On Picket Duty.

The “Public” endorses District Attorney Jerome’s contention that political corruption is but a reflex of commercial corruption. I wonder if the editor of the “Public” read Mr. Byington’s masterly analysis of that error in the October number of Liberty. He certainly could do better service to his theory that politics is not by nature a specific breeder of corruption by refuting Mr. Byington’s arguments than by merely echoing Jerome.

To Judge Coing’s statement that he is unable to see why the legislature should have made it wrong to bet outside of a race track and right to bet inside of one, the New York “Times” answers that “time and place make enormous differences in an enormous number of acts,” and that “there is nothing more absurd in allowing bets to be made on race tracks and forbidding them elsewhere than in the restrictions placed on the betting of carpets.” The “Times” seems to be unaware that neither time or place can rightly affect the legitimacy of an act except as it may affect the invasive quality of the act. It is readily conceivable that the invasiveness of the act of carpet-beating may depend upon time or place, but it is not so easy to see why the betting that is non-invasive at the race track becomes invasive in the pool-room. That “common consent” which the “Times” apparently looks upon as the sole criterion of legitimacy must itself be justified by reason; else, sooner or later, reason will overthrow it.

The State and its upholders keep constantly on hand a stock of excuses under cover of some one of which it is almost always possible to practise upon the individual citizen any particular tyranny that class interest may demand. Principal among these are the sanctity of the United States mails, the purity of the young person, and the public health. The last-named is the most generally useful for tyrannical purposes. It has lately served the New York court of appeals as a ground for declaring constitutional, by a vote of four to three, the law prohibiting bakers from working more than ten hours a day. The argument is that the health of the people requires that bakers be healthy, and that bakers cannot be healthy if overworked. By such reasoning the police powers of the legislature can be made equal to the denial of every form of individual liberty. I am glad to learn, however, that even boards of health recognize a limit to their powers. A New York commissioner actually laughed the other day at a suggestion that sneezing as well as spitting should be prohibited by law.

Roosevelt’s Panama swindle would fail miserably, if the Democratic minority refused to aid the usurper and public humbug. But what can be expected of an opposition in a degenerate republic? The Democratic votes will be forthcoming, and the stolen goods will be received by the “solid South,” in spite of its hatred for the accidental entertainer of Booker T. Washington. The outrage, in truth, would never have been attempted, had the Democratic party given the piratical conspirators any reason to fear a determined and honest resistance. And why should politicians knowingly adopt an unpopular course? Were the question referred to the pious and virtuous electorate, the vote in favor of “digging the canal,” no questions asked, would be overwhelming. The guileless believers in the “plain people” may challenge this assertion, but it is well-founded nevertheless. Bryan talks about conscience-campaigns and appeals to moral maxims. Let him ask his own followers to apply the commandments he invokes to this Panama question; let him try a little referendum among his readers and subscribers. The result will make him spatter, if not wet. Lying and stealing are highly commendable features of statesmanship in the United States.

Many of Herbert Spencer’s admirers were puzzled when the cable brought the news that the philosopher’s will, in appropriating certain sums for certain purposes, had limited such use to the lifetime of Queen Victoria and that of her longest surviving child. That a man without respect for titles should hang an important matter on the lives of the titled seemed curious, not to say disappointing. It was a relief to learn later that the explanation of the anomaly is to be found in a provision of the English law which prevents a testator from devoting funds to a certain purpose perpetually, limiting such appropriation to the lifetime of some individual then existing and his longest surviving child. It has become the practice of lawyers, in drawing wills, to use the lives of the royal family for this measurement of time, and Spencer simply had followed the usual formula. I imagine that some similarly satisfactory explanation will be found for the astounding announcement that the London “Times” of January 18 contained a letter written by Spencer to a Japanese baron in 1898, in which Japan was advised to give as little foothold as possible to foreigners and to forbid absolutely the marriage of Japanese with foreigners. It is easier to believe that the letter is a deliberate forgery than that such advice was ever given by the author of “Man and the State.”

God-Forgotten.

I lowered far, and lo! I stood within
The presence of the Lord Most High,
Sent thither by the sons of earth, to win
Some answer to their cry.

—“The Earth, say’st thou? The Human race?
By me created? Sad its lot?
Nay: I have no remembrance of such place:
Such world I fashioned not.”—

—“O Lord, forgive me when I say
Thou spak’st the word, and mad’st it all.”—

“The Earth of men—let me bethink me . . . Yes!
I dains do recall

Some tiny sphere I framed long back
(Mid millions of such shapes of mine)
So named . . . It perished, surely—not a wrack
Remaining, or a sign?

It lost my interest from the first,
My aims therefor succeeding ill;
Haply it died of doing as it durst?”—

“Lord, it existeth still.”—

“Dark, then, its life? For not a cry
Of aught it bears do I now hear;
Of its own act the threads were snapt whereby
Its plaints had reached mine ear.

It used to ask for gifts of good,
Till came its severance self-entailed,
When sudden silence on that side ensued;
And has till now prevailed.

All other orbs have kept in touch;
Their voices reach me speedily;
They people took upon them overmuch
In sundering them from me!

And it is strange—though sad enough—
Earth’s race should think that one whose call
Frames, daily, shining spheres of flawless stuff
Must heed their tainted ball!

But say’st thou ‘tis by pangs distraught,
And strife, and silent suffering?
Deep grieved am I that injury should be wrought
Even on so poor a thing!

Thou shouldst let have learned that Not to Mourn
For Me could mean but Not to Know:
Hence, Messengers! and straightway put an end
To what men undergo.” . . .

Homeing at dawn, I thought to see
One of the Messengers standing by.
—Oh, childish thought! . . . Yet oft it comes to me
When trouble hovers nigh.

Thomas Hardy.
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"In abolishing rent and interest, the last vestiges of old-time slavery, the revolution abolishes at one stroke the source of the conscience, the seat of the magistrate, the club of the policeman, the grasp of the酷士, the erasing-knife of the department clerk, all those insignia of Polite, which young Liberty grinds beneath her heel."—THUDIEN.

"The appearance in the editorial columns of articles over other signatures than the editor’s initial indicates that the editor approves their central purpose and general tenor, though he does not hold himself responsible for every phrase or word. But the appearance in other parts of the paper of articles by the same or other writers by no means indicates that he disapproves them in any respect; such indication of them being governed largely by motives of convenience.

Spencer and Political Science.

So fully have Spencerian politics, ethics, and sociology been discussed in Liberty that an exhaustive re-examination of the late philosopher’s doctrines from the Anarchistic point of view would be a work of supererogation. A few words, however, in addition to those already uttered, on his rank as a politically-social thinker and reformer, are now in order.

Spencer was not an Anarchist, though his writings have done more to prepare English-speaking students of the social problem for the Anarchistic philosophy than those of any other master. He was a severe and bitter opponent of democracy, and knew that political evolution has not reached the goal. Maine, Lecky, and other critics of "popular government" saw that the great political superstition of the age, majority rule, was a menace to liberty and progress, but they were essentially reactionary in their quasi-constructive suggestions. They had no ideal, and, as Spencer has so well said, even slow progress is impossible if we do not clearly see the way to the ultimate. Society may go backward; American society certainly has gone back to positions abandoned as untenable by its founders; but no honest and intellectually respectable thinker advocates retrogression. Democracy is bound to fail; it can yield us neither liberty nor material well-being. It does not follow, however, that oligarchy or autocracy should be restored.

More consistent and logical than Mill, Buckle, and other individualists, Spencer knew and realized that the remedy for the evils of democracy lay in the restriction of the sphere and scope of government. He proposed repeal, repeal, and repeal. Nearly everything he demanded was Anarchistic in nature and effect. The most notable exception was the land-tenure question. His early views having proved unsound, he became a defender—a reluctant one, it is true—of the status quo. He saw no other alternative than nationalization of the land, and from that it naturally shrunk.

How different the Spencerian State would be from the State as we know it! What Anarchist would not enthusiastically cooperate with Spencerian individualists to bring about their reforms? Only a few steps would then remain to be taken. Auberlon Herbert’s voluntarism, based upon Spencerian principles, is another name for Anarchism. Take away compulsion in taxation and defence, and the State has ceased to exist. The Spencerian individualist would discover that the assumed necessity of invasion in a few fundamental particulars had no real existence, and he would work for the next stage, Anarchism.

Spencer, it is true, claimed to have deduced from the very principles of social organization the legitimacy of compulsory cooperation for defence. His argument, however, was fallacious. He overlooked the fact that there are several methods of securing cooperation for necessary ends, some manifestly non-aggressive and consonant with the principle of equal freedom. It is, of course, unfair for any man to enjoy the benefits of peace and stability while declining to share the risks, sacrifices, and burdens entailed by actual or probable attacks from within or without; but such an unsocial and .cease-spirited individual can be brought to arms by the boycott, material and moral. The biological "society-is-an-organism" argument is thus quite irrelevant. The organic nature of society may create certain necessities; it does not dictate particular methods.

Mr. Spencer’s less scientific attempt, in "Man vs. the State," to discover an "ethical warrant" for compulsory military service, compulsory taxation, and compulsory cooperation in the enforcement of justice, is even more unsuccessful. It is based on the fact that there is "virtual unanimity" of advanced opinion in favor of State action so limited. The word virtual is fatal. The question is evaded, not answered. Has the one man, or the insignificant group of men, that refuses to support the State, in other than the simplest of its functions, the right to stand alone, to ignore it? Spencer never refrained from his own early demonstration of this right, deduced with faultless logic from the principle of equal liberty.

We may say, therefore, that "Social Statistics," though not free from inconsistencies and crudities, was fundamentally an Anarchistic work. It was an advance upon Von Humboldt’s remarkable book on the sphere of the State. All of Spencer’s subsequent writings are individualistic and characterized, philosophically speaking, by a want of finish and boldness. The charge that he conscientiously stopped short of his real convictions out of consideration for a class is too absurd to require attention, but, whatever the explanation may be, the fact must be recognized.

Aside from some specific and detached errors, Spencer was as thoroughgoing as it is possible for the individualist to be. What does Mr. J. H. Levy mean when he says in "Personal Rights" that Spencerian individualism forgot the individual and represented "rather the yielding of the individual to the collective forces of external nature than progress by the agency of the individual himself"? The art of lifting one’s self by the bootstraps remains unmastered; man cannot progress except by adapting himself to nature and exercising his natural faculties. The phrases regarding the conquest of nature are literary, not scientific. I am not aware that Spencer advocated quietism or resignation or submission. Did he not demand the fullest exercise of human faculties, and the widest cooperation, under equal freedom?

A Belgian Balance-Sheet.

Some friend has sent me a copy of a Christian Socialist paper from France. He has marked an article in which a converted Anarchist (Communist) tells why he is a Christian and at the same time an Anarchist, and why he finds that his Christianity not only is compatible with his Anarchism, but even supports it—to wit, because Anarchy is impracticable with such men as we now have, and the only way in which one can look forward with hope to an anarchic future is by a change in human nature; but Christianity is the only power that can produce this change; therefore—etc. I am glad that the man has found the light religiously, and I would not treat the value of that light as a subordinate thing; but I am not satisfied with his logic. It is certainly not good Christianiety to hold that we must wait for somebody else to be good before we can go on to do the will of God, and I do not think it good Anarchist to hold that the Anarchist principle has no valid application to the only sort of human society that we know anything of from experience. Whatever may be the fact as to any relation of cause and effect in either direction, I do not think that Christianity is well recommended by the fact that this man’s gaining religious faith coincided with his losing his social faith; for it seems to me, to use theological language, that his present faith in Anarchism is a mere "historical faith," and not a "saving faith." I am no prophet, indeed, for the quality of his former faith. His conception of Anarchism may, for ought I know, have been such that it really was not practicable; then his finding out the fact would be a real enlightenment, though not of the most complete and fruitful sort. I can hardly help doubting whether he ever saw the full clear light of Anarchism, because it seems as if he could never have lost sight of it if he had.

No man can see the light and fall to follow; none can look afar, Beoding where the heavens grow pale. The gimmer of the hope to-day, Save in his heart begins to burn. Some reflex of that heavenly fire, He cannot waver, flinch, or turn; He must advance, he must desire.

I know our poet’s words are not quite true; yet they are quite true in many cases, and they seem to me so axiomatic that I cannot help looking for them to be true in each case.—But as to our Frenchman: it seems to me furthermore that he must have been already discouraged before he became a Christian, for the reason I have stated above,—to wit, that his new doctrine is contrary to a well-known point of Christianity. I am sorry he did not become a Christian before he got discouraged; then he might have amounted to something.
But the marked article was not the thing that most struck me in this paper. I found more significance in a report of certain social-purity mission work in Belgium, with the account of how a number of soldiers were present at a certain meeting, and this footnote to show how good a thing it was:

A short time before this, it had been shown, in full session at the Brussels number, that thirty-seven per cent. of the non-commissioned officers were affected with venereal diseases.

There you have a statistical fact to go on. Three-tenths of the non-commissioned officers. And the fact is unquestionably a representative one; we can guess, after a fashion, what a mass of all sorts of sexual abnormality it must stand for in all ranks of that army, it three in every eight non-commissioned officers are affected with venereal disease. One need not doubt, to be sure, that the worst case has been selected for report, and that the case of the commissioned officers or of the privates is less serious; nor need one doubt that among so large a number of men there would have been a good deal of the same thing if they had stood alone. But would there have been among any class of them such a condition as is represented by this thirty-seven per cent. infected with disease? Belgium would be the nation of the day, indeed, body and soul, if we were to believe that. But no one will be found to believe it. The effect of army life in such respects is notorious; if any one brought statistics to show that the army of any country lived as decently on the whole as the men at home, he would find it hard work to get his statistics accepted. Nobody will doubt that the largeness of this figure, with the largeness of the unseen mass for which this figure stands, is a result of the organization of the Belgian army, and the question that forces itself upon me is: On what basis can any one think that it paid?

Setting aside the cost of the army in other respects, it has cost the increase of debauchery to such a figure as this. For this cost, what has it returned? It has not defended the Belgian frontier against invasion; the continued independence of Belgium does not depend on the Belgian army. Has it been for foreign conquest? Belgium does hold and conquer the Congo Free State. But for Congo service it would surely be cheaper to hire soldiers of fortune than to spend the blood of Belgian conscripts. I am not arguing in favor of mercenary forces for home defense; but, when you do not want your army for home defense at all, but only for conquering and plundering other countries, I do not see why it is not a good business proposition to hire men wherever you can get the best service for the least money. I may be wrong, however; let us suppose that there must be a large Belgian element in the Congo army if it is to be trustworthy. Then I ask: is it pay? You get from the Congo Free State so many million francs; it ought to be a good lot to correspond to the amount of bloodshed and other outrage by which you gather it. These profits of yours from the Congo may exceed the cash expense of maintaining the Belgian army; I doubt it, but the statistics I have at hand as I write are not recent enough to be worth much. Say they exceed the expense by whatever you dare claim; is it worth the cost in Belgian manhood, in young Belgians whose lives are poisoned by the conditions of your barracks? Will it make up for the mere immediate cash loss to Belgium from having such a section of her population reduced so far in the scale of manhood? But indeed all this is rhetoric; for at any rate the Belgian army is not most of it sent to the Congo, and therefore this cannot be the service it is rendering to justify its existence.

I think that army must be preserved internal order. Belgium, we know, is liable to strikes which are sometimes disorderly; there are a lot of Socialists there, and governments are much afraid of what those terrible Socialists might do if they were not kept under; there are also Anarchists—I need say no more. Now, public order is an excellent thing. Even if by mistake you suppress a really beneficent revolution, the good it would have done is problematical, while the harm is certain. But, gentlemen, I ask in all seriousness, is public order, so far as in your own judgment it depends on this army of yours, worth the cost that is represented by this thirty-seven per cent.? Could the disorders that you think might arise from leaving the public order to the care of the ordinary police, and of such a multitude of subsidized police, be raised from citizens living at home with their families among their neighbors, equal the harm that you are steadily doing year by year in this kind of work of which we now speak? I have even heard that an army was useful to educate the soldiers. Well, if the education given by the Belgian State includes this part of curriculum that we now have under consideration, then the Belgian State must be displaced by another pedagogue. A better can certainly be found. That is positive.

Probably Belgium will be little affected by what I write. But is there an army in the world to which the same considerations do not apply in a considerable degree, even though the figures indicating the evil may be somewhat lower than in Belgium? I think not.

STEVEN T. PRYNTING.

The glibness and confidence with which Mr. David M. Parry, president of the National Association of Manufacturers, attacks the policies of the trade unions indicates that he supposes his arguments to be absolutely unassailable. He must have been a considerably astonished man, therefore, when, after bitterly complaining of trade union efforts to restrict competition by limiting the number of apprentices and the hours of labor (though the unions for the most part make these limitations effective without resort to legislation or other forms of invasive force), he found himself confronted with the following questions, put by the Indianapolis Central Labor Union: "As you believe in unrestricted competition in the employment of labor, do you also believe in conducting industrial enterprises in harmony with natural competitive conditions? Do you believe in free trade or protection? If you are a protectionist, how do you harmonize the application of a natural law in employing laborers and the ignoring of this law in conducting a manufacturing enterprise?" Of course, in reply, Mr. Parry could only chatter about the aim of the tariff being the advancement of the interests of the whole people, which reply the Boston "Herald" justly characterizes as evasive, unsatisfactory, and disingenuous, saying: "Mr. Parry can hardly expect his arguments against organized labor to be received without dissent when he is unwilling to concede their application in the case of those whom he represents." The "Herald's" verdict, however, inevitably suggests the thought that, whenever free trade organs of the "Herald's" stamp are called upon to justify the restrictions which they favor upon competition in banking, they, too, declare the banking monopoly a necessity to the safety of the dear people. Every monopolist who meets a libertarian in debate is obliged to be evasive, unsatisfactory, and disingenuous in defense of the particular monopoly which he favors. The Anarchist is the only thoroughly honest champion of free competition.

The mayor of Chicago, who is not a man of much intelligence or force, has unwittingly exposed the hypocrisy of the law-and-order gang of his crime-ridden city. The awful catastrophe in the Froquois theatre, say the upper-class criminals, would not have occurred, had the laws regulating places of public assembly been strictly enforced. In a spasm of virtue the mayor undertook to "enforce the law." Of course, he took in all the themes in Chicago, as none had complied with the law. Did this please the "solid" grafters and the anti-crime crusaders? Not a bit of it. Mayor Harrison is denounced as a reckless, insincere, demagogical politician. Isn't he enforcing the law? Yes, but—against the wrong parties. It is all right to enforce the law by clubbing pickets and unionists, but, when "business men" violate the law, it is "hysteria" to enforce it. Crocodile tears are shed over the actors and theatre employees who are losing salaries or wages, and that the law, not the mayor, is responsible for that effect is a consideration the respectable offenders do not care to remember. Harrison, it is true, is inconsistent. He closed the theatres and halls, without taking similar action against factories, stores, office-buildings, and other places "enforce the law" in all cases, he would be mobbed by the plutocratic "reformers." I am glad that he has given them a dose of their own medicine. They are beginning to talk about "enforceable laws," and, if labor is not hopelessly stupid, it will thank them for that phrase. If enforceable laws may be ignored, unjust and tyrannical laws may be equally disregarded. Labor could make every unjust law "enforceable."

Will the Spencian philosophy be permanent? F. Howard Collins, one of the late thinker's adherents, writes to the London "Times," saying that Spencer himself would have been the first to deny that his thoughts are final. In fact, Spencer once asked how any one could think that his thoughts were the only things that would prove an exception to the all-pervading principle of evolution. There is a fallacy in this reasoning. Of course philosophy, thought, evolves, and the Spencian system will be (has been already) considerably impaired by criticism and advancing knowledge. But certain thoughts do not evolve. If they represent discoveries, scientific inductions, they remain
Harley makes no assumption of a God forgetting the world, but there is a strong implication that the world is forgetting God." Liberty's readers can read in another column Harley's poem specially entitled "God-Forgotten," and judge for themselves. In my opinion the entire poem, and especially the last stanza, show that the "Munsey" writer's interpretation is the correct one.

He who says that no nation has ever done for another and inferior people as much as the United States have done for the Filipinos is a shallow ignorant or a hypocrite. The statement is found in the message of the present occupant of the White House.

The "Crude" Superstitions.

On January 21 the "Sun" gave some interesting quotations from a momentous lecture by Rev. Dr. Joseph McMahon, director of the Catholic Library Association. I say "momentous," because the reverend doctor called emphatic attention to an influence working in our midst which few suspect, and which, in his opinion, bids fair to undo us ere we are aware of it.

The said dire influence is a strong tendency toward superstition. It is a pitiful and most alarming condition of affairs, but the good doctor says it is true. Listen to what the said good doctor says: "Every priest who fears convictions in this city feels that the circle of this influence is widening daily. I frequently meet people who are ceaselessly investigating the things which they say are referred to these crude forms of superstition. Take, for example, palmistry. What is it? A certain amount of science, shrewd guessing, and a bit of humor."

The "Sun" reporter then adds, "Dr. McMahon closed Christian Science, Dowiesm, faith healing, Unitarianism, and Buddhism all in the same category."

Let's see. Did you ever hear of all the great cures effected (or affected) by the palmists through the handling of some so-called "sacred" relic, or by bathing in some so-called "blessed" pool? What? you didn't? Why, we've all heard of hundreds of them! Not by palmists, you say? By whom, then? By Catholic priests? well, according to the good doctor, the poor and helpless have been mistaken. As to the exploiters, but the exploiters are all right. Oh, I understand what you mean, now! You mean that palmists don't resort to that kind of superstition, but Catholics do. Does Yes, fae, you say again? Again, the good doctor says that thousands flock to clairvoyants, and "pay exorbitant fees to obtain a so-called solution to their various problems, and be informed of events to come. They are crowded with a stock of predictions, and go away happy. This form of the superstition is becoming dangerous." Yeah, it's surely "dangerous," but to whom? To me it looks like a grave danger to the Catholic church, for one thing, where many people go in large numbers (to use the good doctor's own language) to "pay exorbitant fees to obtain a so-called solution to their various problems, and be informed of events to come." What is the confessional for, if not for that? People would not go there, unless they were anxious about their various problems, and "information of events to come." Some are satisfied with what the priests of the church have to offer, while others prefer what the palmists, clairvoyants, or other occult minds, prefer either the palmists or the clairvoyants to the priests, for the former take some chances by making predictions as to things mundane, while the latter are afraid to face any promises maturing this side of the grave. Nobody knows whether their promises mean anything; they are worth a cent, for nobody ever comes back to give testimony of the matter. The priests are wholly safe in that they prophesy, always, because they are too wise to put any of their promises, or prophecies, to the test of earthly conditions—and earthly conditions are the only ones which are legal tender in human affairs.

I am very glad, too, that those superstitious charlatans, the Unitarians, have at last been shown up as they are. They are the very growth of the lower mind. Why, they are so debased in their superstitions that they even deny the immaculate conception of Christ, and the Trinity—where one becomes three, and three become one, and all are divine (but one of them is human), and one emanated from the other to show his love, and the other gives up his immortal life to show his justice, and all are nothing, and each is all—even the Trinity, I say, is denied!—Unitarians through their great lot of the lot, I am glad—oh, so glad!—that the good doctor has "shown up" these superstitious and bigoted Unitarians, and their satellites, the palmists and clairvoyants. The Christian scientists and the faith healers are not so bad. Their superstition is not yet so deep that they discard all the great and thoroughly-proved facts of the world, like the miracles. Their superstition leads them to believe that such great scientific facts are still demonstrable, but they give up that, at times. True science, which Catholics alone possess, teaches us that the solid rock of truth is to be found only by planting our faith upon those things which cannot be demonstrated. Then we know they are of God. If they cease to be demonstrable—men, women and children are， the bapists—all such things. With those hourde needs provided for we can all get along: but, if we are to give way to superstitions—well, we might as well quit the game. I am overflowing with gratitude to the good doctor for putting his foot down hard on all the superstitions, and I now feel like singing with peaceful joy.

I've already picked out the site of my home in the new world for which we (that is, all of us who are not superstitious, and who believe that our good doctors and priests tell us) are bought and sold, and I can choose an oxen house, at the corner of Ruby street and Topaz avenue, opposite Jasper park, where the eagle with the twelve horns blooms 'a golden bazzoo at conic intervals. But those who: : superstitions—palmists, clairvoyants, Christian Scientists, faith healers, Daweites, and Unitarians—well, they will have to be re-baked, in order to burn all the superstition out of their systems. There has always been a favorite method with the church for the elimination of superstition in the development of a true and loving and trusting faith.

To the Editor of Liberty:

The main thing that I want to know about Panama is who has been robbed, and of what; or who has been hurt, and wherein. If by the action of the United States nobody has suffered anything but the loss of the power to oppress, I do not see how there has been anything gained. Even if an equal and similar power to oppress has at the same time been placed in the hands of other persons by the consent of a large majority of those who are to be oppressed.

I had not thought of claiming that Panama was getting liberated or anything of that sort, but if I suppose there are geographical grounds for hoping that the new government will be more liberal than that of Bogota. But nobody has claimed that the intention was any liberal. It is undisputed that the purpose of the whole thing has been to resist one gigantic act of oppression, the most gigantic that within my lifetime has been practically possible as an oppression relating merely to an isolated commercial action, the prohibition of building the canal. All of all parties concerned in this revolution has been to get the canal built; the establishment of the republic of Panama was an incidential; I am sure I do not see why we should treat it as a main point. Though the oppression in question could so doubt have been bought, off, or existed solely for the purpose
of being bought off, I enjoy seeing it done instead.

As to the undeniable fact that Roosevelt would not have dared do the same to England or Germany, I confess that I do not see what on earth has to do with the case, since we are not discussing Roosevelt's personal character nor the existence of a non-picturesque or heroic element in his present action.

STEVEN T. BRITTON.

I answer Mr. Byington that, among others, I have been hurt, and in this,—that a sovereign State, assuming to speak and act for me, has destroyed a portion of the sovereignty of another and weaker sovereign State, justifying this act of destruction on high moral grounds which it unquestionably would dispute as the opposite of moral were another and stronger sovereign State to treat it similarly and for similar reasons. This is an outrage, not on Colombia, but on my personality and on public decency. It was committed by Theodore Roosevelt as president of the United States, and the character and conduct of the president of the United States is precisely the subject that has to be discussed in dealing with this Panama episode.—ETRON LIBERTY.

The Origin of Government. (Williston Fish in "Flock.")

"It was for these lofty purposes," wrote the enthusiastic scholar, "that governments were instituted among men"; and, when he wrote it, his own government was not to have immersed him in a deep and substantial dungeon to show him what governments are really for.

In order to clear up any misconception that may exist, I will now state how and why governments were instituted among men, and will, then, in brief, explain their workings.

To clearly understand the subject of government it will be necessary for us, in imagination, to transport ourselves into the past, and find ourselves surrounded by the forest primeval; the birds are singing in the foliage, the animals are deporting themselves, man is engaged in some agreeable pastime. Birds and animals and all nature are free. Ever man is free, and he is all free; and he knows it, and feeling first.

"I will not, we hear a heed savage observing, "I will not pay my good money to support a king lying beneath a rich, embroi ered canopy eating his viands from a dish put before him in a silver platter.

"Oh! you won't!" says Pete, and straightway governments were instituted among men. And thereafter the heed savages not only put up his good money, but politely bent his knee when he offered it. Moreover, he cheered lustily when the king rode by under his rich embroidered canopy, and in after times he subscribed for a newspaper, and read with delight what the king was in the habit of eating out of his golden dish.

The first government was undoubtedly established by a large furry saber biting another savage with a club and informing him solemnly that his name was Mo Tox, and deductions are correct, the first savage got the notion into his mind that where he could let him have it, by assuring him that his one purpose in life was to do him good.

In this simple manner a great many small governments were instituted among men. Whatever you may think of a king, you must admit that he is a great and glorious nation, and tell them that they were especially remarkable for their intelligence, their public virtues, and their love of liberty. That is why governments were instituted among men.

It would have been a manifest advantage for these small governments to join together, not so much for the protection of the people against invasion, as the book says, but to reduce the percentage of chiefs. When six persons have to support a chief all by themselves, it is an excessive demand upon their civic virtues. It would, therefore, have been much to the credit of the chiefs if they had perceived this and had been intent on remedying the evil when they began to amalgamate governments. But chiefs were not as noble-minded as the states, and govern ments came to be united was this: a chief would see that another chief was disabled by age or wounds or over-eating, and he would therefore take his life and annex his kingdom. In this way there came to be nations of twelve people, and then of twenty-four people, and then of forty-eight people, and governments became established among men.

In the first beginning the chief satisfied himself by taking away the single sovereign. He climbed the tree for,—that was the first government took, because that was all there was to take,—but, as the country became prosperous, and business grew diversified, and the subjects got birds and wild fowl and game and fish, and the great central idea of government became crystallized. The chief then issued an order that he should not be obliged to take the things, but that the subjects should bring them in.

In the earlier times the order was that the subjects should bring in all they had, and this was a very good and perfectly logical idea, and in theory all governments approve of it to this day; but in practice it was not entirely after a while and after many cabinet councils, it was determined to allow the subjects to reserve enough to live on, so that they could continue to bring in things. The reader will understand this. However, the question then arose, what now enough to live on? and a long struggle was precipitated. It was a glorious epoch in government when the chiefs got to leaving the subjects' enough to come out alive on in the spring and fall, and it was a still more glorious epoch when theory and practice were so justly balanced that the government got the very largest amount possible while at the same time the subjects had enough to maintain themselves in the very highest condition of productivity. This glorious epoch has not arrived yet.

As was to be expected, improvements have from time to time been made in the methods of government, and a safeguard now generally adopted is to require the subject to swear how many cocoaanuts he has picked, in order to prevent him from flanoriously coping out a few and enjoying them with his friends. The first chief, as a matter of fact, was very well, and, when there came to be nations of six and twelve and twenty-four subjects, they would complain and grumble and remark about the impositions put on them. They had got the pot well boiling in this way, then they took the yoke—or, rather, to sustain the figure, they might have cooked the chief's goose,—but treachery from time to time revealed the grumblers to the chief. Now, as will surprise those who do not grasp the great and splendid idea of government, the chief took a personal dislike against people who worked or spoke against the government, and he was especially bitter and uncom mining against those who had not to displease him. He would, therefore, spear the ill-advised critics, and elevate the betrayers to the pecking. In this way rules kept their people ever happy and content. To fill their cup to overflowing, the chieftain did not propose to them the propositions that they were noted for their enlightenment and their patriotism, and especially for their love of liberty, which was so strong as to be simply intolerant of oppression and unendingly true.

Considering the older times, it seems to me that Labrador was about the most complimeningly you thing you could call a man. It is certainly strange, although we are constantly told of sagacious sovereigns, and monarchs who encouraged progress, and kings who were paragons of loyalty, yet, and heard of a king who conferred a degree on a traitor. I can account for this only by assuming that the king never lost sight of the great central idea of government.

The Duty of Perpetual Toil. [New York Evening Post.]

It might well be thought by the innocent-minded that Uncle Sam was about to appoint himself universal receiver of revolutions. His course at Panama must have deeply impressed his neighbors in their ears. There was the old gentleman for them to approach with their gold-brick revolutions! Accord ingly, they all set to work. It is a fact, reported by a detective agency employed by Central and South American governments to "shadow" exiles and agi tators in this city, that every mother's son of them took ship the moment that the success of the Panama revolutions was assured by the president's action. Let the revolutions begin, they said, and despair of seeing Mr. Roosevelt or Mr. Hay turn a telescope their way, as in Mr. Opper's cartoon, and say: "I recognize a republic." Indeed, we know how promptly the Dominican insurgents applied for recognition. Off went the Junta, who should not all revolutionaries head bobbing up and down on the horizon look alike to a benevolent and not too inquisitive president?

But it is Uncle Sam as the champion abater of miseries—all but those on his own premises—whom Europeans are invoking. Doubtless, they would be pleased to see him doing scavenger work for their benefit. It has long been their hope that the United States will take hold of Central America, with Hayti and San Domingo, and "clean them up," so that our fastidious trade r's could live there in greater comfort and make more money. There is involved in all this, as in many other notions and plans current in the great political world to-day, a new doctrine. It is the gospel of work, revised so as to read that everybody must work but you. No idlers are to be tolerated except yourself. It is right for you to seek easy conditions of life, but for every one else there must be honest toil and bread earned in the sweat of the face.

This idea crops out amazingly in the letter on the negro in the South which we print to-day. Of its doom, nothing籏eing written was ever more pointed than the writer to the article of that other Southerner, Thomas Nelson Page, in the "North American Review," in which he plainly confesses that lynching is a failure in the very end it aims at. But what most troubles our correspondent is that the negroes can live with work, but little work. That is to him the intolerable thing. He unconsciously echoes the complaints of the United landers about the lazy Kaffirs in the Transvaal; and we are near to the day when we hear he is in "e" case of the letter, that negroes be put under military control and compelled to work twelve hours a day and six days a week, whether they wish to or need to or not. We need to have them do it, and that is a thing they will not.

Now, we have no thought of raising a song in praise of idleness. If any man will not work, neither let him eat. That is sound doctrine. But, if he can obtain what he needs by being idle, there is no doubt he will certainly take it, and work less than we mean to have him work, when he will. All their lives pursue a fortunate large for the sake of the freedom from the necessity of work which it will give them—men who are glad of every vacancy and long to waste their time. The negroes are delighted at the short hours at the offices they are able to keep—suddenly discover what a social offense it is for a poor man to take his case as he goes along.

The same spirit is clearly manifested in the exist-
Corruption Become Cybalial.

[The Public.]

Congressman Hearst’s presidential boom, which has no decided political significance, has brought the Hearst papers and surprised the readers of other journals with its unexpected suddenness and unthinkible magnitude. Bills fair to rank as the most cynical episode in the progress of American politics toward the broad-and-circus games of McKinleyism.

It is commonly believed of Mr. Hearst that he is trying to try a presidential nomination, and then to buy the election. Circumstances seem to justify this impeachment. But what of it, and why not? Should that be his purpose, and should he succeed, the only novelty about it all would be the fact that he had done the buying himself and with his own money.

It is this novelty, however, that gives to the matter its cynical quality. When McKinley’s nomination and election were bought in 1896, the political pro- prietors were observed—superficially. Mr. McKinley bought no nomination. He bought no election. He furnished no funds. Mr. Hearst acted as purchasing agent, and the funds were furnished by the expensively syndicate of Wall st. t. So McKinley became president nominally in the old fashioned way. He did not buy the office. It was bought for him.

Yet the same money has been spent proved that it could be bought; and with cynical shrewdness Mr. Hearst has built up his ambition by taking advantage of that discovery. If the presidency could be bought for McKinley, why not be bought by Hearst? There you have the psychology of the Hearst boom. “Is the office for sale, politicians and voters all? Is money what you want? Don’t go to Wall street. I’ll give money—my own money. And why take the risk of paying the same price as McKinley? I’ll give it myself.” That is the spirit of the Hearst movement.

While this is cynicism to the verge of grim humor, it is due to Mr. Hearst to observe that there is no strings tied to the money he is lavishing. It falls in the one condition that it shall bring him the particular commodity he is openly offering to buy. Unlike the money that bought McKinley’s election, no secret obligation to greedy syndicates goes with Hearst’s money. On the contrary he is committed in most respects to an anti-plutocratic policy. In an interview, for instance, which is reported in the Chicago “Tribune” Mr. Hearst fairly shines as an aggressive Democrat. He says, in substance, that if he were in command of the government, he would purchase the United States.

There is a disturbing fear that in both interview and editorial his rufugue is a reflected light. Mr. Hearst publishes great editorials, but does not always write them. Semi-impassive letters to public meetings, but modestly refrains from verifying their authorship by equally impassive appearances as a speaker. His expression in expression has not been extensive. Yet it must be said for him that in his recent distinction, in the recent editorials and the weekly paper, he has spoken out in words that appear in print.

To see a newspaper in the hands of a man of heat, is to see a newspaper that does not, or can not, act in the hands of a man of heat.

The End and the Means.

[Henry Mace.]

Grocer: is wrong. The straight line is not the shortest... road from one point to another. The more you make the State the master of the conscience, the greater will be your chances of freeing yourselves from State domination. But when a man is really a worker; “you wish the same end that we do, and you will not accept the means!”

The end is liberty. The means is the abolition of force. Force is the only weapon for the people. But we must be united, and that means a common mind, a common spirit, a common will, a common voice, a common name, a common world, a common destiny.

Then it was called the crowning of the office. Napoleon said to us: “My friends, there is nobody who loves liberty as much as I do. But you understand of course that I cannot give it to you as long as I remain divided in thought and opinion, having no moral
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