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On Picket Duty.

Gold monometallism is doomed in this country. Both Democratic and Republican conventions are dropping it and declaring more or less openly for bimetallism. The politicians are profoundly ignorant on the subject, and their jargon about "parity," intrinsic value, etc., is perfectly meaningless, but they realize that silver buys votes. Bimetallism will prove disappointing, but it will pave the way, with the masses, for something better. The important thing is to destroy the gold superstition.

Speaking of the situation in our Senate, the New York "Evening Post" says: "If Coxye had turned them out of the Capitol and installed his army in their places, the net result would have been good for the country, because it would have taught them some sense, which they are not likely to learn in any other way, and would have produced a shock in the 'deestricks' which would have led to the election of better men hereafter." Then why did Godkin demand the imprisonment of Coxeys on such ridiculous grounds as "trampling upon the grass" and "marching?"

The railroad employees who have been boycotting Pullman cars should not attribute their failure to anything inherent in the boycott. They were really not boycotters at all, but strikers. They were not allowed to "boycott" the cars; as soon as they threatened to do so they were discharged, and those who took their places handled the Pullman cars without protest. The public did not boycott the cars, and a public boycott is the only thing that the company could not have stood. There are plenty of unemployed to take the places of the trainmen, but the unemployed could not ride in Pullman cars.

Our friend Trenbel remarks in the "Conservative" that "the gravity of the labor question is not appreciated by American editors as it is by those who control the great papers in England, France, and Germany," and adds that "some will yet wake up, hitherto by their own dangerous ignorance." No, there is little hope of that. It is not so much ignorance (although there is no lack of it) as gravity, lack of principle and of the sense of responsibility. Our newspaper men write, not because they have ideas which they feel it necessary or useful to express, but because they can earn more money by becoming the phonographer of the publishers than by doing honest work.

The fact that the police are corrupt is really a blessing to society. Were the Parkhursts to have their way, life would be an intolerable burden. The police are paid for overlooking violations of stupid and tyrannical legislation: this is doubtless an evil, but the rigid enforcement of that legislation would be a greater evil. The tyranny and ignorance of the legislators are now tempered by the venality and weakness of the executive officers, the citizen being the gainer. Vice ought not to pay tithes; legitimate pursuits ought not to bripe the police into performing their duties; but it is better to part with less than with more. As long as there are restrictions which the people are anxious to evade and dodge, bribes will be offered and accepted. Abolish all restrictions, not only upon legitimate pursuits, but upon vice, and there will be no need and no willingness to pay blackmail. The Parkhurst crusade is a crusade against human nature. You must choose between a system of honest officials and free gambling, drinking, and prostitution, and a system of corrupt officials and "regulated" gambling, drinking, and prostitution. The cure for police corruption is not Parkhurstism, but liberty.

M. D. Conway, in writing in the "Open Court" of Omar Khayyam's poetry and philosophy, says: "His greatness is not simply in his genius, but in its freedom. In this he surpasses the poets of our own time, who either accept Mrs. Grundy for a Muse, or else are crippled by their struggles under her vengeance. Half the poetic genius of our century has been, I believe, suppressed by legal or social censorship, or by their intimation. Shakspere was great not merely by reason of his intellect, but the stage was then free; and Goethe was great largely because he was in a position to deliberate literary laws instead of accepting them from inferiors. Perfect intellectual and moral freedom would surely give us Shakspere and Goethe again. Omar Khayyam's poetry, after eight centuries, is alive as if written today. Time is powerless over genius when developed by perfect freedom to its full fruitage." A plea for perfect freedom from Mr. Conway is doubly welcome, since he is not at all thorough-going in his individualism. He would excuse a good many outrageous interferences on the part of the State and a good many stupidities. I am glad to learn by implication that he is opposed to the Comstock laws and all other restrictions upon literature, the stage, and art.

The proposal to insert in the Swiss Constitution a paragraph affirming the right of every male citizen to employment, has recently been rejected by an overwhelming majority. The Socialists had secured the required number of signatures, and the question was "referred" to the people. The bourgeoisie press looks upon the defeat of the State Socialist proposal as proof of the "sanity" of the Swiss people. Unfortunately it is not so. A people that maintain a system of high protection and otherwise restrict the liberty of the individual do not repudiate the alleged right to employment on libertarian and sane grounds. The result is probably due to demagogic appeals to petty owners of property that their taxes and burdens would be increased by the enforcement of the right to employment. Not that this is false, but the politicians put this plea forward only against measures in the interest of the victims of present injustice and never against measures favoring the monopolists. Liberty disbelieves in the right to employment in the State Socialist sense, but it does not allow itself to be betrayed into the blunder of hailing everything with enthusiasm that seems a libertarian victory without inquiring whether it is really what it seems to be. The semi-individualists, by their failure to discriminate, often play into the hands of Tories and plutocrats.

The income tax has evidently come to stay in American government economy. It is very popular with those who have small incomes, and no political party wants to offend these classes, since they represent the overwhelming majority of the people. The economists agree in regarding the income tax as a just and even ideal measure, but that is because they start out with radically false and vicious principles of political organization. Under freedom, respective cost of protection and insurance would determine the amount paid by individuals, not the value of the property. But under present conditions of monopoly and plutocracy tempered by spoliation, the favor of the income tax with politicians is a sign of progress. We are at least sure of getting rid of the sickening cant of the Danas and spread-eagle orators about the absence of classes and cheerful payment of taxes in this country. An income tax in this country is a recognition of the fact that industrial freedom and equality of opportunity no longer exist here even in the imperfect state in which they once did exist. It is excellent "propaganda by deed," — propaganda of discontent by deed of legislators forced to yield to popular feeling. Dana shrivels that the income tax will sow the seed of violence and revolution, and he may be right. But he is stupid in thinking that if the politicians refused to impose an income tax, there would be less danger of an explosion.
LIBERTY.  291.

The number of "free men" to whom the "free and unfettered" complexion of the Constitution applies is rapidly narrowing. In a generation or two the word "free" will mean little more than freedom from rates or taxes, which is the same thing as freedom from wooden shoes and a small pittance of three more cents a day. The government will not care whether the great, rich, and powerful are "free" or not, but the poor man who cannot pay his taxes, or is prevented from doing so by the old laws of justice, will be considered no longer "free." This is "freedom," according to the "free and unfettered" Constitution.

Notwithstanding the "free" and "unfettered" complexion of the Constitution, the government has become more and more intolerably burdensome. The "free men" are now divided into two classes: the rich, who pay two-thirds of all the taxes, and the poor, who pay one-third. The government, therefore, is not only a burden upon the rich, but a burden upon the poor, for it is they who pay two-thirds of the taxes, while the rich only pay one-third.
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my suggestion: to abolish the death penalty in political cases. The revolutionaries are not sneaks and cowards; they are noble, brave, and generous. If propaganda by deed did not involve the risk of their own lives, they would never attempt the life of anyone in power. They kill because they know that they will be killed. Take away the danger, and their courage and generosity will prompt them to abandon the use of force. The bourgeoisie are too prudent and dull to comprehend this truth; they will try everything but this remedy, and will fail in misery.

**The Great Strike.**

So unprincipled and corrupt is the American press that it is utterly incapable of rising to the comprehension of the motives of apathetic strikers. The industrial proletariat who write the newspaper editorials cannot understand why a workman has no personal grievance against his own employer should strike in order to aid another workman in another trade, and hence their venomous and shameless treatment of the American Railway Union men, who struck, not because they wanted to help themselves, but because they expected to compel Pullman to arbitrate with his striking employees. Shallow and callous lacks a cannot forgive an act of sympathy and nobility, because their own littleness and degradation is brought into stronger relief thereby. There is such a thing as the solidarity of labor, and it is a healthy and encouraging sight to see how the masses recognize the need of mutual support and cooperation in their conflict with monopoly and its official and unofficial servants. Labor has to fight government as well as capital, "law and order," as well as photocracy. It cannot make the slightest movement against monopoly without colliding with some sort of "authority," Federal, State, or municipal. The bourgeoisie has many friends, and it is protected under various pretexts. As long as labor was law-abiding and apologetic and servile, as long as it valued the approval of the photocratic press, its strikes were tolerated. But now a strike is regarded (and very properly) as a war against "law and order," and thus it is necessary to view the strikers and their sympathizers as the adherents of an evil, and to put them under legal and equitable treatment, and not even a perfect acquaintance with the machinery of exploitation. It is essential to know what to fight as well as how to fight.

**Auberon Herbert on Dynamite.**

The pseudo-individualists and the semi-individualists, the apologists of photocracy and the stern moralists, should read Mr. Herbert's broad, philosophical, and judicious observations on the dynamite problem and form an idea of what is the proper attitude for libertarians in the premises. What a pity it is that Herbert Spencer cannot again rise to the philosophic height and calm and fairness of the position he held. Mr. Herbert's insight and sympathy which dictated his admirable utterances on the excesses of the French Revolution in his "Study of Sociology." Today, in referring to the dynamiters, Mr. Spencer utters sentiments that would appeal to the narrowest and dullest philanthlist. Auberon Herbert's clear and persuasive argumentation cannot fail to have a liberating effect on many minds.

To Mr. Herbert's main proposition no exception can be taken. But certain incidental affirmations of his may be shown to be erroneous and to require qualification. For instance, the argument that the reformation by dynamin who imagine that they are on the side of liberty, Mr. Herbert reasons in a way which logically involves the condemnation of force under all circumstances and leads straight to the doctrine of non-resistance. But surely Mr. Herbert does not hold that any resistance to aggression is inconsistent with liberty,—that only non-resistants are true and consistent Anarchists. Mr. Herbert is not a Tolstoi Anarchist; he knows that there is nothing in common between the principle of equal freedom, or non-interference with the non-aggressive, and the principle of non-resistance to aggression. If liberty can have anything to do with dynamite! Mr. Herbert explains, Why, of course it could! Is it a violation of liberty to punish an aggression? And if it is consistent with liberty to hang or decapitate or "electro-" a murderer, why is it not consistent to blow him up? What is true of an unoffending governor,—a murderer,—is equally true of the official governors,—the kings and dictators and presidents. Those who consider them aggressors may, consistently with liberty, punish them as such. But not everything that is consistent with liberty is wise or profitable; hence, although the official governors are aggressors, as a matter of fact, it would be suicidal to attempt to suppress them by dynamite or any other form of violence. The cause of liberty, the progress of liberty, is not to be furthered by such means, and this is the final and sufficient reason for decreasing force as a method of social reform where better methods are possible. Among such better methods are education, criticism, appeals to reason, and by its resistance to aggression. As Herbert must see, in the light of these considerations, which he will not dispute, that some of the dynamiters might really be on the side of liberty. If they are not, the fact is not proved simply by their partiality for dynamite. It so happens that the dynamiters are all Archite Communists who would restrict our liberty even more than the present Archite bourgeoisie do. Still, a dynamitier might be a consistent Anarchist. The question of method is chiefly a question of policy and expediency. It is inaccurate to say that dynamite is the perfection of government, government concentrated and intensified. Everything depends on what the dynamite is intended for. Mr. Herbert says: "Money, indeed, as a means of governing more efficiently, or in more abbreviated form, than to say: 'Do this — or don't do this — unless you desire that a pound of dynamite should be placed tomorrow evening in your ground-floor study.'" But it is possible to say this without governing at all. To force a man to do something which he should be free to omit to do, or to forcibly prevent a man from doing something which he should be free to do, is to govern. But suppose a burglar is about to rob you, and you tell him not to do it unless he is willing to have a taste of dynamite: is that government? Certainly not. Now the State is a burglar, and dynamiters who should use dynamite as a method of governing would not be trying to govern, but to protect themselves from government.

The foregoing will suggest the qualification needed by the statement that force must necessarily fail as a weapon against government. It will fail only where better weapons are neglected. Force is the only weapon; the choice is between force and entire incapacity, force may and should be used for the pur-
pose of acquiring the liberty of using the other and better weapons.

With reference to the actual conditions in France, it is true that the dynamiters are not working in the interest of liberty; and that for those interests dynamite is not the proper weapon. It is not because of the propaganda by deed, but in spite of it, that the French enervate greater liberality and tolerance towards new ideas. No sensible revolutionist has ever claimed more for propaganda by deed than that it prepares the soil for propaganda by word, but there is danger that all opportunity for the latter will be altogether destroyed, instead of enlarged, by the former.

A Lesson on Civil Government in Words of One Syllable.

I am one of the sort that they say throw bombs. I do not use the word here, for it is too long; you know, all my words are to be short. But we do not all throw bombs. Most of those who throw them think that no man ought to have goods of his own, but all men should join to own all goods. They would take the goods from those who have them by force, if need be. I do not think so. I think that those who own a man keep those goods, which goods have no right to use our name, though, as things now are, all men call them by it. Those who think like me do not throw bombs. We talk sense and try to make men see that it is sense. I hope you see it.

STEPHEN T. BINGGOTT.

The Logic of Freethought.

Congressman Morse, of Massachusetts, has introduced a bill in the House, providing for a constitutional amendment, recognizing "God as the governor of the universe, and Jesus Christ as lieutenant governor." Where the Holy Ghost comes in, is not yet specified; it is to be assumed that a place will be found for him lower down on the ticket.

This bill has aroused the ire of the Spiritualists and Freethinkers in general, but why, still remains a mystery. Since the idea of government is derived from the idea of God, it is but appropriate that the latter should receive official recognition from the former, especially as he does not get as much as he used to from other sources. By all means, put God in the Constitution. Yes, and keep him there. The Roman Catholics seem to have more sense than our worthy Freethinkers, for the "Civilta Catholica," of Rome, says: "We want no God," declared the men of 1789, and they put liberty in the place of the Creator. The motto, "No God, no master," is but a natural consequence of this.

It is a ridiculous and yet a pitiful sight, this Liberalism, blinded with fear, straining every nerve in the defense of society. What are your lives worth now, gentlemen? Perhaps you will now begin to see that it is impossible to govern a nation, under the pretense of giving it greater liberty, has been alienated from God, and whose conscience has been daunted. . . .

But we will not reprove you. We only wish to point out that "legalized Apostasy must necessarily provide social Anarchy." ("Literary Digest," March 13, 1894.) It would be palatable, if it were not so amusing, to see these twin superstitions bolstering each other up like two drunken men, in the hope that the staggering of one will counteract the reeling of the other.

George's Latest Absurdities.

Henry George has discovered that monetary conditions have nothing to do with business depression. Speaking in Chicago on the 18th of March, he said:

"There are many who offer as the reason for business depression such explanations as that of too much tariff or too little tariff, or of some difficulty in the administration of financial relations, monetary regulations. But when we consider how wide is the area over which these business depressions show themselves, and the times in which they come, we will see at once that they must come from some deeper cause. Without change in the tariff, without change in monetary regulations, business depressions come and go, and they exist in all parts of the world, among all kinds of tariffs and many differences in monetary regulations."

Of course, there is some excuse for Henry George, but anyone who knows anything about the history of finance is aware that many experiments in monetary regulation have been tried in the United States, while the system of land tenure has hardly been altered at all. The "many differences in monetary regulations," in various countries, are not nearly as great as or as important as the differences in systems of land tenure. So, applying Mr. George's logic, we see that business depressions cannot possibly be caused by our monetary regulations; nearly all of his lectures is devoted to proving that private ownership of land is the sole cause of all our economic ills.

The rest of the speech contains many similar absurdities, over which it is not worth while to waste time and space. More notice has been given to this arch- plagiarist than he deserves. The only claim he has upon our notice is derived from the fact that many people still consider him a leader, although the most clear-headed Single Taxers no longer recognize him as one of their number, since he advocates at least two taxes, one on land values, and one on the issue of State bank notes.

Even the plodding papers speak of the orders issued by the Federal courts in connection with the great railroad strike as "drag-net" and "omnibus" injunctions. An order restraining men from "influencing" or "persuading" others to strike can have no other effect than to convince people that judges will shrink from no outrageous twists and distortions of laws in the service of capital. As a result of the sweeping injunctions, every strike specially assumes the character of a revolt against law and order. Thus does tyranny dig its own grave. To call strikes treason will not make strikes unpopular, but treason popular.

It is possible to arbitrate with strikers who demand higher wages, shorter hours, or official recognition, says the New York "Evening Post," but with boycotters there can be no compromise, no half-way meeting, no arbitration. The man who boycotts one thing today may boycott another thing tomorrow, and finally insist on deciding what goods shall be handled and what not. This is true, but what of it? The boycott is a powerful thing, but it cannot be used for invasive purposes. By means of the boycott a body of men may impress their will on others, but the law cannot permit a one's will on another: the whole question is how you impose your will. If no force is used, no offense is committed, although the boycotter may be a most unsavory man and may make most outrageous demands. All that he threatens to do is to deprive you of his friendship or that of his friends. At the worst he has a right to execute. It is because the boycott is so powerful that the plutocrats hate to see its growing popularity.

Cleveland's second reply to, Altgeld's protest against the sending of Federal troops into Illinois is neither logical nor grammatical. "While I am still persuaded," says Cleveland, "that I have neither transcended my authority or duty [sic!]. I have transcended neither my authority nor my duty," is the correct expression, Mr. President. It seems to me that in this hour of longer and public distress, discussion may be more to the point than the law of all in authority to restore obedience to law and to protect life and property. Now, if Altgeld is right in his contention, Cleveland has himself disobeyed and violated the highest law of the land; yet he has the coolness to talk about all in authority enforcing obedience to law! He virtually says, "You accuse me of an outrageous usurpation and law-breaking; well, I suppose I am guilty; but we cannot discuss the matter now. There are other law-breakers requiring our attention. Let us put them down, and then we will inquire into my legal right to interfere in the matter." But if the President may violate the law in time of public distress, why may not others? A protest against usurpation and lawlessness on his part, the President calls "abstract discussion!" And the "law and order" papers all applaud this "patriotic" utterance.

Nothing but commendation can be given to Judge Gaynor's single-handed fight with the police. Of course his efforts are doomed to total failure, not merely because the "rascals are too many" and powerful for him, but because of a deeper and more fundamental fact, which seems to be completely overlooked by Judge Gaynor. He is reported to have expressed himself to the effect that arbitrary police interference is one of the greatest dangers which this country has had to face, but such a view is very superficial. There are doubtless minor causes which tend to make the police of large cities tyrannical and insolent; still, the chief cause is not to be found in the present system of legalized robbery and monopoly, the plunder of the plutocracy, the police imitate their masters in their treatment of the poor and working classes. The police are hired to protect the property of the rich, and they come to regard every workman as an actual or potential enemy of their patrons. The employment of the militia and police in the suppression of strikes, meetings, and other demonstrations of the oppressed, is largely responsible for the contempt of liberty and hatred of the poor which the police everywhere manifest. As the conflicts between capital and labor grow more violent, the police become more reckless, brutal, and de-
Mr. Blighman is learning considerable wisdom, while having no end of fun, from experience with reformers of the various paternalistic schools. A few weeks ago, the Haskell & Co., publishing company (which also publishes the "Twentieth Century," now a State Socialistic organ) published a new book of Mr. Blighman's, entitled "A Study of the Money Question," in which Mr. Blighman's views on currency, banking, and interest, well known to readers of Liberty, are set for in a somewhat conservative and disguised manner. No man who has any acquaintance with scientific finance can, however, fail to perceive the radical character of Mr. Blighman's propositions. But the contributors and philosophers of the "Twentieth Century," whose ideas on finance are as lively and bold as those of the ordinary Epicurean, did not grasp Mr. Blighman's meaning and point of view, and have been writing ridiculous little notices of the book, accusing the author of capitalistic prophecies, gold-worship, and what not. The critics are unanimous in opposition to gold monometallism and in censuring Mr. Blighman for adhering to this exploded delusion. Not one of them understands the relations to a gold basis, and they innocently suppose that in advocating a gold standard of value, Mr. Blighman commits himself to a gold basis.

A new work on money by a new writer is announced, "The Natural Law of Money," by William Brough. The criticisms of the press indicate that the work is valuable and progressive. The "Yale Review" says of it: "It will be welcomed as a text-book, successful where Jevons fails. The author illustrates the evolution of money and credit by reference to the growth of civilization. All the essential features of the book which he points out.... The prevailing idea of the author is his opposition to all legal-tender law. He pleads for free as opposed to mandatory money. In applying this to our own condition, he presents in strong colors the arguments for a bank-note currency as against a government paper currency."

The broad-headed author occupies himself in discussing the currency problems, and the emphasis he places on credit and its extension — that is, on the close connection between the money and the banking problem, give the book a peculiar value. Everything is centered about the distinction between an artificial and a natural monetary system. Very amusing is the review of the New York "Critie," a purely literary paper edited by a literary woman whose ignorance upon all scientific questions is simply appalling. "This is a curious sort of book, but J. H. has some good ideas, which he has learned from other men, but J. H. has also some very queer ideas, which, apparently, he has not learned from anybody. His hobby is the abolition of all laws providing for a legal tender... He would have the government coin both gold and silver, leaving such market value and market value."

The proposition is not worth criticizing, but it is of some interest as showing to what aberrations the human intellect is liable. In modern society bakers do not criticize shoemakers, and tailors refrain from criticizing watchmakers. The only people who glory in their ignorance and make themselves ridiculous are the professional critics, and I call your attention to the guidance of the "Critie" in such matters as finance. In ignorance it is equalled by few and surpasses by none.

A Scientific Seance.

"Ladies and gentlemen, my truce stands;" we will now hold a scientific seance. The supersitious methods of the earlier days of spiritism are gone. We no longer use a cabinet, nor a dark room, nor even dimmed lights, nor means of influencing the혹. Spiritism has become a science, an exact science, and now ranks with astronomy and mathematics as a part of the indubitable and formulated requirements of the human mind." I sit here, you will observe, in a chair, — an ordinary chair. There is no concealed machinery of any kind, no hidden thing that has confirmed the sort. I am now in a trance. When I am in a trance there is no physical difference observable in me. I breathe as usual, my pulse is not accelerated or retarded. The pupils do not fail to respond to the usual stimuli.

"The evidence that I am in a trance is that I am totally unconscious of what is now going on. If you should take my pulse, it would be as if the head should feel no pain. I might indeed cry out, might perhaps strike out: but these manifestations of apparent pain would really be quite unconscious on my part. It would be but the unconscious reaction, reflex action, as science calls it, of the husk which we name the body."

I am now in a trance. My voice, you will observe, does not change. It is a spirit whose voice is not the spirit's. If the spirit thought it best that the control should influence to some extent the voice of the medium. It was done with the view of interest in what was then a new discovery. But now that spiritism has become a science, scientific methods are required in preference to the former, more dramatic, manifestations.

"As I remarked, I am in a trance, and am inspired by the soul of my control, Ebenezer Whittelsey, formerly pastor of the church at Wiganford, Connecticut."

"My own soul meanwhile is in China, and is inspir- ing the body of a Chinese medium and giving him information as to what is occurring here in New York."

"My control is a body of foreign origin; it can not be determined by physical tests. The soul is without weight. If you should weigh me now and again when the soul has receded, the body would have no difference in weight. That is how the existence of the soul is proved scientifically, for if there were any difference in weight there could not be any soul, for the soul is weightless.

"In every detail of spiritism a similar scientific ac- curacy has been reached. There are also, as most of you know, several other esoteric parts of the complete human nature: the astral body and other human abil- ities, the existence of which is demonstrated in the same way. My astral body at present is exploring the vast galleries left in the cooling lava in the interior of the earth as the head condition."

"How wonderful!" gasped the audience.

"But, as I remarked, I am in a trance; — repent, my brethren, and flee from the wrath to come. All you wives who have disobeyed the divine command, obey your husbands, and humble yourselves before the righteous wrath of the great Judge, will surely burn forever in the lake of fire and melt brimstone, which shall have and lap up your tortured bodies, and pour forth His mercy and for His glory. I trust none of you will take offense at any remark that I may make while under the influence of my control, whose ideas are possibly absurdly antiquated. My astral body is now returning and is bringing with it a spirit from the 'antique vest' which, like all other parts of the un- known, is inhabited by a 'tongue' in the known and unknown world."

"They are coming in the bodies of two commercial travellers on a New Haven express, which is just pulling into the Grand Central. Ah! I am, I fancy, prepared for the meeting of the locomotive: whoo-who-who-who-who! I thought so. You are, of course, aware that what used to be called lifeless matter has been shown by science to be instinct with life. In fact, science demonstrates that all objects have souls. You will observe that, although I am totally unconscious of my actions during a momentary trance such as has just occurred, I am often informed after the trance is over by the other esoteric parts of me what my actions have been during the trance. In fact, that is the way the existence of the trance state is scientifically determined. The inward disturbance of the magnetic aura that surrounds the bodies of each of us, — a red aura may be seen, and, if I may say so, the aura may be seen, and, if I may say so of the aura of all of you, scarlet and blue and purple and gold."

"Ah! yes, my aura is much agitated, it is the astral body returning with its spirit quite.

"I am now, fellow, and follow me with my excursion to the centre of the earth, and my body here will feel entirely tired when it recovers from the trance in which it now is. I regret to interrupt such interesting proceedings, especially as I have brought a modern-minded friend with me, the spirit of Tyndall, in fact, who has confirmed, and would like to assure you that he has confirmed the discerning apprehension of being engulfed in the molten core of the earth, as they call it, is without foundation."

"However, this interesting communication must be postponed until some other evening, as my body, I hinted a moment ago, when it is no longer supported by the control of spirits and mine, its astral companion, will find itself quite exhausted."

"Good evening, gentlemen and ladies. There will be no materialization this evening. My controls desire to materialize. It is not to know, and in that case I become all sorts of people, without changing my appearance or voice, of course, but the change is none the less real, — as real, in fact, as the change in the colour of your face when you apply the wash, which we now understand to be a scientific fact. But not this evening. Some other evening. Good evening.

How much did we take in, Juliet?"

JOHN BEVERLY ROSSON.
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The Secretary wants every reader of Liberty to send in his name for enrolment. Those who do so hereby pledge themselves to write, when possible, a letter every fortnight on Anarchism or kindred subjects, to the "Anarchist Letter-Writing Corps," assigned address. All, whether members or not, are asked to lose no opportunity of informing the secretary of suitable targets.

Address, Streets & Bynoe, East Hardwick, Vt.

Suggestion No. 7 — When you observe any success in the work of the corps, either in getting letters published or in opening anybody's eyes, let me know. If possible, send clippings or marked papers.

Target, Section A. — The "Morning Journal," New York City, publishes letters and topics of the day. On June 21 it published one signed "J. F. G. egoz," saying, "The remedy is not thinking by ourselves, but 'have off,' and we shall work out the best way possible.

Section B. — The Rev. Myron W. Reed, Denver, Col., has resigned because rich members of his church ob- jected to his writing for a paper free for the benefit of the poor. He is a Single Taxer and will soon begin lecturing. Show him that the Single Tax is not the whole solution.
LIBERTY.

THE BEAUTIES OF THE GOVERNMENT.

247 The ponders of Liberty are urgently invited to consider the following facts, it is open to expend good citizens to secure the right of liberty, and to be injured. It is a very important and necessary matter, and should be done. 

No English policeman ever arrests a man for being "sassy" or "giving him impudence," or for not moving on, or for so-called disorderly conduct, which seems to have no legal meaning and to be named. He sees a crime committed or attempted before he makes an arrest, and he knows that if he acts unjustly and without due warrant of law he takes his life in his own hands, and he is especially sensitive on the matter of individual liberty, but the police instructions and regulations of American cities, especially of the larger cities, are silent on such topics. Not even in Russia do the police assume such powers as they do in this country. On the very first day that Judge Gaynor ascended the bench he had an illustration of the undue exercise of authority by a policeman, and he rebuked him from the bench. It was in Long Island City. A man was asked for a poll tax and for an emergency election and after the dispute, and the case hinges on the regularity of the credentials of a policeman. A policeman testified that he was in the room at the time of the dispute, and once again, his testimony was evidence.

"By what right did you do that?" asked Judge Gaynor.

"I thought I'd take chances on it," said the policeman.

"If the Police Commissioner of this place knows his duty, you would have a very slim chance of re-making a policeman," replied Judge Gaynor.

There is no law against lounging in the public streets, yet arrests and imprisonments in Brooklyn on this charge in a few years recently would more than fill the criminal courts at this point. It is no crime to stand about the streets. That is one of the things a street is for, and Judge Gaynor recently said in a case that the man caught before him that any citizen had a right to lounge, and that he was not afraid to stand in the streets if he wanted to do so. In a recent controversy in Brooklyn between a brewer with a large plant and his workingmen a police captain went far as to order certain men not even to come into his precinct. They were not only not to watch who went in and out of the brewhouse and to try to persuade some men not to work, but they wanted to be provided with the product of the brewhouse, but they were forbidden even to walk the streets there. The captain would prefer charges of disorderly conduct to a case of theft, although there were such crimes set down as "disorderly conduct." men almost by the legion have been sent to jail for this alleged offense. "Disorderly conduct," is a most convenient phrase for policemen to use. If a policeman sees something not to his taste he calls it disorderly conduct, and arrests the persons offending him.

One of the best known cases of police interference that came before Judge Gaynor recently was the arrest of Philip J. Dwyer at the Gravesend racetrack in the instigation of Peter La Croix. There was no crime committed or charged, and Judge Gaynor used this strong language in discharging him:

"Racing horses for stakes may be bad, but unlawful arrest for apprehension of this defendant was unwarranted. It was an exercise of arbitrary power, and history teaches that we must to fear from arbitrary power than from all species of gambling combined."

Recently the health authorities of Brooklyn attempted to imprison persons in their houses in order to compel them to submit to vaccination. Two expressmen were actually kept in a stable as prisoners. They were brought before Judge Gaynor on habeas corpus proceedings and made free. In disposing of this case, Judge Gaynor said: "The law was 'more danger to this country from the exercise of arbitrary power than from all contagious diseases combined.'"

Sometimes the police were in receipt of a warrant for the arrest of a man. For the purpose of arresting him, Judge Gaynor laid down the law applicable to police justices as well as to policemen. He said:

"The warrant could not be against the defendant was by a police officer. It charges the defendant with selling a lottery ticket on a specified day, but concludes as follows: 'Dependent further says that he makes this complaint upon information and belief as a police officer of Brooklyn.' A police officer, or any other person, cannot seize one without the arrest warrant, or without an unlawful search and seizure, or an allegation of information and belief. Human liberty never was so cheap as that under our law, or the system from which it is derived. Free body of the law. The execution of a crime upon probable cause is not positively stated before a magistrate has jurisdiction to issue a warrant of arrest. This is guaranteed by the Constitution."

"He will not make a search warrant without probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation.

"No one who knows the history of this guarantee is inclined to blame the law for it against despotic power, and out of which it came, can see it infringed with but a feeling of resentment. It is important that crime should be punished, but far more important that arbitrary power should not be tolerated."
Justice Ryan decided to discharge the driver.
"What satisfaction is that to me?" growled the officer.
The Justice called Schoenbutch back and told him to get Mr. Clark and any other witnesses and make a complaint against the policeman and his privates.
"You want satisfaction?" he said, addressing the officer. "You'll get it before you finish."
Schoenbutch said he would bring the case before the Commission.

[Will the policeman go to jail? Probably not. There are not many Gaynor among our judges.]

HUSBAND AND WIFE ARE ONE.

CORNELIUS BUEB, IA., June 16. — The case of Mr. and Mrs. Metzer, on trial here on a charge of conspiracy to steal, Dr. Wilmot, has been ended by the court's decision on a unique point of law raised by the defense. One person, of course, cannot be guilty of conspiracy. The defense argued that Mr. and Mrs. Metzer are husband and wife, and held in law to be one person, consequently it is impossible for them to commit conspiracy. The court sustained the defense, and the prisoners were discharged.

[But if husband and wife are one person, can either be guilty of assaulting or imprisoning the other? When a husband murders his wife, he must, under the 'law,' be guilty of suicide! But how can a living person be guilty of suicide?]

MORAL CRUSADES CHECKED.

NEW YORK, June 17. — Story published in the "Sun" of the Fassett Committee's failure to investigate the Police Department in 1890 after "Mr. and Mrs. Webb" were found registered at an upstairs hotel and the police discovered that the woman was a member of the committee, and that the "Mrs. Webb" of the occasion was not his wife, brought a vigorous protest to thé front of its story. Write a letter to the editors and attempt to investigate New York's Police Department.

There are many men on the police force today who remember an occasion when the Assembly appointed a committee to investigate their department, and now the law's betting officials marched down to the city and then marched ingloriously back. Those were the days of the St. Nicholas Hotel, which, once a famous hostelry, is now a shadow.

The day before that famous investigation was to begin, one of the most prominent members of the committee, Mr. J. W. Picture, was assassinated.

The next morning this legislator was met in the office of the hotel by a nice young man, who addressed him charmingly with "Good morning, Mr. So and So."

"You are mistaken, sir. I am Assemblyman Blank."

"Well, well," commented the young man, "that is really too bad. If such certainly should be So and So, since you occupied the same apartment with Mrs. So and So last night."

Mrs. So and So was a married woman from Assemblyman Blank's town. The young man was a Central Office detective. No investigation.

The next attempt on the Police Department was in 1894, when the wicked Gibbs Senate Committee was an active instrument of terror. There were plenty of men ready to supply evidence of every sort against everybody in those days, and it was one of these— a prominent official in a certain department—who tried to get Gibbs to investigate the Police Department, the special reason being that he wanted to kill one of the police commissioners. This official kept importing Gibbs to investigate the Police Department and offered to furnish evidence. The nature of this evidence was revealed to Chairman Gibbs later with the consent of the certain department mentioned called on Gibbs and said that he had been ordered by his supervisor to take a woman to a small hotel in which the police commissioner was going to be. He showed the case to the discrete committee as to the disorderly character of the house. Mr. Gibbs's visitor said that he had done as he was ordered for fear of losing his place, but he begged that he be not called, as he was a married man, and his family would be ruined if he were compelled to testify. As has been stated, it was a time when everybody was volunteering to testify against everybody else, "at the very next night came the witness and the officer that Chairman Gibbs was looking for. The officer who was trying to have the Police Department investigated, shortly before, a short time before, been murdered, was a simpleTON and the name of the assailant was never breathed. On the night in question a man called on Chairman Gibbs, and said: "I hear you are going to investigate a certain department." "Well, you do, if you want to testify," continued his visitor. "What do you know about the department?" "I know something about Commissioner Dash. You remember that he was assassinated recently?"

"Yes."

"I'm the man who assassinated him."

There was more talk, the man explaining why he had attempted the life of the commissioner. He agreed to be on hand at the next session of the committee. He was there, so was the poor subordinate, who did not want to testify, and so was the commissioner who wanted the police investigated. The latter went up to Chairman Gibbs and asked: "Well, are you ready to investigate the Police Department?"

"Yes," responded Gibbs, "and now I can't kill your man, but as soon as we get through with him we are going to put that man over in the corner on the stand," indicating the man who said he had tried to take the life of the commissioner.

The commissioner looked at the man, turned pale, said to Gibbs: "You needn't examine my man," and hastily left the room.

THE SALARIES GO ON.

NEW YORK, June 17. — The Board of Educats who control the London schools will, at the present rate of progress, finish with their circular regarding religious instruction about the middle of the next century. We have already two national teachers, composing the Teachers' Association, proved to be relieved from implanting the prescribed doctrine of "the separate existence of three persons in the Deity, or the doctrine of vicarious sacrifice." The board decided not to recognize the Teachers' Association, but to act on each application separately.

ARRESTED ON CIVIC'S COMPLAINT.

NEW YORK, June 17. — Richard Weedon, a bootlegger, was arrested on a warrant issued by Police Justice Tanzer, at the Tombs Police Court, on complaint of Anthony Comstock, charging him with dealing in indecent books and literature. After his arrest, his shop was searched and eleven viles books and four pictures were found. Weedon was taken before Justice Tanzer and held on $300 bail for $1,000. Mr. Comstock said Weedon was formerly engaged in the same business at 32 Myrtle avenue, Brooklyn, and that his place was a headquarters for the supply of dealers in contraband literature.

TO BE REJUDGED ADMISSIBILITY.

WASHINGTON, June 17. — Superintendent Stumpf, of the Bureau of Immigration, has forwarded to the proper officers at the several ports full descriptions of 217 Anarchists expelled from France, height, weight, color of eyes and hair, etc. All persons entering the United States answering the descriptions and found to be of the described class will be deported.

THE LIMIT OF CRITICISM.

NEW YORK, June 17. — In condemning a Munch work to pay $5 for an unfavorable criticism of a new portrait, the original of which is well known there, the judge said that he had not the right only to judge pictures from an artistic point of view and to draw any moral inferences.

CHINA'S EXAMPLE.

NEW YORK, June 17. — Thousands of artisans, repairing the Imperial building at Peking, China, struck for higher wages, and the Emperor ordered them to be arrested on the charge of Tories.
Mutual Bank Propaganda.

To the Editor of Liberty.

I enclose herewith the prospectus of an association which I have been trying to organize for the last eighteen months. This organization is eventually to establish the National Clearing House Association, as stated in the prospectus, to print and furnish to the local Mutual Credit Associations the blank certificates of credit, just as the manufacturers of Washington furnish the blank bills to the national banks. The National Clearing House Association will unite all the local associations and merely make them one organization, and guarantee the circulation of their money.

By this method every city and town would have its local credit association furnish credit in its own form, rendered to individuals, and would remain as an unimpeachable and finalizing their disappearance. This form of credit I define as secured credit, while bank credits are unsecured credit. Now it follows that, if parties who have security acceptable to the Mutual Credit Association of the city can obtain certificates of credit at one-half of one per cent., they will naturally prefer to borrow the credit and pay for cash rather than run bank accounts and, of course, pay credit prices. This is the incentive that will finally overcome all obstacles and defeat all opposition. It is the only effort toward satisfactory money that can be made. It would remain as a white knight.

The history of this new movement is as follows: After long experience of "Jus de Bourse," while the same necessary in consequence of lack of support, and because the Post Office Department demanded mine second-class mail, I saw that it was necessary to develop some new plan to get the ideas before the people, and that, to start up again, it would be better to go farther West and to a smaller city than Chicago. Accordingly, I went to St. Paul and, after spending six months in Lake City and failing to accomplish anything there, I came to St. Paul. I spent six months in that city, making a very thorough canvass with my associates and obtaining the support of the editors and publishers. I then came to this city and did the same here. I sold a thousand copies in each city and gave away many more. I then wrote out the prospectus, had it printed, and canvassed for subscribers to the capital stock, in order to start the first association. I got forty-five subscribers, and we held several meetings, but realizing that meetings for the purpose of discussing organization were still premature, I got together a few of the most advanced thinkers and we called the Mutual Credit Club, the purpose of which is the discussion of the most advanced questions. But I could not get speakers of any prominence; as temporary secretary I addressed letters to bank presidents and lawyers, asking them to speak at our meetings; but they all very politely declined. So, for want of speakers, we had to abandon our effort in that direction. The press, both in St. Paul and in Minneapolis, treated my efforts with respect and consideration; and while the papers were not ventures to discuss it with any thoroughness, I have never been refused publication of articles I have written. The Minneapolis "Times" has published eight long articles.

The plan I propose to carry out with regard to the first associations is as follows: As soon as four or five hundred subscribers to the capital stock of the first association are obtained, I shall call a meeting to organize, and elect the officers, and call in the stock. The association will then start weekly, upon the organ of the movement, and send out, or organize, in five or six other cities. As soon as there are five or six organizations completed, a meeting of the members of these associations will be called to organize the General Clearing House Association. As soon as that is done, the latter organization will at once proceed to print the necessary blank certificates of credit, to furnish to each association, and prescribe the rules for admission of future associations. I propose that the General Clearing House shall issue and circulate on all property pledged, a secured credit, whether by fire, theft, or otherwise, and also, as I anticipate, receipt of certificates of credit issued by any association that has been admitted to membership, in the amount of $1,000.

About five months ago, realizing that my two pamphlets do not cover this question sufficiently and that there was an imperative demand for a complete treatise on the subject, I had this new work to write in a book and have now nearly completed the task. As soon as this new book is published, I shall take up the work of securing subscribers to the stock of the first association and continue the work to which my life is devoted—the annihilation of the money fraud. ALFRED B. WESTON.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINS.

"A Study of the Money Question." Mr. Hugo Bligrman has written for the Twentieth Century Library, under the above title, and the managers of that paper have subscribed to many of its correspondents copies for review. The readers of Liberty, being well acquainted with Mr. Bligrman's views, would, I am sure, enjoy reading the criticism thus evoked. Receiving a copy of Mr. Bligrman's pamphlet, and feeling sure that the most of the contributors would fail to grasp the object of the essay as well as misconstrue its terms and ideas, I wrote a short review, striving, not to make the ideas clearer (that would be impossible), but to direct the attention of the readers to these ideas as distinguished from those of other schools. I sought to show how important was his conception of money,—"any medium of exchange devised to overcome the difficulty of transportation of barter,"—and especially how Mr. Bligrman differed from the "gold bug" while allowing gold to remain a "value denominator, so that every advocate would base all law upon gold, not misunderstanding the act that the amount of gold is so inadequate to represent the value demanded to offset exchange that the most specious and unholy must be prescribed to meet the demand. The soft-money advocate would reject the 'dollar,' making the issue of all money a "government function" by law. A "dollar" would regulate the amount of the flat of government. Mr. Bligrman says, 'A creation of value by law can be conceived only by those who hold value to consist in 'the quantity of an instrument with which may even be banked by an instrument of which it is only need to return them to use, are able, without exciting any surprise or sense of incongruity, to assume the circulation of a new coinage representing new money, while the freest traders that under the system of unrestricted coinage all things would rank according to their real merits. In that case the power and popularity of a newspaper would depend mainly upon the accuracy and the amount of its information, the force of its arguments, the fidelity with which it represents the dominant opinions of the nation. But anyone who will impartially examine the newspapers that have acquired the greatest circulation and influence in Europe and America may easily convince himself of the falsehood of this theory. The leading editors of all the great enterprises in bringing together the kind of information which amuses or interests the public, test its circulation for the first symptoms of change of opinion, a skill in amusing public prejudice; malevolent gossip, sensational falsehood, coarse descriptions, vindictive attacks on individuals, nations, or races, are the elements of which great newspaper ascendancies have been mostly built. Newspaper writing is one of the most open of all professions, but some of the qualities that are most successful in it do not give the smallest presumption of either moral worth or of political competence or integrity.

It is a strange thing, though custom has made it very familiar, that so large a part of the formation and representation of political opinion should be a commercial speculation. Many papers have no doubt been set up to advocate particular causes and interests, and have discharged their task with admirable disinterestedness and integrity. But these are generally the papers which have acquired the widest circulation and success. And, in fact, it must be a commercial speculation, with its interests in many respects coinciding, in some respects directly clashing, with the true interests of the nation. Considered commercially, its popularity is the justification and the measure of its success, and it is a matter of perfect indifference from what source that popularity is derived. It must write to please its readers. Its business is not to improve them, but to please them. If a vicious style, if coarse, vulgar, or immoral descriptions, if personal slander or class attacks are widely popular, it is the commercial interest.
of the newspaper to gratify the taste, and by gratifying, it immensurably increases it. Day after day, week after week, the impression is deepened, the taste is formed, the moral character is shaped as a corrupt press has ever been discovered for vulgarizing the national mind, for lowering the moral sense, for deepening, stimulating, and perpetuating class hatreds or class sympathies. The press may ultimately be treated to national antipathies which have been largely created by newspaper inventive and by the gross partiality of the various publications. The press will be their part in the dangers, while, by the increased circulation of their papers, they reap a large harvest from the excitement of war, they have a direct interest in the war itself. Whereas, the vicious, the pernicious, the old class hatred, some lingering provincial antipathy, a newspaper will arise to represent and inflame it. In countries where class antipathies are deep and savage, or when the form of government is still unsettled and contested, it is extremely difficult to reconcile an unbalanced press with national stability and security. The most plausible argument of the opponents of national education is the fact that in many countries it is so tolerably certain that one of the chief forms of reading of the poor will consist of newspapers and not for the purpose of playing upon their most odious passions.

Individual Sovereignty

[From "Liberty."

Some of my numerous correspondents are exercised with the idea that the "Conservator" leans so the side of crime, to the service of evil, to the liberty that inevitably owes its existence to this and to the state. I have protested for equal freedom. Equal freedom sweeps over, as by one hand, all the objections of the old class so that it contemplated. I therefore, and am aware of yourself, believing that every power that the society, with power of its own, may become a menace to the state. I am not so much by the society of the sacred. I am not so much by the society of the sacred. I am not so much by the society of the sacred.

The scriptures of the human, and he will bring to the social board the fruit of a kingdom. Beggar that individual, and he will stand at your feet an eternal spectre and reproach.

The term of cooperation. The big individual is the best correspondent. He brings a great force to the pull. He meets event with deed, and to him all time is day-bred.

The real democrat dissolves interferences and irritations. He approaches laws direct, not by intercessions. Artists in pulpits and professors in universities may be found, I suppose, who would ask the gods face to face, not by sufferance of classes who claim a special right to carry my message and swear to my dispensations. He recommends himself who shows most insight. The man who carries a line deeper in the sea, the telescopic vision that farthest pierces space, the rapid intuition that most subtly and infallibly fathoms the mystery of being, holds in fee the authority of my credit.

But formal knowledge piled heaver, sigh, not books of learned men, and merely verbal paraphernalia encyclopedic in their range, may have no exchange relations with good sense and spiritual insight.

Culture often miseries. It piles its knowledge of fragments and facts and fails to see the law by which the pile stands. It builds its mountain and misses the mountain's secret. It does not for one moment suspect that it has reached at last and enwrapt the bill it has built and seen the promised land.

There are evil possibilities in culture which must not go unheeded. There are all the evils which any thrill of the human. They undertake to do their work apart from large social interests. The great streams pass by, and the scholar fears to embrace them. It becomes the business of many in laboratories and libraries. The average professor, like the average priest, is subsidized, if not by his position, then by external, churning incitaments which defer the human to artistic 'utility or technical skill.'

With Tolstoi, with Howells, I agree that it is calamitous that the artist and poet, the singer and author, must run money off the nib of his pen or the fluke of his brush.

This seems will come when spiritual gift will cease to partnership money and goods. Man will write and sing what they must. They will stand unashamed in the presence of the material and proclaim the divine law.

Now nearly everybody at some point doffs his hat to respectability. Scholars particularly are bent on the road that leads them to the crowd. If you would be credible, gorge yourself with showy knowledge and the gilt edge of verbal learning, leaving to the masses all the organism and satisfactions of revolution and mead.

Individualists encourage this spirit. When they start they are pure and free. As they journey they lose their spiritual empyre of the equipment in which they travel. Finally, it is not the traveler, but the mode and style of travel, thatHCIEXACC the standard of its life.

Democracy is preserved in liberty. The Church and the state, all formal societies, tend to destroy individualism, to make it conform. We are foreign to it. To be free we must hold them in perpetual servitude. I would shrink and whip an institution to my purpose without remorse as long as it was useful. I would bar all methods which would bind and bury it kindly, but without regret.

We are too meek and lowly. Earth is cursed with our worship and our obeisance for justice. At every door it is hand extended. The stranger is not invited in. It is fed where he stands and condescends to pass on.

Our social philanthropists are vagaries. They despise labor. They may stand on high walls which cannot be scaled and then withdraw the ladder or only let it down for elect applicants.

All social philosophy belongs to self-strength. Any act which beggars another offends truth. Any act which is not in the direction of the extirpation of dependency is traitorous to social health. The structure is weakened at the foundations, which does not aim at and culminate in individual independence and power, whatever its motive, is base and destructive.

The ideals in this great drama are the pitiful sermons of priests and philanthropists who apologize in palliatives for present evils and who drink at no fountain of brave and absolute energy. If we are the merchants and players of the play. They enter and cross the stage, but are not essential to the plot.

Charity is an outrage against the individual. As such it stands condemmed. Charity taken from the veins of personality its most precious blood. The gallows, the guillotine, the garrote, here witness their spiritual counterparts.

Justice speaks in defiance of the individual. It tends him. It makes whole which previously was only a part. It builds muscle and then, its soul is returned to one who has done a long journey and the ineradicable failures of personality.

Charity is a mole. Justice sears to the heavens, and is not dazzled by the sun. Charity lives in holes its forlorn and abandoned seabed; justice measures itself with all space and time.

Merely ethical or theological appeals to good motives, if they are not actually a bar against, only in appearance in processes toward the straightening out of social difficulties. What we need are men who see and discuss radical principles. There is the most difficult and exacting process I find that scholars apologize and supplicate where they should assert and defy.

There are classes who assume a function and authority which does not naturally belong to them. In medicine, the professional doctor; in law, the professional lawyer; in art, in literature, in theology, in ethics, the professional, classical, and ideal; so much, that man, or those many men, in whom pride of profession rises above and makes little of that final human and
service which arbitrates between what is ephemeral and what is of infinite moment.

I would speak to every man rebellion. Hold preciously to yourself the final decision. Reverence authority that you obey, and refuse authority which others attempt to impose upon you. Do not love the atmosphere of courts and churches, of formal culture and polite urbanity. Do not play sheep to another’s shepherd. Violate no other soul, and hold your own soul defiant to the foot of the robber.

Go your own way. From all the parlers and cloisters will come cries of warning. Go your own way. Gather if we and grain. Be those your gift to the social treasury. You can contribute generously when you are big in yourself. To borrow that you may give puts a lien on your future. All the debts must be paid out of your personal private riches you can give and give, and never reduce your store. But if you will put yourself in bond that you may play philosopher, borrower, leader, and receiver are deified and defeated.

Be you yourself, in yourself, whole. Do the acts of justice. Let mutual respect triumph. Let men take their natural place in sufficient relief. Let priests and professional economists retire. Take up the golden thread yourself. It runs through all history and it leads you to the way of all revelation.

Admireable as Mr. Traubel’s plea is, it is open to one serious criticism. It is Emersonian rather than Schweitzer. It fails to introduce essential qualifications, it draws a sharp line between our nature and their nature. It reduces everything to categories, to the idea of the just as a kind of thing. It is, in fact, the nirvana of the just. It is, indeed, a suitable proof of the just. The just is, indeed, the nirvana of the just.

To the just, I say, you are not free to act as you please, to act as you will, to act as you like. You are bound by the law of the State, by the law of the community. You are bound by the law of the society.

And do not think that I am going to gloss over this matter of the law. This is the law, whether you like it or not, whether you think it just or not. This is the law, whether you like it or not, whether you think it just or not.

The law is the law. The law is the law. The law is the law.

And do not think that I am going to gloss over the matter of the law. This is the law, whether you like it or not, whether you think it just or not. This is the law, whether you like it or not, whether you think it just or not.

The law is the law. The law is the law. The law is the law.

And do not think that I am going to gloss over the matter of the law. This is the law, whether you like it or not, whether you think it just or not. This is the law, whether you like it or not, whether you think it just or not.

The law is the law. The law is the law. The law is the law.

And do not think that I am going to gloss over the matter of the law. This is the law, whether you like it or not, whether you think it just or not. This is the law, whether you like it or not, whether you think it just or not.

The law is the law. The law is the law. The law is the law.

And do not think that I am going to gloss over the matter of the law. This is the law, whether you like it or not, whether you think it just or not. This is the law, whether you like it or not, whether you think it just or not.

The law is the law. The law is the law. The law is the law.

And do not think that I am going to gloss over the matter of the law. This is the law, whether you like it or not, whether you think it just or not. This is the law, whether you like it or not, whether you think it just or not.

The law is the law. The law is the law. The law is the law.

And do not think that I am going to gloss over the matter of the law. This is the law, whether you like it or not, whether you think it just or not. This is the law, whether you like it or not, whether you think it just or not.

The law is the law. The law is the law. The law is the law.

And do not think that I am going to gloss over the matter of the law. This is the law, whether you like it or not, whether you think it just or not. This is the law, whether you like it or not, whether you think it just or not.

The law is the law. The law is the law. The law is the law.

And do not think that I am going to gloss over the matter of the law. This is the law, whether you like it or not, whether you think it just or not. This is the law, whether you like it or not, whether you think it just or not.

The law is the law. The law is the law. The law is the law.

And do not think that I am going to gloss over the matter of the law. This is the law, whether you like it or not, whether you think it just or not. This is the law, whether you like it or not, whether you think it just or not.

The law is the law. The law is the law. The law is the law.

And do not think that I am going to gloss over the matter of the law. This is the law, whether you like it or not, whether you think it just or not. This is the law, whether you like it or not, whether you think it just or not.
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The Ethics of Dynamite.

[— Andrew Herbert in the Contemporary Review—]

Perhaps I ought at once, for the benefit of some of our moderate and most serious friends, to apologize for using the word "dynamite" at all; perhaps to apologize for using any such weapon as I imagine it to be; to try to show that I recognize the danger, and that I am not contemplating the use of it, or anything like it, for the promotion of any evil. I wish, indeed, to denote in this paper the pernicious influence which, under the guise of a machine for good, has really been a great evil, the influence of the dynamiter, and the means of resistance to the dynamiter; but I do not mean to suggest that I believe the dynamiter to be any more than a great evil, or that I think it is possible to use the dynamite for any purpose that is at all consistent with the best interests of humanity. I do not mean to suggest that I believe the use of dynamite to be any more than a great evil, or that I think it is possible to use the dynamite for any purpose that is at all consistent with the best interests of humanity. I do not mean to suggest that I believe the use of dynamite to be any more than a great evil, or that I think it is possible to use the dynamite for any purpose that is at all consistent with the best interests of humanity.

LIBERTY. 297

11

Almost every European government is a legalized means of oppression; and every opposition a cause of relaxation, restriction upon restriction, burden upon burden, so that the dynamiter is slowly hammered out every where on the official anvil. The power of the police is never used, but the stronger and more menace of our contemporaries is never restrained, and any weapon is considered right, as the weapon of the wiser against the stronger. It matters little what the great deal of what is done is done in the interest of the people or of other peoples, or in the interest of those who are the enemies of liberty. And if liberty, that is the only true and sure criterion of our liberties. And if liberty, that is the only true and sure criterion of our liberties. And if liberty, that is the only true and sure criterion of our liberties. And if liberty, that is the only true and sure criterion of our liberties.
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