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"For always in thine eyes, O Liberty!"—Shriner's Song High Light Wherewith the World is Paved; And Though Thou Now Sayst, We Will Trust in Thee."

JOHN HAY.

On Picket Duty.

It seems that Mr. Walter Crane, who assisted at the Boston memorial meeting reported in the last number, is threatened with social ostracism and with the withholding of patronage from his art exhibition. It goes without saying that such conduct of the better elements of our society will greatly increase Mr. Crane's respect for our civilized and refined society, and convert him into an object of sympathy and applause. We feel no sympathy for the present.

"What we have to cope with," says Mr. Bellamy, "is not indeed any serious argumentative opposition to our propositions. None has been attempted which has not been based upon obvious misconceptions. What we have to meet is simply the inertness of the human mind, the strength of inherited prejudice, and above all the spirit of pessimism and hopelessness." Does Mr. Bellamy really believe that the opposition of Liberty, or of "Everyday," or of the "Personal Rights Journal," or of the "Free Life," or of the "Plea for Liberty," or of "Justice," is based on nothing but obvious misconceptions of his gospel? I cannot think so; but, if this is his real opinion, then it is evident that what he has to cope with is his own infinite ignorance and stupidity.

Does anybody know the difference between Nationalism and Socialism in Europe? Here is an authoritative statement from Mr. Bellamy himself: "Socialism in Europe as it exists, he says, "is mainly a class movement, a scheme to magnify the trades into a corporation body for the purpose of eventually merging it into the State itself. It is a proletarian scheme. Nationalism, on the other hand, "knows nothing of class distinctions. It stands for the wage-worker, and it equally strives to save the rich man from himself."

No difference, you say? No difference at all, it seems to you, since the Socialists in Europe are emphatic about their generous endeavor to save the rich from themselves. Well, no argument with you is possible. Why, a man so dull may next deny that there is any difference between Sweden and Switzerland.

The American National Prison Congress has been inquiring into the causes of the increase of crime. The conclusion arrived at is that gambling and the "social evil" are the chief factors of crime, and that among the other factors are the "ease with which habitual criminals avoid arrest, the lightness of sentences, laxity of parole, the comfortable quarters and excellent quality of food, the case of visitation to prisoners, and the readiness with which a citizen's personal opinion of the public is as to the system of prison labor, the comfort of quarters and the excellence of food, the case of visitation to prisoners, and the readiness with which there are indications of a general power to escape from the penalties of the law."

Among the Listerian's personal friends there is a certain firm belief in a theory of the "social evils," and a fond of old-fashioned things in general, and yet so broodingly related to the world, and so deep in its sympathies with humanity, that he sees clear through the veil of prejudice which people are continually hanging up and hiding behind. That is to say, with which they are hiding the world from themselves; for prejudice is a good deal like the sand in the ostrich's hide his head; he can't see out of it, but all the world can see him only too plainly. Well, this conservative man of whom the Listerian speaks is not a man of prejudice, and consequently is regarded by prejudiced people as a violent radical; but he calls himself a Tory just the same, and would really like to restore a good many laws and customs which the reforming world has done away with. These laws and customs, he thinks, and justifies his position with good arguments, would render people happier and better than they really are now, with some of their supposed liberation from old tyrannies.

However, with these particular notions of his philosophical friends, Mr. Lister has not just now anything in particular to do. He proposes simply to repeat a word or two that he has said about some recent tendencies and proceedings. Is he likely to believe that the Listerian has, as a matter of fact, said anything about a certain newspaper editor at some time or another? And that is the general disposition to excuse and even commend such outrageous infringement. I saw in a leading Boston daily paper, Friday, an editorial which stated, as if it were a proof of the Chicago Socialists' total lack of respect that the police 'had to enter the hall and force the inmates to raise the American flag.' Is it? Why, man, there is more political depravity in that 'had to' than in all the words and acts of all the Socialists in the country in the last five years. And the American flag is not something which you overlook, or which is just a matter of course. And I learn that the editors of the paper, and not the Socialists, are the authors of this outrageous and dangerous doctrines of the editors. That, I say, is the worst of it. Editors may be ignorant and stupid, but they ought to be a good deal more intelligent and reasonable people ready to rush into print to denounce such mischievous nonsense."

The American Flag a Fetich.

(The Listener in Boston Transcript.)
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The appearance in the editorial column of articles over other signatures than the editor's initial indicates that the other 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 this paper of articles by the same or other writers by no means indicates that he disapproves them in any respect, such disposition of them being governed largely by motives of convenience.

A NEW BOOK GONE AWAY WITH SUCH RENOWN—In the mid-week issue of our local weekly a notice was given of a book that is about to appear. The name of the book is "The Anarchist," by Max Stirner. It is said to be a work of great importance, and that its publication is awaited with great interest.

Confused and Confusing.—In the "Twentieth Century" of Nov. 3 Mr. Pente-
cost triumphantly and conclusively shows that it is not necessary for a man who wishes to be an Anarchist to show much evidence of being an Anarchist. He quotes a paragraph defining and analyzing Anarchism in a way which leaves no doubt that men of his notions are not Anarchists. Mr. Pente-
cost says:

Anarchism, according to Mr. Tucker, contemplates the use of statutes, officials, military, or other symbols of force, and prisons. Anarchists, on the other hand, go much further. They do not believe in a higher power, and therefore in the government by force. They admit that Anarchistic government would be infinitely less injurious than present Govern-
ment, but they acknowledge the danger of a different kind of govern-
ment by force. Mr. Pente-
cost says:

If this means anything, it means that Mr. Pente-
cost would allow crime to go unpunished, and that he would not use "statutes, officials, military, or other symbols of force, and prisons" under any circum-
stances. Mr. Pente-
cost says:

He is most free who experiences the minimum of interference from others, whose life is not hemmed in by restrictions and prohibitions, who is not forced to the lower animals to regulate his conduct. Anarchism is thus made perfectly clear. The strong and brutal are to rule, to have absolute liberty, and the gentle and civilized in the "no rule" are to submit to slavery and indignity without a murmur. This is for us; our civilization; while the Anarchistic system, which grants only equal freedom, is but slightly better than Monarchism or Republicanism.

Well, Mr. Pente-
cost and Count Tolstoi may be right in their view of true civilization. Perhaps non-
resistance is the best method of overcoming evil. It is true that science and common sense are against this theory of progress; but the last word has by no means been said on the subject, and science may yet be forced to accept the Tolstoi-Pente-
cost gospel.
not analyze patiently: does not perceive nature's infinite variety; cannot calculate the nice gradations of feeling and the innumerable results consequent upon hair-line degrees of variance. In fact, the average person is not observant, not reflective, and not inductive. The average person mirrors himself in his opinion, instead of turning his eyes abroad to inspect conditions. But the average person is not the only detractor the newspaper has to meet. The charges which the "Herald" puts in the mouth of the average person are by no means such as superior persons would hesitate to endorse. It is not by the average person alone that the sole ambition of the newspaper is believed to be to make money, and that the papers are held to be at the service of the largest purse. Superior persons are not generally known to credit newspapers with such an intention, and to condemn the newspapers for it. Newspapers are doing excellent work in giving space to the contents of valuable books, to reports of scientific, literary, and artistic events, to the advance of reform movements, is conceded. But why should the newspapers claim credit for this work? It is done because it pays them to do it, because there is a sufficient demand for such work. Do the newspapers hesitate to lie, slander, misrepresent, boycott, when it pays to do so, when the public demands such conduct? No, the answer is too simple to suppose that a, as a rule, newspapers are established to do reform work,—to point out the errors of the people and teach them the truth? To say that newspapers find room for good and wholesome products when they find it profitable to do so, is merely to say that newspaper publishers believe it is profitable to do so, and not turn away from good work because it is good work. But they never welcome good work because of its intrinsic worth, but because, while it is excellent, it is also possessed of market value. A fair, intelligent, honest community and intelligentsia, and ignorant conservatives will have papers representative of their qualities. Natural selection will work to secure the survivor of those who are best adapted to the conditions. American newspapers are improving: the growth of popular intelligence, however, is the antecedent of this improvement. v. v.

Plum-Line Pointers.

How difficult it is to rid oneself of the old theological reverberation day. The Topeka correspondent of a Kansas City paper says:

"It is a crime in this city to sell elder a minute over three days old and an unpardonable desecration to get shaved on Sunday. But vice has to seek other channels."

Although apparently making light of the worship of Sunday, yet this is not his meaning. It is that this is a city of a different character. If this is not his meaning, what does he intend to convey by the declaration that vice, denied entrance to the barber shop on Sunday, seeks "other channels"?

The recent criminal prosecution by the police of Chicago of the right of peaceable assembly in that city is the occasion of much newspaper comment, good, bad, and indifferent. The police in that city have an idea that they have been too much indulged. That the revolutionary Socialists, whose meetings have been so inexcusably broken up, will be either pacified or terrorized by the action of the official bulwarks it were foolish indeed to suppose. Rather, it is much to be feared that serious trouble will grow out of the fantastically outrageous performance of the police.

Many of the revolutionists are men of small reasoning faculties, little or no prudence, and very inflammable temper. They are swung almost to madness by the impassioned talk of their leaders, and are not likely to be discreet in either word or action. One of them got up in the meeting of the State Socialists (at which meeting strong resolutions denouncing the mayor and police authorities were adopted) and attempted to preach the propaganda of force. This is the way of playing directly into their hands—it will be very acceptable to Washburne and his tools. They could ask nothing better. This fire-brand in a powder magazine called himself an Anarchist; the papers call him an Anarchist; the State Socialists call him an Anarchist; the revolutionary Socialists in general call themselves Anarchists; the papers call them Anarchists; the police call them Anarchists; the State Socialists call them Anarchists, and the people at large call them Anarchists. Then on top of all this there are the State and Federal grand juries, and the presiding judge Washburne and the police inspectors as Anarchists! When objection is made to thus sinning the name of Anarchist "Tommy" Morgan sarcastically replies that "the resolutions were designed for Americanism and good institutions, and not to be employed by Americans." The latter considered an Anarchist a man who would throttle the law. This the mayor and the police had done in interfering with meetings in which nothing illegal was said or done. Therefore, in the opinion of the mayor and the police, having throttled the law, were Anarchists." But Mr. Morgan forgets that there are Anarchists and Anarchists. The kind best known to the people of Chicago and to most other Americans would throttle other men's law very much as he throttles the laws of meetings, by brute force. But the philosophical Anarchists would throttle all inexcuseable law by education and, hence, resolutely, by the "abstemious substitution of the opposite good."

The Chicago "Herald," condemning the police inspector for his raids upon the revolutionary Socialists, says: "It should have interfered legally. Its house had no more right to arrest and imprison anyone who uttered some words calculated to excite treason. Treason to whom or what? To certain men who, by virtue of their official positions, can safely spoil and degrade their fellows? Or to savage and semi-savage institutions which have survived into an age of comparative enlightenment? Or, on the other hand, to the principles of liberty and justice? If—which is not probable—you mean the last,—what of the traitor, Comstock, who seeks to gag the press? Of the traitor, Washburne, who savagely suppressed the destruction of the right of free public assembly? Of the traitor, McKinley, who rob the masses in the interest of privileged plutocrats? Of the traitors, the priests and preachers, who would steal one-seventh of our time and free and imprison us if we protest? Ah! "treason"? Before you conjure with any of numberless definitions, tell us what you mean by it.

J. H. Brown, sentenced July 13, 1888, for five years, for burglary in Wyandotte, has had his sentence commuted to four years. Brown was convicted on circumstantial evidence of stealing thirty-one dollars. The prosecuting attorney, deputy and grand jury, witness together with seven of the jury who tried the case and nearly all the county officers of Wyandotte county, petitioned for the man's parole, and there has always been a doubt of his guilt. —Topeka Capital.

But why was he imprisoned at all if "there has always been a doubt of his guilt?" Is this a fair sample of Kansas and American "justice,"—a man sent to the penitentiary for five years on a suspicion of burglary and has the petition of the officials named, the Board of Par- dons took but one year from his sentence! If there is any department of the State and national governments that more than another needs a thorough overhaul and rearrangement it is the Board of Pardons. Criminal it is,—no designation could be more appropriate.

Farriere concludes at last that her love for Martian is what she is given to and takes her attention away from her duties. —Bell Yje.

The clergy reason analogously in relation to the opening of the World's Fair on Sunday. They say to each other: "The people will enjoy themselves very much to-day, and they will never go back to church. The people they go there they cannot attend church services at the same time, and they will care less about taking part in devotions at other hours of the day after they discover how well they can be instructed and amused about the exposition." The clergy does not reason. It will be money out of our pockets if it is." This is what they say to each other in the church's union conference; what they say to the public sounds quite differently: "We must not, as a nation, desecrate the Sabbath. It will call down God's judgment upon them. And if you open the Exposition on Sunday the rich men will soon have the laborers working seven days in the week." Which are the true reasons why the clergy wants to keep closed on "preachers' day"?

General Beauregard still keeps up his lofty connection, and a courier is out among other officials with violating the postal laws. Our northern notions of morality are a great hole to the South. —Brooklyn Times.

Your "northern notions of morality" in regard to gambling remind me of the legend that Satan sometimes puts his sins in a holy war against the Louisiana Lottery, but it is safe to say that five out of every seven adult males in the North try their luck at gambling, in one form or another, at least once a year. And there is large as a portion of the change which people in the Republic- an as in the Democratic party. Yet the Republican party is the national godmother of the anti-lottery crusade. And the very fellows who are among those deepest in the lottery business, here in the North, will throw up their hats and shout for the great and good Republican party until they are black in the face.

My memory reminds me of an amusing instance of this "double-standard" morality which came under my observation in Kansas. At Valley Falls one of the most high-strung, intolerant local Republicans was the city agent for this same Louisiania Lottery! By the way, it seems to me that Brooklyn is too near Wall Street for the "Times" to indulge in many snubs about our "northern notions of morality" being "bore to the South."

Two planks of the German Socialists' platform laid down at the recent Congress in Erfurt, are as follows: 7. Religion to be a matter of private opinion, and all payment of public funds for confessional or religious objects to cease; ecclesiastical or religious bodies to be considered private associations which manage their own affairs. 8. The secularization of the national schools, attendance at them to be compulsory, free education, free books, and free dinners for children attending the public schools, as well as for those pupils of either sex who, by their general capacity, are considered fit to pursue their studies at the higher educational institutions.

The German Socialists have advanced far enough to demand the divorcement of religion and the State, but their development seems to be lopsided, for, instead of consistently asking for the separation of education and the State, they go in for a directly opposite direction, demanding that the State shall be closer than ever before, the State to do more and more of the work of parents and the private educational institutions. Why should not schools be managed by "private associations"? The Socialists say that churches are private associations and the German Socialists insist upon the cessation of State aid to churches for the reason that they do not want churches, while at the same time they demand State schools because schools are one of their wants.

Col. Ingersoll recently lectured upon the "Liberty of Man, Woman, and Child," in the Auditorium, Chicago. He had an immense and enthusiastic audience. Here is his opening sentences, as reported by the New York Herald:

"What do I mean by liberty? Let me explain. If a man is prevented from going where he desires by a high mountain or rushing river or wild beast, he does not think he is confined, that he is deprived of freedom. The Colonel is brilliant and his epigrams are always neat and often very forcible and convincing, but he is not logical enough to perceive their implications nor the direction in which they lead. Take the last sentence in the first paragraph. The County is not to be interfered with by a like intelligence, whether in earth or heaven."

By his own definition, the protective tariff, which helps the也不能理解，因为政策奴隶。The Colonel is brilliant and his epigrams are always neat and often very forcible and convincing, but he is not logical enough to perceive their implications nor the direction in which they lead. Take the last sentence in the first paragraph. The County is not to be interfered with by a like intelligence, whether in earth or heaven."

Col. Ingersoll recently lectured upon the "Liberty of Man, Woman, and Child," in the Auditorium, Chicago. He had an immense and enthusiastic audience. Here is his opening sentences, as reported by the New York Herald:

"What do I mean by liberty? Let me explain. If a man is prevented from going where he desires by a high mountain or rushing river or wild beast, he does not think he is confined, that he is deprived of freedom. The Colonel is brilliant and his epigrams are always neat and often very forcible and convincing, but he is not logical enough to perceive their implications nor the direction in which they lead. Take the last sentence in the first paragraph. The County is not to be interfered with by a like intelligence, whether in earth or heaven."

The end of the paragraph is not clear. It seems to suggest that the County is not to be interfered with by a like intelligence, whether in earth or heaven.
underemphasizing, thick-and-thin superior than Col. Robert G. Ingersoll.

A committee of citizens and clergymen of all denominations, headed by His Grace, Archbishop Gros, of the Catholic church, went before the council today and presented a long petition against the exemption of the State. Among the members who accompanied him were Rev. Fathers Gade, Sonne, and Northman, of his own church; Rev. Dr. Hays, of the First Presbyterian church; Rev. T. E. Clapp, of the First Congregational church; Rev. T. L. Ellis, of the Unitarian church; Rev. Alfred Kimmel, E. church, and Rev. E. Thompson, Secretary of the executive committee, having the Sunday movement in charge. They were given a respectful hearing and the petition was referred to the judiciary committee.

Who can doubt that the Sunday-sanctity crusade is a class movement almost entirely, an effort of the guild of preachers to shut out competitors by the intervention of the State? And note how the clergy of the different branches of the Church singles out doctrinal differences when it comes to the practical question of bread and meat for themselves. Following humbly in the lead of the "Mother Church" clerics come the various orthodox Protestant ministers and even the Unitarian pulpits. How many such forcible objections should really be thought very much before they need arouse themselves to enlightened expression and wise action?

E. C. Walker.

Must the Egg Count Himself Out?

[Tak Tak in English.]

Self-interest masks itself and says slyly we seek the good of the species or we are saying bluntly we do not care enough to pick up all that other individuals let slip from their grasp. Are we not the species as distinctively, different from any individual? When we urge sacrifice for the good of the species, are we not beggar and hypocrites? Persuasion mingled freely with flattery administered to the vanity of the species instead of being that the Moral philosopher flatters himself as he proceeds to reason what he vainly imagines to be a service to his species. Assuming the point of view that he is speaking for the species, he must forget that he is appealing to the self-interest of the strata, but, assuming an individual point of view, the question is differently affected. It then becomes: what use can I make of the species, of the creature?

A summary of ethical teachings by Herbert Spencer says that postulating the desirability of the preservation and prosperity of the species, or even the continuance of the species to the conclusion that "in order of obligation the preservation of the species takes precedence over the preservation of the individual." The point is that there has not been enough of the destructive of the individual to achieve the end, whereas disappearance of individuals makes equivalent somewhat more difficult, the preservation of the individual must be subordinated to the preservation of the species where the two conflict." There are several features of sophistry in this. Let us, however, note that it is still as a point of view an easily manageable system. Now, where confusion is possible the safe way is to lay aside the term. When this is done it will be found that in resting the foregoing propositions it becomes necessary to speak, instead, of all the individuals concerned except one or of all the individuals concerned, without exception. But he has seemed to use the term in both senses. For him, "sacrifice" he has afforded an obligation to subordinate the preservation of one individual to that of another. As it is absolutely unnecessary for the preservation of the species, or even for the continuance of the species that been enough of the destruction of the individual to achieve the end, whereas disappearance of individuals makes equivalent somewhat more difficult, the preservation of the individual must be subordinated to the preservation of the species where the two conflict." There are several features of sophistry in this. Let us, however, note that it is still as a point of view an easily manageable system. Now, where confusion is possible the safe way is to lay aside the term. When this is done it will be found that in resting the foregoing propositions it becomes necessary to speak, instead, of all the individuals concerned except one or of all the individuals concerned, without exception. But he has seemed to use the term in both senses. For him, "sacrifice" he has afforded an obligation to subordinate the preservation of one individual to that of another. As it is absolutely unnecessary for the preservation of the species, or even for the continuance of the species that been enough of the destruction of the individual to achieve the end, whereas disappearance of individuals makes equivalent somewhat more difficult, the preservation of the individual must be subordinated to the preservation of the species where the two conflict."