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"For where the slave is there is Liberty."

Said that high flight where'er the wind is: hear!

and though the skies shine, we will tread in their hue.

Jove.}

On Picket Duty.

"If I were twenty-five years old," said Zola recently to Paul Adam, "I would become an Anarchist." But tell us that Collectiveism is Zola's creed; it seems, at any rate, that Anarchism is his confession.

Abram S. Hewitt says that Southern congressmen have degenerated. For that matter we have Northern congressmen, it being the nature of the congressional function to produce degeneracy both in those who exercise it and in those over whom it is exercised. But I observe that no Northern congressman has shown the wisdom evinced by Mr. Hooker, of Mississippi, who has introduced an amendment to the postal laws providing that printed matter shall be sent through the mails at one uniform rate, no matter who sends it, whereas it comes, whether once sent or sent any number of times, and that no statement shall be required concerning it except that it is printed matter. If this amendment should become law, it would no longer cost me one cent to deliver a copy of Liberty to a street and number in New York City, where it is published, while costing me only one cent of a cent to deliver a copy to a street and number in San Francisco, three thousand miles away. The New York "Sun" calls Mr. Hooker's bill a "unique piece of legislation." Yes, it is unique, in that it is sensible,—too sensible, in fact, to pass.

A contest for a vacancy in the French Academy was lately decided by the election of Heredia, one of the most artistic of French poets, over Zola. Heredia's candidacy had been for months a matter of public knowledge, and had been widely commented upon in the French press, and had received some notice in the American press. Every scholar who pretends to keep abreast with the march of things foreign was well aware that this poet was Zola's opponent. But there is another Heredia in France, an insignificant politician, who once happened to be Minister of Public Works. When the Academic election had taken place, a cable despatch appeared in the New York "Sun" announcing that the ex-Minister of Public Works had defeated Zola. Now, it is a commonly-accepted proposition (in the "Sun" office) that the verdict of history upon all foreign problems, complications, and doings whatever is anticipated in the columns of the "Sun." It discusses and weighs them in ponderous editorials, which, as Ruskin said of Mill's definition of wealth, "sound so very like satisfactory information that one is ashamed, after reading them, to ask for any more." Accordingly, a day or two after printing its cable despatch, the "Sun" heaped its best editorial ridicule upon the action of the French Academy. Educated people all over the city had not finished laughing at its blunder when another editorial paragraph followed, beginning thus: "We have received from Paris [probably a lie, it being much more likely that some less ignorant subscriber had called the editor down] a most welcome and satisfactory correction of a singular piece of Parisian news printed in this country last week. We took occasion the other day to moralize upon this news, which was to the effect that a certain humdrum ex-functionary of the government had been elected to the French Academy over that piquant novelist, M. Émile Zola. The thing seemed incredible and grotesque; but, as no American can ever tell what the Parisian immortals may think when there is a vacant fauteuil to be filled in the Academy, we did no more else than comment in a guarded way upon the peculiarity of the selection." Now, to say nothing of the fact that day and night had continued to succeed one another if the "Sun," left in doubt by this "incredible" news, had said nothing at all about it, and to say nothing of the further fact that, had it been a well-informed journal, this news would have left it in no doubt at all, since a knowledge of Heredia's candidacy would have enabled it to perceive the gross blunder, it is the height of impudence on the "Sun"'s part to claim that it made its comment in a "guarded way." Observe these words from its original paragraph: "His [Zola's] failure in the election of this week was even more mortifying to his vanity than his failure in the election of last year; for the successful candidate was even more contemptible in his eyes than any of the other candidates who have triumphed over him, one after another. Think of a humdrum ex-Minister of Public Works defeating the author of a hundred [sic] novels, and winning immortality, along with a yearly salary of fifteen hundred francs, at his expense!" Anything "guarded" about that? And then, in its later paragraph, the "Sun" goes on: "We know we have the pleasure of receiving the knowledge that there are at least two notable personages of the name of Heredia in France, one of whom was formerly Minister of Public Works, while the other is the delightful middle-aged poet of "Les Trophées," and that it was the latter of these who was chosen by the Académiciens in preference to the meretricious Zola...."

M. José Maria de Heredia, the new Academician, a native of Cuba, is a sonneteer of rare merit, a most worthy scholar, and a deep student in at least one branch of historical research. He is an honor to the French Academy. He is a marvel," What, pray, is the value of the "Sun"'s banal verdict upon the work of a man of whose existence, by its own confession, it has but just heard for the first time? Evidently it is taken on trust from some other authority, just as the editor took on trust the original cable despatch, knowing of his own knowledge nothing whatever. He simply made a ridiculous blunder, and followed it with a fruitless effort to conceal his self-exposure. But why, it may be asked, does Liberty go out of its way to tear off the covering? Because it is well to let light into the hollow pretensions of a journal which, from behind a mask of liberty hideously distorted, surpasses all others in the virulence and malice of its assaults upon the cause of labor.

Prefatory to his report of an extended interview with Voltairine de Cleyre, a New York "Sun" reporter makes this statement, after referring to a lecture which she had delivered in New York some months before: "The "Sun" sent a reporter to find this young woman and learn something of her history, but she had disappeared as suddenly and, seemingly, as mysteriously as she had turned up. And, although, as it now appears, she made no attempt to conceal herself, yet no one to whom the "Sun" reporter applied during those two months could tell where she lived." This does not speak well for the ability of the "Sun"'s stuff. A reporter starting from Newspaper Row in search of Voltairine de Cleyre and returning after twenty-four hours without knowing even her residence should have been discharged on the spot as utterly incompetent. Such a man would instantly have found employment as a Tammany detective to hunt for confidence-men on the Bowery, gamblers in the Tenderloin, and thieves in the City Hall. He would never have discovered any, and his employers would have been the better pleased. I suspect, however, that the reporter is no such ass as the sentence quoted would make him appear in the eyes of those who know that Miss de Cleyre, poetess though she is, is really possessed in her accessibility, but that the words were inserted in his "copy" by the editor with a view to lending an interest to the object of the story by surrounding her with an atmosphere of mystery that does not belong to her, and to impressing the gullible public with the idea that the searching rays of the inevitable "Sun" must eventually fall even on a needle hidden in a haystack.

Little Jack Horner

Sat in a corner,
Eating his Christmas pie:
He put in his thumb,
And he pulled out a plum,
And he said: "What a brave boy am I!"
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Is Interest the Reward of Ability?

These Anarchists who, while opposing interest on capital, uphold property in ideas should read W. H. Mallock's criticism of "Fabian Economics" in the February number of the "Fortnightly Review."

Mr. Mallock maintains that the Fabian distinction (a distinction made by all Socialists) between the idle shareholder and the working superintendent of production is ill-founded; that the dividend paid to the one and the salary paid to the other are equally the reward of ability — that is, of brain-labor, — which reward the Fabians approve; that the proper reward of ability is the difference between the total product and that part of it which common labor could have produced without the aid of ability; that the aid thus furnished by ability takes the form mainly of invention and device, and hence is perpetual in its nature, increasing the productivity, not only of today's labor, but of all future labor in the same line; that the reward, therefore, must not stop with today's salary, but must continue as long as this aid is made use of; and that the Life shareholders in receipt of dividends are simply receiving the interest on salaries of the men of ability who were their ancestors.

It would be interesting to observe the effort of a believer in property in ideas to overthrow this argument. Not, however, that it is sound; the Fabians, who deny property in ideas, as I do and as, in my view, all Anarchists logically must, will have no trouble in controverting it; but from the standpoint of property in ideas it is in-convendrable.

Mr. Mallock's slacity is to be found in his measure of the proper reward of ability. The reward of the able man, the man of brains, the inventor, is not in equable equal to the added product resulting from the invention, as becomes manifest at once as soon as it is seen that to admit the inventor's claim to such a reward is to deprive everybody else for all time of the chance to invent — that is, discover — the same thing for themselves. To oblige all other men to part with such an opportunity in favor of a single individual, whose sole virtue is that, perhaps by ability, perhaps by accident, he "got there first," is as impossible as to oblige them to part with the prospective use of all land or any other natural force or opportunity in favor of the original discoverer.

The proper reward of ability is whatever ability, unsupported by legal monopoly, can obtain in the open market. And, since no idle shareholder could continue in receipt of dividends were it not for the support of monopoly, it follows that these dividends are not a part of the proper reward of ability.

I have purposely avoided notice of Mr. Mallock's unwarranted assumption that the existing shareholders are descendants or legatees of the able men. As a matter of fact they often are not, but have come into possession of the result of ability by hook or by crook: and therefore Mr. Mallock's argument, even were it thoroughly sound, would fail to justify the status quo. But this is an accidental element of the question, the main point being whether ability can equitably bequeath a perpetual wage to its genuine posterity or its chosen beneficiaries. I think the Socialists are right in maintaining that it cannot.

In making these comments upon Mr. Mallock's article it has not been my purpose to revive the controversy on patents and copyrights which at time pretty nearly exhausted the subject in these columns, but simply to point out the close connection, amounting almost to identity, between property in ideas and interest on capital, and that the latter cannot be denied in the same breath in which the former is affirmed. They stand or fall together, and it is Liberty's view that both fall.
strong over the weak, which was the condition of things before people agreed to permit the weak to have the same rights as the strong, but which, however, in spite of the agreement, is not the condition which exists today.

But such people, I am sure, do not pretend to be reformers, and from those who do lay a claim to that distinction I expect an affirmative answer. Therefore, since it is admitted that equal freedom is desirable, it follows that Anarchism is the only true remedy for our social ills, because it is the only expedient which propels the inauguration of equal freedom. No other device offered as a solution of the social problem lessens the invasions of the free common property. That not one of them does grant him such freedom is demonstrated by the very principles upon which each scheme rests. Then it is certainly clear that, if Anarchism is the only social condition that assures equal freedom,—and we have decided that we desire equal freedom,—all other schemes are undesirable, expedient, and worthless. So why not advocate the only true road to happiness?

Blaize Pascal on Usury.

"He united eloquence with Urania's talents, but soon, immolating his genius before God himself, he vindicated the ancient obsequies of Faith. O thou! Religion, whose sovereignty withdrew this great man from Philosophy, permit, at least, regrets for this."

The above was written concerning Blaize Pascal by Jean le Rond d'Alembert. We, too, join with the famous secretary of the Institute in lamenting the immolation of a great genius before bad ideals, for the process of immolation was attended, and at times interrupted, by acts of rebellion and displays of humanity and intelligence which helped, and will still help, to overcome the influences to which he succumbed.

Examination of Pascal's works discloses much in which we can take great satisfaction. The writer of these lines, when a youth, formed an opinion of Pascal quite different from the one which he now possesses, his information not having been then obtained from a study of Pascal's works in their entirety. Even now he cannot quote from the recent editions of Pascal's works, some of which are said to be decidedly superior, not only to earlier editions, but to those of almost any classical writer.

But the more one studies classical writers, the more chance he will have to learn that almost any complete edition will give much that is more to the credit of the writer than the representations of their views with which libraries are deluged,—much also that is less.

Such passages as the following from Pascal are usually suppressed, or an attempt is made to nullify their force.

"The power of kings is founded upon the reason and the folly of the people, but chiefly upon their folly."

"The greatest and most important thing in the world has weakness for its foundation: and this is an admirable sure foundation, for there is nothing surer than that the people will be weak; that which is founded solely on reason is poorly established, as esteem of wisdom."

"Our magistrates have well understood this mystery. Their red robes, their emblems in which they wrap themselves up like furled cats, palaces where they pass judgment, feu-dé-lis,—

the whole imposing apparatus was necessary; and if the physicians had not had their casacks and mules, and the doctors of divinity their square caps and robes four times too big for them, they would never have doped the people, unable to resist this show of authenticity." The following is worthy of attention:

"Justice is liable to be disputed; force is easily recognized and is indisputable. So that the only thing to do was to give force to justice. Having been unable to bring it about that that which was just should have force, they have enacted that force should be justice."

But, alas! it is interesting to consider many of Pascal's sayings, the main purpose of this article is to present his views on usury. In the eighth of his "Letters to a Provincial" he says, conversing with a Jesuit father: "Let us now speak of business men. You know that to turn them away from usury is the hardest thing to do with them; therefore our fathers have paid particular attention to this, since they detest this vice so much that Escobar says, in tr. 3, ex. 3, p. 1, "that to say that usury is not a sin would be a heresy," and our Father Banny, in his "Nouveaux," ch. 14, lists several passages with punishments due to usurers. He declares them to be "infamous during their lives and unworthy of burial after their death.""

"O father, I had not thought him so severe!"

"He is when it is necessary; but, this learned casist having remarked that one is not drawn to usury except by desire of gain, he says in the same place: "One would bring the people under no slight obligation to, in guarding them from the bad effects of usury ad at the same time from the sin which is the cause of it, one mustish them with the means of obtaining as much and more profit from their money by some good and legitimate employment than would be obtained by their usuries."

"1 Doubtless, my father, there would be no more usuries after that."

"And that is why he has furnished a general method for all sorts of persons—gentlemen, presidents, councilors, etc., and such an easy one that it only consists in the use of several words which one must pronounce in lending his money, in consequence of which one can take the interest of it without fearing that it is usury, as it doubtless would have been otherwise."

"Well, my father, what are these mysterious phrases?"

"Here you have them," said he to me, "and in his very words, for he has written his "Book of the Summary of Sins" in French, "to be understood by every one," as he remarks in the preface: "He, then, of whom one asks money will reply thus: I have no money to lend, though indeed I have to put out for honest and lien profit. If you want the sum that you ask wherewith to make your industry productive and will divide the profits and losses, perhaps I can fix it. But since, in truth, it is too much trouble to come to terms about the profit, if you wish to guarantee me a certain amount of it, and so much on the principal that there be no risk, we might immediately come to terms, and you could have the money at once."

"Isn't that a very easy way to get money without sin? And was not Father Banny right in saying these words, with which he concludes: "There you have, in my opinion, the means by which many persons in the world, who, by their usuries, extortions, and illicit contracts, provoke the just indignation of God, can save themselves while making good, honest, and lien profits."

"O my father! what powerful words! Doubtless they have some hidden virtue, which I do not comprehend, to destroy usury, for I had always supposed that this sin consisted in taking back more money than one had lent."

"That is why our Father Escober shows how he saves the usury by a shift of intention in tr. 3, ex. 3, p. 43, 44. "It would be usury," says he, "to take interest from borrowers if one should exact it as a requirement of justice; but if one only requires it as a due from gratitude, it is not usury. It is not lawful to have the intention of profiting directly from the money lent, but to claim it by the medium of the benevolence of the borrower—moder benevolentia—is not usury. There are subtle methods to you, but one of the best, in my opinion (for we have a number to choose from), is the Mohatra contract."

"The Mohatra contract, father?"

"I see clearly that you do not understand what that is. The name is the only strange thing about it. Escober will furnish you the explanation in tr. 3, ex. 3, p. 36. "The Mohatra contract is that according to which they buy goods at a high price for credit, in order to sell back at the same instant, to the same person, at a low price for cash. That's the 'Mohatra contract' by which you see, one receives a certain sum in cash, remaining under obligation for a greater sum."

"But, my father, I think nobody but Escober can have used that term. Are there other books that refer to it?"

"How little you know! replied the father. "The last book on moral theology (theologic morale: theological morality?), printed this very year at Paris, speaks of the Mohatra, and learnedly. It is called "Epilogus Summarum," and is an abridgment of all the summaries of theology, extracted from Fathers Sireau, Sanchez, Lessius, Fagundes, Hurtado, and other celebrated casists, as the title declares. You will find there, on page 54: "The Mohatra takes place when a man who has occasion for twenty pistols buys goods of a merchant for thirty pistols, payable in one year, and sells them back to him on the spot for twenty pistols, cash down. Thus you see plainly that the Mohatra is not an unheard-of word."

"Very well, father; is that contract permitted?"

"Escober," replied the father, "tells us in the same place that there are laws which forbid it under very severe penalties."

"So it is useless, father?"

"By no means," said he; "for Escober, in
the same place, gives expedients to render it
permissible; he says, "It is so when the
principal intention of both buyer and seller is to make
a profit, provided only that the seller does not exceed the highest price for such goods, and the
buyer does not go below the lowest, and that no previous bargain has been agreed upon, expressly
or otherwise." Lessin, however, says: de 
L. 2. n. 31. d. 16. "That, even if one had sold
with the intention of re-purchasing at a les s price,
one need never make restitution of this profit,
except, perhaps, out of charity, in case he from
whom it had been exacted was in poverty, and
not even then if one cannot do it without inconven ience, of counsel, non posset." There you have
the utmost that is to be said.

"Indeed, my father, I think further indulgence
would be pernicious.

"Our fathers," replied he, "know very well
how to stop in good time. So you see the utility
of the Molatza."

The Provincial Letters were widely published,
and a Latin translation which was made is said
to have met Pascal's approval. The above transla
tion is the one referred to in a translation said
to have been compared with the Latin one.

We have reason, then, to think that Pascal
approved of the doctrine which condemned usury.

ALEX.

The Fovital Problem.

The social question is pressing for a solution
with accumulating and accelerating energy. But
the average "intelligent agent" in the industrial
drama now ensuing seems to have lost his cue
and to be utterly at a loss with regard to what
to say and do next. The ruling powers are poli
ishing their guns and erecting stronger fortifica
tions of the poor, of economic phenomena and
movements. There is in this fact more than a
reasonable promise that in the end sober counsel
will prevail and offer a solution of the economic
difficulties and perplexities surrounding us.

It is a step in the right direction to determine
the point where the trouble lies. Socialists
of all schools have long recognized that it is not
a question of production that concerns the
people at the present time. Their sufferings and evils
of which complaint is made are not due to a lack
of the materials needed to supply human wants.
Though there is no end to the evolution and
perfection of the productive forces, it is also true
that with the improved mechanical processes now
in use enough goods of all kinds can be turned
out to provide the entire population of the world
with everything desirable. As ex-Governor Long
recently said in a speech before the Beacon So
ciety: "There is an abundance of food stored in
our grain houses, there is clothing enough for
everybody, and people who have it are anxious
to dispose of it."

The question before the world, then, is not so
much how to produce the best advantage as how
to distribute the goods produced efficiently and
equitably. Here, also, the Socialists of all schools
are agreed that it is a question, not of produc.
tion, but of distribution. It is a point gained to
find this admitted by ex-Governor Long, and also
by the Boston "Herald" in its editorial com
ments on his speech. The "Herald" thinks that
the problem of mediating between want and ex
cess, the problem of distribution, ought to be a
simple one, and then ventures to say in explana
tion of why it has not yet been solved that pos
sibly the concentration of attention upon produc
tive industry has complicated the problem through
relative neglect, whereupon it concludes: "It is
probable that, when the same amount of earnest
attention is given to getting the products of field
and factory into the hands of those who want
them that thus far has been devoted to producing
these things, the solution will be found, and
that, like most great problems, it will prove to
be so simple that the wonder will be: that no one
had thought of it before. When that time comes
there will be no question of lack of employment
to those who want employment and are fit for
it."

The "Herald," in this matter as well as in
most others, is at least fifty years behind the
times; else it would know that the problem of
distribution, in its own sense, was solved long
ago by Proudhon, who offered his solution at the
same time also as the solution of the social problem. Proudhon's solution is contained in his
proposal of the organization of credit in the Bank
of the People. By abolishing the royalty of
gold and entitling all values to equal representa
tion in the currency this proposal promised to
end all the consequences of the distribu
tion of commodities to the verge of possibility,
and, by destroying interest through free com
petition in banking, to enable labor to secure its
full product. Free trade in banking is indeed
very simple, and the wonder is that it has re
mained neglected and ignored so long after at	ention had been so eloquently and powerfully
directed to it, especially since it is more than
probable that its practical realization would have
prevented and made utterly impossible the prev
ailing business depression and the rise of the
unemployed. The only explanation why it has not
been accepted is the absence of common intel
ligence, the circumstance that it contravenes the
existing order or rather disorder of society, and
the fact that it is interdicted by the government.
But it is too much to expect that now, in the
midst of want and distress and when so many
people are racking their brains for expedients to
help the needy and suffering, it shall receive the
attention which it deserves."

G. S.

"My theory," said Voltairina de Cleyre to a
"Sun" reporter (and she has said the same to me),
"is that of Jesus Christ: If a man unite
upon the right cheek, turn him the left." But
inasmuch as I find her saying in "Lucifer"
of January 26, regarding a pamphlet which she
has written: "It was intended to stir in the
mass the idea of the right to rob robbers, and at
the same time to be so worded as not to place its
author in prison," I conclude that she has for
 gotten that other remark which Jesus made in
the same breath: "And if any man take away
thy coat, let him have thy cloak also." How
Christ would have deemed this latter-day dic
tive? It Miss de Cleyre believes in non-resis
tance and at the same time urges the people
to resistance; I leave her to the condemnation of
that conscience (true conscience, does she call it?) before which she, as a moralist, bows. And
if, in addition to this, in violation of her pro
fessed belief, but in furtherance of her secret
wish, she is inclining the people to acts that will
almost surely lodge them in prison, and deliber
ately so wording her incitement that she may
keep out of prison herself, I "censoriously" visit
her on the condemnation of that sentiment
of manliness which even the hated helenist
admires.

At Mrs. Lease's recent lecture in Cooper Union
Pentecost sat on the platform. Is this the be
ginning of a fresh swing around the circle of ref
orm?

Frequently at one now sees in the New York
"Sun" such `lingo ejaculations as "Vote an
other battle nipp" and "Carry on the work of
building up the navy," it is only ten years since
its editorial page was sprinkled in even greater
profusion with the cry: "Release the army to
ten thousand men." It had not then dawned
upon Dana that the existence of his brotherhood
of thieves is dependent upon the State mili
tant.

The Turkish government freezes upon those
of its subjects who transfer their allegiance
from the Sultan to other potentates or powers, and
even goes so far as to attempt to punish them
when they revile Turkey. The United States
in the past has protected its naturalized citizen
of Turkish extraction against such treatment, but
President Cleveland, both in his former adminis
tration and the present one, has sometimes
depreciated the protection. As a consequence
Armenians naturalized in the United States and
doing business here are liable to be thrown into
prison in Turkey if they go there to buy goods.
Said one of these merchants to a reporter re
cently: "The government might as well tell
Armenians who are in the Oriental business that
they must go out of the business altogether as to
tell them that they are not to receive protection
if they go abroad. American dealers in the same
line will have no difficulty in sending their agents
to Turkey, and you can see the immense advan
tage they will have over us." It does not seem
to have occurred to this Armian-American
merchant that the attitude of the United States
in this matter is probably inspired by the influ
ence of American dealers who have a "pull"
with the administration. The result which he
fears is, it is to be presumed, the precise result
that was intended. Among those who have con
tributed most liberally to the expenses of Cleve
land's campaigns are men of large interests in
the dry goods trade, and a near relative of one
of them was appointed by Cleveland as Minister
to Turkey. Behind the veil of tyranny, as be
hind nearly all others, you will find the Almighty
Dollar somewhere lurking.

At the recent Lincoln dinner of the Republi
can Club at Delmonico's Bishop John P. New
man said: "We cannot fail. With Sherman
in the Senate [applause], Tom Reed in the House
[increased applause], McKinley in Ohio [applause
and cheers], and God over all [enthusiastic ap

plume and cheer, we must win." It is interesting to note that if all monopolists
\[ \text{God is the favorite. It used to be said that one} \]
\[ \text{with God is a majority; and here there are three} \]
\[ \text{with God, victory seems sure to} \]
\[ \text{Bishop Newman. But somehow things failed to} \]
\[ \text{go their way in 1892, when all these powers were} \]
\[ \text{in their respective places. Is God a recent con} \]
\[ \text{vert to McKinleyism?} \]
\[ \text{I thought we had always heard of his protecting} \]
\[ \text{care.} \]

Some people argue that, since Vaillant did not kill, he did not deserve to be killed. This argument might have some force on the planet Mars, where, according to the fancy of certain dreamers, social justice prevails; but on a planet like ours, where the crimes that succeed are the only crimes that are not crimes, and where the severest punishments are reserved for the men who fail, its whole weight is against Vaillant rather than for him. As the conservatives often remind us, we live on Earth, not in Dreamland.

When Vaillant’s bomb exploded in the Chamber of Deputies, a pending bill was under discussion. Before the smoke had cleared away, M. Dupuy, the presiding officer, with a seeming coldness and presence of mind that secured him the encomiums of press and public and added new luster to a waning reputation, spoke the following words: "The discussion continues. The ever ready Clemenceau, in his journal, "La Justice," the next day deftly turned this declaration of account by saying in substance: Yes, M. Dupuy, you have spoken the sensible word; the act of Vaillant, startlingly indicative as it is of intense and growing discontent underbodons imposed by an unjust social system, leaves us but one wise course, if indeed there ever was another, — to let the discussion continue, not only in the Chamber, but in the press and on the platform the world over, till a way shall be found of righting social wrongs. Instead of which M. Dupuy and the deputies, whose courage lasted but a moment, promptly proceeded in a fit of fear and panic to place a gag upon discussion of social questions, not only in the press and upon the platform, but even by private correspondence; and, if the discussion still continues to an extent, it is in spite, and not because, of M. Dupuy.

I print Charlotte Perkins Stetson’s poem, in another column, because, in the first place, it is a good poem, and because, in the second place, its sarcasm against charity is well-directed. Its economics, however, are bellamistic and bad. If the big brother and the little brother had "each in freedom calmly helped himself," all would have been well; in that case, the food by the hypothesis being "free and plenty for them both," the big brother could not have taken all. When Mrs. Stetson says that he did, she contradicts her premise; and if not in all poems, at least in economic poems good logic is a requisite. Stetson is not a logician; she would have no right to say that there was all that each wanted. It being absurd to suppose that the big brother took more than he wanted, there must have been left all that the little brother wanted. Then there would have been no need for charity, which would have been fortunate, or for Mrs. Stetson’s poem, which would have been unfortunate. But it is not true that "each in freedom calmly helped himself." What really happened was this: sometimes the big brother was foolish enough to think that there was not plenty for both, and so he tied the little brother’s hands; at other times the big brother was too lazy even to take, and so he forced the little brother to do all the taking and to deposit in his (the big brother’s) lap nearly all that he took. In neither case did the little brother help himself in freedom. Because Mrs. Stetson supposes that he did, she wants to abolish freedom. If she could only understand that the little brother has always been a slave,— and to some extent the big brother too,— she would try, instead, to abolish slavery. That is to say, when Mrs. Stetson can think as well as she can sing, she will be no longer a Nationalist, but an Anarchist.

A subscriber living in Provincetown, Mass., writes: "We do not yet feel the pressure of the times here as severely as in most towns of this size, and chiefly for the reason that there is no manufacturing of any account. The only factory in the place is a shirt factory, which employed 150 or 300 girls. That closed last August for a two weeks’ vacation (?) and has not resumed operations since. The fisheries are what support my people, and here we have our chief "law of equal liberty" prevailing, in so far as every man can take his boat and go out on the water and get a catch of fish without being obliged to surrender one-fourth of his crop to a landlord or water lord." Let the fishermen of Provincetown enjoy their blessings while they have them. My word for it, they are not for long. Sooner or later their industry too will be capitalized like the rest, unless free money comes sometimes to prevent this by abolishing interest and raising wages. On the shores of France this has already happened. There long ago the capitalists said to the fisherman: "Every day you go forth on an uncertain errand; you may do well, you may do ill; therefore sell me your boat; every day you shall go forth for me, and I will pay you a certain wage, whatever the result." Allured by this prospect of security, all the fishermen sold their boats and became the employees of the capitalist companies. In consequence, they do surrender a huge portion of their product, not indeed to a water lord, but to the money lord, and are in the condition of all wage-earners everywhere. When, in consequence of hard times, the demand for fish decreases, the fishing industry, like other industries, shrugs down, at least partially, and the suspended fishermen no longer have boats of their own with which to procure even a supply for their families. And now not only is the fisherman’s support precluded, but his liberty is gone. In former times, if the storm was so severe that a wreck seemed certain, the fisherman could choose to stay at home. Now, in the busy season, whatever the weather and whatever the risk, he must face it or lose his job. The capitalist must have his interest, regardless of the laborer’s life. The only pleasant and easy gain is by steady fishing than he loses by the occasional wreck of a boat; what, however, is an average to a dead fisherman or his family? There is a lesson in this for the Single Taxers. Free water but partially solves the problem. Neither free land nor taxed land will do much more. Free money, capital without interest,—this is the laborer’s greatest need.

Contempt of Court.
[San Francisco Examiner.]
Judge Seawell, I am told you sentenced a man to prison for contempt of court. Because the man was inebriated, and smiled against you greatly. You are so stiff and stately. He must be very lucky to have such a judge at all. To speak at all before you. Small wonder such behavior scares — Small wonder should it "floor" you. Such dignity you have, it stills the life of even Alexander Campbell’s chin. It was a witness whom you juled. At least so goes the story. In reverence for you he’d failed And spoke his mind. What’s more, he scorned Campbell’s oratory. Campbell, a man whose name is like A tongue or two, — men fear him, And even the angels don’t aspire To go too near him. This lonely witness feared not him nor his, And said he was a liar. Well, he is.

Not in the sense that he offended To signify unpleasant views About one’s mere obsession By the spirit of transgression. No, he’ll not lie (that is allowed) In any way feasible. Because he’s a fool, because he’s proud, Because he’s in a passion. He’ll tell a falsehood only for a fee. What? shall he starve instead? Not he, not he.

That’s neither here nor there; the man Was punished for contempt. Insulting words from one who can At pleasure be tormenting, Rude, brutal, unrelenting, With all immunity from blame — Even in your Honor’s house. May fool with hints of a maid’s good name, And muddle men by suavering — Is short, a lawyer. Did you ever chide One of that gang of saying a witness lied?

Contempt of court? It’s not contempt When an attorney, spurring The laws of defense and justice From laws of love and learning — Goes on for hours attaining? Why is it not contempt when, Of Man and God defaming, Defames a witness for a fee, Or lauds a scurrilous eliot? Does Justice need such dirty work? My view, Judge, if you think so, is — the full needs you.

A. B. Freeman."

Charity.
[In This Our World.]
Cam, two young children to their mother’s shelf (One was quite little and the other big). And each in freedom calmly helped himself (One was a pig).

The food was free and plenty for them both. But one was rather dull and very small; So the big smarter brother, nothing loath, He took well.

At which the little fellow milled a yells Which filled the room with a mighty din; far afloat in his head with wondrous eyes from his strange wax. He gave him here a crust and there a shell Of his four fingers.

He gave with pride, in manner calm and bland, Finding the other his hunger a delight; He gave with plenty — his full left hand Held from his right.

He gave and gave — Oh blessed Charity! How sweet and beautiful a thing it is! How fine to see that big boy giving free

What was not his!}

Charlotte Perkins Stetson.
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The Beauties of Government.

"The result of Liberty are urgently invited to con- tribute to this department. It is open to any statement of facts which exhibits the capacity of the people, in the distant, affording the opportunities to the".

The Beauforts, a more or less detail on the National Guard of this State, are taken by the police in the Peace of the schools and the principals are asked to furnish the com-
mittee of the health board a list of names of those re-
fusing to furnish the certificate of vaccination, and the certificate list is taken as evidence of their disso-
ance in all necessary steps they deem proper. It is either vaccinated at the unneccessy, risk of the child’s life or move out of town.

"[The same State that imprisons people for at-
tempts to kill themselves kills them to prevent them from catching disease.]"

The Coming Age of Universal Infantry.

"These are indeed parlous days on Beacon Hill, and within the sacred State House bowed by Borditch. I dare say, that our State has the only the State in the Union."

Everything is very much in evidence this session. The State has schemes to prevent a man from calling in the physician of his choice, unless he belongs to a certain school. There are plans to delar the dyspeptic from taking any kind of medicine, no matter how beneficial it may have proved in his case, unless it has been mulled over and vouched for by a solemn State commission. A".

And, last in this line of campaign, comes a proposal to prevent any representative of the rat race from wit-
nessing any stage entertainment, unless he has reached the age of 18, or perhaps 24.

What notion will next be exploited in proposed legis-
lative measures? I were hard, to the man, the usage and customs of puritanical days cannot logically stop with this attempt to curtail the privileges of our young people. It will be the old folks’ turn, next thing the public knows.

Perhaps this very day some legislative regulator will offer a law providing that no citizen of the commonwealth shall absent himself from home after 9 p.m. without being subject to fine, unless he can show to the satisfaction of a commission that he had urgent business on hand.

It is probable that, under the State at its per-
feci, the chief industry, and the first to be taken over by the State Socialists, will be the manufacture of diapers for the overgrown but helpless brats that all of us then will be."

Beyond the Reach of the Policeman’s Proctor.

One of the consequences of the abnormal activity into which the police have been plunged, as advocated by Dr. Parkhurst is the proposed formation, by a party of young men who are fond of late supperers with cheerful young women who are not eligible to registration at the Vauxville, and who are to the people of the London model. These London supper clubs are numerous and prosperous. The law closing public houses and restaurants at midnight is strictly enforced in London, and young men who have no mind to end their evening at that hour combine to organize a club, where, as club members, they can eat and drink as long as they choose without molestation. Each club has its own peculiar following, and one set makes affractures under another. Admission to these clubs is an absolute test of character, but cost and the ability to spend money are about the only qualifica-
tions for membership. Parliament has tried its best to reform the supper clubs, but "the English law doesn’t seem to have any effect."

The police have searched several buildings near the club house, notably Mariot Bordain’s private lodgings in Great Titchfield street and the rooms of Jean Pierre Francois, who was supposed to have failed an examination, and to have been the accomplice of a Inspectors and tried to extort. They found much Anchist literature of the orthodox kind in both places and a few explosives in Bordain’s rooms.

The police, who went into the club house, the front door were astonished and indignant, but only one of them, a Frenchman, resisted the police. He strug-
gelled savagely, clawing and biting right and left, and cheering for Anarchist when finally pinned against the wall.

The total number of prisoners is about eighty. The majority of them are Germans and Bohemians. All were examined carefully and then ordered to show their passports. Few of them were willing to do so.
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mental governments have resorted to formal protests. Thanks to Thursday's incident in Greenwich Park, the authorities have practically yielded, and instructions have been issued from the British Home Office to the police to pursue the Anarchists without mercy. It has also been intimated that the police need not be bound by the ordinary forms of law when seeking a justifiable end against the conspirators. High-handed measures, if followed by legal difficulties, will be upheld by the government, and those using them will be protected. This extraordinary step is quite necessary in England, for under the law the police have not a fraction of the power exercised by Superintendent Byrnes in dealing with suspected persons. The Anarchists have been charged with wholesale bankruptcy to reduce these estimates by $3,000,000 if the municipality wants to avoid wreck. Mayor Hopkins announced today that there was no mistake about the city's financial distress. He bitterly assailed the source of the evil.—Chicago's system of secessions—declaring a willingness to go before the people on that issue. He said: "The people are being robbed by officeholders. The remedy is within the legislature, and I shall use all my influence to have the honest people elected change." 

[What are officeholders for, anyhow? Is not robbery their function?]

VAILLANTS GRAVE MUST NOT BE KEPT GREEN. [New York Sun.]

Pittsburgh, Feb. 14.—A commission of experts, appointed by the city council, went to the grave of an infant killed in the city, to determine the cause of death and the exact age and sex of the infant. The commission's report will be made public in a few days.

WORLD DESTRUCTION OF A COUNTY BANK. [New York Sun.]

Washington, Jan. 30.—A commission of experts, appointed by the county commission, went to the grave of an infant killed in the city, to determine the cause of death and the exact age and sex of the infant. The commission's report will be made public in a few days.

[Here the best remedy would be to make the government so poor that it would need no vaults.]

COMPLIANT EDUCATION OF ADULTS. [Le Mat.]

Many of the young women of Lorraine, living near the French frontier, are being educated in the schools of the country, and of such obscure character, inferiority of construction, and minimum of security as would cause them to be rejected as unfit for use by any country bank in a backwoods town.

[Compulsory education has always been defended as essential to the production of good citizens; the real reason for which it would seem to be that it is essential to the production of good soldiers.]

FOLLOWING IN RUSSIA'S FOOTSTEPS. [New York Sun.]

At a meeting of the Russian Council on Wednesday, a long discussion took place on a resolution to blot all betting and gambling news from the papers taken at the various athletic meetings in the city. The vice chairman of the libraries committee and others spoke strongly in opposition. It was contended that it would be difficult to decide what news should be blotted out and what should be printed. The resolution was defeated by a vote of 8 to 7. The motion to blot out was carried, nineteen voting for it and sixteen against.

EVERYBODY CAUGHT EXCEPT THE GUilty. [New York Herald.]

A gang of desperate and skillful masked burglars has made life on Long Island a nightmare for several months past. The police of Long Island City put three details of men at work on the case. There is jealousy in the police force of that city, and, instead of working in harmony, each detail followed a different course, hoping to capture the gang and be made detectives forever and all time. The result is that two separate gangs of alleged masked burglars are under arrest, each charged with committing the same crimes. Each faction of police year will be compelled to give up some of his share for the general good. The comptroller's estimates referred to the council's committee are $3,000,000 in excess of what the city can afford to pay without having to resort to bankruptcy. These estimates by $3,000,000 if the municipality wants to avoid wreck. Mayor Hopkins announced today that there was no mistake about the city's financial distress. He bitterly assailed the source of the evil.—Chicago's system of secessions—declaring a willingness to go before the people on that issue. He said: "The people are being robbed by officeholders. The remedy is within the legislature, and I shall use all my influence to have the honest people elected change." 

[Under government, punishment is considered such a good thing in itself and such a blessing (to the men paid to do the punishing) that it is always deemed advisable to let a guilty man escape if thereby ninety-nine innocent men may be punished in his stead.]

THE BEAUTY TAKES THE CAKE. [New York Sun.]

Montpelier, Vt., March 1.—The State Supreme Court today rendered a decision in the famous case of the State against John O'Neill, of Rutland. The court denied the petitioner's petition for a new trial, and sentenced him to a fine of $6,160 and two months in the House of Correction. This case has been on trial for twelve years. O'Neill, a liquor dealer in Whitefield, N. H., sent liquor to Rutland for Sale. He was arrested on October 10, 1908, before Justice Wallace Bailey in Rutland for 457 offenses, and sentenced by Bailey to 26,810 days, or over seventy-nine years, in the House of Correction. O'Neill appealed to the County Court, where he pleaded guilty of 307 offenses, reduced the penalty to about sixty years. He appealed to the Supreme Court on the ground of excessive and unusual punishment, but the decision of the lower court was affirmed. The case was then taken to the United States Court of Appeals and on the plea that the Vermont prohibitory law was unconstitutional. That court decided that it had no jurisdiction. As a last resort it was taken back to the State Supreme Court on a motion to arrest judgment.

AN INDUSTRY NOT AFFECTED BY THE TARIFF. [New York Tribune.]

Chicago, Jan. 5.—Fifty-two prisoners are now in the Cook County jail, charged with murder. Besides this large number of men who are to be tried for their lives, over 500 other prisoners are in jail awaiting trial. Not a cell is empty, and in many instances three and four are crowded within the narrow walls of a cell.

[In these hard times, when nearly all industries are idle, that criminal factory, the State, should shut down also. Its warehouses will not hold the product.]

PEACE ONLY FOR THE WICKED AND THE SICK. [New York Post.]

Albany, N. Y., Jan. 5.—The New York State Homeopathic Medical Society will bring before the legislature the question of marriage among those tainted by heredity with crime, insanity, or disease. The Society believes that the State can pass laws that will prohibit such marriages.

[When this law goes into operation, many good people suffering in the bonds of matrimony will repent their early lives of innocence. And in that coming day when the good and the same and the healthy will refuse to marry, what will become of matrimony if the wicked and the sick and the daft are not allowed to marry?]

SELECTIAMS OBER SELECT WOMEN. [New York World.]

Amesbury, Mass., Jan. 5.—The rather loud posters advertising Sarah, the White House, were demonstrated by members of the selectmen and instigated by the Women's Christian Temperance Union.

[The billboards belong to the saints, and the saints belong all to the W. C. T. U.]
The Execution of Vaillant.

Liberty, which in its issue of February 24 gave a full account of Vaillant's trial, supplements it in the present issue with several accounts of the execution, taken from French newspapers of various political opinions. The first is from "Le Figaro," a conservative organ.

Not until seven o'clock the evening previous to the execution was M. Debray, the executioner, summoned to the house of the victim; and only the next morning, after several hours of deliberation, did he order his carriage to carry out the death-sentence the following morning (February 25) at half past seven. Only at eleven in the evening were the various officials notified of President Carnot's decree. It was midnight when M. Galliot, the chief of the municipal police, immediately sent a force of 1000 police to the Place de la Roquette. At one o'clock in the morning barriers were set up, beginning at the street corner and extending to the upper end of the square was permitted to the public, who were not allowed, however, to enter the reserved space. The crowd outside the barriers was smaller than usual. Far from being noisy, like the crowds that gather with the execution of notorious criminals, it was silent, as if absorbed in thought. Entrance to the reserved space was permitted only to journalists and the few persons who had admission cards—scarcely two or three in all. The people packed up and down the sidewalk in little groups, stumping their feet to keep them warm, while M. Debray, very nervous and agitated, urged upon his men the necessity of fighting against the wind and the bitter cold. The place was locked up, and its windows were closed. The police were authorized to charge the crowd with the bayonet.

As he quartz his cell to the door of the offices, where M. Debray awaited him, it is observed that he displayed his scrofulous face prominently. As the executioner, long and thin, of the ex-convict, but quickly recovers, and with docility submits to the whim of his arms behind his back.

"How many precautions!" he exclaims. "Are you afraid, then, that I will fly away?"

They offer him a glass of brandy.

"Keep it for another time," he says; "I do not need anything to give me courage."

At eight minutes past nine the two sections of the procession will begin. Vaillant appeals to the executioner at his left, two assistants at his right. He advances with a firm step, his head held high. He wears his full beard. His face is slightly pale. His overcoat is thrown over his arm. His overcoat has been taken from him. His face is slightly pale. His overcoat is thrown over his arm. His overcoat has been taken from him. Then he takes a few steps forward, and voluntarily throws himself upon the beard. At eleven minutes past seven the knife falls. The basket containing the remains is immediately placed in the vase, which stands, with an imposing escort, for the Here in the body, not being chained by the family, belonged by law to the Medical Faculty. Such, moreover, was Vaillant's desire. But the death of the Faculty, notified forty-two, he had been able to give the necessary orders, and the body was lowered into the grave.

"L'Écho de Paris," representing the moderate wing of the French Republicans, gave the following account written by its reporter, Edouard Coste:

To witness the putting of a man to death is a fashion of participating therein. One sanctions it by his presence. If the man who goes to see his fellow creature killed should analyze his curiosity, he would find himself justified in being there. For no reason has he a more right than another to have seen Vaillant's head cut off, of all the multitude with which he went to his fate contains an element of beauty. But the suspicion that one is entitled to entertain concerning the necessity of certain reports of court proceedings had left me in doubt regarding the condemned.

At last daylight succeed for illuminating our pale and odious faces, not proud of what they are about to see, and to revive in our hearts the emotion which hours of waiting have weakened. All looks converge upon the prison door, the windows of which are closed with hope and fear at the same time. Five interminable and feverish minutes, shaken by the blows that one deals his own soul to punish it for witnessing this foul deed. Suddenly an hour or so later, the door opens with a bell once, in the same direction. The doors have been seen to swing; the condemned appears. Ah! how pale is his face, and what steel in his eyes, embracing with their sweeping glance the entire square with its lines of troops and groups of uniformed citizens, and with a curious air, who disdains, and rightly, for he is about to die and we feed on his distress. His chest expands extra-ordinarily. There is a simple majesty in it; first march to the square, in this case of his head that is, a degree of contempt that forbids all deeds of its reality. No, I have never seen a man look down upon others from a loftier height. Half-way to the guillotine, he looks at the people Colonel Prieur, and the profound silence, and the dignity, the gravity, there rings from his throat, clarion-like, a strong and serious voice. "Death to the bourgeoisie society! Vive l'Anarchie!"

And this said, without a particle of that instinctive fear, familiar to those who have witnessed executions, he lies down on the plank.

"There was a head for you!" cries an enthusiastic policeman.

"Yes, indeed, there was a head!"

The account given by Marcel Pradier in "Le Journal," an independent newspaper devoted mainly to literature, closes thus:

Vaillant appears. The Anarchist walks very rapidly and firmly, in spite of his boots. His white shirt wide open, his black cocked hat on his head, his trousers turned up to the knees, he is as tidy as a man of business. Not a word, not a breath; all except he were breathless. When within eight steps of the guillotine, Vaillant, like the cock that crows at day-break, launches, in trumpet tones capable of commanding a battalion, the famous "Death to the bourgeoisie society!" Then, in a softer voice, but still as penetrating in the impala- silence, he continues as if hopefully: "Vive l'Anarchie!"

The Abbé Vaillant, who had followed him, advanced. But Vaillant saw nothing but the guillotine knife, which he contemplated with a smile of cynicism. With perfect self-possession, he placed himself against the plank and bent forward. The executioner's assistants bent only to rid his convulsion. One of them adjusted the head, and the knife fell, leaving nothing to be seen but an enormous spurt of blood and a decapitated body, uncertainty regarding the fact. The first assistant selected the other basket into which the head had fallen and emptied it upon the body. Four men placed the basket in the van, and, under the escort of twenty aviators with drawn sabres, the body started on its journey to the Place de la Roquette. The assistants began washing the blood from the machine preparatory to its removal. One of the horses in the procession fell upon the slippery pavement, causing a delay at the Rue de la Roquette, which, though brief, was too long to suit Debray, who was sweating with fear.

During the day the grave was visited by many working-people. About four in the afternoon a laborer appeared, carrying two little girls by the hand. The little girls placed modest bouquets on either side of the mound.

French Opinion of Vaillant and His Act.

It is interesting and instructive to know that in France, where the newspapers are written, not by hacks and scribblers, but by the foremost literary men of the country, opinion, and even bourgeoisie opinion, is by no means sonorous, as it is in the daily press of the United States, in recklessly and vitriolically condemning Vaillant's conduct as utterly without excuse, but is, on the contrary, disposed to consider the matter with some degree of philosophy. Below are given some extracts from Paris newspapers written before and after the trial and the execution. Henry Brulard, a conserva- tivejournalist of high reputation contributing many articles every week to the provincial French dailies, and until recently a member of the Chamber of Deputies, wrote as follows in "L'Écho de Paris" on January 10:

Today opens, in the Court of Assizes, the trial of M. Vaillant. It seems to me that this judicial drama must be one of the most interesting of our time. Not that it is one of those cases which excite a rather base curiosity born of a desire to know whether the criminal will be able to give the necessary orders, and the body was lowered into the grave.
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He is not aware of these patents. M. Vaillant, I imagine, will not retract his admissions made at the preliminary ex- amination. He will acknowledge that he has, many witnesses to speak, attacked society as it exists today, in place of empty speculations, putting to- gether in one a lack of social progress and the Left, and even the parliamentary Socialists,—all "bourgeois," all "exploiters." So we shall see Anarchie, for the moment, appearing before opinion, —that is, before the jury. As soon as possible, pregnant with the unexpected, raising the most delicate and most terrible questions. For the question submitted to the jury to pronounce on the consequence of the jury is not one of fact. For the solution of a question of fact there is a safe rule. The accused must be given the benefit of any doubt. But today the matter to be judged is the state of soul of a man whose crime is a disinterested crime, however
The suppressed of all ideal. For the revolutionary socialist everything — faith, traditions, resignation, political conception of discipline, and not an idea of justice. Unfortunately, is the most unjust of ideas. Revolutionary justice, in fact, is equality of the grossest and most inequitable character: it is the suppression of legitimate hierarchy, it is the suppression of human effort by equally rewarding all effort. It is an aspiration to barbarism scientifically organized, worse than the instinctive barbarism of societies in process of formation. Very well. But to combat this new thing, Pullman's opinion, I wonder if it is necessary to have recourse to other means than those of classic resistance, repression of the old style, and a 2ness of character that may appear very like very conformity.

I doubt even whether repression, however active it may be, can be indefinitely sufficient. There is passing through the minds of our time something vague but powerful, over white force, which is always prevail. It is opinion is more disturbed at severity than astonished at indulgence. Vaillant's blood may flow, and at the same time ripen bloody harvests. To the criminal attempt of the despairing man reason itself, as well as sentiment, opposes the causes of his despair. He is born — oh, fame! — of a policeman who abandons him; he wishes to labor, and cannot: he undertakes enterprises, and they fail. Threefold question of the family, of the street, of the law. It seems to me that those who strike the rebels cannot do it with sufficient authority unless they show a noble concern about social problems. There are, in history, troubles hours when law must not be the first thing, but the second, to respond to a growing ideal of equity. Who knows that the present is not such an hour?

I should not like to seem to joke about such matters. But what the government chiefly lacks, in my view, is the originality of a 'romanticism,' shall I say, which finds its place at times in politics as well as in literature. To callixtine Vaillant is classic and commonplace, I confess; if that I were a deputy, even I would have some reason to doubt. I should be deeply moved at the thought: that a man was doubtless to die for this imperial crime, which, in his mind, punished the long impotence, the idleness, and the evil of man. In fact, the part taken by our revolutionists, the characteristic mark of our Parliamentarians. I should ask myself if it is not of this egoism that are born those sincere despair which lead a man to risk his life.

And from this narrow-mindedness of some, from the egoism of others, from the fear which some have of great and others of wisdom, it will follow that a man, in the morning, will mount the scaffold, conquered, killed, unaccustomed of his fate, a man who, having made no victims, will be looked upon as a hero. And that, while we are courting death, the poor man for whom the blood from their wounds. But at the hospital scientific interest or humanitarian emotion triumph over physical repugnance, which soon disappears; and in war, even after the battle, one is sustained, still intoxicated the sacrifice. Our energy, the energy of the common people, the energy of the burden is carried on under the shadow of the slaughter-house. Yes, I was afraid of this spectacle which never I desired to see, afraid of the crowd, afraid of myself. Accuse me of cowardice who will. But I am not a man, and into the crowd I throw, together with pity, to the terror of the man for a heart. They are as numerous, those who are capable of dying for a mad idea,
If, for the last time, I return to this sad subject, it is not because, having favored mercy, I feel anger and bitterness toward those who have refused it. They had reason, thinking to obey their duty, they chose the solution most painful to them. It would be too degrading to think that wretched electoral considerations could here play any part, thrown into the balance—triumbling in the hands of men entrusted with the responsibility of hearing and judging the appeals taken from the uncertain justice of earth. Let us not deprecate its grader—the least objectionable of unconcious belligerency. Only I mean to say further that this bloody affair is not so simple a matter as some seem to think, that it ends nothing, and that the headman's axe has not solved the problem

M. Clemenceau, in "La Justice," struck one of his most direct blows:

Who has given us—us—this right which we deny to Vaillant, — the right to kill?

If ever a prodigal stupidity was triumphantly formulated, it was Alphonse Karr's: "Let the assassins begin.

So, all that you have to say to the assassins, you, society, trustee of the moral sanction in this world, is to leave them, these beings of inferior morality, to set you the example, you pretend to do justice.

And if the assassins do not set you the good example that you ask of them, if they do not rise to your level, you will discourse.

Lofty social conscience, surely, which does great honor to the civilization which we adorn in vain with the pomposity lies of humanity, without succeeding in concealing the burlesque reality.

No, it is for the assassins to begin, it is for the honest people. And it is for M. Carnot to speak for them.

Following up the thought of M. Clemenceau, Henry Maret wrote as follows in "Le Radical" of January 15:

"M. Debiller is not without occupation this year. He has now nine heads to cut off."

Some gave this item lightly, as they would have declared that M. Sardou is writing a play for the Vaudeville. Others enlivened it with a few witty comments, it being indeed a very comical subject.

There is nothing so dull, I allow, as a man announced in advance as having to kill nine people. It is excessively gay, especially when it is remembered that these premeditated murders are to be executed under the paternal eye of the law, which condones murder to do what we might call an act of conscience to prove that it should not be done, is one of those exquisite inventions which give a high idea of human reason.

I know very well that there was Alphonse Karr, who said: "Let the assassins begin." But Carnot is quite right in declaring this phrase a gross stupidity. For it consists in asking malefactors to set honest people the example of virtue. Yet it is the only argument in favor of the death penalty, all the rest is but a distant resemblance. That is to say: We, Society, find nothing better to do than to imitate the assassins and take them as a model, and, as soon as they assassinate, we hasten to assassinate in turn. Thus, simply to justify them; for, if we can give a reason for reason, the preservation of our welfare, they can give, as a reason for killing an interested motive absolutely analogous. Ours is worth neither more nor less.

I am aware that, in speaking in this way at this moment, I must seem like a lunatic. Thirty or forty years ago such would not have been the case, for then there were resolute opponents of the death penalty. In this matter, as in the others, it is the duty of the writer of our time to be the defender of the position that has been forgotten, and to maintain that the crime of murder is not necessarily a crime of which the life of the offender is not prepared to be exacted from him. The history of the world shows that the execution of the law, in the case of the guilty, is not always an act of vengeance.

The government, therefore, has the right to furnish to the tobacco dealers the list of newspapers which they are authorized to sell.

The government has the right to furnish with a dealer to be sold for me, were to say to him: "My friend, I forbid you to sell henceforth the Iak manufactured by Richard Roe." He would probably answer me: "What you give me to sell concerns you, but what I sell concerns me." It is the same with the tobacco-dealers in their relation to the government. They are subject to it in the matter of tobacco, but no more in the matter of newspapers than in the matter of groceries, fruit, or any other article of commerce which they may see fit to add to their stock.

If the empire had resorted to such a measure, what an outcry would have been raised against us for our repulsiveness to the lips of the day! But the only thing that is hearing us alone knows no obstacles. We are shooting back at a rate of 10,000 at a thousand hours an hour; we recognize as we pass them all the places that we have for such an hour. This is not a clever trick, such a money spender, a tender brat; every day carries us farther away, and takes us back into familiar waters; an adverse current has seized our bark, and we are off for the countries whence we came.

Well, my brothers, there being just a slight re- vival of religion among us, let us pray God to stop us at Louis XIV. Perhaps society will have been sufficiently saved when it shall have once more known the Dragonettes.

A Healthy and Tasteful Protest

It is pleasant to reflect that the following editorial article from the French "Loustic Leader" is from the pen of a man (Frank K. Potter) who is one of the most influential trade unionists in the country and who former ly was a pronounced and cocksure State Socialist.

For the first time in this State, so far as I am aware, a bill has been introduced in the legislature—by Representative George of Haverhill—which proposes to abrogate the right of contract and to make it an offence punishable by fine for any firm or corporation to employ a man more than seven hours in one day. Several labor men have testified in behalf of this bill, and it is not unlikely that its promoter seriously supposes that the principle it represents is in favor with perhaps a majority of the people. I say this, because the support which such a bill would require should not be given to legislation of this nature.

There is a wide distinction, in the first place, between a "legal" nine-hour working day, as the phrase is used in this country, and a "compulsory" nine-hour day. We have, for instance, a nine-hour day, but a man may make a contract to work any number of hours he chooses, so far as the law is concerned. It is an entirely different principle which is contemplated by the bill of George. Let us, for instance, suppose that the adult male citizen, armed with the power of free association, is quite capable of looking after his own interests without asking the State to be his mentor and guardian, and to return back three hundred years into the domain of status.

Even those tryos in social economics who regard it possible to do almost anything by the vote of the politician ought to have been taught before surrendering something so precious as the right of contract. I know that there are some visionaries so far "advanced" that they do not mind a little thing like this, but the sober student of history and logic of our time is prepared to feel the very press upon which the wage-earning class has mounted to a higher indus trial and social level. The tendency of any bill which would make the acts of wage-earners hedged in and hampered by administrative process fixed by status is distinctly unsound, mischievous, and retroactive. It is no answer to say that the end is desirable. No intelligent wage-earner questions the desirability of a reduction of hours of labor, but he sees such a thing as paying too high a price for a desirable thing. It is de sirable, for instance, that there shall not be such monstrous inequality in social conditions. This would not justify legislation which should absolutely abolish promise to property and thereby establish license and rapine.

Bagchi, in his masterly "Physics, u. Politics," traces out the slow and painful processes by which the right of contract was established among men, and de monstrates conclusively that it is the concomitant of the highest civilization. The English speaking race has had a pretty fair test of what cannot be done by the interference of the State; in hours and wages for adult males. Under pressure of helping the laborer, the par tial guardianism of the government from 1775 to 1824 made his burdens almost intolerable. Thorold Rogers says: "For more than two centuries and a half the English law, and those who administered the law, were engaged in grinding the English workman down to the lowest pittance, in stamping out every expression or act which indicated any organized discontent, and in multiplying all possible means to render him whenever he thought of his natural rights." This has been the common result when the State has been given power to act as dictator in industrial affairs. Mr. George's bill would be a direct hindrance to the legitimate short-hour movement. It teaches men to look to that shadowy entity, the State, for things they can do better themselves; it contradicts in principle every policy which has made this State what she is as a leader and teacher; and, if there was any danger of its receiving much support, it would be a serious matter, indeed.

A Writer's View of Literary Property.
[Arlene Alexander in L' Echo de Paris.]

This question of literary property, which now touches so closely the material interests of writers, will doubt less seem a paltry matter if seen from the idea of the hour. I have been asked to write an article on this subject. I think it proper to point out the complicity between the misfortune of the country. It is a matter of what is called copyright, and it is the author's right to the fruits of his labor for a definite time, and if after the term has expired he is not the owner of his property. This is a just right, and it is necessary that it should be protected and respected by the State. A writer's property is his livelihood, and it is essential that it should be safeguarded against any unauthorized use.

For the Other Fellow Only.
[Boston.]

Conscience is a club of which each man uses to beat his neighbor.

The Measure of Liberty.

One is free in proportion as one is strong; there is no real liberty save that which one takes oneself.

A Usurpation of Function.
[L' Echo de Paris.]

In court.

THE JUDGE. — "You have been caught stealing goods from a window."

PRISONER. — "I did not steal."

THE JUDGE. — "Why lie? [after a pause.] You have a lawyer."

Shingle Money in the Corner State.
[Morning Oregonian.]

Shingle certificates operate as a circulating medium in Boise, Wash. A certain $40,000 recently circulated until it had paid nearly $200 in local debts before finally reaching the place whence it started. The basis of the certificate was salutary, and it would purchase flour, meat, coffee, blankets, fuel, clothing for the wife and babies, and perform all the functions of a gold-bullion certificate.
Interest is Unjust.

The Manchester "Times" of May 19 published a criticism, by J. G. Fisher, of my paper, "Is Interest Just?" No. 2, which is a fair sample of the logic of the defenders of capitalism.

Language is a tool for conveying thoughts, but unfortunately the ambigutiy of words makes it impossible to convey the true meaning of one's thoughts. A critic should therefore endeavor to accept the words of the author in the sense in which he uses them, to the exclusion of all other meanings. Moreover, he should be well informed and not deny or ignore facts of which he happens to be ignorant. My critic has honored these maxims by his breach.

In the attempt to controvert the theory that money bears interest because of its inadequate supply and that capitalism creates interest, he falls back upon the stereotyped reply that in the absence of money hire would be paid for tools. This I never denied, since I admitted that, in a state of no interest, hire would be paid equal to risk and deterioration. But more than this. If interest accrues to capital because we have no enough money, then interest will rise as the volume of money is reduced, and in the absence of money interest will assume the form of the object in servitude in slavery. A high rate of interest in the absence of money is therefore in full accord with the theory I defend.

According to the modern school, money bears interest because the real capital, capable of being profitably employed, can be bought with it. In contesting this explanation of the interest-bearing power of money, I have assumed as self-evident that the promoters of this theory consider Mr. Fisher's as such capital. But Mr. Fisher declares this a fallacy, stating that gold coin is not barren, intimating that it is capable of gratifying desires. In this he does not attack me so much as his friend, Mr. Fisher. I can defend them in this particular. Barren means incapable of increase and not incapable of gratifying desires, a property of gold which cannot be denied; nor has it any bearing on the interest question.

Now we have it that government restricts any form of credit. It is the monetization of credit which is restricted. And quite consistent with his misconstruction, he takes exception to my comparing the government control of the issue of credit money with a suppositions restriction of the making of shoes, saying that I should have compared it with a restriction of the amount of gold. But since I have shown how money comes into existence as a result of the medium of exchange, just as shoes can be made of the raw material "leather," I beg to reject his suggestion, which is due to his failure to follow the spirit of my argument. In order to defend his language and his reasoning, he introduces an erroneous classification of wealth, intimating that gold coin is money while bank notes are not. My critic's forte evidently consists in misunderstanding the meaning of the words I use. By "money" I mean anything of which I can receive satisfaction in the place of "money." But this does not affect my argument and would be simply a verbal quibble.

To illustrate the correctness of my classification, let us suppose that a man, whose bank note, say of $100 worth of goods, and having no "money" (gold coin), I offer in payment $100 in bank notes, which constitute a non-interest-bearing lien on the property of the issuer of the notes, and he will accept them. Will I be accept my offer? I fancy he will. But if I should offer him a non-interest-bearing lien on my property, however well secured, he will reject it. Why this difference? Because he has not assumed the guarantee and has authorized the use of the property of the bank in circulation. The same conclusion is to be reached on comparing the banks' security, assumes guarantee of payment, and authorizes the circulation of its debts, while it not only rejects my offer in the form of, say, a mortgage note, but will give me a greater value and agree to cover by insurance all remaining risks, but even forbids me to put my debts, however well secured, into circulation in competition with the banker's notes! With the government's guarantee, or possibly even by a simple withdrawal of the law forbidding the issue of such promissory notes, the lien on my wealth, properly secured, will be as good as the banker's lien on his wealth.

Can Mr. Fisher deny the existence of an unjust discrimination? He appears to be ignorant of the law forbidding the circulation of bearer checks for even sums made to be used in place of cash. Nor does it seem to me that the government essentially objet to being regularly paid in checks, since they cannot use them in stores where they are unknown. Checks are for this reason unfit to perform the money work, and are in this sense not money. Why, then, quote them as though they were?

Mr. Fisher also impugns my assertion that bank-notes are only nominally redeemable on demand. Is he really ignorant of the fact that so many are re redeemable? No bank can carry a redemption fund equal to the issuance of its notes. Nothing but the willingness of the people to circulate them for an indefinite period renders possible their issue in excess of the amount of true coin. I do not deny that under prevailing conditions they are, with few exceptions, practically redeemable on demand, but that the fact that there are exceptions confirms my assertion.

In objecting to the inference derived from my illustration of the process of lowering, which shows borrowing to be merely a temporary exchange of promises, notes, he reminds me that my note has been lying idle while its holder has been active use. But he overlooks that my note was condemned to idleness because the government forcibly prevents its issue in a form in which it can take the place of the banker's notes. Mr. Fisher's only excuse for this assertion is that I was compelled to pay interest to the bank merely because of the government's discrimination between the banker's notes and mine.

I am fully referred to the fructification theory of interest. Has my critic ever read Volume I of Bocch Bawker's "Capital and Interest?" In this volume the fructification theory is so completely refuted that Mr. Fisher should think twice before digging up this grave yard. An outline of the only rational theory of interest is given below.

I can conceive no better proof of the correctness of my position than the fact that I am criticised only in the measure in which my critic misinterprets that which I have said.

Mr. Fisher's criticism (Liberty, June 10) of the same paper may be summed up as follows: The paper aims to condemn a number of other forms of unjoint incomes; interest accrues to capital, for reasons other than the monopoly of money; interest, rent, and profits are different in name only; and an excess of production over consumption, if it becomes the property of the producer, must result in sedition.

He seems to have expected an exhaustive treatise on the Distribution of Wealth. There are but a few words to be said in response. Every income is in economic cause, and, if different incomes have heterogeneous causes, or even if they require a different treatment in tracing the cause, the logician is compelled to classify them. A distinction must therefore be made between rent, interest on money, capital-profit, occasional profit, and profit (or wages) to the producer, the last being really justly. For the same reason a distinction must also be made between land and capital, and between the preceding as an act of further production. The land question being not pertinent to the interest question, I can here say no more than that I consider the private appropriation of rent to be unjust. The only pertinent fact is that of the employment of the land to capital and producer. I will endeavor to give an outline of the only theory which, to my mind, can account for it.

Capital-profit, or interest, is an excess of the value of a given production over the value of the mass of capital employed. The theory of the value theory teaches that market-values tend to the cost of production, and, as land, he produces no rent and is used for an excess. But this excess can be accounted for as follows: Money is a tool of trade without which a division of labor would be impossible. The producers, therefore, are in a position to mediate these exchanges, producers will borrow money, which commands a premium for their Prodcedures. The amount of money in circulation being inadequate to mediate these exchanges, producers will borrow money, which commands a premium for their procedures. This interest is to the producers an unavoidable outlay, and therefore a part of the cost, which as such enters the market value of the product.

Those individuals who were so fortunate as to secure the exclusive right of producing with their exclusive production, at the market value, containing, as a item, the interest payable by their less fortunate competitors, and can accordingly score an excess over cost. This, and consequently the interest of money, is the interest of money production, regarding which the modern economists are doing their utmost to find a theory that will not expose the system of industrial piracy of today. But, since every one of their pet theories is based on some fallacy, they cannot agree upon any one.

According to the above theory of interest it is plain that the abolition of the money monopoly will also abolish the power of capital to appropriate a net profit.

The Single Tax "As She Is Spoke." -- Justice, the Philadelphia organ of Anarchism, offers a method of reducing the burden of men by eliminating the banking system. It is written by G. F. Stephenson, a member of the Single Taxers' national committee and one of the most fair and independent men on earth.

Rule I. We must advocate a Single Tax on the rental value of land and the abolition of all other taxes.

The exceptions to all rules are as follows:

Exception 1. --Taxes on bank notes.

Exception 2. --Taxes on incomes.

Exception 3. --Taxes on wages.

Exception 4. --Taxes on the revenue.

Exception 5. --Taxes heavy enough to be prohibitory.

Exception 6. --Taxes in enforcement of police powers.

Rule II. We must assert the exclusive right of the individual to that which is justly his property.

Exception 1. --Property in intoxicating liquors.

Rule III. We must demand absolute freedom of speech for all.

Exception 1. --Anarchists.

Rule IV. We must assert the equal rights of all men to the use of the earth.

Exception 1. --Foreigners who won't assimilate.

The Woman Taken in Adultery. [Gospel according to St. John 8:1-11.]

1. Jesus, being at Jerusalem, saw a woman whom the scribes and Pharisees had taken in adultery and whom they were preparing to stone. They approached Jesus, hoping to embarrass him.

2. "Master," said they, "this woman was taken in adultery. It is lawful to stone her, that such a woman should be stoned for her sin. But what thinkest thou should be done to her?"

3. Jesus saw their souls and answered them: "How can Moses have known of this woman's sin? Who can foresee the sins of the future and punish them?"

4. "No!" said the judgment. "Art thou without sin cast the first stone?"

5. The scribes, crucified, looked at each other and consulted together.

6. "What does that mean, Master?" Art thou without sin cast the first stone?"

7. Jesus, in wrath, rebuked him.

8. "What does that mean, Master?" Art thou without sin cast the first stone?"

9. "No, Master," said the man, "but I am her husband."

Pierre Verger.
LIBERTY'S HEALTHY INFLUENCE.

New Indited Mercury.

The suspension of the "New Nation," Mr. Belknap's organ of Nationalism, is followed by the return of Liberty. Mr. Belknap's organ of Anarchism. Between Mr. Belknap and Mr. Tucker there is a great gulf, in which we apprehend the larger part of humanity is standing. It is scarcely likely that the death of the Nationalist journal and the birth of the Anarchist paper can be taken to indicate that the socialistic idea is visibly yielding to the individualistic theory. If the tangible signs are of any worth, the Belknap school has more followers than the Tucker school. Most of its are in some way desiring extensions of the scope of government, and even men who scout the fantasies of "Looking backward" would be astonished to know that they are incipient Socialists are yet looking to the State for help in some of the things which they are specially interested. Against this tendency Mr. Tucker and his journal are a protest,—an extreme protest, it may be,—but a protest about whose meaning there is no shadow of a doubt. For ourselves, we have no question that such a protest is needed, even if it is couched in the strong and sometimes intemperate language in which the editor of Liberty is wont to indulge. It may be that the evolution of society is to lead to an entirely different end than the ideal of the Anarchist. That is a matter which may safely be left to the centuries to determine. For the present, the tendency to dependence upon "the State" is too pronounced. The debate is too one-sided. The knowledge that a demoralised Socialism is popular leads to acquiescence in it in quarters where there should be questioning and dissent. The country needs an advocate of the other side. And we fancy that to be heard it is necessary that he should sometimes speak in strident tones.

A CONVINCING REASON.

By Charles R. Nichols.

To Hugh O. Pentecost.

I would never suggest a plague on your house. But yet must protest that a lion's turned house.
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No Treason. No. VI. Showing that the constitution is of the people, and that the government of the people is subject to the rule of the majority. By Lyman Spurr. Price, 25 cents.
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A LETTER TO THOMAS P. BAYARD. Challenging his right—and that of all the other so-called senators and representatives of any other political party in the United States. By Lyman Spurr. Price, 50 cents.

Send all subscriptions to BENJ. R. TUCKER, BOX 1312, NEW YORK CITY.

THE MOST VALUABLE EVER OFFERED BY A NEWSPAPER.

All Subscribers to Liberty

GIVE THE BENEFIT OF WHOLESALE PRICES

ON PURCHASES OF BOOKS, PERIODICALS, AND STATIONERY.

Every person now an annual subscriber to Liberty, and every person hereafter sending $2.00 in payment for a year's subscription, is entitled during the period of his subscription, and as long thereafter as he may continue to be a subscriber paid in advance, to the following valuable privileges:

1. ALL ORDERS FOR BOOKS PUBLISHED IN THE UNITED STATES (except the publications of Benj. R. Tucker) will be filled on receipt of the wholesale price, plus postage,—an average saving of at least 30 per cent.

2. ALL ORDERS FOR BOOKS PUBLISHED IN GREAT BRITAIN (on such books there is a duty of 25 per cent.) will be filled at the uniform rate of 25 cents to the shilling free of duty and free of postage. That is, a book retailing in Great Britain at four shillings will be sold to Liberty subscribers at one dollar. An American bookdealer would usually charge $1.30.

3. ALL ORDERS FOR BOOKS PUBLISHED IN PRUSSIA (in the French language will be filled at the uniform rate of 20 cents to the franc, free of postage. American bookdealers generally charge from 27 to 35 cents to the franc. On French books there is no duty.

4. ALL ORDERS FOR BOOKS PUBLISHED IN GERMANY in the German language will be filled at the uniform rate of 25 cents to the mark, free of postage. American bookdealers generally charge from 20 to 40 cents to the mark. On German books there is no duty.

5. ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTIONS FOR ALL PERIODICALS OR NEWSPAPERS (except dailies) will be filled upon receipt of the wholesale price, which is usually 20 per cent. less than the retail price.

6. ALL ORDERS FOR STATIONERY OR STATIONERS' SUPPLIES of any kind, provided the order amounts to at least $2, will be filled upon receipt of the wholesale price, plus postage or expressage,—an average saving of one-third.

All orders must be accompanied by cash. An estimate of the cost of any contemplated order will be furnished on application. The better way, however, is to make a deposit with the publisher of Liberty and order against it.

Orders for books or other articles, as well as requests for estimates, should state title, name of publisher, and place of publication. The publisher of Liberty reserves the right to ignore all orders and requests in which this condition is not complied with.

The above privileges enable any one whose purchases amount to $10 a year to save from $2 to $5 a year. If his purchases amount to $50 a year, he will save from $100 to $25 a year. These purchases need not be limited to books. They can be made at any time during the period of subscription, and as often as desired.