenophon. Consulting Editor: George Hempi. Cloth. $1.00. (Partly prepared.)

The issuance of the three volumes last mentioned will depend somewhat on the number of the advance orders received for them. Other Series are contemplated, as of Anglo-Saxon, Chinese, Hebrew, Italian, Japanese, Latin, Russian, Sanskrit, and Spanish Texts for English Readers; as well as Series for other than English readers, as French Texts for German readers and English Texts for French readers.

---

**For WHAT Remarkable**

For its Fundamental Principle that the language comprehended quite as much by Practice as by Theory; that ideas can and should be associated in the mind, must actually be present in the mind — the mind — ever, and over, and over again.

For its System of Phonemic Notes, the Universal Alphabet of "Le Matre Phonique," a journal circulated in its different compositions has also been applied to about 300 languages and dialects, and bids fair to come into world-wide popular use. After one language has been learned, other languages are much easier to learn.

For its Four Parallel Texts always in sight, three of them corresponding, line for line, and word for word; thus avoiding perfect and absolute errors. Each text is, however, distinct from the others; thus enabling the student to give his attention exclusively and continuously on any one of the four texts.

For its Phonemic German Text giving the exact pronunciation and stress of each word as spoken in the particular context in which it occurs. This phonemic reproduction is commonly given in textbooks, grammars and dictionaries, are not only separate and in number and exact, but arbitrary; fixed to no particular context.

For its Ordinary German Text corresponding line for line and word for word with the phonetic German text, and providing a type.

For its Verbal English Text, a word-for-word rendering, corresponding line for line with the ordinary German and phonetic Germanrawn, the student or instructor to find at a glance the literal German, in the particular context in which occurs.

For its Free English Text giving the meaning, general spirit and style of the German, and often a literal rendering of the same.

---

**The Study of Modern Languages in Boston, Mass.**

*From Le Matre Phonique for March, 1903.*

The publication of the Ideophonic Texts for Acquiring Languages... shows a real at once rare and determined in the teaching of languages by the phonemic method. The two facing pages appear four parallel texts of the subject-matter: a phonetic foreign text, an ordinary foreign text, a word-for-word rendering of the last, and a free rendering of the text. The sounds of any language are taught by means of the Universal Alphabet of the International Phonetic Association. Students of phonemic systems are to be congratulated that the editor has not followed the usual custom of inventing a new system which they have not practice on before really starting in.

October, 1900

J. MAXIM GROSS, Professor of Romance Languages

**UNIVERSAL ALPHABET**

In this table, the letters representing the identical sounds, that is, the sounds produced without vibration of the vocal cords, are enclosed in circles. A solid black circle represents that the sound is produced with the tongue from the teeth to the arch; a solid white circle, that the sound is produced with the tongue from the lips to the arch; and an empty circle, that the sound is produced with the tongue from the teeth to the lips.

---

**HINDS & NOBLE, Publishers**

31-33-35 West Fifteenth Street, New York, N. Y.