On Picket Duty

Kaiser Wilhelm has interfered with a theatrical production in Germany which contained a caricature of President Roosevelt. Surely Teddy will now find some way of securing the acceptance of the Kaiser's gift of a statue of Frederick the Great to this bellicose republic.

Russia will no longer permit war news to be sent by wireless. Doubtless recent events at the seat of war have led the great, white father to suspect that the czarist court is literally swarming with Japanese spooks and holgobliins eager to intercept any item of news that may be sailing through space.

Johann Otten, who founded a "Periodical for Individualist Anarchism" in Hamburg some time ago, has recently changed its name to "Freiheit." He proposes to continue the discussion and propagation of true libertarian principles in Germany, and invites the cooperation of congenial spirits everywhere. His address is Uhlenkamp 27, Hamburg-Barmbek, Germany.

A man has written to a New York newspaper, proponing the following query: "What human being alive to-day is of the most importance to the world and his fellows?" Without waiting for a reply—knowing, of course, that all the rest of us share his opinion and would at once hasten to deprive him of the glory of the discovery—he assures the question himself. It is really needless to add that the said human being is the emperor of Germany.

The society that is long on name and short on fame is keeping very quiet about the fact that somebody made it give back to a Chinaman the wife whom it stole from him. It doesn't often have to disgorge its prey, although its methods are frequently severely rebuked by the courts. The S. P. C. C. was very loud in its shouts of victory over the heathen husband, but it found out later that Chinese women, like those of other races, are sometimes not so young as they look.

A letter-carrier in Milwaukee has been arrested for destroying letters instead of delivering them, which latter he was too lazy to do. In extenuation of his offense he pleaded that he saved the addresses a great deal of time which they would have spent reading their letters! Thus doth the spirit of paternalism permeate the entire postal system. What great economies a governmental grocery could accomplish with delivery clerks of the species to which this postman belongs. We should all be saved the trouble of eating.

Whether or not it is due to the vigorous propaganda of the anti-vaccination society, there is undoubtedly an increasing large number of people who fear vaccinations more than small pox. Twenty girls employed at a factory at Camden, New Jersey, were recently exposed to the disease, and a physician was sent there to vaccinate them. On hearing of his arrival the girls jumped from the windows in order to escape. Whether they were followed up or not is not recorded; but the incident shows that it is becoming more difficult every day to convince people that anything with such dangerous possibilities as vaccination should be forced upon unwilling persons.

It is "sad news, bad news" that comes under the ocean from Rome—the pope is ill, for his luncheon was delayed two hours on account of the prolonged Easter services. He should have provided against such an emergency by sticking a sandwich under his nose before starting out. The photographs of the pope represent him as plump and well fed—much more so than those countrymen and faithful co-religionists of his who reach this country, and who often go longer than two hours past meal-time. If the papal food supply is really low, it might not be amiss to suggest that there is possibly a bull in the Vatican which could be spared, anything to keep Mr. Tailor's digestive organs from becoming atrophied.

The New York "Times" is getting very much disturbed over the possibility of Mormon Smoot being admitted to the senate. But it is not because Smoot is himself so bad; it is Cannon who is the real culprit, and he has snatched Smoot by being "in full political, religious, and social fellowship" with him. The "Times" cannot see how "anybody of self-respecting men" can consent to let Smoot in, which would indicate that the "Times" has taken altogether too much for granted concerning the self-respect of the senate; and it even permits itself to say that "a man who avows that he married two sisters on the same day is simply not fit for human society." Why? Would it have been more virtuous to marry on the same day two women who were not sisters? Or would the offense have been less heinous if one sister had been discreetly married on one day and the other on the next? The public is left in doubt in this very important point. Evidently, however, the evils of polygamy may be mitigated by a selection of wives from different families, or by the avoidance of the obvious economy of getting married twice on the same day; or by both.

To the residents of New York City or of any other large city it is not news that landlords object to renting apartments to tenants with children. Nobody need be told why it is, and, excepting the inconveniences it brings to those who have children and wish to live in the city, it need cause no alarm to any but those pseudo-sociologists of the Roosevelt type who are preaching against "race suicide." Mrs. Lydia Kingswill Commander, discussing the subject in the New York "Independent," finds that this unwillingness of landlords to have their property soiled and defaced by children is a cause that is making for smaller families among urban residents. What if it does? The rearing of a family must be treated as a business proposition. It must be made to pay, or it must be abandoned. Perhaps slowly, but none the less surely, will the law of supply and demand operate here as elsewhere. When social and industrial conditions are such that it is advantageous to raise children, children will be produced, and landlords will have to house them. In the meantime, those who find it impossible to live where children can be brought up under healthy conditions, and where there are few opportunities for their invasion of the personal and property rights of others, will simply be obliged to refrain from having children—just as one who cannot stable a horse must refrain from owning one. In any case, it is clearly a question that will settle itself.

Little Lyrics.

If God, as you urge, left his crown and throne, To snatch us from sin's vile flame. How is it that millions have never known So much as that even he came?

FAITH.

Poor mask so oft in many a bloody fray Sword-slash'd and mud-blotched since man's dim youth, Pitious the trapping thou dost make to-day, Pr'd she battle on the grand white brow of Truth!

THE GuLF.

"I feel that my soul is immortal," You tell me with visage aglow; But emotion as never yet knowledge, And ah, the infinity stretching To "I wonder I feel" from "I know".

SOCIALISM.

"As, rash optimists, who fondly plan To consummate the Equality of Man, I etern your purpose and the goal ye prize What ills of human selfishness arise!"

Sidger Forsyth.
on the part of the "News" to state that bribe-givers as well as bribe-takers must exist in order to make corruption possible. But neither of these statements proves the culpability of the bribe-giver.

In order to simplify the problem, let us reduce it to its lowest terms—or, at least, let the problem be stated in such a way that our emotions will not be too much disturbed. The bribe-giver wishes to obtain something which is of value to him, and naturally, while perhaps wishing to make sure that his competitor does not forestall him, he is desirous of obtaining a contract or franchise on the most favorable terms possible. His ambition is a laudable one, and the fact that he is dealing with a representative of the public, and not with the public directly, in nowise alters the aspect of the case. Let us suppose, for instance, that the private individual is dealing with the whole number of people comprising the community from which he wishes to obtain a concession. If he proposes to add, to a price already offered, a bonus to be given directly to all the members of that community—which bonus might be divided equally among them all—it would not occur to anybody to allege that he had resorted to bribery to accomplish his object. And I further maintain that his act is not changed from a non-invasive to an invasive one simply because he happens to be dealing with a duly authorized representative instead of the principal. If the agent chooses to betray his trust, and thereby defrauds his employer, that is no affair of the other party to the contract.

Let us suppose, again, that a clerk in a store sells a one-dollar article for 75 cents, puts 75 cents of that in his pocket and only 50 cents in the cash drawer; would any rational being hold that the purchaser was equally guilty with the clerk? Is it not perfectly clear that no guilt whatever can attach to his act of purchase, since he paid the price demanded and since everyone has a right to infer that the storekeeper and his clerks know their business? If the storekeeper, on learning of his clerk's turpitude, wishes to prosecute the latter, that does not concern the purchaser of the article in question.

Why, then, should the matter be looked upon in a wholly different light when the faithless clerk is a representative in a legislative body or is a department official and his employer the people? Clearly there is no reason for this, except the asinine inanity of the public, and the further fact that all their lives the dear people have been deluded into thinking that there is an enormous difference between twodle-dee and twedle-duum.

A Case With "Two Sides." Mr. John Brisben Walker, editor of the "Cosmopolitan," who is a well-known advocate of many propositions for government control, has lately been directing his efforts towards inducing the government to inaugurate a system of parcels post, so as to drive the express companies out of business, or at least to cut down their present enormous profits, and of course to give the people a cheaper service for the transmission of such matter as is now handled largely by the express companies. In addition to this, he is an ardent supporter of the movement for lower postal rates on printed matter.

Now, in his zeal for his cause, he has assumed the rôle of a special pleader, and has been led to present some of his statements in a very misleading manner. In the first place, he has properly pointed out that the postal officials high in power are usually owned by the express companies and that their repeated statements about the government losing money by carrying merchandise for one cent per ounce is all sheer rot. He contends that, as the government has for many years been carrying second-class matter in packages up to over 200 pounds at a rate of one cent per pound, it cannot be losing money on merchandise at sixteen cents per pound,—especially, says Mr. Walker, as certain "slow express" companies haul periodicals onefifth of a cent per pound, which causes all the magazine publishers to use the express in preference to the mails.

On the other hand, the post-office department holds that the second-class matter which the government carries for one cent per pound actually costs it five cents per pound to handle and transmit. There is a discrepancy between this statement, on the one hand, and the fact, on the other, that some transportation companies carry the matter (at a profit) for one-twenty-fifth of what the postal officials say it costs that one naturally seeks the explanation. It is impossible to know whether the government estimate is correct, but it is easy to detect some fallacies in Mr. Walker's statements.

In the first place, one of the "slow express" companies he mentions is the Merchants Despatch, which everybody knows is a freight company, and of course does not use the passenger trains on the railroads as do the post-office and the express companies. Next, the rate of one-fifth of a cent per pound was from New York to Boston and similar distances, while the post-office carried all its matter at a uniform rate to every part of the United States and its island possessions. Again, the Merchants Despatch, being a freight carrier, does not make a business of carrying small packages, and it is therefore only when the shipment amounts to one hundred pounds or more that the low rate is obtained. Now the post-office department transporports periodicals in packages weighing a fraction of an ounce at the uniform rate of one cent per pound, the papers being weighed in bulk. Furthermore, it delivers at the resideunce of the addressee each separate package, and for the other classes it makes collections from numerous stated points. The freight companies do neither of these; and in many instances, where the freight has been long in transit, the cartage expense at either end has been more than the freight charge. So it is easily seen that this collecting and delivery feature of the post-office (and which is a part of the express system, also) has a very important bearing on the problem.

Mr. Walker ignores the fact that it is cheaper to handle and transport goods in large packages than in small, consequently, his arguments react upon him when he insists that, since the government carries a 500-pound package of periodicals for one cent per pound, it ought to find it equally profitable to carry a one-pound package of merchandise at the same rate. Any school
very far in order to see them waiting with patient endurance for the time to come when they can secure legal permission to enter into conjugal relations. There is no doubt that many men and women will live in virtuous isolation waiting for Uncle Sam to grant them marriage licenses. But again it is a false alarm. They will not have to wait. Roosevelt will be at hand, and presto! marriage licenses may be issued direct from the white house to the suffering inhabitants of the island.

It is more than possible that there will be a better rule, not an exemption from the making of laws than the one Mr. Byington suggests; for, when we shall have reached the point where there are no laws, their absence will indicate that public sentiment has destroyed them—or permitted their lapse into dead letters. The plan of keeping certain laws, and not to enforce these laws by violence, leads practically to an impossibility. A law, to be a law, must be capable of being enforced, and there are some laws that can be enforced only by violence. Mr. Byington’s proposal to make the enforcement of law by violence itself a violation of law seems to complicate matters unnecessarily. He has not proved the necessity for a law that ought not to be enforced—by violence, if necessary. Why not abolish such a law instead of enforcing it? That sounds more practical. His “simplest and clearest solution” has no claim to those qualifications. We should be going more directly to the root of the matter by saying at once that we shall not hold it legitimate for anyone to aggress, the right of self-defence following as a corollary. It is scarcely warranteed, either, to conclude that, in a voluntary defence association, the jury system would be clumsy. It is reasonable to assume that it would be much less unwieldy than it is under present conditions, and even now it is resorted to much more freely, both in criminal and civil action, than Mr. Byington predicts will be the case when the law of equal freedom is to be enforced. The gradual abolition of all laws incompatible with equality of freedom is undoubtedly in the direct line of the evolutionary process; and it is furthermore certain that such laws will cease to be enforced even before they are formally abolished. Thus the anomaly of being obliged to use violence in preventing a man from enforcing a law is one that will probably never be witnessed.

The extremes to which the government of Spain has gone in recent years in its attempts to suppress free speech, free press, and all opposition—either tentative or definite—to its high-handed proceedings have made it practically impossible to publish, within the borders of that country, any periodical that would tell the unvarnished facts. This has led to the establishment of a bi-monthly paper (printed in a secret language) in Paris, called "L’Espagne Inquisitoriale," an "organ of international indignation against Spanish tyranny." The editor, in the first number, which has just come to hand, speaking of the "infamous tortures and persecutions to which workmen are subjected by the present Spanish régime," says: "We wish to do everything possible to prevent the Spanish working people, who are not the last to strive for liberty and human emancipation, from being wholly crushed by an ignorant and barbarous bourgeoisie." This is a laudable effort, to which Liberty extends its warmest sympathy. The publisher of "L’Espagne Inquisitoriale" is Charles Loizel, 4 Rue de la Roquette (XVI), Paris. No subscription rate or even price for single number is given, but the support of the paper will depend upon voluntary contributions, which may be sent to the publisher.

Oriental war developments seem to indicate that the easiest way for Japan to conquer Russia would be to induce the czar to plant a plentiful supply of mines in his harbors and navigate his warships over them.

The Engenderment of Laws

I have lately had the question put to me, where laws come from; and the answer appears to involve some truths which we cannot leave out of account in our anticipations of future society.

Of course every one knows where a great many laws come from. They are made by the legislature here, or by the tsar in Russia; or they are evolved by the courts—sometimes marvellously and at other times slowly existing. This being undisputed, the question in hand is whether there are any other laws besides those made by legislatures and courts. To be sure there are also the law of gravitation and the law of excluded middle. How do we begin by defining what I just now mean by a law?

1. A law is a rule of action to which one or more persons are expected to conform under the influence of the fact that somebody will use physical force against them if they do not.

2. A law is a rule of action to which one or more persons are expected to conform under the influence of the fact that somebody will use physical force against them if they do not.

Such are the laws that I want to talk about; and my special interest is in the laws that are imposed on many persons by physical force. The rest of my definitions are subsidiary to this part. And note that when I say "under the influence," I do not mean to say that this is necessarily the only motive.

Now what I want to call attention to is this: we have around us a large number of laws of which we know with certainty that they did not originate in any way as we have spoken of. We know that they were not enacted by the legislature or any department of the recognized government; in some cases the recognized government has all along been, and is today, in direct opposition to these laws. We know also that they were not enacted by any poet, philosopher, church, secret society, trade union, all-terrifying bully, indignation meeting, or other legislative person or body of persons capable of taking the government's place by physical or moral force. We know them to be laws that never were legislated. We are able to know all this because we know these laws to have started within a limited time, a time so recent that we can check the possibilities by historical records; we know by the records that the legislature made no such laws, we know that no quasi-legislature has publicly made them, and we know that no quasi-legislature has had the power, within the time in question, to put such laws so widely in effect without publicity. We can also fairly say that in some cases that no legislature, recognized or unrecognized, would have cared to make the laws that have been made. A few examples of the laws I mean are these:

A driver in America, meeting another team, shall turn out to the right. *

Ladies should not smoke tobacco.

Gentlemen should not smoke in the company of ladies nor indoors when ladies are present, unless the ladies give leave.

* The point is that this American law must be of American origin, because it is a reversal of the British law to turn to the left. Of course the government has adopted this law, but not till after it was already in force as the accepted law of the American road.
In frontier regions, horse-stealing is punishable with death, even though the same penalty might not b. permissible for other thefts of much larger value.*

The rape of a white woman by a black man shall be punished by lynching procedure and not by legal procedure.†

A bridge-room, in certain extensive sections of society, must pay a rearrange tax of a cigar, a glass of beer, or the like, to the men of whose women be has his associates.‡

Among boys in New York City and the region dominated by it, the right of property in an object—owing to the street (for instance, a stick of kindling-wood, the street itself)—is not a "bony that." If by some accident the street is full of treasures, a lively boy can scurry about bonying this and that much faster than he could have taken de facto possible in a goods store. And why is this done? Bonying.

Boys here in Cambridge inform me that the same law exists here, but the word is "bony."§

Some parts of international law may have been decreed by ancient priests, and some parts have been decreed by international congresses of late years; but much of it is known to have originated in neither way—for instance, the limitation of a government's jurisdiction over the sea to a distance of a league from the coast.

The law against beating any man to a third term as president of the United States, though in some respects not important, is made especially instructive by the fact that its entire history is well known.

If my list might rightly include the dueling code, most of the rules of dueling, the law against hitting a man below the belt in a fist fight, the rules of brawling in old New England, and parts of the common law of trade unions; but I am not sure that these have had a legislative origin at some time or other. The instances I have cited are enough to show what I mean and to prove my case. The list of unenacted laws includes frivolous laws and important laws, useful laws and useless laws, statutes of essence and statutes of nonessence, and laws of technical procedure, laws which are enforced by violence and laws which are not so enforced, laws which bear equally on all and laws which favor one class and not the other. In the case of each of these I favor the energetic against the sluggish ("bony"), the protracted against the propertyless (hang the horse-thief), or a dominant caste against a dominated caste.

I believe the government has in a few cases clipped the wings of the common business man, who is more widespread than anywhere else the government either ordained or regulated. I believe that business men of the type that had to be reckoned with in a certain, fixed, and given economic environment are also, in most cases, and one that had to be reckoned with as current, in many places where it had been by no means uniform. In some cases it has been the result of greater economic pressure, and in others it has been the result of the mere wear and tear of the law.\*

I have been heard of its being reputed that when men desired to be held in high esteem, they would be regarded as a lawmaker not because they thought necessary. The case is one where peculiar circumstances are more important than the law, and the prisoner, and the first speaker is the head of the lynching party, and I say that the law is the common, common, common law.
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Two causes seem to have operated to make men glad to introduce the legislative method. One is the need of amendment. Old laws are outgrown, and there is no question of legal fiction or the like. In other words, you have a legislature. Where there is no legislature, and the law has grown tolerably stiff, the procedure is to evade it by a legal fiction, as in my lynching-law story. Secondly, there is the need of change that is especially sacred, or in some other way inaccessible to legislative change; the Talmud is a shining instance, and the process has visibly begun in the case of the United States constitution. But legislation is a more salutary legal fiction. The second cause is the need of certainty in some kinds of laws, where it has been reasonably said that certainty is sometimes more important than justice. At least it is more satisfactory to the sufferers at the moment than any amount of uncertainty. It is a law that is especially sacred, or in some other way inaccessible to legislative change; the Talmud is a shining instance, and the process has visibly begun in the case of the United States constitution. Legislation is a more salutary legal fiction.

Looking backward, I see this; looking forward, I see things that are even more certain. The growth of laws is a constant phenomenon of society, which goes on apart from legislative authorities, and therefore would not be stopped by the abolition of such authorities; the tendency is for hard habits to change the laws. There will be no way to keep men from making laws, apparently, but by having a law against laws.* But I do not think we want to get rid of all our laws; I am sure it is more convenient to have every driver go where he wants to than to have everybody know which way the man in front of him is going to turn. A law against enforcing laws by violence would be better. But this law would have to be an exception to itself—you would have to suppress by force the use of force. But this is a way that the law will grow—no way has been found to prevent that; and when a friend of the law sees it violated, especially if the violation is in the nature of an innovation, he will be as anxious to have the new law enforce the old dogma, first bicycle, and you cannot warrant that he will not take the hardy short cut of force unless he knows of some one who is going to stop him; then, if those who don’t like his action are in general too Quakerish to fight him, and he cannot get his authority from the other, his way will be to know better (in which case you don’t get rid of enforced law anyhow), they cannot on Quaker principles restrain the more hot-headed minority of their party from fighting if it feels strong enough. To be sure, the boycott can be substituted for force in all this, but I doubt whether many will claim that the boycott will invariably do the work. Therefore, if we have to have no laws enforced by violence, we must get this by a system of violence against those who would enforce them. Then we get the perplexity of deciding whether a given case is actually in the nature of law-enforcement, and therefore to be put down, or whether it is a mere outbreak of lawlessness with an insignificant basis, and therefore not to be suppressed. It does no good to stop the traffic, but it is something like what our communist friends will have to come to, who will not accept the law of equal liberty as a test, and yet will not consent that miscellaneous laws can be substituted for the law of the majority regardless of equal liberty. For my own part, with all the known disputable cases under the law of equal liberty, I find by far the simplest and clearest solution will hold it, that for the defensive party to use force in resistance to force, but not for the assailant to use force against the defensive force of the attacked; and we will not countenance any use of force on either side when we find much difference of opinion as to which side our rule would favor." And I wish our communists would tell me by what simpler method they propose to prevent the lynching of a negro who takes a white woman away from a Greek who, according to the Chinese inhabitants of a California town when one of them is believed to have courted a white girl, the Carne-Natvique of drinking-saloons in Maine, the Chinese, is making a more liberal use of the lynching-law than was ever made before; and of which things can be done by five per cent of the population against the will of the other ninety-five, unless the ninety-five know how they are going to stop it.

In other words, I find that the only practicable security against the spectacle of a tyrannical government by way of custom and lynching law is to uphold the law of equal freedom as something to be enforced whenever the interested parties and their friends have the will and the power. Now as to the lynching-law process. I am not saying against the excessive use of juries, in addition to the well-known clumsiness of the jury system. This clumsiness will itself, of course, be enough to prevent the frequent convicting of actual juries in any states where things are done on a business basis; defensive associations will have their judges, and their troupes as to the method of arbitration when two associations are on opposite sides of a case, and these tribunals of one or three judges will be states of grace whereas if some one does not distinctly demand a jury, I suppose a case will almost never come before a jury except on appeal, and appeals will be discouraged. But, aside from this, I am now reminded that the precaution that the justice of the peace is a law offer it to give us a whole lot more of that intolerable uncertainty which we have just now as to the Comstock law and as to the conditions for admission to the second-class method. For example, what questions on which there is a nearly equal division of opinion would settle themselves by the practical certainty of a hung jury and consequent liberation of the accused; but there remain a lot of cases, on which the opinion of the jury can be taken to have twentythree to one, to where we should have the uncertainty—whether the jury would be unanimous for conviction or not quite. For example, if trials were now decided by juries on Lyman Spooner’s principles, I would not risk five dollars on a hung jury in his case for execution for going naked into the public street. The great majority would consider such an exposure outrageous, would call it invasive if you told them what ‘invasive’ meant, and, if you convinced them that it was non-invasive, would simply conclude that they would rather see the law of equal liberty sent tc Lilliput than live where such things were going to un unchecked. On the other hand, there are a few who do not think that Lyman Spooner has any more business and that it was better not to interfere with him; and there are just about enough of those to make it a reasonable doubt whether you get one on the jury or not. Result: a hung jury in that case, and also exaggerates the extent to which other people agree with him, tries the experiment and has the luck to get off by one jurymen when he is prosecuted. A syn pathizer of his hopes of it, tries the same thing, and finds himself in jail. The whole can be repeated as often . . . you can find a man who thinks his neighbors agree . . . he more largely than they do agree; and I should like to know who will have any reason to be satisfied with the outcome. "Here will be neither side with any interest in going on with the trial. So that their feelings outraged by the sight of occasional exceptions, and the minority will be free to (un)dress as they like without risk of jail. I should think the matter worth our putting in practice, because the defensive associations, as good men of business, would resolve to accept as decisive any verdict rendered within ten years by a jury of last resort, and would refuse to concern them with anything. In one case that any case that these experts regarded as plainly identical with one which had been so decided. If the jury had jailed the man who went out naked, they would not undertake the defense of another man who had done the same thing unless they had met with the same result; on the other hand, they (or some of them) will accept the charge of jailing this other man, and will refuse to allow him a jury when he asks for it, and he will find no adequate force willing to take the job of making and has always been maintained by aggression. The ing them bring him before a jury. If any defensive association was sitting in judgment for demanding juries in such cases whenever its clients asked for them, it would go bankrupt with litigation and leave the field to the more conservative ones. If, on the other hand, the reason why the com er, then no agency would undertake to restrain another such man, no matter how unanimous was the eull from an indignant neighborhood; nor would they hesitate to undertake his defense against the majority.

Something of that sort, I think, will have to be done. The precise details given are merely illustrative; these things will all have to be settled by the business experience of those who go into the police business as a free trade of some sort.

Another conclusion that I come to is that we shall want a legislature of some sort. In civil cases, especially, there will be all sorts of "customs of mar chants" that will be presumptively part of the contract, and will go on being so after the mere ‘put is tired of them, unless there is some sort of an agency that can give recognized expression to the general desire, or what shall thenceforth be presumed to be such, and shall be able to give an instance of what I mean. Of course such decrees would have no universal compulsory force; but the leading defensive associations would have a treaty or an understanding by which the dictum of a certain body of men shall be treated as a law, making and unmaking the laws on certain subjects.

I believe that in parts of this article I am glooming new ground, and am running rather that risk of error which one must run when one tries to make up his mind without being able to compare the minds of others. Such errors may be shown up by contradiction. I shall not be sorry, therefore, to see enough contradiction to put my guessess to the test; and I guess the contradiction will come. STEVEN T. EVANS.

What Anarchy Is and Is Not.*

So you want me to tell you what Anarchy is, do you? I can do no less than make the attempt, and in my own simple way try to make you understand at least that it is not what the capitalist newspapers, clairs and villains generally say it is.

In the first place, let me urge upon all who desire to learn the truth about Anarchism not to go to the enemies of that philosophy for information, but to talk with Anarchists and read Anarchist literature. And I am not always safe to talk to even a dozen half persons may say about it, either though they call themselves Anarchists. Take what a good number of them say and then canzen those statements in which they are not in accord. What remains is probably the real thing. What is Christianity? Ask a dozen or more people and it is likely their answers will not agree in every particular. They may, however, agree upon some fundamental principles. This is probably to be the right position of Christianity than the statements made by any one of them. This process of cancelation is the best way of finding out what any philosophy is. This I have done in determining what Anarchism is, and have fair premption that I have arrived tolerably near the truth.

Anarchism, in the language of Benj. R. Tucker, may be described as the doctrine that "all the affairs of men should be managed by individuals or voluntary associations, and that this is the thing." The State is the "embodiment of the principle of invasion in an individual, or a band of individuals, assuming to act as representatives or masters of the people in a given area." Government is "the embodiment of the non-invasive individual to an external will." Now, keep these definitions in mind, and don’t use the word State or government or Anarchist in any other way than that which Dr. Tucker himself uses it. Mr. Tucker’s definitions are universally accepted by Anarchists everywhere.

*A paper read by Mr. Joseph A. Labadie before the Band of Prisonable Research, Detroit, Mich.
The State, according to Mr. Herbert Spencer and others, originated in war, aggressive war, violence, function of the State has been always to govern—to make the non-ruling classes do what the ruling classes want done. The State is an institution by which the king and parliament in a limited monarchy, elected representatives in a republic such as exists in the United States, and the majority of the voters in a democracy as in Switzerland. History shows that the non-ruling classes are always the exploited, the ruled, the groundless, material conditions as the powers of the State over the individual are reduced. As man becomes more enlightened regarding his interests, individual and collective, he demands more authority over him and his conduct shall be abolished. He points out that the fact that the church has improved in its material affairs, to say nothing of the spiritual, since the individual is not compelled to support it and accept the doctrine or doctrine of the church, and the material conditions of the State over the individual are reduced. As man becomes more enlightened regarding his interests, individual and collective, he demands more authority over him and his conduct shall be abolished.

It would be evident to each individual or association: the right to issue money as a medium of exchange, thereby abolishing interest on money so far as it operates monopolistically.

It denies the justice of any body of people to tax the individual for anything he does not want, but that taxation, say, Muckey's "The Anarchist," Anarchist, and some others, are the organized forces of the nation, are used by churches, trades unions, insurance societies and other voluntary associations.

It believes that freedom in every walk of life is the greatest possible means of elevating the human race to happier conditions. It is said that Anarchism is not Socialism. This is a mistake. Anarchism is voluntary Socialism. There are two kinds of Socialism, anarchistic and Anarchist, authoritarians, and Libertarians, State and Free. Indeed, every proposition for social betterment is either to increase or decrease the powers of external wills and forces over the individual. As they increase; they are anarchistic; as they decrease they are Anarchistic.

Anarchist, Reformist for Liberty, freedom, independence, free play, self-government, non-interference, mind your own business and let your neighbors' alone, laisser faire, ungovernmented, autonomy, and so on. Now that I am done I find that you have been given only a part of the case, as it is and am to blame. Those who desire to pursue the subject further will find food for intellectual adults in Tucker's "Instead of A Book,"ブランドウッズの "What is Property," and "Economical Contradictions," Tandy's "Voluntary Society," and Anarchist, Herbert's "Free Life," "The Demonstrator," "Lecter," and a lot of other books, papers and pamphlets.}


Dear Sir:—I want to extend to you my sympathy and thank you for the sacrifice you have voluntarily undertaken to help us. I am the constitutionality of the laws which under which we were arrested, which seems in such obvious conflict with our constitution and the genius of our institutions, and contrary to common sense.

We can only apologize by saying that this law was passed in a fit of impotent frenzy: we had the misfortune to have a president whose acts against an unoffending people were so outrageous (stopping to fool falsification and usurpation to carry his ignoble ends) that the righteous indignation of one of our people was stirred to the point of criminality.

An outrageous act and a mistake,—for two wrongs cannot make a right. But it is not plain how any amount of law directed against effect can cure the cause. This crime had its specific causes. And to say it at the door of any school of philosophy is wanton slander.

If your case should prove this law in question unconstitutional, our brilliant lawmakers might in future direct their efforts against the cause, to aver effects we so lonesome.

If it is a question of killing or inciting to kill, your architect is a past master. He will assume the divine right to make the most inflammatory speeches, so that men are moved to assault a womanchild with murder and the very last bulldog menacing by a devil.

I believe it is not of record that you ever advo- cated killing. No, that is not the offense. The whole trouble is that neither church nor State could ever contemplate with equanimity the loss of its prerogatives, though every such law has marked an advance in civilization.

No less an authority than Rev. Heber Newton, D.D., has said that "Anarchism is in reality the ideal of political and social science and also the ideal of religion. It is the ideal to which Christ looked for ward. Christ founded no church, established no

State, gave practically no laws, or owned no government, and set up no external authority; he did seek to write, on the hearts of men, God's laws and make them self-governing." And, as growth is from within, it is a grand sentiment that "anarchism" can never take place through the agency of coercion.

Government rests on coercion. Leadership rests on voluntary following. The Anarchist will have men learn to give up the evil practice of coercion, having an eve-soaring faith that wise leadership commands voluntary following.

Anarchist: not aim to eliminate government next year or the next hundred years. But they stand for, and insist on upholding, the Christian ideal, that it is a principle of human freedom, that sooner we enjoy perfect liberty to talk about it, the sooner it will be attained.

Therefore, we say, all hail to you, John Turner! Yours sincerely,

W. E. Jackson,
229 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, April 8, 1894.

The Theory of Stickers.

To the Editor of Liberty:

Since I wrote you my letter about stickers I have been using up some sheets of them on my own account, and this has set me to answering the not unnatural question, what I expect to accomplish by them after all, I was obliged to give out for public consumption part of the answers that have suggested themselves to me during practical use.

I do not know when I first heard the name of Anarchism, but it must have been as long ago as most's trial in London, when I was a boy; but the first real attention I paid to it was in 1886, when the papers had reports of a bomb in Chicago, and then for months after month kept us in mind of the shock, and it was a bomb which I could not read through the reports of the trial,—I was never any hand at reading court-room news anyhow,—but I knew what was the constant topic of the scare-heads in the papers, and accordingly a great share of the attention of the American public. I was eighteen or nineteen years old, and therefore was busy making up my mind about the world in general. It seemed to me not only that, on general grounds of orthodoxy, I was bound to condemn the Anarchists, but also that, on grounds of self-respect and self-respect, I was bound to know why they should be condemned. So I set to thinking out for myself the reasons why there should be a government.

Now I had had so old-fashioned a bringing-up that I thought the question of the rightness or wrongness to be the most authentic starting-point for such a mode of thought. The result is obvious; any orthodox patriot of to-day can tell you what will be the dire results of leaving the declaration within reach of children, Hillman, or other underlings.

I decided that the Anarchists represented a reaction against an overthrown position on the government side, and that when I was through college and had a hearing I would show the world what was of value in the constitution and answer to all Anarchist sophistries. Then the Chicago men were hanged and disappeared from the papers, and the ideas I had developed were crowded into the background of my memory by other things. Still, they were brought back by finding that Herbert A. Suter had said it all before me in a well-known chapter of the old edition of "Social Studies." It was not till later that I learned that my youthful refutation of Anarchism was identical with one which had all along been carried under the name of Anarchism. When I found that out, I began to join myself to the comrades I had found.

It is doubtless natural to expect that other minds will follow the same track as mine. Where it has always seemed to me that this was the normal way of making Anarchists—that young people at the formative age should have their attention called to the fact that the Anarchist problem has been pronounced, and that it is one of those problems to which they must now give a yes or no with such reasons as they see fit. If this can be done, we ought to expect that a good share of the most logical and independent minds will come to conclusions which neither they nor their friends would have expected.
Bow, then, shall we call their attention? A bomb and a proctor trial called mine. But this method is very expensive; besides, it creates an effective argument against us. I have not yet thought of a more economical and telling way to keep ourselves before the public than by an explicitly-worded sticker. Argument is essential here; argument might even be harmful, for it would distract the attention from the problem to the narrower question of the particular argument used. It is for this service that about a fifth of my stickers are such bald statements as "Our Government is a monster." "If government means well, it is well-meaning crime." I do not expect such as these to carry conviction in any instance whatever; they are meant to challenge a consideration of the topic and the thinking therein if it is few enough; and for this purpose the main consideration has been to choose such words as should not permit any one to doubt that this is an anarchist flag that is being waved.

May I refer to facts, quotes, arguments; and after some use I am not ill satisfied with the selection. I do not "think in eighteen or twenty of the briefest possible statements I have exhausted the anarchist case; but I find them to cover the ground that is ordinarily needed. I could almost be possible to carry on a silent debate with an average conservative by laying a sheet of the stickers before him, and pointing with a pencil to the sticker that answers each statement he makes or asks. I do not know whether this could be done against a C'tist. I see that Pentecost has been found a society which has among its pledges the endeavor: "To bore no one by trying to have any way of thinking. To preach to no one who does not wish to be preached to."

That depends. If these people around me are going to continue abusing me and my neighbors by government, I shall bore them as much as seems to be serviceable toward inducing them to stop. At worst it is a very mild form of retaliation. Doubtless, in declaring my purpose to keep a topic before the minds of a nation with intent that they should "see with their eyes, hear with their ears, understand with their heart, and turn about, and be healed," when the nation would much rather not be reminded that any one disagrees with them on this topic, I am declaring myself a wulfet bore; but I think the game is worth the candle. Let the case of Pentecost vs. Byington be decided by the survival of the fittest.

STEVEN T. BYINGTON.

In Defence of Free Speech.

On April 9 Emma Goldman was to deliver a public lecture in Philadelphia, which city has a director of public safety. In trying to find some excuse for drying his salary, this official decided to prevent Miss Goldman from holding a meeting, and the police were on hand to carry out his order. To men, who asserted their right to enter the hall which had been hired for the occasion, were arrested and imprisoned. A prominent Philadelphia attorney, Mr. George G. Meyer, was engaged to defend the prisoners, and it is refreshing to read his speech in their behalf before the court, some of his remarks being here reproduced:

Yesterday's newspapers announced a meeting at Odd Fellows' Temple to be addressed by Emma Goldman on "The Tragedy of Woman's Emancipation," certainly a peaceful topic. Those who attempted to attend the meeting, among the number being my clients, were met at the door by policemen, who ordered them away, saying that the authorities would not permit the meeting. According to the primary meaning of the word, an anarchist is one who advocates a social theory of absolute individual liberty and who believes in the complete abrogation of all government of man without the necessity of any forcible enforcement of the law. I have never seen Emma Goldman, have never heard her speak, and have no belief in the present practicability of her political ideal; but, if I rightly understand her position, she is the peaceful advocate of a state of society in which government, as we understand it, would be unnecessary. In one of the morning's newspapers I read her statement that she had always been permitted to speak on this topic in the city of New York. As a citizen of Philadelphia, who has been here and has lived here all my life, I hang my head and I come to think that this woman, when she comes to the city where the declaration of independence was made, is denied the right of free speech on another topic simply because she is known to believe in Anarchism in its higher and better sense.

Anarchist Stickers.

Aggressive, concise anarchist assertions and arguments, ground and performed, to be planted everywhere as broadcast seed for thought: 25 in a sheet: 1 sheet for 2 cents; 5 for 5 cents, 20 for 25 cents, 100 for $1.

Address: N. T. BYINGTON, 70 Olde Street, East Cambridge, Mass.

What is Anarchism?

An explanation by Stephen T. Byington. 4 copies for 10 cents, 25 for 25 cents, 100 for 50 cents. Address N. T. Byington, 70 Old Street, East Cambridge.

PROBLEMS OF NUMBER AND MEASURE.

By BECLT MURDIE FERRIS.

An Outline and Bibliography of the Application of the Arabic System of Notation to a Radio Other Than Ten, and an Account of the Early History of the "New" System of Non-Decimal Arithmetic as the Basis of a Thoroughgoing Reform of the Metric System of the World.

21 Pages.

$1.00 Postpaid

Robert M. Ferris, Room 49, 114 Fifth Ave., N.Y.

A Chambermaid's Diary.

BY OCTAVIE MARBEAU.

Translated from the French by BENJ. R. FUCHER.

A French chambermaid, who has served in the homes of the nobility, of prominent Parisans, and of the government, assures a position in a country home; and there begins the task of keeping of her. In describing her daily experiences and her people about her, she is often reminded of episodes of her past, and thus, by frequent digression, reviews her entire career. She mercilessly tears away the veil that covers all sorts of crimes, foibles, prejudices, and facts in the various occupations of her life; and her reticence, simple, and direct, is the various society of office, so that her return is a social success. The author describes her book as filled with "the address that makes a witty, a biting, and a caustic literature that makes them weep."

A French critic declares that "the purpose of the work seems to be to show that nearly all the masters are bewildered women, and that society is reasonable, as well as a man of wit."

"The French original, published in August, 1899, has already reached its thirteenth edition.

A handsome printed volume of 416 pages.

Cloth, $1.25; paper, 60 cents.

Mailed, post-paid, on receipt of price, by the Publisher:

BENJ. R. FUCHER, P. O. Box 1313, New York City.

THE ATTITUDE OF ANARCHISM TOWARD INDUSTRIAL COMBINATIONS.

By BENJ. R. FUCHER.

An address delivered at Central Music Hall, Chicago, on September 14, 1899, before the Conference on Trusts held under the auspices of the Civic Federation.

Price, Five Cents; 100 Copies, $2.00.

Mailed, post-paid, by the Publisher:

BENJ. R. FUCHER, P. O. Box 1313, New York City.
A NEW SYSTEM OF BOOKS

The Ideophonic Texts
for
Acquiring Languages

Edited by
ROBERT MORRIS PIERCE

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 I. Four pazzel texts, as shown in the following reduced facsimile of two facing pages. Editorial Critic: George Hemp. Professor of English Philology and Linguistics at the University of Michigan. 26-272 pages. Cloth $1.00 postpaid to any part of the world.

Schiller's Wilhem Tell Act II. Same arrangement as that of Act I. Editorial Critic: George Hemp. Cloth. $1.00. (Partly prepared.)

French Texts for English Readers

Ludovic Hallevy's LABRE CONSTANTIN Part I. Four parallel texts, similar to those mentioned above. In the phonetic text the attempt is made to represent the actual Athenian pronunciation of the time of Xenophanes. Consulting Editor: George Hemp. Cloth. $1.00.

Greek Texts for English Readers

Xenophon's ANABASIS Book I. 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 Xenophanes. Consulting Editor: George Hemp. Cloth. $1.00. (Partly prepared.)

The issuance of the three volumes last mentioned will deposit somewhat on the number of the advance orders received for them. Other Series are contemplated, as of English-Saxon, Chinese, Hebrew, Italian, Latin, Greek, Sanskrit, and Pehlevi 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.

John Locke:

"And to make the reading and understanding of it the last order, and difficult to him, let him help himself as he can with the English Translation. Nor let the objection be made, that he shall then know it only by eye, or by ear, but by sight. This, when well corrected, is not an equal or moment against, but plainly for this way of learning a language. For languages are only to be learned by the eye.

For WHOM

FOR WHAT

Remarkable

For its Fundamental Principle that languages are learned as much by practice as by theory, that ideas and sounds, to become sufficiently associated in the mind, must be united in the mind—in the right combinations—over, and over, and over again.

FOR Its System of Phonetic Notation

The Study of Modern Languages in Boston, Mass.

(from Le Motif phonétique for March, 1901)

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

October, 1900

JAMES GENNIS, Professor of Romance Languages

in the University of Boston

UNIVERSAL ALPHABET

In this table, the letters representing the sounds mark such in the words, produced without vibration of the vocal cords, are placed in black. When a letter is pronounced with the lips pursed together, it is shown blue. Sounds that are pronounced with the tongue only are shown red. Sounds that are pronounced with the lips and the tongue only are shown green. Sounds that are pronounced with the teeth only are shown yellow. Sounds that are pronounced with the lips, the tongue, and the teeth are shown brown. Sounds that are not pronounced with the lips, the tongue, and the teeth are shown purple.
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