

Benjamin Tucker's

Liberty

NOT THE DAUGHTER BUT THE MOTHER OF ORDER. PROHIBIT



*Instead Of a Book, By Men Too Modest
To Write One*

Benjamin Tucker's Liberty

Instead Of a Book, By Men Too Modest To Write One

Edited by

Lukas Nikodym

Tomas Nikodym

Foreword by

Lawrence W. Reed

Produced by

MiceEatCheese.co

Martin Moravec

Published by

ReadLiberty.org

Version: 1.0.0



Liberty itself is in the [public domain](#), meaning that everybody can use it freely. Everything else is a subject to the [CCo](#) license.

Thanks to:

Archivers:

John Zube

Shawn P. Wilbur

Transcribers:

Martin Moravec

Benjamin Sojda

Lukas Nikodym

Tomas Nikodym

Ivan Burbakov

Proofreaders:

William Kiely

FOREWORD

By Lawrence W. Reed

Hardly a day goes by when I don't hear someone proclaim with certainty an opinion that he thinks is new and correct but which is in fact both ancient and wrong. "Where men are the most sure and arrogant," wrote Scottish philosopher David Hume in the 18th Century, "they are commonly the most mistaken."

We have so much to learn from the past, so much that we ignore at our peril. This is as true of men's words as it is of their deeds. Wisdom is not unique to our present age, though we may fancy ourselves wiser than those who came before us and lived in simpler times. The fact is, most of the issues of our day reflect similar ones of the past that were discussed and debated in their own temporal and cultural context, often by men of greater vision than the loudest and most self-righteous pontificators now.

This is why it's important to rediscover the discussions and debates of old. Dusting off and becoming reacquainted with the contributions of dead wise men

should always be a part of the discussion among enlightened *living* men who seek wisdom. When I read the classics in the literature of liberty, I am struck by their present relevance and applicability. I often think to myself, “If only we had learned from these men and women of the past, we could have avoided the mischief they warned against or enjoyed the benefits they argued for!”

This collection of essays and articles is drawn from early issues of the celebrated periodical called *Liberty*, published by the American philosopher Benjamin Tucker from 1881 to 1908. Among its distinguished contributors represented herein are Lysander Spooner, Auberon Herbert, Voltairine de Cleyre and Tucker himself. In its very first issue, Tucker wrote, “We are not afraid of discussion, and shall do what we can to make room for short, serious, and well-considered objection to our views.” Indeed, *Liberty* quickly became a very lively forum for argument among serious men. They all embraced the notion that each person is entitled to be free of coercion but they didn’t always agree on what that looked like or how to achieve it. Most were comfortable with the “anarchist” label but not in the violent sense that the word is popularly received today; they were referring to a peaceful, civil society in which governance was as local as it gets and in which force was only used in defense of rights and property.

How, the reader might ask, is a 19th Century discussion among anarchists relevant to any debate going on today? Nobody, it seems, talks of anarchy as a solution to any of our day's pressing social, economic and political problems.

But every social, economic and political problem today begs the real questions that the writers and thinkers in *Liberty* dealt with all the time: Is there a proper role for government as we know it? Are there viable, more promising alternatives? When is the use of force legitimate and when is it a travesty? What rights does the individual have and where does he get them from? What is the nature of a contract, and can people of one generation properly bind a future one to its terms? Is "law" nothing more than what a majority of legislators decree or is it properly something more eternal and natural?

One should not have to agree with the views of the writers in this collection to appreciate the value of their having raised these fundamental questions and attempted to supply reasonable, if controversial, answers to them. Our own "modern" opinions on "current" issues are actually and often rooted in assumptions we've subconsciously made about these

questions—without ever having given a fraction of thought to them that the authors in *Liberty* did.

Some of what you read here will puzzle you. Other parts may outrage you. At other times you'll find yourself delighted at the turn of a phrase, a colorful insight, or an irrefutable truism. But you cannot read this collection without being provoked to thought, if not to action as well. And that's a rather powerful testament to the value of words written more than a century ago by men you never met.

--- Lawrence W. Reed

President, Foundation for Economic Education,
www.fee.org

Irvington, New York and Atlanta, Georgia,

January 1, 2014

THE EDITORS' FOREWORD

We are very pleased to be able to introduce the first collection of essays and articles from Benjamin Tucker's libertarian *Liberty* periodical from the late 19th century. *Liberty* offered its readers a notable mix of voluntaryist ideas and we have tried to select the best essays and articles from the 26 issues of Volume I. We have also tried to preserve the combination of libertarian ideas (as we understand libertarianism today) and the ideas of left-wing libertarians or voluntary communists.

This method of selection may not suit everyone. Tucker himself was aware of that when he wrote: "*It may be well to state at the outset that this journal will be edited to suit its editor, not its readers. He hopes that what suites him will suit them; but, if not, it will make no difference.*" We may not agree with the communist and socialist ideology, but it is important to realize that there was a common enemy which ruled out voluntary and peaceful cooperation: the State and its monopoly of legislation. As Tucker pointed out: "*The effect of one-half of our laws is to make criminals; the purpose of the other half is to punish them.*" On the other hand, a libertarian society does not preclude the existence of areas based on the principles of voluntary communism.

As we mentioned before, the main topic of *Liberty* is the relationship of the State and coercion. There are also other topics mediated through the discussions about the State and legislation. We have decided to select essays and articles from three categories: Law and Economics, Socialism and Anarchy and the State.

The Law and Economics section includes, for example, governmental manipulation of money, usury, the concept of land ownership, the relationship between natural rights and legislation, women's rights etc. The Socialist section of *Liberty* focuses on, for example, the clash of voluntary and enforced socialism or the lunacy of nationalization. The articles on Anarchy deal with an explanation of what Anarchy really means and why Hobbes was wrong about it, enforced education or the question of what would happen, if we abolished the State.

Why these topics? We believe deeply that these topics are as "timeless" as the ideal of liberty itself and that they can therefore also be inspirational in contemporary discussions about liberty, the state or legislation.

Finally, we would like to thank all the supporters of the *ReadLiberty* project for their help, but especially

Lawrence Reed; Stephan Kinsella; Gerard Casey; Jeffrey Tucker, James Tuttle and David S. D'Amato. We also have to thank all the people working on the transcription of the original *Liberty* scans. And, of course, thank you all for reading *Liberty*.

Lukas Nikodym; Tomas Nikodym

<http://www.readliberty.org/>

Prague, January 18, 2014

TABLE OF CONTENT

A LETTER TO THOMAS F. BAYARD	1
AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE	14
A DEFENCE OF CAPITAL	21
A REVIEW OF GERMAN SOCIALISM	23
BASTIAT'S FABLE	33
ENFORCED EDUCATION	36
HARD-PAN JURISPRUDENCE	38
LAND AND LIBERTY	40
LEGITIMATE MINING	44
LIBERTY'S WEAPONS	46
LIGHT-HEADED SOCIALIST	48
ORDER AND ANARCHY	51
THE LAND FOR THE PEOPLE	59
THE REDEMPTION OF MONEY	63
THE WEAKNESS OF COMPULSORY CREDIT	66
TWO KINDS OF COMMUNISM	67
WHAT WE MEAN	69
THE „AUTHORITIES“	73
MONOPOLY THE CAUSE OF POVERTY	75
PORNOGRAPHY	77
LEADERSHIP AND DRIVERSHIP	80

TRADES-UNIONISM	83
LAW AND AUTHORITY	86
MICHAEL DAVITT AND HIS SEDUCER	94
THE GEORGE THEORY OF TAXATION	102
A WAR CATECHETICALLY ANALYZED	104
THE ANATOMY OF LIBERTY.....	107
WHERE WE STAND.....	112

A LETTER TO THOMAS F. BAYARD

CHALLENGING HIS RIGHT - AND THAT OF ALL THE OTHER SO-CALLED SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES IN CONGRESS - TO EXERCISE ANY LEGISLATIVE POWER WHATSOEVER OVER THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES

To Thomas F. Bayard, of Delaware:

Sir,- I have read your letter to Rev. Lyman Abbott, in which you express the opinion that it is at least possible for a man to be a legislator, (under the Constitution of the United States), and yet be an honest man.

This proposition implies that you hold it to be at least possible that some four hundred men should, by some process or other, become invested with the right *to make laws of their own* - that is, *laws wholly of their own device*, and therefore necessarily distinct from the law nature, or the principles of natural justice; and that these laws of their own making shall be really and truly obligatory upon the people of the United States; and that, therefore, the people rightfully be compelled to obey them.

All this implies that you are of the opinion that the Congress of the United States, of which you are a member, has, by some process or other, become possessed of some right of *arbitrary dominion* over the people of the United States; which right of arbitrary dominion is not given by, and is, therefore, necessarily in conflict with, the law of nature, the principles of natural justice, and the natural rights of men, as individuals. All this is necessarily implied in the idea of Congress now possesses any right whatever to make any laws whatever, *of its own device* - that is, any laws shall be either more, less, or other than that natural law, which it can neither make, unmake, nor alter - and cause them to be enforced upon the people of the United States, or any of them, against their will.

You assume that the right of arbitrary dominion that is, the right of making laws of their own device, and compelling obedience to them - is a "trust" that has been delegated to those who now exercise that power. You call it "*the trust of public power.*"

1. No man can delegate, or give to another, any right of arbitrary dominion over himself; for that would be giving himself away as a slave. And this no one can do. Any contract to do so is necessarily an absurd one, and has no validity. To call such a contract a "constitution," or by any other high-sounding name, does not alter its character as an absurd and void contract.
2. No man can delegate, or give to another, any right of arbitrary dominion over a third person;

for that would imply a right in the first person, not only to make the third person his slave, but also a right to dispose of him as a slave to still other persons. Any contract to do this is necessarily a criminal one, and therefore invalid. To call such a contract a "Constitution" does not at all lessen its criminality, or add to its validity.

These facts, that no man can delegate, or give away, his own natural right to liberty, nor any other man's natural right to liberty, prove that he can delegate no right of arbitrary dominion whatever — or what is the same thing, no legislative power whatever - over himself or any body else, to any man, or body of men.

This impossibility of any man's delegating any legislative power whatever necessarily results from the fact, that the law of nature has drawn the line, and the only line - and that, too, a line that can never be effaced nor removed - between each man's own inherent and inalienable rights of person and property, and each and every other man's inherent and inalienable rights of person and property. It, therefore, necessarily fixes the unalterable limits, within which every man may rightfully seek his own happiness, in his own way, free from all responsibility to, or interference by, his fellow men, or any of them.

All this pretended delegation of legislative power - that is, of a power, on the part of the legislators, so-called, to make any laws of their own device, distinct from the

law of nature - is therefore an entire falsehood; a falsehood, whose only purpose is to cover and hide a pure Usurpation, by one body of men, of arbitrary dominion over other men.

That this legislative power, or power of arbitrary dominion, is a pure usurpation, on the part of those who now exercise it, and not "a trust" delegated to them, is still further proved by the fact that the only delegation of power, that is even professed or pretended to be made, is made *secretly* - that is, *by secret ballot* — and not in any open and authentic manner; and therefore not by any men, who make themselves personally responsible, as principals, for the acts of those to whom they profess to delegate the power.

All this pretended delegation of power having been made secretly - that is, only by secret ballot - not a single one of all the legislators, so-called, who profess to be exercising only a delegated power, has himself any legal knowledge, or can offer any legal proof, as to who the particular individuals were, who delegated it to him. And having no power to identify the individuals who professed to delegate the power to him, he cannot show any legal proof that any body ever even attempted of pretended to delegate it to him.

That this legislative power, or power of arbitrary dominion, is a pure usurpation, on the part of those who now examine it, and not "a trust" delegated to them, is still further proved by the fact that the only delegation or power, that is even professed or

pretended to be made, is made *secretly* — that is, by *secret ballot* — and not in any open and authentic manner; and therefore not by any men, or body of men, who make themselves personally responsible, as principals, for the acts of those to whom they profess to delegate the power.

All this pretended delegation of power having been made secretly — that is, only by secret ballot — not a single one of all the legislators, so-called, who profess to be exercising only a delegated power, has himself any legal knowledge, or can offer any legal proof, as to who the particular individuals were, who delegated it to him. And having no power to identify the individuals who professed to delegate the power to him, he cannot show any legal proof that any body ever even attempted or pretended to delegate it to him.

Plainly a man, who exercises any arbitrary dominion over other man, and who claims to be exercising only a delegated power, but cannot show who his principals are, nor, consequently, prove that he has any principals, must be presumed, both in law and reason, to have no principals; and therefore to be exercising no power but his own. And having, of right, no such power of his own, he is, both in law and reason, a naked usurper.

Sir, a secret ballot makes a secret government; and secret government is a government of conspiracy; in which the people at large can have no rights. And that is the only government we now have. It is the

government which you are a voluntary member, and supporter, and yet you claim to be an honest man. If you are an honest man, is not your honesty that of a thoughtless, ignorant man, who merely drifts with the current, instead of exercising any judgment of his own?

For still another reason, all legislators, so-called, under the Constitution of the United States, are exercising simply an arbitrary and irresponsible dominion of their own; and not any authority that has been delegated, or pretended to have been delegated, to them. And that reason is, that the Constitution itself (Art. 1, Sec. 6) prescribes that:--

"For any speech or debate [or vote] in either house, they [the Senators and Representatives] shall not be questioned [held to any legal responsibility] in any other place."

This provision makes the legislators constitutionally irresponsible to anybody; either to those on whom they exercise their power, or to those who may have, either openly or secretly, attempted or pretended to delegate power to them. And men, who are legally responsible to nobody for their acts, cannot truly be said to be the agents of any body, or to be exercising any power not their own: for all real agents are necessarily responsible both to those on whom they act, and to those for whom they act.

To say that the people of this country ever have bound, or ever could bind, themselves by any contract

whatever — the Constitution, or any other — to thus give away all their natural rights of property, liberty, and life, into the hands of a few men - a mere conclave —and that they should make it a part of the contract itself that these few men should be held legally irresponsible for the disposal they should make of those rights, is an utter absurdity. It is to say that they have bound themselves, and that they could bind themselves, by an utterly idiotic and suicidal contract.

If such a contract had ever been made by one private individual to another, and had been signed, sealed, witnessed, acknowledged, and delivered, with all possible legal formalities, no decent court on earth - certainly none in this country - would have regarded it, for a moment, as conveying any right, or delegating any power, or as having the slightest legal validity, or obligation.

For all the reasons now given, and for still others that might be given, the legislative power now exercised by Congress, is, in both law and reason, a purely personal, arbitrary, irresponsible, usurped dominion on the part of the legislators themselves, and not a power delegated to them by anybody.

Yet under the pretence that this instrument gives them the right of an arbitrary and irresponsible dominion over the whole people of the United States, Congress has now gone on, for ninety years and more, filling great volumes with laws of their own device, which the people at large have never read, nor ever seen, nor

ever will read or see; and of whose legal meanings it is morally impossible that they should ever know any thing. Congress has never dared to require the people even to read these laws. Had it done so, the oppression would have been an intolerable one; and the people, rather than endure it, would have either rebelled, and overthrown the government, or would have fled the country. Yet these laws, which Congress has not dared to require the people even to read, it has compelled them, at the point of the bayonet, to obey.

And this moral, and legal, and political monstrosity is the kind of government which Congress claims that the Constitution authorize it to impose upon the people.

Sir, can you say that such an arbitrary and irresponsible dominion as this, over the properties, liberties, and lives of fifty millions of people - or even over the property, liberty, or life on any one of those fifty millions - can be justified on any reason whatever? If no, with what color of truth can you say that you yourself, or anybody else, can act as a legislator, under the Constitution of the United States, and yet be an honest man?

To say that the arbitrary and irresponsible dominion, that is exercised by Congress, has been delegated to it by the Constitution, *and not solely by the secret ballots of the voters for the time being*, is the height of absurdity; for what is the Constitution? It is, at best, a writing that was drawn up more than ninety years ago; was

assented to at the time only by a small number of men; generally those few white male adults who had prescribed amounts of property; probably not more than two hundred thousand in all; or one in twenty of the whole population.

These men have been long since dead. They never had any right of arbitrary dominion over even their contemporaries; and they never had any over us. Their wills or wishes have no more rightful authority over us, than have the wills or wishes of men who lived before the flood. They never personally signed, sealed, acknowledged, or delivered, or dared to sign, seal, acknowledge, or deliver, the instrument which they imposed upon the country as law. They never, in any open and authentic manner, bound even themselves to obey it, or made themselves personally responsible for the acts of their so-called agents under it. They had no natural right to impose it, as law, upon a single human being. The whole proceeding was a pure usurpation.

In practice, the Constitution has been an utter fraud from the beginning. Professing to have been "ordained and established" by "*We, the people of the United States,*" it has never been submitted to them, as individuals, for their voluntary acceptance or rejection. They have never been asked to sign, seal, acknowledge, or deliver it, as their free act and deed. They have never signed, sealed, acknowledged, or delivered it, or promised, or laid themselves under any kind of obligation, to obey it. Very few of them have ever read, or even seen it; or ever will read or see it. Of its legal meaning (if it can

be said to said to have any) they really know nothing; and never did, nor ever will, know any thing.

Why is it, Sir, that such an instrument as the Constitution, for which nobody has been responsible, and of which few persons have ever known any thing, has been suffered to stand, for the last ninety years, and to be used for such audacious and criminal purposes? It is solely because it has been sustained by the same kind of conspiracy as that by which it was established; that is, by the wealth and the power of those few who were to profit by the arbitrary dominion it was assumed to give them over others. While the poor, the weak, and the ignorant, who were to be cheated, plundered, and enslaved by it, have been told, and some of them doubtless made to believe, that it is a sacred instrument, designed for the preservation of their rights.

These cheated, plundered, and enslaved persons have been made to feel, if not to believe, that the Constitution had such miraculous power, that it could authorize the majority (or even a plurality) of the male adults, for the time being — a majority numbering at this time, say, five millions in all — to exercise, through their agents, secretly appointed, an arbitrary and irresponsible dominion over the properties, liberties, and lives of the whole fifty millions; and that these fifty millions have no rightful alternative but to submit all their rights to this arbitrary dominion, or suffer such confiscation, imprisonment, or death as this secretly appointed, irresponsible cabal, of so-called

legislators, should see fit to resort to for the maintenance of its power.

As might have been expected, and as was, to a large degree, at least, intended, this Constitution has been used from the beginning by ambitious, rapacious, and unprincipled men, to enable them to maintain, at the point of the bayonet, an arbitrary and irresponsible dominion over those who were too ignorant and too weak to protect themselves against the conspirators who had thus combined to deceive, plunder, and enslave them.

Do you really think, Sir, that such a constitution as this can avail to justify those who, like yourself, are engaged in enforcing it? Is it not plain, rather, that members of Congress, as a legislative body, whether they are conscious of it, or not, are, in reality, a mere cabal of swindlers, usurpers, tyrants, and robbers? Is it not plain that they are stupendous blockheads, if they imagine that they are anything else than such a cabal? Or that their so-called laws impose the least obligation upon anybody?

If you have never before looked at this matter in this light, I ask you to do so now. And in the hope to aid you in doing so candidly, and to some useful purpose, I take the liberty to mail for you a pamphlet entitled:

"NATURAL LAW; OR THE SCIENCE OF JUSTICE; *a Treatise on Natural Law, Natural Justice, Natural Rights, Natural Liberty, and Natural society;*

*Showing That All Legislation Whatsoever Is an Absurdity,
A Usurpation, and a Crime. Part I."*

In this pamphlet, I have endeavored to controvert distinctly the proposition that, by any possible process whatever, any man, or body of men, can become possessed of any right of arbitrary dominion over other men, or other men's property; or, consequently, any right whatever to make any law whatever, *of their own* - distinct from the law of nature - and compel any other to obey it.

I trust I need not suspect you, as a legislator under the Constitution, and claiming to be an honest man, of any desire to evade the issue presented in this pamphlet. If you shall see fit to meet it, I hope you will excuse me for suggesting that - to avoid verbiage, and everything indefinite - you give at least a single specimen of law that either heretofore has been made, or that you conceive it possible for legislators to make - that is, some law of their own device - that either has been or shall be, really and truly obligatory upon other persons, and which such other persons have been, or may be, rightfully compelled to obey.

If you can either find or devise any such law, I trust you will make it known, that it may be examined, and the question of its obligation be fairly settled in the popular mind.

But if it should happen that you can neither find such a law in the existing statute books of the United States, nor, in your own mind, conceive of such a law as

possible under the Constitution, I give you leave to find it, if that be possible, in the constitution or statute book of any other people that now exists, or ever have existed, on the earth.

If, finally, you shall find no such law, anywhere, nor be able to conceive of any such law yourself, I take the liberty to suggest that it is your imperative duty to submit the question to your associate legislators; and, if they can give no light on the subject, that you call upon them to burn all the existing statute books of the United States, and then to go home and content themselves with the exercise of only such rights and power as nature has given to them in common with the rest of mankind.

LYSANDER SPOONER

BOSTON, May 27, 1882

AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

The following article, written by Lysander Spooner, originally appeared February 24, 1877, in the now defunct "New Age," J. M. L. Babcock's journal, but cannot be revived and reprinted too often until the craze of the women to join in human oppression shall have been turned into a determination to abolish human oppression:

Women are human beings, and consequently have all the natural rights that any human beings can have. They have just as good a right to *make laws* as men have, and no better; AND THAT IS JUST NO RIGHT AT ALL. No human being, nor any number of human beings, have any right to *make laws*, and compel other human beings to obey them. To say that they have is to say that they are the masters and owners of those of whom they require such obedience.

The only law that any human being can rightfully be *compelled* to obey is simply the law of justice. And justice is not a thing that is *made*, or that can be unmade, or altered, by any human authority. It is a *natural* principle, inhering in the very nature of man and of things. It is that natural principle which determines what is mine and what is thine, what is one man's right or property and what is another man's right or property. It is, so to speak, the line that Nature has drawn between one man's rights of person and

property and another man's right of person and property.

But for this line, which Nature has drawn, separating the rights of one man from the rights of any and all other men, no human being could be said to have any rights whatever. Every human being would be at the mercy of any and all other human beings who were stronger than he.

The natural principle, which we will call justice, and which assign to each and every human being his or her rights, and separates them from the rights of each other and every other human beings, is, I repeat, not a thing that man has *made*, but is a matter of science to be learned, like mathematics, or chemistry, or geology. And all the *laws*, so called, that men have ever *made*, either to create, define, or control the rights of individuals, were intrinsically just as absurd and ridiculous as would be laws to create, define, or control mathematics, or chemistry, or geology.

Substantially all the tyranny and robbery and crime that governments have ever committed – and they have either themselves committed, or licensed other to commit, nearly all that have ever been committed in the world by anybody – have been committed by them under pretence of *making laws*. Some man, or some body of men, have claimed the right, or usurped the power, of *making laws*, and compelling other men to obey; thus setting up their own will, and enforcing it, in place of that natural law, or natural principle, which

says that no man or body of men can rightfully exercise any arbitrary power whatever over the persons of property of other men.

There are a large class of men who are so rapacious that they desire to appropriate to their own uses the persons and properties of other men. They combine for the purpose, call themselves governments, *make what they call laws*, and then employ courts, and governors, and constables, and, in the last resort, bayonets, to enforce obedience.

There is another class of men, who are devoured by ambitions, by the love of power, and the love of fame.

They think it a very glorious thing to rule over men; to make laws to govern them. But as they have no power of their own to compel obedience, they unite with the rapacious class before mentioned, and become their tools. They promise to *make such laws* as the rapacious class desire, if this latter class will but authorize them to act in their name, and furnish the money and the soldiers necessary for carrying their laws, so called, into execution.

Still another class of men, with a sublime conceit of their own wisdom, or virtue, or religion, think they have a right, and a sort of divine authority, for *making laws* to govern those who, they think, are less wise, or less virtuous, or less religious than themselves. They assume to know what is best for all other men to do and not to do, to be and not to be, to have and not to have. And they conspire to *make laws to compel* all these

other men to conform to their will, or, as they would say, to their superior discretion. They seem to have no perception of the rights that each and every human being has had given to him a mind and body of his own, separate and distinct from all minds and bodies of all other men; and that each man's mind and body have, by nature, rights that are utterly separate and distinct from the rights of any and all other men; that these individual rights are really the only *human* rights there are in the world; that each man's rights are simply the right to control his own soul, and body, and property, according to his own will, pleasure, and discretion, so long as he does not interfere with the equal right of any other man to the free exercise and control of his own soul, body, and property. They seem to have no conception of the truth that, so long as he lets all other men's souls, bodies, and properties alone, he is under no obligation whatever to believe in such wisdom, or virtue, or religion as they do, or as they think best for him.

This body of self-conceited, wise, virtuous, and religious people, not being sufficiently powerful of themselves to *make laws* and enforce them upon the rest of mankind, combine with the rapacious and ambitious classes before mentioned to carry out such purposes as they can all agree upon. And the farce, and jargon, and batel they all make of what they call government would be supremely ludicrous and ridiculous, if it were not the cause of nearly poverty, ignorance, vice, crime, and misery there are in the world.

Of this latter class – that is, the self-conceited wise, virtuous, and religious class – are those woman suffrage persons who are so anxious that woman should participate in all the falsehood, absurdity, usurpation, and crime of *making laws*, and enforcing them upon other persons. It is astonishing what an amount of wisdom, virtue, and knowledge they propose to inflict upon, or force into, the rest of mankind, if they can but be permitted to participate wit the men in *making laws*. According to their own promises and predictions, there will not be a single natural human being left upon the globe, if the women can but get hold of us, and add their power to that of the men in making such laws as nobody has any right to make, and such as nobody will be under the least obligation to obey. According to their programme, we are all to be put into their legislative mill, and be run through, ground up, worked over, and made into some shape in which we shall scarcely be recognized as human beings. Assuming to be gods, they propose to make us over into their own images. But there are so many different images among them, that we can have, at most, but one feature after on model, and another after another. What the whole conglomerate human animal will be like, it is impossible to conjecture.

In all conscience, is it not better for us even to bear the nearly unbearable ills inflicted upon us by the laws already made,- at any rate is it not better for us to be (if we can but be permitted to be) such simple human beings as Nature made us,- than suffer ourselves to be made over into such grotesque and horrible shapes as a

new act of lawmakers would makes us into, if we suffer them to try their powers upon us?

The excuse which the women offer for all the laws which they propose to inflict upon us is that they themselves are oppressed by the laws that now exist. Of course they are oppressed; and so are all *men* – except the oppressors themselves – oppressed by the laws that are *made*. As a general rule, oppression was the only motive for which laws were ever *made*. If men wanted justice, and only justice, no laws would ever need to be *made*; since justice itself is not a thing that can be *made*. If men or women, or men and women, want justice, and only justice, their true course is *not to make any more laws, but to abolish the laws – all the laws – that have already been made*. When they shall have abolished all the laws that have already been *made*, let them give themselves to the study and observance, and, if need be, the enforcement, of that one universal law – the law of Nature – which is “the same at Rome and Athens” – in China and in England – and which *man did not make*. Women and men alike will then have their *rights; all their rights; all the rights that Nature gave them*. But until then, neither men nor women will have anything that they can call their *rights*. They will at most have only such liberties or privileges as the laws that are *made* shall see fit to allow them.

If the women, instead of petitioning to be admitted to participation in the power of *making more laws*, will but give notice to the present lawmakers that they (the women) are going up to the State house, and are going

to throw all the existing statute books in the fire, they will do a very sensible thing,- one of the most sensible things it is in their power to do. And they will have a crowd of men – at least all the sensible and honest men in the country to go with them.

But this subject requires a treatise, and is not to be judged of by the few words here written. Nor is any special odium designed to be cast on the woman suffragists; many of whom are undoubtedly among the best and most honest of all those foolish people who believe that laws should be *made*.

A DEFENCE OF CAPITAL

My Dear Mr. Tucker:-- Why do you "grieve" at a difference of opinion between us? Am I to be bribed to agree with a valued friend by the fear that he will grieve if I do not? Liberty, I should say, imposes no such burden on freedom of thought, but, rather, rejoices in its fullest exercise.

I did not know that the "no-profit" theory had become so well established, or so generally accepted, as to render ridiculous any proposition not based upon it.

Yet that is the only point I understand you to urge against the measure I proposed. But I never could see that labor, in its unequal struggle for its rights, gained anything by extravagant claims. Whatever contributes to production is entitled to an equitable share in the distribution. In the production of a loaf of bread (the example which you set forth in a magnificent paragraph), the plough performs an important, if not indispensable service, and equitably comes in for a share of the loaf. Is that share to be a slice which compensates only for the wear and tear? It seems to me that it should lie slightly thicker, even if no more than "the ninth part of a hair." For suppose one man spends his life in making ploughs to be used by others who sow and harvest wheat. If he furnishes his ploughs only on condition that they be returned to him in as good state as when taken away, how is he to get his bread? Labor, empty-handed, proposes to raise wheat;

but it can do nothing without a plough, and asks the loan of one from the man who made it. If this man receives nothing more than his plough again, he receives nothing for the product of his own labor, and is on the way to starvation. What proportion he ought to receive is another question, on which I do not enter here; it may be ever so small, but it should be something.

Capital, we will agree, has hitherto had the lion's share; why condemn a measure which simply proposes to restore to labor a portion, at least, of what it is entitled to?

I say nothing on the theory of "natural laws," because I understood you to suggest that point only to waive it.

Cordially yours,

J. M. L. Babcock.

A REVIEW OF GERMAN SOCIALISM

At the last elections to the German Reichstag thirteen candidates of the Social Democracy were successful. This fact has added to the world-wide interest in German socialism, but the lamentable ignorance and misapprehension concerning that movement still prevail. Its true history and real significance are concisely and admirably set forth in the following outline sketch, which is borrowed from "Le Révolté":

When the bold and success-crowned agitation of Lassalle had once started the labor movement in Germany, there immediately appeared a goodly number of talented men, capable of appreciating with statesmanlike clairvoyance the movement in its full extent and all its consequences and of comprehending the advantages in the future which it offered to the champions of the new party. These men at once ranged themselves by the side of the Universal Society of German Laborers (Allgemeiner Deutscher Arbeiter-Verein).

After the premature death of Lassalle, and in consequence of the questionable management of President Schweitzer, a crisis occurred, from which, nevertheless, the labor movement emerged triumphant, though divided into two hostile factions:

(i) The party of the Lassallians, under the leadership of Hasenclever and Hasselmann, whose journalistic organ

was the "New Social Democrat." This party confined itself to an orthodox observance of the doctrines expounded by Lassalle.

(2) The Party of Eisenach, under the leadership of Liebknecht and Bebel,- the former having converted the latter from an advocate of the ideas of Schultze-Delitzsch (industrial credit, &c.) and a deadly enemy of socialism into a well-grounded socialist. This party, with the aid of its Journal, the "Popular State" (Volksstaat), more as core developed communistic ideas, always in the direction of authority and centralization by the Popular State, a phrase expressive of the ideal of Messrs, Marx and Engels and their faithful disciple, Liebknecht.

The war of Prussia against Austria and the victory of the former country, combined with the annexation of Hanover and Hesse-Cassel, led to the establishment of the Confederation of North Germany (Norddeutscher Bund) and the Parliament of North Germany (Norddeutsches Zollparlament). To popularize these political automata, viewed with disfavor by the people, the iron chancellor (so Bismarck was called) gave the people universal suffrage in parliamentary elections, which Lassalle had previously demanded in elections to the Prussian Chamber.

Then it was that the Social Democrats seized with enthusiasm upon "this new weapon for the enfranchisement of the people from the yoke of class-rule;" then it was that these hostile brethren sought for

ascendency each over the other, and that such accusations as "sold Prussians" (the Lassallians) and "*agents welfes*" (the Party of Eisenach) - that is, agents in the pay of the ex-king of Hanover - multiplied.

The Franco-German war, with the reconstruction of the German Empire and the transformation of the Parliament of the North Germany into the Parliament of the Empire (Reichstag) on a basis of universal suffrage, extended still further the parliamentary agitation of the Social Democrats. And in spite of the excellent pamphlet by Liebknecht "On the Political Attitude of the Social Democracy, Especially in Relation to the Reichstag," in which he showed very clearly the impossibility of the enfranchisement of the people by parliamentary methods and the inconvenience to laborers of participation in elections, and while crying: "No peace with the present *régime!* And war on the doctrine of universal suffrage!" the Party of Eisenach, under the leadership of this same Liebknecht, gave all its efforts to the enlistment of German Workingmen in the parliamentary struggle and to the choice of the largest possible number of socialistic deputies as members of that parliament where "one can only sacrifice his principles" because "principles are indivisible, and must be either completely maintained or completely sacrificed," for "he who treats with the enemy parleys, and he who parleys compromises."

The two factions of the Social Democracy were soon compelled to see that they principally injured

themselves in fighting each other so furiously, while really having in view common object. Both desired *social reform through the State*. Little by little they came together, and in 1875 at the congress of Gotha they achieved a consolidation in the Socialistic Workingmen's Party, after which they rapidly advanced from one "electoral-victory" to another.

It undoubtedly will seem very strange to our readers that the Liebknechts and their fellows while seeing so clearly the futility of participation in elections, should nevertheless have dared to urge (and with success) the laboring masses into the electoral path. But, on the one band, while continually achieving these apparent successes in the election of socialistic deputies, they could and did say to the workingmen: "OH!, we are obliged to take part in the elections, not to be deputies, but only to count voices, to ascertain the number of our followers, which it is impossible to find out otherwise, and, above all, to profit by the general excitement attending an electoral campaign in successfully developing our principles at political rallies; "and on the other hand, it should not be forgotten that the German workingman, long accustomed to blindly follow a few men either in one direction or another, could not easily shake off this habit, it having entered, so to speak, into his blood.

The workingman saw in all these agitators and editors of socialistic sheets -- founded one after another and *paid for out of his pocket* -- sincere friends of the people, incapable of harboring any other thought than the

immediate enfranchisement of the people. He forgot that these men, undoubtedly devoted with all their hearts to the interests of the party when they joined it,- whose speeches were always denunciatory of the selfishness of the *bourgeoisie*,- must necessarily, by the security of the position created for them, view the situation less darkly from the simple fact that they no longer ran the labor's risk of being thrown at any hour upon the pavement at the mercy of an employer,- one of the chief cause of the social revolution.

And finally, it must be said, it was easier for the workingman to follow the advice of eloquent men than to take upon himself the heavy burden of thinking for himself and investigating for himself the grave questions then coming to the fore.

But while the number of votes for the socialistic candidates kept on increasing at every election, it became evident that already there were a certain number of laborers who were scarcely Social Democrats, but Anarchists rather, for not only did they repudiate electoral tactics, but denied also this pretended beneficence of the Popular State; they were opponents of all authority, of all submission of minorities to majorities.

No doubt there had been in Germany for a long time learned men who, in their social studies, had occupied themselves with anarchistic theories; nevertheless, the fruits of these studies had scarcely seen the light and had not entered the heads of the laborers. Not until

1875 did a few German workingmen embrace and publicly defend the anarchistic ideas.

As was to be expected alter the methods employed by the Social Democrats against the Anarchists in other countries, the most distinguished men of the Social Democratic party of Germany and Switzerland were not slow in beginning a deadly struggle against these sincere and disinterested workingmen, whom they were pleased to honor with such titles as "mad-men," "lunatics," "hired agents of sedition," "spies," and many other pleasant appellations. Their hatred of them was the greater inasmuch as many of these "madmen" had formerly been for many years very zealous agitators for this party of "scientific socialism," and therefore were acquainted -- to the sorrow of the leaders -- with troublesome facts that had occurred within the committees.

The foundation of an Anarchistic Journal in the German language at Berne in 1876 was not calculated to appease the anger of these system-making gentlemen. With all possible variations they repeated the most infamous slanders against the Anarchists. And, in spite of that, it was impossible to stifle the movement by such means. The Anarchists soon found adherents in several such German cities as Berlin, Leipzig, Magdeburg, Munich, and other places. Then at the universal socialistic congress of Gand in 1877 two German delegates appeared to defend anarchistic principles. There it was that, one of the delegates having said, in reply to the reproaches of Grenlich

"that it was easy to preach anarchistic ideas in free Switzerland, but that they should do the same in Germany," "Yes, that is just what we mean to do," Liebknecht, rising excitedly, cried out: "Dare, then, to come into Germany to attack our Organization, and *we will annihilate you by every possible means!*"

They tried hard to keep this promise, but unsuccessfully. The anarchistic idea spread through Germany further and further.

The year 1878 followed, and the attempts of Hoedel and Nobiling on the life of the emperor. The Reichstag voted the famous laws against the "extravagances" of the Social Democracy, the law which suppresses the whole socialistic press and all socialistic societies and assemblies; the law which permits the dissolution and prohibition of every assembly in which there may be a Socialist; the law which allows the regional authority to ask permission of the federal council to declare the minor state of siege, in order that *each suspected citizen* may be expelled as dangerous to the general safety. One would suppose that, after the commission of such an act by the Reichstag, the Social Democrats would have abstained from attendance on a parliament which tramples under foot the last vestiges of equality and justice. Far from that, the majority of the socialistic deputies, under the pretext of defending "every inch" of legal ground still left to them, continued to sit among their implacable enemies, ready to assent to all measures, even the most violent, against the Socialists.

Nevertheless, everybody did not agree with them, and after the exceptional law a good portion of the Social Democrats separated themselves from the legal party,- among them Hasselmann and Most. Another portion declared themselves against further participation in elections, proclaiming revolutionary tactics. Others withdrew altogether, and withdrew, and, from fear of the persecutions which socialistic agitation involves. A large portion of the socialistic laborers still remain in the legal path, as the last elections prove; in spite of that it may be affirmed that a considerable number of workingmen have abandoned the idea of the enfranchisement of the people by legal means.

The club of German communists at London has founded the social-revolutionary journal, "Freiheit" (Freedom), whose first editor, Johann Most, was condemned at London for an article on the death of Alexander II. On every occasion, and lately *à propos* of the German elections, this journal has declared itself in favor of electoral abstention and revolutionary propagandism. But it must not be forgotten that its founders have often improved an opportunity to declare themselves *revolutionary Social Democrats* in order to fix it in their readers' minds that their object, also, is the Popular State. Nevertheless, it should be recognized that from the beginning the journal has permitted free discussion in its columns,- and perhaps that is the reason why the "Freiheit" becomes more and more anarchistic, and why the ideas discussed in its pages draw further away from the authority theory in each successive number. Indeed, nothing else was to be

expected for in free discussion the anti-authority theory will always triumph over authority ideas of whatever sort. In spite of the continual prosecutions brought by the police against every man suspected of receiving it, the "Freiheit" is widely read in Germany. Besides the journal thousands of tracts on different subject have been scattered throughout Germany,- for instance, "To Our Brothers in the Barracks" (destined exclusively for circulation in the army), "The Revolutionary Social Democracy," "The Madness of Property," "Electoral Abstention," and many others.

It is certain that such an agitation often calls for victims from our ranks, and we should be carried too far, were we to attempt to count all our companions who have had to suffer for their zeal; let it suffice to remind our readers of the late trials at Leipzig.

Another proof that our brother in Germany are not only laboring to organize the masses for the revolution, but also repudiate the whole idea of authority, so inimical to the definitive enfranchisement of humanity, is the attitude of the German delegates to the revolutionary congress at London.

Let the *bourgeoisie* do what it will, let the summit of the oppressive class strive to suppress our agitation, let "our friends," the editors of the "Social Democrat" and the other "great men" of the parliamentary party, treat us as "madmen," "spies," and "hired agents of sedition," and libel us in any way that pleases them,- none of these things shall prevent our ideas from spreading,

new adherents from joining us every day, or even our misfortunes from finding us unexpected friends.

We are sure that the day will come when champions of the Popular State will no longer be able to command even the 280,000 votes now remaining to them out of the 800,000 of which Braun d'Altona was the representative. We, the Revolutionary Anarchist of Germany, shall do our utmost to strip the political intriguers of their remaining strength, and, the old idols once overthrown, the people will understand that there is no necessity for creating new ones; relieved of all prejudices and of that bad habit of allowing themselves to be led, they will freely organize themselves to the final struggles, for the truly GREAT REVOLUTION, and, the struggle over, will know how to organize for other purposes without the aid of all these "scientific" men who pretend to have found the philosopher's stone in the Popular State.

BASTIAT'S FABLE

[From Auguste Blanqui's "Capital and Labor"]

All the old economists neglected the question of the legitimacy of usury. This question is recent, dating in the public mind scarcely farther back than 1848.

Bastiat seized upon it and made it the text of his discussions with Proudhon, the socialistic champion of that period. The arguments of his fellow-writers, whatever their form, do not differ from his own. On this question of interest, then, may be refuted, in Bastiat's person, all political economy.

For the rest, the form of the fable that he devises to demonstrate the legitimacy of usury has been employed also by others. They use it with assurance, - one might say, with presumption. They seem to believe themselves irrefutable, and treat their adversaries after the manner of grand lords towards the common people. Bastiat notably assumes an air or overweening conceit thoroughly ridiculous. He seems to fear, in his argument, lest someone may accuse him of storming gates already open, so Jove-like is his style.

James first exchanges his plane for money. He lends the money to William, and William exchanges the money for a saw. The transaction is divided into two factors. But thereby its nature is not changed. It none the less contains all the elements of a direct loan.

There lies the sophistry and the delusion. The money ceases to be what it should be, a simple instrument of exchange. It abandons this beneficent rule to assume a harmful one. From a friend it becomes an enemy; from a benefit, a scourge. From an auxiliary it becomes an obstacle; from an aid, a barrier. This metamorphosis is effected during its passage through the hands of James, who uses the coin that he holds to fleece his neighbor. For he does not exchange it at par for a product of equal value, as was done for him in the substitution of the coin for his product. For he obtains at the end of a year either a portion of William's product equal in value to his own with a bonus in addition, or his money increased by one-twentieth. His duty was to buy with his coin a product equal in value to that which he had sold for the coin. He has wickedly retained the money which he should have restored to circulation by the complementary operation of the exchange,- namely, the barter of the coin for a product equal in value to the first. If he did not wish to proceed immediately to this barter, it was free to him to choose his hour, provided he should ultimately fulfill the fair and just condition of exchange,- an equality of the two values exchanged through the mediation of the coin.

As for the pretended service of the loan, service deserving reward, that is a sham. If James had needed his tool, he would have used it. Apparently he did not remain idle during the year that William had possession of his plane. If he lent his plane, he did so because he could get along without it. To say that he has made a sacrifice, that he has deprived himself of a

useful object for the benefit of his neighbor, is pure hypocrisy. He labored during the year of the loan, and received the price of his product. He has no claim on the product of William. Whether William used the plane or not, it is sufficient for him to return it to James in the condition that he received it. He owes him nothing further.

"But why should I lend," says James, "if nothing is to come back to me" for the service that I render? "I will refuse, then."

Refuse, if you like. But you cannot escape this dilemma. Either you need your plane, or you do not. If it is detrimental to your interests to part with it, keep it and use it. If you can dispense with it, if, without loss to yourself, you can do something else, to demand, as reward for a service that costs you nothing, one-twentieth of the price of your plane, besides a new plane, is simply a swindle.

ENFORCED EDUCATION

EDITOR LIBERTY: -- Thanks for the copy of your most excellent first number. Count me as one subscriber, with hope of others. "The Anatomy of Liberty" is the best article on the subject that it has been my good fortune to read. The first four lines of the extract from "L. Verite" regarding liberty of parents are sufficient to convince any rationalist of the fallacy of *compulsory education*. We run no great risk of contradiction in saying that the public-school system is deficient, that the course of study is ill-advised and, in many respects, unwise, and that the teachers do not fully comprehend the scope of education and the field to cover. If it becomes compulsory, common schools become degraded to the level of educational jails. We lower the character of every pupil in her or her own estimation the moment they enter the schoolyard. We insult the spirit on intelligence and common sense in the American people. Children would not as readily learn if they felt they were driven to school by law. Incentive would be blighted, pride hurt, and ambition distorted. Compulsion in any form is antagonistic to the spirit of our institutions, and if a foothold is obtained in the public schools, it will establish an undesirable precedent.

With these premises we may assert that the *necessity* that compels parents to send their children to shops, stores, factories, etc., should be removed. If parents are to be *compelled* to send children to school, the

community owes the parents two things: first, that the school be *fit* to send children to; second, that the father, by industry and thrift, be *enabled* to allow his children to go to school. Love of esteem; ambition; pride; the influence of good example; the advantages to be derived from education, -- these and other influences combine to induce parents to send children to school without the aid of compulsory measures. In fact, the true business of the American legislature is to go behind the returns, and see to it that the conditions are such as to lead the people to accept *voluntarily* the benefits and advantages of common-school education. The question of compulsory education will be solved by the solution of deeper and broader questions behind it, present reference to which would intrench too far on our time and your space.

EL-D. L. Philadelphia, August, 1881.

HARD-PAN JURISPRUDENCE

One Abraham Payne of Providence, a liberal in theology, a woman suffragist, and an advanced thinker on many subjects, lately attempted to tell the people of Rhode Island whether they had the right to call a convention and frame a new constitution. The learning and great legal reputation of the gentleman brought a very intelligent audience to hear his paper.

But, instead of assuming to have an opinion of his own on the subject, Mr. Payne consumed his whole time in quoting the opinions of Daniel Webster. Chief Justice Durfee, and other fossils. "This authority says this," "this authority says that," etc.

"But what do *you* say?" shouted an ignorant laborer, after the reading of the paper. Mr. Payne responded by a speedy retirement. He, of course, had no opinion in the presence of the dead and dry bones of Webster and other defunct judicial popes.

Mr. Payne, as a vice-president of the Free Religious Association, regards with cultured pity and contempt the benighted Orthodox who look to popes, bibles, and preachers for their opinions in theology. In his profession, however, he waives his right of judgment in the presence of his judicial superiors,- an authority-ridden judicial slave.

The ignorant laborer suggested that anything was constitutional that had bayonets enough behind it, and that brute force, after all, was the highest judicial authority. He was ignorant and uncultured enough to have an opinion, and dare to express it. Is there not a possibility that he had studied constitutional law with greater success than Popes Webster and Durfee?

LAND AND LIBERTY

Within the past two years the above heading probably has decorated every public bulletin-board in this country and Great Britain. Yet probably it owes its prominence to the mere accidental alliteration, and has no rational significance to the average mind.

What has land to do with liberty, or liberty with land? Certainly, if political liberty is meant, the Land Leaguers are strangely adrift, for in the very country to-day where savage despotism reigns and liberty is almost unknown, the people possess, occupy, and enjoy the soil with a liberality equalled by no other, while in that country said to have the most liberal, popular, and truly representative constitution on earth, the people are practically cut-off from free and equitable enjoyment of the soil. Russia is as far ahead of Great Britain in the matter of popular enjoyment of the land as Great Britain is in advance of Russia in the matter of political liberty. Again, in Switzerland and the United States, both republics, we find in the former a most liberal and equitable distribution of the land, while in the latter land monopoly is scarcely less formidable, and vastly more threatening for the future, than in Great Britain.

The sense in which our friends are prompted to associate land with liberty probably arises from the very natural feeling that, were the land more widely

distributed, the rent-tax now levied upon the mass of farmers in Ireland would be lifted from their shoulders, and they would attain to greater liberty in the sense that any other animal acquires greater liberty through a lessening or removal of its load. A very elementary idea of liberty this, but logical as far as it goes.

But since the rent-tax is only one form of profit-theft, why *land* and liberty any more than every other article of commerce, and liberty? For it is by no means certain that land-monopoly is the chief source of profit-theft. It is the original (temporal) source, and a very good basis upon which to attack profit-theft; but it is, after all, only one source. Behind the wide range of profit-plunder lies the concrete embodiment of the whole iniquity -- usury.

The problem, then, upon closer analysis, reduces itself to this affirmation: Destroy usury, and you attain liberty. That greatest of all powers for good now working on this planet for the emancipation of oppressed humanity, the "Irish World," has got so far with the problem. "Usury is theft!" it cries out to 100,000 profit-ridden slaves every week, and it means by usury every species of something-for-nothing tribute, whether it be in the form of rent, interest, or ordinary profits in the realm of trade.

But the "Irish World," glorious as is its work and mission, has yet one more stage in the problem to conquer. Who is responsible for usury? Who sustains it? Who backs it with artillery? Usury, left to its merits

as a voluntary social arrangement, not stand for a day. As Patrick Ford well knows, the insignificant banditti known as landlords, who enslave Ireland, would run for their lives, or sink to their knees like cars whining for mercy, were not a police force of 100,000 men kept at their backs against the protest of 5,000,000 people.

The State, then, is the author and defender of usury, as it to-day holds its murderous grasp at the throat of Ireland. And who is the State? The landlords, as the "Irish World" has reiterated a hundred times. Why, then, not abolish the State, and get down to the hardpan of the whole problem?

Ah! but here we touch delicate ground. The "Irish World" will never reach that third and last stage of the problem of liberty. It is with a feeling of deep regret that we now indulge in a little plain talk, but duty will not permit us to talk otherwise, if we talk at all, and silence would be a crime against liberty. The moment the "Irish World" attacks the State, it attacks the pope, the bishops, the priests, and the whole tribe of spiritual usurers, who knew their art well before the first temporal landlord was born.

Spiritual usurers! Yea, these are the worst abominations in the whole series. "The monopolizing of natural wealth," cries the "Irish World," "is the bottom crime!" But we have natural wealth spiritual and natural wealth temporal. We have landlords spiritual and landlords temporal. Yea, and the landlords spiritual are the creators, abettors, supporters,

and defenders of the landlords temporal. The very Christian God to whom the "Irish World" appeals every week is the Father of usury, and his agents, the ecclesiastics, from the pope down to the pettiest priest who demands an admission-fee at the church-door for the supposed benefit of enjoying the sacraments, are spiritual landlords' bailiffs. These so-called sacraments -- what are they but spiritual natural wealth monopolized by these mitred and surpliced thieves, and rented out for profit? If there is any power for good in this world that it pains us to criticise, it is Patrick Ford's great "Industrial Liberator." But a more pitiable plight never fell to the lot of a beneficent organ of light and truth. It has reached the second stage of solution in the problem of liberty, but can never get any further so long as it remains the "Irish World" with that phallic symbol, the cross, at the top.

The State is the immediate supporter and defender of usury. Behind the civil state is the spiritual state. Both have one common cause, the enslavement of the masses. Behind the whole is God, the author and finisher of usury and every other enslaving device that paves the way for man's inhumanity to man. Liberty aims to abolish them all, and all superstitious reverence for their unholy offices. Liberty alone has mastered the third stage of the problem of emancipation, and proposes to stand upon the logic of it without fear or favor. Come with us, good friends, and then you will not only know what "Land and Liberty" means, but, in solving the whole problem of liberty, all those other good things will be added unto you.

LEGITIMATE MINING

Some one has favored us with a copy of a very handsome paper called "The Conservative." The principal tiling that it desires to "conserve" appears to be "legitimate mining." We are by no means experts in mining, but, in our view, legitimate mining consists simply in digging minerals out of the earth and stilling them to those who desire them for products embodying an amount of labor equal to that which the minerals have cost the miner. If any such business as this is going on in any part of the world, and "The Conservative" is trying to "conserve" it, it is engaged in a very commendable work, in which we join, heart and hand.

But what is generally known as "legitimate mining" consists, as far as we have observed, in staking off a large tract of land in some abandoned region which nobody by any chance ever visits, paying some alleged mining expert to examine its contents and lie about them in terms sufficiently technical to hide the lie from the unlearned, vesting the ownership of the land in a stock company, electing the original holders as the officers, selling shares at prices corresponding in enormity to the lies that induce people to buy them, using most of the money thus received to pay princely salaries to the aforesaid officials, spending the balance in digging a mine, causing some "accident" to befall it, telling more lies about the wonderful results that the "accident" has prevented, assessing the stockholders to

repair damages and keep up the salaries, selling the little mineral that may be brought to the surface at the highest possible prices regardless of the labor-cost, repeating these operations until they are no longer endurable and all the fools have been fleeced, and, finally, going into bankruptcy, and, perhaps, "skipping out" with the remaining funds. There is a plenty of such business as this going on in many parts of the world; but, if "The Conservative" is trying to "conserve" it, it is engaged in a very damnable work, which we fight, tooth and nail. Liberty's attitude toward these and all other swindles is not at all conservative, but very *radical*. She would destroy them, root and branch. And their roots are land monopoly and money monopoly.

LIBERTY'S WEAPONS

Our methods are methods of peace. Liberty is not the advocate of force. Speaking for itself, it hates murderous weapons of all descriptions. It enters into no planning, plotting, or dark and secret measure of assassination or revolution. The French were to call their statue in New York harbor, "Liberty enlightening the world." And that is Liberty's proper function. Compared with the light that is to come, the world sits in darkness. Liberty is the torch we bear aloft, convinced that Liberty's light is to lead the world to heights and into a fullness of life beyond the heart of man now to conceive.

With old, dead, and decaying ideas; with shows and shams; with half-heartedness, hypocrisy, and pious, moralistic, pharisaic pretension; with all that hinders, cripples, dwarfs the human intellect and the robust heart of mankind, -- Liberty fights; but with the ploughshare of thought and the lance of freest criticism, disbelieving in all other weapons -- those that are death-dealing and not life-giving.

And yet Liberty finds words of approval for the Hartsmanns and the tyrant-slayers who in secrecy plot the revenges of fate. Why? Because Liberty is forced to choose between one class that slays to oppress and another that slays to free.

Is there not a difference?

You know there is, you editors who mouth about assassination, and, if you say there isn't, why, we take the Liberty to say the truth is not in you.

Some of our friends are in a great hurry for a full and systematic explanation of Liberty's philosophy and purposes. They are very anxious to know "just what we are driving at." Patience, good friend, patience! You will get it all in due season. But Liberty's philosophy is a comprehensive one, and cannot be compressed in a day or in a column. The contents of a a little fortnightly journal like this, hastily put together as they are in a few spare moments of an otherwise busy life, must perforce present it in driblets, a little here and a little there. Only follow it closely, in all its applications, and you will finally find that it fits everywhere and is deeply rooted. But to a certain extent Liberty, like the rest of the world, floats with the tide, and the development of her philosophy is governed by progress of affairs. Where we shall next branch out, we can no more tell than could John Ruskin, who answered a similar criticism for his "Fors Clavigera" in these words: "As well please with a birch-tree growing out of a crag to arrange its boughs beforehand. The winds and floods will arrange them according to their wild liking; all that the tree has to do, or can do, is to grow gaily, if it may be; sadly, if gaiety be impossible; and let the black jags scar rend the rose-white of its trunk where Fors shall choose." Meanwhile, we are scoring one point, and for the present the most important one, in arousing people to the fact that *we are driving at something*.

LIGHT-HEADED SOCIALIST

The platform adopted by the convention of socialists which met in New York last week is as singular a heap of sociological *bric à brac* as could be well jumbled together. Such a ridiculous confusion of ideas easily sifts itself to no ideas at all. The key note of this remarkable *pot-pourri* is compulsion. This is not, however, very singular, since the socialistic machine, like every other which does not propose to stand on its own merits by voluntary assent, can only be run by extraneous force.

It is, indeed, astonishing that a convention of otherwise intelligent and well-meaning men should meet to denounce the present machine, and yet, in the same breath, set up another, with exactly the same despotic element in it that damns the first, - compulsion. Compulsory factory legislation today makes the protest of the pillaged operative nugatory. Compulsory legislation makes the great railways the deadly suckers of farm labor. Compulsory education makes the Colleges, the pulpits, and the newspapers the lick-spittles of capital. Yet, after denouncing these institutions as the agents of robbery and oppression, the socialists immediately set to work, not alone to imitate their methods, but to revive them in infinitely more atrocious forms.

Take, for instance, compulsory education. Of course the new education under the socialistic *regime* will be

socialistic education. The taxes to support it must be levied by force. The writer of this article does not believe such to be education, but worse than ignorance. He would consider that he was insulting and degrading his children to send them to school under such a system. Now, do the socialists propose to have the audacity to compel him to pay for this education, whether he wants it or not? If so, then their denunciation of the present order is mockery, and they are worse enemies to progress than those whom they call to account.

This absurd craze of "nationalizing" things is the most impertinent lunacy that could make reform ridiculous. In last week's "Irish World" William Howard comes out with a scheme for "free travel." The government, which to-day alone puts travelers at the mercy of usurious corporations, is asked to buy up the railroads and thereby exterminate the only element, competition, which keeps the price of a ride from Boston to Chicago from being one hundred dollars instead of ten dollars. "But the government must run the roads at cost!" cries Mr. Howard. Whose cost? The government's cost, of course; and yet, if Mr. Howard would only be at the pains to consult the facts, he would know beyond all cavil that the cost of running things by government is almost always above that of the most extortionate corporations. Thieving as are the great railroad monopolies to-day, this government, even though it should set to work in dead earnest to run the roads at cost, could not do it at the cost which is imposed upon the travelling public by the

corporations. The most expensive public service of its kind is the national postal service, so often cited by the Socialists and Greenbackers as a guiding "star route" to perfection. A corporation now stands ready to do that service, under the most substantial guarantees and even in governmental handcuffs, at far less cost and more efficiently, whenever it shall be permitted to do so.

We are not generally supposed to be remarkably wanting in the virtue of patience, but patience with this over-repeated idiocy of "nationalization" is one of the things that puts us most severely to the test. Guiteau's attempt to popularize the taking-off of governmental figure-heads by "theocratizing" murder is ridiculous enough, but has the whole weight of inspiration and religious logic on its side, and his arguments challenge the respect of the learned, the wise, and the pious. The socialists, more absurd than he, are in a fair way to yet demand the "nationalization" of love, lunacy, and common sense, backed by compulsory taxation. As yet we have got no farther into their logic than to concede that "free travel" to the lunatic asylums would not be altogether objectionable.

ORDER AND ANARCHY

[Translated from "Le Revolte."]

We are often reproached with having accepted as a motto the word *anarchy*, which so frightens many minds. "Your ideas are excellent," they tell us, "but confess that your party's name is unfortunately chosen. Anarchy, in the current tongue, is a synonym of disorder, chaos; it awakens in the mind the idea of clashing interests, of individuals at war with each other and unable to establish harmony."

Let us begin by observing that a party of action, a party representing a new tendency, is rarely allowed to choose its own name. The *Gueux* (beggars) of Brabant did not invent that name, which afterward became so popular. But, at first a nickname,- and a very felicitous one, too,- it was taken up by the party, generally accepted, and soon became its motto. It will be agreed, moreover, that the word contained a complete idea.

And the *sans-culottes* of 1793? It was the enemies of the popular revolution that flung that name; but did it not contain a complete idea, that of the revolt of the people, in tatters and tiled of misery, against all those royalists, *soi-disant* patriots, and jacobins, dressed well and with scrupulous neatness, who, in spite of their pompons speeches and the incense burned before their statues by the *bourgeois* historians, were the real enemies of the people, since they profoundly despised

the people for their poverty, their love of liberty and equality, and their revolutionary spirit?

And so with the name *Nihilists*, which so puzzled journalists and was the occasion of so many plays upon words, good and bad, until it became understood that it denoted, not a sect of semi-religious cranks, but a real revolutionary power. Launched by Tourgueneff in his novel, "Fathers and Sons," it was taken up by the "fathers," who by this nickname revenged themselves for the disobedience of the "sons." The "sons" accepted it, and when, later, they saw that it was the source of misunderstandings and tried to disembarass themselves of it, it was impossible to do so. The press and public were unwilling to designate the Russian revolutionists by any other name than this. Moreover, the name is by no means badly chosen, for it contains an idea. It expresses the negation of the sum total of the facts of the existing civilization, based on the oppression of one class by another: the negation of the present economic *regime*, the negation of governmentalism and power, of *bourgeois* politics, of *bourgeois* morality, of routine science, of art placed at the service of exploiters, or the grotesque customs and usages, often detestable because of their hypocrisy, handed down from past centuries to existing society, - in short, the negation of all that the *bourgeois* civilization venerates to-day.

The same with the Anarchists. When there arose within the International a party denying authority in the bosom of the Association and revolting against

authority in all its forms, that party first gave itself the name of Federalist, and later Anti-Stateist or *Anti-Autoritaire*. At that time it even avoided the name of Anarchists. The word *an-archy* (for so it was written then) seemed to connect the party too closely with the followers of Proudhon, to whose ideas of economic reform the International at that time was opposed. But for this very reason, in order to induce confusion, their enemies saw fit to use this name, saying, further, that the very name of the Anarchists proved that they desired only disorder and chaos, regardless of future results.

Then the Anarchistic party hastened to accept the name bestowed upon it. It insisted at first on the hyphen between *an* and *archy*, explaining that in this form the word *an-archy*, of Greek origin, signified *no government*, not "disorder;" but soon it accepted it just as it is, without giving useless trouble to proof-readers or a lesson in Greek to the people.

The word, then, has recovered its primitive, ordinary, common significance, expressed in 1816 in these words by an English philosopher, Bentham: "The philosopher who desires to reform a bad law does not preach insurrection against it. . . . The character of the Anarchist is very different. He denies the existence of the law, he rejects its validity, he excites men not to recognize it as law and to resist its execution." To-day the meaning of the word has grown in breadth: the Anarchist denies not only existing laws, but all established power, all authority. Nevertheless, its

essence remains the same: he revolts -- and that is his starting-point -- against power, authority, under whatever form it happens to exist.

But this word, they tell us, awakens in the mind the negation of order, and, consequently, the idea of disorder, chaos.

We will try, nevertheless, to understand each other. What *order* is in question? Is it the harmony that we Anarchists dream of? The harmony in human relations that will freely establish itself after humanity is no longer divided into two classes, one of which is sacrificed for the benefit of the other? the harmony that will spring spontaneously from the solidarity of interests, when all men shall form one and the same family, when each will labor for the good of all and all for the good of each? Clearly, no! Those who reproach anarchy with being the negation of *order* do not mean the harmony of the future; they mean order, as it is conceived to-day, in our present society. Let us see, then, what this order is that anarchy wishes to destroy.

Order, to-day,- what they mean by order,- is nine-tenths of humanity laboring to maintain a handful of idlers in luxury, enjoyment, and the satisfaction of the most execrable passions.

Order is the deprivation of these nine-tenths of every necessary condition of healthy life and rational intellectual development. To reduce nine-tenths of humanity to the condition of beasts of burden living

from day to day, without ever daring to think of the enjoyment which man finds in the study of science and the pursuit of art,- that is order!

Order is misery and famine become the normal state of society. It is the Irish peasant dying of hunger; it is the peasant of one-third of Russia dying of diphtheria, of typhoid fever, of hunger in consequence of scarcity, amid carloads of wheat on their way to foreign countries; it is the people of Italy compelled to abandon their luxuriant fields to roam through Europe seeking some tunnel to dig, where they may run the risk of being massacred after having existed a few additional months. It is the land taken from the peasant for the rearing of cattle to feed the rich; it is the land allowed to lie fallow rather than be restored to him who asks no more than to cultivate it.

Order is woman selling herself to support her children, is the child compelled to be confined in a factory or die of inanition, is the workingman reduced to the state of a machine. It is the phantom of hunger ever present at the doors of the laborer, the phantom of the insurgent laborer at the doors of the rich, the phantom of the insurgent people at the doors of their governors.

Order is a minority of a few, versed in governmental affairs, imposing themselves for that reason on the majority and bringing up their children to fill the same offices later, in order to maintain the same privileges, by stratagem, corruption, force, and wholesale murder.

Order is the continual war of man upon man, of trade upon trade, of class upon class, of nation upon nation. It is the unceasing roar of the cannon in Europe, the devastation of the country, the sacrifice of entire generations on the battle-field, the destruction in one year of wealth accumulated by centuries of hard labor.

Order is servitude, thought in chains, the degradation of the human race, maintained by blood and the sword. It is hundreds of miners buried annually in the mines through the avarice of the owners, and mitrailleused, shot down, and bayoneted, if they dare to protest against these massacres.

Order, finally, is the Commune of Paris drowned in blood. It is thirty thousand men, women, and children cut to pieces by shells, rained upon by the mitrailleused, buried in quicklime beneath Parisian pavements. It is Young Russia within prison walls, buried in Siberian snows, its best, purest, most unselfish representatives strangling in the hangman's noose.

That is order!

And disorder,- that which they call disorder?

It is the people in revolt against this ignoble order, breaking their chains, tearing down barriers, and marching toward a better future. It is all that is most glorious in the history or humanity.

It is the revolt of thought on the eve of revolutions; it is the overturning of hypotheses sanctioned by the inertia of centuries past; it is the birth of a whole flood of new ideas, of bold inventions, of audacious solutions of scientific problems.

Disorder is the abolition of ancient slavery, the insurrection of the communes, the abolition of feudal serfdom, the attempts at abolition of economic servitude.

Disorder is the peasants risen against the priests and lords, burning castles to make room for cottages, leaving their dens in search of the sunlight. It is France abolishing royalty and dealing a mortal blow at serfdom throughout Western Europe.

Disorder is 1848 causing kings to tremble and proclaiming the right of labor. It is the people of Paris fighting for a new idea, and, though overpowered by massacre, bequeathing to humanity the idea of the free Commune and breaking the war for that revolution whose approach we now feel and which will be known as the Social Revolution.

Disorder -- what they call disorder -- is the epochs during which entire generations bear up in superhuman struggle and sacrifice themselves to prepare for humanity a better existence by relieving it of the chains of the past. It is the epochs during which the popular genius finds free scope, and in a few years takes those gigantic strides without which man would

have remained in the state of ancient slavery, a servile being in abject misery.

Disorder is the flowering of the most beautiful passions and the grandest self-sacrifices; it is the epic history of the supreme love, the love of humanity.

The word *anarchy*, implying the negation of such an order and invoking the memory of the highest moments in humanity's life,- is it not well chosen for a party which marches onward to the conquest of a better future?

THE LAND FOR THE PEOPLE

The natural wealth of the earth belongs to all the people. The land, the coal, the minerals, the water courses,- all that furnishes the basis of the prime opportunities for human well-being should be the common possession of all.

The above proposition is practically accepted by the leading thinkers and agitators of the world. The socialists declare it as the bottom plank of their system. The communists of course avow it. The "Irish World" cries it aloud from week to week. John Stuart Mill affirmed it almost in so many words. Herbert Spencer reiterates it constantly, and even Froude and John Bright have repeatedly accepted it by inference. Liberty affirms it too; so one main and vital proposition is generally admitted by all shades of advanced reformers.

But at the point where this proposition is accepted begins the great socialistic controversy in which we find ourselves at uncompromising war with social democrats, the communists, and the whole rank and file of government regulationists. "By what method do you propose to give every man a fair opportunity to enjoy all these 'natural gifts'?" "How can you best secure this natural wealth to all the people?" These are questions which tower in importance above all others which now confront thinking men.

Now, Liberty's way of getting all these good things to the people is to put every man on his own merits. The very purpose of that machine called the State is to set an artificial patent man-trap, by which the intended servile classes shall be crippled in the race for natural wealth and natural opportunities.

Years ago the natural wealth of the public waters was not interfered with by legislation. Go to the shores of our bays and rivers, and the poor fishermen, if not already starved out or forced into the service of big operators, will recall with a sigh the good old days when all poor men fared alike and could make a living out of the public waters. But since politics have become a thieving trade, legislation has so "put a job" on natural water privileges that the poor are practically evicted and choked off, while the big concerns who dictate the legislation scoop up the fisherman in their politico-industrial nets under the current despotic wage system.

Cease to protect landlords in their monopoly of the land through the State, and the land will readily revert to the people. It will revert, too, speedily, with little expense, and with less violence, injustice, and dissatisfaction than under our boasted law-and-order arrangements. The land of Ireland belongs to the people, as Bishop Nulty and the "Irish World" assert. But why do the people not enjoy it? Simply because their wits are not awakened to their real enemy, the State. Acting better than it knows, the Land League, as a power for Liberty, is only strong in the fact that is

has been this expression of practical revolt against the British State. The London "Times," more sagacious than the blind leaders of the League, foresees that a successful strike against that tax known as rent is only a step, which needs to be followed by a strike against that other tax which needs to be followed by a strike against that other tax which is levied to support the State in order that the tap-root of the whole scheme of landlordism may be reached.

And yet the mass of Irishmen are so swallowed up in the delusion that society is impossible without a State that the craze of Irish national independence came near capturing the recent convention at Chicago, and threatens to yet the beneficent work of the Land League movement. The prospective Irish State will be the same machine, under another banner, that now has the Irish tenant by the throat. The American republic is to-day more favorable to landlords than is the government of England. A late editorial in the New York "Tribune" produced unanswerable proof that the laws of this country are vastly more favorable to the landlord and more severe to the tenant than the laws which hold sway in Ireland. Unless Irish human nature is the one exception of the world, the coming Irish republic will be simply a reproduction of the machine which inevitably provides that the land *shall not* come into the hands of the people. The very purpose of the State is to make the mass of the people the slaves of the privileged classes. The State, in its very nature, cannot be of the people and by the people.

It is of the few and by the few by virtue of its organic structure.

Until these bottom facts of despotism can be gotten into the heads of the Irish leaders, the land war will flounder along blindly. The leaders of the movement are to-day ignorant of the only saving grace there is "no rent." When the London "Times" says that "no rent" is but the stepping-stone to "no taxes," it shows a far keener insight into the situation than Parnell and his infatuated companions who cry for Irish national independence. Stop feeding the infernal machine which alone protects the landlord in his piracy, and the game is up with one stroke. To institute another machine in its place is simply to invite the Irish to practice upon their own race what the hated Saxon has been practicing all these centuries, and to substitute the Irish swindle for the English is about the extent of the average Irishman's aspiration. Nothing better can be expected till the agitation shall call forth somebody who has the sense and courage to supplement Michael Davitt's "no rent" with "no taxes" and "no State." Then this now useless cry of "the land for the people" will begin to mean something for Ireland and the whole human race. A sort of blind Providence has driven Ireland into the "no rent" resolve, but her vaunted leaders are ignorant of its real significance. They are mere children besides such men as Michael Bakounine, the founder of Nihilism, and are entitled only to the credit of blindly acting better than they know.

THE REDEMPTION OF MONEY

If we can fully determine what redemption is, we shall accomplish a great work for human progress. A promise to pay, written on paper, is generally considered redeemed when it is exchanged for coin. This is not always true. If I take a banknote promising to pay one dollar, so far as I am concerned, the note is redeemed; but, if the note is yet outstanding against the bank, it is not redeemed.

If A gives B a note promising to pay one dollar, and B passes that note to C, and C returns it to A, just so soon as A receives it at its full face value, that note is fully redeemed. The great difficulty, in connection with the redemption of paper money, consists of this, - that the promise to pay implies a promise to pay coin; whereas, by right, it should be considered a promise to pay value equal to gold, or silver, whichever may be taken as the standard of value.

In commerce scarcely anybody wants gold, but everybody wants *value equal to gold*.

If a gold dollar will buy ten yards of cotton cloth, and a bushel of wheat will buy a gold dollar, can there be any difficulty in exchanging wheat for cotton cloth?

Let us remember that, although an absolute standard of value is impossible, a comparative standard is

indispensable. We want *something of value* by which to compare, count, and exchange all other valuable things.

How much fog, mud, and moonshine has been waded through by the would-be teachers of political economy, just because the above truth has not been clearly seen!

Primitive people, as a rule, believe the false and do the wrong. And even when the true thing has been discovered, they are almost sure to start for it in the wrong direction. This is eminently true in regard to money.

Let me repeat,- everybody wants *value*. Now, if A, B, and C can exchange their goods on the base of a gold valuation, what is the necessity of the gold itself?

Gold always has a marketable value, which is well known. Now, let business men make their exchanges on the *value of gold*, and not on the gold itself. Then they can use their own credit as money, and redeem their promises to pay by receiving them, and thus, by mutually acting together, they can be independent of the money-lender. For, be it understood that borrowing money, as a good business transaction, is but an exchange of credits. Will the people ever get over the stupid and barbarous notion that money is something of itself?

Our paper money at the present time (November, 1881) is at par with gold because the government receives it. If A owes B \$1,000 and C holds all the gold, how can A

pay his debt? If A has made the promise to pay the gold itself, he must go to C and give him a bonus for the gold. That is the nature of usury, or interest. But if A, being solvent, has promised to pay B \$1,000 in value equal to gold, the debt can be easily cancelled.

What a monstrous barbarism is the arbitrary limitation of money!

And yet money must be limited, to be good money, until people shall find a way to redeem their notes, other than by swapping them for coin.

APEX.

THE WEAKNESS OF COMPULSORY CREDIT

The following extract from a speech recently delivered by Thomas F. Bayard in the United States senate shows that a voice for Liberty is sometimes heard in the halls of power:

I argued and voted against the coercive principle which compelled any citizen of the United States, any person in the United States, artificial or natural, any set to citizen who had their money invested in bank stocks or not in bank stocks, to take any obligation of the government perforce and under compulsion. I believed then, and I believe now, that, whenever it is necessary to accompany your demand for credit by a threat, you weaken that credit and do not strengthen it. I think it is a symbol of weakness, and not of strength, for the government to make either its demand notes or its bonds an enforced legal tender upon anybody. It did not add one stiver to the value of the treasury notes issued in time of war. It did not prevent their depreciation one penny when disaster threatened the government that issued them and its credit was threatened to be weakened by disaster. Your bonds are not to be made stronger, they are not to be held with more confidence, by fixing upon them any feature of compulsory acceptance by the banks, or by individuals, or by anybody, foreign or domestic. It is a mistake to suppose so.

TWO KINDS OF COMMUNISM

We do not believe in communism in the economic sense of the word. To us it seems, for many reasons, an impossible and undesirable form of society. Proudhon described it accurately as well as epigrammatically when he called it the "religion of poverty." But it is not our special business to antagonize the voluntary communism vigorously pictured by W. H. Riley in another column. He, and those of his friends who agree with him, may attempt any associative experiment they please; Liberty will look on with interest and report results.

It is compulsory communism of the Bismarckian stamp that we combat. It is the needle-gun socialism of Ferdinand Lassalle that we oppose. Statecraft is our enemy, whether it be that advocated by Jay Gould in the New York "Tribune," or that advocated by our good friend, W. G. H. Smart, in a note printed elsewhere in this journal, -- a note, by the way, so good-humored, so straightforward, so utterly void of the circumlocution too frequently characteristic of Mr. Smart's newspaper articles, that we publish it with great pleasure. Space is lacking to meet his points now. Nevertheless, one misapprehension should be corrected immediately. *We do not* believe that any one can "stand alone." *We do* wish "social ties and guarantees." We wish all there are. We believe in human solidarity. We believe that the members of society are interdependent. We would preserve these interdependencies

untrammelled and inviolate. But we have faith in the sufficiency of natural forces. Motives and good impulses aside, we have no sort of sympathy with these multitudinous groups of so-called socialists, of all colors, stripes, and propensities, with each its little scheme for bursting the bonds by which nature unites us and tying men and women together anew with artificial chains. None of them, whatever they may claim, believe in the unity of the race. All its members, in their opinion, need to be cemented into unity, and for this purpose each has his patent glue. They wish a manufactured solidarity; we are satisfied with the solidarity inherent in the universe. When Mr. Smart has whipped the Universe, "body, soul, and breeches," Liberty too will throw up the sponge.

WHAT WE MEAN

Our purpose is the abolition, not only of all existing States, but of the State itself. Is not this a straightforward and well-defined purpose? There can be no mistaking it, and it admits of no equivocation. The least that our enemies can say of us is that we stand in the market-place of thought and action with a square protest and a square assertion.

And what is the State? It is not a thing that can be especially defined by Russia, Germany, Great Britain, or Massachusetts. The State is a principle, a philosophical error in social existence. The State is chaos, rioting under the guise of law, order, and morality. The State is a mob, posited on unscientific premises. We propose to supplant the mob by that true social order which is pivoted on the sovereignty of individualities associated for mutual well-being under the law of natural attraction and selection, - Liberty.

Under this formula we do not, in the best sense of the Word, discard government. On the contrary, it is government that we are after. The State is not government, since it denies Liberty. The State becomes impossible the moment you remove from it the element of compulsion. But it is exactly at this point that government begins. Where the State ceases government begins, and, conversely, where the State begins government ceases.

We often hear of a wise parent governing his children by love. Did anyone ever hear of a monarch conducting a State by love? Did not the State originate in a distrust of love and natural selection as the true motors of government? Was not the very motive of the first rulers of peoples the abolition of government? Were they not designing conspirators, who saw that, under a system of natural association, there would be universal well-being and a just distribution of natural wealth and the rewards of labor? In order to enrich themselves and gratify their vanity and love of power at the expense of others, they took advantage of the superstitious element in man, and erected their thrones under cover of the divinity. Their purpose was to supplant government by force, and their machine they called the State.

Now, wherever force takes the place of natural selection and associative mutualism founded on consent, there a State is inaugurated. It may be in the church; it may be in the political State; it may be in the league, the club, the lyceum, the labor union, or the household. It is a State, in that it posits authority and supplements it by force, thus denying government and substituting despotism.

We assert that delegated authority assumed to be vested in any titled or elected person, not excepting God himself, is, in the very nature of the case, a lie, a fraud, and, moreover, a scientific impossibility, since the individual is the only source of authority, and, even if he would, could not alienate from his personality the

control of himself by contract. Hence we regard all popes, kings, emperors, presidents, and persons in authority everywhere as impostors and usurpers, and the constitutions, "vested rights," and other lying parchments under which they claim the right to rule as binding only on such as freely give their consent.

When we state as our purpose, then, the abolition of the State, the reader must not have in view a forcible raid upon the palace of some king, or a military expedition against some state house, parliament or arsenal, even though at some later day circumstances should give rise to such incidents in our warfare. What we mean by the abolition of the State is the abolition of a false philosophy, or, rather the overthrow of a gigantic fraud under which people consent to be coerced and restrained from minding their own business. The philosophy of Liberty can be applied everywhere, and he who successfully applies it in his family in the place of avenging Gods, arbitrary codes, threats, commands, and whips may easily have the satisfaction of abolishing at least one State. When we have substituted our philosophy in place of the old, then the palaces, cathedrals, and arsenals will naturally fall to pieces through neglect and the rust that is sure to corrupt tenantless and obsolete structures.

We should like to be able to better elucidate our philosophy in a larger and more frequently issued sheet. We do the best that we can in the little space at our command. Meanwhile, all the signs of times

promise well, and we go on with our humble work
rejoicing, -conquering and to conquer.

THE „AUTHORITIES“

The Socialists of New York and vicinity, with a devotion that does honor to their manhood, very properly thought Sunday the most appropriate day on which to dedicate their temple of humanity. Socialism was their religion, and, as religious processions are always in order, they concluded to march through the streets to the place of dedication.

But certain grog-mongering aldermen, rowdy police commissioners, and other political loafers immediately suffered a severe shock of their pious sensibilities, and straightway prohibited the proposed procession, on the ground that the dedication services were not to be of a religious nature. These fellows have a very delicate scent of what constitute the true attributes of religion.

The "New Yorker Volkszeitung," in its indignation, suggested that the Socialists should arrange themselves in marching order, with banners bearing such devices as, "Society the religion of humanity." "The ancient order of Jesus Christ," "The society of Christian redemption," etc., and thus leave the eternal odium upon the "authorities" of suppressing a religious procession. But men so thoroughly outlawed from anything worthy the name of humanity as are these politicians are impervious to shame and oblivious to odium.

And who are these low-minded loafers who make up the government (so-called) of New York? Let every Socialist who lauds the ballot and "works" on election day remember that they are simply vile creatures of whom he has helped in the making. The trouble with the Socialists is that they stoop to recognize these villains as "authorities." They are self-elected bullies, who represent nobody in the political sphere - not even themselves. They are figureheads that stand for the State, and, having compulsory taxation, guns, and clubs at their backs, perform whatever tricks they conceive to be safest and most popular and most profitable. So long as the Socialists recognize the State they can consistently make no protest. When they become wise enough to put these politicians on the same plane as all other irresponsible ruffians who assault peaceable processions on the streets, it is probable that the religious instincts of all concerned will receive a fresh and saving impetus.

MONOPOLY THE CAUSE OF POVERTY

The following clear analysis of the causes of poverty is taken from W. N. Slocum's (for the most part) admirable pamphlet, "Revolution," the publication of which by H. W. Brown of Boston was announced in our last issue:

The primal causes of poverty lie at the very base of our social system, and cannot be rooted out without radical change in the system itself. They are organic-sanctioned by custom, sustained by the church, enforced the law, and interwoven with the very fabric of society. The main cause of crime, poverty, and degradation throughout the world is the monopoly of the natural sources of wealth,-the usurpation by the few of that which by right belongs to all. From the earliest organization of government among men to the present time the preponderance of legislation has been for the protection of property. By natural right that only can be private property which is produced by labor; and all so produced is subject to decay; but human enactments affirm that to be private which nature made public; and human law gives the power of increase to that which nature dooms to destruction. Statutes thus in conflict with the laws of "God" must necessarily be in derogation to the rights of man. By virtue of these usurping laws it follows that what is recognized as property consists of two distinct species.- one externally existent, the other acquired - one a gift

of nature, the other product of labor. It is evident that without exclusive control of the one it would be impossible to monopolize the other; because all created wealth soon passes away, and can only be replaced by additional labor. No sane person advocates an arbitrary division of this species of property, because, under our system, created wealth constantly flows into channels by which it is concentrated into the hands of those who monopolize the sources of wealth. The way to destroy a poisonous plant is not by pruning its branches, but by striking at by roots.

PORNOGRAPHY

A proposition by A French deputy named Goblet for the enactment of a law against obscenity recently elicited the following protest from Maurice Talmeyr, one of the writers for "L'Intransigeant;"

It appears that M. Goblet burns with a desire to attach his name to a law against pornography. It is well known what M. Goblet is. What is pornography?

Pornography is obscenity in books, journals, and works of art. As it actually induces the sale of many obscene pictures and pamphlets, the intention is to ask the Chambers to pass a law prohibiting the sale and punishing the authors.

Here we once more meet face to face one of the oldest questions of Liberty ever discussed. We are not surprised that it is not yet solved in the minds of all, but we do not believe that there are many questions concerning which experience furnishes so many arguments in favor of absolute Liberty.

Those of our contemporaries who, holding a pen, ask to be enabled to prosecute dealers in obscenity remind us a little of the winegrowers who uproot almond trees from their vineyards because they shut out the sun. To avoid the loss of three grapes they deprive themselves of a fine crop of almonds. To save themselves from the unpleasantness of two or three improper street-cries or

a few suspicious leaflets, to which only those who secretly delight in them ever pay attention, they risk the consignment of nine-tenths of literature to the paper-mill.

To the repressive laws which are supposed to menace only pornography, but which really menace art itself, we shall always oppose the old argument — as old as the world and equally and solid - that has always been opposed to them.

Tell us where, in art, obscenity begins; tell us where it ends; fix a limit that shall not be so arbitrary and movable that the obscene of yesterday may become the sublime of tomorrow. Do that, and then you may intelligently legislate against pornography. Until then hands off, and let the unclean sheets appear, lest tomorrow some idiot should take it upon himself to prevent us from reading "Pantagruel," the "Religieuse," or the "Man with Forty Crowns."

Why is it not yet recognized, in the face of so many well-known instances, that obscenity, like morality, is the most elastically relative and hence the most intangible and indefinable thing in the World? "Madame Bovary," in which it is impossible to discover anything at all obscene, was prosecuted nevertheless, under the empire as obscene. Why? The edition of La Fontaine's "Fables," called of the "Farmers General," a few years ago was destroyed, ground up, and annihilated at the command of the courts. Why?

Why? Because there was a law that entrusted the whole of art and the whole of literature to the prudery of a tribunal, - that is, to four or five simple men always liable to be dull and mischievous idiots; because prudery; like vice, has no boundaries; because such or such a judge, having to pass upon a pamphlet or a picture, will perhaps decide that in his personal opinion all nudity is obscene, and that the very word "love" is wounding to modesty; because no library, at any given moment, would stand the test of certain possible standards, and because thenceforth everything would disappear, from the "Iliad" to the "Legend of the Centuries."

There exists a sect of Protestants whose members put breeches on the legs of their pianos lest they might inspire impure thoughts. And after all perhaps they do inspire them. Let us leave these pantaloon fanatics to seek their pleasure where they find it, but let us hope never to be judged by them.

Yet that is what the Goblet law may prove one day to hold in store for us. Whoever the editor, it would always put the book, the picture, and the journal at the mercy of personal estimates; it would contribute its share to the persecution with which men, we know not why, have always pursued the human mind.

LEADERSHIP AND DRIVERSHIP

There are two methods of inducing an individual to move on towards the goal of an ideal civilization. The first method is to place one's self squarely and openly before him - tangible to his eyes, ears, and understanding,- and seek by human persuasion and attraction to lead him.

In doing this the leader should always stand out the subject's light. He should not make the remotest reference to force, as a possible alternative. He should not resort to any manner of strategy, by which to obscure the wits of the subject. He must not ask — much less coerce — the subject to pay the bills attending the experiment. If then, on his own merits and at his own costs, he succeeds in inducing the subject to follow him, he may consider himself fairly "elected" the guide and director of his subject, always, however, with the proviso that dissent at any moment on the part of his follower shall disqualify him from office, without appeal. Any individual who is thus freely led, under these conditions is "governed," if you will, but it is self-government, and is a perfect negation of the State.

The second method is the method of the State. It is to get behind the individual,- not before him,- and, armed with a good supply of whips, bayonets, clubs, and threats (all of which the subject to be governed is forced to pay for), coerce him to travel blindly whither

he naturally could not be induced to go. Upon demanding of his driver a warrant for such brutal proceeding, the subject is possibly shown an old parchment concocted by former drivers before he was born. In vain does he protest that said constitution is not binding upon him without his consent. Thereupon insult is added to injury, and the coercive whips are seasoned with the epithets "traitor," "socialist," "communist," "anarchist," *etc.*

We have, then, these two principal methods of government, -- leadership and drivership. The first is the method of Nature, and is found everywhere in rational social intercourse, wherever the State finds it impossible to interpose. The second is opposed to Nature, and is as irrational as it is irresponsible and brutal. Yet it is the method of the State. It is the method which it is thought treasonable to dissent from. It is animalism opposed to humanism. It is anarchy in the popular but perverted sense of that term, since it secures government from behind instead of before, debases instead of elevates, and even fails to accomplish the very purposes for which it pretends to be instituted. It is a crime and a failure.

There is another and subsidiary method of putting the individual over the road of State, which might very properly be called the *Jumbo trick*. It is a cross between leadership and drivership, and consists in seducing the subject into the political box and carting off his individuality on wheels, he of course being obliged to pay for his forced ride in the political Black Maria.

This latter method is the one now, chiefly in vogue in so-called "liberal" States, but is fully as unwarrantable, if not quite as discourteous, as the method of absolutism.

The method of Liberty is the method of voluntary leadership, as opposed to brutal drivership. We demand the abolition of every political State, since the essence of all is drivership. The *Jumbo trick* does not deceive us, although disguised under the names of constitutional monarchy and republic. We demand a rational and voluntary socialism in the place of political animalism; and that our demands are not chimerical the drift of passing events offers the most cheering and satisfying promise.

TRADES-UNIONISM

Of late there has been a remarkable activity on the part of all classes of working men in this country in the way of combining for mutual protection and well-being. And not only has this activity been pushed among the obnoxious "foreigners," but simon-pure American mechanics have been forming trades unions in all quarters.

Liberty rejoices at the rapidly increasing numbers of American trades unions; not that the animus of a labor union is on a one whit higher plane than that of a capitalist union, but because labor combinations are a crude step in the direction of supplanting the State. The trades unions involve a movement for self-government on the part of the people, the logical outcome of which is ultimate revolt against those usurping political conspiracies which manifest themselves in courts and legislatures. Just as the Land League has become a formidable rival of the British State, so the amalgamated trades unions may yet become a power sufficiently strong to defy the legislatures and overthrow them.

The capitalists and their tools, the legislatures, already begin to scent the impending dangers of trades-union socialism, and initiatory steps are on foot in the legislatures of several states to construe labor combinations as conspiracies against commerce and industry, and suppress them by law. They have already

boldly shown their hand in New York and New Jersey, and the capitalistic organs are putting out adroitly disguised feelers in order to ascertain how American sentiment would receive the introduction of Russian and Bismarckian methods at the United States

Working people should be on the alert for the kind of legislation which is now pending in Now York, whereby the police are given discretionary power to suppress labor meetings and are acquitted of homicide in case of the anticipated killing of refractory laborers who decline to be "evicted" at the butt end of a club from a hall where they have assembled for the peaceable discussion of grievances and remedies. When the enforcement of such atrocious legislation is attempted, every one of the five thousand laborers who may assemble in Cooper Union should take special precaution to have with him an escort in the form of a reliable six-shooter, and be ready to use without stint upon such servants of the "law" as may feel too sure that they are already acquitted of homicide before they commence the deliberate assassination of outraged workingmen. Russian methods of government will justify Russian methods of resistance.

How plain it ought to be to an unprejudiced workingman that the legislature itself is the really dangerous and lawless Conspiracy! It is in supplanting this political conspiracy by so intelligent and self-governing socialism that the trades unions develop their chief significance. In this view we are willing to temper somewhat, for the time, our criticism of the

fact that the trades unions themselves are generally largely imbued with the element of force and authority. Perhaps they could hardly be expected to be otherwise, when we remember that the new-born labor Organizations are plants growing out of the old political order. But, imperfect as they are, they are the beginnings of a revolt against the authority of the political State. They promise the coming substitution of industrial socialism for usurping legislative mobism. While we hail the growth of labor combinations as a potent sign of emancipation, we invite workingmen to study the methods of Liberty, throw overboard the State, repudiate all politicians and their services, and go straight forward about their business. One or two more lessons like the Pittsburgh riots, if administered intelligently, will begin to set the legislative mobists seriously to thinking.

LAW AND AUTHORITY

[Translated from "Le Révolté."]

"When ignorance prevails in the bosom of society and disorder in the minds of the people, laws become numerous. Men expect everything from legislation, and, each new law proving a new disappointment, *they are led to look to it unceasingly for that which can come only from themselves, from their own education, from their own moral condition.*" It certainly is not a revolutionist who says this; not even a reformer. It is a jurist, Dalloz, the author of a compilation of French laws, entitled "Répertoire de la Législation." And yet these lines, although written by a man who was himself a maker and an admirer of laws, perfectly picture the abnormal condition of society to-day.

In the existing States a new law is considered a remedy for all evils. Instead of changing themselves what is bad, the people begin by calling for a law to change it. Is the road between two villages impassable? The farmer says that a law of highways is necessary. Has the village constable, taking advantage of the stupidity of those who surround him with their respect, insulted some one? "A law is needed," cries the insulted party, "to establish a standard politeness for village constables." Are commerce and agriculture at a standstill? "We must have a protective law," argue the husbandman, the cattle-raiser, the grain speculator, down to the dealer in old rags, there is not one who

does not demand a law to protect his petty traffic. Does the employer lower wages or add to the hour of labor? "There must be a law to regulate that," shout those anxious to the legislators, instead of telling the operatives that there is another and more effective method of "regulating that," - namely, to take back from the employer that which he has stolen from generations of workers. In short, everywhere a law! A law of roads, a law of fashion, a law of mad dogs, a law of virtue, a law to oppose a barrier to all the vices, all the evils that result only from human indolence and cowardice.

We are all so perverted by an education which from infancy stides within us the spirit of rebellion and develops that of submission to authority, we are so perverted by this existence under the ferule of the Law which regulates all things,— our birth, our education, our development, our love, our friendships,— that, if it continues, we shall lose all power of initiative, all habit of thinking for ourselves. Our society seems unable to understand that it can exist otherwise than under the control of the law, elaborated by a representative government and administered by a handful of governors; and even when it succeeds in emancipating itself from this yoke, its first care is to immediately restore it. "The year 1 of Liberty" has never lasted more than a day, for, after its proclamation, the yoke of the Law, of authority, is resumed on the very next day.

In fact, for thousands of years our governors have been repeating with various intonations: Respect for the law, obedience to authority! Father and mother bring up their children in this sentiment. The school confirms them; it proves its necessity by inculcating in children scraps of false science cunningly assorted; of obedience to the law it makes a religion; it marries the god and the law of the masters in one and the same divinity. The hero of history whom it has manufactured is he who obeys the law, who protects it against rebels.

Later, when the child enters public life, society and literature, striking each day, each moment, like the drop of water wearing away the stone, continue to inculcate the same prejudice him. The books of history, of political science, of social economy are full to overflowing of respect for the law: even the physical sciences are brought into requisition, and, by introducing into these sciences of Observation false terms borrowed from theology and absolutism, it is skilfully contrived to confuse the mind, always to maintain respect for the law. The journal does the same work; there is not a newspaper article that does not preach obedience to the law, even through on another page it daily establishes the imbecility of the law, and shows how it is dragged through mud and mire by those charged with its maintenance. Servility before the law has become a virtue, and it is doubtful if there ever was a single revolutionist who did not begin in his youth by defending the law against what are generally known as "its abuses," the inevitable consequence of the law itself.

Art chimes in with so-called science. The hero of the sculptor, painter, and musician covers the Law with his buckler, and, eyes flashing and nostrils dilating, stands ready to strike with his sword whoever shall dare to touch it. Temples are built to it and high priests appointed, whom the revolutionists themselves hesitate to touch; and, if the Revolution itself succeeds in sweeping away some old institution, it is again by a Law that it seeks to perpetuate its work.

This mass of rules of conduct, left us by slavery, servitude, feudalism, and royalty, which is called Law, has taken the place of the stone monsters before which human victims formerly were immolated and which the slave did not dare even to touch, through fear of being killed by a thunderbolt from heaven.

Especially since the advent of the *bourgeoisie*, since the great French Revolution,— has this religion succeeded in establishing itself. Under the old régime but little was heard of the laws, outside of the Montesquieus, Rousseaus, and Voltaires, as opposed to the royal caprice; the people were bound to obey the good pleasure of the king and his valets, or suffer the penalty of imprisonment or death. But during and since the revolution the lawyers, having attained power, have done their best to confirm this principle on which they depended to establish their reign. The *bourgeoisie* accepted it without opposition, as its anchor of safety, to stem the popular torrent. The priesthood hastened to sanctify it, to save its bark tossing in the waves of the

torrent. And finally the people accepted it as a step in advance of arbitrary rule and the violence of the past.

To understand the eighteenth century one must carry himself back to it in imagination. His heart must have bled at the recital of the atrocities committed during that period by the all-powerful nobles upon the men and women of the people in order to understand what magic influence these words, "equality before the law, obedience to the law, without distinction of birth or fortune," must have exercised a century ago over the mind of the peasant. He who up to that time had been treated more cruelly than an animal, he who had never enjoyed any right at all and could never obtain justice against the noble for his most revolting acts except he took revenge by killing him and getting himself hanged,— he saw himself recognized by this maxim, at least in theory and so far as his personal rights were concerned, as the equal of his lord. Whatever the law might be, it promised to reach equally lord and peasant, and proclaimed the equality, in the eyes of the judge, of the poor and the rich. This promise was a falsehood, as we now know; but then it was a step forward, an homage rendered to justice in the same sense that "hypocrisy is an homage rendered to truth." That is why, when the saviours of the threatened *bourgeoisie*, the Robespierres and the Dantons, basing themselves upon the writings of the philosophers of the *bourgeoisie*, the Rousseaus and the Voltaires, proclaimed "respect for the law, equal for all," the people, whose revolutionary ardor had already cooled in the face of an enemy more and more solidly organized, accepted the

compromise. They bent the neck under the yoke of the Law to save themselves from the tyranny of the lord.

Since then the *bourgeoisie* has not ceased to cultivate this maxim, which, with another principle, representative government, embodies the philosophy of the century of the *bourgeoisie*, the nineteenth century. It has preached it in the schools, it has propagated it in its writings, it has created its science and its arts with this as its objective, it has thrust it everywhere, after the manner of the English devotee who slips under your door his religious tracts. And so well has it done its work that to-day we are confronted by this abominable fact; at the very hour of the re-awakening of the spirit of discontent, the people, desiring to be free, begin by asking their masters to be so kind as to protect them by modifying the laws made by these same masters.

But nevertheless times and minds have changed during the last hundred years. Everywhere rebels are to be found who will no longer obey the law without inquiring into its origin, its utility, the source of the obligation to obey it and the respect with which it is surrounded. The approaching revolution is a "Revolution," and not a simple insurrection, for the very reason that the rebels of to-day submit to their criticism all the foundations of society hitherto venerated, and, first of all, this fetich, the Law.

They analyze its origin, and find it either in a god — a product of savage fears, as stupid, narrow, and wicked

as the priests who talk of his supernatural origin — or in blood, conquest by fire and sword. They study its character, and find as its distinctive trait unchangeability in the place of the continuous development of humanity, the tendency to permanently fix that which ought to develop and be modified daily. They ask how the law is maintained, and see the atrocities of Byzantinism and the cruelties of the Inquisition; the tortures of the middle ages, living flesh cut into strips by the executioner's lash; chain, club, and axe at the service of the law; the dark vaults of prisons; sufferings, tears, and maledictions. To-day still the axe, the rope, the chassepot, the prisons; on the one hand, the brutishness of the prisoner reduced to the condition of a caged beast, the degradation of his moral nature, and, on the other hand, the judge, stripped of all sentiments that constitute the better part of human nature, living like a visionary in a world of legal fictions, applying with passionate delight the guillotine, bloody or dry, the coldly wicked madman not even suspecting the abyss of degradation into which he himself has fallen, compared with those whom he condemns.

We see a race of lawmakers legislating upon matters of which they know nothing: voting to-day a law governing the sanitary condition of cities without having the slightest notion of hygiene; to-morrow regulating military armaments without even understanding a musket; making laws of instruction and education while unable to give any instruction whatever or an honest education to their children;

legislating at random, but never forgetting the fine to be imposed upon the vagabond, the prison and the galleys to be inflicted upon men a thousand times less immoral than they themselves, these legislators. We see, finally, the jailer becoming more and more devoid of every human sentiment, the policeman trained to the duties of a bloodhound, the spy despising himself, the informer's occupation regarded as an honorable one, corruption erected into a system; all the vices, all the bad phases of human nature favored and cultivated for the triumph of the Law.

We see these things, and for that reason, instead of stupidity repeating the old formula, "Respect for the law," we cry: "Contempt for the law and its attributes!" For the cowardly phrase, "Obedience to the law," we substitute: "Rebellion against all laws!" Only let the misdeeds committed in the name of each law be compared with the benefits which each law has conferred, let the good and the evil be weighed, and it will be seen whether we are right.

MICHAEL DAVITT AND HIS SEDUCER

Omnipotent is the power of ideas; omnipotent for good when the ideas are sound; sometimes well-nigh omnipotent for evil when the ideas are at war with Liberty and true social order. When an idea germinates afresh and struggles till it can stand alone, there is abundant power and time to crush it in the bud, if it is false; but, when a false idea captures a whole army in a bunch and carries away the head of its bravest and most sincere leaders, it is indeed a dire calamity.

Such a calamity we most deeply mourn in the late astounding new departure of Michael Davitt, whom we had been proud to contemplate as the coming man in the great agrarian struggle the seat of which is in Ireland, but upon the settlement of which humanity has more at stake than on any issue with which the world ever grappled.

Some two years ago Henry George came into the literary market with his work on "Progress and Poverty," in search of a publisher. He had long been prominent in the West as an agitator of the land and labor questions, and he, least of all, to say nothing of his fellows, presumably had never dreamed that any leading publishing house in America would consent to identify itself with his ideas. But, to the intense surprise of reformers, it was suddenly announced that the great publishing firm of the Appletons was to publish his book. When, after the fulfilment of this

announcement, we went through the first few chapters of his work and took in his stirring indictment of capital, his masterly riddling of the Malthusian sophistry, and his graphic pen-pictures of the persistence of poverty in the midst of plenty, still greater did the wonder grow that a world-known publishing house should consent to scatter such wholesome truths.

But upon entering the chapters of Book III., the secret was woefully revealed. George here entered upon a defence of usury more damaging in its influence than the studied reasoning of Bastiat and the other political economists. Here was a prize that more than atoned for his land nationalization schemes, which were not new, and which capitalist and landlords well understand can never obtain a lasting hold on the laboring masses. *A socialist and labor reformer defending usury!* This was a plum, however, too precious to be lost; and so, in the interest of capital and as an attack by the enemy of the opponents of usury, the book was launched on its career of notoriety.

Labor reformers and level-headed men on every hand, however, were quick to see the trap and discover the poison bait. Nearly every one of the writers for the "Irish World" who had built up its reputation as the ablest enemy of usury in existence was astonished, and made haste to record his protest. But some fatal genius had beclouded the master spirit of the "Irish World." It was admitted that a lamentable seduction had been accomplished.

The wily seducer was Henry George himself, and the victim was Patrick Ford. With subtle sophistry, aided by the soothing air of meekness which characterizes the author of "Progress and Poverty," he shadowed the intellect of Ford day and night for weeks until he had securely accomplished his purpose. This done, he was ingratiated into the confidence of the Land League, and sent into more fruitful fields across the water.

The momentous accidents of the campaign all proved happy cards for George. Michael Davitt was sent to prison, and fortune so favored the successful seducer of Ford that "Progress and Poverty" was the only treatise on the land question that he was allowed to see. If the American money-grabbers in whose interest the Appletons published the work had themselves arranged it, they could not have executed a happier conspiracy with British landlords by which to capture Davitt, the "noblest Roman of them all," George boasts, in a letter to the "Irish World," that Davitt read and re-read his book several times. Alone, in the solitude of his cell, it was his only mental food. He was no other work refuting its stealthy defense of usury and rent. It became his only love. Its unrefuted sophism took root in the mind of Davitt. He, too, like the editorial recluse, Patrick Ford, was ripe for capture when the glad tidings of his release came to his ears.

Now was George's opportunity. As the cat shadows the mouse, he was quick upon the heels of the liberated Davitt. He hovered over his game with unremitting zeal. He sat beside his pillow in the first hours of his

liberty. With siren tongue he inveigled the victim into his scheme of land nationalization, although the honest Davitt knew that it could not be carried out except by mortgaging his country to English rule under a terrible load of bond-usury. But usury is no offence in the eyes of George, provided the State becomes the sole usurer. Yea, he laboriously seeks to prove, in "Progress and Poverty," that usury is just, if but the State be endowed with a monopoly of it. But to the sad sequel, after the fellow-victim of Patrick Ford is securely bagged.

In his Manchester speech we find brave Michael Davitt - the man who once recorded his fame in letters of fire by declaring rent an immoral tax upon industry - advocating the bonding of his country to fifty years of English rule with the immoral tax payable in the form of interest. He had not even followed his master well, for George had always stood for the confiscation of the land to the national rent-gatherer, without compensation. Where now is the no-rent hero, whose words once smote the heart of landlordism like a thunderbolt? Verily - gone the way of that other victim, Patrick Ford, from whose "Irish World" the once glorious no-rent headings in mammoth type have departed, perhaps forever.

A deadly and disastrous calamity has divided the Land League movement. The Nationalist now have the Leaguers on the hip. Patrick Ford will find out before many weeks that his having fallen under the seduction of Henry George is the heaviest blow ever struck at his influence and the prestige of the "Irish World." To let

go of the all-conquering weapon of no-rent in favor of the delusive phantom of George is an offence to Ireland and humanity almost deserving the name of treason. To swap no-rent for universal rent, with the State as sole monopolist, is serious business for the man who has so long gladdened the hearts of true reformers with his "Usury is theft" column. We regret exceedingly to speak in such caustic terms of the great "Industrial Liberator" and its proprietor, whom we love to cherish as the Irish Garrison, but to us the late turn in the tide of affairs is too serious and far-reaching in its consequences to be dealt with mincingly

And what is it all about? What is the secret of this dangerous infatuation that has carried off the heads of Ford and Davitt? The secret is that which has ever taken captive those in whom an ingrained faith in salvation through authority and government is native. It cannot be that Patrick Ford has been induced by George to believe that usury is just. If so, then the "Irish World's" occupation is gone. The anti-usury column should be stricken out, and no more labor and type should be wasted in protesting against rent as the mammoth crime that afflicts humanity.

No, that is not the situation. But such is the amazing faith in governments which lurks in the brain of Ford that he has been induced to subscribe to the astonishing delusion that, if an immoral tax can be gathered solely by the State and distributed on communistic principles, the tax thereby becomes just and beneficent. According to this miserable logic theft becomes a virtue if one big

boss thief can be crowned the sublime monopolist of it, in the hollow assumption that he will distribute the plunder equitably.

Sunk in the slough of this pitiable superstition, Michael Davitt stands accused of advocating communism by those whose former faith in him was unbounded. And we sorely regret to say that the accusation is just. The scheme of governmental distribution of the rent plunder can be nothing less, in the nature of the case, than unmitigated communism. Worse, it will be communism without equality. Thieves never divide plunder on a scientific basis. Governments, which exist solely for plunder, always divide the spoils among the few schemers who set themselves up as their figure-heads. Will George's new socialistic government do better than the old ones? To us it is evident that it will do vastly worse, for professional thieves become vicious and audacious in exact proportion to the richness of the spoils. George's *régime* of universal rent spoliation once established, the whole programme of Karl Marx's governmental supervision and robbery will be in order, for it is absurd to maintain that, if rent collection by government is proper, then interest collection, wages collection, and profit collection are not also logically proper. In short, whereas it is now only possible for laboring men to keep from starving by virtue of the limitations put upon legislative theft, under this new scheme the power of the few political thieves and their capitalistic backers is made boundless and beyond appeal. Are men like Patrick Ford and Michael Davitt

gone mad that such infinite absurdity can possess them?

The source of George's wild scheme may be found in his utter oversight of the fact that the just basis of possession must first be fixed before any safe investigations can begin in economics. He bases the justice of rent on the various degrees of fertility of various soils, as does Ricardo. But he assumes that one individual can properly be possessor of many tracts of land, irrespective of occupation, cultivation, and improvement. Admitting that the title of such individual is valid in equity, then, of course, tenants will bid for the best parcels, the degree of fertility that will barely sustain life being the minimum of rent.

But the assumption that any individual can justly hold more parcels than he can personally occupy and cultivate is in its inception false; and, were the just basis insisted upon, rent would be totally impossible, since no one could be the landlord of more than his own domain. This George entirely overlooks, and assuming that individuals can properly become lords of vast and various domains, with various degrees of fertility, he proposes to take the business out of their hands, vest it solely in the government, and divide the spoils among all the people. In other words, he creates the spoils and then unseats the spoilers, instead of making them impossible in the first place by fixing upon a just basis of possession. Under the craze of this absurdity he would abolish "peasant proprietorship" (peasant possession, we prefer to say) and substitute a

despotic State monopoly of landlordism, when it is evident that the trouble is not in peasant proprietorship but in the disregard of the just basis of peasant possession and all other possession.

Taken all together, a more absurd and ridiculous tissue of economic error was never spun and published than George's scheme. That such unscientific and unsightly rubbish should have succeeded in obscuring the vision of men like Patrick Ford and Michael Davitt is an amazing as it is lamentable. Not because these fallible mortals count for more in themselves than others do we lament their misleadings, but because of the fact that circumstances have made them authority in this momentous struggle. We earnestly hope that they may be speedily led to see the error of their ways before the great Land League movement is irrecoverably divided against itself and its glorious promises brought to naught. But better, if need be, that the Land League should die than that George's monstrous craze should live.

THE GEORGE THEORY OF TAXATION

Admitting the justice of compulsory taxation (which Liberty utterly denies), the following remarks upon it, submitted by Dr. E. F. Miller in a letter to the New York "Star," are strictly correct and highly important:

The doctrine in reference to taxation announced by George, which is, "that all taxes should be placed upon the land; that it is wrong to tax labor or production," or even "to tax luxuries," must be regarded as a grave error. If anything in this world should escape taxation, it should be land; if anything in this world should be taxed, it is luxuries, and property, or labor product. It seems to me that those who announce the doctrine that "all taxes should be laid upon the land" entirely ignore the true objects of taxation. As we understand the subject, the object of taxation is to support the Government. The objects of Government are to protect the lives and property and promote the best interests of the people. Who, then, should be taxed? Should not all who have lives and property to protect bear their share of taxation? Therefore every man, every laborer, every kind of property that needs protection should be taxed. The land needs no protection, but the people living on it do, and the products of labor placed upon it do also; therefore, tax the people and tax their property, but tax the land only as it becomes property that needs the protecting arm of the Government. To lay all taxes upon the land, and let other forms of property go without taxation, would lay an increased burden upon

the tillers of the soil that they could not and would not submit to. There is no class of people who work so many hours, or so hard and for so small a compensation, as the farmers. To increase their burdens would be an act of injustice that should not be entertained for a moment.

A WAR CATECHETICALLY ANALYZED

[New York Graphic.]

Question — Do nations go to war nowadays?

Answer — No; their rulers do.

Q. But what does the nation do?

A. The fighting and the paying

Q. How many men were directly concerned in making the trouble between England and Egypt?

A. Possibly half a dozen lords and bankers.

Q. And the remainder of England's millions?

A. Follow their leaders, and have very little to do or say in the matter.

Q. And what is the war all about?

A. A debt.

Q. Owed by all the Egyptians to all the English?

A. No; owed by a few fast Egyptians to a few English money-lenders.

Q. Anything else?

A. Yes; desire of a few Englishmen to run Egypt on high salaries.

Q. What interest has Mrs. Dustepanne, lodging-house keeper, No. 14 Tottenham Court Road, London, in all this row?

A. Not a pennyworth.

Q. Who is Mrs. Dustepanne?

A. One of her majesty's ten thousand loyal and loving subjects engaged in keeping lodgings.

Q. Had Smith, the grocer, No. 15 Museum Street, or Jones, the publican, next door, or Brown, the baker, No. 7 Bishop's Gate Street, any hand in the killing of the two hundred men, women, and children during the bombardment of Alexandria?

A. None at all.

Q. Yet all these are —

A. English taxpayers, English people, and parts of the English nation.

Q. What is the part of the English fleet and army now in Egypt?

A. That of the overbearing bully who clubs the weaker party at the command of his employer.

Q. Who, then, in reality fired the guns which killed the two hundred men, women, and children in Alexandria?

A. A few conceited English lords and grasping money-lenders.

Q. And Sir Garnet Wolseley and Admiral Seymour with army and fleet are —

A. Paid policemen in uniform in the service of the strongest party.

Q. And what will the English parson do next Sunday

A. Pray for the success of her most Christian majesty's most Christian army and navy in Egypt.

Q. And what will happen to the apostolic-descended clergyman of her most Christian majesty's Church of England if he does not so pray?

A. He will lose his place and his pay for preaching the religion of peace and good-will to men.

THE ANATOMY OF LIBERTY

Nine-tenths of life is spent in complaining of wrongs and trying to abolish them. The average man or woman goes to bed with some wrong hanging on the eyelids. He or she awakes, and generally the first thought is of some wrong. The bed is wrong; the breakfast is wrong; somebody's talk or treatment is wrong; some law or custom is wrong; two-thirds of everything is wrong.

The great field of reform deals negatively with nothing but wrongs. The whole of Ireland to-day is a sad theatre of wrongs. The laborer is complaining of wrongs. The woman suffragists are advertising wrongs all over the land. So is the prison reformer, the temperance advocate, the greenbacker, the infidel, and even the politician.

Yet summon the whole army of reformers together and ask them, individually, to define what a wrong is in its essence, and probably not one in a hundred would have an intelligent idea. Restricted suffrage, land monopoly, the wage system, and currency limitations, they say, are wrongs; but until they have analyzed the essential nature of a wrong, their efforts, as is practically the case, are as liable to be aimed against ultimate liberty as for it.

A re-former is one who proposes to construct a new form, or alter an old form, of social practice so as to

make it better accord with the conditions of well-being. But the majority of reformers are utterly incapable of defining where the old form violates some immutable principle. The average standard of condemning a thing as wrong is that it works injustice to some class of individuals. But this is no valid scientific basis. For the class that is injured perhaps a much larger class is benefited by the social practice complained of. The bulk of reforms come to nothing simply because they represent nothing but wars of classes. It is selfishness in contact with itself. In Ireland they say: "Landlord rights mean tenant wrongs." So everywhere capitalist rights mean labor wrongs. The real thing which must yet be settled before there will ever be any logical and effectual basis of reform is this: What is a right and what is a wrong in human relations? There are no class rights and class wrongs. A thing is right, now and forever, because it accords with the immutable law of our being. It is wrong, now and forever, because it is opposed to that law. *What is that law as it pertains to human relations?* is the problem of Liberty.

But the lamentable inability of reformers to define wrongs is an infinitely less serious matter than their methods of abolishing them. Every wrong, as the reader who follows us in succeeding numbers will discover, is the result of some violation of the law of true liberty, and can generally be directly traced to the said violation. The law of liberty is spontaneous association by natural selection. The first condition of its normal operation is that the basic factor of social existence, the individual, shall be left entirely and

absolutely free to regulate his life as experimental contact with other equally free individuals may seem to direct.

Bear in mind that liberty does not preclude regulation. But regulation, under the law of liberty, comes of selection and voluntary assent. Under its operation, security of life and possession, that bogus pretext which is made the chief apology for so-called governments, is as much more firmly assured as are the normal processes of Nature more effectual than the artificial expedients of man.

The antipode of liberty is artificial, arbitrary, pro forma intervention between individuals who are seeking the best results of experimental association. Its concrete expression is Authority. Its organized exercise is known as Government. Now, the most lamentable spectacle to-day, next to rampant despotism itself, is the short-sighted reformer attempting to secure greater liberty by advocating the method of more authority, more intervention, more government. In the case of Irish landlordism, the greenback movement, suffrage reform, and socialism, the wrong pretested against is, in every case, an actual one, and the motive of the protestants a noble one, but the method proposed in every case by which to abolish the wrong hinges upon the very despotic element which created that wrong and perpetuates it. Landlordism in Ireland, so far from being a voluntary regulation between the landlord and his victim is an artificial contrivance of despotism, created by the few magnates who style themselves the

government. Left to its merits as a voluntary arrangement of associative life, it could not stand an hour. It is forced upon five millions of people by some two thousand absentee thieves. And yet the great bulk of Irish land reformers seem to expect that, by a change of engineers, the machine of the future will be run for different and better purposes than the present one.

What is true of the land reformers is equally true of the currency and suffrage reformers. And the worst spectacle of all is that of the socialists, who expect to mitigate the deadly power of the government machine by enlarging it and extending its capacity for despotism into the remotest concerns of life. All these misguided propagandists are yet blind to the main spring of the whole scheme of despotism. Curiously enough, the leaders, many of them, are aware of the mischief which that superstitions fiction, the "Government of God," has exercised in stultifying rational progress, but forget that the State is simply the old fiction arranged to play upon men in the practical economies of life.

Theocracy is the original machine invented to enslave the race. It set up a king in the person of God. Two thousand years ago it took on an heir apparent in the form of Christ, a prince made more in conformity with the intelligence of the age. The powers were subsequently distributed into the hands of other agents, known as popes and graded ecclesiastics. The distributing, segregating process has gone on till we

have the modern republic. But all forms of government are radiations from the parent trunk. The reformer who abolishes the fiction God as a factor of authority in human concerns can never stop, if he is logical, till the whole machine of government which grows out of it is also abolished. He then stands upon a clean, rational basis. The man who clings to that superstition known as the State, and boasts of having flung away the fetters of theology and priestcraft, does not understand himself. The State is as much a theological superstition as the doctrine of the atonement. It is simply the human side of theology. It is only another application of the idea of authority, which is the central idea of theological despotism. All this we propose to illustrate and amplify, as Liberty goes out upon its mission of enlightenment, from issue to issue

WHERE WE STAND

Mr. B. W. Ball writes the best articles that appear in the "Index," which is not saying much, and among the best that appear in any of the weeklies, which is saying a good deal. We were the mere gratified, therefore, to find him treating in a recent number the incipient, but increasing, opposition to the existence of the State. He at least is clear-sighted enough not to underrate the importance of the advent into social and political agitation of so straightforward, consistent, unterrified, determined, and, withal, philosophically rooted a factor as modern Anarchism, although his editorial chief, Mr. Underwood, declares that the issue which the Anarchists present "admits of no discussion."

But even Mr. Ball shows, by his article on "Anti-State Theorists," that, despite his promptness to discover and be impressed by the appearance of this new movement, he has as yet studied it too superficially to know anything of the groundwork of the thought which produced, animates, and guides it. Indeed this first shot of his flies so wide of the mark that certain incidental phrases indicative of the object of his aim were needed to reassure us that Anarchism really was his target. In a word, he has opened fire on the Anarchists without inquiring where we stand.

Where, then, does he suppose us to stand? His central argument against us, stated briefly, is this: where crime exists, force must exist to repress it. Who denies it?

Certainly not Liberty; certainly not the Anarchists. Anarchism is not a revival of non-resistance, although there may be non-resistants in its ranks. The direction of Mr. Ball's attack implies that we would let robbery, rape, and murder make havoc in the community without lifting anger to stay their brutal, bloody work. On the contrary, we are the sternest enemies of invasion of person and property, and, although chiefly busy in destroying the causes thereof, have no scruples against such heroic treatment of its immediate manifestations as circumstances and wisdom may dictate. It is true that we look forward to the ultimate disappearance of the necessity of force even for the purpose of repressing crime, but this though involved in it as a necessary result, is by no means a necessary conditioner the abolition of the State.

In opposing the State, therefore, we do not deny Mr. Ball's proposition but distinctly affirm and emphasize it. We make war upon the State as the chief invader of person and property, as the cause of substantially all the crime and misery that exist, as itself the most gigantic criminal extant. It manufactures criminals much faster than it punishes them. It exists to create and sustain the privileges which produce economic and social chaos. It is the sole support of the monopolies which concentrate wealth and learning in the hands of a few and disperse poverty and ignorance among the masses, to the increase of which inequality the increase of crime is directly proportional. It protects a minority in plundering the majority by methods too subtle to be understood by the victims, and then punishes such

unruly members of the majority as attempt to plunder others by methods too simple and straightforward to be recognized by the State as legitimate, crowning its outrages by deluding scholars and philosophers of Mr. Ball's stamp into pleading, as an excuse for its infamous existence, the necessity of repressing the crime which it steadily creates.

Mr. Ball,—to his honor be it said,—during antislavery days, was a steadfast abolitionist. He earnestly desired the abolition of slavery. Doubtless he remembers how often he was met with the argument that slavery was necessary to keep the unlettered blacks out of mischief, and that it would be unsafe to give freedom to such a mass of ignorance. Mr. Ball in those days saw through the sophistry of such reasoning, and knew that those who urged it did so to give some color of moral justification to their conduct in living in luxury on the enforced toil of slaves. He probably was wont to answer them something after this fashion: "It is the institution of slavery that keeps the blacks in ignorance, and to justify slavery on the ground of their ignorance is to reason in a circle and beg the very question at issue."

Today Mr. Ball — again to his honor be it said — is a religious abolitionist. He earnestly desires the abolition, or at least the disappearance, of the Church. How frequently he must meet or hear of priests who, while willing to privately admit that the doctrines of the Church are a bundle of delusions, argue that the Church is necessary to keep the superstition-ridden

masses in order, and that their release from the mental subjection in which it holds them would be equivalent to their precipitation into unbridled dissipation, libertinism, and ultimate ruin! Mr. Ball sees clearly through the fallacy of all such logic, and knows that those who use it do so to gain a moral footing on which to stand while collecting their fees from the poor fools who know no better than to pay them. We can fancy him replying with pardonable indignation: "Cunning knaves, you know very well that it is your Church that saturates the people with superstition, and that to justify its existence on the ground of their superstition is to put the cart before the horse and assume the very point in dispute."

Now, we Anarchists are political abolitionists. We earnestly desire the abolition of the State. Our position on this question is parallel in most respects to those of the Church abolitionists and the slavery abolitionists. But in this case Mr. Ball — to his disgrace be it said — takes the side of the tyrants against the abolitionists, and raises the cry so frequently raised against him: The State is necessary to keep thieves and murderers in subjection, and, were it not for the State, we should all be garroted in foe streets and have our throats cut in our beds. As Mr. Ball saw through the sophistry of his opponents, so we see through his, precisely similar to theirs, though we know that not he, but the capitalists use it to blind the people to the real object of the institution by which they are able to extort from labor the bulk of its products. We answer him as we did them, and in no very patient mood: Can you not see

that it is the State that creates the conditions which give birth to thieves and murderers, and that to justify its existence on the ground of the prevalence of theft and murder is a logical process every whit as absurd as those used to defeat your efforts to abolish slavery and the Church?

Once for all, then, we are not opposed to the punishment of thieves and murderers; we are opposed to their manufacture. Right here Mr. Ball must attack us, or not at all. When next he writes on Anarchism, let him answer these questions:

Are not the laboring classes deprived of their earnings by usury in its three forms,—interest, rent, and profit?

Is to not such deprivation the principal cause of poverty?

Is not poverty, directly or indirectly, the principal cause of illegal crime?

Is not usury dependent upon monopoly, and especially upon the land and money monopolies?

Could these monopolies exist without the State f t. their back?

Does not by far the larger part of the work of the State consist in establishing and sustaining these monopolies and other results of special legislation?

Would not the abolition of these invasive functions of the State lead gradually to the disappearance of crime?

If so, would not the disappearance of crime render the protective functions of the State superfluous?

In that case, would not the State have been entirely abolished?

Would not this be the realization of Anarchy and the fulfilment of Proudhon's prophecy of "the dissolution of government in the economic organism"?

To each of these questions we answer: Yes. That answer constitutes the ground on which we stand and from which, we refuse to be drawn away. We invite Mr. Ball to meet us on it, and whip us if he can.