On Picket Duty.

France is not herself without treason. Dreyfus may be a thing of the past, but a new traitor has been found (or manufactured by the general staff), and the "patriots" are happy.

The State of New York now has a law which specifically prohibits the offering of libel to labor-union leaders, making it a criminal offense to do so. The next step in legislative idiocy will undoubtedly be to penalize the tipping of waiters. Why do we not hear a shout of delight from our friends the communists? Can they not see that the logical outcome of this species of legislation is the abolition of payment for services rendered, the abolition of private property?

A wealthy Chicago woman has been caught shoplifting. The Boston "Herald" thinks she cannot be a kleptomaniac unless it can be shown that she had stolen in the presence of a policeman. This is not necessarily so. It does not require an alienist to observe that insane people often exhibit an extraordinary amount of shrewdness. Kleptomania is doubtless a euphemism that would spell theft if the thief were poor and without social standing; but the sanity of this woman is not proven by contending that a person must be totally oblivious of the consequences of his acts in order to be insane.

The super-case, having economically waited until John Turner was safely in England, has at last decided that he should be deported. The court is unanimous, and so the constitutionality of the law is fixed, as was almost inevitable, although the New York "Evening Post" points out the futility and "fatal weakness" of the law, since "it is aimed at a state of mind rather than an overt act." On the whole, the advertising given to the ideas of people who believe in free speech, and the discussion aroused by the detention of Turner and by the people who came to his defense, have been a distinct gain to the cause of freedom, for all of which the action of the government is primarily the cause. Thus does the great, blundering thing usually defeat its own plans.

A lieutenant-colonel in the regular army has been officially called to account for failing to keep a promise of marriage with a young lady. Why this sudden burst of virginal solicitude on the part of the war department? Why did it not champion the cause of those Filipinas who, when some regiments were returning to the United States, accompanied the soldiers to the ships, naturally "expiring" to be taken on board? They were left behind, although they were not merely "engaged," but had been taken as wives, in good soldier fashion, and could see no reason why they should be separated from those whom they supposed to be their husbands. In this one case, apparently, the officer is subject to more restrictions than the private soldier. For all of which, let it be hoped, the latter is truly grateful.

In the first issue of "Froelich," (published at 816 Broadway, New York City), Mr. Horr, the editor, explains why he is not an Anarchist. The explanation is not likely to satisfy any critical reader. It tells us, after a fashion, not why Mr. Horr is not an Anarchist, but why he does not call himself one, which is a very different question. One of the reasons, declared to be particularly strong, is that "Anarchism expresses the idea of the absence of all invasion, a condition that will in all probability never be realized." The term expresses no such idea. It expresses the theoretical negation of the right to invade, the intellectual denial of all arithmetical claims, rather than the absence of invasion in fact. The existence of invasion in any degree cannot affect the soundness of a doctrine, of a philosophy of social and political organization. Again, we learn from Mr. Horr that the Anarchists' preaching and practice involve "the usual anarchism." What anarchism, pray? What does the phrase mean, anyway? Mr. Horr prefers the term libertarian, as a label. Well; that term will not arouse "a storm of opposition," nor even a murmur, but neither will it arouse interest, and to a form that is fatal.

Since the government is going to try to put all the "quack" doctors out of business by issuing fraud orders against them and withholding their mail, the vigilant daily newspapers (vigilant whenever their pockets are touched) are beginning to fear that the post-office department may consider any advertising doctor to be a quack. If such be the construction put upon the matter, a very prolific source of revenue will be cut off from the aforesaid daily newspapers; hence their sudden fear that the proposed censorship might not be a judicious one,—especially as all newspapers carrying the advertisements of the quacks may become likewise unmailable. The New York "Times" is even bold enough to say that, while the purpose of a general censorship of the advertisements in the newspapers of the country is admirable, "its execution involves the settlement of innumerable questions in which there can be a wide difference of honest opinion," and adds: "The trouble is to determine where to draw the line." But this is ridiculous. Questions are never "settled" by a censorship. The settlement is made elsewhere and otherwise, as even the temerarious post-office department may discover after awhile. The "Medical Journal" would like to see the idea carried out,—would like to see all newspapers with quack advertisements decarried from the mails. It is needless to call attention to the fact that that virtuous periodical does not insert such unholy things as the advertisements of heterodox doctors; and, of course, no one would ever suspect that it receives any financial remuneration for puffs of "regular" physicians and surgeons which appear as reading matter.

The Ancient Russian Mariner.

[Milwaukee: Sentinels.]

It was an ancient mariner
Who stopped a "Journal" cab;
"Unhast me!" the reporter said,
"Then art a fresh old dub!"

"I fear thee, ancient mariner!"
The young reporter said;
"Methinks I hear the merry buzz
Of drivewheels in thy head!"

"I am a ghost," the sailor said,
In accents strange and low;
I sailed from old St. Petersbourg
About a month ago.

"Sung in our strong torpedo boat,
For ten long days sailed we;
We wore the worst that ever burst
Into the Yellow Sea!"

"And when we stood the Yellow Sea,
We went upon a drunk—
The Japs attacked us savagely
And straightway were we sunk!"

"Upon the bottom lay our boat;
Happy? Well, I don't think it! Water, water, water,
And not a drop to drink!

"When we were tired of staying sunk,
We rose with might and main,
And then the Japs would rally round
And sink us once again!"

"Thus were we sunk, my lad, about
Three dozen times, I guess;
First by the Japs and then by the
Associated Press!"

"And Hearst, he sank us fifteen times
With much red ink and gloom,
So I have journeyed here to haunt
His presidential boom!"
Liberty.
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"In abolishing rent and interest, the last vestiges of old-time slavery, the Revolution abolishes at one stroke the sound of the Cherokee gong and the creak of the galleon, the club of the policeman, the gauze of the asceticism, the mean-minded of the department clerks, all these iniquities of Peking town which young Liberty prods beneath her heel."

-Puck.

The appearance in the editorial column 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 bold 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 disposition of them being governed largely by motives of convenience.

Spencer as His Own Critic.

Among the many extraordinary things in Spencerian philosophy are two or three specimen reviews by the author of his own books. The professional or pseudo-professional critics, he found, did not know their business, or were too indolent and careless to do it properly. "Social Statics," certainly a coehancing work, hardly attracted any attention. "No analytical account of the book appeared, and, as usual with books of the kind, readers were left to find out its nature for themselves."

Mr. Spencer, in order to show the incompetents critics "how to do it," proceeds to sketch out such a review of Social Statics as might have been written by a thoughtful member of the tribe who had honestly read the book through and given due thought to its arguments. It is not my purpose to examine this "hypothetical review" in a general way. One of its features, however, is of great and special interest to readers of Liberty.

I refer to Spencer's remarks on that famous and discomfiting phrase, "The Right vs. Ignorance the Vote," which he omitted from the revised editions of "Social Statics" as a word of direct explanation, and the decision of which was tacitly denied in "Justice." In this imaginary review Spencer takes occasion to point out the alleged fallacy of the argument in that chapter—show that the principle of equal liberty does not involve or lead to the recognition of the right to ignore the State. Here is the passage which concerns us in full:

"It is unquestionable Mr. Spencer has "the courage of his convictions"; for in a chapter entitled "The Right to Ignore the State" he actually contents that the citizen may properly refuse to pay taxes, if at the same time he surrenders the advantages with State aid and State protection yield him. But how can he surrender them! In whatever way he maintains himself, he must make use of sundry appliances which are indirectly due to governmental organization; and he cannot claim the benefits of the social order which government maintains. Even if he lives on a shore and makes shoes, he cannot sell his goods or buy the things he wants without using the road to the neighboring cities, and profiting by the paving and perhaps the lighting when he gets there. And, though he may say he does not want police guardianship, yet, in keeping down foot-pads and burglars, the police necessarily protect him, whether he asks them or not. Surely it is manifest—as indeed Mr. Spencer himself elsewhere implies—that the citizen is so entangled in the organization of his society that he can neither escape the evils nor relinquish the benefits which come to him from it."

Spencer's critic is wrong, and Spencer the author is right. The former wrote without due thought upon the arguments of the latter, and especially without full realization of the far-reaching implications of the law of equal freedom.

It is true that a man who lives and works among his fellows cannot surrender all the supposed advantages of the State. Mr. Spencer the critic is successful in showing that some advantages he will continue to enjoy in spite of his condition of voluntary outlawry. But what a jumped-at, illogical, and violent conclusion it is that, because of this fact, the voluntary outlaw may be compelled to pay, not only for these incidentally-confounded advantages, but for all the other alleged benefits of the State!

Or the critic's own showing is that the man has the right to refuse to pay for advantages which he can relinquish. He can say to the State: "Instruct your policemen, soldiers, firemen, etc., to let me severely alone and to respond to no call for help in case of assault, invasion, fire, or any other misfortune." Let me commend to the critic these words of the author in the chapter under review: "If every man has freedom to do all that he wills, provided he infringes not the equal freedom of any other man, then is he free to drop connection with the State—to relinquish its protection and to refuse paying toward its support. It is self-evident, that in so behaving, he is in no way trenches upon the liberty of others; for his position is a passive one, and while passive he cannot become an aggressor. It is, therefore, impossible for him to be coerced into a political combination without a breach of the law of equal freedom; he can withdraw from it without conning any such breach; and he has therefore a right to withdraw." Now, is a man who refuses to pay for incidentally-advantaged benefits have not solicited an aggressor? Is it a breach of the law of equal freedom to withdraw from a combination that, in working for itself and pursuing its own benefit, indirectly benefits one who is perfectly willing to forego the blessings of the uninvited beneficence?

The argument of Spencer the critic demands revision of the formula of equal freedom. Let me attempt the criticism: Every man who has freedom to do all that he wills, provided he infringes not the equal freedom of any other man, and provided further that no one confers upon him benefits which he cannot wholly surrender while remaining a producer and trader. Would this version have satisfied the author Spencer?

Furthermore, if the right to ignore the State be denied for the reason assigned, has an individual the right to withheld proper contributions from neighbors who, individually or collectively, benefit him by caring for their own interests? If my neighbors hire private watchmen, they benefit me indirectly and incidentally. If my neighbors build fine houses or cultivate gardens, they indirectly minister to my pleasure. Are they entitled to recoup for these benefits because I cannot "surrender" them? It is unnecessary to multiply illustrations: the point is clear.

In one of his letters to an American disciple, Spencer called Huxley a blackmailer and charged him with surrendering the whole evolutional position in maintaining that the ethical sentiments of men were at war with the cosmic process. The passage I have quoted from the imaginary reviewer reduces the principle of equal liberty to sheer nonsense—repudiates and abandons it completely. The argument is lame, superficial and trivial. I can imagine what the author of "Social Statics" would have said if a reviewer actually had attacked the logic and position of the chapter on the right to ignore the State!

There were many crudities of thought and style in "Social Statics," but the chapter which Spencer subsequently suppressed was one of the soundest and least vulnerable in the book. Spencer's surrender of that part of his political philosophy remains an amazing fact. It involves the repudiation of the principle of equal freedom.

A Non-Decimal System of Counting.

When the public learned that Spencer had made (contingently) provision in his will for opposing the introduction of the decimal metric system of weights and measures into England, a great many people, including even some of the dead philosopher's admirers, thought that he had made a great mistake.

The ground for this supposition lies in the fact (which has only to be stated to be admitted) that the decimal system of weights and measures, as now used in a majority of the civilized countries, is immensely superior to the antiquated and clumsy system in vogue in England and America and their colonies (England and Australia not even having a decimal monetary system). Spencer himself, even admitted this. But all this does not prove that ten is the best base of numeric notation. In fact, it is very easy to prove that there are several other such bases which offer many advantages over ten. Spencer favored twelve for a radix, because of the large number of factors which it contains, thus, in his opinion, rendering it more serviceable than any other.

Elaborating this idea, Mr. Robert Morris Pierce has written an essay* which will give the student many valuable data and aid to a clearer conception of several other possible radices.

Ten, it is pointed out, is divisible by only two numbers besides itself and unity, and to quarter it produces a fraction, which, as every one knows, is very inconvenient in prac-

* "Problems of Number and Measure," by Robert Morris Pierce. Published by the author at 15 West Eighteenth Street, New York.
labor in computation becomes greater. With sixteen, however, it is at once evident that a vast amount of labor would be saved in computation, while fractions would be absent even down to four subdivisions by two. Then of twelve we can take one-half, one-third, one-fourth, and one-sixth without having a fraction.

Mr. Pierce gives examples of what he terms the "octonial," "denal," "duodenal," and "sexidotal" systems in parallel columns, with decidedly disastrous effect upon the "denal." It will be seen at once that, with any radix higher than ten, a new terminology becomes necessary. Mr. Pierce has not attempted to supply this in the graphic form, but he has suggested a verbal terminology up to a certain point, the continuation being obvious and simple. This nomenclature seems rather foreign and fantastic at first sight, as all purely artificial verbal creations must seem; but no doubt they would rapidly become familiar to us once we were using them. If not, let somebody invent a better. Like all inventions, however, names in this case would undoubtedly come naturally as soon as the graphic signs came into use.

The subject is a deep and important one, which will some day force itself upon the world for consideration; and Anarchists will not be likely to be the last ones to welcome such a significant and far-reaching reform. The decimal system is so firmly entrenched in some departments of numeric notation, however, that it will probably be a long time before a dollar will contain, instead of 100 cents, either 54, 114, or 256.

The Converters of Mayor Jones.

Some years ago I heard Benjamin Fay Mills, before a meeting of the Whitman Fellowship, in Boston, tell how he "converted" Mayor Jones, of Toledo, into a Whitmanite. It was a very picturesque tale, the scene of which was laid in Jones's home, with Mills sitting up in the early morning, seeking Whitmanian in the unwilling ears of Jones, until the latter went to sleep. The next time he visited Toledo, he found Jones quoting Whitman in his political speeches and holding family services with "Leaves of Grass" at home. Later, I heard Mills repeat the story, with slight variations, before another audience, and I took it for granted that, since Benjamin Fay had corroborated himself, as it were, the facts had been correctly reported.

Imagine my surprise, then, when the "Whin" for May appeared with a new story of this remarkable conversion, this time the claimant for honors being one of the editor's of the "Whin,"—Ernest Crosby, presumably. The gospel according to Crosby locates the scene on "the top of a high mountain," near Lake George, while Jones had been enticed, and Crosby poured a sort of sermon on the moment from Whitman's poems to the victim. It is true, Crosby does give Mills credit for being one of the conspirators, in which he shows greater magnanimity than his rival; but it was Crosby who, "a few months later, found that Jones was quoting Whitman on all occasions."

And now I am beginning to wonder who will be the author of the next story of the Saint-Paul-like conversion,—who will next demand a share of the glory (or the responsibility, as it may yet prove to be) of this miraculous achievement. I am forced to suspect, too, that there may not be glory enough to go around.

C. L. S.

Is It Wise to Lie?

To the Editor of Liberty:

Some days ago I sent you a copy of my letter to the "Times" in regard to the little girl who lied. I have just seen the Liberty for March, and am sorry to see that you have fallen into a predilection by making an unwarranted assumption. You put the question in this form: "Did the girl injure the panic-stricken women by lying to them and thus saving their lives?" The fallacy of the question as here stated is in the assumption that the lie saved the lives; similarly the little girl assumed that the people in the house would act unwisely if they knew the truth. Therefore she lied. This is the excuse which authority always makes for censorship: the truth is dangerous. But even granting that the lie did save the lives, an occasional or isolated good result does not substantiate or validate which in the greatest number of cases has bad effects.

Besides, unless the doctrine of evolution is based on false premises, it would have been better that the people in the house should have died as a result of being, told the truth, than that to lie to people in danger should become an established rule of conduct. When enough people die through pietas, whose ear is left will have sense; but people who are continually kept in ignorance will never learn anything.

Sincerely yours,

A. C. PLEDDLE

52 William St., New York, April 15, 1904.

[Whether or not the lie saved the lives of the people is beside the real point which Mr. Pleydell raises. What he terms the "fallacy of the question" can be omitted (if the newspaper accounts were not true) and the ethical problem remains unchanged. Since the lie cannot be shown to have injured the people, it cannot be maintained that they were injured; if they were not injured, the girl's action was not "wrong." Besides, the girl did not act with authority or force, for the truth was not suppressed, in the sense that a government censorship suppresses it,—the untruth was merely offered, the women being left perfectly free to accept or reject it; and therefore Mr. Pleydell's analogy fails. While Liberty admits that, in the main, it may be expedient to tell the truth, it does not hold that a rigid adherence to any standard of conduct, however scientific, is essential. In this instance, it was meant merely to ridicule the hopeless blundering of those moralists who have national standards of right and wrong."

To recognize the law of the survival of the fittest does not make it invasive (however unwise it may be) to protect the unfit.—

EDITOR LIBERTY."

Three lines in the daily press suffice to state a fact that might well make a philosopher think in full-page "scare" heads. The news referred to is from Albuquerque, New Mexico, where Judge Baker, of the United States district court, has issued an injunction against private conversation. This is an epoch-marking order, because it denies not merely the right of free speech in public (which denial has now become an old story and is taken for granted in this country), but also the right to converse privately. It matters not that the persons enjoined are strikers, for, if a judge can legally so enjoin any person, he can legally so enjoin every person. This decision is not only far reaching—it is all encompassing. It need not stop short of a universal injunction of silence against all people who do not favor the domestic employers. But there are still one or two things to be reckoned with, before universal silence can be successfully enjoined; and Judge Baker has set a danger signal.

John Hare, when speaking the lines of a play, is incomparable; but John Hare, posing as a reformer and pleading for a national theatre endowed by the State, exhibits a faith in governmental meddling in matters of art that is little less than puerile. He calls attention to what has been done in other countries than his own (England), but he need look no farther than Germany to see the debilitating effects of imperial supervision upon art in every form. It ought to be apparent to everyone that, in a subsidized theatre, there is produced only what, generally speaking, is approved by the ruling power. It cannot be otherwise. And there is any indication that what Mr. Hare calls "the nobles' ad

itions of the British stage" would be upheld by the petty official whom Mr. Balfour might see fit to install as the manager of the government house. Politics and art can never go hand in hand, and Mr. Hare, if he wishes to avoid making himself ridiculous, should stick to his prompt-book.

The most important incident so far in the Russo-Japanese war is the death of Verestchagin, for his war pictures—depicting the horrors and the suffering caused by human combat, rather than the military glory and pomp displayed by the French war artist, DETAILS—have had no small influence upon the public mind in favor of peace. Doubtless he was in quest of "material" for a new painting when he was lost with Makarov. It seems somewhat strange that he should have been a guest on a Russian battlefield when we remember that the Russian government refused to let his war paintings be exhibited in the Russian section of the Paris exposition because his pictures were "true to life" and, therefore, did not have a tendency to inspire a love of war in the beholder. The originals of such subjects, however, are produced only by governments, and so the artist had to go where the materials were to be found.

Mr. Julius Hopp, whose address is 203 East 114th street, New York City, invites the cooperation of all those who are interested in "carrying to the masses the beauties that lie latent in the treasuries of dramatic art," his object being "to produce on Sunday afternoons plays of modern tendency as well as classical dramas, before an audience consisting mainly of the intelligent and progressive proletariat." The scheme is worthy of encouragement, but the season chosen for the launching of the project is unfortunate. At this time of year the proletariat, intelligent and unintelligent, progressive and non-progressive, is much more concerned in an attempt to get some fresh air on a Sunday afternoon than he is in any sort of performance given in a city.
to be a believer in "millennial men" in order to observe that public sentiment, when a statute law is in disfavor, adopts the plan of ignoring it rather than of forcibly preventing its enforcement. People seem unconsciously to recognize that passive resistance is generally more expeditious than overt action.

State Socialists, unaccountably, do not seem to be particularly hilarious over the vagrancy laws recently passed in some of the southern States. Any man not employed is seized by the government and his services as a laborer are sold. This is paternalism carried to its logical conclusion. Of course it is slavery pure and simple; but, since it is aimed at the lazy negroes of the South, nobody but the class affected seems to complain. It is only an emphasis of the "right to work," so much vaunted by our collectivist friends; and what, indeed, can more fitly emphasize the "right to work" than a denial of the right to refrain from work?

That Article on Laws.

To the Editor of Liberty:

So far as I can see, my propositions about laws will survive being written down at any rate in which you begin. Do you mean, in your first sentence, that it is desirable to have no laws? If so, the proposition has some novelty, and would be worth expounding and arguing. Laws, as we are in the habit of enforcing only by violence, it does not follow that "keeping certain laws" and not thus enforcing them is an impossibility; it is only necessary that the "some" and the "certain" be not the same laws. Or, "Mr. Pygmy's" proposal to rehearse the language of law by violence itself a violation of law seems to complicate matters unnecessarily, you say; but this is what has always been the proposal of all who have called themselves Anarchists, though they have used it as to whether the sense should be "enforcement of any law" or "enforcement of some law." You say that I have "not proved the necessity for a law that ought not to be enforced—by violence." Nor have I asserted it; so I don't have to prove it. I wouldn't much mind saying it, perhaps, but I would rather find out what is thought of what I did say before I complete the matter in being in other issues. You say that my "simplest and clearest solution" (which was stated thus: "to say, We will hold it legitimate for the attacked party to use force in resistance to be resisted) is not simple and clearest, and you prefer "saying at once that we shall not hold it legitimate for any one to aggress, the right of self-defense following as a corollary." You will see that your statement and the first half of mine are practically identical; the difference is that you omit to mention the case where it is debatable who is the aggressor. This omission leaves me only clearer, at least to one who remembers the existence of differences of opinion. But, since in your next sentence you defend the Anarchist jury system, you must be in practical agreement with me on this point that you have not expressed. As to your statement and the first half of mine are practically identical; the difference is that you omit to mention the case where it is debatable who is the aggressor. This omission leaves me only clearer, at least to one who remembers the existence of differences of opinion. But, since in your next sentence you defend the Anarchist jury system, you must be in practical agreement with me on this point that you have not expressed. As to your statement and the first half of mine are practically identical; the difference is that you omit to mention the case where it is debatable who is the aggressor. This omission leaves me only clearer, at least to one who remembers the existence of differences of opinion. But, since in your next sentence you defend the Anarchist jury system, you must be in practical agreement with me on this point that you have not expressed.

Steven T. Byington.

Some Reflections on Malicious Phlebotomy.

To the Editor of Liberty:

The writer of these lines must acknowledge a certain partiality toward Italians. He learned to know them as members of the Italian Club in Boston, where his father had a strong affection for it, and, as the result of many years' intimate intercourse with Italians of Boston and New York, came to be in a certain sense Italianized himself.

There is little peculiarity about the natives of Italy which the average American is wont to "view with alarm," and that is a penchant for malicious phlebotomy, in the form of "enforcing" for legal redress of wrongs. I add the word "malicious" to the euphemism advisedly, because this system of phlebotomy is foreign to regular surgery. It is performed crudely with a stiletto, and its purpose is to prolong the patient's suffering on the opposite. This very objectionable fact is not a characteristic of Italians in general, as many Americans imagine, but of a certain element among Neapolitans, Corellans and Sicilians.

I witnessed a little episode of this kind in New York last December. It did not get into the so-called "front-paced journals", because their wide-awake reporters were busy writing up such vitally important matters as Rockefeller's Bible Class, and an Italian stabbing affair drawing a crowd of a thousand people on Eighth Avenue was probably considered a relatively trivial event.

Between 14th and 18th Streets on that avenue there is an Italian cobbler shop, of the well-known type found in basement all over New York. On the evening in question I went there to have some slight repair to my footgear, which would probably have been hired a wait of over ten minutes. The proprietor, with whom I was slightly acquainted, said he couldn't touch it, but preferred that I should come a quarter of an hour later. As I was intending to visit a barber-shop that evening, and the place I regularly patronized (condemned by the cobbler's wife) was directly over the cobbler's shop, I saw that the handiest arrangement was to pass the intervening period in the barber's chair.

The time taken by me in ascending the stairs from the basement, entering the transom establishment, taking a chair and having my foot lathered must have been extremely brief, yet this interval was long enough for a quarrelsome neighbor of the cob-
An Individualist on Interest.*

Mr. J. H. Levy has nowhere been more fully described as an individualist with a cause worthy of a better course, in that he defends the godless of liberty against the tyranny of State Socialism yet differs from domesticate liberty as the sole satisfactory solution of the economic problem of society, has recently been published, under the auspices of the British Personal Rights Association, a book entitled: "Short Studies in Economic Subjects." Wherein, on a cover of revolutionaries some of the most astonishing atrocities against reason that a reformed was ever called upon to combat. It cannot be said that our author "judged better than he knew," for the greater probability is that he knew better than he judged, and that his book is the result of interior designs upon the intelligence of the working people, whom he urges to the study of economic science as a guard against the pitfalls of politics. According to Mr. Levy, economic is not a social science, and its provinces, therefore, is not to show how production and exchange ought to take place with a view to equity and social harmony, but how they actually do take place. But there is a very large school which differs radically from Mr. Levy, and his mere say-so is not sufficient to put them out of court.

For the economic evils which afflict the laborers Mr. Levy has next to nothing to say in the sense of a solution. For instance: Statistics show that interest on capital absorbs annually about one-half of the total product of labor; but all he has to offer on this point amounts to nothing. In the same way, he becomes so common among the people that the great majority will prefer postponed consumption to present consumption, then interest will fall to zero by reason of the force of changed consumption on loan. This is the philosophy of a man who urges the workers to turn their thoughts to the study of economic science!

In seeking the source of interest on capital Mr. Levy supposes *the case of men who have access to the capital that they may produce more for each of his own support. Their remuneration will be the produce they obtain.* That is to say: their product will be their property. But let us point out right here that in this supposition Mr. Levy violates the terms of his description of money involved as showing how production does, and not how it ought to proceed: for, since the institution of government does not permit free access to the raw material of the globe, nor property in the product of labor, such a supposition is entirely beside the point. "But, when we get a little further on in economic development we may find him laboring for the production of some instance in which he can see to make his labor more productive. Pay great attention to him while he is doing this; for, when the first man did this, capital was born." Good! but mark the following: *Now what is the result of this action of the creator of capital? He has to wait longer for his reward. It is there before him. He has made an investment which he can afterwards apply so as to make his labor more productive." His labor, if you please, Mr. Levy; not some one else's labor. Let us stick to the text. "But," continues our author, "ignoring my interruption, larger one (reward). The excess remuneration, then, is due to extra labor, but to waiting.... and is called interest." Says Mr. Levy, on page 63: *Interest there will be so long as men engage in productive occupations and the present order of nature exists." Yet on page 73 he absolutely contradicts this statement by saying: "I believe there is nothing to prevent interest going down to zero, provided its accumulation be not prolonged." Could something more absurd be said? Suppose Mr. Levy, on reaching home one evening, should find his house ablaze. Would he appreciate the wisdom of the bystander who would say, "I believe there is nothing to prevent that conflagration going down to zero, provided its blazing be not discouraged." Besides, look at the logic of the latter quotation. So long as nothing is done to discourage the accumulation of interest, Mr. Levy sees nothing to prevent it "going down to zero." To this we say: *False!* If, as I believe, the demand for deferred consumption will at last cut off that for anticipated consumption, we may look forward to a time when interest will not merely disappear, but when it will become negative. Now every one of persons offering capital on loan is in the nature of a discouragement to the accumulation of interest by competitively lowering the rate thereof. What, then, becomes of Mr. Levy's stipulation as to怎么 interference with the accumulation of interest being the sole condition of its dissolution?

Looking at his argument from all sides, I can only come to the conclusion that Mr. Levy has expressed himself completely. Briefly and plainly put, his theory amounts to this: *Let nothing be done to prevent the accumulation of interest and it will die a natural death! All the facts are against such a theory.* In the absence of all restrictions to the accumulation of interest, one per cent. compound interest in the year A.D. 1, would have amounted in A.D. 1803 to a mass of gold twenty-five thousand million times the size of the globe. The political being in evidence does not in any way obviate the liability, interest assumes the form of legal claims to wealth of that amount. Thus the workers are condemned to life-long servitude; that is to produce and to toil the whole of their time. If, then, with the exception of sufficient to keep them from starvation or suicide, in order to satisfy the rapacious maw of usury. Under these circumstances it is not difficult to guess the remorselessness of the time when the economic is one and the same, capital, or "deferred consumption," in sufficient amount to cause interest to go down "to zero." Such, then, is Mr. Levy's position in relation to the...
abduction of interest. I have, by quotations, separated from each other only a few pages, shown direct and absolute contradiction, and my analysis of single propositions of philosophy and science. I have to bear in mind what he has written about us; that he has heard the case of the Americans against interest, and the methods proposed for its abolition, I have no doubt. It remains for him now to state his objections, as an individualist, as a believer in liberty, to the theory that an equilibrium between purchasing power and productive power may be maintained through the medium of a free currency.

William J. Rothen.

April 1, 1904.

Nietzsche and His Companions.

(From "Free and Easy.")

Parallels, like comparisons, tend to distinctions, which are invisible, and thus, according to legend, to the parables. The village church had little interest in the movement of the moths of every great thinker who has helped to bring order out of the chaos which, to a certain extent, still pervades the provinces of ethics and economics; for, broadly and generally speaking, there are no other provinces.

No one person, perhaps, has caused such universal commotion among the students of ethics, as this gentleman, as has Friedrich Nietzsche. Nobody has so boldly and so clearly submitted the thoughts and arguments in contravention of the Christian and time-honored system of morality, and so invariably carried on discussion and controversy into its own cause. No man who could not in the future of science, in the future of mankind, bear the mental immorality, and also that "true virtue consists in thirst for danger and courage for the forbidden." could avoid bringing upon his head the anathema of both the church and the State. Nothing could be more revolutionary to their codes of ethics. But Nietzsche reaches these positions by cold and philosophical reasoning. He produces the facts of history and facts of natural science to prove the former contention, and unanswerable arguments to prove the latter. The tendency of all Nietzsche's thought is toward the upbuilding of the individual, rather than toward the upbuilding of the society. This conceives the human brotherhood idea, and thus incurs the envy of all the dominant forces in modern society. Indeed, "human brotherhood," in its general and indiscriminate sense, was so strange to Nietzsche as was the sentiment of theologians.

Nietzsche, it may be said, stands near the pinnacle of his generation in the conception of rational ethics. Yet, not far from him in either in altitude or distance, stands another commanding figure—Max Stirner. How evident that the same impulses and emotions, to a certain extent, governed these two men! Then, as of most the same period, although directed toward the same general ideal, we have Froebel in France, Ibsen in Norway, Spencer (though not so close) in England, and Tocqueville and Burrow and Walt Whitman in America. If we take the short step from the drama and poetry

to music, we might also name Wagner and Richard Strauss, who have taken positions far in advance of their contemporaries, and who, I firmly believe, have been actualized by the same general impulse of progress, that has manifested itself in other branches of human thought.

It is true that we must not forget that Nietzsche himself, after an ardent admirer and friend of Wagner, later in life turned and actively opposed him. But, while we may recognize this difference between two giant intellects, and while undoubtedly in its latest phases Wagner's work was to a certain extent reactionary, we must not lose sight of the fact that the main Yinger's music stands— if it stands for anything—before rebellion against established forms and ideals, and that it is the foremost greatest character of his intellect— the emblem of the man, rather than the essential respect, of the idea of "Nietzsche's" overman. Siegfried was a broken idol, and the gods of the world were gods of supercilious and superstitious, and was the anguished of "Thirst for danger and courage for the forbidden."

While Nietzsche was not an Anarchist, he has, in most of his writings, a mystic and disinterested for the State, and I can do no better in closing this article than by quoting one of his most striking arrangements of it: "Whatever the State speaks is falsehood, and whatever it possesses it has stolen. Everything is counterfeit in it. The barking monster—it bites with stolen teeth. Its very bowels are counterfeit. Nietzsche had little use for cant and hypocrisy, and the cowardice of which they were bred. His ideals were courage, strength and honesty—a super-trinity!

A Spurious Substitute for Work.

Mr. George Bernard Shaw, being asked by a London daily newspaper for his opinion on athletes, sent the editor the following, with which sentiment many sane people will find themselves in accord:

I have no pastime. My time is fully occupied. With regard to the benefit of athletics to the community, I should say that there is only one benefit, namely, the discovery of the hideous lassitude of athletics; the ruinous effect on them of the body, the mind, and the temper; and the rampant quackery and paltriness of all such professors of the same. There is no moral substitute for the manual and bodily labor, which athletic amateurs are forbidden to perform by the law, greed, arrogance, and rapacity of their classes. I could keep a man in perfect health and temper if I had to do a couple of hours' work every day as a navvy without "doing a poor man out of his job." As it is, I have to worry myself and waste my energy in licentiousness and tatters, where I have no business over roads which I have tramped until I am tired of them. I have no right to drudge through "exercises" to keep myself from becoming a human pig. I have seen piled upon India rubber ropes until I could not bear the revolving absurdity of it, even without an audience to laugh at me. The whole business is too sickening for public discussion. Half the population lives miserably, and breaks down, not primarily from excess of bodily toil. The other half does the same because there is no bodily work left for it to do. That is what is called civilization.

The Right to Boycott.

Under the foregoing title Mr. John Shillady, of Buffalo, N. Y., has an article in "Progress," of this city, and the article is so much better than what ordinarily is printed on that subject that a part of it is herewith reprinted for Liberty's readers:

To boycott is to do a non-innovative thing—a doing nothing, a negative act, a refusal to do. The "legal" mind cannot comprehend this attitude. The law or the tyrannical "boss" has no means of repressing those who simply refuse to patronize others. Only a befuddled or prejuiced thinker can twist this essentially peaceful method into a "conspiracy." No one thinks of denying the right of boycott to prohibitionists and other "intolerants," when they refrain themselves and urge others to refrain from patronizing liquor saloons; to vegetarians who hold meetings and circulate literature "conspiring" to ruin the business of those who sell flesh of animals, unless those who practise are "preaching against tea and coffee drinking;" to dress reformers who inveigh against the corset and thereby menace a considerable industry. Yet, it often happens that a vegetarian total abstainer, who would like nothing better than to "ruin" the business of meat dealers and "rum" sellers, who denounce money for that purpose, is loudest in denunciation at these wicked labor men who urge others to totally abstain from buying meat, groceries, iron, steel, or what not, until such time as the em- ployer concedes better conditions to his men.

It is true that society has a right to the patronage or business of his followers. No man has any claim on humanity because of having been "ruined" by his customers refusing to buy. The customers have the right to impose conditions as to price, quality, or anything that reason, whim, or caprice may suggest. He cannot or will not meet these conditions, he may have to give up. But, no wrong has been done him. His refusal is conform to the wishes of those whose custom he desires.

The right to boycott equals the right to refuse to buy. The right to persuade others to patronize a friend equals the right to persuade others to refrain from patronizing your enemy, if you have one. Let no one be persuaded that what is right for one to do is wrong for another to do.

The principle involved in the boycott is the soundest principle for the promotion of reforms. It is powerful, non-invasive, requires no force, and is effective.

The Workings of a Trust Law.

(From a Report of the House Committee on Patents.)

Our drugs and fine chemicals are largely made in foreign countries. These foreign countries do not grant patents upon the chemicals or drugs themselves, but only upon some of the steps in their preparation (in many countries no patent is granted even upon the process of manufacture), while our country grants a patent upon the article itself. A German manufacturer or inventor, therefore, is able to come to the United States and secure a patent upon a drug or chemical of his invention, which he cannot do at home.

The common medical remedy phenacetin is patented in this country, the patent being owned by a German patentee. Phenacetin, manufactured in Germany by the holder of the United States patent, is sold in Canada at fifteen cents more than the same article, made by the same manufacturer, put up in the same way, is sold in the United States at about one dollar per ounce. The difference in price is caused wholly by the fact that in the United States the patent is granted for the product itself and not for the process of making it.

There were presented before your committee two one-ounce boxes of Phenacetin, both manufactured by the same manufacturer in Germany. Upon one was the printed statement: "The residue and importation to the United States of the exact article." That ounce of phenacetin, or one similar to it, can be purchased anywhere in Canada or Europe for about fifteen cents. The other box had printed on it the statement: "Manufactured for the United States patent." This box is put up only for sale in the United States and costs one dollar a box in the United States.

Too Wise to Work.

(St.ijo Lopez and Thomas T. Patterson in the Springfield

The charge is that the Filipinos will not work. The sec. we. is not complete; it should read: "The Filipinos will not work for foreigners." That is to say, existence of the work for the vampire and the wolf whose sole intent is to amass wealth by the labor of others. This is a fact of which every Filipino ought to be proud, for it places the Filipinos in marked contrast
Liberty's Library.

For any of the following works, address, Benj. R. Tucker, Box 1312, New York.


A Blow at Trial by Jury. By Emilio E. Tucker. An examination of the special jury law passed by the New York State legislature in 1898. A speech delivered at a mass meeting held in Cooper Union under the auspices of several labor organizations. 40 pages. Price, 25 cents.

Read the vital words of this woman. - The Commissioner.

Whitman's Ideal Democracy, and Other Writings.

By Helena Born.

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

A radical individualism. - Chicago Daily News. "In these essays one comes in touch with a rare spirit." - Boston Herald.

Plus examples of serious writing. - The Socialist Spirit.

A simple volume, beautifully printed.

Copies for sale by Helen Tupper, 4 Park Street, Boston, Mass.

Languages Printing Company.

15 West 18th Street, New York. Telephone 6152 Gramercy.

Languages Publishing Company.

HIGH CLASS JOB AND BOOK WORK.

Linotype Composition for newspapers, magazines, books and jobs in English, German, French, Spanish, Italian, Dutch, Hebrew, Russian, Bohemian, Polish, Hebrew, Latin, Greek, and other languages.

LINOTYPE & HAND COMPOSITION.

Problems of Number and Measure

By Robert Morris Fiske

An Outline and Bibliography of the applications of the Arabic system of notation to a radix other than ten, and an account of the resulting new system of non-decimal arithmetic as the basis of a thoroughly reformed system of the metric system of the world.

32 pp. $1.00 Postpaid

Robert W. Fiske, 15 West 18th St., N. Y.

The Attitude of Anarchism Toward Industrial Combinations.

By Benj. R. Tucker.

An address delivered in 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, $1.00.

Mailed, post-paid, by the Publisher, Benj. R. Tucker, P. O. Box 1312, 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 that constitute the acquirement of languages. The ideas are presented by means of the native language of the student, and the sounds of the foreign language by means of the Universal Alphabet of the International Phonetic Association, as shown in the reduced facsimiles below.

German Texts for English Readers

Schiller's Wilhelm Tell Act 1. Four parallel texts, as shown in the following reduced facsimile of two facing pages. Editorial Critic; George Hempel. Professor of English Philology and General Linguistics in the University of Michigan, 24, 259 octavo pages. Cloth. $2.00 postpaid to any part of the world.

Schiller's Wilhelm Tell Act 2. Same arrangement as that of Act 1. Editorial Critic, George Hempel. Cloth. $3.00. (Partly prepared)

French Texts for English Readers

Ledoux de La Grèe's L'Arbre Constant Part I. Four parallel texts, similar to those shown, as a preparation for the two volumes of Le Maitre Phonetique. (Preparation arranged for.)

John Locke

"The ideophonic texts are designed to furnish abundant material for forming those myriad associations of mental and organic processes that constitute the acquirement 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."

Edmond Demolins

"In short, the only practical and rapid way of learning a language is to store in the memory the most vivid and accessible phrases and words, as possible. By the time a pupil has read and mastered forty words and phrases, languages are only to be learned by heart."

For WHAT Remarkable

For Its Fundamental Principle that language is acquired, as much by Practice as by Theory; that Ideas and Sounds, being accurately associated in the mind, must actually be present in the mind, are not only, ever, and ever again, for the Study of Phonetic Notation, the International Alphabet of "Le Maitre Phonetique", a journal circulated in 20 languages; the English text has recently appeared; the student can after a few lessons be expected to learn the new language with facility, and is ready for passage into the world wide popular volumes."

For Its Three Parallel Texts always in right, three of them corresponding, line for line, word for word, with the phonetic text, the reader is certain, first, that the language he has learned by heart, only another language is much easier to learn.

For Its Phonemic German Text giving the exact pronunciation and stress of each word as spoken in the particular context, in which it occurs. Pronunciations as commonly given in text books, grammars and dictionaries, are not only few in number and incomplete, but arbitrary; there is no particular context.

For Its Ordinary German Text corresponding line for line and word for word with the phonetic German text, and printed in large, clear roman type.

For Its Free English Text, a word-for-word rendering, corresponding line for line with the phonetic and phonemic German texts;rcuring the stip. - - - - line for line and word for word with the phonetic German text, and printed in large, clear roman type.

HINDS & NOBLE, Publishers
31-33-35 West Fifteenth Street, New York, U.S.A.