NOT THE DAUGHTER BUT THE MOTHER OF ORDER

Vol. VIII.—No. 28.
BOSTON, MASS., SATURDAY, DECEMBER 19, 1891.

On Picket Duty.

The editor of the “Open Court” says that he has not as yet found two Anarchists who hold the same view of Anarchism. Some day Dr. Carus will discover Liberty and the Boston Anarchists, and his troubles will be at an end. We can tell him what Anarchism is and what the Anarchistic conception of justice is.

Count Tolstoi has issued a manifesto declaring that unless the Russian government promises to feed the people until the next harvest and faithfully performs the pledge, there will be a revolution in Russia and he will take part himself. How is this for an apostle of non-rule-at-all in the Tolstoi-Pentecost sense,—a believer in non-resistance? Tolstoi seems to be inconsistent as Pentecost. Some of the non-resisters remain passive as long as nobody threatens to injure them; when they are attacked, they are as ready to fight as the rest of us.

Pfeffer, the Alliance Senator, has introduced a resolution in the Senate directing the finance committee to inquire and report as to the actual expenses attending the business of money lending as conducted in this country by bankers and others. The preamble to the resolution recites that “complaint is made that money-lending yields larger profits than industrial pursuits.” I hope the Senate will approve the resolution and authorize the inquiry. The falsehoods of the witnesses and the insinuous examination of the examination will make suggestive reading.

The editorial on “Land and Money,” reprinted from the “Journal of the Knights of Labor” in this issue, is a sign of the times and a gratifying indication that unionists are beginning to appreciate the importance of the currency problem. There seems to be some significance, too, in the failure of the writer to wind up his argument by a plea for Greenbackism, which the Knights of Labor platform endorse. He contents himself by culling attention to the superior claims of the problem upon our immediate and future consideration, but refrains from recommending any special remedy. Perhaps he is studying free banking.

C. L. James, the champion bungler and mountebank of the Communist-Anarchist movement, declares in truly uncalculated fashion that Proudhon “was the father of Anarchism,” while “for its dynamics we must refer to his rival Marx.” That this oracle is ignorant of the teachings of Proudhon no less than of those of Marx need not be denied. And it is difficult to see why the “Twentieth Century” prints his idiotic jargon about things hopelessly beyond his grasp. His business in life seems to be confusion-sowing, but he seems to succeed more in imposing on himself than on others. Mr. Sullivan knows the statistics and dynamics of Marxism; how can he contain himself under the circumstances?

Undoubtedly there is no real difference of opinion between Mr. Yarros and myself regarding the errors into which Mr. John Ruskin has fallen (probably through the misguidance of some Kropotkins) and which Mr. Yarros points out in another column. But Mr. Yarros, in his criticisms, does not use terms quite as

Liberty has been in the habit of using them when dealing strictly with the matter of party lines. Therefore it is best, in order to preserve the integrity of Liberty’s position, that I should point out that, though Anarchism is synonymous with individualism, it is not synonymous with Individualism, and that, though Communism may be more Socialist than any other Socialism if we are to take General Walker’s definition of Socialism, by Liberty’s definition (laid down in No. 42 and again in No. 160) Communism is no more Socialist than other Socialism nor is Anarchism less so, but Communism, State Socialism, and Anarchism are equally Socialist. Liberty remains what it always has been,—individualist, Anarchist, and Socialist.

The Massachusetts Legislature of 1891 passed a “Weavers’ Fines” bill, providing that no employer shall impose a fine upon a weaver for “imperfections that may arise during the process of weaving.” In other words, for bad work. This act has just been declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, and, while the employers are pleased, the workmen loudly denounce the tendency of the judiciary to neutralize and nullify the legislation favorable to labor interests (theoretically). The workmen’s complaints are well-grounded, but they ought to know that this law, like other labor laws, would have remained a dead letter anyway. Such laws are easily evaded, and the action is seldom punished. I am glad to see that the editor of the “Labor Leader” draws the right moral from the incident. “There will be one point gained,” he said, “if wage earners learn from this decision that it is useless to look to the State for any measure of relief.” It is quite probable that such object-lessons as this will not be lost upon State Socialists who make consistent individualists; but, as there is less danger from extreme State Socialists than from the unconscious and moderate paternalists, we prefer to deal with men who fully realize the scope and character of their work for social organization. If men cannot be intelligent enough to embrace the philosophy of liberty, we welcome their acceptance of radical State Socialism as the next best thing. The soberer libertarians and authoritarians stand face to face and face the sea.

Prof. Tyn dall is not distinguished for his unalterable opposition to government interference with the citizen. When, therefore, in discussing the prevention of phthisis, he tells us most emphatically that “the most pressing work of sanitary reformers is not so much to legislate as to educate,—to make the man of the people in some degree participant in the knowledge of the causes of disease which is possessed by men of science,” his words are deserving of the attention of those busy writers whose first impulse is to call in the government. The newspapers advertise all sorts of compulsory regulations, while at the last annual meeting of the American Medical Association a paper was read and approved in which the following position was taken: “Whenever a case of tuberculosis is removed from a house, or the patient dies, the State should at once, before the house can be occupied by another, thoroughly disinfect every part of it, scrape and resurface the room which was occupied by the patient, and take precautions that none of the clothing or furniture which had been used by the patient be given away or left for the use of others without first having been thoroughly disinfected. A house thus cleansed should be so recorded in the office of the health department, so that any one wishing to move into it will be able first to assure himself that he runs no risk.” The paper does not advocate the ownership of all buildings by the State, but that is the next step, doubtless.

Some months ago, in opposing the effort to obtain a pension for Walt Whitman on the ground that he was engaged in the war and its abolition was reluctantly acquiesced in, as a war measure, rather than eagerly determined upon in the interests of civilization.” I am glad to see that my suggestion was not thrown away upon him, and that he has revised his opinion. In the “Open Court” of December 3, he writes as follows: “The Emancipation Proclamation was not ‘the greatest moral document of his presidency’; it was not a moral document at all. It was a political document, and Mr. Lincoln himself never claimed it for its moral quality. But it was issued, with much parade of apology, as a bit of military strategy, and a ‘war measure.’ It had a dual character. It is anti-slavery now, but, had its terms been accepted by the Confederates, it would have been pro-slavery. By the very terms of its slavery was to be preserved should the States in rebellion return to their allegiance within a hundred days. And, as it was, it abolished slavery only where we had jurisdiction, and retained it where we had not.” Well, is, Gen. Trumbull still justified that he fought for the preservation of slavery?

In “Today” of December 10 I find the following paragraph: “Mr. Jacob H. Schiff contends that had it not been for the silver legislation of 1878 and 1880 the volume of currency would have been insufficient, and we should have passed from spasm to spasm, from one commercial crisis to another.” The present law, unsatisfactory as it is, should be modified or a substitute found for it, until the public is educated enough to see that ‘government issues of currency in every form are in themselves unsound, for a sound circulating medium must be moved with actual production. . . . A sound currency must be elastic, expand and contract with the requirements of commerce and industry,—a function which no government note issue can perform.’ The objection is certainly well taken. The government is not sufficiently sensitive to the needs of more currency, and its machinery is too cumbersome to respond quickly enough to the requirements of business,—even supposing we had congressmen intelligent enough to perceive what these requirements really are. Mr. Schiff thinks that the function of furnishing currency to industry with the necessary circulation properly belongs to the banks; but he very truly observes that the people are not ready to grant new privileges to the banks. If the element of government monopoly in banking were removed, would not this obstacle be on the part of the people disappear?” Considering that two short months ago “Today” pronounced the cry for “enough money to transact the business of the country” hollow and absurd, the above marks a distinct advance in intelligence.
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Rae on "Anarchism."

In the second edition of Mr. John Ra's interesting work on "Contemporary Socialism" we find a new chapter, dealing with "Anarchism," which Rae, however, nothing more nor less is meant than revolution, Revolutionary Communism, or Anarchistic Communism, as it is still called by a few. Mr. Rae clearly perceives the close kinship between State Socialism and that species of "Anarchism," and easily proves that the latter is merely the extreme element of the modern Socialist movement. The contention of the State Socialists that the "Anarchists" are the very opposite of Socialists,—that they are individualists of the boldest stamp,—Mr. Rae dismisses as totally unfounded.

The man of the party whose deeds made a stir on both sides of the Atlantic is undoubtedly more Socialist than the Socialists themselves. I have said that the Socialist of the present day may be described in these words: Anarchistic Socialist, and in every one of these three characteristics the Anarchists go beyond other Socialists instead of falling short. They are really more Socialist, more democratic, and more revolutionary than the rest of their comrades. They are more Socialist, because they are disposed to want not only common property and common production, but common consumption as well. They are more democratic, because they will have no government of any kind over the people except the people themselves — no tax, no import duties, no public institutions, either imperial or local, but merely every little industrial group of people managing its public affairs as it will. They are at the same time the most democratic in the literal sense, for they have no faith, even temporarily, in constitutional procedure, and think making a little trouble is always the best way of bringing about a big revolution.

Natural as it is for the respectable members of the parlementary Socialists to regard with the feelings of alarm and fear this misshapen and mischievous element, they cannot be allowed to disclaim it. Mr. Rae is perfectly right, and we Individualist-Anarchists owe him a vote of thanks for his voluntary testimony in our behalf. For Mr. Rae cheerfully admits that our "Anarchism" is essentially Individualistic, although he omits to point out that the name "Anarchism" properly belongs to us, and is impudently and ignorantly usurped by the revolutionaries. Here is what Mr. Rae says about us:

There are individualists Anarchists, no doubt. The Anarchists of Boston, in America, are Individualists; one of the groups of English Anarchists in London is Individualist; but these individualist Anarchists are very few in number any where.

And in another place in the book:

The Boston Anarchists, perhaps, ought not, strictly speaking, to be included in any account of Socialist, for, unlike most contemporary Anarchists, they are not Socialists, but exclusively Anarchists. The creed of the American Anarchist is the doctrine of a disenchanted Socialist, Josiah Warren, who had lived with Robert Owen at New Lanark, and who came to the conclusion that human slavery failed because the individual had been too much sunk in the community and no room was left for the play of individual interests, individual rights, and individual responsibilities. From Owen's Communist, Warren ran to the opposite extreme, and thought it impossible to individualize things too much. He would abolish the State, and have the work of police and defence done by committees, like any other service. He issued some books, tried to carry out his views by practical experiment, and, though they failed, he has still a small band of believing disciples who publish a newspaper called Liberty, but have no organization and no importance.

The question of our "importance" need not be discussed. It should be borne in mind that Mr. Rae is writing, not of contemporary individualism, but of contemporary Socialism, and that in his commendable effort to assign Communist Anarchism its proper place his bias prompts him to magnify the importance of that movement and make up as merely accessory the Socialist movement.

Mr. Rae's views would have been greatly simplified if it had occurred to him at the outset to deny that the revolutionary Communists are Anarchists at all. Had he spoken throughout of them as Pseudo-Anarchists, his case would have been more strong, and he would have had no fear that on this point Mr. Rae is considerably mixed himself, and that he fails to see that Anarchism is synonymous with Individualism. Mr. Rae's confusion is further revealed in his classification of Proudhon as a Communist and as an Anarchist. He is aware that Proudhon distinguishes Anarchism from Democracy and from Communist government, but he pretends that the distinctions are not easy to apprehend exactly. That "Anarchy as a principle of political economy" is a "false advocacy" is perfectly true, but it makes the rule. "Mr. Rae knows well enough, but of the nature of Proudhon's teachings he seems to be ignorant. This ignorance accounts for the fact that the book contains only two brief references to Proudhon, and that the "Anarchist" which is definitely written upon concerning him is that of the extreme reaction to revolutionary tactics as a means of promoting social reform.

V. V.

Plumb-Line Pointers.

That good results can be attained through ordinary political processes is denied by most Anarchists. That the Democratic party can be depended upon to blunder in every important crisis is implicitly believed by nearly all Republicans and by many others. Both these beliefs receive strong confirmation from the Democratic caucus of Judge Crisp as Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Democrats have won most of their recent successes because of their supposed adherence to tariff reform. Their only hope of carrying the country in 1892 was known to all observant persons to be inseparable associated with its manifest views of the tariff laws, and their courageous and consistent championship of the position so clearly outlined by Grover Cleveland. With Cleveland and Boies as their candidates standing upon a tariff reform platform there was every reason to believe that they could carry the elections, and enforce the laws. But there was a preparatory test of their sincerity and practical sense. They have an overwhelming majority of the lower house of the present Congress. The speech to which the Republicans had been listening, with the position, and the one only to whom to whom the Democrats can appeal to the anti-high tariff men must have given them their support. Mills should have been selected by a practically unanimous vote. Every Democrat knew that Mills had the honor of being haled by the arch-enemy of Grover Cleveland, the Democratic leader, and of what little is left of Jeffersonian principles in the Democratic party. They knew that this Republican in dis- guise, this marplot Dana of the New York "Sun,* was behind the candidacy of Crisp, and that with him were such men as Hill and Gorman and the remnant of the followers of Randall, the old-time Democratic champion of the protectionist idea. They knew, or should have known, that the man whom Dana favored was the man whom they despised. The law suits and underhand methods which they did not defeat him. Instead, they voted for him as against the one man who was entitled to their support. They voted for him and so voting defeated their party in '92, and, let us hope, for another twenty years. The fact that which permits itself to be led by such an imperialist as Dana. And when before have such self-styled reformers as Springer and Hatch and McMillan marked themselves lower in the scale of infamy? To qualify their party, the Bahana ambitions by courting, to the defeat of the man who has done ten times more than all of them put together to give their party national prestige and power. McMillan partially re- deemed himself in the closing moments of the groisy quibble, but Springer at that supreme instant fired the last bridge between himself and honor. No, Monopoly has nothing to fear from a party fooled by a spy like Dana, betrayed by knavish leaders like Hill and Springer, and represented in Congress by the one hundred and fifty imbeciles who voted for Hatch, McMillan, Springer, and Crisp.

When at the Cassagda Congress of the American Secular Union, then the National Liberal League, the membership of the press and men was ignored and the foolish and cowardly policy of silence adopted, the organization started upon the downward way which ended on the last day in October in a four hours' session of the Union in Philadelphia. Here the old and new Free-thinkers who had been among the mainstays of the movement were insulted and voted down by a handful of orthodox people who had obtained control of the society through the mistaken concessions of the very men whom they now contemptuously denounce.

Had Mr. Wakeman, the Foot's, the "True American Progressive" and other radicals in the East stood it all by the flag of repeal at Cassagda as the West had helped them stand at Chicago, St. Louis, and Milwaukee, the history of the last three years of the Union would read differently, and, I believe, be far less discreditable. But to old Secularists with the blush of shame. The disgraceful reign of the Westbrook-Craddock combination was the logical sequel of the surrender of Cassagda. The standard was lowered to admit the "modifiers" and the "influentials" people were supposed to be tinctured with heretical notions concerning the Union of Church and State. A few came; a little more money was raised, which nearly all went to pay the salaries of secretaries who, at the best, did no more than the League secretaries did, and, at the poorest and least, and last, did far less. And the few who came scuttled the ship. Now the question is, Can the dredders of Chicago, to whom the sunken wreck was turned over, with the assistance of the disgraced leaders, appeal New Yorkers, raise and rehabilitate the old hulk? Mr. Wakeman and his conferences pledge themselves to fling the repeal flag to the breeze and rally the forces of Free-thought in defense of a vital issue, the liberty of speech as a press and mails? We wish, they say, to follow in the footsteps of old Free-thinkers. Let us watch and see if they do, really.

Is not that a fantastic idea for Chicago? I allude to the latest development in the "Anarchists" affair. After it has been indisputably shown that the police were wholly to blame throughout, a magistrate solemnly fines each of the arrested "Anarchists," whose cases had not before been disposed of, ten dollars and then fines the fines paid by the guilty. Or why were the fines remitted, if they were not guilty why were they fined at all? And if the latter supposition is the correct one, what about the fines paid by those who had earlier received the attention of the courts? Will the fines be returned? And the time lost, the counsel fees paid by the victims; will the city make reparation for those losses?
Land and Money.
[Journal of the Knights of Labor]

The monopoly of natural opportunities, otherwise land monopoly, is a great wrong, and there never can be industrial freedom until it is abolished. While industry must be left to the individual to develop, so far as he is able to get raw material into wealth, liberty is impossible. But though much of the poverty and pauperism and of the misery and ruin of society is owing to the monopoly of natural opportunities, it is beyond all doubt due and traceable to land monopoly, yet land monopoly is not the only source of social injustice, nor even the most disabling to society. It is probably true that in time the holders of the land will be able to dictate terms to the holders of gold. Nevertheless it is a fact, patent to every one, that gold monopoly has been more potent than land monopoly in bringing about the present unequal and unjust distribution of wealth. The enormous public and private indebtedness of the United States, with the stupendous burden of interest it entails, has been created mainly by money monopoly, not by land monopoly. Possibly— as we see it, probably— when the public property is devoured by the speculators of natural opportunities will be able to subjugate and despise the money kings, but the inequalities which cursed society at the present time are due as much to gold monopoly as to the monopoly of land. Were it not for the gold superplenty money monopoly could not exist, but with gold the basis of all wealth, not capital, but money and the consent control of industry by the owners of money is inevitable. Land reformers do good work when they strive to arouse the public conscience to the injustice of private property monopolies, but the root cause of poverty is money monopoly and the consent control of industry, and when this is removed the remedy is necessary—perhaps of more immediate and pressing necessity.

E. C. WALKER

State Currency.
[London Personal Rights Journal]

To challenge the issue of money as a State function seems to the man in the street very like a symptom of insanity. But, by the test of the history of all institutions that have been divesting his own intellectual impotence on the currency question. Use, as John Stuart Mill has said, is not only a second nature to man; it is an instinct with which he is born. No political thinker of sufficient independence and logical power states, as an irrefutable conclusion from what he holds to be principles of justice, and therefore of the highest expediency, that the control of government in this matter is inhuman and oppressive, he is regarded as a person who has taken flight on the wings of some wild hypothesis from the terms of reasonable discourse. But Mr. Noble's astonishment is but the measure of his incapacity. It is not even difficult of demonstration, to those who can learn from anything but that which is the direct opposite of all that the average to the world, to the well-informed and the average voter of State money puts out of the question, that the fruit of this monopoly has been almost unmixed evil. In our own country, we should not now be working with a system of money, weights, and measures which might have been in use in Noah's ark — such is their antiquated cumbersome officiality. If State interferences have not prevented the competition of better methods; and thousands of clerks would not, in this "practical" England of ours, be working, day after day through the weary year, utilising the precious instruments which they hold in their hands with the labor of Skipton, if the politician had not put his paw and stamped the struggle for existence between rival systems of value, weight, etc., which have resulted in the survival and wide adoption of the fittest.

And not only are we cursed with this State-created babel of standards, not have our "children to learn a set of "tables" which are quite gratuitous, but the notion that we obtain uniformity by the action of the State is the very reverse of the truth. Before we can ascertain how much is due to State action, we must know what would happen in its absence; and who, except a very few individuals, attempts to attain so knowledge, or problems which are as human and as vital as those of Skipton, if the politician had not put its paw and stamped the struggle for existence between rival systems of value, weight, etc., which have resulted in the survival and wide adoption of the fittest.

And not only are we cursed with this State-created babel of standards, not have our "children to learn a set of "tables" which are quite gratuitous, but the notion that we obtain uniformity by the action of the State is the very reverse of the truth. Before we can ascertain how much is due to State action, we must know what would happen in its absence; and who, except a very few individuals, attempts to attain so knowledge, or problems which are as human and as vital as those of Skipton, if the politician had not put its paw and stamped the struggle for existence between rival systems of value, weight, etc., which have resulted in the survival and wide adoption of the fittest.

But they did when hear of it, they said it was only the natural folly of youth rebelling against wholesome and ben- clement, r, whose good purpose they were too young to un- derstand.

One there was amongst the officers who was treated by all with much regard, because of the good opinion that he had with kind and soothing words, which was not the manner of the other officers.

He was an exceedingly holy man, and regained their way- wardness, saying:

"It is good, my children, to be content in the station wherein it has pleased God to place you."

"Bear ye one another's burdens."

"Remember that it is the Lord's will that you respect those in authority over you and obey them in all things, as the Lord will.

And with many such words did he comfort them.

And many hearkened to his voice and straightforward went and proclaimed their daily task and resignation.

And they rebelled not against the rules made for their guidance.

But some there were who headed not the words of the holy man, and waxed exceeding wicked, refusing to receive their lessons and perform their daily tasks.

And they reviled the masters who were over them, and went amongst the others, saying:

"Let us arise and put away these masters, for they are hard taskmasters, feeding us badly and giving us weary days all day long, and we will have them no more. But take into the school other masters of our own choice, who will give us easy lessons and many holidays. Then shall we be able to learn and make good rules, and we shall no more be oppressed."

Now, when the masters and rulers heard of those sayings, they assembled all of the scholars, young and old, and of the keys of the deep dungeon and who was much feared by all the scholars, for he had great power and authority over all.

And the masters ordered him to take those wicked and rebellious boys, and cast them into the dungeon. And for a long time thereafter discontent and rebellion were unknown in that school.

But after a while another evil arose, and the boys clasped more loosely for easier lessons and more rest.

And many ceased to go into the fields and the shops as usual.

Then the masters came to them and said:

"Corn will not grow, and our cattle will not eat as of old, unless ye go into the fields, you will assuredly perish for want of bread. Ungrateful wretches that ye are, behold the great school we have provided for you, and ye do not use it. The boys who live upon the wherous isle, and the beds that are, and above all the wonderful education in all arts and knowledge which is our free gift to you all. Yet ye do perform what we require of you. Against these hateful and instructive lessons you rebel. The cause is not taught but lassitude and overfeeding. Know ye not the penalty for misbehavior?"

And the rule setting forth was read to the disobedient boys. Then was the officer called out who had charge of the dungeon, but seeing so many boys defying his authority, was both to lay hands on them.

"Therefore," said he unto the masters, "a counsel must be held," and the Board was formed.

And much deliberation amongst themselves, they came forth and said to the masters: "We cannot put all these rebellious scholars in our dungeon, for they are too many; but we have devised another plan to bring them to reason."

And the masters answered and said: "We have faith in the power of reason, and we will not do as you shall do."

Now the boys did not know what was going forward, and still held out.

Then the matter was thereupon referred to the school, shutting the bad boys out from the dining-hall, the kitchen, the dormitories, and the provision store, giving the good boys to be divided between them.

And when the scholars came in to dine, there was no food to be had, and when night came they had no place to rest. Then came the officer to them and said: "Come with me: you are no less scholars here than the masters have found other boys, who will abide by our rules and receive their lessons and do their tasks gladly."

And to each he said: "Then may'st thou yet whither thou wilt. Come, I will escort you beyond the estate."

And they followed him to the outermost gate, which was opened, and then they went to another school that liked they left. But it was a desolate region, and in every direction they found it to be a vast and desolate wilderness.

And when many of their number had perished of want and cold, the rest were slain to return to the school. And by degree they came to the gate in ones and twos, not daring to show the sign of their purpose, and imploring the masters to take them in.

So, when they were humbled sufficiently, the masters permuted and it happened that they did not kill the school.

When many years had passed, this great calamity was forgotten by the boys, and some of the younger ones would go as they might going rather to go out into the world beyond. Yet did they fare so better than the first who committed that folly.

And they found that some of the scholars grew in years and knowledge, they caused their rulers much anxiety by raising their voices against some of the rules of the school.

And they also clamored for some of the men who sat on the Board which governed the school.

For they thought that such a change would give them easier lessons and regulations which would not oppress.

And when they were all agreed upon this thing, they were
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For any of the following Romances, address: BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 3306, Boston, Mass.


REVOLUTION: The Only Remedy for the Oppressed Classes of Ireland, England, and Other Parts of the British Empire. No. 1. A picture of the condition of the workers in the coal mines, and a plea for their liberation. 186 pages. Price, cloth, $1.00; paper, 50 cents.

NATURAL LAW: or, The Science of Justice. A treatise on the nature and extent of human rights, natural law, and natural society. Showing that all legislation whatsoever is an interference with the rights of man, and that all rulers are tyrants. 100 pages. Price, cloth, 50 cents; paper, 25 cents.

LETTER TO THOMAS S. FAYARD. Challenging his right and that of all the other so-called senators and representatives in kind, and showing how it is possible for all men to live in harmony and mutual respect. 100 pages. Price, cloth, $1.00; paper, 50 cents.

Address: BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 3306, Boston, Mass.

Address: BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 3306, Boston, Mass.