Looking Backward," he would have learned of the arrival, half a century ago, of a man who reconciled, not indeed State Socialism or Nationalism, but the just reward of labor, with the perfect liberty of man. "Letters to Farmers’ Sons," published by the Twentieth Century Publishing Company, may contain some good things. — I have not read it, — but it certainly is the latest manifestation of the "illogical" mind. What can one think of the consistency and persistency of a man who, while expressing contempt for books, invites the public to purchase and read his own book? If he has not thought it proper to consult any books whatever, how can he expect the public — whom he wishes to teach and influence — to consult his book? If they follow his example, they will consult no books whatever, and then of the making of books there will be an end. Of course, if he has nothing new to say, he will publish the book shows that he wishes the public to be guided by his judgment in other matters, but not in the treatment of books; but they will be apt to think that there can be no profit in reading an author who writes without knowing that he has something new to say.

The May “Contemporary Review” is a dull number; and the dullest and duffest and most insipid article in it belongs to Grant Allen. It is entitled “Democracy and Diamonds,” and exhorts those to whom democracy is becoming a true religion to encourage good handcraft and to despise diamonds. But incidentally Mr. Allen drops a few remarks which are calculated to alarm his Fabian compadres, if not disgust with their very uncertain new convert.

The world,” he says, “will never be revolutionized, as Mr. Edward Bellamy seems to imagine, by one definite act of the American legislature. But it can and will be slowly revolutionized by the gradual growth of higher moral feeling. You cannot take the kingdom of heaven by force: it must grow within our souls. It is only proportion as individual men attain that moral level will immorality at large become fit for Socialism.” Fate, it appears, has not been wholly unmeritorious to Mr. Allen. He has turned State Socialist, it is true, but it is a consolation to know that he is neither a revolutionary nor a political agitator, and that he is not in favor of using force to accomplish his ends.

The “Open Court” prints an admirable lecture on “Evolution and Human Progress,” of which Professor Le Conte is the author. The last paragraph, however, affords evidence of a tendency to lose its meaning (if not worse than meaningless) expressions unpardonable in a real scientific thinker. “This capacity,” says the lecturer in all sincerity, “characteristic of man alone, of forming ideals, and this conscious voluntary pursuit of such ideals, is essentially human.” When analyzed and reduced to its simplest terms, it is taught else than the consciousness in man of his close relation to the infinite and the attempt to realize the divine in human characteristics. In the mouth of a theologian, of a believer in a divinity, such language is entirely rational. But in what sense can an evolutionist and experientialist speak of man’s close relation to the infinite? Man is conscious of his ignorance of many things. He has no experience in the wide sense, and he cannot attempt to realize the divine because he cannot form any idea of it. The adjective divine is merely used to emphasize the happiness-producing and beautiful and benign attributes of things or acts. Man loves peace and health and beauty, and he consciously pursues his ideals of beauty and health and peace. The infinite has nothing to do with his ideals or his practical attempts to realize them.

I observe that the otherwise excellent indictment of Gen. Ordway, printed in another column, charges that he “gave a false and malicious representation of the character of labor organizations, and adroitly and with purpose wove them in with his allusions to professional rioters and organizations with unpardonable names [Anarchists] to convince the militia that there are no differences between them.” Did the man who drew this indictment mean to say to the secretary of war that there is a difference between labor organizations and Anarchist organizations, of such a nature as to warrant the militia in shooting down members of the latter while not molesting members of the former? Or, if not, what did he mean? I fear that this subordinate officer is following his master’s cowardly method of making himself and his followers look white by painting the Anarchists black. If this Knight of Labor, when he says that Gen. Ordway “tries to show that such members of a mob as may really be working people or Socialist ‘dreamers’ are the followers of ‘Anarchists’ and deserve the same fate” [of being shot], means to admit that Anarchists really do deserve such a fate, — and I can get no other idea from his words, — the substitution of himself for Gen. Ordway as commander of the militia would be a horribly beautiful illustration of the truth of Alphonse Karr’s epigram: Plus ça change, plus c’est la même chose.

My remark that murder is committed is made only as the result of a conference of the influence of passion or “human beasts” with a low development of social sentiments, while the liberty to drink is insisted upon by the most refined and intelligent men of all ages and classes, is commented upon by the “Voice” as follows: “Jack the Ripper’s style of murder is passionate and beastly, and hence the fundamental law of ‘life’ forbids it. If he would only change his style and murder people in a refined and cultured way, — by slow poison, to the thinking of cut-glass decanters, — he would be put in Parliament, perhaps, and, instead of being hunted by the police, be hunted by the office-seekers. See the difference? Why, of course.” With the talk about office-seekers and Parliamentary honours supposed to be in store for rich rum-dealers I am not concerned. Merely observing that the fundamental law of associative life forbids all and any possible “styles” of murder, I wish to know whether the “Voice” is really prepared to justify prohibition by the novel argument implied in the expression “slow poison to the thinking of cut-glass decanters” used in reference to liquor-dealers’ business. In the controversy with Mr. Yarros, the “Voice” pretended to defend prohibition on the sole ground that, among the people whom the dealers tempt to drink, some drink to excess and commit crimes while in an irresponsible state, and insisted that it was the welfare of society, or the third party, at heart. Now the “Voice” tells us that the liquor dealers “murder people” by “slow poison,” which, if true, would be a sufficient reason for prohibiting the liquor traffic even if the third party were imperilled. Has the “Voice” changed its position? If not, how can it justify this question-begging talk about murder and slow poison? I should advise the “Voice” to eschew sarcasm and irony, and attend to its logic, which badly needs improving.
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"In serving rent and interest, the last vestiges of old-time slavery, the Revolution abolished at one stroke the sword of the executioner, the yoke of the magistrate, the club of the policeman, the gage of the sheriff, and formed the basis of all those trumps of Politics which young Liberty prized beneath her banner!"—P/JRCHER.

The appearance in the editorial columns of articles on other than social and political questions is unusual, and, as the editor approves their central purpose and general tenor, though he does not hold himself responsible for every phrase or word, but the appearance in other parts of the paper of articles by the same or other writers by no means indicates that he approves them in any respect, such disposition of them being governed largely by motives of convenience.

A NEW BOOK GIVEN AWAY WITH EACH RENEWAL.

Payment of rent is to be required in advance. The names of subscribers not heard from within two weeks of the publication of the book should be stricken from the list. But to every subscriber who sends his renewal for one year at a time on or before the 10th of June, the publisher will mail at his option a copy of his new book, "The Fair Play," and a new and regular contributor to the columns of Liberty, a sure and authoritative guide for all books and pamphlets published by R. J. Tucker.

A Standard of Value a Necessity.

Readers of Liberty will remember an article in No. 184 on "The Functions of Money," reprinted from the Galvano Zephyr. In a letter to the "News," I commented upon this article as follows:

While not hesitating for a moment to accept the "News's" explanation that, when hinting that a standard of value is not indispensable, it was speaking of barter only, I may point out nevertheless that it appears to me absurd to suppose that the words actually used conveyed the idea that something more than barter was in view. Let me quote from the original:

It is far from being a medium of exchange is absolutely necessary, and this interpretation receives additional justification when it is remembered that the words were used in answer to the "Evening Post's" contention that, in comparing the two functions of money, its office of medium of exchange must be held inferior to its office of measure of value.

However, the "News" now makes it sufficiently clear that a standard of value is absolutely essential to money, thereby taking common ground with me against the position of Comrade Westrup. Still I cannot agree with all that is said in comment upon the Westrup view.

First, I question its admission that a measure of value differs from a measure of length in that the former is empirical. True, value is a relation; but does not length also form the relation of an object to space? If so, then the yardstick does not possess the quality of extension in itself, being as dependent for it upon space as gold is dependent for its value upon other commodities. But perhaps this is merely a case of language, and do not insist, and pass on to a more important consideration.

Second, I question whether the "News's" counter-vailling difference between a standard of length and a standard of value establishes all that it claims. In the supposed case of a bank loan secured by mortgage, the margin between the valuation and the obligation practically secures the note-holder against loss from a decline in the value of the security, but it does not secure him against loss from a decline in the value of the standard, or make it impossible for him to profit by a rise in the value of the standard. Suppose that a farmer, having a farm worth $5,000 in gold, mortgaged $2,500 of it, and later on the notes newly issued by the bank against this farm. With these notes he purchases implements from a manufacturer. When the mortgage expires a year later, the borrower falls to it. Meanwhile gold has declined 50%. The farmer repays the notes for the hammer and brings, instead of $5,000 in gold, $6,500 in gold. Of this sum $2,500 is used to meet the notes held by the manufacturer who took them a year before in payment for the implements sold to the farmer. Now, can the manufacturer now make his implements with $2,500 in gold? Manifestly not, for gold has gone down. Why, then, is not this manufacturer a sufferer from the variation in the standard of value, precisely as the man who buys cloth with a short yardstick and sells it with a long one is a sufferer from the variation in the standard of length? The claim that a standard of value varies, and inflicts damage by its variations, is perfectly sound, but the same is true, not only of the standard of value, but of every valuable commodity as well. Even if there is no such thing as money, still nothing could prevent a partial failure of the wheat crop from enhancing the value of every bushel of wheat. Such evils, so far as they arise from natural causes, are in the nature of inevitable disasters and accidents, which no one can prevent whatever he may say. It is an argument against the adoption of a standard of value. If every yardstick in existence, instead of constantly remaining thirty-six inches long, were to vary from day to day within the limits of thirty-five and thirty-seven inches, very few people would be any better off than with no yardstick at all. But it would be no more foolish to abolish the yardstick because of such a defect than it would be to abolish the standard of value, and therefore money, simply because no commodity can be found for a standard which is not subject to the law of supply and demand.

State Socialism's Scylla and Charybdis.

Any one who has been watching the New York "Voice" with half an eye for the past year, and noticed the space and attention which that organ of prohibition has been devoting to the various phases of the labor movement, knows very well that the design is to exploit the industrial revolt in the interest of the newly formed People's party. The campaign which it carried on at the close of the recent Cleveland conference made this motive manifest to the blindest. But that conference, though a majority of the delegates composing it were, in my judgment, Prohibitionists, had the prudence to soothe the issue thus raised, which it could only do by bowing it down. Hence the disappointed "Voice" condemns the conference utterly, and calls on all Prohibitionists to withdraw their support from the newly-formed People's party. But this call will be heeded only par- tially, for the new politicians will still try to engraft their view upon the People's party platform. Banished for the moment, the question of prohibition of liquor-selling will surely return to torment the friends of prohibition of money-lending. And all the oppositions of non-cooperation will act together, and in this fact lies the safety of liberty. Nothing so militates against the advent of State Socialism as the necessity of accepting each application of its principle having enough particular advantage to appear to be a step forward on its pet project. And, unless it can, refuses to support the other prohibitions, from which situation one of two things follows: either the whole prohibitory movement splits up into factions, no one of which is strong enough to carry any of the others, or else all the prohibitions are bundled together, and then those friends of each who are unable to swallow the whole dose secede in sufficient numbers to make defeat certain. The passage between the Scylla of division and the Charybdis of union is destined to narrow down till it wrecks the craft of democratic authority.
Reform in Many Spheres.

The way the transgressor is hard, and every re-
former and progressive innovator is looked upon as a transgressor to whom no quarter should be given and no mercy shown? Not that the mysterious law of compensation entirely fails here: in reform still finds an ally in kindred and none but the trained and hardened devotees ever experience it. It is not easy to reform the world, which, naturally enough, objects to being incessantly lectured upon its faults, bad habits, vices, and ignor-
ance.[12] What is the average man for his determination to make the most of the few good things he is allowed to enjoy, and for his decision to bear resolutely the ills he is habituated to. But no more can the average man justly con-
clude that the reformer for refusing to heed his vain cry for peace when there is no peace and when real peace is impossible to the great majority. The average man never falls into a more comical error than when he supposes that his practical philosophy, his happy and wise policy, are totally unknown to the restless and nervous agitators. The reformer is fully aware of the great truths that half a loaf is better than none, and that life is short; but he cannot forget, at the same time, that, for him, things would have been far worse than they are. His successes in the past encourage him to think that much more must be done; and though he is far from complete his task and give it all that he deems worthy having. The reformer is often guilty of injustice toward the present, often too reckless and contemptuous and haughty; but it is to be remembered that we in dealing with angry and the terms cowardice, suspicion, and blind aversion to change. Still, for these extremities only explanations may be found, not excuses. As for indulging and fol-
lowing them, that is out of the question. Fortunately, though we are far from the extremities, there is much in the life of the world lulls with the extremities are simply victims of the world's dulness or carelessness. Theoretically every reasoning and logical person is an extremist, — a bold and fierce, explorer and champion of truth. Practically a reasoning man is an extremist; for he who grasps a great problem in all its complexity and plenitude cannot possibly be deceived as to difficulties in the way of accomplishing a radical reform.

Reform is near, but the heaviest burden is carried by the political — using the word in its broad signifi-
cation — reformer. It is not easy to fight prejudice, habit, custom, routine, custom, even when not backed by brute force; how much more serious an undertaking it must be to fight interests, institutions, arrangements, and con-
tinued society. As the question is defined and shaped to the needs of the day, so the forces are shaped affects the State and party. There where there is little popular folly and prejudice to overcome, reformers need only patience, perseverance, firmness, and courage. Sooner or later, the throne, or the worth of their ideas and schemes, is appreciated by at least a portion of so-called enlightened society. Indeed, candor compels the admission that sterling merit and great genius are not even neglected very long by the cultured elements of modern society. At first the opposition is bitter; but the struggle is then terminated in favor of the representative of progress. Social reformers are not so fortunate. Though, if they are wise and clear-sighted, they are not always galvanized to face the dangers and sufferings from which their protot-
ges in the struggle are not always galvanized to face it with braveness and the struggle between them and the beneficiaries of privilege and injustice promises to be long and bitter. There is no naivete in this; the contrast, the difference is all that I here emphasize, the inevitability of the change, the possibility of the change, the power of the change.

To follow the Zola has taken the position that the State and all are correct to fight for the protection of the poor, and there are no means to do it. The result is, as everybody knows, an armistice of the State and society.

As for the State and all are correct to fight for the protection of the poor, and there are no means to do it. The result is, as everybody knows, an armistice of the State and society. The defeat of the State and all means is right.

This is, as everybody knows, an armistice of the State and society. The defeat of the State and all means is right.
a second time, and the author's reputation suffers with that of the publisher's imprint. The magazine which this year sells on account of the contributors' names it presents attached to poor materials feels the mistake next year. I was talking on this point with an editor only a few days ago. This is what he said: "I see the trend to be steady in the reading public is becoming more and more impatient with big names. The question is, Is the story a good one? Is the poem meritorious? Why, the few most successful hits in my magazine last year were two anonymous contributions and two from authors whose names no one in our office even knew when the manuscript came in. We heard more from those four stories and articles than anything else, although we published some big authors last year." And I find much the same state of affairs which I described last year.

The change is a good one, for it means that editors and publishers will be more than ever ready and willing to help the rising school of authors.

A step in the right direction, to be sure; but it seems that much more is needed to make our magazines what they ought to be. The need for an independent magazine is certainly not as urgent as the need for an independent theatre, yet even that is coming. "There is in the air here," says a New York correspondent of a literary journal, "rumors of an old magazine which may appear as early as next season. It will be something in its favor from the start,—it is unique, and will be unlike anything ever attempted before in the professional world. The policy of the magazine will be based on the belief that the very best things written today never see the light of day because the editors are afraid of innovations; from experience they know what pleases their readers most, and month after month they shall in the same waters.

A striking piece of work comes along, the editor recognizes its distinct individuality, but he is afraid to put it into his magazine, and the apprehension is more than endorsed by the publishing department and from the proprietor's chair. Now, this is the very piece of work upon which this new magazine will thrive. What others conceal becomes the admiration of the public, but out of their line will be directly within the scope of this literary newcomer. It will not be sensational in any respect, on the contrary, it will cater to the best intellects. It will be in black—probably a dollar a single issue. The business department will be made distinctly secondary—advertisements will be taken, but not solicited. They will also come high. The aim of the magazine is not a pecuniary one, but entirely in the interest of creating an American literature which, it is claimed, will be the answer to the dry policies. This scheme is the idea of J. M. Stoddard, the editor of "Lippincott's Magazine." It is he who has the whole plan in hand and is working it out. I can say for it the idea is in no sense visionary."

Another alarm is the suspicion that a warm debate and passionate attack is anonymous reviewing. Now those who write literary tendencies cannot fail to see that this abuse shows aware of decay, and that its days are numbered. The practice of responsible and honest reviewing for abstinence is much moreosaic, to the advantage of literature and human nature. It should not be inferred that I look forward to the speedy and total disappearance of all vice and all perfection from the ills of humanity. Doubtless the reign of my name is not remote; still abuse, oh, abuse, would lead to the death of the age of literature and human nature."

Editor Frank K. Foster, of the "Labor Leader," will be an Anarchist before he knows it. Indeed, it might almost be said that he is already an Anarchist and does not know it. Reviewing in his paper the whole of Spencer's long article, "From Freedom to Bondage," he says: "The stupidness of the whole argument is based on the part of those who hope to achieve by force of law upon community that which is not to be expected from the individuals making up the community. It may be that Mr. Spencer underestimates the necessity for coercive association in the industrial world. I am myself of that opinion. And yet this necessity largely springs from the restriction of free competition brought about by legislative enactment for the privileged classes. There is probably no trade unkind but regrets the existing condition of society will not persist, but there is no reason why the voluntary principles do-er run through most trade associations. The man who does not infringe upon the industrial rights of others—in doing which he properly conies within the scope of overcharge and discrimination—cannot be said to have Socialism. To the Socialist State would greatly lessen this freedom, for what is now accomplished by moral suasion and appeal to the social faculties would then be enforced by the arm of the law. Mr. Spencer's article should at least have been me more radical. But the doctrine of the Socialist regime cannot be pooched-pooched away. The test of actual affairs must be used to demonstrate their wisdom or fallacy." The words which I have italicized contain the essence of the Anarchist position. They should be the watchword of the "Labor Leader." On this point he ought to be good authority, for he has spent many years in trying to pooh-pooh them. It is only within a few months that he has perceived the futility of the endeavor. Mr. Foster is far along in the path which has already brought Joseph A. Labadie, John W. H. Hutcheson, and other prominent labor leaders into the camp of the Anarchists. And yet the "Journal of the Knights of Labor" says that we have influence worth mentioning.

Plum-Line Pointers.

The Comstock—Tyner—Blair—St. John people might put their time to worse use than devoting it to the pressure of these sentences of Bulwer's Paul Clifford: "Oh, unknown, invisible, inexpressible love, are there not some sciences, arts, and mysteries but one? You cannot frame a tolerable law for the life and soul of you. You lay down rules it is impossible to keep, you get the lengthening list to obey. You call each other monsters because you cannot conquer the impossibility! You invent all sorts of vices, under pretense of making laws for promoting virtue. You make yourselves as ignorant and useless as you can by all sorts of galling, vexatious institutions."

I think you wrong in your condemnation of the payment of a commission to the community—this is a misstatement from the point of view that the people should not consume all they produce, but should economize in their personal consumption and add to the funds employed in raising useful products. It is desirable that, out of the produce raised by means of their savings, some should receive more income than necessary for their subsistence. —John Stuart Mill.

It would seem that abstinence is its own reward. If it be not done for the purpose of obtaining the sum of tens of dollars in harmful indulgence, it receives remuneration in three ways for that abstinence. He has, first, the increased virility of his body; secondly, the physical vigor which has not been impaired; and, thirdly, he has the ten dollars, which he would in other circumstances have spent, to add to the sums of some fortunate or mentally decept person be taxed to bestow upon him an additional reward for doing that which was really his own, and almost too easily within his reach without the sum borrowed, what more can equity demand? But there is the risk, you say. Ah! then interest is a premium over the coin, so to speak, for abstinence. Well then, when the sum borrowed is returned, together with such further sum as represents the actual expenses incurred by the lender in the collection of the transaction, is not the lender entitled to his, cool interest? Could the lender not secure more than this if there were not a monopoly of the opportunity to issue money?

The New York "Sun" reports Walt McAllister as saying that it is the duty of all who go to the circus in this country to "Let us know the show is a world and down in the show there is not a single woman who is not interested in the show and all the women who go to the show are in the show the same as men are in the show." He should not be inferred that I look forward to the speedy and total disappearance of all vice and all perfection from the ills of humanity. Doubtless the reign of my name is not remote; still abuse, oh, abuse, would lead to the death of the age of literature and human nature."


The following, taken from the Washington "Star" of May 25, shows that the Knights of Labor are after the scalp of Gen. Albert Ordway. I hope they may get it. If they do, their success will establish an excellent record d'etre for an organization seemingly at the door of deserved death. It is gratifying to see that the man who would give his personal reputation in the matter is a subordinate of Liberty, Paul T. Bowen.

This morning a committee composed of Messrs. Paul T. Bowen, L. P. Wild, and E. W. Hamblowton, representing District Assembly No. 60, Knights of Labor, called upon the Secretary of the Treasury and presented to him charges against Brigadier Gen. Albert Ordway, commanding the United States Naval District of the Columbia. The Secretary informed the committee that he would give his personal reputation in the matter is a subordinate of Liberty, Paul T. Bowen.
This assembly is composed of delegates from labor organizations, socialists, anarchists, radicals, and various political parties. The assembly is charged with the responsibility of drafting a constitution for the new republic. The delegates are divided into three main groups: the labor group, the socialist group, and the radical group. Each group is represented by a leader who is responsible for representing the interests of their members. The assembly is being held in a large hall with several hundred people attending. The leaders are speaking passionately, using gestures and exuberance to convey their arguments. The atmosphere is charged with tension and excitement as the delegates debate the key issues of the day. The tension is palpable, and the mood is one of urgency and determination. The leaders are speaking with a clear aim to achieve their objectives.

The leaders are addressing the assembly on the following key issues:

1. The role of the state and the role of labor in society.
2. The distribution of wealth and the question of economic justice.
3. The importance of democracy and the need for broad participation in decision-making.
4. The question of freedom of speech and the role of the press.
5. The preservation of cultural heritage and the need for a diverse and inclusive society.

The leaders are calling for a more participatory and inclusive society, where the voice of the people is heard and valued. They are calling for a new model of governance that is based on the principles of equality, justice, and democracy. The leaders are urging the delegates to work together to create a society that is fair and just for all.

The assembly is expected to conclude its work by the end of the week, with the final constitution to be ratified by the people in a national referendum.
Liberty, 1863

logically, each necessarily comes to different conclusions. Consequently, there is no correlation between equality in occupying ownership of land and the ownership and control of ideas. No one can own ideas as they are not objects that can be possessed by a person who owns ideas. Land, on the other hand, is not a product; ideas are. He who conceives an idea has in its own right. It is his property; no one can own it. So the idea is not transferrable. In this sense, a person who has the freedom to act can transfer his own ideas to another, thereby giving them a new owner. However, in the absence of an owner, the idea is not considered to be in the possession of an owner. Hence, it is not a movable property subject to transfer.

[Image 0x0 to 612x782]

lichen with your own rights, and that ideas are human products. — ENTITLED LIBERTY.

Revolution by the Dozen.

It appears that, when Dr. Joseph Rodes Buchanan is not predicting geological and social revolutions, he is engaged in mixing revolutions. His revolutions create no more disturbance than his predictions, but that is not his fault. We are a wicked and profane people, if we can enjoy the following report from the pen of the New York "times" reviewer, of Dr. Buchanan's latest achievement.

There is richness in "Therapeutic Sarcastomony," by Dr. Joseph Rodes Buchanan. The book weighs five pounds and is wholly dedicated to representing something that has not been a gift of the New York "times" reviewer, of Dr. Buchanan's latest achievement.

Money and Bank Checks.

Accepting as correct the statement made by the New York "Times" that "one-fifth per cent of the business transacted through the banks is done by means of checks, what is the inference as regards the probable necessity for money? At first, the idea suggests that the writer, on the one hand, is feeding a passion for the abolition of all forms of money, and on the other, is reiterating the definition of what constitutes the necessary, or, if not necessary, the infeasi- bility of checks.

Even if it were true, it does not answer the question: how much money is needed? The declining rate of interest in banks has led to a decrease in the use of checks. Banks are now paying less than the legal rate for their services, thus reducing the cost of banking. Nevertheless, the use of checks continues to grow. Even if the use of checks decreases, the demand for money will still exist. Money and bank checks are interdependent, and the use of checks is a reflection of the need for money. Even if the use of checks decreases, the demand for money will still exist. Money and bank checks are interdependent, and the use of checks is a reflection of the need for money.

The fact that no Russian daily newspaper can go to press until it has passed the censorship accounts for the following announcement in the "Gorizonian"—"We are unable to issue any more of our morning edition owing to the circumstance that the censor appointed to examine all telegrams was not at home all night. As soon as he has come up to 2 o'clock in the morning, we shall begin to publish our morning paper."
PROMOUND'S WORKS.
Great Reduction of Price.
$1.00 instead of $5.50.

WHAT IS PROPERTY? Or an Inquiry into the True Object and Substance of Property. By Lysander Spooner. Published for the Truth Unveiling Proprietors by a Philanthropist, and devoted to the progress of human freedom. Translated from the French by J. H. Thoreau. With an introductory chapter by the translator, and a full account of the history of the institution of property, its laws, and the enforcement of the law of nature in America and England. This is a complete edition of the work, containing a full account of all the cases and decisions of the courts of law and equity, with the expressions and startling appeals of the crimes which it condemns. Price, cloth, $1.00; half calf, blue, gilt edges, $1.20.

SYSTEM OF ECONOMIC CONTRADICTORIES.
A New, Rational, and Complete System of Economics. Translated from the French by J. B. Tucker. This work contains a complete system of economics, and is published in a style uniform with that of "What is Property?" It discusses a style as to how to earn, the price of labor, the division of labor, etc. It is an indispensable work in the study of economics, and is well worth the attention of all who are interested in the subject. Price, cloth, $1.00; half calf, gilt edges, $1.20.

W. E. CHAPMAN.
In the style of the typographic art. Price, cloth, $1.00; full calf, gilt edges, $1.20.

William E. Chapman.

BRIDGE.
A Manual of Bridge for the use of the Bridge Club. By W. E. Chapman. Price, cloth, $1.00; half calf, gilt edges, $1.20.
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Robert E. Chapman.
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A Manual of Bridge for the use of the Bridge Club. By W. E. Chapman. Price, cloth, $1.00; half calf, gilt edges, $1.20.

Robert E. Chapman.
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A Manual of Bridge for the use of the Bridge Club. By W. E. Chapman. Price, cloth, $1.00; half calf, gilt edges, $1.20.

Robert E. Chapman.
STURM.

By JOHN HENRY MACKAY.


Price, cloth, 75 cents; paper, 50 cents.

Address: BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 3300, Boston, Mass.

THE SCIENCE OF SOCIETY.

By Stephen Pearl Andrews.

This work, long out of print, is now republished to meet a demand for this valuable work on the science of society. It was published about forty years ago, and yet its teachings will be found pertinent today. In this book, Andrews presents a comprehensive analysis of the social sciences, providing insights into the development of society and the contribution of various factors to its growth.
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