On Picket Duty.

"The security of the rights of the individual," says the New York "Sun," "is much more important than even philanthropy." This is anent the refusal of the police commissioner of New York to grant special police powers to certain societies for the prevention of something or other. This is a sound position to take on the proposition, in view of the fact that the work of the said societies is not only unnecessary, but invasive.

Usually jurors supinely submit when a judge orders them to bring in a verdict, regardless of their own opinions on the matter, but two Philadelphia jurors not long ago proved themselves to be exceptions to the rule. When the judge ordered a verdict for the street car company in a suit for damages brought by a person who had been injured, the said jurors objected and expressed the opinion that they should be permitted to decide that question for themselves. Of course their objection was overruled on the ground that it was a question of law and not of fact; but the incident shows that there is occasionally a man who has some conception of the essential basis of a rational jury system. Liberty has reason to believe that this case is the result of some Anarchistic leaven that has been at work in Philadelphia.

The plutocratic press has been highly indignant over the fact that it has transpired that certain letter-carriers banded together in the last election to defeat a candidate for congress who refused to promise his support to their demand for an increase of pay. Futility as political action is a means of solving industrial problems, there is a certain justification in a resort to it on the part of government employees. It is said that the administration is going to "prevent and punish" this "abuse," but it is clear that this cannot be done without practically disfranchising the letter-carriers; for, to deny the right to agree with another man to vote the same way is to deny the freedom of the ballot, about which we hear that there is so much solicitude on the part of politicians. According to the theory of a democracy, the case ought to be analogous to that of a joint-stock company, with the voters as stockholders in the government. Who would think it improper for a certain number of stockholders in a joint-stock company to join together to defeat the election of officials whom they might deem to be inimical to their interests—even if these stockholders should be also employees of the company? Obviously nobody. And certainly the letter-carriers would be fools were they to heed the generous advice of the government organs, which is that they should always wait until after election before arguing their claim.

The recent case of a man in New York who was arrested upon the complaint of a woman who mistook him for her truant husband has brought out the fact that, under such circumstances, the prisoner cannot be released upon the mere acknowledgment of the woman that view was mistaken, but that the admittedly innocent man must lie in prison (or give bail) until he can be taken before a judge and formally released. Fortune, too, is he if he escape being photographed for the rogues' gallery. In any case, the stigma of arrest forever rests upon him, the least disadvantage of which is, as society looks at things, that some clever lawyer may some time use that fact to discredit the unfortunate victim's testimony on the witness stand. Rarely is it, moreover, that any legal redress can be obtained by the victim. For the law says that, even if you are innocent, once you have been taken into custody on the word of a witness who knows that she has made a mistake, there you must stay. "In such a case," the New York "Sun" is led to exclaim, "we are inclined to think that the law is an ass. Not only an ass, but a knave."

Some weeks ago Moses Harman, editor of "Lucifer," was arrested on the technical charge of depositing non-mailable matter in the United States mails. He was released on bail, and, up to the present time, his case has not reached a trial. As far as can be learned, the specific things that were alleged to be unmailable are one of a series of articles by Dora Forster on "Sex Radicalism" and another article of similar nature written by one of "Lucifer's" other contributors. The former series has since been published in pamphlet form, and it goes without saying that there is not a single line in it which an unperverted mind would find objectionable as language, although the ideas expressed therein are such as very many honest and sincere people would take exception to. The pamphlet—whether one agrees with its thesis or not—is well written; the subject is well presented, and the literary quality of the articles is above the average of that contributed by "Lucifer's" correspondents. Mrs. Forster reasons from the standpoint of one who believes in perfect freedom in sexual matters, and in this her work is sane and sound. She presents an instructive array of facts, and her conclusions are logical and well drawn, for the most part, although they would naturally lead Comstock into deep water. This gentleman can have no other excuse for his action in this case than that he fails to understand what the matter he finds objectionable is all about. To him it is filthy, because anything that he doesn't understand is taboo. What is needed is the education of Anthony Comstock; but that is not likely to occur as long as there is such a fat salary attaching to the office of secretary of the Society for the Prevention of Vice, and as long as he does not have to account strictly for the salacious pictures which he seize.

The all-wise supreme court of the United States has decided that compulsory vaccination, as ordered by local boards of health, under authority conferred by act of legislature, is not an infraction of the liberty of the individual as guaranteed by the constitution. "This will end the discussion of vaccination as a measure of protection against the one disease which it perfectly controls," says the New York "Times," "but it should end the useful life of the societies of crusaders formed to resist the operation of laws relative to vaccination. Their occupation is gone." In opening its comment, however, the "Times" had said: "The contention that compulsory vaccination is an infraction of personal liberty and an unconstitutional interference with the right of the individual to have the smallpox if he wants it, and to communicate it to others, has been ended, so far as this country is concerned." In view of this, the "Times" ought to go farther and point out how, if vaccination "perfectly controls" smallpox, the individual who has it can communicate it to vaccinated people. But that astute newspaper is not accustomed to venture beyond its depth; and then, too, such news would not be "fit to print."

Gulls.

Where the gray gulls flap and soar,
And their white breasts flash and dip,
In the Harbor, New York,
Like a bronze-green deity
In the eyes of shore and ship,
For the nations to adore,
There upstandeth Liberty.
In the Harbor of New York;
Where the trade-walls tower high
And the great ships beat them by
In the Harbor of New York;
Standing, standing, evermore,
Why uplifteth Liberty
In the Harbor of New York?
For the gray gulls of the sea
Or the white gulls on the shore
Is this mocking blasphemiy
In the Harbor of New York?

—J. William Lloyd.
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In abolishing rent and interest, the last vestiges of old-time slavery, the revolution abolishes 1 can strike the sound of the gong that marks the end of the m gong, the club of the policeman, the mace of the constable, the erasing-knife of the department chief, all those trappings of authority, now young Liberty grinds her heel.”" — Proudhon.

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

Bakunin's Book on Warren.

The announcement in the last issue of Liberty of the forthcoming publication of "Josiah Warren, the First American Anarchist," has met with a quick and gratifying response. Already over seventy-five subscriptions have come in.

The warm interest evinced in Mr. Bakunin's book shows that although Warren, although thirty years have elapsed since his striking personality passed away, has not been forgotten. Warren's influence on modern thought is probably more potent today than it was when he was preparing his "True Civilization," near half a century ago. While adapted to the needs of civilized people at all times, the social ideals of the pioneer Anarchist will be better appreciated and more easily practised as we become a more highly individualized, more liberty-demanding people.

The ever-growing public that appreciates 
Isen, Soutenmann, and Shaw, which listens to 
Tolstoy, 
Nietzsche, and Spencer, will assuredly find the seeds of "Truth planted by these modern thinkers already germinating in the mind and practice of Josiah Warren.

In this book we can see and follow the process of development working itself out in a fashion original with Warren. The aim and purpose of his life are brought before us forcibly and sympathetically. The book will form both an exposition and a text-book of the better kind of individualism, which is not disregard for others, but a true appreciation at all times of the rights of others. Every friend of Liberty, every believer in the supreme right of the individual to himself, his product, his freedom, his property and reputation, should possess Mr. Bakunin's study of Warren, the New England Puritan, individualist Anarchist.

It may be added that the number of subscriptions so far received is not yet sufficient to warrant Mr. Bakunin's plan of associating with the publication of the book, hence he would ask all those who are interested in its appearance, and who have not yet added their names to the advance list of subscribers, to signify, by notifying the editor of Liberty as soon as possible, their intention of taking one or more copies so that he may know, before putting the matter in the hands of the printer, just how many subscriptions he can count upon, and so that he may be able, also, to measure more fully the interest manifested in the work. Responses have been received from England, Germany, and Belgium, which shows that the interest in Warren is not confined to America. C. I. S.

The Simple Life and the Strainless Life.

I head this article with two phrases that have lately been very familiar, not to say hackneyed. Now I do not suppose that the coiner of these phrases meant either of them to convey any reference to the other; still less that they meant to furnish battle-cries for two contrary schools. For there is assuredly no reason why the two may not be combined in perfect harmony. Such names as Vesuvius, John Wesley, Russell Sage, Louise Michel—would it be easy to lengthen the list—prove that a man may live very plainly and at the same time be a tireless and successful worker in any walk of life. Probably the foremost extreme case of the simple life in American history is Johnny Appleseed. He had but his self-imposed life-work from which he never rested. Without exaggerating the importance of Johnny Appleseed's work for good or evil, it may at least be said that the life-long specialized effort of that ignant public spirited tramp has doubtless had more effect on the life of the American people than has the work of any other man who had so little equipment other of capital or of ability of any sort. Assuredly, these simple men have been strenuous, and have found in their very simplicity a help toward the concentration of strenuousness; and we have heard that sort of thing preached by moralists from our childhood, till it seems very queer to see a man beginning a discussion by offering proof of so trudged a commonplace. Nevertheless, traditions die, and the popular point of view seems to be changing so much that what I have written is not superfluous.

For there is also much to support the view that the two ideals tend to become antagonistic.

If, instead of citing just now the foremost American extremist in the simple life, I had spoken of the most conspicuous and familiar American instance, I should have had to name Thoreau. Now he was not strenuous. He was determined, he was effective, he could work, he could work persistently, he did work, but he did not live an indusrious life. He preferred to "leave and invite his soul" to an extent which it must horrify Mr. Roosevelt to think of. And the Thoreau type is not a scarce one either.

The Thoreau type is that which makes the simple life auxiliary to a third ideal while his nominal expression is nearly two thousand older than the other phrases: "the contemplative life." Their creed has two articles. First, living is of more consequence than getting a living. Second, a living which takes a lot of getting, and therefore takes a large part of one's time off from living to put it onto getting, is less of a living than one which takes less getting and so leaves more time for living. This will be recognized as a "philosophical" view. It has in fact been largely characteristic of philosophers. Socrates was a veryadvanced Thoreauite. Indeed, all the wisdom of ancient Greece, so far as it is represented by the schools which are now remembered as having contributed something definite toward the solution of the problem of the conduct of life, converged on this solution. The Cynic and the Epicurean, hostile as they were, agreed in this. The Stoic could find a proper place for strenuousness in his philosophy, but only on condition that it did not aim at any of the customary aims of strenuousness; this proviso made the Stoics' influence practically hostile to Roosevelt's ideal in most cases, if tradition may be trusted, and they do not seem to have left that they were being seriously misunderstood in this point.

In fact, philosophy has always been the very special debtor of men of this type. The industrious philosophers, like Aristotel or Herbert Spencer, have had an immense philosophic reputation in their own days, and have had a great permanent effect on history in the matter of the relation between philosophy and practical life; but how many of us can tell precisely what addition Aristotle ever made to the sum of human wisdom? There are no men of smaller reputation, and not less attainments, for whom we could more easily answer such a question. (All this may be pretty nearly the same to say that philosophy, as distinguished from practical science, is of the nature of poetry). What I say of philosophy is also in great measure true of contemplative religion. It is remarkable, and probably instructive, that theology—which one would surely expect to find running parallel either to philosophy or to contemplative religion—owes its great works to strenuous men.

Closely akin to this life of philosophic contemplation and bookless study or basking in the delights of nature, as exemplified by Socrates, Thoreau, and the village loafer, is the life of bookish scholarship. Educated society has indeed agreed to list the student—sometimes very unjustly, indeed—among the industrious; it will even half a Darwin as a great example of strenuousness, after he has shown the fruit of his long toil. If Darwin had died in middle life he would have been reproached with having wasted his time in stringing together, on a basis of his own fancy, facts which in his arrangement did not serve toward the further development of any known truth; and can it be made out that the reproach would not have been just? At least, his life (except that part which was spent in getting monographs on coral reefs, crinoids, etc.) would have been a life from which the world received no service to speak of; and so long as this is so, it makes little difference to the world whether the man himself went to bed tired with working or with writing. Such is certainly the outcome of my many a life of scholarship: some, doubtless, which would have shown rich fruit if the brain which carried the contemplation of the studies had lived longer; others which would never have produced a result worth giving a single lecture on if they had been elaborated through all the years of Methuselah. No sufficient test has been found, except the survival of the fittest, to decide which man's work is valuable and which is trash.

We have at least one example of a nation running to this sort of life. The Icelanders of modern times are an untroublous, unperturbed
people, with some uncivilized characteristics such as a lack of cleanliness. For these things their climate is in part responsible; but all this dates especially from the loss of their political independence—imperialists please take notice. They are a nation of scholars still, however. It is no eccentricity in Iceland for a peasant to en-
joy reading books in different languages for the purpose of instruction; and to find time and means for doing so; and, if I understand aright, to keep these habits after he is grown up. It pays us, when we are considering what may be possible to man, to remember that there is such a nation on earth yet.

The relevance of all this to the relations be-
tween the strenuous life and the simple life is as follows. Doubtless simplicity and strenuousness are perfectly friendly to each other. But not many men are going to live a strenuous life without some purpose; nor will most of them consent to live a simple life when they have the wherewithal for an elaborate life. The ordinary aim of strenuousness is the elaborate life: and the ordinary result of successful strenuousness, even when the aim was something else, is the elaborate life. Here come in other ideals, these desires to devote life to something for which strenuousness leaves too little time. To satisfy these, we want a way to escape from strenuousness; and the attraction of the simple life is that it offers such a way. But for this, how few would live simply! Individuals, then, may—and sometimes do—make the sim’ e life an aid to the strenuous life; but in ordinary human experience, the simple life is simply in expedition to escape from the strenuous life in the interest of some other ideal, high or low. Hence comes the genuine practical antagonism between these two perfectly compatible principles.

The reason for bringing all this into an An-
archist paper is that some of these strenuous people, following the quite legitimate impulse of strenuousness to shape the world both of nature and of man, and guide it by the perfectly natural tendency to feel that one’s own ideals are the ideals best worth the world’s living for, are setting out to say that we must all be strenuous whether we like it or not. There shall be no more Thoreaus or Socrateses; the time given to such occupations as theirs must be only what is left over after one has done a full day of vigorous work. I do not mean to complain that they are preaching to us. Preaching is fair; the right to criticize is sacred; the loafer and the philosopher make so much use of that right that we need not fear their wishing to abridge its liberty even when it is used against them. Somewhat harder it is when they pass from criticizing to upbraiding. Nevertheless, a Thoreau succeeds in facing the opinion of his town, or a Socrates that of his wife. It is un-
sirable, to be sure, to organize society so that the form of organization shall especially tend to make these blasts of public opinion inevitable. This seems to be a fault of the Communist scheme. After some years of experience of actual Anarchist-Communist life on a small scale, this was the chief fault that Dr. Rossi found with it. At one time the colony suffered from not having enough Communist strenuousness about it; then an infusion of excellent new

blood saved the day in that respect, but the next thing was that—

There resulted the peculiar phenomenon that, in this Anarchist fellowship, every one felt the oversight of his comrade burdening him, though silently and covertly, a much heavier and more intolerable over-
load than that of a European work-
shop. Since in reality the right to idleness was lack-
ing. Anarchist had become a word: residence in Cecilia had become morally painful for some.*

Rossi does indeed credit this partly to the personality of the strenuous newcomers, though he does not rate these personalities as abnormals; but his later writings show him holding the conviction that some such de-
fect is in separable from any full-fledged Com-
munist society. And on the other hand the fore-
most Communist unites maintain one of the most ticklish parts of this doctrine, the notion that all normal men must take their share in all typical forms of induc-
v. Everybody must be a farmer for some hours every morning, a mechanic for a few more, an investigator of na-
tural science for a few more, etc.; so that one man shall not devote himself to a more attractive activity and shirk his share of the necessary coarser work, thereby compelling others to do an undue amount of this latter. Even in the works of men like Kropotkin one finds this principle laid down in words which, if one were to take them with sarcastic literalness, would imply that every man must in the course of his life grin a few spectacles-lenses, act Engineer of a few experiments in a few of the astronomical predictions for the almanacs. Now, if they thus acknowledge the deep neces-

sity that every man in a Communist society should take his share of the coarse work, how will they warrant us against the expectation that the scourgé of public opinion will be laid on hard to whip up those who seem to be in default here? This is what did happen in the actual experience of Cecilia, and it seems to me a natural result.

Steven T. Byington.

(To be concluded.)

Walker and Rights.

"Communism and Conscience" is the title of a pamphlet just issued by E. C. Walker. Originally it was prepared for delivery before the Manhattan Liberal Club, after which it was extended for printing in the "Truth Seeker" and in its present form. It will be remembered that, in No. 386 of Liberty, an extended criticism of one phase of Mr. Walker’s position was made by Mr. Byington. An examination of the present publication discloses the fact that Mr. Walker’s position is open to still further criticism. The main part of the work is devoted to a discussion of the ever-perplexing question of human rights, and the following quotation is as one point, a fair statement of the author’s position:

The assumption that there are no natural rights, that there are only social rights, at most, grows out of the strange forgetfulness of the fact that all we are, in body, in emotions, in mind, in morals, in social life, is natural. If we have social rights, they are composed of all the natural, which are parts of nature. Man, with all his intellect and his ethics and complex society, is just as natural, because just as much a part of nature, as was his ancestor, the mammal in the ancient sea.**

Now, this is a misunderstanding (inexcus-
able on the part of Mr. Walker) of the meaning of those who hold that there are no natural rights. I make this positive statement because the only other hypothesis—that Mr. Walker has consciously begged the question—is untenable. This whole contention of his, therefore, that nothing that exists is unnatural is a mere waste of words; it is a truism that no sensible person thinks of disputing. But Mr. Walker ought to know that the term "natural," as applied to rights, serves as a designation for those rights which some persons allege to belong to people by virtue of the fact of their birth, and which the authors of the Declaration of Independence describe as "inalienable," in contradistinction to those which are the result of acquisition by conquest or by contract, in which latter categories all rights necessarily belong. To deny that any right can be called natural is not to assert that acquired rights are therefore unnatural. If Mr. Walker’s postulates were exact, we should be confronted with a serious dilemma. If certain rights are natural, it follows that to deprive us of them would be unnatural; but, as a matter of fact, we are deprived every day of some of those rights which Mr. Walker holds to be natural, and this process of deprivation is, according to a justifiable interpretation of his contention, likewise quite natural. That is the circle in which his reasoning leads him, and from which there is no escape. It is true that he may fai back upon the old dictum that whatever is in nature, from which it follows that the word "unnatural" has no place in our vocabulary. But, with respect to rights, the cold fact remains that we have no rights—either at birth or at any other time—which are not obtained either through conquest or by conquest; and, while it is true that it is perfectly natural for us to obtain them by either of those methods, that fact does make them inhere in us by virtue of the mere fact that we have been born. It is, of course, a mere quibble to contend that, if there are natural rights, we must possess them simply because it is natural for us to have them; but Mr. Walker’s reasoning leads to just such a conclusion. It is natural that it should rain, and it rains—not regardless or perpetually, but only when the conditions are favorable; it is natural that we should have rights, and we have some—not merely because it is natural or because we want them, but only when conditions are favorable, that is, when, by contract or by conquest, we are able to obtain them.

Equally confusing is Mr. Walker’s use of the term "invasion." He commits the egregious error of making it synonymous with "injury." This is what led him to say, in the paragraph quoted by Mr. Byington in No. 386:

I may not... rightfully injure you wantonly.

On the contrary, he may rightfully injure me wantonly; but whether that injury is an invasion or not depends upon whether it is the result of action or of inaction,—of the use of physical force; in other words, whether force is actively or passively applied. If no overt act be committed,—that is, if there be merely abstention from acting,—certain it is that there has been no invasion.
All this is a propp of the boycott, upon which question Mr. Walker always permits himself to get so deeply entangled in the mazes of his moralistic reasoning. He says further:

I am injuring you wantonly if my act furthers my intention to injure you because of an action of yours which is not injurious.

Very true; but that injury is invisible only when it is the result of an act of bis and not merely of a natural and accidental difference between which seems constantly to evade Mr. Walker's comprehension; and I am led to suspect that the temporary blindness which prevents him from seeing this difference is due in fact to the principal phase of the boycott is the withholding of patronage from a merchant, in which case the effect upon the latter is so palpable that Mr. Walker's sympathies are enlisted. Now, illustrations are not argument; but perhaps one may serve to enlighten Mr. Walker, especially as he is fond of resorting to that expedient himself. Let us suppose that a merchant, has incurred (by no act of his) the displeasure of a customer. Let us suppose, again, that A deals exclusively in teas and coffees, of which commodity B has been a large purchaser and consumer. Now, B intentionally attempts to injure A by withdrawing his custom, and let us concede that he openly avows this intention. He proceeds to carry out his threat, not by transferring his patronage to some other tea and coffee merchant, but, since it is conceivable that those articles are not absolute necessities, by ceasing to use them. Let us admit that B's cessation of the consumption (and consequently purchase) of tea and coffee has injured A. since Mr. Walker admits (when he says "I rightfully may do in association with another what I rightfully may do alone") that, if B's withdrawal alone were not sufficient to injure A, he might, without changing the aspect of the case, induce a sufficient number of his friends to leave off drinking tea and coffee, and thus to withdraw their patronage from A, in order to accomplish the latter's ruin. In such a case, I respectfully ask Mr. Walker, what is he going to do about it? Would he force B and his friends to resume the consumption of tea and coffee (the use of which articles they may have in the meantime decided to be injurious to their health anyway), to buy the goods and not use them, or to pay to A an indemnity?

A Social Anticipation.

Mr. Alexander Horn (or, technically, the Free Land Printing and Publishing Company) has recently brought out a new paper edition of Dr. Theodor Hertzka's "Freeland," which has been out of print for some time. The translation is by Arthur Ransom, an English disciple of Hertzka, and it is, on the whole, a fair rendering of the original, although certain literary defects might be pointed out: but it is not with these that Liberty is concerned. The volume is of some interest now because Mr. Horn and a number of other Freeland enthusiasts have organized a Freeland colony, at Bow, Washing-ton, for the purpose of putting into practice the plan of a regimented civilization set forth in Dr. Hertzka's book, and for the eventual realization of a dream of social and economic reform.

Mr. Horn is a good advertiser, and he has been preaching Hertzka and Freeland both in season and out of season and from the Atlantic to the Pacific—from the platform and in his papers, "Freeland"—for months past, so that he has collected a considerable following, some of whom have remained in New York to carry on the campaign here, while Mr. Horn with others has gone with "Freeland" to the colony site, where we may soon expect to hear of the practical operation of Hertzka's "Social Anticipation."

But tothe book itself. Any one who has read "Looking Backward" will understand at once when told that "Freeland" is a work of similar scope and purpose; and I see no reason why the latter should not achieve quite the same popularity as the former,—unless it be, perhaps, because Hertzka chose to place the scene of his book on the highlands of equatorial Africa, instead of in the heart of occidental civilization. Something there was a touch of reality about "Looking Backward" which is lacking in its German prototype, and this is undoubtedly due to the fact that the tropical coloring of the picture of Freeland is too remote and too unfamiliar to us of the northern temperate zone. With all of the popularity of his book, however, Edward Bellamy has probably no more tangible result of his work—no more evidence of an attempt to put into practice his dream—than has Hertzka in the Freeland colony in the Northwest.

Hertzka, like Bellamy, has attempted to work out every detail of life under the new régime, even going so far as to describe the wearing apparel of the inhabitants of his fairyland, and has given a description of the duly authorized marriage ceremony, taking great pains to assert (but not to prove) that man is a monogamous animal, and so on, with charming dogmatism. Anarchism, too, is an anomalous thing in Freeland, because, on account of the very admirable political order which exists in that happy land, no one would be dissatisfied with the way things were conducted. This is, indeed, a most splendid picture, and is to be accounted for only by the fact that "what gives its especial charm to the society of Freeland is the really childlike joy that beams upon one from every face." Certainly the naive sentiments that some of the characters in the book express cause no surprise when one has discovered that every one goes about with his face beaming with childlike joy.

To deal purely with essentials, nothing more need be said than that the book attempts to solve serious problems in sociology, and especially in economics, by giving a detailed plan of life and action for people who, although they might steer in the main direction indicated, are more likely than in travel in other directions—especially in radically different climates and environments—before they can rid themselves of present-day institutions. It is true, the book is in a sense an acceptance of the standing challenge of the philosophians to Socialists that the latter offer something in place of what they would abolish,—an attempt to refuse the charge that the doctrines of social reformers are purely destructive: what more, after "Freeland," can anybody ask? Moreover, it is not State Socialism or Nationalism—neither is it Anarchism; it is a hyb'of for which no name had been found, except Freeland, until Mr. Horn gave it the euphonious name of "Anticriticism." But, if the Freelanders can organize and maintain their institution—which it may be called for the sake of a better word—under the jurisdiction of our benevolent government without being assimilated, I certainly wish them every measure of success, and this while doubting the plan and doubting the value of it even if it should duplicate the experiences of the fictitious African experiment.

C. L. S.

Some time ago a detective agency of Houston, Texas, addressed to the mayor and council of that city the following proposition: "If there is no legal objection, we are prepared to compete for a contract to do police work for the city of Houston for less money than the work now costs. If you cannot see your way clear to open the matter to competition at the present time, we would suggest that such a provision be embodied in the charter." Why not? This proposition may be unique in municipal affairs, but the fundamental idea is as old as Anarchism. There is no doubt that, under some such arrangement, the city would get its police work done more cheaply and more efficiently than at present, provided that the contract were awarded under perfectly free competition. This proposal is absolutely essential, however, and any evasion of it will nullify the whole effort and lead eventually to the common condition of boidelsiasm. The detective agency guarantees to protect the city from the thieves, which is something that, it is safe to say, the present police force does not do.

The Anarchistic View of the Expansion Question.

(A paper read by Joseph A. Labadie before the Detroit Anarchistic League. (Concluded.)

Do they love liberty who carry on a war for domination over the Filipinos, who deny equal rights to the Porto Rican, who rob the Cubans, under the plea that it is for their good? Ay, do they love liberty who take the prize of the women of this country without granting them the doubtful expediency of even protesting through the ballot-box? Let us suppose it to be true, as some of the imperialists claim, that the Filipinos cannot take care of themselves, what business is that to you or to me? Haven't we enough to do to take care of ourselves? If there be those among us who have spare time and money and want to spend them for the benefit of the Filipinos, does that give them the right to impose their notions of justice and equity to compel those to contribute who have no time and money to spare? Mr. Edward Atkinson claims that the war with Spain and "the criminal aggression" on the Philippines will cost the people of this country $8,000 a day in loss of life and property. I don't know how it is with the rest of you, but I do know that some of us know that some of us know that some of us know that in any case we are not going to contribute very small comfort to the little brown babies across the sea. Ahl indeed, Gen. Sherman was right when he said that war is hell. This country could much better be raising wheat than raising a disturbance.

But I suspect that the war in the Philippines is not for the good of the Filipinos. Judging by all that I can learn from papers and speeches of those who favor it, I come to no other conclusion than that they are guided by misinformation, a deplorable lack of appreciation of that which makes for social progress, or of downright villainy! They do not
know that, as Froebel said half a century ago, “Liberty is not the daughter but the mother of order”; maybe they do not care.

One of the excuses made for this war of aggression is that, under the control of the United States government, we shall learn self-government. Of whom will they learn it? Certainly not from those who are making war upon them. No one can teach what he does not know. What is self-government? Is it that some one else shall have control over your life, liberties, and property? Has not the power of understanding plain English words, “self-government” means just what it says. Does it not do violence to good sense to say that it means that I shall have the power to govern myself? Does it not mean that I shall have the power to govern myself? And does this not neces-sarily preclude the idea that one person shall have the power to govern another? Was it not Lincoln who said (and said again) that there is no one wise enough to govern another against his consent?

It is, however, a contradiction to say that the just powers of government are derived from the consent of the governed. Government is the subjection of the non-involuntary will. When we consent to do what others want us to do there is no government. The essence of government is to compel people by force to do what we— not want to do. Hence, when they consent to do what somebody else wants them to do, the essential element of govern ment is absent.

He has not yet learned the cause of human progress who believes he should forcibly bring others under submission to his will. The extension of personal free-dom has done more for human happiness than any other one thing in the world. Man is right when he said the curse of the above liberty is more liberty.

When I disagree almost entirely with Mr. Hug-hson’s position, and think it not only unjust, but brutal, he nevertheless asked his opponents a pertinent question when he asked if the government should go to him, and if they could not govern him. The correct answer to this question is necessary to make democracy a consistent and har monious theory. I have shown you the logic of the Declaration of Independence. If, therefore, demo cracy takes that document as its political creed, then it must stand for the inferences that are necessarily drawn from it. Therefore, the answer to Mr. Hug-hson is inevitable: If self-government is right, then it is tyrannical. No body can govern people, however great or small, have a just right to compel me to do what I do not want to do. To quote Mr. Tucker: “Man’s only duty is to respect the rights of others; and man’s only right over others is to protect them from tyrrany.”

And have we the right to pursue happiness in our own way? Not at all. We must get our happiness as others think we should. There is an orthodox way of getting happiness as there is a stereotyped way of doing almost everything. The authoritarian is a regular Chinese for uniformity. He who has the courage to live his own life in his own way is sure to be marked as a crank.

There is a universal desire to govern others, to stick our noses in other people’s business. Government is a disease which is worse than a pesti lence. If one person invades the rights of another, that person is just as much a po lice, elected by ballot or ruled by so-called divine right. Government retards progress towards better social-industrial conditions.

On the plea of helping others, the governmental expansionist project, as a rule, in helping himself. Is there much doubt in your mind that the Spanish war in Cuba, notwithstanding the glamour for humanity’s sake, would never have occurred had not Spanish rule in Cuba kept alive the guerrilla spirit, enlightened with the commercial interests of persons close to the powers at Wash ington? Wars for humanity’s sake rarely if ever occur. Back of it all, and the motive for it all, is something else. The people rarely ever profit by war, whoever wins.

Notwithstanding the ignorant and widespread notion that Anarchism means universal bloodshed, robbery and ruin, the fact is that the Anarchist is the only person in society who sets his face hard against war and the aggression of the mighty upon those less. He believes in the law of equal freedom; that, as a matter of fact, the only possible socialorganization consists in teaching men to govern themselves by letting them do it.” Mr. Hughson would teach men how to govern themselves by first crushing their spirit and making slaves of them. He is not free who understands that government does not in vade the rights of others. No, we have not the right to pursue happiness in our own way, and if we cannot do that, the quest for happiness is a comparatively futile one.

Mr. Hughson claims much for the English colonial policy. Indeed, we do not all know how happy the Six Y. había been under English rule, and how grossly overfed and prosperous the people of India are since the liberals gave them freedom to take care of themselves! But I wonder how he knows what the condition of these people would be had the English not so kindly ruled them—and robbed them in the meantime.

So, we see, no matter how much we pretend to ad mire the Declaration of Independence, we have kept far away from making its principles the practical rule of our every-day life. However true Jefferson’s principles are, and they are as good as a prin ciple we have rather gone in the direction pointed out by Hamilton. Even among those who call themselves democrats and claim to be adherents of Jeffersonian principles, it is impossible Jefferson’s ultimate aim and few of his contemporaries in the con cession, let me vote that Gen. M. M. Trumbull says in his excellent little pamphlet on Thomas Jefferson: “The democracy of Jefferson was not so much a form or method of government as it was a political principle opposed to government. It was a code of restraints upon sovereignty and mastership; a system of limitations upon public power. I think the theory of it was a good government and a strong citizen; a poor government and a rich people. Gov ernment is not to be confounded with nation or State. It means the supreme authority over the subject, as they phrase it in England, over the citizen as we call it in America. Jefferson thought that government could not have anything, nor own anything, either of money or power, but what it abstracted from the peo ple, and therefore the less it possessed of either, the more it enjoyed. He was not op posed to a strong government, but also to a tyrannical government. Sweeping his eyes over the history of a thousand years he saw the tendency of government to encroach upon the liberties of the people and make itself the king of a jealous tyrant of all governments and all governments became ‘suspects,’ and he desired that the principle of rotation should be applied, not only to presidents, judges, and legislators, but to the very constitution itself. He thought that no constitution should exist longer than 34 years, and that each generation should make a new constitution for itself. He could hardly separate the idea of government from force, and, in his judgment, the very spirit of tyrannical government could never live without government enjoy their in mass an infinitely greater degree of happiness than those who live under the European governments. Among the former, pub lic opinion is in the place of law, restraining morals as powerfully as do force and law. The application of the principles laid down here gives you the position of Anarchist on the subject of expansion. The Anarchists are simply uninterred Jeffersonian democrats!”

The higher the state of civilization, the more completely do the actions of one member of the social body influence all the rest, and the less possible is the existence of any life without interfering, more or less, with the freedom of all his fellow-citizens.—Huxley.

If No One Would Take Rockefeller by the Hand.

(An index to New York “American.”) In last Tuesday’s issue of this paper “T. O. M.” concluded her excellent letter on the Rockefeller donation thus: “Are not some members of our families mistaking personal anti-pathy for religious zeal?” “Some members of the board” may take care of themselves; but, as I sided with them, I want to say that I do not mistake my personal antipathy for anything whatever. It is that antipathy, not personal antipathy. And when I fail to feed and to cherish that sentiment toward Mr. Rockefeller and all others of his detestable breed; when, I begin to feel charity for them, find excuses for them, credit them with good intentions, overcome the prejudices and class prejudices, the purity of their personal lives and the rest of it—then I shall know that I am contributing out of my own desire and conscience to that national fund of adulation which makes them possible. I shall know that I am accountable by the glamour of their wealth, their power and their distinction; that my personal standard of morality is no higher, my personal sense of right and wrong no keener, than those of my age and country—which can be said of no man of any country in any age.

If a man have no religion a bitter personal antipathy to such follows as John D. Rockefeller will serve him fairly well in place of one, and make him of at least some small value to his fellow-countrymen.

Not to overlook your fellow men, for that implies wisdom and is itself unwise, but mortally to hate their enemies—their flatterers and their betrayers, who equally prey upon the state of the arts of art, the whole law. Before condemning it in favor of something milder and sweeter, let the reader consider what would be the result of its general adoption—and what is the result of what we have instead. For a single illustration, what would be the effects of Mr. Rookedge, or Mr. Morgan, or Mr. Armour, or Mr. Belmont, or any other public enemy, if no man would take him by the hand; if no woman would visit him to address him, if every brat in the street should follow and jeer? Do you honestly, that the gospel of charity, of toleration, of the “brotherhood of man” and so forth, as we have the happiness to bear it dinned into our ears, can ever accomplish the reform and its consequences which would flow from that? If it can, it is about time for it to begin.

The Anarchism of Art.

(“The New Era,” Cape Town, South Africa.) Modern critics in all departments of art are evidently pervaded by an uneasy consciousness that some external controlling force is required to evoke order out of unchaired chaos. In the wotler of production there is no rule of classification, no general standard of excellence, and the verdict of popularity is often hopelessly at variance with that of the clique or cliques supposed to sum up the higher order of public opinion. We know, perhaps, what we like, but not why we like it, still less of whether we ought to like it at all, and we want some one in authority to make up our minds for us. So we are told, at least, by those who advance the creation of official boards of taste, academies of literature, or national theatres of art, distinctly so-called, we have it already, but it does not seem to achieve the desired result. There is a growing tendency on the part of artists to revolt from the judgment of the Royal Academies, distinctively so-called, and to secede to other self-constituted guilds of the craftsmen of the brush. Neither does the public accept any longer with the touching faith it was once wont to extend to them, the sententious of the great national school of the arts of art, which interfered.

The drama is the latest form of art which formulates a claim to be nationalized by the creation of a theatre subsidized by the State. This proposal relates extensive support from all those interested in dramatic art, and is the subject of a certain amount of organized agitation in its favor. It represents, no doubt, a sense of despair with the present conditions
of the theatre, dominated by the necessity of catering for a public incapable of appreciating anything beyond appeals to the most trivial of motives and perceptions.

Mr. Jones drew a sombre picture of the present condition and prospects of the theatre in London in his recent lecture at the Royal Institution in "The Foundations of a National Drama." His complaint was of the general lowering of the standard of drama, which has ceased to give a picture of the future of English life or of any life at all and resembled rather a "series of music-hall sketches, songs, and dances, threaded together by no rational, or possible, or plausible story. He further summarized it as "totalitarianism, placed among the kindest pretends to nothing else, while a great deal of the "fanny" business is often rather dreary and

It is not entirely true that the class of piece which draws best at the present day is musical comedy, a kaleidoscopic entertainment consisting of pretty scenery, dances, and songs, linked together by the thinnest and most perfunctory of plots. Looked at from one point of view, it is a reaction from the prevailing fashion in music, as the ordinary concert programme with its forlorn list of German or Slavonic composers is little calculated to appeal to the popular taste. Melody is a sine qua non of the music-play, and this it finds in the frivolous interludes of the lighter lyrical stage. If the performance pleases the eye at the same time, it will have done its part for recreation, if not for improvement. The better-class" might probably place the fantastic world into which it finds himself transported to such a transcript of life as Mr. Jones thinks it is the function of the stage to present to him.

His argument is that the drama should be not merely entertaining but instructive, a conduit of per- fect necessities, and in its realization the first of these is that the playwright should himself be a vehicle of a sort of浸moral" and that he should impress his teachings upon others. Where is such a genius to be found, and, if he exist, will he be at once command attention, by his rare powers? Mr. Jones's answer to this question would appear to be in the negative, for he declares it to be impossible under our present system to write plays of great passion or serious intellectual import. His view seems to be that the artist is rather the creature than the controller of circumstance. His thoughts are known to his friends, and are unjustly suspected by playwrights and critics, as an author is mainly conditioned in his choice of subjects and themes by the possibility of getting them adequately played and adequately staged at a theatre of report. He is in his compound role, as the author of his surroundings, and sinks to the level imposed by circumstances. Hence the necessity for the recognition of the drama as something distinct from mere amuse- ment. That necessity, he opines, can best be met by fostering the drama as a national art in a national theatre.

Here it is not easy to see how the charm is to work. If the drama is to be a school of morals, the drama is to be developing itself in the school of life. Who is to guarantee that this will be so? If we are to accept him as a preacher and prophet, it must be in the conviction that he is far beyond us in wisdom and knowledge. Mr. Jones's view seems to be that the author should be allowed to speak his piece in a sermon, but surely that depends entirely on the author's choice of subject, and that again on his mental idiosyncrasy. It is not life that he represents, but the life he wants to impose upon us. It is not his right of his own tendencies or experiences. If a sour and disappointed man, his drama will show us the wickd flourishing like a bay-tree, and the good per- secuted by fortune till the end of his days. If he be self-seeking, he will leave us with a large proportion of his audience morally bettered by the spectacle, and if no worse than this can be said of his play, it may claim superiority over many of those in vogue at present.

In any case, to make the theatre a government institution will never accomplish Mr. Jones's objects, and it will create evils that are worse than any immorality that may now be fostered by the stage.

The stern moralist, indeed, might well say that what the stage stands most in need of is some check on its growing tendency to license both in subject and treatment. The tendency is, and will be, a matter of the utmost importance, and it might be thought that if some stern moralist were to bear on this post, as it furnishes the most efficacious leverage for raising the moral standard. Their agitation in favor of the rights of sex could have no more useful object than that of protesting against the effeminacy of any form.

They might seem almost Utopian to suggest that no lady should assist at a representation where any member of her family is required to be present. She would not, perhaps, willily see a near relation of her own, sister or daughter, yet it would be hard to maintain that this is not a true standard of feminine "impartiality. The performers fettered by custom and the necessity of bread-winner may have little choice in the matter, but the audience are under no such compulsion, and, if unanimous, could dictate their own terms to managers and proprietors. It would be a very practical beginning for the reform of the stage, and would, in a great extent, redeem it from the servitude to mere spectacular frivolity of which Mr. Jones so justly complains.

Russian Autocracy and Russian Plutocracy.

[The Public.]

We may pity the Russian Czar who has suffered untold deaths and worse, by thousands upon thousands, through generations of Russian tyranny. We may deplore the long list of undeserved hangings. We may denounce the awful torture of the secret cell and the terrifying knout. We may be even so much as dubious about the abomination of the Russian worker from the land, and his consequent victimization by landlords. We may wish the peasant and the city man might get better wages so they could live above the level of starvation. Our fellow feeling may be tender enough in every way for the scores upon scores of thousands whose sufferings offer a deep, dark background for the flames of Russian revolution. But we seldom think of that dreadful pre-revolutionary period as a reign of terror. Its victims are only peasants, or strikers, with an occasional noble, a traitor to his class, or an overthrown priest who forgets his vows of obedience. All this may be and, but there is no terror in it. The terror comes only when the outraged masses turn with vengeful fury upon their persecutors and exact eye for eye and tooth for tooth. This is a reign of terror as a matter of course. We are not likely to see it.

Unhappily such a reign of terror will probably come with the Russian revolution as it came with that of France. But, if it does come, let us place the blame where it belongs. Not upon the victims of generations of oppression made furious by wanton slaughter such as that in St. Petersburg; but upon those who invite the terror by oppressing the masses of the people to the very height of human endurance, and slavering their victims. The only thing for them is to ask for a free and open petition for relief. The great criminals of Russia are not the nihilists, the bomb throwers, the socialists, the striking workmen, the fanatic priests, nor the madmen peasants; nor will they be though they should have been brought to the scaffold.

The great criminals of Russia are the nobility of Russia. They are great thieves because they plunder the producers of Russia under the sanction of laws of their own enactment. They use their power to despoil them because they murder Russian producers for the purpose of perpetuating their power to plunder.

Nor let us be too quick, on account of the wholesale assassinations at St. Petersburg, to condemn the Russian government. It is said that all who are not worth it will be re- warded, and vice castigat per facto. There is no warrant that in either case he will send away his audience morally bettered by the spectacle, and if no worse than this can be said of his play, it may claim superiority over many of those in vogue at present.

In any case, to make the theatre a government institution will never accomplish Mr. Jones's objects.
An Evolved Populist.

To the Editor of Liberty:

I was a Populist, afterwards became a Socialist. I do not think the argument in favor of cooperation can be refuted. But I think the Anarchistic view of society is the right one. I do not think a majority has any right to coerce one in regard to this matter. I have imbibed the spirit of Anarchism, but I am not able to defend all of its arguments. We can all see that no one man has a right to rule his neighbor. Those who try to make their neighbors conform to their notions socially, politically or religiously, are, in fact, enemies to true liberty. This is perfectly true, as said by Mr. Labadie: "What you individually have no right to do, you cannot dictate to others." This completely knocks the prop out from under every form of organized government. The authors named are taught to look on Anarchism as the embodiment of everything vile. It is asserted that we never would have had Anarchists in this country if they had not come from the worst classes of foreign elements. All of the above is self-righteous. That was before I knew any better. That was when I listened to the booms, the self-appointed leaders of society. They are self-appointed teachers and demand to be believed. But I have heard in the lesson that we have advocated improvement. There are false teachers; many of them are honest, but others are hypocrites. I have learned that the popular opinion in regard to Anarchism is false.

I have always been the first to advocate a republic for this country. He was as much an American as Washington, and meet all the patriots. Those who have read "The Rights of Man," can see that Paine had ideas much farther in advance, that he could have advocated individual sovereignty himself. He believed the people ready to receive that doctrine. As Anarchism is the logical outcome of the ideas of Paine and Jefferson, it is perfectly stupid to say that it is not indigenous to the United States. As this country set a great example to all the world, why should further progress be thought unnatural to it? But thought cannot be confined to any particular locality. There is no barrier sufficient to prevent men at the antipodes from each other from entertaining substantially the same ideas. The idea of Anarchism is here to stay and will not out. It is as natural to this soil as to any other. You cannot prevent men from thinking. You may put a gag in their mouths but you cannot lock up their thinking organs. Every country has its share of radical thinkers. They ought to be more numerous in this country. They will continue to increase, if the captives are not depleted through war. Seeing this to be a fact, it is folly for this government to prevent them from coming here from foreign lands.

I have come to see that Anarchism means eternal justice; that it is not a more grave protest against the abuse of power, but that it holds that government is an expensive evil in itself well worth trying to get rid of. Anarchism holds up the loftiest ideal that was ever evolved in the brain of man. It is impertinent or vain to wonder where its arguments can be answered. Its fundamental truth seems to me to be self-evident. They may brand Anarchism with the vilification of epithets, as has been done to every progressive movement of modern times. They have done this, following blindly after their self-appointed leaders. So we see that majorities have more often been wrong than right. We cannot depend upon a majority for a declaration of truths upon any newly discovered truth or any progressive movement. They may heap upon Anarchism every inanity conceivable. But that does not answer its arguments. Such is the miserable make-shifts and customary resorts of those who are devoid of arguments.

J. M. Gilbert.
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