On Picket Duty.

The London "Anarchist" has stopped again,—this time definitively. The concluding issue contains the promised decisive article on Egoism, which, however, decided only that the editor had nothing new to offer.

The London correspondent of the New York "Sun" informs us that "a very entertaining epistolarity war has been raging in the columns of the 'Daily Telegraph' on the question 'Is Marriage a Failure?'" and that "many funny opinions and experiences have been brought to light." Not having seen the "Telegraph," I am without knowledge as to the value and result of that discussion, but the very fact that the subject is being discussed in such a form in such a paper as the "Telegraph" seems to test most positively that marriage is a failure.

When the publisher of Liberty or any of his co-workers begin to make money out of the paper or get any reward for their labor beyond the pleasure of its performance, so even when they have ceased to pay roundly in money and toll for the insinuative privilege of "saying their say," it will then be in season for those who desire to be particularly generous in the supply of their brain products to Liberty's readers to accompany their offers to write for these columns with an assurance that may do all free of charge. Until then, that goes without saying.

"Lucifer" prints an extract from Grunlund's book derogatory of majority judgment. This is misleading. Those who are familiar with "Lucifer's" view of government and ignorant of Grunlund's are liable to receive the impression that Grunlund's deductions from the fact of the non-competency of the majority are identical with those of "Lucifer." But the truth is that Grunlund would indignantly repudiate "Lucifer's" advocacy of individual sovereignty; and would demand "a government of the few for the many," which desire of "Lucifer" is the only thing needed and the only thing really potent that we bring us into the field as full-ledged Anarchistic reformers.

The editor of the "Workers' Advocate" is "astonished" that the London "Commonweal" speaks of new Italian Communist-Anarchist organs as having entered the field of "Socialist journalism." Perhaps it is too much to expect his mental calibre to perceive that William Morris himself is far more of a Kropotkian than an orthodox State Socialist, but it certainly does not require any great power of penetration to plainly see that quoting approvingly two definitions of Socialism as a theory advocating more harmonious and equitable social arrangements, it is absurdly illogical to deny the title Socialist to anyone who strives after what seems to him a more harmonious and equitable social order.

The State Socialists and other worshippers of the majority principle have never forgiven the Anarchist Club for that article in the constitution which provided that "... the conducting secretary shall be in the chair and, from his decision there shall be no appeal." The torrents of fierce protest, protestative reproach, abuse, denunciation, sarcasm, ridicule, which have been discharged on our heads would probably be sufficient for the Club, were it not for unexpected miraculous help from the enemies themselves. First a non-Anarchist organization in Boston, after taking an active part in the attack against the "despotic" provision, all at once turned right-about-face and adopted the Club's article of policy, and now the New York Society, before fellows suit and work out a new set of rules for the conduct of their meetings, by which the chairman is authorized to enforce a previously-made programme, without allowing the introduction of any business by the audience or entertaining any motions. It is safe to say that the Club will now enjoy a rest from the fire of the ardent friends of "popular rights." But what "meanwhile, about the Socialists? Do they not realize that they are violating the principles of social-honesty, in their attempts to control in individual control and management? If they do not, then they are poor reasoners indeed, and, in this instance again, build wiser than they know.

Vive le Parapluie! (The Listener in the Boston Transcript.)

There is a passage in Mr. Bellamy's "Looking Backward," which illustrates neatly the mistaken position which that interesting work takes upon social subjects. In its Utopian Boston of the year 2000, nobody goes under an umbrella in a shower, because the street fronts of all the buildings are provided with water-tight awnings, which are let down over the sidewalk whenever it rains,—and also across the streets, crossings, though the author does not explain just how the year 2000 Bostonians manage that,—and under these canopies, provided at public cost, everybody goes dry-shod. In the book, when the nineteenth-century Bostonian, walking along the "Elephant," with the fair Edith Leete and her father, expressed his "discomfort at the apparatus over the streets—"

Dr. Leete, who was walking ahead, overhearing something of our talk, turned to say that the difference between the age of individualism and the age of concert was well characterized by the taxi, that, in the nineteenth century, when it rained, the people put up an umbrella over their heads, but when he walked, Edith said, "The private umbrella is father's favorite subject to illustrate the old way when everybody lived for himself and his family. There is a nineteenth-century painting at the art gallery representing a crowd of people, in the rain, each one holding his umbrella over himself and his wall, and giving his neighbors the drippings, which he claims must have been meant for some "screw purposes of his time."

Now, the Listener is perversely reactive enough to maintain that the nineteenth century is ahead of the last year of the twentieth in this respect. The difference between the individualist and the socialist sidewalk can- npy is precisely the difference between freedom and servitude. With an umbrella, the citizen is free to come and go where he pleases, and no one can interfere with him. He can be as cranky as he likes to, or cut across the corner of the street if he is in a hurry, and be independent of everybody else, just as everybody likes to be as far as he can, and just as everybody would like to be as long as the world lasts, and as everybody ought to like to be. Under the sidewalk canopy, one would have to follow the beaten path that the State has laid down for them, or else go in the rain. Under his rainy hat, the citizen can get all the air there is, and all the light, and not be at the mercy of a State canopy, shutting out the light and confining the air, to say nothing of the dressing rooms that the State would provide. It is probable that some States that have ever been, would now and then be sure to provide through some official's maladministration. The umbrella serves very well as a symbol of civilization, because it is the emblem of the individual effort, upon the basis of which all progress has been made. As such it is the symbol of progress, while the State sidewalk canopy would be the symbol of stagnation. Vive le parapluie! They'll Call Honesty Censor Now. (Honesty.)

The London organ of our Communist-Anarchist comrades, "Freedom," says: "We Revolutionary Communist-Anarchists differ from our Revolutionary Mutualist comrades in this theory that, after the workers have destroyed the existing system of private property, they will set about creating a free-speech,—by attempting to secure to every individual neither more nor less than the exact amount of wealth resulting from the exercise of his own capacities." Apart from the statement that we would set about creating the monopoly of property afshef (which is not true), we fail to see wherein denying the worker the right of title is consistent with freedom and Anarchy,—that is, if it is meant that such conditions are to be imposed upon the individualist, e. e. we would ask our comrades to harmonize it with this statement in an equal number of words, "Individuality is indefensible and cannot be abrogated." The existing inequalities are not the result of individual accumulation, as of the people, for other purposes than the prevention of direct coercion against natural rights of individuals, a correct principle? If it is, there is nothing for reformers but to form new parties that shall be the right of official personnel under the right civil service rules. In the case that the opposite view is entertained, party changes may be compared to the momentary relief sought by the man who is bearing a heavy burden and who transfers it from one shoulder to the other, to use the simile of a modern German writer who has written interestingly on the conventional falsehoods of civilization. It has been asserted that the position of the present day argues a worse state than the optimism of the first French revolution... This assertion is open to the criticism that at the first French revolution the people 1. ... not tried representative government, and were therefore naturally hopeful. Now they have tried representative government, and under it they are disappointed. This is cause enough for an access of gloomy feelings. But if reflection may suggest in a while to the man, as it has already done to some students of history and sociology, that the political machinery of the proper organ of government is not, but that this is really practicable by industrial science, a new optimism quite unlike the blind instinctive optimism of political tradition, while the construction and conversion of the legislative assembly may appear as curses, and the first step in reform may appear clearly to be to cease expecting from the beneficent plans, if it is like to be as long as the world lasts, and as everybody ought to like to be. Under the sidewalk canopy, one would have to follow the beaten path that the State has laid down for them, or else go in the rain. Under his rainy hat, the citizen can get all the air there is, and all the light, and not
THE RAG-PICKER OF PARIS.
By FELIX PYAT.
Translated from the French by H. E. Tuckner.

PART FIRST.
THE BASKET.
Continued from No. 115.

The new-comer seemed too courteous and too sagacious to violate this rule. Brevet made haste to give him a seat. For a moment the latter said:

"To whom do I owe the honor of your visit?" said the bankier, impatiently.

"Frankly, Monsieur, and saying nothing of sympathy, I make you this visit as a means of soliciting your charity; you are known to me, at least by name, as you are to all Paris, especially since your misfortunes.

"As you are well known!" exclaimed Berville, with a sigh.

"But, Monsieur, that which has made you known to me has also aroused my sympathy.

"Thank you, Monsieur, for your kindness.

"And I come to give you a proof of it ... by asking you to accept it."

"What does it concern?" asked the agitated bankier.

"It concerns your life, your health, your peace.

"My salvation? How? Speak."

"And my interest also, as I have told you."

"Well, what do you want me to do?"

"We no longer live in the golden age, I believe," said the unknown with fine irony, "but in the age of paper. I am not a knight, but a capitalist. I do not come, I am ashamed to confess, Monsieur Berville, but I wish to make you a present; you are not a Don Quixote before you, but rather a matter-of-fact squire. In short, I come to make you a gift you again quite plainly, in your interest and mine. I know your indolent honesty and I know that, if you wish to take me as a partner in your bank ..."

"Have the honor and the advantage of aiding you and putting you on your feet again. I believe I have nearly the amount that you have lost! Three hundred thousand francs, the papers say, do they not? If, then, you are willing, I will share in your losses in order to share in your profits. I put the amount at your disposal ... this very day."

It was a most absurd proposition. Gertrude clasped her hands.

"Monsieur, such a service ... gratitude stiles my voice," said the bankier.

"No thanks. You owe me nothing. I do not render you a service; it is simply a matter of business. I have here a capital of one hundred thousand francs, which I sold to the current of gold, which is quite the more brightly because caused by egoism, gave thanks aloud, first to God for this token of grace, and then to the bank, whose title, of course, she had remembered.

The cash簿 was opened, although less readily.

As for the bankier, who had at first cried: "Saved!" and who had accepted everything suddenly, without even an idea of a reference or even of reflection, as the fulling was too much for him after all that happened. His cheeks became purple, and the reddish petticoat which spotted them became violet. He had only time to cry to the cashier:

"Take immedi-..."

And he fell back on his chair, served with a second summons by the great creditor.

But there was no immediate execution. Death still granted a delay, long enough at least to allow everything to be regulated according to the desire of the bank and the bankier.

M. Berville was on his feet again in time to establish the bank in his place as his partner and thus meet his obligations, restore honor to his business, avoid bank-ruptcy, and save his credit, his reputation, and his bank, which then became the bank of the Roi de France.

The bank, thanks to the aid of the diligent cashier and to his own aptitude, in twenty-four hours became familiar with the business and was initiated into the secrets of the book-keeping. Man learns nothing so readily as robbery. One would have said that he had had his life no other merit.

"He will be worth two Berville," thought Brevet.

In this partnership, the bank was his equal. All was saved, the bank and honor. The proverb says; "As one makes his bed, he must lie in it." Let us add: "And the bank which he left it. The banker had put his in a bag! He found it there, without taking any more care before putting it under seal."

Non ader, as Vespasian said, an emperor whose name on this account has been given to two from the note that is the bank."

But if the bank had succeeded in the bank, he had no less succeeded in Gertrude's heart. He had won that likewise, at once stroke.

He has literally become her cousin, his gallantry even, the singularity of his intervention and of his name, and above all his title of baron, had subjugated her, taken her by main force, like an irritable rape. Love had entered there as into the hissing of a brocade; door, gratitude and peace. Everything comes to those who know how to wait, who can. Finally, like Archimedes, she had found it.

But in fact, the other had confessed to Berville that it was with the keenest irritation of his intervention and of his name, and above all his title of baron, had subjugated her, taken her by main force, like an irritable rape. Love had entered there as into the hissing of a brocade; door, gratitude and peace. Everything comes to those who know how to wait, who can. Finally, like Archimedes, she had found it.

Consequently, feeling that he was about to die, Gertrude's cousin had summoned her to his death-bed, had confided to her the intentions of his partner, had urged superior considerations and pressing circumstances, and, in the name of all the properties, the interest of the banking-house, the future of his son to whom she was to be the guardian, had assured her of the same, and had, as it were, sent the baron's offers were it only out of gratitude for past services and in the hope of services to come, saying, with all the emotion which he was capable in his last hour, to the devoted to his interests and that he should die happy if, by the sacrifice of her liberty, she should assure the future of the family and the honor of the house.

So much effect was unnecessary. The fortress was captured, and made a show of defence only to surrender more graciously. Aga had subdued the wall, and the prayer of the dying man, assisting, without further discussion of fortune and fame, money and life, all in the same breath, creating all dispensations, delays, and impotency, and publicity ("there are ways of compromising with harken") and the religious marriage being the most important to Gertrude, reserving (the civil marriage, which was also a matter of great importance) By a lager date, the Baron de Hoffmann and Gertrude de Berville was therefore resolved upon in presence of the dying cavalier.

In this contested preference of marriage and burial one—upon the other, there was something rational no doubt, but also something for which the baron had been the guardian of the old cashier and, though possibly in a less degree, that of the old maid as well.

The marriage took place at Saint-Boech, at night, by special permission, and consecrated in the church by the greatest of the using priests, the famous doctor Dubois, a third and last attack of the devoted and cousin Hoffmann closed the eyes of cousin Berville, who died in the odor of sanctity.

And the next morning the "Constitutionnel" announced the death and funeral of the Liberal banker, devoting to him a dithyrambic obituary in marked contrast with that of the noble Duke de Crillon-Gourgeau.

CHAPTER XVI.
AT SAINT-BOECH.

Twenty-four hours later, at noon, the bell of Saint-Boech tolled a prolonged knell.

At the altar of the church was hung, from cornices to base, with black draperies ornamented with silver tinsels, and a mass also of silver.

The steps of the front of the steps stood a file of mourning coaches similarly caparisoned, cushioned, and lettered, official coaches of the family and the clergy, followed by private equipages in black and crape livery even to the horses and whips.

A screen of cloth was spread, in front of which stood a number of mourners who laughed at their godsend, undertaker's employees indulging in merry jokes over this fat corpse,—in short, all the grief of pomp, all the formal sorrow, all the flesh and savage, grotesque and lugubrious exterior of first-class Christian burials.

Let us go with the crowd into this Catholic temple, Pagan—1 beg Jupiter's paroxysm in the Julian calendar and you, the Jesuits in the Gregorian.

As for the two burials, they offered no less a contrast in their solemnity.

For one, in the centre of the broad nave, before the divine altar and before the ceiling, a noble church, studded with stars in precious metal, and the vaults, adorned with painted figures, and adorned with silver fringes and tassels, and lighted by a triple row of tapers, a mass of silk and fire.

Beneath this splendid dome, in the midst of im-

At the head of the coffin, more hypocritically if not more religiously, stood the clerical officiant, first the choristers, sinners of the Devil as well as of God, in the place of honor, and the choir itself, and last, and first, and fattest of all, Monsieur the parish priest, the able Ventron, though not thoughtful... yet profoundly absorbed, calculating and storing in advance in his heart the pro-

Brevity in one hand, scapulier in the other, dipped in a silver holy-water bottle, he was whispering and with an air of grief intoned, in a tongue which not one there understood, and ceu-clic, which the operatives sang in chorus without understanding it any more than the listeners.

What said this De Profundis in Latin? De profundis call to me, Lord, and hear me.

In English: From the depths of the abyss, O Lord, have mercy upon me, who am...
A strong king is a beacon, a symbol of strength and security. He protects his kingdom and its people from external threats. His wisdom and counsel are sought after, and his guidance is followed with trust. In the face of adversity, his strength and determination inspire his subjects to stand firm and persevere.

His successor, however, may struggle to fill his shoes. The new king may lack the same qualities that made his predecessor great. He may be weak, indecisive, or unable to inspire confidence. This transition period can be a time of uncertainty and turmoil for the kingdom.

Historically, the transition of power from one king to another was often marked by challenges. The new ruler may face resistance from those who preferred the old king’s style of governance, or from various factions within the kingdom that sought to maintain their power or influence. In some cases, the transition was peaceful and smooth, with the new king gaining the support of the people and establishing a strong reign. In other cases, the transition was marred by conflict, intrigue, and甚至 civil war.

The fate of a kingdom in such a period depends on the readiness of the people. If they are content with change and willing to support the new king, the kingdom will likely thrive under his leadership. If the people are resistant and divided, the kingdom may face significant challenges and even collapse.

In summary, the transition of power from one king to another is a critical period in the history of a kingdom. It requires strong leadership from both the outgoing and incoming rulers, as well as the support and cooperation of the people.

---

**Note:** The above text is a fictional narrative inspired by the concept of a strong king and his successor. It is not based on historical events.
Competition and Monopoly Confounded.

To the Editor of Liberty:

Does competition mean war? you ask, and then go on to monopolize it as one of its forms.

"The suppression that competition means war rests upon old notions and false phrases that have been current, but are rapidly passing into the limbo of exploded fallacies."

Pardon me, Mr. Talmage, but I am quite sure that the supposition in question rests upon nothing more than "old notions and false phrases." Go out into the highways and byways of the workaday world around you, and you will find that this desk can make it, for even the grand old Whitaker himself has not been able to evolve "equal liberty" from the free competition of unequal forces.

When the benefits of competition cease to be "won by one class at the expense of another" and when they are shared "by all at the expense of nature's forces," then have its raison d'être and dies, its benefit will not be obtained by preaching,—otherwise the church would become the battle ground of God's people, and the whole church triumphant; or by force,—otherwise progress would have gone hand in hand in authority instead of with liberty; but only by unrestricted freedom,—that is, by competition, the necessary condition of control upon the selfish, as the selfish, which can never come as long as monopoly, "the economic expression of hostility and mastery," continues to exist.

T.

Marriage "Under the "Sun."

The number of the "Westminster Review" contains a striking article on "Marriage" written by Mr. W. H. Bagehot. In this present age of dogmatism and forms of sexual relations are described with rare ability and denouement with uncommon force. Her plain talk about the respectable stupidity and stupid respectability of modern bourgeois society is very refreshing, and her "sharp sayings" are, indeed, as the New York Times says, "an honest "Sun" foes, "sweet morsels for the opponents of marriage." Mrs. Caird's remedy is absolute freedom of marriage, "out-and-out free love and nothing else," as, again, the "Sun" has it. Excepting her belief that a replacement of the present competitive system by a co-operative independence would be necessary and able as a preliminary to the inauguration of freedom in love relations, the whole article is thoroughly sound and Anarchistic.

In the "Sun" an editorial criticizes the position of Mrs. Caird's reasoning appears, which is also very striking—for its dullness. The things it has to say against Mrs. Caird are perhaps even sweeter morsels to the opponents of marriage than what she offers in support of it. It starts out with a lie and a dishonorable intimation that Mrs. Caird's views are "heresies." It ends with a "lie" when it says that the "Westminster Review" express disclaims responsibility for "her revolutionary views," the fact being simply that Mrs. Caird appears, among others on different subjects, including, for instance, one on so offensive a topic as Mr. Whistler's views on art, in the "Independent Section," a regular department in which the editors allow the free expression of opinion on all topics of public interest. And when it insists that "there is enough of truth" in Mrs. Caird's statements "to make their unqualified utterance permissible in a period like the present," it stimulates bold investigation and criticism while inverting suppression.

As an argument in favor of State interference, we are told by the "Sun" that "the State and society have and have not a larger goal and so important that of right and of necessity this goal is advocated in the contract. When a man and a woman marry, they enter into a relation which is not of private concern merely, but one which is also of deep public concern, for the increase of the community, the rights of property, and the moral and social development of the future. Besides the man and the woman, all society is affected by the contract, and the general interests far transcended in importance the sentimental gratification of the couple themselves." Now, I have known the "Sun" to write in favor of the "establishment of a democratic government,—one that would prove best by doing least. How is this view of the marriage contract to be brought into harmony with Jeffersonian principles? What new interpretation is intended upon the declaration of our inalienable right to life, libr.
Courts and Conspiracies.

The usual notion of social progress is that we go from a simple state to a complex state. Now is it true that, as complexity develops, human becomes more complex? In the matter of machinery this does not seem to be the case. The old Washington hand press, for example, was a very simple machine. But the printing press gradually became more complex,—that is to say, the machinery was more cumbersome and the power for the accomplishment of the desired result required much greater development than in the old one.

Note the ten-cent Henry Press. What a mass of wheels and drums and ropes and treads and plates it is, and what an army of men and boys it takes to run it! But that press is now discarded,—not for social machinery, but for machinery that are simpler in their construction, and more effective.

The higher development is from the complex to the simple.

The primitive savage had few wants, and his methods of satisfying those wants were very simple indeed. A stone or a stick served for a house, clothing, and a living. From this he went to bows and arrows and the roundest kind of agriculture. He made his own implements. His functions became "simple," because in him they were simple. Now, we live in an implement-manufacturing age, and the higher his equipment, the more complex his society.

My notion of Anarchy,—of a highly developed community of human beings,—is where simplicity is the most highly developed. Anarchy is the ideal of simplicity, and therefore necessary of social progress.

COURTLANDT PALMER.

"Let one cog be a poem of strength."
Oonder, brave, and faithful soul.
Above the rock built in the sea.
The Silent Seat—
Yours is the good man's gentle fame.
In grateful hearts I but nurse a sense
Incongruity. Who's here in the deep war.
Of superfluous conquerors,
No more the east and care of life.
No more the oars of strife, and
And no more pain.

Weep not the tear, withhold the sigh.
As close a cup, as close the fall.
So wisely calm:
"I cometh swiftly to us all—
Quenched in the core a funeral flame."
All quenched—the living name.
None the less, none the more.

We leave him where his field was won,
In dreams, in sleep of duty done.
He is relieved, and he may sleep.
But ours is still a watch to keep—
Courted, farewell.
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The Problem Which the Child Presents.

In attempting to give utterance to some of the many thoughts which have occurred to me who have been privileged to take exception to my ideas about love and the life in have and the life that comes from have, I would rather be not written upon a paper, nor would I have them read aloud. I have real objections which have not seemed to me to hold some germ of truth. While I suffer with them, I also feel that in many ways they have been most useful to me. I feel much sympathy. If we are not in the same truth, we have touched truths here and there, and this touch has a feeling of being real with me. When we have charge of one child, there may be six different questions in regard to what shall be done with the child. If there are, five people will say, we shall do it this way or that. And if it is to be done, we shall do it. And all the six people will have to keep the child constantly in mind that it may not fail or hurt itself. They would have to be constantly nutrient in all departments of human activity, our future economic conditions would not be materially improved. We miss, I think, in this, in all else, individual initiative under the idea of love is a less powerful motive in the world than the use of obligation or duty or responsibility. A mother, I believe, would never work, save for her children. Nor are her opportunities less than before, but, on the contrary, as much more as the leisure of a man who is supporting only one instead of three.

Tell me, you who are afraid, does a lover spend less time with the woman he loves than a husband? After her first joy of love-decayed passion is past, where, in the scale of pleasant things, does a husband place an evening with his wife? And before she was his wife, would an evening away from her have been weighed for a moment against one by her? Is it so with the ties of friendship? O, no! It is not the ties of friendship, but love, ties of love, that are the ties of world. It is not a knot, it is a bond, a bond that is unbreakable. And it is not that there is more consciousness of self in love, but that there is more consciousness of the other person. And what shall we say to the child who is left behind? It is a hard question to answer. We are not alone for our selves, but for their selves, the best we can. If he cannot be the best, let us try to be the second, and the second best we can. But do not think we bring them into the world for the world’s sake or for their rakes, but simply for the joy of rapture and the peace of getting and the doing. And yet all our sentiment is opposed to its belonging to any one, except as Mr. Lloyd uses the word, as the fruit to the tree. We would choose that way.

And there is one thing that will surely never be less true than now. If we insist upon establishing a balance "three years of a happy life." If a mother’s home will make her feel her death. When any claims that men will have no motives to beget children whom they cannot control, does he not forget how many women there are who think that they knew that law and society may at any time give the control of them into the O. Lloyd’s power. Loving him, they trust in him, and he is their hope. When a boy is young, he has been without its burdens which have seemed “too grievous to be borne,” has brought me into great sympathy with others who have been left to bear the burdens of the world, those with careless, frivolous, or even light-hearted men and woman life. But it is not because I feel burdens and bowed forms the whole life of love and need to be destroyed. But it is only that, being ill myself, I am greatly in sympathy with others who are ill, and that I am very sorry for anybody, who is in pain. I do not exactly understand how painless and in its place is love. I am sick. Nevertheless, I believe in health, and, although I am a little cross with you now, in my innocent unconsciouness, in the face of this; but it is only that.

And only will responsibility be concentrated, and so beems, but it is only that, being ill myself, I am greatly in sympathy with others who are ill, and that I am very sorry for anybody, who is in pain. I do not exactly understand how painless and in its place is love. I am sick. Nevertheless, I believe in health, and, although I am a little cross with you now, in my innocent unconsciousness, in the face of this; but it is only that.
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