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BOSTON, MASS., SATURDAY, APRIL 17, 1886.

Whole No. 79.

"Der Arme Teufel" Speaks.

The following article by Robert Rettßel, a man of unimpeachable character and editor of "Der Arme Teufel,"—a German weekly published at Detroit, and one of the best in the country,—will serve, I think, together with the main and beautiful letter from Justus H. Schwab which it embodies, to convince some of my own words that the charges recently preferred in those columns against the Most party, or members thereof, were not wanton lies, but fearful veracities. It is translated from "Der Arme Teufel" of April 10.

Serious charges have of late been raised against the Most faction of the Social Democratic party.

At first only the rumor was afoot that particular members of the party, for their personal enrichment, had instituted a delusive system of crime in New York; then came the story of the murder of Schemel and Most; and now, at last, the story finally appeared in Liberty,—an Anarchistic journal published by B. Tucker in Boston,—a set charge against Most and his confederates, which, though indeed it has been in circulation for some time, has been kept a secret until now, in order to avoid creating a panic among the members of the party, and then it is our right and our duty to consider what they have done, and, if we find it to have been wrongly or injuriously to our cause, to disavow and condemn them; or they acted to advance their own private interests, and then they are but common criminals,—worse than ever, for it is a profession of trade, and those who are thus engaged are to be considered as the most dangerous of all revolutionaries.

"My dear Robert:—Before these lines reach you, you have probably been enlightened through Liberty as to how I stand with Most, and for myself, I have so far managed the Jeesteful maxim:—"The end justifies the means," as to say that the means must not detract from the end. I regard myself as a member of the International Working People's Association,—first, because I stand upon its ground principles, and, secondly, because, as far as I can comprehend, it is the only institution of integrity, and I am not bound to the same.

I am not a man, party, and I mean to be a man, and I mean to be known in my own right, and for my own sake. I am not bound to the same, and for my own sake. I mean to be a man, and I mean to be known in my own right, and for my own sake.

"We have a right to self-defense, and we have a right to protect our homes and our families, and our children, and our friends, and our neighbors, and our country.

"Love thy neighbor as thyself, and love thy enemy as thyself."

By hearty greeting, thy

JOHNS H. SCHWARZ.

"Recapitulation of "Der Arme Teufel."—That these deeds have been committed admits of no doubt; the record of them has escaped the knowledge of the police. The matter of concern now is: Are these deeds chargeable to the party; for, if so, the concern must be, in the eyes of every honest man, an organization of gallows-birds, who the sooner they reach their destination the better. But, if, on the other hand, the party has nothing to do with them, then, and only then, is there danger to the party, for the names of some men who use the same of the party to disparage it, is then it is the duty of the leaders—Most being a man—to emphatically repudiate them. Most will probably by this time have realized what you and I have appealed to him about. In his pamphlet, "The Property Robber," he says: "Seize upon private property—kill the innocent, if necessary,—but seize upon it at all hazards!" Of the spirits whom he summons, every one is already past reclaiming.

The Firebugs' Defence.

To the Editor of Liberty:

I hope you have seen Most's answer. It seems to me very much like the defence in the famous Kansas case: 1. Such actions were never committed; 2. They were committed, but not by our people; 3. If they have been our people, but not with my approval. Don't, seriously speaking, can anything be more absurd than Most's claim that these acts were private affairs, and did not concern him? Assassination and robbery private affairs! And when Anarchists come? Of course any act committed in the name of a party or a cause is not private, but is a fit subject for discussion. In the name of a cause or either of those acts acted in the name of the party, and then it is our right and our duty to consider what they have done, and, if we find them to have acted wrongly or injuriously to our cause, to disavow and condemn them; or they acted to advance their own private interests, and then they are but common criminals,—worse than ever, for it is a profession of trade, and those who are thus engaged are to be considered as the most dangerous of all revolutionaries. We have a right to self-defense, and we have a right to protect our homes and our families, and our children, and our friends, and our neighbors, and our country.

L. W. R."

HOBOKEN, NEW JERSEY, APRIL 9, 1886.

Malthusianism.

It is with the greatest surprise that I see in "Lecturer," of March 26, E. C. Walker, whom we have long been in the habit of regarding as a first-rate Anarchist, one who had probably been the cause of the present unjust distribution of wealth, propose Malthusianism as a measure in any way calculated to relieve the distress of the laboring masses. Can Mr. Walker really be so ignorant of the "law of wages" that he does not see that the reduction in the number of the members of a family, the very moment it becomes general, can have no other result than a reduction of wages? Can we really be so stupid as to pretend that the advantage to men only as long as they are confined to a few?

Mr. Walker says, when, "the laboring masses shall have for their object the practical means of limit their offspring to two to each family, the great robberies of which our reformers complain will no longer be possible." I think that the verdict of history is against Mr. Walker. France has had small families for now nearly three generations, and the working-people are there no better off, no nearer to a solution of the social problem, than they are in any country in which large families prevail. D. L. W. M.

"The New York Times."—"In connection with the testimony of Charles H. Merriam, local United States attorney, in the trial of William H. Thomas, at the United States court on the charges of murder and assault with intent to murder, the witness George A. Smith, another Manufacturing engineer, was called to the stand by the defense. Mr. Smith testified that he was the foreman of the machine shop in the plant at the time Thomas was killed and that an accident happened to the machine which he was working. Mr. Smith stated that Thomas was injured and that he was taken to a hospital. He added that he had never worked with Thomas before the accident and that he had never had any trouble with him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never heard of Thomas before the accident and that he had never seen him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never worked with Thomas before the accident and that he had never had any trouble with him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never heard of Thomas before the accident and that he had never seen him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never worked with Thomas before the accident and that he had never had any trouble with him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never heard of Thomas before the accident and that he had never seen him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never worked with Thomas before the accident and that he had never had any trouble with him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never heard of Thomas before the accident and that he had never seen him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never worked with Thomas before the accident and that he had never had any trouble with him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never heard of Thomas before the accident and that he had never seen him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never worked with Thomas before the accident and that he had never had any trouble with him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never heard of Thomas before the accident and that he had never seen him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never worked with Thomas before the accident and that he had never had any trouble with him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never heard of Thomas before the accident and that he had never seen him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never worked with Thomas before the accident and that he had never had any trouble with him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never heard of Thomas before the accident and that he had never seen him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never worked with Thomas before the accident and that he had never had any trouble with him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never heard of Thomas before the accident and that he had never seen him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never worked with Thomas before the accident and that he had never had any trouble with him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never heard of Thomas before the accident and that he had never seen him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never worked with Thomas before the accident and that he had never had any trouble with him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never heard of Thomas before the accident and that he had never seen him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never worked with Thomas before the accident and that he had never had any trouble with him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never heard of Thomas before the accident and that he had never seen him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never worked with Thomas before the accident and that he had never had any trouble with him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never heard of Thomas before the accident and that he had never seen him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never worked with Thomas before the accident and that he had never had any trouble with him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never heard of Thomas before the accident and that he had never seen him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never worked with Thomas before the accident and that he had never had any trouble with him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never heard of Thomas before the accident and that he had never seen him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never worked with Thomas before the accident and that he had never had any trouble with him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never heard of Thomas before the accident and that he had never seen him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never worked with Thomas before the accident and that he had never had any trouble with him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never heard of Thomas before the accident and that he had never seen him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never worked with Thomas before the accident and that he had never had any trouble with him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never heard of Thomas before the accident and that he had never seen him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never worked with Thomas before the accident and that he had never had any trouble with him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never heard of Thomas before the accident and that he had never seen him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never worked with Thomas before the accident and that he had never had any trouble with him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never heard of Thomas before the accident and that he had never seen him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never worked with Thomas before the accident and that he had never had any trouble with him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never heard of Thomas before the accident and that he had never seen him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never worked with Thomas before the accident and that he had never had any trouble with him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never heard of Thomas before the accident and that he had never seen him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never worked with Thomas before the accident and that he had never had any trouble with him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never heard of Thomas before the accident and that he had never seen him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never worked with Thomas before the accident and that he had never had any trouble with him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never heard of Thomas before the accident and that he had never seen him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never worked with Thomas before the accident and that he had never had any trouble with him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never heard of Thomas before the accident and that he had never seen him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never worked with Thomas before the accident and that he had never had any trouble with him before. Mr. Smith said that he had never heard of Thomas before the accident and that he had never see
IRELAND!

BY GEORGES SAUTON.

Translated from the French for Liberty by Sarah E. Holmes.

Continued from No. 76.

Today, the patient was sitting up, converseable, but trembling, feebly, feebly, his wounds barely closed; hence, as the young girl who had just begged of him, they felt the necessity of restraining themselves.

So they gave everyone a秩序 to be quite indifferent to the bill-posting by the soldiers, who had first thought of the church for that purpose. Under the arch there seemed to be the proper place for the placard, but the cemetery presented a more effective, and secret, and secret, and secret, and secret, they knew that to the United Irishmen the priest virtually closed the house of God.

Nevertheless, in spite of themselves, in spite of their appearance of absolute indifference, they adopted systematic plans which they imagined shut up in the profoundest secrets of their discretion, as in a tomb heavily sealed.

At intervals, regularly, their looks converged on Arklow’s hut, and, quickly as the wind, the long, black, thick, and silent, or, tom lichfield, surprised them, and instantly suspected that here was the retreat of the agitator.

From Gowen, who had become furious as soon as he heard he had been fired, and, who had to the glibet to take away his prisoner, the spy had learned the story of his discomfiture, and he did not doubt that the "bird"—to use the word of his choice—had not flown far, but had lodged somewhere in the vicinity; using his business as a pretext, to thrust him into the only restaurant.

They had not resisted him everywhere; but Arklow’s door, relentlessly closed, had awakened his ardor; now, he did not doubt that his man was there.

What confirmed him still more in his opinion was the fright of everyone when the soldiers, charged with the posting of the everlasting placard, stopped before the threshold of the old sailors.

Suddenly, a deadly silence reigned, in which nothing was heard except the measured and tenuious tread of the squad marching hither and thither in the vicinity.

And no one breathed till after the departure of the bill-posters. Tom lichfield, applying his fore-finger to the rubicund side of his hollow nose, reflected on the way he could adopt appropriate though secret means, to discover their secret.

But his preoccupation, his absorption, put a fea in the ears of the Bundybians, especially Paddy’s.

The placard glanced more dextrously than the others at Arklow’s door, his pupils sparkled with such an intense fire that they excited attention. Then he talked to himself, debated with himself, approved himself, criticised himself, now rubbing his hands contentedly, now snapping his fingers in spite.

"Business is not good, then?" asked Paddy Neill, suddenly; "or are you considering the plan of an operation which presents difficulties?"

"Tom lichfield, I spoke myself frankly, or was he setting him at defiance? With his devil of a face, it was impossible to be sure.

And the other comrades who had drawn near with the mutilated man, and surrounded them, were equally of that opinion.

Nevertheless, he was not long in comprehending that the bustling Irishman looked to the place of the gun for the capital of the enterprise.

As lichfield, in the centre of this bullwark of men, which cut off the view of the precious hut, threw stealthy and anxious glances in that direction, Paddy interposed.

"You have, then, no spectators?"

"Pardon me; all sorts and excellent ones," responded he, mechanically, but still master of himself, and motive of his thumbs, "now, we have no one, and our conscience is clear.

"In that case, why don’t you put some on?" said Paddy. "You seem to be looking for something that escapes you."

"Tom lichfield, a fit of conghing, but he would not be put out of countenance by such a small matter, and answered;

"Certainly, I am looking for customers. I have hardly made a sale for a week."

"And you will not make another this day?"

"No, no," denied Paddy, at each object enumerated.

"Religious books!" confirmed the merchant.

"For each."

"Oh! you joker!" exclaimed Tom, giving the flayed man a dig in the stomach.

And, laughing with everybody, and putting on a juridal expression, he repeated his words.

"You joker! you joker!" said he; but he could think of nothing more to say, and his mien which had been glowing, and which was just awaked, and resumed again, finding the reward of his good fortune, of his intelligence, of his courage, of his talents, in honors, flattering distinctions, high places among his associates, and, perhaps, why not—the supreme magnificence of his ally, the patrimony of nobility confessed by the sovereign in reward for his distinguished and important services.

The banquet of Bunclody had its festal pretensions, what prerogatives would result from this elevation? And all this flattering prospect to vanish in death, under the blows of mad-men! He served himself up, conquered his weak- ness, ate from his tricks, and drank from the bottle of his extraordinary skill, such as King George did not drink at his gala dinners, and which he, Tom lichfield, reserved for his personal use.

The next morning, by careful survey, that the suspicious ears and eyes of the soldiers had disappeared, exhibiting his Philadelphian papers, his credentials from societies with sympathy with the miseries of the natives of the savages, he represented himself as hostel, even more so than themselves, to the tyrants. Ah! the vows that he framed for deliverance, for the extermination of the tyrants! Into the arms of these meditations, he did not fear to be destroyed! there must not be a single set foot again in England. Food for thought: all those who should escape massacre; any trap, any treachery, with regard to these men—should be identifiable, and identifiable.

But his insatiable eloquence, his pernicious violence, were all spent in vain; they sounded so false, and, besides, Arklow himself had enlightened Paddy in regard to the merchant.

To be continued.

THE WIFE OF NUMBER 4,237.

BY SOPHIE KROPOTKINE.

Translated from the French for Liberty by Sarah E. Holmes.

Continued from No. 72.

A cousin of Jean—he had no other relatives—persuaded Julie to leave the village for the city, where she could find occupation. She learned the trade of winder, and was soon working by the side of her cousin.

The consumption of the young girl had been a merciful punishment.

"You will not forget me during my absence?" said the young man. "You will wait for me? It is happily only a year; it will not be long. Be patient a little longer, and I will return to you as soon as I return; I will take care of you, my beauty; you will rest from all that you have suffered."

"Can you doubt it?" answered Julie. "Never, no, never, can anyone take your place in my heart."

"Take care, Julie. If you should love another, you know that I would be capable of anything: of killing you, of you, and of putting an end to my own life."

Why do you say that, Jean, dear? You do not know me. Go, since it must be, and return as quickly as possible. Your Julie will wait for you. But you, take care that, with your hot head, no misfortune comes to you: I could not survive your insatiable eloquence.

The young people passed the whole day together in this way, driving away the anxieties of the separation by dreams of happiness after the return. The evening found Julie in little stiffing work shop, under the superintendence of a bigoted old woman; the poverty that is inevitable on wages of forty sous a day; the revolting advances of the employer’s son,—one must hear everything to avoid being put out on the street. But she had the sweet words of her mother and Jean’s letters, which the atmosphere of the barracks had not been able to soil with its fetid breath.

At last, the year had passed. Jean had returned, and a life of peaceful happiness began for the three. Julie worked more in the shop; Jean, who made a good living, demanded that she should rest a little and care for her mother. This lasted some months, a year of happiness.

All the little details of these months that had passed so happily, sprang up again in Julie’s memory. They were so happy, and everything had been so brutally shattered.

She shuddered at the recollection of the evening when they came to tell her that he had been arrested; during police station: that, quarrelling with an overseer, he had almost killed him with a knife.

"Jean, Jean, why did you do this?" murmured Julie. "How happy we might have been without this!"

And immediately the image of her cousin rose before her, a child on her hands, the child of this overseer, a rascal who had abandoned her after having seduced her—oh, that Julie hastened it!”

"No, no, forgive me for having dared to make you, even in my thought, this reproach. Alone in the world, without relatives, were you not bound to take her part?"

And she sees the court-room: an indifferent public, comes to seek impressions and something to gossip about; her cousin, pale and trembling in a corner of the witness bench; her husband between two policemen. Before him, the judges, somnolent, fair-spoken, tranquil; an attorney-general, choleric, furious at having obtained only six years’ confinement for child-murderers of eighteen years, who had just been tried before the same court.

Her husband’s voice, tranquil, assured, a little tired, still resounded in her ears. She had done as many as sixty at the same time, and the husband of this mistress, that he had done what he ought to do? An advocate would have talked an hour; he confined himself to relating what this overseer was, what his cousin had suffered.

Jean’s passion for mankind, and the solidarity of the working-classes, he insisted on the need of reacting, of treating the turbulent rigorously; he dwelt especially on the resistance Jean had made at the moment of his arrest, and he begged him five years’ imprisonment.

Jean was condemned to three years in prison.

The old mother could not endure this sorrow; she carried her to the cemetery, and the last time that the news bounded a row, the bower that was her lifelong companion, covered with the summit of the hills. The silent night enveloped the prison and the hamlet. A thick mist, heavy and somber, was descending over the valley and covering it with a veil, effacing the sharp lines of the buildings. Julie did not feel it penetrate her clothes, her flesh, her bones; she did not have the fatigue of the prison. For the first time, with her head bent forward on her arm, she slept, still leaning against the window open to the cold night breeze.

III.

At five o’clock Julie was up; at seven o’clock she was already ringing at the grated door of the prison.
A LETTER TO GROVER CLEVELAND, or
His False, Absurd, Self-Contradictory, and Ridiculous Inaugural Address.

By LYSDAVER SPONNER.

The author reserves his copyright in this letter.}

XXIV

John Marshall has the reputation of having been the greatest jurist the country has produced. I think it is curiously fallacious to call a great jurist one of the fundamental propositions, on which all his legal, political, and constitutional ideas were based, had been true.

The first thing, first, that government has all power; and, secondly, that the people have no rights.

Two these propositions were, in him, cardinal principles, from which, I think, he never wavered.

For these reasons he was the oracle of all the rapacious classes, in whose interest the government was administered. And from them he got all his fame. To prevent a moral and civil body, which he ever vindicated men's natural rights, in opposition to the arbitrary legislation of congress. He was chief justice thirty-four years: from 1801 to 1835. In all that time, so far as I have known, he never declared a single act of congress unconstitutional; and probably never would have done so, if he had lived to this time.

And, so far as I know, he never declared a single State law unconstitutional, on account of its injustice, or its violation of men's natural rights; but only on account of its conflict with the constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States.

He was considered very profound on questions of sovereignty. In fact, he never said much in regard to anything else. He held that, in this country, "sovereignty" was divided: that the national government was "sovereign" over certain things, and the state governments over all other things. He had apparently never heard of any natural, individual, human rights, that had never been delegated to either the general or State governments.

As a practical matter, it was an almost infallible rule, that the national government had "sovereignty" enough to destroy as many of the natural rights of the people as it should please to destroy; and that the State governments had "sovereignty" enough to destroy what he left, if it could be destroyed. He evidently considered that, to the national government, had been delegated the part of the lion, with the right to devour as much of his prey as his appetite should crave; and that the State governments had been delegated the part of the jackal, with power to devour what the lion should leave.

In his efforts to establish the absolutism of our governments, he made himself an adept in the use of all those false definitions, and false assumptions, to which courts are driven, who hold that constitutions and all men's books are superseded by all natural principles of justice, and over all the natural rights of mankind.

Here is his definition of law. He professes to have borrowed it from some one,—he does not know whom,—but he accepts it as his own.

Law has been defined by a writer, whose definitions especially have been the theme of almost universal panegyric,—"To be a rule of civil conduct prescribed by the supreme power for the presiding, or directing, the community according to the rules of its own legislation, where its action is not restrained by the constitutions of the United States.—Osgood vs. Spence."

This definition is an utterly false one. It denies all the natural rights of the people; and is resorted to only by usurpers and tyrants, to justify their crimes.

The common law, in the United States, is a most supine one and unessential one, existing only to the extent of the law of nations; and not anything that man ever made, or can make, or unmake, or alter. Thus we speak of the laws of matter, and the laws of mind; of the law of gravitation, the laws of light, heat and electricity, the laws of chemistry, botany; of physiological laws, of astronomical and atmospheric laws, etc., etc.

All these are natural laws, that man never made, nor can ever unmake, or alter. They exist, however, and the common law is not only an absolutely void law, but an evil one, for it is without any rule of law, and without anything that man ever made, can or may, can make, or unmake, or alter. Thus we speak of the laws of matter, and the laws of mind; of the law of gravitation, the laws of light, heat and electricity, the laws of chemistry, botany; of physiological laws, of astronomical and atmospheric laws, etc., etc.

Yet Marshall holds that this natural law of justice is no law at all, in comparison with some with such a rule of civil conduct prescribed by [what he calls] the supreme power in a State.

And he gives this miserable definition, which he picked up somewhere—out of the legal filth in which he wallowed—as his sufficient authority for striking down all the natural obligation of all men's books are superseded by all natural laws of the universe, and set up their own will in its stead, as it would be to talk of their having the power to abolish the law of gravitation, or any of the other natural laws of the universe, and set up their own will in the place of them.

But what is the director returned?" was her first question, as soon as the porter appeared behind the grating with his bundle of keys.

Yes, he had returned. But he would not be there before eight o'clock,—the porter replied to the question he could not contract.

Julie begged him to let her enter, to wait at the clerk's office. Dreading of lose this single minute, she wished to see the director as soon as he arrived. and she resumed her place on the bench, mutting witness of so much suffering. All expectation, she was ready to spring up each time that she heard a door open.

Nine o'clock, ten—at last it was ten. This could not be the director. It must be gone so directly to the pretorium. Guards came and went, exchanged words in a slang peculiar to their calling, of which Julie could comprehend nothing. She still waited, each moment keeping her off that case...

Such at such a law should suit the purposes of men like Marshall, who believes that governments should have all power, and men no rights, accounts for nothing. If he can assume that all men's natural rights to trade with each other, and as lawmakers have seen it fit to allow them—since the State and United governments were established,—or at least for the last eighty years.

The right of [government] to regulate contracts, to prescribe the rules by which they may be evidenced, to prohibit such as may be deemed mischiefous, is unquestionable, and has been exercised by them.

He here asserts that "the supreme power in a State"—that is, the legislature of a State—has "the right to "determine mischiefous" to allow men to exercise their natural right to make their own contracts! Contracts that have a natural obligation, and are not enacted by a State, are natural, and are not criminal. Contracts that are naturally obligatory, "its right to prohibit them is unquestionable." In this his equivocation is to say that governments have all power, and the people no rights.

On the same principle, and under the same definition of law, the lawmakers of a State, of course, hold that they can prevent all of their other natural rights, as well as their right to make their own contracts; and may therefore prohibit the exercise of any, or all, of them.

It is no equivocation to say that governments have all power, and the people no rights.

If a government can forbid the free exercise of a single one of men's natural rights, it can give the same to them; and, thus establish, practically and absolutely, Marshall's principles, that the government has all power, and the people no rights.

In the same case, of Ogden v. Saunders, Marshall's principle was agreed to by all the other justices, and all the lawyers!

Thus Thompson, one of the justices, said that within the hands of the State legislature to declare expiratoryly, no one should be made responsible, upon contracts entered into before arriving at the age of twenty-five years. This, I presume, cannot be declared.—p. 300.

On the other principle, he says: "The private parties, holding all sorts of contracts, may declare that no person, under fifty, or seventy, or a hundred, years of age, shall exercise his natural right of making any contract that is naturally obligatory.

If the positive law (that is, the statute law of the State) declares the contract shall have no obligation, it can have no obligation, whatever may be the principles of natural law in regard to the contract. It is a contract, and is binding upon the parties, in the sense in which that phrase is used, as independent nations. The power of controlling, modifying, and even taking away, all obligations from the natural principles of society, as they, independently of the laws, would have been obligatory, has been exercised by all independent sovereigns.—p. 320.

Yes; and why has this power been exercised by all States and nations, and all independent sovereigns? Solely because these governments have all—or at least the most of what they have—of the power of controlling, modifying, and even taking away, all obligations from the natural principles of society, as they, independently of the laws, would have been obligatory, has been exercised by all independent sovereigns.

Thus it seems that Trimble, like all the rest of them, got his constitutional law, not because the natural principles of society, as they, independently of the laws, would have been obligatory, has been exercised by all independent sovereigns.

On the other hand, Marshall's principle is no less palpable. The natural, and the constitution of the United States, nor even from any constitution affirming any rights, but from the independence of the States, which has been held and maintained by all [those] States and nations, and all [those] independent sovereigns, who have usurped all power, and denied all the natural rights of mankind.

Marshall is another of his false definitions, which are among of them; and thus establishes, in the whole court, in regard to the power of congress to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, he asserts the right of congress to an arbitrament over all men's natural rights to carry on such commerce.

Thus says he:

What is this power? It is the power to regulate: that is, to prescribe the rule by which a thing is to be done, in its continuance, or within its duration. A single power in itself, may be exercised to its utmost extent, and acknowledges no limitations, other than are imposed by the power of the laws. But the limitations which arise in this case, or which have been discussed at the bar. If, as has always been understood, the sovereignty of congress, though limited to specific objects, is plenary in its extent,—the power of creating and extinguishing wars, and among the several States, is vested in congress as absolutely as it would be in a single government, having in its hands whatever authority, which has been held and maintained by all [those] States and nations, and all [those] independent sovereigns, who have usurped all power, and denied all the natural rights of mankind.

Therefore he says, among other things, that congress has power to pass all commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, with whatever restraint whatsoever upon congress, in the exercise of their lawful powers.

This is a general declaration of absolutism over all "commerce with foreign nations and among the several States," with certain exceptions mentioned in the constitution; such as "all duties, imposts, and excise shall be uniform throughout the United States," and "no preference shall be given by any regulation of commerce or revenue, to the ports of one State over those of another; nor shall vessels bound to, or from the coast of the United States, be obliged to touch at any particular place...." According to this opinion of the court, congress has—subject to the exceptions referred to—absolute, irresistible dominion over all commerce with foreign nations and among the several States; and "no preference shall be given, by any regulation of commerce or revenue, to the ports of one State over those of another; nor shall vessels bound to, or from the coast of the United States, be obliged to touch at any particular place...."

They say that among "all the other [practically unlimited] powers, vested in congress," is the power of "declaiming war," and, of course, of carrying on war; and they hold that congress has power to carry on war, for any reason, to any extent, and against any people, it pleases.

Thus they say, virtually, that the natural rights of mankind impose no constitutional limitations on congress, in the exercise of its powers, so far as they relate to foreign nations and subjects with which they trade, as well as with the several States...

In this case, if congress shall have power to override all commerce with foreign nations, and...
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"A free man is one who enjoys the use of his reason and his faculties; who is neither blinded by passion, nor hoodwinked or driven by oppression, nor deceived by erroneous opinions."—PROCTER.

Time Will Tell.

To the fearful charges of crime made in the last issue of Liberty against the "Communistic Anarchists" of New York and vicinity John Most makes answer in "Freiheit." After exhausting his choicest vocabulary of epithets upon myself and parties whom he supposes to be behind me, he says that the press have ignored the charges as facile; that I could not know such a publication as I had done, that I was biased in Boston; that the two Bohemian referred to by me did not belong to the Bohemian group; that Schwab left the "Freiheit," not to separate himself from crime, but out of cowardice and fear of the police; that he (Most) was never informed that such crimes had been perpetrated. His best effort is to throw it all upon me, to deny he had done anything about it, because he never meddled with private matters that do not concern the party; and that he had not had criminals for lieutenants. I do not see why he did not add one more to this catalogue of lies by saying either that the crimes alleged by me were never committed, or that they were not committed by members of the organizations which I mentioned. Perhaps he was deterred from this by the memory that he has admitted in the presence of a dozen persons the perpetration of specific crimes, and has attempted to apologize for or excuse the guilty parties.

I do not propose to bandy words with John Most. It has never been my intention to try these charges, or prove them, in these columns. Sooner or later they will be done elsewhere. But I have nothing to retract. On the contrary, I reiterate all my charges, as emphatically as before, and declare that I keep far inside of the horrible truth. Those who know me know that I would not make such charges lightly. I came into possession of them before the use of Labor literature. I have never used them. I have not committed any crimes or criminal. The poor fools who choose to attribute my course to jealousy, envy, revenge, or any other petty motive whatsoever, may wag their tongues as they will; I wait for Time to do justice to the firebugs, to their friends, John Most, and to their enemies, myself. And I shall not wait in vain.

BENJ. R. TUCKER.

Anarchism and Expediency.

The late lectures of Dr. Gertrude B. Kelly in New Era Hall in this city was a phenomenal treat, such as has rarely gladdened those who were fortunate enough to hear her. Whether the subtlety of the young lady's intellect or her personal loveliness be the more captivating it would be difficult to say. That her effort was a magnificent one need not be repeated to any of her facetious followers.

But since no human judgment is final, and "truth is a gem that fears no light," I wish to register a few points touching her subject, "Anarchism and Expediency." I confess to being far looser in my notions about this topic than people organized so severely on the plumb-line principle as Miss Kelly and Brother Tucker; and, lest I should gradually drift into a laxity that might imperil my mental integrity and moral soundness, wish to set myself right, or else be set right.

Miss Kelly argued that the eight-hour movement was no final settlement of the labor question,—in fact, no settlement at all. She was right. She further argued that the Knights of Labor were organized on essentially the same evil basis of force of which they complained in capital, and that their main drift was squarely against liberty. She was right.

Again she showed that cooperation organized upon a concession and utilization of the present prerogatives of capital is only an enlargement and popularization of the very curse that enslaves labor. She was right.

So the fair speaker went through a lengthy program of social remedies now being put forth to heal that great wound in the world's industrial flesh, and with masterly power showed that they were all quack remedies. She was right.

Well, then, what? What's to be done? What is my business as an Anarchist? Miss Kelly and Brother Tucker to keep it in its natural disarray from those movements and to discourage and denounce them with the keenest and most merciless weapons of argument and satire. I say it is my business as an anti-bigot and broad, rounded philanthropist to affiliate with them all, and let me now—to speak upon their platforms,—write for them,—work for them,—love them. If this be expediency, then make the most of it! I had rather err on a broad-gauge love of all who struggle for liberty than be a logical Pharisee.

Miss Kelly and Brother Tucker keep their eyes open, and having done more to open the eyes of her countrymen through my "Honorous" letters in the "Irish World" than any other man in this country. Yet all the time that I was writing those letters I was an Anarchist, and knew that the writer of them was an American, and I could not help pitying the poor creatures who were led to pitch popes, priests, and statesmen down the back stairs. Had I said so, Patrick Ford would have pitched me down the back stairs upon the first attempt at displacing the true remedy. But instead of this I "compromised," by quietly faking out whatever I could find in dislike of Americanism in the Irish movement, calling that which was done by it by some other name than Anarchism, and by a dexterous handling of my readers gradually working the choice material among them up to a point where all they needed was simply the finishing label,—Anarchism. Hence the Irish movement, the Irish republicans, the Irish supporters of Liberty whom I thus served up upon the expediency plan. The loveliest, the brightest, and the most promising of them all is Gertrude B. Kelly. But for my expediency tactics she would not have been at New Era Hall on Sunday, March 28, to prove that the method that she saved her for liberty is false, pernicious, and dishonest.

On that occasion Mr. McKenize, with far-seeing sagacity, pointed out that there is a very strong nucleus of Americanism and expediency in the Irish movement. There is indeed far more of the Anarchist method in the Knights of Labor than was afforded "Honorous" as a basis for making an Anarchist of Miss Kelly. Shall "X" of Liberty retrieve "Honorous" of the "Irish World" by denouncing the Knights of Labor, or shall he get upon their platforms, win the hearts of poor children of toil and sorrow who are not gifted with so much brains as Miss Kelly and Brother Tucker through kindly words, emphasize the Anarchistic points where they will belong, and save more precious souls like theirs to Anarchism?

I never can forget the sublime response ascribed to Thomas Paine, whose rugged soul crowned the bombastic toast: "Where liberty is, there is my country!" I would have added, "Where conversion is not, there is no country!" So, in humble imitation of that great man, I say: Where Anarchism is not, there is not my place. I hate this I-am-brainer-than-thou spirit. It would have told Christ to have stood up to the Pharisees. It would have said to Socrates to have kept out of the elms. It tells me to keep out of the eight-hour meetings, off of the Knights of Labor platforms, and to turn my back upon Miss Kelly's poor ignorant countrymen because their methods are not up to the level of her and Brother Tucker's, and have not the slight of human misery, and of ignorance which should be met with love and charity, rather than the haughty, relentless, big heads of ice, stuck up on despotic poles. I had rather my heart would warm the brain into insobriquet than that the brain should freeze the heart and make it a bigon.

Possibly Brother Tucker has yet to learn that compromise is a true scientific principle under Anarchism. He further argued that Anarchism is a lie, because the latter is not always the faithful. I have never found a final settlement of any problem yet, save that of my own ignorance: therefore do I rise for prayer, and ask Sister Kelly and Brother Tucker to keep me from going astray.

Plumb-Line or Cork-Screw, Which?

I have no wish to discuss the personality of the writer of the foregoing article; in fact, I am decidedly unimportant. But I confess to the proposition taken by me upon a question of ethics and policy, and so interweaves his personality therewith that I cannot escape its discussion except by that silence which he almost insists that I shall not persist in, and which, therefore, I must not persist in, discrediting. In conclusion, then, he must take the responsibility of its results. If he finds that it involves the saying of things to him unpleasant, harsh, and severe, the blame will rest with him for forcing me, his friend, to speak of him in public with that frankness of characterization which neither he nor I have ever hesitated to employ when addressing each other in private. He champions the policy of compromise which I assail, and offers in defense thereof nothing except the feeble and confused jargon of the "Americanism" school. Therefore I am obliged to examine that personal career and those results, to see what they are and what they might have been. And in view of this necessary personal examination, I shall disregard the pseudo-"X" and "Y" characterizations of my direct, plumb-line fashion, with Henry Appleton.

Mr. Appleton's chief claim appears to be that his expediency tactics in the "Irish World" he succeeded in making a great many Irish Anarchists. Against this assertion I put the table of honest Americanism in Liberty, which has always—until very lately, at any rate—been of the uncompromising order, though addressing a constituency only one-fifth as large as the "Irish World's," has helped to make at least twenty times as many Anarchists as have been "rolled up" by any Irish republican in the last sixty years.

My position is as susceptible of proof as his, and if it be true, it is true to presume that, if all the work of his life had been of a similarly uncompromising character, it would have had similarly important results.

And after all how many staunch Irish Anarchists, with a deep-rooted comprehension of Anarchism, did the "Honorous" letters ever make? I doubt if Mr. Appleton could name over half a dozen. But whether half a dozen or a dozen or more, how many of the "Honorous" letters ever made converts rather than in spite of them? Not one, in my judgment. Certainly not Gertrude Kelly, or any person of her type. She was never wheedled or cajoled into an acceptance of Anarchism by the instinating methods which Mr. Appleton describes so poorly. She became an Anarchist principally because she had brains in her head and was bound to become one in very short order. She very likely found the seed-thought in some of the many flat-footed Anarchist "Honorous" letters; but, if she had not found it there, she would have found it elsewhere, and, "Honorous" or no "Honorous," she would by this time have been in New Era Hall or somewhere else spreading the light thus acquired. No! She spread it in the plumb-line fashion of expediency. Nor can those of the few other brainy people to whom the "Honorous" letters gave a start and who have landed on solid Anarchistic ground.

It is undoubtedly true that these letters, by their anemic, scanty, insipid grace, and often by the guise of an anecdote, by his habit of connecting his thought with daily life, and by his faculty of concretely presenting abstract ideas, did greatly charm and captivate a multitude of readers; and it is not unlikely that over many of them any other than expediency tactics would have made it impossible to exercise this charm. But these people were simply charmed; they never got any ade-

quate idea of the meaning of liberty from the letters and were incapable of getting any. Their mental calibers may be estimated by the fact of which Miss Kelly assums to be true that the most intelligent of
them, who were loud in their praise of the "Honors" letters, as loudly denounced Mr. Appleton's unqualified editorial expression of his own non-attachment to, and non-condemnation of, the"letters being written by me. Upon such minds as these plausible reasoning has no effect, and the only effect that cork-screw instination has upon them is to insert itself in the yielding fibre called their brains, and, when the attempt is made to exercise the supposed grip, that the fibre simply tears away, and that the convert is not converted at all.

Again, in asporting the credit for whatever Irish Anarchists have been made, it must not be forgotten that as they were must be upon the non-interference with the clause, the attempt is made to exercise what they do to be a "man who is no compromiser, who abides by the "Anarchist" dogma, and to the chagrin of those who have always been free from all of these matters, to me, is absolutely the same as to pay the "toilet of the Pharisists, then let him be a man, as Jesus was, and say so; let him leave them, as Jesus did, and no longer pretend to be one of them; and as he goes, let him leave those parting words ringing in their ears: "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?"—To be his as uncompromising as Jesus. Jesus did not dodge about from Pharisees to publican and from publican back to Pharisees. He did not champion the one today and coquet with the other tomorrow. He took his stand definitely with the one and against the other, and there was never any doubt about his attitude.

If, on second thought, Mr. Appleton finds these standards selected by himself—Paine, Socrates, Jesus—too high for him, I will then simply ask him to return to the standards which he selected for his recent "New Haven speech." He can read it in another column, as reported by Comrade Yarros. Perhaps a "little reflection" will suffice to once more "make it clear" to him that "all those who ignore "first principles" and engage in "practical" or "meaning by it temporary relief, compromises, etc.—are in reality wasting time and labor, and are engaged in a most ridiculous and fruitless work." That is near enough to the plumb-line to suit me.

Apart from the unpleasant task which it has imposed upon me, there is cause for rejoicing in the fact that Mr. Appleton has been forced into an apologetic attitude. Even if Miss Kelly's Boston lecture had done no other good, she might still find ample cause for self-congratulation in having so skilfully cut the coat of compromise that Mr. Appleton cannot help seeing that it fits him, has put it on, and is now trying as hard as he can to find some ground for feeling a pride in his garment. When she has further shown that there are two sides of the question, in one of which, at least, that this coat cannot be worn by upright human beings and only fits him because of his deformity, it is to be hoped that he will try even harder to wriggle himself out of his cork-screw shape and become a plumb-line Anarchist.

Max's Mirror.

Mr. Joseph Pulitzer, having drawn a salary from the government for violations of law and common honesty, thinks to stop the mouth of the press by giving the money to a hospital for the benefit of newspaper men. He has got a great deal of advertising out of this little scheme of quack genre, where he leads you in full of platit deer and tall tales. As a congressmen, Hon. J. Pulitzer is a quack. As a journalist, Editor J. Pulitzer is a greater quack, and he runs the biggest quack newspaper printed on the crust of this planet. The New York "World" is the ultimate expression of quackery in human affairs. It is the very flower of this age of humbug and charlatanism. I hope its figures of circulation—probably lying as high as six millions, and upon its journalistic pets by the newspaper quacklets of the back districts.

PARING OLIMPS.

The red men "must give up their superstitions," says Gen. J. D. C. Atkins, commissioner of Indian affairs, in his annual report to the secretary of the interior. He says they must exchange their superstitions for the white man's and worship only government. The Vanderbittes seem to understand their attitude toward mankind.—Mayor Powell of Newport strictly enforced a new street law, and the police were fined for first time in half a century. Prayers before grub.—The "Republib" says: "Ireland never did, and never will, object to paying fair rents." Then she never will be free.—Boston "Globe": "As the United States is governed directly and wholly by the people, having no state or national save that of heart and no nobility but brains." Davemob.—Seventeen hundred lawyers in Philadelphia. Hundreds of them, Judge says, don't earn fees enough to pay car fare. Must get living honestly, then.—French mine manager trampled to death. Man trampled to death. Man.
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among the several States," solely on the strength of a false definition of the verb "to regulate," the power to regulate commerce is the "power to prescribe the rule by which commerce is to be governed."

This definition is an utterly false, absurd, and atrocious one. It would give Congress power absolutely to regulate commerce, to prescribe the rule by which commerce is to be governed.

The verb "to regulate" does not, as Marshall asserts, imply the exercise of any arbitrary control whatever over the thing regulated; nor any power to "prescribe [arbitrarily] the rule which is to govern or control commerce." The Latin word, regulat, a rule; and implies the pre-existence of a rule, to which the thing regulated is to be subject. L'Académie Française rules that "le règlement" is used only when it is made to conform to, or mark truly, the dissimilar revolutions of the same thing. These definitions of the English constitute the pre-existing rule, by which alone a rule can be regulated.

Among the States, one of the most absurd, is to be found in the phrase "transactions of the States," at the will of an operator, without reference to the north pole. But it is regulated when it is freed from all disturbing influences, and suffered to point constantly to the north, as it is its nature to do.

A locomotive is not "regulated," when it is made to go, to stop, to go backwards, to go sideways, when the road is what it is to be; but is "regulated," only when it is made to conform to, or mark truly, the dissimilar revolutions of the same thing. These definitions of the English constitute the pre-existing rule, by which alone a rule can be regulated.

When all commerce is in its nature, and is regulated, as is its nature to do.

This false definition of the verb "to regulate" has been used, torn out of mind, by several courts, and tends to mislead those engaged in commerce, and to mislead the judges of the courts, in their right to do their own businesses in all such ways — that are naturally and intrinsically just and lawful, furnishes the pre-existing rule, by which alone commerce can be regulated. It is the only rule, to which every congress has some constitutionally, and must be used to regulate commerce.

When all commerce, that is intrinsically just and lawful, is secured and protected, and all commerce, that is intrinsically unjust and unlawful, is prohibited, this commerce is regulated, and not before.

This false definition of the verb "to regulate," has always been used, torn out of mind, by several courts, and has been applied by them to natural and intrinsically just and lawful commerce, furnishes the pre-existing rule, by which alone commerce can be regulated. It is the only rule, to which every congress has some constitutionally, and must be used to regulate commerce.

The assumption that, by a certain paper, called the constitution of the United States, all the people are to be governed, and nobody else, is utterly false. Few persons ever read, and which the great body of the people never saw — and all the some forty subsidiary papers, called State constitutions, which also nobody ever reads, and which the great body of the people never saw, — all making a perfect system of the merest nothingness — that is, the organisation of the Constitution. The only thing there is, that is theirs, and which they have over into the irresponsible custody of some forty little cabals of blockheads and villains called lawmakers — blockheads, who imagine themselves wiser than justice itself, and who, care nothing for either wisdom or justice, but only for gratification of their avarice and ambitions; and that these cabals be invested with the right to dispose of the property, liberty, and lives of all the rest of the people, at their pleasure or discretion; or, as Marshall says, "their wisdom and discretion!"

If such an assumption as that does not embrace nearly, or quite, all the other false assumptions that tyrants and tyrants can ever dream of, to justify themselves in robbing, enslaving, and murdering all the rest of mankind, it is less comprehensible than it appears to me to be.

The following paragraph may be found another batch of Marshall's false assumptions.

The right to contract is the attribute of a free agent, and he may rightfully coerce performance of contracts and require obedience to the obligations into which he has voluntarily surrendered. Society prohibits the use of private individual coercion, and gives its own coercion, to make the right to contract safe and certain, and to prevent the surrender with the right to coercive performance. — Ogden vs. Saunders, 12 Wheaton 350.

In this extract, taken in connection with the rest of his opinion in the same case, Marshall convicts himself of the grossest falsehood. He means that the people have "an intrinsic obligation"; that they have an "original and natural right" to coercive performance of contracts. And virtually asserts that this is not an "intrinsic obligation"; but that they have an "original and natural right" to coerced performance of contracts. And really means to say, that, in consideration of such surrender of their "original and natural right of coercion," "society" pledges itself to them that it will give them this "more safe and certain remedy"; that it will give them more safety and more certitude to their contracts than they can do themselves.

And yet, in the same opinion — only two and three pages preceding this extract — Marshall tells us that "it is absolutely essential to the safety and well being of the entire community, that he calls "society" — "to prohibit such contracts as may be deemed mischievous, is unquestionable." — p. 347.

An illustration of the exercise of this right of "society" to prohibit such contracts "as may be deemed mischievous," he cites the usury laws, thus:

The acts against usury declare the contract to be void in the beginning. They deny that they ever have any existence at all; and cannot impair that which never came into existence. — p. 365.

All this is as much as to say, that when a man has voluntarily "come into society," and has "surrendered" to society, all his "original and natural right of coercion" the fulfilling of his contracts, and when he has done this in the confidence that society will fulfill its pledge to "give him a more safe and more certain remedy" than he was capable of himself, "society" may then turn around to him, and say:

We acknowledge that you have a natural right to make your own contracts. We acknowledge that you have an "original and natural right" to coerce the fulfillment of them. We acknowledge that it was solely in consideration of our pledge to you, that we would give you a more safe and more certain coercion than you were capable of yourself; and we say to you: "Your right to coercive fulfillment of them. And we acknowledge that, according to our pledge we now say to you, that we gave you a human being. But after you had surrendered to us your own right of coercion, we took a different view of the pledges we had given you; and concluded that it would be "mischievous" to allow you to make such contracts. We therefore "prohibited" your making them. And having prohibited the making of such a contract, under our "unquestionable" right to make such a contract, we now say to you, that we possess a human being. And therefore, by your surrender, we are now able to take from you your ownright. And we say to you: "Your ownright, under our "unquestionable" right to make such contracts, we now say to you, that we possess a human being. And therefore, by your surrender, we are now able to take from you your ownright.

We therefore "prohibited" your making them. And after prohibiting the making of such a contract, under our "unquestionable" right to make such contracts, we now say to you, that we possess a human being. And therefore, by your surrender, we are now able to take from you your ownright. And we say to you: "Your ownright, under our "unquestionable" right to make such contracts, we now say to you, that we possess a human being. And therefore, by your surrender, we are now able to take from you your ownright.

What's to be Done?

A ROMANCE.

Translated by B. E. TUCKER.

Continued from page 76.

XXIII.

They live gayly and as friends, working and resting, enjoying life and looking forward to the future, if not without anxiety, at least with the firm assurance that...
LIBERTY.
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The farther we advance in life, the better it becomes. Thus they have spent the last two years. Towards the last end of winter Véra Pavlovna said to herself: "Will there be another cold day, so that we can have at least one more sleigh-party eaten down beside the fire? They went away yesterday, and the day after, and the thaw continued, and every day the chances for a sleigh-party diminished. But it came after they had lost all hope. There was a heavy fall of snow, by God! We are twenty, and when we are twenty there is always a snowfall, and the evening could not be more beautiful. "The sleigh-party! The sleigh-party!" In their haste they had not time to get many people together,—a small circle of friends, a group of them who were invited to be her guests that night. Two sled trains were laid on. In one they started and joked, and in the other all the proprieties were disregarded. Sorely they were out of the city before they began to sing at the top of their voices. What?

Véra Pavlovna began her story.

"Ah, ha, ha! That dear Julie! I like her very much. And she always says, amusing things, and behaves most improperly, the dear Julie!"

"Bravo, Véra Pavlovna! 'I will throw myself out of the window!" Bravo, gentlemen!" The lady in black began to applaud. At this command the young people lamented her in a defense of her name said "Bravo!" and "Hurrah!"

"What's the matter with you? What's the matter with you?" cried Katérina Vasílievna, in fright, two or three minutes later.

"Nothing's nothing: give me some water, do not be troubled." Mosolof is already bringing some.

"Thank you, Mosolof." She takes the glass, brought by the young companion who had withdrawn to the window.

"How have you taught him? He knows everything in advance. Now it has entirely crossed. Keep on, I pray you, I am listening.

"No, I am fatigued," said she, five minutes later, rising calmly from the divan. I must have a sleep hour or an hour and a half. See, I am going a sleep without ceremony. Go and find the old gentleman, Mosolof; let him prepare everything.

"Permit me, why should I not attend to it?" said Katérina Vasílievna.

"Permit me, why should I not attend to it?" said the lady in black, with a somewhat sarcastic smile. "For the first time.

"You abandon us?" said a young man, assuming a tragic posture; "if we had foreseen that, we would have brought some daggers with us. Now we have nothing with which to stab ourselves.

"They will bring something to eat, and then we can stab ourselves with the forks!" said another, in a tone of exaltation.

"No, I do not wish the hope of the country to be cut off in its flower," said the lady in black, with a smile of self-sufficiency; "console yourselves, my children. Mosolof, a cushion on the table! Mosolof placed a cushion on the table. The lady in black assumed a majestic pose near the table and let her hand slowly fall upon the cushion.

The young people kissed her hand, and Katérina Vasílievna escorted the tired lady.

"Poor woman!" said with one voice the three persons of the well-behaved party after they had gone out of the room.

To be continued.


The above heading appeared in the New York "Herald" in August 1886. It shows the depth of mental and moral depravity in which we exist, when such an announcement may appear in a leading paper in a leading city without exciting a single comment. A "lady is a person who does nothing for her living; who produces nothing; who would be highly insignificant, if any well-behaved lady ever engaged in any useful labor, that she had at any time contributed in the least to her own support; and yet she is enabled by this wondrous system under which we live to give a vacation to a "hard-working young woman." How long are the hard-working young women and the hard-working young men going to stand this state of things? Is it not enough to rob the fruits of one's labor, without adding to the labor, and making it palatable, without having insinuated a sense of obligation.

I wonder if Mr. Spencer does not see any "slavery," not "coming," but here, in the long vacations with high salaries that the men and women are forced to give the ladies and gentlemen.

The good work of the ladies still goes on, as we learn from the "Herald" of March 9 that the second annual meeting of the Association of Working Girls' Societies was to be held on May 23. Some three hundred representatives from New York, Brooklyn, and Hoboken were to be present; that the hall was to be divided by bright-colored ribbons, each club having its own color; a knot of the color was to be worn by each member, so that it may be told at a glance to which society a group of girls belongs. The general questions of the meeting were those connected with the education and interests of the association, which, I suppose, would be both literally and figuratively "look down" upon the girls.

In what age of the world are we living when girls are marked like cattle at a fair? Would it not be an excellent idea to ticket the girls in such a manner that those who support them could "tell at a glance" how many men had been ground to death, how many women had been ruined, how many children's lives lost, that they should exist, the elegant things that they do, and the labor-unions that this would be the most effective union-label that was ever gotten out; it would be a union-label that would give a very valuable lesson, that would assist greatly in opening men's eyes to the truth.

What debt do we owe to the philanthropic ladies! The most prominent philanthropic lady in Hoboken belongs to the great robber-family of that city. Hoboken is, or was, a land of salt meadows. Much of this land (under water) was bought by thrifty workmen at the Holland prices. The city of Hoboken, now musty, was a place of good standing. Those men who were worked, after the ordinary day's work was over, at collecting materials necessary to fill in the lot, and in trying to erect little houses in which they expected to spend their old age. In order to complete the house, the rent was in many cases simply to mortgage the property, and during the mortgage were foreclosed, and the Hoboken Land Improvement Company (which practically is one family) raked it, in a few months, the earnings of many men for many years. And now the daughters of those men whose houses were stolen are ribboned by the same family, and must be told at a glance to whom they belong.

The most philanthropic lady in New York also belongs to a most distinguished family. One member resigned the presidency of a railroad company because trains were run on Sundays, and on Sundays there were to be no trainees, not to make them work. These men employed as track-layers, etc., on this road received at that time ninety cents a day. It is quite easy with the rest of the proceeds of their labor for the ladies of this most noble family to engage laboring men.

Another most excellent work engaged in by these philanthropic ladies is furnishing work to needy women at less than the market rate, and then helping them to eke out their exist- ence by means of donations. The effect of this is to lower the wages in that branch, thus forcing the other women to also accept charity, make up the amount necessary to support existence by means of vice, or to leave that trade and enter some other, thus tending to bring down the wages in that other also by increased competition. How beautifully philanthropic works! What has become of the pride of the American working-girl? Where are the independent girls who once worked in the New England mills, and recognized as such as superior to them? What pity of the lovely lady who has been satisfied; we are coming down to the level of the slave, with none of our "class in Europe."
The Right Man in the Right Place.

To the Editor of Liberty:

The Knights of Labor have grown very powerful of late in New Haven. Their annual activity in the line of agitation and organization is greater than that of any other labor organization, which they have had with some establishments and institutions, have attracted public attention and made subjects for general discussion. The Knights have been led by the spirit of complete triumph and, seeing nothing but good in it, their ideas are opposite of what they were. But as this is rather a deliberate subject to handle, some difficulty was experienced in finding a speaker. Here was a need of a man who had been to New York, who was not afraid to dare speak the unspoken truth and attack lies, wrongs, and fallacies wherever they are found. The name of Mr. Appleton and his suggestion pleased us, and I chose him, the right man for the right place.

It was advertised in all the local newspapers that the famous "Honorius" of the "Irish World" would lecture before the Club on labor organization generally and the Knights of Labor in particular. Many of the large foreign audiences of the Amalgamated Union of Dockmen. Mr. Appleton was made up of Yale students, business men, and mechanics. His speech lasted two hours, and it was deeply appreciated. The audience present at the meeting. He spoke to the question of labor unionism, and the topic of labor agitation, and the question of labor and the questions of labor and the questions of labor and the questions of labor and the questions of labor and the questions of labor...

"How can and will this end? Open war will finally break out, riot, confusion, and bloodshed.

No, this war will not break out. The world will never be saved by force, hate, and despotism. Labor must organize for peaceable self-help and cooperation, not for war. Cease to be divided by trade and interests. Work together, and go down monopoly. Instead of fighting the capitalists and the states, who have as good a right to strike back as we have to strike back, organize the labor masters, and declare yourselves free. Then you will achieve economic liberty.

Professor Sumner, by request, replied to Mr. Appleton. He spoke with unusual earnestness and animation. He said he was fully in accord with the general ideas and arguments of Mr. Appleton, but that he failed to understand why the Knights of Labor are so widely known, and why they should have a name at all. They were not interested in economic liberty. The world is divided into rich and poor, and the poor are not to be divided into rich and poor. It is true, replied Mr. Appleton, but the point is that it is the poor who are interested in economic liberty. It is labor that is rewarded, not capital. The Almighty blesses the master, but the master does not bless the labors. The laborer gets a part of this blessing for his labor. He then referred to the editor of Kingling's book.

Mormon and Caesar.

Cesar's spirit still stalks the earth. Having scaled Olympian and brought the gods into unity, its imperial claims will not relax for man. Driven from the throne, it sought refuge in the desert; the power of the desert lasted, politics gained. Progress for centuries has been towards greater freedom. In America, legislation is tending toward greater restriction. The idea of Caesar's spirit is impossible. The "American Idea" of that day was—"the best government is that which governs least;" hence men are led to wrong conclusions about the right of Caesar. Why this eddy in the stream of progress? This reversion of Caesar's ghost urging centralization and reliance on might?

The answer is plainly to be seen. The spirit of Caesar, renounced the idea of separation of branches of government. That spirit made it necessary to tighten their own chains. But when the radical reformer raises his voice, he is led down as a theory, dreamer, charlatan, etc. The mental machinery of practical and serene philosophy is lost.

"Well, let us see what the intelligent American mechanic, who has been educated at the hands of the Knights of Labor organization, proposes to do. He is thoroughly respectable, pure, conservative, and sober-minded. He will never become a politician, a speculator, a mechanic, a practical and serene philosopher at all.

"It is said of a to-day's wages for a fair day's work. Is it not beautiful? What a fairy and practical demand! No nonsense about it; no dreams; all he wants is justice. But, my friend, what is a fair day's wages, and what is a fair day's work? My intelligent American mechanic is dumb. Here is a more intelligent American mech-