On Picket Duty.

Most says that Liberty is the only organ of Anarchism in the world. Considering that in English alone there are seven or eight journals advocating what he calls individualistic Anarchism, I presume that most men say that Anarchism (as most men) has no small monthly organ in English, as the London "Freedom." But wasn't it an amusing
to make?

The judge, after explicitly stating that "the use of plain language, although offensive to ears polite, might be permitted," to writers "if good faith and effect are desired," overruled the motion to quash the indictment under which the publisher of "Labour" was to be tried for mailing obscene literature, and charged the jury with the character of the periodical, if it is an "immoral or give up the cause of the first order.

The bold and ignorant boast of the so-called "Worker's Advocate" do not provide any of the contemptible party. I am aware that it takes all sorts of people to make even a Socialist world, and no doubt the existence of individuals like the editor of the anarchist sheet is due to some earlier influence, but I am sure that when a better system of society is established that species of interlopers, such as the socialists and moral anarchists will tend to become extinct.

It is nothing if people should read more, they would do more writing of less, may be an unsettled question, but that the writing would be of higher quality and merit than now is insufficient upon the impression of the recent reader. The appearance of such an article as Professor Sumner's on "Civil Liberty" can only be explained on the supposition that the author has not read anything of value on that question. To one conversant with the writings of Mill, Buckle, Humboldt, Spencer, and Thompson on liberty, the professor's essay is remarkable for nothing except superficiality and ineptitude. There is nothing novel in it that has not received better presentation before, and there is not a new idea in it that does not lack weight and truth. The remarks on Anarchism except utter unfamiliarity with our literature, and are as trite as they are false.

Quercy the Boston "Labor Leader": "Is it not true that men who talk in a little brief authority" gets a set of puritanical quaint as an occasion more to the philosophy but the very true that public officials are usually aggressive and oftentimes cruel? The principle of voluntary association is one thing. The universal enforcement of submission to bureaucracy is another. The agencies through which the State enforces its now limited prerogatives are too often unkind.

"Shall we have faith enough in human nature to believe that, if these prerogatives were extended, the agents would act for the better?" Not if we believe in the science and logic. It is only the evil of partial liberty that we can say with Ruskin that "our remedy is larger liberty: but that we can induce a tyrant to practice equity by increasing his power over his helpless subjects must be, but to whom he is likely to be an enemy and from that point of view is to a certain extent a fundamental change in the usages of mankind, and others like them, are, it seems to me, nothing more than the lingering traces of a belief that we are falling off. It was once even a strong belief that our civilization was advancing by slow steps, and what is good for him better than he knows himself. Our post office has once and again had to overcome private competition, which it could not meet in any other way, by force. And where it has no authority to quell opposition by the strong hand, private enterprise competes with it with marked success. Our public schools, though never sufficiently strengthened by the fact that every man is forced to contribute to their support, and by being allowed to afford their children taught elsewhere, are nevertheless unable to prevail among private schools all over the country, to which many who can afford to do so send their children; the inference being unavoidable that the public schools furnish a better quality of education. Are the prisoners to the onerous labor and severe treatment, often afflicting the individual, to be able to make a "living wage" for himself or her in small groups of associates, will have as much opportunity to work as if he or she were engaged in common with the mass. The actual fact is the amount of goods the small shop and the actual fact is the -independent labor is a toil-worthy, but it is impossible to reconcile utter antagonists holding diametrically opposite views by telling each of them that he is right.

The San Francisco "Weekly Star" of a recent date contains a four-column "analysis" of Victor Yate's pamphlet on "Anarchism." The writer imagines that he has really found in it everything he wanted to find, -immoralities, labor in the world by law can you prevent it being followed by its natural consequences by another law. You can't." Now the last aversion flatly contradicts the first. What is Mr. Preston willing to put forth as a clear, exact explanation of the matter? Remember labor is a useful, but it is impossible to reconcile utter antagonists holding diametrically opposite views by telling each of them that he is right.

The San Francisco "Weekly Star" of a recent date contains a four-column "analysis" of Victor Yate's pamphlet on "Anarchism." The writer imagines that he has really found in it everything he wanted to find, -immoralities, labor in the world by law can you prevent it being followed by its natural consequences by another law. You can't." Now the fact is that "the small shop and the actual fact is the -independent labor is a toil-worthy, but it is impossible to reconcile utter antagonists holding diametrically opposite views by telling each of them that he is right.

The San Francisco "Weekly Star" of a recent date contains a four-column "analysis" of Victor Yate's pamphlet on "Anarchism." The writer imagines that he has really found in it everything he wanted to find, -immoralities, labor in the world by law can you prevent it being followed by its natural consequences by another law. You can't." Now the fact is that "the small shop and the actual fact is the -independent labor is a toil-worthy, but it is impossible to reconcile utter antagonists holding diametrically opposite views by telling each of them that he is right.
THE RAG-PICKER OF PARIS.

By FELIX PYAT.

Translated from the French by BENJ. H. TUCKER.

PART FOURTH.

THE STRUGGLE.

Continued from No. 117.

All leave me, young man, I need to isolate myself in my trouble; else I shall hear a lot of nonsense, be told to do stupid things; break and smash everything . . . and there is nothing here but walls. Anger loses its rights.

Bonnin, who had become serious with emotion, shook the old man’s hand and went away, screwing up his face to suppress a tear.

“I say! I am not going to weep.”

The keeper raised his voice and said, addressing the prisoners:

“Come in, Mr. Bonnin. Come in, without fear, gentlemen; we do not mix those who have done everything and those who have done nothing. The bourgeois, lord of their case, have rooms apart. Here as everywhere, respect for the bourgeois. They have escaped, the rustics, the aristocrats, the loafers, elegant and filthy alike, each finds his place and keeps his rank. The ‘Heapy’ is not made for the ‘haves,’ but for the ‘have-nots.’

And in truth the poor-deterred Tomasi entered the courtyard, while the more distinguished went up to the rooms reserved for them above.

But Bonnin, intent upon his business, received the new-comers with workman-like frankness, always hand up, robust, chiseling them into his own fashion and according to their appearance.

Catching sight of the first, he asked:

“Say, you, Rigolo, what have you done?”

The fellow confessed his offence complacently.

“If I almost knocked down my father-in-law, and she entered a complaint.”

Bonnin gave him a friend’s advice.

“Another time you will knock her down completely; she will have nothing more to say; at least that’s my opinion. You’re in for three weeks.”

He passed to the other.

“Your crime, Gredinet?”

“Assault in the night-time,” answered the other.

“Ah!” said Bonnin, “that’s an affair of ‘aare’ - ‘a-aaha.”

Then to the next;

“And you, poor Azot?”

“I thrashed a policeman in broad daylight,” was the answer.

“Poor fellow! You’ll get three years. Three weeks, that’s easy; three months, that’s endurable; but three years, that’s too hard. Keep your courage up!”

A beggar in rags and tatters came through the door.

“Why do you come here, Cressus?” inquired Bonnin.

“To look for bread. I stole some yesterday in order to have some today.”

Bonnin was silent.

A younger followed, saying in his vicious little voice:

“My parents want me shut up in a house of correction, and I come here to serve my apprenticeship.”

“Your parents are right,” declared Bonnin; “they wish to show you a good example. Choose your profession. When you do this, you will have a sure trade, with no danger of ever getting out of work.”

The keeper reappeared, shouting again:

“Attention!”

A man rushed into the courtyard, stumbling over the pavements, hitting his head against the walls, and screaming at the top of his voice:

“He sank upon the bench beside Brutus Chaumette, while Bonnin murmured:

“Whoever sold him his liquor didn’t cheat him.”

“My daughter!” screamed Father Jean, for it was he whom they committed to prison. “My daughter!”...

“Marie!”... The letter!... The Quai!... The wine!... The proof!... Lost!”

“She is mad,” said Bonnin, addressing Chaumette.

“She is mad!”... His daughter!... July, 1871!

Hoots had greeted the entrance of the rag-picker. Several prisoners ran after him, bawling:

“A drunkard! A drunkard!”

And one of them cried:

“To the fountain.

The Old Chaumette stood up in front of Father Jean, covering him with his body.

A step farther, gang of hooligans,” he growled.

But a burst of laughter answered him.

Bonnin, appeased by Chaumette, interposed also and, taking his place beside him, in a placid attitude, he shouted:

“Well! I touch him and see!”

His resolute attitude produced an effect upon the leaders, and, no one making a move to chase the first blow, only a few called back by the noise, had time to intervene and release Father Jean by dealing heavy blows right and left with his key.

Meanwhile the prison bell rang, announcing the hour for returning to the dormitory.

The prisoners formed a procession in pairs, Jean on Chaumette’s arm and repeating: “Mariol! My daughter!” while Bonnin brought up the rear, saying to himself:

“Jueuo, ou n’aurons plus de familles sous les toits. What can we do have done? We shall sleep with our windows open, when he has slept off his wine,—that is, if his head doesn’t ache too hard.”

Then, his natural disposition coming to the surface, he added:

“Everybody’s looking for his daughter today. No wonder there are so many lost girls.”

And with this salty he climbed the stairs of Morphée.

CHAPTER V.

SAINT-LAZARE.

From the men’s prison let us go to the women’s, from the Conciergerie to Saint-Lazare. And here again there is always the same room. The gloomy house is gradually becoming animated. It is visitor’s day.

The first to send in his name was Camille Berville.

“Some one already,” said the sister to herself, introducing the young man into an enclosure set off by railings.

Camille, in great agitation, saluted the man, saying:

“Please be good enough, Madame, to send for Madame Camille Marie Didier.”

The sister consulted her book and, starting towards a corridor, cried:

“Number 57, Miss Marie Didier!”

“Such a call in such a place,” thought Camille sorrowfully. “What a pity!”

Poor saint in hell!”

Again he addressed the nun:

“My sister, Mademoiselle Didier is innocent, the victim of an error. Show her, then, please, all the consideration compatible with your duty.”
The sun softly acquiesced.
"I will heed your recommendation, Mousier," she answered, thinking to her- self, "Lord, can I ever be Masterful!"

And with affec tion she added:
"Here, Mademoiselle!"
She took her arm, and led the Maris, grown thin and pale, made her entrance, clad in the sombre prison garb.

"Ah! Mousier Camille," she cried, with enthusiasm.

To be continued.

FREE POLITICO INSTITUTIONS:

THEIR NATURE, ESSENCE, AND MAINTENANCE.

AN ABRIDGEMENT AND ARRANGEMENT OF

Lysander Spooner’s “Trial by Jury.”

EDITED BY VICTOR ARBES.

LEGITIMATE GOVERNMENT AND MAJORITY RULE.

Continued from No. 147.

It is supposed, that, if twelve men be taken by lot from the mass of the people, without the possibility of any previous knowledge, choice, or selection of them on the part of the governed, the same will be a fair epitome of the country as a whole, and not merely of the party or faction that sustain the measures of the government; that substantially all classes of opinions prevailing among the people will be represented in the jury; and especially that the opinions of the great mass of the people (if the government have any opponents) will be represented there as well as its champions. And whereas, the people are oppressed by the laws of the government (if any are thus oppressed) will have representatives in the jury as well as those who take side with the oppressor—that is, with the government.

Facts are the same in every case, and the question is, that such a tribunal will agree to no conviction except such as substantially the whole country will agree to, if they were present tak- ing part in the trial. A trial by such a tribunal is therefore in effect a trial by the country. In its results it practically bears the same relation to the trial by the whole country as any trial that is practicable to have without waiting for the whole country, and at its expense. And as unanimity is required for a conviction, it follows that no one can be convicted except for the views of the jury, and if the government have the will, the whole country will have to maintain the government. The government can enforce none of its laws (by punishing offenders through the verdict of juries) except such as substantially the whole country will agree to.

But this trial by the country would be no trial at all by the country, but only a trial by the government, if the conviction could either decide who may and who may not be judges, or could dictate to the jury anything whatever, either by law or evidence, that is of the essence of the trial.

The government may decide who may and who may not be jurors, it will of course select only its partisans and its friendly to its measures; it will only prescribe who may and who may not be eligible to be drawn as jurors, but it may also question each person drawn as a juror as to his sentiments in regard to the part in the particular law involved in each trial before they carry him in. And they can dictate to him the law itself, and such panel, and exclude him if he be found unfavorable to the maintenance of such a law.

So, also, if the government may dictate to the jury what laws they are to en- force, it is no longer a trial by the country, but a trial by the government; because the jury then goes not only near to a trial by the whole country, but as a formal and substantial dictated to them by the government. And the standard thus dictated by the government becomes the measure of the people’s liberties. If the government dictate the standard of trial, it determines in their hands and in the hands of the jury what is to be a trial by the government, and they plainly do nothi ng to protect the people against that same standard; for there are no oppressions which the government may not authorize by law.

The government, therefore, the laws are rightly expounded them by the court. Unless they judge on this point, they do nothing to protect their lib- eries against the oppressions that are capable of being practised under cover of a cover of the position of the law. If the judiciary can authoritatively dictate to the jury any ex- position of the law, they can dictate to them the law itself, and such laws as they please; because laws are in practice one thing or another according as the court may dictate to them.

The jury must also judge whether there really be any such law as the accused is charged with having transgressed.

The dictates of the law of evidence. If the government can dictate to a jury the law of evidence, it can not only shut out any evidence it pleases, but also tend to invalidate the accused, but it can require that any evidence which it is not for the government, to go to the government. They must judge of the existence of the law; of the true ex- position of the law; of the true facts of the law of the crime; of the justice of the law; and of the admissibility and weight of all the evidence offered. All the government will be the standard by which the jury will be measured in its hands, and the trial will be in reality a trial by the government, not by the whole country, for which they were chosen. The government will determine its own position, and even in the hands of the people’s de- termining their liberties against the government; and it will be an entire delusion to imagine that they are a trial by the government, if they agree to any protection to the people against the domination and tyranny of the govern- ment.

The right and duty of juror is plain; it is that, instead of juror being a palladium of liberty, a barrier against the tyranny of the government, they are really more tools in its hands for carrying into execution any injustice and oppression it may desire to have executed.

But for their right to judge of the law, and the justice of the law, juror would be no protection to an accused person, even as to matters of fact; for, if the govern- ment could dictate to a jury any law whatever in a criminal case, it can certainly dictate to them the laws of evidence. That is, it can dictate what evidence is admissible and what inadmissible, and also what force or weight is to be given to the evidence. And whereas, if the government can dictate the laws of evidence, it can not only make it necessary for them to convict on a partial exhibi- tion of the evidence; rightfully pertaining to the case, but it can even require them to convict on any evidence that it pleased to put in.”

The question, then, between trial by jury as thus described, and trial by the government, is simply a question between liberty and despotism. The authority to judge of the laws and powers of the government, and to determine the liberties of the people must necessarily be vested in one or the other of the parties themselves; because there is no third party to whom it can be entrusted. If the authority be vested in the people, then the government has no liberties except such as the people choose to give it, and the people can exercise no power except such as the whole people consent that it may exercise.

The force and justice of the preceding argument cannot be evaded by saying that the government is chosen by the people, that it represents the people; that it is designed to be the will of the people; that its members are all sworn to observe the fundamental laws, as they are instituted by the people; that its acts are therefore entitled to be considered acts of the people; and that to allow a jury representing the people to invalidate the acts of the government would therefore be to allow the people to govern themselves.

There are two answers to such an argument.

One answer is that in a representative government there is no slavery or control, or any other force by which the people is arrayed against, or curtailed, its own powers, in requiring that the statutes or enactments of the government shall pass the ordeal of any number of separate tribunals before it shall be determined that they are to have the force of laws. Whereas, in a government composed of those who are elected by a majority of the people, there is no more reason for any one to be more arrayed against themselves when a jury puts its veto upon a statute which the other tribunals have sanctioned than when they are the same veto is exercised by the ex- ecutive or legislative branch.

But another answer is that the government, and all the departments of the govern- ment, are merely the servants and agents of the people, not invested with arbit- rary or absolute authority to do as they please, but required to submit all their enactments to the judgment of a tribunal more fairly representing the whole people; an authority to which, if the government had not the right of absolutely enacting laws, the words, the people had reserved to themselves no veto upon the acts of the govern- ment. Therefore, it is not the government, but the people, whose acts would be an absolute despot over the people. It would have all power in its own hands, because the power to punish carries all other powers with it. A power over the people, and by its authority it can compel obedience and submission, and is above all responsibility for the character of its laws.

In short, it is a despotism.

And it is of no consequence to inquire how a government came by this power to punish: whether by prescription, by inheritance, by usurpation, or by delegation from the people. If it have now but got it, the government is absolute.

But, therefore, it is seen, that the government with power to make laws that are absolutely binding, and to punish transgressors, they have surrendered their liberties unreverently into the hands of the government.

It is an American maxim that we have the victory of the one in that state surrendering their liberties the people took an oath from the government that it would exer- cise its power within certain constitutional limits; for when states once restrained the power of the government, it was otherwise restrained by the Constitution. Or the government fail to determine that all its acts were within the constitutional and authorized limits of its power, if it were permitted to claim otherwise, it must put the question for itself.

Neither is it of any help to say that, if the government with power to prescribe and enact unjust and oppressive laws, the government may be changed by the influence of the people. That is, that the people can do nothing to prevent the enactment, or procure the repeal, of unjust laws, unless it be under- stood that the discussion is to be followed by resistance. Tyrants care nothing what the people think, if they are to end them; and they will not interfere with the enforcement of their laws but idle wind to them. Suffrage is equally powerless and unreliable. It can be exercised only periodically, and the tyranny must at lest be borne until the issue in which they use it.

But the right of suffrage can be exercised only periodically, and between the periods the legislators are wholly irresponsible. No deposit was ever more entirely the gift of the people. The government is under the power of the people, for which they are chosen. They can neither be removed from their office, nor called to account what they may. Moreover, the whole power of the government is equally irresponsible to the people, and are only responsible (by impeach- ment and other means, and dependence for their salaries) to those irresponsible legislators. This dependence of the judiciary and executive gives guarantee that they will always sanction and execute their laws, whether just or unjust. Thus the people hold the whole power of the government in their hands, and are at the same time utterly irresponsible for the manner in which they use it.

If, now this government (the three branches they really united into one) can determine the liberty of the people, it is, for the time being, entire- ly absolute and wholly irresponsible to the people.

To be continued.
The Basis of Individualism.

More than to any sociological author are the Anarchists indebted to Herbert Spencer for the scientific and philosophical formulation of their position. Spencer lacks nothing but a little determined consistency to be an Anarchist. But none the less do I feel it necessary to warn the Denver “Arbitrator” against cultivating an implicit faith in every- thing that Spencer says, and against the subtle but undeniable neglect of the indispensable distinguishing and discriminating faculty. No dread of casuistic abuse of the distinguish must blind us to its virtues. That excellent organ of sound individualism lays itself open to serious attack by resorting its philosophy on Spencer’s reasoning in derivation of his “first principle of human happiness” in his first immature work, “Social Statistics.” Such a process is altogether out of date, and the beautiful but insubstantial carapaces of a theory such as the “Arbitrator” respecting the alleged “scientifically derived yardstick” for the determination of all social and political preludes appear highly ludicrous to men familiar with the researches and discussions that have occurred amongst the heretics of “Social Statistics,” or the practical value of the “first principle,” the method pursued in that book is utterly unscientific and signally out of harmony with modern evolutionary lines of thought. It is in fact a metaphysical illusion, deeply and thoroughly discredited, by all the theological notions, not at all an exact investigation. It is as little pertinent to advise collectivists to study any part of “Social Statistics” as it is for them to refer to us the economic half truths of Marx. Spencer’s early professed adherence to the socialistic theories of his friends—by Huxley, Harrison, Richilde, and State Socialist authen- ters. Even Goodrich has succeeded in exposing the fundamental view and weakness of the central argument of that work, and Spencer himself is not only characteristically reluctant to advert to it, but he at one time actually contemplated its suppression. I say without hesitation that collectivists have absolutely nothing to fear, but everything to gain, from our adoption of that book as the text book of individualism.

The true basis of individualism is not any natural individual right, for that has never been sought or wished for, but a broad utilitarianism, social expediency. The hope and strength of our cause lies in the great verity that, as men gain in enlightenment and refinement, they come to realize more and more that not stern or spiritual but continual and practical, folding of individuality, not force and repression, but liberty and sympathy, should be determined upon for the working out of a harmonious social order. It is not that one man has no natural right to tyrannize over another, but he must use he must use his power in a spirit of sublue and ennui a small or number there is nothing whatever in nature to interdict such a policy. But it is becoming incomprehensible, unwise, impossible, as Pro- phesy would say. Prohibition does not and cannot remedy the evil it is trying to remedy in the bitterness and variety of law cannot elevate or change (except to the worse) the criminally inclined. Majority rule is fast becoming impracticable. The brain is mightier than the sword, and government expects the moment a protesting ille- gal is not sufficient to tell us in which the extremely bad odor the entire Anarchist school is with him. The abolition of the State, involving as it does the liberation of labor from the wrongful tribute of profit, interest, rent, taxation, and all other burdens of legal privilege, he describes as a foolish idea, which is a more foolish means proposed to bring it about. And nothing would be gained; for since the Anarchists are uncompromising foes of Communism and fanatical champions of private property no lasting blessings would flow from the mere abolition of the State; the hogged of property prevailing today would still continue. And then this great logician proceeds to expose public view a flow in Anarchist logic. Private property, he says, implies protection, but protection of private pro- perty, prevailing today would still continue. And then this great logician proceeds to expose public view a flow in Anarchist logic. Private property, he says, implies protection, but protection of private pro- perty, prevailing today would still continue. And then this great logician proceeds to expose public view a flow in Anarchist logic. Private property, he says, implies protection, but protection of private pro-
liberty of labor result from natural causes; he believes that the State in its exercise of power will control labor of its all and having abolished competition, will be the master of the situation, and the only way out of the difficulty will be that the State's control over various business enterprises under its own control. He thinks that nature will get us into this difficulty, and nothing but the government can solve it. His solution is that the government will make the result of the laissez faire policy, but exists just because we have not adopted that policy. If the State-created privileges will be the monopolies of monopoly, and, etc., are abolished, labor will come into possession of its own, and the products of labor will be distributed as in the blood in the human body. He believes that the most "intelligent" manner of distributing blood in a body, or products among laborers, whether the distributor or the tax collector.

It is true that I used the word nature is the sense by alleged by Mr. Cohen, but it is not true it; I criticized him for the similar use of the term. It is not at all illegitimate to use the word nature in contradistinction to intelligence. But one should not thoughtlessly connect it with the idea of conscious with such a use of it. I do not mean at anybody, as Mr. Cohen does, for offering to "help" nature, or, if I do, is rather because I think nature is used, not merely helped. The statement that nature needs no help, and that man has sometimes, and sometimes only a commonplace, but far oftener it is nonsense. Mr. Cohen avers that he intended to exclude nothing but arbitrary legislation, but he had no logical right to do that. As Morey says, men do not miraculously become innately different circumstances unless every man is to be able to refuse to admit any claim to supernaturalism on the part of States. He includes any conscious action at all, he must include the action of authoritarians as well as that of libertarians. Everything that is natural, is to time to learn the silly cant of the "nature" philosophy.

Existing evils are not due to individualism, in the proper cause, is plain to everybody who knows the state of society. The state of society is irrationally tyrannical; and the one proposed by State Socialists containing the same elements of injustice, we naturally object to it. But we have no quarrel with their desire to improve upon blind and wasteful social order and to exchange one social evil for another. Only, when they deliberately base their social system on the principle of majority rule, we raise our voice in protest, deeming it essentially anti-social; and we believe the State Socialists by the right of every individual to experiment and choose his way of seeking happiness, at his own cost. Mr. Cohen does not understand the Anarchistic conception of the "let alone" motto.

I thank him for the trouble to enlighten me on the question of the law of universal change, but it was entirely superfluous. When he has read the first part of Buelke's "History of Civilization," he will appreciate my distinction between the statism of nature and the progressiveness of man.

While Henry George is currying the war into England, discussion and confusion spread in his camp here. We have seen that Mr. McCreary sorrowfully dismisses the idea of nationalizing railroads, telegraphs, the currency, etc. And now comes Mr. Shearman and cooly destroys George's dreams about the great benefits of the single-tax by declaring that the plan of "artificially increasing State expenditures for the mere purpose of absorbing rent" would involve extravagance and wasteful superfluity, which would be more injurious to the people generally, than the more appropriation of a few millions to private use, and proposes to leave ten or fifteen per cent. of the rent to the landlord.

From the "State" he says, "tries to be the sole landlord." It will fail, because the average of the human mind is unconscious vision. Without discussing the merits of Mr. Shearman's scheme, it is interesting to note that the contrast between the boldness and confidence which the State Socialists have on the small scale of democracy at the beginning, and the modesty and triviality to which it is now reduced. In a little while, the thunderers of the new "progressive" will be completely forgotten, and the only practical effect of that noisy agitation will be the addition of a few mild tariff-reform politicians to the Democratic party. The mountain will have labored and the mouse will have been born.

"Clarke" Litchman, whilom labor reformer, editor, knight, organizer, and secretary of the order, has just been rewarded by the president with a fat office for his services to the Republicans in the last campaign. His great ambition has been achievement of ambition but ill-used to climb into power: Join a labor union, display great zeal and devotion to the cause of organization, get yourself elected to office by your dupes, boast of all the labor and infirmity of your own importance as their representative; and then, at a critical moment, in a closely contested election, when political parties are in search of recruits, resign your office in the union, come out with a statement in which the latter (liberal chances of victory, and declare your readiness to work for its platform. Then wait. What Litchman has obtained by this policy is equally assured to all who imitate him.

Lovelessness Curable by Knowledge.

A friend sends Litchman the following fragment from a letter to a comrade in the Comp. Union of Seattle and Lien, and contained in Haeuber's translation of their correspondence:

How ever could you think that I should "scoff" at any of your magunificent effusions?

The forms in which we endeavor to gain comfort in our miseries, as the superhuman nature, the nature of our feelings, the character of our culture and of our more or less artistic sensations.

But could I be heartless enough to believe that to him alone the true form has been revealed? Only he who could think who has never had passion for himself; such a form of his hope and faith, have whose dull mind it has been instilled from outside as some one else's formula, who therefore does not possess sufficient inner power to preserve an empty creation and to withstand social ends. Only, who thus communicates the formula received from others as a formula for others.

The hope of good and hope and believes will merely in the hope and faith of others; all contention about the true form is mere empty self-assertion.

Dear friend, I have a strong faith, on account of which I have been bitterly scoffed at by our politicians and agues of the law.

I have faith in the future of the human race, and that faith I draw simply from my inner necessity.

I have succeeded in observing the phenomena of nature and never with love and faith, and the only evil I have discovered in their true essence is lovelessness. But this lovelessness I also explain to myself as an error, as one must lead us to natural unconsciuosness to the knowledge of the solely beautiful necessity of love.

To gain that knowledge is the task of history; and the scene on which that knowledge will be practically shown is no other than our earth, as nature, in which there are all the elements tending to the great love.

The state of lovelessness is the state of suffering for the human race; the fulness of this suffering surpasses us now, and tortures your friend with a thousand burning wounds; but behold, it is we recognize the glorious necessity of love; we call to each other and greet each other with the power of love, which would be impossible without this painful recognition.

In this manner we gain a power of which man in his natural and social development, and the power of all humanity, will in the future create on this earth a state of things from which no one will long to fly to a heretofore humanly unknown country, where we will all be happy, will live and love. Who longs to fly from this life while he loves? Well, well, we suffer now. We now should despair and go mad without further fact. But we are hereafter, and have just shown you this hereafter.

If it lies beyond my life, it does not lie beyond that which I can feel, think, conceive, and comprehend; for I believe in mankind and require nothing further.

If now ask you, who at the bottom of his heart shares my faith and my joy, who do you, who have and demonstrate love as no one else has proved and practised it yet? You realize your faith in every moment of your life; I know deeply and truly what you believe; how then could I scoff at the form from which such a miracle springs? I am truly grateful for my friend and, I hope, for my friend, who did not falsely understand you. Let us bravely fight and struggle; then all whisms will disappear.

The true thing remaining from my battlefield is what makes me complain so often.
The Abolition of Marriage.

As I have read before the Manhattan Liberal Club, Not to know to have a man for a master, to be the slave of anyone, I will tell you plainly at the outset that I am about to advocate the abolition of marriage.

I am not now going to explain myself. No doubt there are some here who immediately impede us to go away rather than to give even a hearing to such atrocious suggestions. But I want to explain that all such will accept the assurance that I am as well disposed toward mankind as they are; that, if the state of affairs which I shall indicate is at all filled with the most galling and heart-rending pain, then the same pain to which I feel, they too have only to show that it is so and I will gladly relinquish my opinions and adopt theirs.

It is not possible that a deliberate one is upon which even radicals are not to be conservative. About there it nihilism is the "touch-me-not" atmosphere that originates in its tendency to bring down all that stands in the way of the new. Marriage has its root in the remaining aridities of theology that still hang about us. It is a respect for a formula, a reverence for an ancient ceremony.

It is based on the idea that right and wrong are to be tested by some different criterion than the mere power to minister to human wants. It is the expression of the age.

Like all superstitions it consists in a combination of our happiness from fear of a fanciful danger.

In the abstract, to do what I may to all appearances from all superstitions, the "old age may come, as many see it coming, the old age which shall soon be filled with no horrors of the world.

Already these results are a partly seen. Few women will marry a man whose chances have been very rare, who is not only unlikely to be to her, but who, even after the union, will care to go on with the affair, if they happen to discover that the affection she cherishes is chiefly affection for being taken out of or their marriage for another reason. And after that they are married, if differences occur, the finest results from a reasonable proceeding.

So far as in the conduct of human association, Christian marriages are well regulated. The natural law is in the most simple and straightforward way of action, without the aid of any outside authority. And the civil marriage, in its most simple and straightforward way of action, without the aid of any outside authority.

The objection is on the lips of one who hears such propositions for the first time. What would become of children? What would become of the family?

As to the children, in the first place, "unwelcome child." In the second place, "That burden under which so many women now groan, of childbearing at the behest of their master, under the penalty of loss of support, would be removed.

The risk, the care, of childbearing would be assumed by the woman voluntarily. No man could coerce her. The voluntary assumption of the care of the child would be to the man a source of love to other child. The child, it is quite clear, would be a source of the care of the child. The child, it is quite clear, would be a source of care to the woman. And the child, it is quite clear, would be a source of care to the woman.

But of all who know you have children, where there is no difficulty about their support, the instinctive love of children, comes supernaturally, so that it would not be a question of who could produce children most thoughtlessly and hate the burden afterwards, as it now is; but it would be a question of who could produce children, and this the child, it is quite clear, would be a source of care to the woman. And the child, it is quite clear, would be a source of care to the woman.

As for the children, is it anything to be cared for or cherished? Does indeed anything what is called a family now exist?

The popular conception of a family is the conjugal and the conjugal and the conjugal and the conjugal and the conjugal and the conjugal. The popular conception of a family is the conjugal and the conjugal and the conjugal and the conjugal and the conjugal and the conjugal.

Later, in feudal times, his proprietorship was more limited, but still asserted in Prutchevar asserts it: "You are my house, my house, my ox, my ass, my anything." In marriage, the laws are more limited, and a natural right of disposal of his body as she pleads for the un意大 toward the woman of this nation or otherwise. (By other men, I mean, for instance, slavery.)

Now let me impress upon you in the strongest possible way (I think you will excuse me in spite of my last efforts many will fear this denial means, under the impression that I am urging all married people at once to separate, in order to live, a life of their own, which is not for the benefit of women, but for the sort), let me impress upon you that, when I denounce marriage, I have no objection to anybody living happily together. It only says that the possession of a club in the family is not conducive to happiness.
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