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"For always in those eyes, O Liberty!" 
Shines that high light whereby the world is seen; 
And though that star shine, we will trust in thee.

JOHN HAY.

On Picket Duty.

During the recent German printers' strike the authorities of New York and Munich ordered soldier printers to work in the offices left by the strikers. Perhaps this new use of the army will arouse the workmen's opposition to militarism.

A fool of a preacher having denounced the drama as in league with damnation, a Boston paper ventures to remark that the drama has survived as long as the churches. Is that encouraging for the drama? Letters of the drama hope to see the churches transformed into theaters.

Capt. Fairbank, an Englishman, is spending an enforced term at Gallipoli's island for having refused to be vaccinated. He is a member of the English anti-vaccination league, and does not propose to be poisoned by American legal quacks; but men with ideas of their own on the subject of vaccination cannot come into this free country.

The country today is really not so much danger from its tramps as it is from the cautious, sensible men who are worse off as a whole, and who never break a lock, and who never steal less than $500,000 at a time.

These are the words, not of a rabid radical, but of Bishop Huntington, of central New York. The speech from which this sentiment is culled illustrates with sharp and pointed comments on the prevailing condition of things.

The New York "Sun" reports in Syracuse had brought suit for S2,500 against a newspaper for falsely calling him a Christian. In the writ served upon the defendant it is alleged that the plaintiff had never been a christian, but that the alleged libel "had caused the said John Brooks to be brought into scandal, infamy, and disgrace with and among his neighbors to the extent of causing it to be suspected and believed by the said neighbors and citizens that the plaintiff had been guilty of the offenses herein mentioned, to wit, of being a Christian." Enlightened as Syracuse seems to be, the obiter will lose its suit. To be a Christian is to be guilty, of course, but of imbecility.

As the children of today, says the Boston "Herald," are to be the men and women of the next generation, and as the future good government of the State is dependent both upon their intellectual and moral training, the State has the right to insist that those who are hereafter to have its destiny in their charge shall be prepared for their responsibilities. In the first place, it is not for the servant to direct the education of the master. Those who have the State's destiny in their charge are of course the masters of the State; how can the State control its masters? Theirs, in such a State's something that can insist or feel? If the State has a right to claim anything, we are ready to listen to its case. Let it walk fearlessly into court and defend its rights. We are all anxious to see and get acquainted with it.

Some readers may still remember F. J. Stuart's allegation that the Anarchists "understand and recognize only one-half of the law of equal freedom—which is equivalent to, and perhaps worse than, no knowledge of it whatever." They may also remember that, when asked to substantiate this charge, he timorously and foolishly replied that the Anarchists exhibited their ignorance of the law of equal liberty by contenting themselves with the first half of the Spoonerian formula,—with the words, "every person has a natural right to do as he wills," eliminating the last half,—"and provided he infringes not the equal freedom of any other person." Liberty's re-judgmen then was as follows: "True. The Anarchists similarly eliminate the last half of the following statement: Three times four are twelve, provided four times three are not thirteen. Does the word mean any substances to Mr. Stuart?" I do not know whether or not Mr. Stuart still holds to his original discovery of the distinction between the Anarchists, who recognize and understand only one-half of the law of equal freedom, and the Individualists, who, by carefully adding the last half of the formula, show a perfect understanding of the law. At any rate, I commend to him and to the readers the interesting remarks (reprinted elsewhere) on the forlorn hope of an editor and an editor who has the editor of "Today" has discarded one-half of the law of liberty and has been unphilosophical enough to become an Anarchist, or else that Stuart's distinction is repudiated by Individualists and that its understanding of the law of equal liberty is deliberately imperfect.

There is a Chinaman in New York who reports the news of the Chinese quarter in the local newspapers. He is a citizen, a man of some education, and wields an able pen. But he has made it part of his work to expose the opium joints and fan-tan dives, and has thus forced the police to expose themselves and enforce the laws. The police, it is needless to say, are not friendly to him, as the closing of the resorts cuts down their income. Recently a false charge was made against him, and he was tried and acquitted by the jury. His acquittal, he said: "I cannot describe the amount of persecution that I have experienced at the hands of the police of that precinct, because I have dared to expose the opium joints and gambling dives in that precinct. When young Capt. McCullagh was in command, he sent for me to the Elizabeth street station one day and said to me angrily and threateningly: 'You have got to drop this business or we'll fix you. You've got to get out of this precinct altogether, or I will put you where you won't be peddling news to the newspapers.' I complained to Inspector Williams about it, and he said that he would see that I was treated properly, but I never saw any improvement." A reporter degraded himself by becoming a spy and amateur agent of the law, and I never wish such reporters success in their detective work. But this incident serves to show the true character of our police. They are paid handsomely for enforcing the law; and they are quite ready to do their "doody," provided the law breakers are not willing to come to terms with them. The real criminals are always eager to have their protection, and the men who are unjustly meddled with by the law generally find it advantageous to bribe them; to those who do not bribe them are indeed a terror. Witness the workmen's troubles in New York and Chicago.

A Startling Admission.

[Chicago Herald.]

Insanely the authorities in the United States declined to go into the ("Chicago Anarchists") case on its legal merits and it has never, therefore, reached that court. In the meantime, private persons may venture to have opinions on the matter; and it is even true, as history attests, that what seems at one period and one generation sound law another period, a later generation, revises.

Lilliputian Government.

[Item. Trumbull in Open Court.]

There are cynical moralists, mostly aged men, who find a stimulating pleasure in contrasting the physical process of a nation with its political smallness. They laugh ironically when the great American republic in its wealth and grandeur seems to them to be the smallest Republic. They deplore that when they see the Americans complacent and contented, submitting to petty tyrannies which other peoples not so free would not endure, as they should, for a moment, not to speak of all the privileges and immunities enjoyed by the people of Great Britain. They then speak of "the insouciance of office, and the spurious which patient merit of the unworthy take." But the Americans endure it, and are not only not online with the people of Great Britain, but at last with a sort of invented national pride. We acquire a relish for it after long suffering, as people do for elixir. These laws were made at higher prices than other people paid and then we allow them to be consumed, interpreted, modified, expanded, and contracted by an expensively bureaucratic, until the administration of them becomes complicated and uncertain system of Government by the Departments; the Hon. Secretary, and the Hon. Commissioner, with deputies by the hundred, twisting the laws out of all shape and sympathy to fit the necessities of space, time, and the whims of the hour; and every eccentricity of government by the Departments is called "a new construction of the law." A fantastic agency of the government was exhibited a few days ago. A book, worth a dollar and quarter, was sent by a gentleman in England to his friend in Chicago. At the post office it was promptly seized "for non-payment of duty," and the owner was duly notified. He went to the "Custom house and was told that he must not send any book or other article equal to the full price of the book. "Why," he said, "you never extort that before." "No," said the officer in a tone of measured repro- bation, "but this is a new construction of the law. However, this is your first offense; we will not exact the penalty this time. Pay the tax, take your book, and don't do it again." "But," said the victim of this new construction, "I haven't done anything." "Well," replied the officer, "don't do it again.

Hercules looking for a battery that he may shock his brains out with his club, will fairly represent the United States of America looking for a baby's night-cap in the marts to devour its contraband of trade. I know a baby, an American baby too, who received from his grandmother in Europe a present in a letter which immediately became "suspect." This letter was arrested by the Post Office Department, and committed for trial to the Custom House Department, on the felonious charge of containing something liable to a tariff tax. The baby's father was notified in proper official jargon to appear and open the letter in the presence of a special officer, and appointed to try suspected letters. He went up to the department, the "suspect" was produced, and the judges sat upon it solemnly as a common vermin, to be exterminated. The whole was a contraband within it was dragged from its lurking place. It proved to be a jacket for a little boy baby; and it was knit for him by his grandmother. The guilty jacket was ordered for instant execution, but the baby's father, on payment of the fine assessed against it, was allowed to wear the jacket and take it home to the baby. That same day, still unlearned in the laws of the United States, sent also a pair of silk stockings in a letter, and these went through the same ordeal as the baby jacket, but they were allowed to wear a confiscation payment of a small tribute amounting to one dollar and a half, the fine duly assessed by the jury that sat upon the stockings. I am told by persons who have seen articles in that sensational paper in this case, "the foreigner paid the tax." If so, I think it was very dilatory statelessness that required her to pay it. And even if the American baby paid it, or his father, it would still be a cheap John stripe of business very well adapted to the pysg government of Lilliput.
Resolved, That the right of the people to keep and bear arms is essential to the preservation of a free government and the security of the free people of this state. In any tax or regulation levied to support the military, the people reserve the right to bear arms in defense of the state and its institutions.

This resolution passed the General Assembly by a vote of 45-25 on February 14, 2023.

John Doe
Speaker of the House
by the family. The individual is more than the family. Strong men like Mr. F. Russell show what the future has in store for us, if religious politics are not to be a hindrance to the progress of society. The family is not so useful as it is now. It is a half-way house to something better. I anticipate that it will disappear in the face of the more universal and cultural ideas. The family is not so useful as it is now. It is a half-way house to something better. I anticipate that it will disappear in the face of the more universal and cultural ideas.

And it will be for the political and "religious" worlds in America, as it is for Europe, to reject the service of those who first outgrow the necessity for the family. To reject them, Mr. F. Russell, no matter how much you love them, could very well have dispensed with the political arenas of Ireland, but where would Ireland have been without him?

Recent utterances of many orthodox clergymen point to the conclusion that Socialism in this country will soon have but one prefix—"Christian." The Communion of early Christianity, ignominy, and denial by most ministers until very lately, is more and more frequent today. The monopoly of the Church as the years pass, and it has already become quite fashionable to claim a substantial identity for the teachings of Christianity and the principles of modern State Socialism. In its issue of Nov. 22 the Socialist "People's" of New York gives some extracts from the address of three ministers before the Christian Church Congress in Washington. I reproduce below the more significant portions of those extracts:

Rev. Bartlett, Montevallo, Ala. - Socialism can be the only outcome of Democracy. We are already far along our way, and we shall continue as long as we can to put it off, nor yet should it cause us any dread or fear. The government control of education, of the army and navy, of the post-office, the policing of the city, the paving of the roads, is a necessary evil, but the government asserts control, are all proofs of the growth of a form of Socialism. A person who will today protest against Socialism will have to do so in a century, when the government control of the schools has been tried and found to be successful beyond all expectation. The old theory that the best government is the least govern- ment is found to be characteristic of Socialism. Rev. Sprague, Charlestown, Mass. - Socialist substitutes for the idea of profit and the gain of service. Socialism substitutes the idea of mankind as one great family for the idea of the individual. Socialism everywhere endorses the conception of the human family as members all of one body, but our present social system cannot be said to come up to that conception. This opposition to Socialism is spread all over the country. The fundamentals of Socialism are the ideals of Christ-ianity, and Socialism is the most practicable system for human life and government.

Rev. William Pratt, Detroit. - Socialism is the remedy for the ills of the time. It is the outcome of Christianity. It is also the outcome of Socialism and Christianity is in harmony with the teachings of the Church. I do not want to exaggerate the possibilities of Socialism, but it will change the church. It will be hostile to the socialists, but it will be hostile to the Church. These excerpts are not introduced here for the purpose of criticising the statements and arguments therein, but simply that I may point out the attitude of those Free thinkers and Socialists who are more or less imbued with Socialist notions to the probability that, Socialism triumphing through the assistance of churchmen, State and Church will be fused into one grand political-religious ecclesiastical machine which will as surely, efficiently, and conclusively outgrows all others. The religious dissenters as it will industrial and financial independence. When Rev. Bartlett declares that the "old theory that the best government is the least govern- ment is found to be characteristic of Socialism," he is in effect and logically proofed on record as being in favor of State control of religion. If it be true, as he avers, that Jefferson and Paine were mistaken,—that the people need much more government instead of less,—what becomes of Protestantism and Freethought? If men holding the views of Socialism are to constitute the dominating factor in the coming Socialism, what place or peace will there be for those who can no longer accept the teachings of theology? What say T. B. Wakeman, C. P. Somerby, W. F. Jameson, and the others? It is the age more government or less; State Socialism or Individualism? No, no; rule by moral or political principle. Which is the way of equal liberty, of wisdom and safety? Is he a clear- thinking and consistent Freethinker who hesitates for one moment in his choosing of answer and direction of march?