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Disgust of the country, including the plutocratic press, with the incompetents and dishonest senators, must have been a welcome opportunity to that discreditied body to recover lost ground by cheap patriotism and hypocritical Americanism. Congratulations upon Pullman's loyalty are now in order.

A prominent New York clergyman denounces the boycott as a "foreign word, Anarchistic and un-Christian." Yes, the boycott is Anarchistic,—that is, non-invasive and legitimate; but why is it un-Christian? Is the shooting by the government troops Christian? If it is un-Christian to resist evil in any way, then the boycott, though a fairer weapon than any other, is nevertheless un-Christian, since it is a form of resistance. But our modern clergymen are not so sentimental as to favor non-resistance. Of all the champions of "law and order," they are the most relentless, cold-blooded, and brutal. As for the religious editors, the majority of them have neither feelings nor ideas deserving to be described as Christian. They are as vicious and ignorant as the editors of the newspapers, whom indeed they merely copy and follow. It is not the business of truly religious editors to rush to the aid of law and order, property, or government. There are others to take care of that. They ought to apply the essential principles of their religion to the struggles of the day, and call for generosity, sympathy, and forbearance. If they do not, there is no reason for their existence.

The pseudo-individualist "Liberty Review" advances an original theory in explanation of American lynchings. At the root of the trouble, it seems, is the labor question, "as the negro is, of necessity, a free laborer, while the white men have become slaves of the unions, and responsive to the lash of slave-drivers, humorously called labor leaders. As a result of freedom, the negro is becoming a property owner and a successful rival for employment in the labor market. The crime which is the alleged cause of the lynching is, in nine cases out of ten, that he has become well-off, while the white slave is wasting his time and starving, because his master, the union, will not let him work except on terms arranged for him by others." Such a length of absurdities, no one of labor organizations carry a "labor advocate of landisnism, privilege, and robbery! The same organ speaks as follows about strikes and labor agitation: "A few more strikes got up in the interest of foreign shipowners, manufacturers, and merchants will open his eye of the most blind among the dupes of these paid dis-organizers of British industry, these subsidized plotters against the welfare of British com-

merce, these mercenaries who are engaged in a foul conspiracy to destroy the conditions of our national prosperity and to bring upon our heads utter and irretrievable ruin." Such intemperate and silly and malicious attacks hurt no one but the class whose apostles are compelled to defy common sense and common knowledge. But the true individualist who is called upon to criticize labor and disapprove its course must always guard against the natural misconception which holds liberty and individualism responsible for the violent nonsense and the sophistry of the sham individualist, who is the cause of the general distrust of libertarian principles.

A silly congressman has introduced a bill "to suppress Anarchy," and a stupid congress may pass it. The bill first defines Anarchy, as follows: "Any person or persons appointed, designated, or employed by any society or organization existing in this country or in any foreign country which provides in writing or by verbal agreement, understanding or countenance, for the taking of human life unlawfully, or for the unlawful destruction of a building or buildings or other property where the loss of human life is the probable result of such destruction of property, shall be deemed an Anarchist." According to this jargon, any number of persons employed or designated in the specified way will be deemed "an Anarchist," one Anarchist. Doubtless there is some wicked design behind this strange merging of many into one; what can it be? Having defined Anarchy, the bill goes on to declare that any person who shall attempt the theft of any person holding office, elective or appointive, or employed under the Constitution and laws of the United States, or who shall attempt the destruction of any building or buildings or other property where the loss of the life of any such United States official or employee would be the probable result of such a destruction of buildings or other property, shall upon trial and conviction of such offense in any circuit or district court of the United States of the district where such offense was attempted, be sentenced to death by hanging, which sentence shall be executed by the marshal of the district in accordance with the sentence of the judge before whom the case was tried." Under this bill, a man who is not acting under orders from an organization is not an "Anarchist," whatever his acts may be. The punishment is therefore to be inflicted, not for acts, but for membership in organizations of a certain kind. Is there any sense in this distinction? The wise legislator evidently thought that every revolutionist must be a member of a secret society.
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There are who call themselves Christians while denying even his human existence, regarding the alleged historical character as an abstraction merely. With this kind of Christianity, of course, anything is compatible.

The real Christianity, though, is a different matter: it is a religion, and it is the religion which Mr. Byington, in his recent excellent article, confesses he knows nothing about,—the Catholic religion. This is at least the most conscientious representative of the Christian religion in Europe and the Americas. Now, the basis of this religion, as of all other religions, is authority.

The victims, or devotees, or upholders, or whatever you prefer to call them, of any religion must begin by submitting the superiority of certain persons and yielding obedience to them. Christianity, as a religion, must be opposed to Atheism, the denial of all religion, and not merely to various religions of the supernatural.

The question is, whether Anarchism is compatible with religion at large or not, for, in denying its compatibility with Christianity as a religion, its compatibility with all religion is denied.

The essential point in the Catholic Church is the admission by the believer that certain men, by an alleged historical chain of physical contact with their predecessors in office, have the power to do much damage to the laity who violates their commands. As in all other religions, it is a supernatural power which is feared: in fact, religion may be accurately defined as the fear of the supernatural.

The first effective rally from this fear, and defiance of this authority, was the Protestant Reformation. Judge for yourself; think for yourself: these were its precursors.

True enough, it had no sooner said than it took all back and vowed it never meant anything of the sort; but the stopper was out, and the bottle has ever since been running from the bottle, and while we talk it is beginning to assume a giant's shape, the shape of Humanity, never to be compressed into the bottle again.

Ever since Luther pulled the cork, the denial of authority has continued and extended. The only really living authority, the only power which men fear, not knowing its worthlessness, is an alleged morality which the State is supposed to support. This last authority is now denied by Anarchism, which is the natural culmination of Protestantism and of Democracy, the political sponsors of Protestantism.

All that Mr. Byington says of Protestant Christianity's emphatic denial as to their antagonism or compatibility, we must first make it clear what we mean by Christianity.

Nowadays Christianity may mean almost anything. Priests of Christians, who call themselves such, and are admitted to be such by almost all other varieties of Christians, do not hesitate to deny the divinity of Christ. Some
Byington in another article, "A Lesson on Civil Government," are no doubt supposed by him to be essentially Christian. "It is wrong to kill a man, or to shut him up," and so on, "if he does no such thing to you."

The axiomatic Christian moral precept is to do the will of God, and of his representative, the king or the president, as the case may be; to kill those whom these bid to kill, to rob those whom these bid to rob, is his essence of Christianity. Not right to hurt a man who does not hurt you! Pure heterodoxy in the old-fashioned Christian's eyes. Not ten minutes ago a pillar of the Church was telling me that he had his way, I, whom he condescends to favor with his personal esteem, as he explained, should nevertheless be imprisoned for life, or until I should retract my "horrible", opinions. The Golden Rule? I questioned. Faugh! pooh! pish! the Golden Rule, forsooth, quoth he, and I knew he was a genuine Christian.

Mr. Byington is in a transition stage from the frank brutality of real Christianity, by the natural ascent of moralitarianism which calls itself Christianity, but is not.

JOHN BEVERLEY ROBINSON.

The Strike and the Editors.

The great railroad strike has furnished the sentimental editors with material for another campaign in favor of inconsequential and illogical reforms, and the brutal and sophistical editors with an assortment of dangerous and misleading half-truths. Several important questions were raised by the strike,—such as the propriety of sympathetic strikes, the legitimacy of the boycott, Federal encroachment, violent and aggressive methods in labor troubles, and a number of others. The sentimental editors, those who have not sold their souls to the plutocracy, express sympathy with the strikers, while regretting their use of illegal means, and mildly suggest such measures of relief as arbitration, government regulation of railroad labor, or public control of natural monopolies. The positions taken by these editors are creditable to their hearts, but they do not commend themselves to the mind. Well-meaning suggestions are not to be despised in these days of conflict and drawing of the lines, but one is compelled to point out the weakness and lameness of the conclusions drawn by those who are incapable of analysis and scientific reasoning. To denounce Pullman for refusing to submit to arbitration, to blame the railroad managers for their contemptuous treatment of the strikers, is well, perhaps, but it leads to nothing and contributes nothing to the solution of the problem. The brutal sophists, on the other hand, make a parade of impartial and thorough dealing with the situation, and, by evading and suppressing and shuffling facts, arrive at conclusions whose fallaciousness is not obvious to the reader. In their puerile and plausible interpretations there is greater danger than in blind and unqualified condemnation.

Here is, for instance, a review of the facts of the strike from the alleged standpoint of "first principle" by that sophist and hypocrite, the "Sun":

The workmen employed by George M. Pullman had a perfect right to refuse the wages offered, and to quit work in protest if they deemed it expedient. But they had no right, by the exercise of any kind of pressure to force Pullman to run his works at a loss. Pullman has solemnly declared that the last car contracts carried out by him involved a loss, and that he is unable to transmit business to his competitors. From his point of view, therefore, there is nothing to arbitrate; for no stranger will submit to the decision of an arbitrator that he shall do business at a loss. This is a few-country business as it is for his employes. We are not yet ready for any sort of tyranny here; neither, for the man on horseback nor for Socialistic despotism.

The workingmen composing the American Railway Union had a perfect right to sympathize with the Pullman strikers, although, as we have seen, the latter had no real gripe. R. U. had no right to carry the expression of its sympathy beyond certain lawful limits. They had a right to request, in contempt of all general confederacies, the officials of the railroads running out of Chicago not to haul Pullman cars. Those officials had an equal right to refuse the request, and, indeed, were bound to do so by their duty to earn dividends for their stockholders, and to subsist the underwriters of interstate commerce. They have pointed out that, if Pullman cars are detached, mail trains can only be run at a loss; and such a loss is the A. R. U. and States government any right to inflict. The railroads have contracted to carry the mails, but the contract gives the railways officers the right of the method in which trains shall be made up. Selfinterest can be treated to cause the officials to make up the trains in such a way as to answer the needs of the travelling public. Those men must not be answerable by a refusal to haul Pullman cars.

The demand of the A. R. U., that is should dictate the make-up of trains, having been rejected, the workmen continuing that association had a right to quit work upon the railways running out of Chicago, and to seek employment elsewhere, or live upon their savings, if the demand for work was not forthcoming. But their rights stopped short. They have no right to deprive the American citizens from accepting the posts vacated by the strikers. Yet these unprofitable acts have notoriously been done. The new men employed by the railways in the place of the strikers have been subjected to violence or threatened with it; tracks have been obstructed; switches demolished; watch towers destroyed, and cars derailed, overturned, and burnt.

Now: it is necessary to inquire where the flaw is in this argument. It apparently commends itself to sober sense and rational judgment. It seems clear, indeed, while the arguments of the sentimentalists are vague, inconclusive, and flabby. As far as it goes, the "Sun" must be admitted to be perfectly right. Yet there must be a fallacy somewhere in or be hind the argument, for, if not, the verdict must be against the strikers in every case where violence is used, and for the strikers are accompanied by violence, it must follow that most strikers are so wrong and vicious as to forfeit all claim to consideration. This is precisely what the "Sun" is endeavoring to enforce, hence it is necessary to challenge and refute its apparently sound argument.

The vice or fallacy in the "Sun" is reasoning is found in his assumption that the strikers fight under entirely fair conditions and have no other and greater grievances than those serving as the immediate cause of the strike. The "Sun" account of the trouble purposely begins with the declaration of Pullman's wage schedule by his employes; no other antecedents are touched on as much as hinted at, as if it were wholly immaterial whether or not there are such antecedents. But it is very material; the verdict really depends upon that point. If everything else were fair, just, and equitable at Pullman; if equality of opportunities existed there-and equality prevails, then it would be proper to treat the wages disagreement as the first act of the drama. But equality of opportunities and freedom never prevailed in Pullman's jurisdiction, any more than they prevail elsewhere, and the wage dispute was not merely local.

The Pullman employees are victims of the system of monopoly, privilege, and legal injustice from which all labor is suffering, and they entered the fight handicapped, burdened, and exhausted. Pullman was not merely their employer, but their exploiter and slave-driver, the State's injustice having invested him with the power to exploit and oppress. It was by violence, organized force and fraud, that labor was reduced to the necessity of accepting the Pullman terms, and this great general grievance was deeply felt (unfortunately it was but very imperfectly understood by the employees when the struggle was forced upon them by the minor special grievance. To tell them to use violent and illegitimate means in the circumstances, impudent mockery. It is beyond human nature to refrain from violence when it is perfectly well known that so-called orderly strikes are predestined to total failure. But two wrongs don't make a right, it may be objected. Granted that the workmen are robbed and oppressed by the officials of the present monopoly system, how does this fact justify their coercion of non-union men, their destruction of property, and other aggressions? Do these aggressions contribute to the solution of the larger problems and the removal of the deeper grievances? No; no such contention is made, nor is it claimed that the aggressions of the State and its allies justify retaliation. What is claimed and emphasized in this, that the workmen do retaliate and force down the oppressors' throats a dose of their own medicine, it is not the business of lovers of justice and equity to denounce them. The use of force by the victims of plutocracy may not be wise or just in all cases, but it is natural, inevitable, and our business at this point is the logic of events and pass on to the examination of the root of the evil. We are opposed to all aggression, but for labor's aggressions there are many excuses. To those who shirk that labor is criminal, we say that capital is far more criminal; to those who sophistically talk about labor's overstepping the bounds of legitimate warfare, we say that it does not lie in monopoly's mouth to make such a charge, for its original and graver offenses are the cause of labor's transgressions. Monopoly's tears excite no sympathy, labor's violence arouses no indignation. Monopoly cannot expect to retain a monopoly of the weapon of force forever.

Labor is slow, but it is gradually learning the tricks of monopoly and will master the whole science before long. Let those who preach peace, order, and fairness to labor see to it that monopoly does not render these things impossible by a régime of violence, fraud, and crime. Let those who favor orderly strikes create conditions under which orderly strikes could hope to succeed. Despise capital of its unfair advantages; give labor opportunity; insist on a fair field. Labor's violence is the violence of despair and hopelessness. Such violence cannot be prevented, it cannot be reasonably con-
demned. Unless steps are taken in the direction of equity, there will be more violence. If force is continued to be used by the authorities, and sophistry by the editors, nothing will save them from the wrath of outraged victims, not even the efforts of the radical reformers, who realize the futility and danger of so-called revolutions.

Inopportunism.

Often, while admitting the strength of the Anarchists' central proposals, Opportunities, or, as they might better be called, Inopportunistas, argue that we cannot hope for a complete realization of our plans at once, and must be content to take one step at a time. Sometimes these men will even quote from Herbert Spencer that "It is not to be expected, however, that any very marked effects are to be produced by the clearest demonstration of this truth, ... even by a demonstration beyond all question." Had they read the rest of the paragraph, they would have discovered that the whole of the book from which they quote was written to combat the very position they seek to strengthen by reference to it.

It may be very well to take one step at a time. No Anarchist is unwilling to do this, no matter how insignificant a step may seem, provided that step be on the road to freedom. But not one step will we move in the opposite direction, for we believe with John Morley that "a small and temporary improvement may really be the beginning of a great and permanent improvement..." The same form, if it be not made with reference to some large progressive principle, and with a view to further extension of its scope, makes it all the more difficult to return to the right line and direction when improvement is again demanded.

Now this is just what the Opportunist does not understand. He is after anything for a change, and tells us, "You fellows never want to do anything practical," because we refuse to howl for government control of railways, telegraphs, etc. His position is that not of the man who claims that these industries will be a source of profit after rent and interest are abolished, because they are by their very nature monopolies, and so much under the control of the community, that he often believes this; but he hopes to derive some immediate benefit from the nationalization of them.

As a Socialist, the Opportunist knows well enough that our economic ills are due to the creation of surplus value, and that as long as rent and interest remain unalloyed, nothing can be of any but the most trifling importance. He knows also that, today at any rate, no matter what he may hope for in the future, politicians are strictly dishonest, mere hirelings of capital and "master workmen" of the brotherhood of thieves. What can he expect from handing over "natural monopolies" to the mercy of such an outfit? The business will assuredly be mismanaged, and the loss made up by taxes which must in the ultimate be paid by labor, while any advantage that may possibly be derived will just as surely be reaped by the landlord and money-lender. Even supposing that the postal system is all that the State Socialists claim for it, they cannot show that it has added surplus value in the slightest, except as affording an opportunity for fat con-

tracts to railroad corporations. For what more may we hope from similar "reforms"?

Spencer shows us what the result of such extension of State functions must be. He sums up his case in these words: "So that, inevitably, each further growth of the instrumentalities which control, or administer, or inspect, or in any way direct social forces, increases the impediment to further modification, both positively, by strengthening that which has to be modified, and negatively, by weakening the remainder; until at length the rigidity becomes so great that change is impossible and the type becomes fixed."

Let it further be noted that which is thus strengthened is not the ideal of the Socialist, but the head centre of the present incessant system. Thus the Opportunist and all his ilk are not only hindering the Anarchists from the attainment of their ends, but are handicapping State Socialists and other reformers in a similar manner.

These "steps forward" can do no possible good to labor, and only result in strengthening the present State, the arch enemy of all reform, and so we fight them to the last.

The Grand Army's Indiscretion.

The Grand Army may see some of the results of its disrespect for President Cleveland. In refusing to march under a banner bearing his image, in denouncing him, and in burning members of his cabinet in effigy, they brought his high office into contempt. They should not merely have looked at Cleveland, but at the Presidency of the United States. If they should have looked at one, you discredited the other. By bringing the Presidency into disrepute, the Grand Army show an amazing lack of understanding regarding the theory they represented when they fought. This confirms the growing belief that they did not know what they were fighting for.

Now, when three governors are opposing Federal laws, and thousands of working-men are resisting it, we see the effect of their bad example.

The G. A. R. must be careful, or they will kill the goose that lays the golden eggs. If the opposition to the Federal government continues to grow, it will not be able to pay them half a million dollars a year in pensions.

It is useless for Editor Hudspeath, of the "Western Laborer," to try to comprehend Liberty's objections to woman suffrage. Liberty's arguments are addressed to those who are at home in scientific politics, not to half-baked reformers who confound equal freedom with Populist absurdity.

It is proper to warn the pioetates and their hirelings in Europe and America that they are going too far. Their attempt to suppress all freedom of speech and of the press, their reckless disregard of the elementary principles of political freedom that have been dear even to the bourgeois, will not be tolerated. Too slow, keep cool, gentlemen. Don't invite disaster.

The excited politicians in France are overdoing it. Their little reaction is not causing anybody any sleepless nights. They will be thanked by the dynamiters for the friends which they are rapidly making for the method of violence. The anti-press laws will, of course, be ignored and laughed at, while the mere attempt to suppress the freedom of speech does discredit the so-called Republican government with all liberal elements of society.

Judge Cooley, of Michigan, is a great authority on constitutional law, and his opinion of Cleveland's course in this instance is interesting. In his letter of endorsement he said: "I am specially gratified that a great and valuable lesson in constitutional construction has been settled for all time with remarkably little bloodshed." The constitutional question is one that involved in Federal invasion of a State without the consent or sanction of the Governor, and we think that it has been settled for all time by Cleveland. How? By a masterly argument and analysis? No, by violence, little bloodshed. Now we know how great constitutional questions are settled. Deeds should not lose courage. The newspapers and judges and officials are now against him simply because he was weaker than Cleveland; had he been stronger, law and order would have stood on his side, and he would have settled the great constitutional question. Judge Cooley is probably unaware of the fact that he is guilty of encouraging and inciting to violence. He indirectly glorifies dynamite. Nothing, he implies, is needed to settle any great legal question except force. He who succeeds is the master and lawgiver.

Mr. Fisher misconceives Liberty's object in referring to General Walker's attitude on the currency problem. In pointing out the more or less any other economist, because I consider his "authority" more potent than Mr. Fisher's alleged arguments, but because it is Mr. Fisher's habit to sneer at "mutual bankists," and others who entertain views different from his, as cranks and quacks and ignoramuses. Liberty can take care of any argumentative weapon Mr. Fisher has at his disposal. It is only to indulge in indiscriminate accusations of ignorance, the only way to silence him is to show him that those who are at the head of his own school are out of sympathy and patience with the exploded notions and crude little dogmas that the small fry among the economists still seriously propagate as the self-evident truths of science. It has been true that General Walker may be in error on other points than that referred to by Liberty, but his errors are not the errors of a quack or crank. Mr. Fisher's observation that the evil felt from the appreciation of gold is not owing to restriction of currency, but only to the consequent unsatisfactory values, is question begging. The appreciation of gold unsettles the balance of trade, and makes evil, but the attempt to do the world's business on a gold basis is productive of other and greater evils than the unsettlement of values. General Walker distinctly declares that the demand for money is not and cannot be satisfied under monometallism (more correctly, under a gold standard, for a standard of value and of currency are two distinct things), and it is obvious that a money famine cripples production and exchange, crushes the small businesses, and keeps labor in subjection. These are graver evils than the unsettlement of values, and it is chiefly as a remedy for them that mutual banking is advocated.
Federal interference in the railroad strike is said by many to constitute an argument for government control or ownership of railways. If it should be true, it would not hold in such interference an argument for free and competitive mails instead. The "United States mails" are words inspiring awe, and obstruction of a mail train, which plutocratic judges construe to mean any train to which a mail car is attached, brings the strikers within the jurisdiction of the Federal government. But private mails would be no more sacred than private apples or hogs or rails.

The "Western Laborer" tells its readers that Liberty devoted the entire editorial page of one of its issues to prove that the "Laborer's" argument is without force. This is untrue. Liberty devoted two columns, about one-half its editorial space in the issue in question, to the "Laborer's" argument. In competition, it (1) to its statements about the postal service, (2) to its pleadings about the lack of competition, (3) to the relation between monopoly and competition, and (4) to the true secret of monopoly. Why not adhere to facts, Mr. Huldspeth?

The proposition to make Pullman pay a proportionate part of the assessment rendered necessary by the Illinois law providing for the payment of damages to the victims of riots and disturbances, is denounced by a newspaper in one of the principal cities of the country as "for sale." The "Laborer" is better to buy than to have it forced on one at a monopoly price, as at present. This is order for sale means Anarchist.

The London "Standard" quotes a preface of the latest book by "Anarchist outrages," the aphorism of labor, that "it may become necessary to sacrifice liberty in order to save civilization." Bills abolishing trial by jury, free speech, and other manifestations of liberty are favored as steps necessary for the preservation of civilization. It is curious how words take the place of ideas with some people who pretend to be sober and prudent. Shall we sacrifice liberty for the sake of saving? What is civilization but a synonym of liberty? Electric cars, telephones, and sensational newspapers are not civilization; moreover, they are not threatened by anybody. Nor is government civilization, since every thinking person knows that at best government is represented to be an organization for the defense of property. Unfortunately governments will not be allowed to sacrifice liberty in order to save themselves or anything else; after liberty is gone, there is nothing worth saving, and the dynamiter will have the sympathy of many who are now indifferent to him.

The New York "Sun"'s hatred of Cleveland has overcome its devotion to the interests of the brothel-owners of thieves, and dictated an admission that is dangerous in the extreme. The plutocratic mouthpieces have loudly protested that Governor Alger's constitutional objections to the railroad strike were legitimate quibbles, and that Cleveland merely performed a plain and imperative duty. But now read carefully this Machiavellian utterance of the man whom (to use its own language) "stole the country" and "ruined his country" with Cleveland during the crisis and gave him the "best, the most unwavering and most unceasing aid and approval": "If it had been customary to look immediately to the general government for protection against such disorders as Debs's, the country would naturally have passed through the crisis with far less painful anxiety. . . . Happily, however, in the twos years since 1892, Mr. Cleveland had experienced a radical change of impulse or of mind. United States troops were sent to Chicago with an impetuosity bordering on the zeal of the converted heathen, with an outraged people and to atone for the crime of the past. There was no preliminary communication, we believe, with the Governor of Illinois, to make sure of the power or impotence of that State to cope with the difficulty; but Federal troops were sent to Chicago with unprecedented haste, and the President had declared himself for the unbalanced rule of law, for the preservation of order, and for the submission of a people, and against the right that he had smiled at two years before, with a solemnity as though not one such exertion were in search of law for its justification. [Italics mine.] Here we have intimations that Governor AlgLert was entirely right, and that Cleveland's interference was really an act of usurpation. And because this is the case, all the aid and sympathy of the benefactors of monopoly. Great is "law and order!"

Not Against Free Banking.

The Editor of Liberty:

Mr. A. L. Dunlop's criticism of an article in the July-September number of Liberty is the first time that some of its statements reached my notice indicating that the critic has understood the spirit of my suggestions. It is very discouraging to find that scores of critics have failed to follow the line of reasoning, and my only comfort is that "gainst us advance gods even fights. a vate." Permit me to make one remark in regard to Mr. Ballou's contribution.

The rebuke contained in the fourth paragraphs is due to a faulty composition on my part. The sentence criticized was "I am just as ready against the advocates of free banking as the context appears to indicate, but was directed against those who, while professing to defend liberty, are opposed to any extension of the national banking system, regarding what would practically be free banking with a ferocious superfi- 1

Discussion, Sham and True.

[From Life.]—Mr. Fawcett raises the question why some of the governments in the old world, which were governments on a vast scale, were not abolished. It is that they were in so inconstant purely government by discussion. It is true that they discussed first, but after they had discussed and come to a conclusion by voting, the government continued. There is this mistake, that the latter part vitiates the former. If people are after discussion to vote and use force, they will not discuss anything. And in proportion as discussion becomes more perfect, will the force necessary to attain the same purpose be increased. The two proceedings, discussing, reasoning, and persuading, and then voting and using force, are inconsistent and incompatible. If the appeal be to reason, it cannot be, for the power of reason and power are contrary. Let us then take the next great step in progress, and in the moral advancement of humanity, and make the appeal entirely to reason, conviction, and persuasion. Let us be ruled by intellect and virtue, like free men, not slaves by the lash. The whip is for the tyrant, the crutch, in the words of the poet, who at your word, and takes your wives and daughters and property from you as he pleases; this is the man to whom we are just as free, and in the same way as he is the aggressor. To our fellow men in all other cases we have no right to use any other force than that of reason and persuasion. Then let us aim by securing this government, which is altogether simple and in reality, and we shall inaugurate a new and brighter era than that even of the Greek and Bulgarian revolutions, an era when human beings will conquer new realms in literature, art, and science, which shall eclipse all the glorious of the past, when the keeping of the peace and the punishment of crime will be an inferior occupation, a mere humble adjunct of government by discussion, and will be delegated to a different class of men, and kept quite distinct from the higher function.

Anarchist Letter-Writing Corps.

The Secretary wants every reader of Liberty to send in his name for enrolment. Those who do so thereby pledge themselves to write, when possible, a letter every fortnight, on Anarchism or kindred subjects, to the "target" assigned for Liberty for that fortnight. All, whether members or not, are invited to lose the opportunity of informing the secretary of suitable targets. Address, Stephen F. Dyer, East Hardwick, Vt.

Suggestion No. 8.—Don't be discouraged when some targets prove difficult to reach; and don't always assume that there is no effect when you don't see it.

Target, section A.—Elbrae Mone, Marion, Ind., had a letter in "The Voice" of July 12, against the proposition that the woman suffrage question be settled by a majority vote of women. He says, "Legislas tive enactments cannot create human rights. Nature has done this; and the only just function of our laws is to secure us in the exercise of natural rights. The laws of the land frequently conflict with natural rights, and are thus far wicked—simply acts of conquest of the strong over the weak. . . . Neither can a majority of the women have a moral right to determine whether the minority has the right to vote. . . . If one woman in the State wants a voice in making the laws which shall govern herself, her property, and her children, no number of men or women have any moral right to deny her."

Section B.—St. Clair Kelty, editor of the Brooklyn (N. Y.) "Eagle," spoke at Roseland Park, July 4, on "The Sale of Law," as illustrated by the sugar schedule and the Tammany police. He said toward the end: "The effect is to create Anarchy and to multiply Anarchists. When administration becomes criminal, no action is too black-hearted to be defended as a black-hearted or black-hearted law. When rulers become robbers, the band of allegiance is broken. If these evils were not redressible, if these effects were not terminate, capital as a corrupter and governor would be as black-hearted as a black-hearted law. And seriously perish from the earth. Better the imperfect Anarchism of the chaos of all law than its conversion into commonplace results. If this country has black-hearted law, . . .
The Beautes of Government.

"The road of the just is full of trodden paths, of unexpected flowers; and he whose soul is enlightened in this school of nature will walk out of storms and darkness with all the assurance that the path upon which he treads is promised by the presence of the tree or bush. The apple-tree bears apples, the cherry-tree cherries; violet- plants yield violet-flowers, and Holly-hocks Hollyflowers. It is delirium."—Steventon.

WHAT COULD WE DO WITHOUT THE POLICE?

The investigation of the police by the Civil Police Department, by the legislative committee, has, with evidence sufficient at least to justify moral conviction, established the fact that any one who wishes to enter the police force, in no matter what his qualifications, has to purchase his place by the payment of at least $300. The policeman so appointed, therefore, knows that in order to obtain his position he has had to bribe some body among his superiors, and that this somebody has not only accepted, but exacted, the bribe. The policeman naturally concludes that getting money by acceptance, in the highest degree, is becoming his superior, at least those among them to whom his $300 have gone, not as a punishable offence, but as a matter of business. The policeman further concludes that getting money by acceptance, not only is not discovered, but that several among his superiors will afford him protection if he does the same thing within the sphere of his power and opportunites, and he will be justified in thinking that he is even expected to do this, in order, in the first place, to recover the sums with which he bought his way into the force. Thus the policeman, however pure originally, has not been allowed to become an exception, but has been seduced from the very start seduced to do corrupt things.

Liberty.

In the same manner the evidence produces the most horrid situation in the force to be regularly paid for, the charge for a police capateny being about $10,000—several times the amount of a year's salary. The moral effect of this transaction upon the police captain need hardly be described. When he meets certain of his superiors he knows that the bribe money he had to pay for his place went straight into their pockets, and that they not only could not be discovered, but that they could actually do things, but naturally expect him, and have substantially authorized him, by first emptying his pockets, to do them in a similar way by taking advantage of his opportunities.

Thus the police force, in all its grades, is systematically introduced into corrupt practices by the very manner in which each man gains his place. These men see with their own eyes how, in order to make this initial bribery possible, the civil service law is most shamelessly violated, how pupils of candidates and all sorts of fraudulent devices are resorted to, not only without any opposition from the chief, but with their known connivance, and even at their instigation. But they see more. They see in all the branches of the municipal service which they have occasion for observing, systematic arrangements for making use of the public expense, they see the whole city governed by the absolute control of an irresponsible organization of men "on the make," they see the chiefs of that organization rapidly getting rich in mysterious ways, and they find themselves employed in cooperating in the most daring election fraud to keep that organization in power. Thus the police, which should be the organ of the authorities in matters of public peace and security and in enforcing the laws, is not only introduced in corrupt practices at the start, but it is constantly and systematically the victim of ignorance of law in politics by methods in the criminal perversion of its power and opportunities for selfish ends.

The force of common sense dictates that the organization of the police be improved, that the criminal perversion of its power and opportunities be stopped.

The police, which are the organ of the community. What has shocked many of our good people most severely in the course of the present administration is the exposure of this protection afforded by the police to disorderly houses in their precincts; consideration of certain regular payments, thus making the protection of vice appear as a regular source of revenue to the same officers who are appointed to aid in the suppression of the same. Under these circumstances, the habit of vice a police captain has in his precinct the greater will be his revenue. Police captains therefore notoriously desire to be put over those precincts in which such haunts of sin exist where they consider themselves slighted and wronged in their fortunes when they are exiled to districts which are exceptionally clean. It is not surprising, therefore, that under this system, police captains will find it in their interest not only not to suppress existing disorderly houses, gambling halls, and the like, but to encourage the establishment of new ones. The excuse has existed of some other things, in order to allow him to jump out of the window, in order to regain his liberty. About this time, too, he declares, that his wife began refusing to cook his meals and mend his clothes, but always cooked and darned promptly for Hinch. Hinch likewise mortified and injured him in even worse ways than this.

Blankart had to mortgage their home on Arndt street for the pur,use of raising money to go into the grocery business; that with the money she rented a house and store on Moran street from Hinch; has been charged with being a common Public enemy, while Blankart, as manager, and without consulting Blankart, Hinch taking the money and Blankart kept from knowing how much was paying or not. Blankart was finally forced to take his meals away from home, and when he complained Hinch laughed at him. Hinch has gone riding with her and took her to a Put-in-Bay excursion, andadid this in order to get him to refuse to get his meals all, but told him he couldn't go anywhere else to sleep, because nobody would have him in their house at night.

To pay $3,000 a being more attractive.

A remarkable case has been on trial in Judge Hotch- man's court the past week. One of the parties to it is Blankart, a mild, elderly German, with a diminutive appearance, who has been working at life and having to live alone; he had in a hotel in the last four years. Mrs. Blankart, the other party chiefly concerned in the suit, is a German housewife, who is separated from her husband and accused of a shameful conspiracy with Hinch against Blankart. The witnesses were mainly substantial, plain German neighbors and relatives, who seemed to want to tell the truth. The case as set forth is as follows: In 1873 John Blankart married his wife, Elizabeth. All went well according to him until one fatal night five years ago, when he found his wife, who was staying with Hinch. It was a dance at Arl Berber House. As usual at dances, according to the poet, all went as merry as a marriage bell on a merry marriage bell got badly cracked; there was only jangling and discord. Adolph, he declares, like the camel that once got his nose into his tent, pushed himself in until he filled the room, not even a corner for Blankart. Blankart hardly knew exactly when this occurred; it was done so gradually and, unobtrusively. First, at Mrs. Blankart's invitation, Hinch came to stay and has never gone away. He began to take charge of affairs, to be the boss of the house; to order the wife about and even to boss the children. Blankart frequently told him he didn't want him around the premises, but Hinch paid no more attention than if he had been the head of the family and Blankart the boarder. In fact, he had ordered Blankart out of the house. Mrs. Blankart, says the complaining husband, went to different places and did not return until late in the morning. By 8 o'clock the next day, the house was practically empty, and Blankart evidently began to reflect that the trouble was going on.

As he told a friend, "I can't prove anything, but even a blind man can see." In July he was sitting in the front yard to keep cool when his wife came out and ordered him to go in. Instead of obeying her he began to argue with her and tried to persuade her that he was nothing doing any particular harm out there. Whatever effect this had or his wife, Hinch was not convinced. He came out with the how, turned the water on Blankart and drove into his house, which was sleeping on the sofa of a Sunday afternoon, while Hinch and his wife were present, some one filled his mouth with red pepper. That caused him after the manner of red pepper, even to bathe him with the pain of his lips and mouth, but what made him still laugh was the laugh of his wife as she was wakening and choking. He began reproving her for allowing such tricks to be played upon her husband. Hinch, according to Blank- hart, admitted in telling the police how he had been lecturing her for her little offense like that, for he came up behind him and dealt him a blow which fell him to the floor. Blankart then ran upstairs to a room in which Hinch lived and considered himself slighted and wronged in their fortunes when they are exiled to districts which are exceptionally clean. It is not surprising, therefore, that under this system, police captains will find it in their interest not only not to suppress existing disorderly houses, gambling halls, and the like, but to encourage the establishment of new ones. The excuse has existed of some other things, in order to allow him to jump out of the window, in order to regain his liberty. About this time, too, he declares, that his wife began refusing to cook his meals and mend his clothes, but always cooked and darned promptly for Hinch. Hinch likewise mortified and injured him in even worse ways than this.
BLASPHEMY AS A CRIME AND SANCTION.

(Letter.)

To some of our readers it may seem late to notice the prosecution of C. C. Moore, of the "Blue Grass Blade," Lexington, Ky., for the crime (of) "blasphemy." The following is a copy of the indictment as we find it in the "Independent Pulpit," of Waco, Texas:

"PAGGSET CIRCUIT COURT.
The Commonwealth of Kentucky

[Signature]

The grand jury of Fayette county, in the name and by the authority of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, accuses C. C. Moore of the offense of blasphemy, committed as follows: The said C. C. Moore, in the county aforesaid, printed, distributed, and caused to be distributed, a certain newspaper, containing words, baseless statements, insinuating and blasphemously published, and pervading the Christian religion, and concerning Jesus Christ and the Holy Bible, in the following words, to wit: -

"When I was a man exactly like you, and had a human father and mother exactly like I had, some of the grounds call it blasphemy. When they say that Jesus Christ was born as the result of a Breckenridge-Pollard conjunction between God and a woman, I call it blasphemy, because there is no support for this belief."

Another indictment was obtained at the same time against "Mr. Moore," charging him with uttering blasphemous and seditious language. The following is the substance being the same publication complained of as being blasphemous:

"A DREAM OF JERUSALEM." [Boston Transcript.]

ATLANTA, Ga., March 10. - Mrs. J. R. Rice, the evangelist, while preaching on the street last evening, was arrested and taken before Recorder Goudel, charged with disorderly conduct. Before the beginning of the hearing she asked for time to secure witnesses, but the Recorder met her request with the reply: "I will give you a dose of Jerusa, justice," and then he sentenced her to thirty days in the count jail and to pay a fine of $30. As soon as the verdict became known, her husband, who is known as the cowboy preacher, mounted a hansom in the railroad yard and with a crowd of fifty-two thousand citizens. The crowd was entirely in sympathy with him, and threats of tearing down the city lock-up were heard on all sides, while there were threats from the police and city officials. The police force was called out to hold the crowd in check. The matter was finally laid before Attorney Clarence Cole, who declared it a case of arrest and trial and legal and proceeded to draw up the papers necessary for her release.

IGNORANCE IN THE "NEW NAVY."

WASHINGTON, May 18. - Among the serious charges that Secretary Herbert is investigating on the coast defense ship Monterey at San Francisco is one relating to the use of the hydraulic tongs which contain the big 18-inch rifles of that ship's battery. It is understood that on the recent sea cruise of the ship during the practice firing of the guns that this was thought by the officer in charge that the hydraulic mechanism for taking up the recoil needed modification. This apparatus consists of a perforated plunger working in a heavy cylinder through which water is forced. The machinists of the ship were ordered to "do " the job. The first tongs had their diameter between a quarter and a half inch. This sweeping instruction was followed, a quarter of an inch being removed, and the plunger were replaced. When the guns were worked the water would naturally pass the plungers with very little resistance, and every pipe and joint connected with the apparatus burst, flooding the turrets and necessitating repairs which will consume several days. This extraordinary and inexplicable text is quite on the gun magazine and was not totally dismantled by the recoil of the monster weapon. Ordinance officers of the ship declare that the apparatus was probably all right at the outset and not more than one-thirty-second of an inch should have been removed in any event.

PHOTOGRAPHIC Printing is nearing the perfection of any importance. How to make poor work pass for good, and to help each other in the deception, were the two animating principles. Prof. Alger's emphatic statements that the report contains one of the most interest extending all through the world. The moralist must confess something to "a goodness, when he sees that the ranks of politics, and that utter disregard of conscience which he expects in our bosses and political leaders extend downward as much as we have called the "honest laboring man." Honesty of purpose and conscientiousness are more important than prime desiderata among craftsmen. But wherever politics has imprisoned us, there has been a slight bit with it.

PUNISHED FOR IMPROVEMENTS.

[From W. S. C. U. in London Financial Chronicle.]

A few days ago we were at Messrs. Lever Bros. We got a little shed near the large factory, where we got a lot of free transportation from Liverpool to the Cheshire side of the river. In addition to the factory there are large numbers of small and masses of prime desiderata for their workers. In building their works they have done much to benefit the place, but they are fined by the local authorities as though they had done an evil in place of good to the district. The taxes are on all the improvements they have made: the greater the improvement the heavier the taxation. The Board of Trade compelled them to build the chimney of the works 150 feet high, and asked them, since the neighborhood would probably become a residential one, to make it 200 feet. They did this at a considerable extra cost, and had to pay rates on this extra cost. Between the works and Birkenhead there are many acres of uncropped land; this land pays no taxation.

HOW'S THIS FOR BAD TAPS?

[Brooklyn Eagle.]

To the Editor of the Brooklyn Eagle:

Will you not kindly publish the enclosed scrap and make an effort to have the beautiful trees saved for our city this season has so long been famous? We had the ship work on the two guns to get a permit to take the cattailers off of the trees. We intend to save our trees if possible, permit or no permit. Have we to be held to a permit in such a case? You are all powerful. Will you not help to deliver us from the plague soon?

AUGUST FINK.

THE STATE NEEDS SOLDIERS.

[London Star.]

To the Editor:

I have been nearly four years a Post Office messenger, and this is a case that because a lad may be 5 ft. 3½ in. instead of 5 ft. 4 in. he cannot pass. What difference can it make to the soldier, a boy being a quarter or half an inch shorter than the standard? Then, again, when the examination was set at the age of 18, one six months afterwards, and yet another two years after that. Numbers of lads—in fact the majority—are rejected as unfit, and yet the same lads in many cases have gone immediately and passed, what one would think a far stricter medical examination, for the Army, Navy, and Royal Marines. The truth is that the authorities wish to drive the youth into the Army, and so to make room for discharged soldiers and sailors. Moreover, you should know that we have wasted the best four years of our lives in the Postal service, years in which we could have learned a useful trade. As it is, we are fit for nothing outside the Post Office. Unless we join the army or police, we are fit for nothing outside the Post Office. Unless we join the army or police, we are not to be considered as fit for the army or police.

UNCLE SAM'S BUSINESS THICK.

[New York Advocate.]

The new postal regulation prohibiting the use of all mutilated stamps is another illustration of the stupidity and petty tyranny of our makers. In a fiftv cent square of stamps, some of the perforation is quite sure to be so wretchedly imperfect that to separate them without "getting on the grass" is next to impossible. And if we must lower forever every time we tear a corner, we demand that Uncle Sam get a science grinder to put his perforating machine in repair.

GOVERNMENT PROPERTY SACRED.

[London Truth.]

When the Hulme's last night at Portsmouth, a warrant officer on board produced to a custom house officer a parcel which he had brought home for a comrade to post in England. The parcel was tied up with a piece of government seal, and at the line. The custom house officer remarked: "That's government property. It cannot be landed," and, taking a knife, he cut the string. This is a sorry lot of a nice piece of nonsense. Supposing, however, that the custom house officer faithfully carried out the letter of his instructions before passing the string—said to have been between two and three feet in length? Has it been returned into store? Is anybody to be prosecuted for attempting to make away with it? And will the custom house officer be punished for damaging "government property" by cutting the string when he might have united the knot? Only the officials may read them.

COST OF A STATE MONOPOLY.

[London Liberty Review.]

A Treasury return, issued on the 10th inst., shows that the total receipts of the Post Office Telegraph Service in the year 1893 amounted to £2,596,313, the total expenditure having been £1,896,883 more than that amount. The total expenditure for the transfer of the Telegraph Service to the State is £50,709.

THE PENALTY AND THE CRIME.

[Boston Transcript.]

Three years ago a boy was sent to Sing Sing for 44 years for having stolen $1.50. Now it turns out that he was innocent, the real culprit having confessed, and a petition for the boy's pardon has been started.

STRIKERS CONTINUED TO WORK.

Boston, May 19. - A strong force of military and police surrounded the camp of the six thousand bakers who struck against the requirement that the master baker deposit $8000 to ($8) as a guarantee that they will sell bread of a certain weight, and made prisoners of them all. The strikers will be compelled to go to work under military supervision.
The Press Subsidized by the State.

The Postal Department of the British Government rests upon a tyrannical power assumed as a right by the government who may or may not exercise it. This power is supposed to have originated in the desire of the rulers to prevent communications, particularly those which are likely to be inconvenient to them. But in modern times it is sought to justify its maintenance upon the ground that the carriage of letters cannot be efficiently performed otherwise than by an agency embracing the whole country, and insulated from the influence of competition. There are the most overwhelming arguments against this hypothesis, and it would probably never have been invented had not the scramble for the monopoly for the monopoly be somewhat out of date and discarded. Be this as it may, most will agree that the great function of letter-carrying, which forms the bulk of the operations of the department, ought to be conducted on a fair and business-like basis.

In arranging the scale of postage, if equity or commercial principles prevailed, the cost of collecting, sorting, conveying, and distributing each kind of postal packet ought to be taken into consideration, and the charges levied ought to approximate as nearly as possible the variable expense of delivery of the average cost. It is possible and, in fact, highly probable, that the so-called profit upon the operations of the department is either a loss or a loss to the nation at large. All taxes yield revenue to the government exchequer; but every financier regards certain possible or actual taxes as injurious to the nation, and every departmental committee determines that others believe direct taxation harmful in general or in special cases, and all discriminate as to the schemes they recommend, thus showing that certain taxes or certain proportions of revenue raised are less injurious to others, and hence relatively harmful. The postal revenue, being a tax upon knowledge and commerce, is the most morally objectionable of all the taxes. To justify taxes upon knowledge would require very cogent arguments. No attempt is made by the defenders of the monopoly to deal with this point. The service, therefore, ought not to be conducted for the purpose of yielding any tangible gain to the State, unless the private pecuniary condonation can be shown to be unsustainable. However this be, each section of the working should be carried on at an equitable profit, and no section should be worked at a loss. Even if it be not admitted that the postal revenue is an evil, still equity and expediency both demand that it should be uniformly proportionate to the cost, and that no one class of the population should bear an exorbitant profit in order to yield a tax revenue while others are simultaneously exonerated or overcharged.

There is no valid reason why a book should be carried of paper than a letter, or a newspaper cheaper than a letter of monopoly of the post office does not "protect" it from competition, and the care of other packets than letters (held to include circular letters). Any packet can be carried by private enterprise, provided it does not contain a letter or a circular letter. But this is no reason why the department should go out of its way to carry non-monopoly matter at an lowered cost. It is a must useless system to regulate operations which ought to be commercial on far-fetched inquiries as to whether some branches of the trade are suppressor so much more desirable in the public than the carriage of a letter or newspaper or a bulky article of such kind and quality of business and upon the commerce of epistolary correspondence. In addition to this the number of letters for each class of books and newspapers is a trade which, in other respects, is governed by the ordinary principles of supply and demand. It can always be paid to the creditors or the distribution of bread, books, or coal. But, in order to subsidize and stimulate these "intellectual" trades, the department must carry packets (as it is alleged by the officials) at a loss, and in the most improper elucidation of all other kinds of business and upon the commerce of epistolary correspondence. In addition to this the number of letters for each class of books and newspapers is a tax which presses more heavily upon the poor than upon the rich. It will hardly be disputed that the correspondence is a great preponderance of letters, as compared with "books," etc., than does that of the rich. The well-to-do much more frequently subscribe for newspapers through post, and are much more

sured credit instead of borrowing at interest. This is another example of ignoring the fundamental difference between demand or convertible credit and deposits of money. If the banks would trade upon the currency of his private checks would court disaster. Give me time, says the needy. He does not ask nor care to have the hazardous existence in a limited amount of money. Interest is the hire of commodities sold from their owner to entrusted another person. The time of separation is a privation to the one party (in morals the temporary possession of) and a benefit to the other party. The loan of a horse, a sewing machine, a typewriter, a farm, deprives the lender and benefits the borrower. The benefit may be given gratuitously, but in business it will not be accorded without an equivalent determined by competition and the survival of the fittest.

As for the Editor's remarks and the lengthy quotation from General F. A. Walker, reinforced by quotations from Mr. Giffen, it suffices to say that argument must forever remain more potent than authority. The fact that if the fall in prices is not owing to restriction or deficiency of currency, but only to the consequent unsettlement of prices of gold and silver by injury, but no method of evading has been discovered that the general run of mankind would not produce the production of gold any cheaper, and it is inconceivable that it could admit of a much greater diminution of prices by reducing the annual supply and enable commerce to live more completely than at present from hand to mouth in gold production and consumption. If prices fall 90 per cent., then one dollar or one pound sterling would buy as much today as it did before the war. If prices fall 90 per cent., then one dollar or one pound sterling would buy as much today as it did before the war. If prices fall 90 per cent., then one dollar or one pound sterling would buy as much today as it did before the war. If prices fall 90 per cent., then one dollar or one pound sterling would buy as much today as it did before the war. If prices fall 90 per cent., then one dollar or one pound sterling would buy as much today as it did before the war. If prices fall 90 per cent., then one dollar or one pound sterling would buy as much today as it did before the war. If prices fall 90 per cent., then one dollar or one pound sterling would buy as much today as it did before the war. If prices fall 90 per cent., then one dollar or one pound sterling would buy as much today as it did before the war. If prices fall 90 per cent., then one dollar or one pound sterling would buy as much today as it did before the war. If prices fall 90 per cent., then one dollar or one pound sterling would buy as much today as it did before the war. If prices fall 90 per cent., then one dollar or one pound sterling would buy as much today as it did before the war. If prices fall 90 per cent., then one dollar or one pound sterling would buy as much today as it did before the war. If prices fall 90 per cent., then one dollar or one pound sterling would buy as much today as it did before the war. If prices fall 90 per cent., then one dollar or one pound sterling would buy as much today as it did before the war. If prices fall 90 per cent., then one dollar or one pound sterling would buy as much today as it did before the war. If prices fall 90 per cent., then one dollar or one pound sterling would buy as much today as it did before the war. If prices fall 90 per cent., then one dollar or one pound sterling would buy as much today as it did before the war. If prices fall 90 per cent., then one dollar or one pound sterling would buy as much today as it did before the war. If prices fall 90 per cent., then one dollar or one pound sterling would buy as much today as it did before the war. If prices fall 90 per cent., then one dollar or one pound sterling would buy as much today as it did before the war. If prices fall 90 per cent., then one dollar or one pound sterling would buy as much today as it did before the war. If prices fall 90 per cent., then one dollar or one pound sterling would buy as much today as it did before the war. If prices fall 90 per cent., then one dollar or one pound sterling would buy as much today as it did before the war. If prices fall 90 per cent., then one dollar or one pound sterling would buy as much today as it did before the war. If prices fall 90 per cent., then one dollar or one pound sterling would buy as much today as it did before the war. If prices fall 90 per cent., then one dollar or one pound sterling would buy as much today as it did before the war. If prices fall 90 per cent., then one dollar or one pound sterling would buy as much today as it did before the war. If prices fall 90 per cent., then one dollar or one pound sterling would buy as much today as it did before the war. If prices fall 90 per cent., then one dollar or one pound sterling would buy as much today as it did before the war. If prices fall 90 per cent., then one dollar or one pound sterling would buy as much today as it did before the war. If prices fall 90 per cent., then one dollar or one pound sterling would buy as much today as it did before the war.
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White-Flag Anarchism — A Color Line.

[Image of text]
LIBERTY 218

1836

The French authorities are in a state of alarm approaching panic over the warnings of fresh Anarchist plots. The authorities have been furnished with intelligence by the London and other foreign police, and extraordinary precautions have been taken to prevent the execution of the bloodthirsty designs. These measures are so stringent that all foreigners in France are likely to suffer inconvenience. Merely stopping to admire the architecture of the public buildings is likely to lead to arrest on suspicion, as an innocent Englishman who gazed curiously for five minutes at the Foreign Office recently. The customs inspectors have been instructed to investigate the contents of every parcel. The bill for the suppression of Anarchists, which is almost certain to pass the Chamber, is one of the most drastic pieces of legislation in history. It literally fulfills Mannock's prophecy of a period before which liberty in order to preserve civilization. It almost forbids people to think Anarchist. Certainly forbidden to mention it in a private letter. It is true that several will not a jury, amounting now to fiveusers, and one to Ceyenne. Arrangements for international cooperation against the Anarchists are now being made satisfactory progress. Germany is the principal obstacle. More complete police cooperation will undoubtedly be agreed upon.

[London Correspondence of the New York Times.]

Although it is apparent enough that the French government has promulgated new police regulations through the Chamber of Deputies by a round majority, the character of the debate on the measure produces the effect on observers of a moral defeat for the ministry. It is impossible to evade the fact that the arguments are heavily on the side of the opposition, and they are being advanced day after day, and with a greater force and weight of conviction every day. I have never known the London papers to print such full reports of a French parliamentary debate before, nor the Information of the cabinet. Notice of the speech is reported in the English papers. Thos. is clearly due to a feeling here that the whole course of the question is shared at Berlin and the centres of European politics, that revolutionary trouble is brewing in France. One gets at the root of this feeling best by examining one state-event which has been made over and over again in the Chamber of Deputies and out of it during the week, namely, that Carnot's death was principally due to the Cabinet. He had the standard of the French political, as much as to the Paris workers, or to Grévy or to the Wilson decorum scandal. One Republican newspaper has fastened attention upon the fact that as recently as Volland's numerous demonstration in the Chamber of Deputies an additional sum of $100,000 was voted to strengthen the police, and that a certain number had an annual sum of $50,000, of which four-fifths was charged to the Paris force. With all this money worse than nothing has been done. The police at Céte, Lyons, and Paris alike knew all about Cesarò, had heard his "despair" in their books for months, and purported to have him under surveillance. A drab, scrawny man, yet let him journey by rail and foot to Lyons, buy a knife, talk of his intentions, almost at random, and state the "As there is no war, no belling," as a policeman in all France. To speak plainly, these huge sums, ostensibly devoted to the police service, have been subjected to petty administrative control in central France. No official attempt is forthcoming to show by the books that the money was expended honestly. It is tacitly conceded that it wasn't. This is bad enough, but worse, there is a tradition, inherited from the republic, from the empire, was never the mark of cleanliness and efficiency set by the other departments of the government, and when it is represented really a reforming impulse. Since Andreux took the police force bodily into politics, it has been degenerating steadily, till now it produces all the vilest aspects of the Due de Morny's rule. Under the empire its heads were venal, and its ranks were filled with informers, maîtres, and agents provocateurs. At every step in the development of the police system one runs across a sordid trial of police spies, joining in plots, betraying "clique" on plotters, helping on conspiracies for their own, benefit or to entangle rival politicians upon whom their position in the question arises if they be not more detestable vermin than the bomb throwers themselves. It is to these uncanny hands that the enforcement of any new discoveries, the new labor guild, the new government, are to be committed. The other departments of the government are so contrary to the spirit of the imperial government. Meanwhile, the effect of the measure in the Chamber of Deputies has been to drive the old Radical, headed by Brienen, into an alliance with the Socialists, and this insurrectionous union is picking up recruits from the aristocratic Extreme Right of types which recall Mironne, now Philippe Égalité. There has been no such enthusiastic accession since the formation of the republic, any such consolidated opposition party. Its appearance now marks a momentous departure in French politics. Its one controlling principle will be to turn the rascals out, and, unless the face of affairs completely changes, it will literally sweep the country when the general election comes.

[Paris Correspondence of the New York Times.]

There was a great deal of anxiety, however, I found, among the liberal-minded for fear that the new law on the press and the law providing for the trial of persons accused of high treason would be carried entirely too far, and provoke a reaction which would overthrow the republic. Several gentlemen, and not all of them belonging to the extreme, were engaged in expressing an anxiety on that subject to me. They said: "If you draw the right of jury in these cases, and if you provide for private trials, of which no report will be published, where is the liberty we have contended for so long?"

[Mr. Foster's excellent argument is marred by the unsupported assertion that the use of the ballot is "essential" to the movement for the abolition of monopoly. Surely he does not want us to take the statement literally. He may regard the ballots as a method of obtaining freedom, not restriction, the play of the enfranchising and competitive principle among free agencies, the voluntary association of citizens and wage earners for mutual aid. Now, if this is the road, where does the ballot come in? To be sure, the monopolistic legislation might be repealed through the ballot, and the formation of a rival party has been urged by some Anarchists. But the feasibility of the plan is more than doubtful.]
LIBERTY. 292

The Art and Moral of Ibsen's "Ghosts."

[Post-Look.]

When Ibselin chose to found his greatest tragedy on the story of the father devouring his own children, I wonder, whether, "Herbert," "Incident," "Globe," the "Critics," and the "Literary Worlds" of that older day, or aught then corresponding to them, frowned down the primal subject for art, solely as the "Hathock" and "All about us are all at tended to in one storm" in Act I.

Act II, considered as the halting-place of the movement, corresponding to the usual Act IV., is also measurably without the maddening which has been made to be the key to explain Parson Mander's character a little more fully by means of Engstrand, a unexpectedly humorous figure as played by Mr. Roy, and this is all the more in danger of being inter rupted; for the anticipated result of Oswald's heart rending confessions to his mother is to make her tell her secret as uncircumventible. Still, she does not do so.

"Now she is going to," said a quick-witted girl behind me. "Well, so she will." She does not, because she is driven home in the phrase, "the joy of life." Miss Godfriev had played her, of suppressed impulse and tempered experience, who is confirmed in the habit of seeing her way rather by acting before setting. Yet the situation called for a more enlightened and the course of Oswald's love for Regina adds to the argument.

To tell the truth, I was so hurried on by the artistic necessity of the action that I forget the structural rules and lose sight of the fact which I realized afterwards—that it was Ibselin's art that had deceived me, but got rid of any sense of its own at all, and that the only one of this is again apparent in the stress it puts upon the moment when Mrs. Alving recognizes what Oswald means by "the joy of life," perceives the stain again, and which has retaliated the fate upon itself as at last the vanity of scheme against it. The first rivet of Ibselin's action is marked by the word "Ghosts." The second rivet is its speech to "Godfriev," "O, now I can speak," says Mrs. Alving. "Now, my boy, you will know the whole truth. And then you can choose. Oswald? Regina?" Mander's entrance stops her from this, and she tells of her proposal to send Regina to England and Oswald's interference making the truth still more imperative. Then again she is stopped by a different solicitude—"The play is on fire!"

Useful as this event is in the second act, it had other uses, too. From the first it was prepared for, and it provoked considerable comment on Mrs. Alving as well as on the pension. It is not so easy to rate Ibselin's playcraft too high; and as for the critic who finds nothing in "Ghosts" but "a note book stolen from a dissecting table," one feels tempted to say that he has seen the play within it seeing it for never was scientific note-book rich as this in the artist's way of seeing and the dramatist's way of putting his divination.

Parson Mander's portraiture is not forgotten in the powerful dramaturgy of the closing act. His professional skill, his shrewdness, make of conventional morality receives a satire both biting and smooth, that puts the last polish on the picture. The vulgarity that lurks in Regina's character is not unjustifiably for, when in Ibselin's "Lear," the sharpness, the yearning, the absence of self safety, the avowed inexplicable, she resents her wrongs—is next revealed to the life, and then, with the stage clear for the catastrophe, the last act is the effect of the. Mrs. Courtney Thorpe's boyish boredom soldiers the true intuition all along in the lighter utterances of his first appearances as Oswald. Again, in the desolate anger and the impelling passion, and then in his selfish absorption in his plans to meditate his devious future, his every eccentric was the right one and the only one of his difficulties he put the only climax, he was marvellous, just where Mrs. Godfriev, as it seemed to me, began to fall in the integrity of her person. Oswald's part had been that of the victim; in this act it becomes the revolutionary. His recklessness toward the border sharpener of Greteis, more bitter than the daggers Hamlet spoke to Queen Gertrude. For the theme of "Ghosts" is not merely that the sins of the fathers will fall upon the children; that is but the initial and more commonplace half of the motive. The supplemental half is the sin of the mothers' perversity,—their crime against their own offspring, against those who are their own men and women, or duty to "Law and Order" shall save them from reaping the woes appointed for themselves and their seed. And this responsibility is what the mothers escape, says Ibselin, nor the judgment shall they evade, for all their shirking and juggling. The cry of this age for the freedom of women to be indeed responsible results in the recognition of women as men.

This conception of Mrs. Alving's share in the drama was not perfectly brought out by Mrs. Godfriev. If it had been, her star would not have pulsed at the last in tragic fire beside Oswald's. It would have burned with a more awful light in a culminating thank the fullest powers of a tragedy queen. The moral side of "Ghosts" is, to my mind, you see, merged in the artistic, and the high quality of the twain is so incontestable that I am out of all patience with the blindness of those who regard the play as doctoral, as a mere play of the brain, and left the colorless, dull, and the labor love delights in. And when they talk of the pessimist Ibselin, who preaches the gloomy gospel of life's futility, a deep sense is that they should appreciate and honor the optimistic Ibselin, true artist and poet, who, through the via dolorosa, guides to health and pleasure, to the joy of life and work. And is this not against which are published in "Ghosts."

The New Theatre in Germany.

[From the New Monthly.]

The tendency of the German to reason about everything, leads him to put emphasis on the point that the theatre should be a school of manliness. But Germany has more dramatic critics who regard a play a moral point of view. Without insisting that the drama should teach a direct lesson, the German critic realizes that in any interpretation of life by art there always will be something taught, salutary or harmful, and that it is a matter of the first importance that this lesson should be salutary. An interesting evidence of this is the establishment of two theatres in Berlin, by Bruno Willis, where representations are given to subscribers who form a society. The oldest of these, which is nearly four years in existence, is directed by the Socialist party. This party owned Willis from this theatre because he was considered too much of an Anarchist, and the second theatre, which is true Anarchist, but one who is an enemy of all violence. Both theatres are prosperous and number their adherents by thousands. Their objects is not to build a political or religious party, but simply, as the laws of the societies declare, to offer their members, in return for a very small monthly contribution, the opportunity of seeing fine works of art, dramatic or musical, or of hearing lectures at which these works are commented on and explained.

The Kind State?

It appears that in Russia the peasants to some extent have been paying their taxes out of money lent to them by the State. Money was lent on grain by the government, but since the grain was sold as a tax, the government, etc., the warehouse raifare was lowered in certain directions. What the State always does is to rob you of your own money and then you back the pl. Kind, honest, truthful, clever State!