On Picket Duty.

Comrade Bailie’s article in this issue on “Ireland’s Need of a Free Currency” is suggestive. It certainly is none too early to begin to prepare that unhappy country to make the most of her freedom when she shall get it. The Irishman or Irish-American who devotes himself to that work will do his country inestimable service. But Ireland’s situation is peculiar. Unlike all other civilized nations, her first and greatest need is free land, not free money. In America free land would do but little good unless preceded by free money. In Ireland it is just the reverse. There free money could do little unless preceded by free land. But Ireland, once her land is free, will offer a splendid opportunity for the introduction of free money. With so powerful an entrenched financial interests to offer innumerable obstacles, freedom of banking would have a clear field and a fair trial. Let us hope, yes, let us work that the light may so spread in Erin that, when the opportunity comes, the intelligence and will to seize it shall not be lacking.

Another monopoly is threatened. At present, as is well known, Wagner’s “Parsifal” can be performed only at Bayreuth. This music-drama is Madame Wagner’s property, and she refuses to allow any one else to produce it. But in Austria, it seems, every copyrighted work becomes free ten years after the author’s death. Next year, therefore, “Parsifal” can be performed in Austria by any one who chooses. Madame Wagner is moving heaven and earth to secure the passage of a new law in Austria in the interest of her monopoly, and it is said that she may succeed. If she does, then Austrians, like Frenchmen, Englishmen, Americans, and the people of all other nations who have chosen to make slaves of themselves, must continue to pay tribute, not only to Madame Wagner, but to hotel-keepers and railroad corporations, if they desire to witness a representation of the greatest achievement in musical composition yet attained. This situation illustrates another absurdity of property in ideas, to which attention has never been called in these columns. As long as Madame Wagner is allowed to retain her monopoly,—and really, if it is rightfully her property, it ought never to be taken from her,—the price which a man must pay to see “Parsifal” is proportionate to the distance between his residence and Bayreuth. The citizen of Bayreuth pays but five dollars for the privilege which must cost a citizen of the United States from two to four hundred dollars. And this because of one woman’s will and the rest of the world’s lack of will. It may be replied, of course, that the same situation exists regarding many works of art and nature, and cannot be avoided,—for instance, a painting by Titian or the falls of Niagara. This is unfortunately true; but the only good reason for putting up with such a state of things is that we cannot be moved in the later editions of the poet’s works. My friend Horace L. Traubel, Whitman’s literary executor, in a recent conversation with me, confirmed Mr. Lloyd’s view. Be it so, then; so much the worse for Whitman. Not being allowed to forget the disgraceful lines, we must consider them an inedible stain upon a great life-work. “William and Tucker didn’t understand me,” said Whitman, as reported by Mr. Traubel. (The William refers to the Emperor, but William D. O’Connor, the poet’s staunchest champion and warmest admirer, who was as indignant as I over the lines in question.) So Mr. Traubel explained to me Whitman’s attitude. The explanations were two. First, Whitman was able to include William in his song, because the poet’s philosophy was broad enough to include even the greatest criminal. Second, Whitman believed that the unification of Germany was a great and good work, just as he believed in the unification of these States, not in a display of political overreach, but in the ground of comradeship. The first thing to note about these explanations is that they are none too consistent with each other. It is not likely that in four lines of verse Whitman meant to celebrate the Emperor’s work and at the same time to offer him his hand in brotherhood as he would offer it to a criminal. But this point need not be dwelt on, since the language of the poem is distinctly at variance with either explanation. The gospel of comradeship, however inclusive it may be, is something more and worse than inclusive when it describes the criminal in power—that is, the tyrant—as “a faithful shepherd of his people.” Nor does such language properly apply to any ruler who, whatever advantages he may have reaped from his administration, was to “his people,” not a shepherd, but an outrageous oppressor. For myself I consider the unification of Germany an evil of itself, no more promoting comradeship than marriage does, but this is a point on which decent men may differ. On the other hand, it is impossible for lovers of liberty to differ as to the infamous character of the Bismarckian régime. No, the thing cannot be explained. One must say of such explanations as Colonel Ingersoll says of the Christian endeavor to harmonize the Bible with science: “I ’Twont do.”

Victor Rehabilitated.

To the Editor of Liberty:

It seems to me that Emma Heller was a little harsh to Victor for saying that he considers every man litterate who has not read Her bert Spencer. I fully agree that Victor is a bookworm, but at the same time I know something else of Victor, which nobody can deny. Last year there appeared an article by Victor, in which he criticized the “People” for saying that Pentecost, having begun to practice law, has no longer a right to attack the ruling classes in behalf of the oppressed. And Victor, among other things, said that he appreciated every well-stated argument, though it be uttered by the lowest prostitute. Does not this disprove Emma Heller’s statement? Respectfully yours,

H. Baranovitch.

[Victor? Who is Victor, anyhow? Has my good correspondent any private information concerning David Copperfield or Robinson Crusoe? I beg him to observe that Emma Heller is a writer of fiction. —Editor Liberty.]

Tom’s Soliloquy.—I.

I want to do Jim good, make him like me.
He wants to do me good, make me like him.
The fool! I know I’m right, and yet you see
He’s sure I’m wrong, is Jim.

But though I’m tired, I’ll get his worthless soul
Saved yet, the holy terror that he is;
Not that I care for Jim, his ugly soul
Would shock a saint in bliss.

There’s privileges comes to faithful zeal;
It’s then I’m after, and in ways Jim
I’ve saved a many, set on them Christ’s seal;
I’ll not be done by him.

Jim’s Soliloquy.—II.

Tom’s an infernal scamp, a hypocrite.
With his old rotten cant about the Word,
His sly look sideways through his fat lids slit,
His jaw when I am bored.

I bile my time, but when he’s had his say,
I’ll serve the Bible up and make him ill;
Such blasphemies I’ll speak to him to-day
As shall his fervor kill.

Not that I care in any sort for Tom,
But I will spoil his trim religious doings.
O ho! my true friend, I’ve such a bomb
For you, old meek! old mug!

Ezrum Davilet.
Liberty.
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Ireland's Need of a Free Currency.

At all periods of human history it is possible to observe a combination of times and conditions that seems conspicuously ripe for the recognition and adoption of the golden rule of national freedom, and the successful progress of that great social movement which is the necessary consequence of the universal law of social progress. The combination of such a combination is the recognition of the need of a free currency, and the adoption of the principles of a system of free circulation of money, which is the necessary consequence of the universal law of social progress.

The economic regeneration of that country through the death of Interest by means of a free currency is the idea which the writer believes peculiarly fitting at this juncture of her career to inaugurate the industrial and social Revolution.

A glance at the circumstances upon which this assumption is based cannot fail to interest all students of the economics of Amaranth, besides furnishing the reasons for offering this suggestion to Liberty. Ireland's industrial position to-day is that of a people whose commercial prospects and productive efforts have been effectually enlightened and corrected out by the foreign general truth embodied in particular ideas and principles borne mostly on the obscure banners of hitherto unnoticed reform. Such an occasion, it venturer to believe, is presented by the dawning hopes to which the impending political change gives birth in the state of long-suffered and ever-suffering Ireland.

The economic regeneration of that country through the death of Interest by means of a free currency is the idea which the writer believes peculiarly fitting at this juncture of her career to inaugurate the industrial and social Revolution.

As a people the Irish are by no means favorable to Usury. They are hereditary and inerminate foes to its own brother, Rent. They would be as easily aroused against the former as they have always been against the latter. Is there not in these circumstances a remarkably favorable field for the prosecution of Mutual Banking and the realization of Ireland's dream? There is now a large surplus of agricultural products over the home consumption. Her peculiar position compels her to export this surplus without receiving equivalent values in return. The rise of an industrial and commercial class would absorb this abundant produce and also offer an equitable return. Therefore, neither raw material nor real wages—i.e., the necessities of life—are wanting; nothing but a medium of exchange, a monetary capital, is needed to insure the growth of boundless prosperity.

Anarchists in their financial plans offer a medium of exchange, scientifically sound and practically unlimited, free money, capital without usury or interest, a peaceful method of economic revolution.

Among the readers of Liberty there are none who can do or suggest anything which would help to spread the principles of anarchism where there is an exceptional chance of their bringing forth fruit? Has Liberty any readers in the Green Isle who can inaugurate the propaganda? May there not be found an Irish-American Anarchist with talents, means, and time to put a practical aspect on this imperfect but honest suggestion?

William Ballih.

CLASS DISTINCTIONS.

Dear Sir,—

It would appear that your criticism of the New York health authorities is unjust, being based on a misapprehension of the facts. The Normann's steerage passengers and crew were infected when the vessel reached port; the cabin passengers were not. The steerage passengers and crew were disinfected and removed to Hoffman Island, all except the sick, who were put on Swan Island, and a portion of the crew, who were on board to care for the ship. Assuredly you could not have put the cabin passengers, among whom there had been cases of cholera, on Hoffman Island, with the steerage passengers and crew, several of whom were on board to care for the sick. The others of whom had just been removed to the hospital on Swan Island? This would have, manifestly, increased the chances of an epidemic, the one thing to be guarded against.

Speaking of the steerage passengers, you say: "Yet not a word do we hear about them and their possible fate." That may be true of most New Yorkers, but here in Boston we knew several days ago that the steerage passengers were not "left in the path of the danger, to die of fright if not of the pest." On the contrary, they were removed from the pest-ship long before the cabin passengers were, and put on islands, the sick on one and well on another.

No doubt the health authorities have plenty of sins to answer for, but it seems clear that in this instance they are not guilty as charged in your indictment.

E. C. Walker.

I stand fairly convicted of error and hasten to acknowledge it. My excuse is that I had read in two New York dailies that the steerage passengers of the Normann were taken to Hoffman Island to be bathed and disinfected and were returned to the vessel the next day. But I apologize, the less heavily to Mr. Walker, to the health authorities, to the State, and to the readers of Liberty. Such carelessness on my part well merits the lash of satire, and I, who use that excellent weapon very freely, hope not to complain when I am justly laid across my own shoulders.

However, though I was wrong in my facts, the position which the facts were intended to illustrate remains unshaken. My purpose was to call attention to a Parliamentary plan in this country, despite the frequent proclamation by the newspaper editors that they have been abolished; and I can several times replace the instance which Mr. Walker has exploded, without going
far outside the quarantine limits within which theuse instance was located.

The compulsory bathing of the steerage pas-

tengers was in itself a class distinction, unless the
cabin passengers were subjected to the same
rule. (Perhaps they were, but I think not; I

speak cautiously, that I may not again dove-

correction.) To say that the steerage passengers

had been more exposed is not to the purpose.

That the cabin passengers had been exposed to
the danger of the illness is shown by the fact
that they were kept in quarantine.

Now, the virtue of a quarantine consists in its
perfection. An individual not in quarantine

may take such risks as he chooses, but health

officers guarding the lives of millions may take
no risks at all. They must extend their precau-

tions to the minutest details. Therefore, if it

was incumbent upon them to bathe the steerage

passengers, it was incumbent upon them to

bathe the cabin passengers. In doing the one

and failing in the other they created a class
distinction.

Akin to this is another class distinction of a

sanitary character, which prevails, not alone in
times of epidemic, but under ordinary circum-

stances. One of Liberty's subscribers points me
to it. I give his letter.

To the Editor of Liberty:

I can give you another instance of the distinction
made between steerage and saloon passengers on the

Atlantic liners.

By United States law all passengers who cannot fur-

nish evidence of having been vaccinated have to submit
to compulsory vaccination before entering port. Sta-

coon passengers are never interfered with. Steerage

passengers have been subjected to the indignity.

Now, I came here as a saloon passenger. I am an

Englishman, a speculator, a banker in a small way, and

a practical usurer. — Illegal usury at that. But my

blood boils at this distinction in the treatment of rich

and poor,—a distinction that could not happen in Eng-

land, with all her faults.

But then I have discovered in other respects that

Americans' boasting about their liberty and equality,
or even legislative justice, is a stupendous sham. How-

ever, it suits me all right. I trim my sails accordingly.

Respectfully,

Saloon Passenger.

CALLAWAY, NEBRASKA, OCT. 10, 1862.

Perhaps a more striking class distinction than

either of the foregoing is that developed by the

quarantine, not between cabin and steerage pas-

sengers, but between the clam-diggers and the

little town of Islip and the high-titb-bob-

alans who inhabit the city of New York. Fire

Island is under the jurisdiction of Islip. The

State of N. Y. purchased Fire Island with a

view to placing quarantined passengers there.
The citizens of Islip objected, and obtained an

order from a Supreme Court judge enjoining the

governor or any one else from landing any quar-

antined passengers on Fire Island. Nevertheless

an attempt was made to land them, but the citi-

zens of Islip assembled at the dock and prevented

the landing. Subsequently a landing was ef-

fected after the injunction had been vacated on

a technicality by a bench of three judges, and

after calling out the military, who came near get-

ting drowned on their way to the island. Now

the citizens of Islip are taking further legal pro-

ceedings to prevent their territory from invasion

by the pest. The class distinction consists in

enforcing upon Islip, whose citizens are poor

fishermen, an expense to danger and disease
which aristocratic and powerful New York re-

fused to suffer. New York, which would not

allow the Normanna's passengers within miles

of the city, not only compelled Islip to receive

them, but wilfully abused the citizens of Islip as an

"inhuman mob" because, acting under the au-

thority of law, they, in defence of their health,

forcibly repelled this invasion. Here is an ab-

ominal class distinction, resting on the fact that

law and public opinion regard the life of an hon-

eous workman in the same light as that with

that of a rich thief. Most New Yorkers steal their

living; the fishermen of Islip earn theirs; hence the former should be protected from postelence and the latter exposed to it. Such is substantially the attitude of the authori-

ties in the present crisis. But, it is claimed, the

fishermen of Islip were not afraid of the cholera;

they were alarmed about their fishing interests,

which were suffering seriously because of the

proximity of the pest, there being no market for

possibly infected fish; now men, in the face of

the plague, are governed by property consider-

ations are selfish brutes. I do not see the force

of this position. In the first place, I do not see

what entitles any one to assert that these people

were not actuated by fear of cholera. But even

if they were not, I do not see, in the second

place, why the citizen of New York who in his

extremity is willing to subject innocent travellers
to hardship in order to save himself and his fam-

ily from cholera if any less selfish, any less in-

human, than the citizen of Islip who is willing to

resort to similar measures to keep the bread from

being taken from his children's mouths. And in

the third place I do not see the justice in call-

ing men who were defending themselves under

the sanction of the courts a mob and in calling

the governor of the State, who said that if he

were the sheriff, he would land those passengers

in disobedience of the injunction and take his

penalty therefor, a champion of law and order,

I see in all these things only a disposition to sur-

round the rich with safeguards and to send the

poor to the devil.

Have I said enough? Is the existence of class

distinctions proven? Are there any fresh errors

in my state of facts? If so, let them be pointed

out. For every one in my indictment that shall

be overthrown I undertake to bring two new

times that cannot be shaken.

—Lucifer—prints some English verses, which

credit's to "Jean Richepin in Liberty." The

Son of the Morning has made a mistake. Jean

Richepin has written verses for Lib-

erty, nor have any English verses written by

Jean Richepin ever appeared in Liberty. If

"Lucifer" has found any English verses by that

author, it has access to sources closed to me. It

certainly has found none in Liberty.

Conjugal Bliss.

"Jessie, you must not ask these people again; I will

not have them come to the house."

"But I like them, Tom; Ellen is a great chum of

mine; we were school-girls together."

"I can't help that. I don't like them, and that's enough."

"Then it seems this house is yours, and not ours."

"Be reasonable, you are always extreme. It is ours

for all right and proper purposes."

"I will try to be reasonable, Tom, but I am so stu-

pid, and I cannot understand. You endowed me with

all your worldly goods, I thought; and this house —

was it excepted?"

"Really, Jessie, what a goose you are! That was a

mere form, — a detail in the marriage service."

"Well, let us quit that now, Tom. You admit it

is ours for right and proper purposes, but you decide

that for me to meet my old time-fried friends herein

is not right and proper. By what authority do you

become the law-maker?"

"In the first place, you vowed to obey, and in the

second here is my warrant. God made man to rule over

his wife."

"Oh! now I begin to see daylight, Tom. Your first

point is that the marriage service I had forgotten;

for the second, it is a forgery, God is absolute. As I do not

recognize him, I rebel."

"What! Jessie! How insane you are! Remember,

I support this house by my earnings and will always

regulate its affairs. I insist that you do not ask

the Sherman again."

"I might as well fight as live as I desire if I spent

my time and strength in printing or teaching, instead of

in bringing forth and rearing our children and in do-

ing the housework, etc. This is not to be taken as the

equivalent of your labor."

"No, dear child, you do not understand. You dear little fool, what do you do but potter about and make the house pleasant for a chap when he's tired. I am glad to have you singing round and making it easy, but —"

"You said just now "I insist." Suppose I also in

sist and ask Ellen again."

"Jessie, you make me tired. I shall turn her out

and crop if she comes."

"Now I see completely. It is all clear, Tom. You

are stronger than I am. Your right to command is only

might to enforce your will. We are not equals in

muscle, and I have put myself in your power. I have

been for years past suspecting ours was no mar-

riage. I go to take lessons of Sullivan; when I return,

I may be strong enough to eject Mr. Hartnell, your

cookin, whose presence in this house is a continual

force to me."

"Jessie, you're enough to drive me to the devil.

What are you putting on your hat for?"

"That is my concern."

"Sit down, I tell you."

"If you touch me, Tom, I shall go at some future

time and not come back to you. I am wanting fresh

air. I must be alone. I must think."

"Think? That is too absurd! Now, come, dear icle

sing, let's call up this silly quarrel. Your chap loves

your wee wife."

"Quarrel! I have not been angry and besides it

is too cold and sad a fact to fall out over. The truth

bears me out that what is gold is only brass. I am a slave. I, who you are acknow-

ledged equal in learning and accomplishments, falling

the muscle, have to kneel under, deceive you, or go.

Which of the two ways shall I select—first the

third so homose, sorrowful, and untrue, I take, re-

 mains to be proved, but —"

Exit Tom banging the door and whistling — Yankee

Doodle. — MIRIAM DANSKIL.

Enthusiasm and Judgment.

The following, from the Philadelphia "Ledger," is

interesting as an impartial presentation of the two

views of enthusiasm that have recently been given

expression in Liberty.

There is no spice of exaggeration in enthu-

siasm. It is no use to quarrel with this; it is a neces-

sary element. He who sees vividly and feels intensely

upon any subject is at present unprepared to view its
difficulties, its obstacles, its other side. Could he do

this, it would lessen his zeal and diminish his efforts. He

must be, in a measure, one-sided; he must present

his cause in strong colors, and, perhaps, overestimate

its importance or its practicability. This will not be
done correctly, for sincerely is the very core of enthun-

siasm. He will be fully convinced, not only of the

truth of his convictions, but that they contain the whole

equal, and in proportion to his power, he will persuade

others of the same. In no sense is more sure of a

temporary success than this enthusiastic one-sidedness

when wielded by ability. It is the eager reformer, who

sees no objections to his schemes, who wins popular

sympathy. He is the lawyer or orator, pleading for-
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