On Picket Duty.

The French Parliament has passed the drastic "Anti-Anarchist" bill. It is safe to wager, however, that its press classes will remain a dead letter.

All signs seem to point to an explosion. The blind fury of the powers that be, the ignorant and unprincipled course of the press, the prevailing industrial depression, the bitterness of the proletariat, everything makes for war and confusion. But what then, after the explosion? Labor is not ready for any permanent solution of its problem. Whatever our feelings may prompt, the judgment finds no satisfaction in the prospect of a revolution which will do nothing for the social revolution.

The plutocratic editors are nominating Senator Davis for the presidency. Senator Davis is an obscure person, whose sudden prominence is due to a speech or two he made in defense of Pullman, Cleveland, & Co., and in opposition to the rebellious strikers and their sympathizers. Is the brotherhood of thieves so weak and servile as to offer such a reward for a word in its behalf? Hardly; the explanation of the Davis boom is that American editors are sillier than schoolboys.

The French journalists resent the charge that journalism is a trade instead of a profession, and the individual who made it is compelled to fight a duel with a representative of the outraged fraternity. Imagine an American journalist being guilty of such silly and sentimental nonsense! What are words to him? If there is more money in journalism as a trade, then he will be proud of his trade. The French are stupid enough to cherish ideals; the American presses have forgotten even the meaning of the word. They laugh at everything but the dollar, and would surely eat their own mothers (since, as Rosecrans remarks, it is only a sentiment that keeps us from putting our mothers to such practical use) if business required it. They have become spies, blackguards, impostors, why not cannibals? What a fine story it would make, the description of how it feels to be a human being! I advise the sensational and special-feature papers to consider this scheme.

All liars have short memories, especially the newspaper liars. The very papers which have fiercely denounced Cleveland for his "dictatorial" letter on the tariff to Congressman Wilson and his alleged attempt to influence legislation in contempt of the constitution, traditions, propriety, and what not, were among his most ardent supporters during the great railroad strike, his interference in which they claimed to be eminently proper. That is, to order troops to a State without any communication with the Governor is not a menace to constitutional safeguards, but to write a private letter to a member of Congress on a measure of general interest is a dangerous precedent and an act of usurpation! This, however, is not as irrational as it seems to be. In the strike, Cleveland came to the aid of monopoly, and was welcomed in the tariff controversy, he came near upsetting the conspiracies between the conservative Senators and a few trusts, and was therefore sent about his business with considerable warmth.

The "Iowa State Register" criticizes the trades assembly of Des Moines for voting to boycott those Chicago papers whose attitude in the great strike was particularly shameless and outrageous. It admits the guilt of the papers, but pleads that it is not the business of the labor organizations to edit the newspapers. On the same principle, if a shoemaker calls an editor a thief and a scoundrel, the editor must continue to buy his shoes of the offending shoemaker, for it is not the business of the editor to run a shoe shop. Hasn't a man a right to choose his shoemaker or baker or bootblack or editor? Why is it improper for workmen to refuse to buy papers that persistently lie and misrepresent them? Compelling a man to be decent by threatening him with the loss of his favor is one of the most natural and inexcusable ways of enforcing fair play. It is an indirect interference with his business, but since when has such interference been illegitimate? It is curious to observe into what inconsistencies men are led by the lack of guiding principles. They will sanction the plainest aggressions, the most obvious infringements of fundamental rights and, shake their heads at the most indirect and insidious methods of enforcing respect for one's rights.

The immigration bill introduced by Lord Salisbury in the House of Lords contains a provision as follows: "Whenever one of her Majesty's principal secretaries of State shall have reason to believe that for the preservation of the peace and tranquility of any part of this realm, or for the prevention of crimes within or without the dominions of Her Majesty, it is expedient to remove from the realm any alien who may be in it, it shall be lawful for the secretary of State to cause an order under his hand to be served personally upon such alien, or to be published in the 'London Gazette,' if personal service in the opinion of the secretary of State be not practicable, and such order may direct that the alien named therein shall depart this realm within a specified time; and if such alien shall knowingly and willfully refuse or neglect to pay obedience to such order, or shall be found in any part of the realm contrary to such order, after the service or publication and after the expiration of the time limited in such order, such alien shall be guilty of misdemeanor, and, being convicted thereof, shall, at the discretion of the court, be adjudged to suffer imprisonment for any time not exceeding one month for the first offense, and not exceeding twelve months for the second or any subsequent offense." Not only would this provision abolish the right of asylum at one stroke, but, so far as aliens are concerned, it also does away with the freedom of speech in England. The killing of a tyrant could not be applauded or even excused by any foreigner; such an act as Auberon Herbert's, on the ethics of dynastic philosophy, written by an alien, would render him liable to expulsion, as the opinions expressed would certainly be found to be dangerous to the peace of the realm by any official. The Liberals are opposed to the measure, and it will fail. But the American newspapers are perfectly willing to have such a bill enacted here; they can see nothing in it that is inconsistent with American freedom, or their notion of it.

Free Womanhood.
(Charlotte Perkins Gilman.)

Can you imagine nothing better than that which you have always had before? Have you been so content with "wife and mother" You dare hope nothing more?

Have you forever prized her, praised her, sung her, the happy queen of a most happy reign? Never dishonored her, despised her, flung her Partition and disdain?

Go ask the literature of all the ages! Books that were written before woman read! Pagan and Christian, Satirists and Sages! Read what the world has said!

There was no power on earth to bid you slacken The generous hand that painted her diadems! There was no shame on earth too black to blacken That much-praised woman-face!

Eve and Pandora—alive you begin it The Ancestors called her, Sin and Shame and Death! There is no evil without woman in it! The modern proverb sale.

She has been yours in uttermost possession! Your slave, your mother, your well-chosen bride— And you have owned in million-fold confession You were not satisfied.

Peace, then! Fear not the coming woman, brother! Owning herself she giveth all the more! She shall be better woman, wife, and mother Than man hath known before!
Liberty
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"In estabishing root and interest, the last shrillings of old-time death, the foxtrot evolution of a stroke the of the executioner, the all of the inhuman, the conviction of the department clerk, all those doctrines of Politics, which young Liberty forever hatred to."

"- Pugwash.

The appearance in the editorial column of articles over other signatures than the editor's initial indicates that the editor approves their central purpose and general tenor, though he does not hold himself responsible for every phrase or word. But the appearance in other columns of articles signed by other writers by no means indicates that he disapproves them in any respect, or disposes of them governed largely by motives of convenience.

Government and the Bomb-Throwers. George E. Macdonald publishes some comments in the "Truthseeker" on the theory and practice of bomb-throwing. They are decidedly too violent. There is no good reason for Mr. Macdonald's indignation, anger, and hatred. He should discuss the subject more philosophically. If he did, he would not be guilty of such a falacy as that hidden in his comparison between the official dynamiters, the governments, and the unofficial ones, like Caserio and Vaillant. The government, says Mr. Macdonald, with all its faults and injustices, at least professes and attempts to distinguish between the guilty and the innocent; it tries accused persons; it establishes their guilt in some way before punishing them. The dynamiters, on the other hand, punish the guilty and innocent alike. They blow up people without trial or conviction.

How superfluous all this is! If the revolutionists' case against governments rested solely or even mainly on faults and blunders committed in their courts of justice, the criticism of Mr. Macdonald would be a valid one. If the official dynamiters say, "You governors do not try people properly; your courts are not just; you do not protect the innocent well enough and do not punish the guilty as they deserve; to make you more just, we will dynamite you and your families and friends," —if they said this and proceeded to throw bombs, they would be open to Mr. Macdonald's charge of being even worse than the governments. But their case against the governments rests chiefly on the crimes and blunders that never reach courts of justice. By its monopolies, privileges, taxes, and aggression of all kinds, the State condemns millions of men, women, and children to starvation, death. These are real trials and found guilty of anythings; their punishment is inflicted without any formalities; they are innocent of wrong-doing. And it is this violation of equity and freedom which is responsible for the terrible condition of the masses of the innocent people, —for their poverty, enforced idleness, vice, and sin, —for the bomb-throwers to seek to punish.

Most of those whom the government does try and punish under form of law are driven into criminal careers by its own injustice.

Of course, the bomb-throwers are not philosophers; they punish individuals for systems and institutions which, however wrong, cannot be always traced to the conscious wickedness of anybody living or dead. But human nature is human nature. No revolution, no revolt, is philosophical. In all revolutions, in all wars, innocent people are bound to suffer. Even the soldiers of an invading army are not always the worst offenders; the invading and invaded new reigns are ordered to do so by their superiors. Yet do those who resist invasion refrain from punishing these innocent soldiers? In the war between the masses and the classes, neither side is philosophical, neither side wholly innocent. Those who are philosophically enough to grasp the situation, to trace the evil to its source, can do nothing but warn those who happen to occupy the position of the aggressors at this juncture, and enjoy the fruits of injustice, and educate those who happen to be the aggressed-upon, the victims. We have a right to expect a little more philosophy from those who reap the benefits of the present system than from those whom it condemns to ignorance and misery. Those are blind, cruel, inhuman, and deaf, those below cannot be blamed for being even more brutal. If the powerful show no disposition to overhaul things, examine the complaints and protests of the dispossessed, peace is impossible.

It is easy to dismiss the whole subject by saying that both the exploiters and the exploited are ignorant and unjust. This is a truism, but the struggle will not cease. The ranks of the suffering will continue to send forth philosophical champions to assert their vague claims and demand a new order of things. These champions, to arrest the attention of the heedless and demoralized plutocrats, will continue to use daggers and dynamite. All this is natural. It cannot be otherwise. But the question is, where will it end? Violence will accomplish nothing. Political education alone, given the desire to do justice, can guide us to the establishment and maintenance of a harmonious social order. As Mr. Macdonald's function is that of an educator, it is important that he should guard against a misapplication of his true principles and a misinterpretation of the facts and phenomena with which we have to deal. These are critical times, and it is not easy to preserve intellectual equilibrium. First principles should not be neglected for a moment, but the factor of human nature should also be taken into account.

The Woman-Suffrage Question.

In a recent issue of the "Twentieth Century," Ellen Battelle Dietrick, a progressive and able woman of strong individualist leanings, whose writings would have great weight and value if her economic ideas were borrowed from the shallow and exploded bourgeoisie economics, animalverts upon my position on the woman-suffrage question as stated in Liberty of June 30. I am not sure that Mrs. Dietrick understands my position, and before taking up her points seriatim, it may be well to emphasize one or two general considerations.

From the view-point of current political doctrine and prevailing political practices, there is no rational objection to woman suffrage. It is imprudence, self-stultification, and contemptible meanness for those who really believe that suffrage is a right, an attribute of sovereignty, a function of responsible and intelligent citizenship, to deny the fitness of woman for the exercise of the suffrage. To the demands and protests of the women who want the ballot, the supporters of popular government have nothing to oppose. They are beginning to perceive and admit it, for the average Republican or Democrat now speaks from the pulpit that the women deserve the suffrage. Liberty is not arguing from the standpoint of current political belief, however, but from that of perfect individualism, equal freedom, no-government; or, more correctly, from the standpoint of men who, believing in individualism or equal freedom, wish to do and promote everything making for that ideal of political life, and to discourage and hinder everything calculated to obstruct progress and strengthen vicious tendencies and institutions. We do not believe that men are entitled to vote; we do not regard the ballot as a corollary of equal freedom. We do not believe in government, in the sovereignty, in enforcing rules by the ballot box. The ballot is a weapon of coercion, compulsion, government, and as such we condemn it. We seek to deprive men of this weapon, to abolish all coercive government of man by man. Now, while thus fighting coercion and government, we are called upon to deal with a practical movement in favor of extending the suffrage to women to-day, in behalf of a few additional millions with the dangerous weapon of voting. Our first and natural inquiry is, will the women use this new weapon in the interest of progress or of reaction? The question is not one of right, but of expediency. The women are not entitled to the ballot not because they are women, but because the ballot is not something which can be claimed by any one under the highest law of social existence, —equal freedom. Is it well for society, for progress, that women should obtain this weapon and wield it pending the realization of the new ideal of a free society? This is the only pertinent question, and it is a question which can only be answered in the light of woman's work and experience. The Anarchists and individualists oppose woman suffrage simply and solely because they are convinced that woman's political activity would be directed tyrannically and would arrest the political emancipation of all of us. If we thought otherwise, we would aid women in their present efforts, for, as object being the liberation of liberty, we naturally favor the use of every method that leads to that result.

Having made these general statements, I turn to Mrs. Dietrick's criticisms. Of course, in meeting pro-woman-suffrage arguments, it is not always needful to refer to the general objections specified; some of the incidental and irrelevant objections are disposed of by the application of mere common sense and ordinary logic or experience.

Thus Mrs. Dietrick attempts to dispute my assertion that woman suffrage would curtail the amount of liberty we now enjoy. She remarks:

"It is one of the most amusing facts of the male creed against woman's right to self-government that we here have, on the one hand, "Y" possessing that to
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give women equal liberty with men will plunge us into "the way of the bee"... But, on the other hand, we have the scores of excited editors pronouncing woman's present possession of such liberty in Wyoming a failure because it has not resulted in any prohibition whatever! The editors of the "Omaha Bee" and many other Western newspapers affirm that after twenty-five years of equal rights of citizenship between men and women in Wyoming, the women want to gamble, those who want to drink, drink, and those who want to make themselves lower than beasts by excessive sensual indulgences follow their perverted tastes with full approval before women receive their own liberty to express an opinion in their community. 'Y' would do well to suspend his diurnal prophesying and turn to the "Omaha Bee" for comfort, for the "Omaha Bee" pronounces woman's quest of a century of freedom in Wyoming a failure on the ground that it has not resulted in "more Constable laws, more prohibition, more mending, more cost and hypocrisy, and more reform by force!" Like the Kilkenny cats, the argument of 'Y' and of the "Omaha Bee" may be left to finish each other.

Had an ordinary woman attempted to smuggle this deliverance through as a piece of reasoning, I should have witnessed the act with wonder and applause. Dr. Dick's writings have led me to expect better logic from her. What logical canon justifies her conclusion that, because certain papers have expressed views directly opposite to mine, we must both be wrong? If I say a thing is white, and another asserts that it is black, must it necessarily be green or red or yellow? May it not be white (or black) after all? It is a new kind of proof of error, surely, to show a man that somebody else squarely differs with him. The "Omaha Bee" (a paper which I read every day, and which never impressed me as a great authority on any question) complains that woman suffrage has not resulted in more prohibitive legislation, while I express the fear and believe the fact that it will lead to such legislation. Is my fear at once shown to be groundless? In the first place, the "Bee" may be ignorant of the facts and talk without any knowledge of the situation. The "Bee's" facts have to be looked into first of all. I care nothing about the "affirmations" of the newspapers. Does Mrs. Dick's book contain any facts? Has she kept track of Wyoming legislation and attempts at legislation? If she has, and can show that a period of twenty years of woman suffrage in Wyoming has not checked the progress of liberty, a evidence will possess a certain value, though it will still remain an unseated question how far special circumstances have operated to bring about a result which may be exceptional. But surely it is a wonderfully easy way to refute an opinion by citing a divergent or antithetical opinion; and had this method been countenanced by logic, it would have been used far more generally than it is. It would have saved a great many from intellectual annihilation.

The point is that it would be difficult to find a more illegal piece of rubbish than my notion of what is implied in "women's demand for active cooperation with men." I am sorry to have to charge my critique with careless reading. I expressed no opinion as to the implications of "women's demand for active cooperation with men." I said, and what Mrs. Dick quotes, is this:

"Even the most progressive and modern of the champions of woman suffrage astonished one by the audacity and ignorance of their assertions. Their favorite argument is that male government has proved a miserable failure, and that the abdication of crime, vice, and miracle is impossible without the active cooperation of women. The implication, of course, is that women are wiser, purer, and better than men."

Here, manifestly, I speak of the implication carried by the "favorite argument" for woman sufrage, not by the demand for woman suffrage. The demand may imply much, little, or nothing. When the reasons for the demand, the arguments, are disclosed, we have something to deal with: we have the arguments themselves and their implications. I mentioned a certain specific "favorite argument" and pointed out its implication. All of Mrs. Dietrick's talk is wholly irrelevant, because of her careless assumption that I had reference to the implication of the mere demand for woman suffrage. She says:

If a man and a woman enter a contract to live together (thus originating a variety of mutual affairs), in order to have the best mutual understanding and to conserve the equal rights and equal liberty of these parties; it is absolutely necessary that they should agree to live in a perfect union; to settle their affairs, when possible, by mutual and equally free expression of opinion, or, to present themselves as equals before arbitrators or judges, when required to do so, according to their settlements. This is not because the woman is wiser, purer, and better than the man, or vice versa. Nor is it because she is one of one sex and the other of the other sex. It is simply and solely because the fact that the one who is denied the right given to the other is placed in an inferior and relatively defenseless position; towards the other.

This is true, but it does not touch the point.

Mrs. Dietrick cannot logically deny that the implication of her perfectly obvious argument is that what I held to be, that "women are wiser, purer, and better than men." If the implication is not intended, there is no virtue or meaning in the argument. If women are not wiser and purer than men, their cooperation will not prevent government from being a miserable failure and will not succeed in abolishing crime and avarice.

My proposition that "for self-protection no vote is needed," Mrs. Dietrick pronounces a glaring absurdity, pointing out that the vote is merely a voice, or an expression of an opinion. Mrs. Dietrick is not a thorough-going individualist, but she ought to have a clear and complete comprehension of the position of those who are thorough-going individualists. Under compulsory cooperation, government, a vote is more than an expression of an opinion: it is, in addition, an expression of a determination to enforce that opinion. The voter hopes and expects to be with the majority and to compel the minority to do his bidding. For mere self-protection, it is unnecessary, no vote is essential. In the absence of compulsion and governmental invasion (public or private), each would buy protection as he buys bread and eggs and butter, for a sum certain, determined by competition among the insurance and police associations. There would be no voting that would bind the majority to aid the individual. For this Anarchistic ideal, Mrs. Dietrick well knows that there are possible forms of political cooperation under which rights may be fully secured without the voting institution. Take Carlyle's ideal of a benevolent and just despotism. Men may enjoy as much real freedom under a Monarchy as under a Republican form of government. Voting is simply an appliance, a means, and when the end is secured without it, is it not needed. Popular government means the cooperation of a large number of small invaders; the women are clamoring for a chance to do a little (a good deal, rather) of the invading. Do those who maintain that women want to vote for self-protection imply that they contemplate the formation of a party having a repeal platform and seeking to abolish all invasion and privilege? Hardly.

Referring to my comments on the action of Miss Anthony and the Rev. Anna Shaw in connection with the Kansas Populist plank on woman suffrage, Mrs. Dietrick says:

The only trouble with "Y" argument here is that its premises are a mixture in which falsehood largely predominates over the grain of truth. Neither Miss Anthony nor Miss Shaw formally declared in the Populist platform to induce the Populist State Convention of Kansas to adopt a plank in favor of woman suffrage. The Populist State Convention adopted the "Y" plank because it was invited to the platform and both expressed their fervent gratitude to Miss Anthony, and also because they speak in Populist gatherings in favor of this plank. Moreover, Miss Shaw does believe in several (though not all) of the distinctively Populist doctrines, and in regard to one or two matters, those doctrines have not yet given the subject sufficient consideration.

Mrs. Dietrick must have other sources of information than those on which most of us rely. I am not a great admirer of our newspapers, but when their accounts are not disputed, I assume them to be true, unless there are prior considerations against such an assumption. My account of the affair was based, not on the reports of one paper, but on the reports of several, including "Kite Field's Washington." As all the papers commented on the incident in rather strong language without eliciting any denial or explanation, it was entirely safe to accept the main statements as true. Mrs. Dietrick now gives a totally different version of the affair: what is her authority, and why was her version given to the general public?

But suppose my version is correct: can the question of the moral superiority of twelve million of persons, asks Mrs. Dietrick, be definitely settled by citing the moral inferiority of two persons? No, it cannot; but when the two persons are admirable leaders and their action is tacitly endorsed by thousands of followers, it is legitimate and even imperative to watch their conduct and cite it as an indication of the general state of feeling.

Space forbids the consideration of other points of minor importance raised by my critic; but even at the risk of repetition, I quote these general observations for analysis:

His position seems to be as follows: Every individual should be as free from coercion and interference as possible, therefore all women should be deprived of even the degree of freedom men now enjoy! This is the same as if one who was trying to induce the whole human race to run freely, should refuse to allow any woman even to walk. Men have learned all they know or care to know by progressive experiments in great and greater use of liberty. There is no other way under heaven for women to learn to love and respect liberty save by similar experiment, and liberty for the whole race depends upon the appreciation of it fully cherished by the whole race, not only by the male half. . . . "Y" says, "It is impossible to point out a single advantage to woman in being expected to anticipate from woman suffrage, whereas all good disadvantages would inevitably and specifically result from it." Just so much a weak, foolish mother argue in regard to allowing her infant to learn to walk. The
chief good in woman suffrage is to the women who exercise it, just as the chief good in the walking lesson is to the infant. The benefit to society in both these cases is indirect, and comes through the self-develop-ment of the real and the artificial infant, neither of whom can help society save by their own self-development.

Women are entitled, not to the degree of freedom men now enjoy, but to the largest amount of freedom compatible with equality of freedom. The ballot, the "right to vote," is not a right deducible from equal freedom, and no person can justly claim it. Men unjustly claim and exercise it, but that is a poor reason to withhold it for women. The fact that one man steals does not justify another man in attempting to steal. The vote should, and will, be taken away from men in due time, as soon as sound political ideas and the meaning of free institutions penetrate a sufficient number of minds. It is true that men have learned something of liberty (not all they know of it, by any means) by experiments in coercion. The failures of legislation have taught them the lesson of less interference. But cannot women profit by men's experience; can they not read, observe, analyze, compare, reflect? Where is history, political science, economics, ethics, and practical politics? Will the ballot do more for women than half a century of human thought and experience? The factors which have had most to do with the progressive civilization and liberalization of men are business relations, social intercourse, and the advance of knowledge. Women are but beginning to feel the influence of these factors, their educational experience being but limited, but the future is safely theirs, and their growth and education are assured.

The infant-and-walking analogy is decidedly imperfect. Infants learn to walk and never have any occasion to unlearn it. To become independent, useful members of society, infants must learn to walk. The vote, unlike walking, is impossible for the independent individual as it is inconsistent with free manhood or womanhood. Men are outgrowing it, and what we maintain is that there is no occasion for teaching it to those who can have no use for it. The thing is obsolete; its days are numbered. Men acquired it at a time when nothing better was known or possible. Now healthier and truer ideas prevail, and women can be saved from it. That the vote is a benefit to woman, is a proposition which we dispute; but even if it were admitted, the far more important question would remain whether it is a benefit which she may properly claim. A benefit at the expense of others (and a vote is a power to coerce others), is not something we are anxious to confer on any one. Teaching an infant to walk is a pleasure to the parent, a necessity to the infant, and a benefit to society, which needs self-reliant, normal members. So far as the ballot is concerned, women are infants, but teaching them to vote is a menace to society and a necessity or legitimate pleasure to none.

Since Artemus Ward's patriotic readiness to send his wife's relatives to fight for his country, there has been no thing so inspiring as the attitude of the American press on the question of a free vote. The French government, in fighting dynamite, has found it necessary to deprive the press of the right to report the trials of dynamiters. The theory of the imbeciles is that consuming vanity and thirst for notoriety are responsible for the dynamite crusade, and by interdicting all reference in the papers to the proceedings of the revolvers, they expect to rob bomb-throwing of most of its attractions. That the newspapers have some rights in the premises, that the public are entitled to know how trials are conducted, does not seem to have occurred to the statesmen. The French papers are naturally disqualified, and the public and the public must be presumed to be still less reconciled to the innovation. The American papers deplore this sad lack of patriotism on the part of the French press and public. "Free speech," they say, "is double a fine thing, but extraordinary occasions demand extraordinary measures, and if there is no other way of crushing dynamite, you ought to submit cheerfully to the sacrifice demanded of you. Of course, we sympathize with you deeply. Besides the great and sacred principles involved, about which you talk far more eloquently than we can, there is the still more important question of extra editions and additional sales. It is hard to stand the strain, and the loss of circulation to contem-poraries, think of France, think of society, think of civilization, think of the human race, think of the solar system. Dynamite threatens everything; it must be suppressed at all hazards. Submit, therefore, be resigned; the crisis will not last; your freedom and extra earnings will be restored to you." These sentiments comman-d sincere admiration; they flow from a pure and noble source. But it strikes one as queer that these good and unselfish papers generally manage to put in the parenthetical remark that here, in America, such a provision as that affecting the press in the French law would not be possible or desirable, and would probably be declared unconstitutional if enacted. Is human nature different here from what it is in France; is revolutionary nature different? If our dynamiters need the same treatment as those of France, why would anti-press laws be impossible and undesirable here? Are our papers just as heroic enough to sacrifice their French contemporaries, but unequal to any greater demand, much as the laws of their circulation? We, who enjoy an intimate knowledge of the character of our press, can never fall into the error of accusing it of want of patriotism; but the French papers, I fear, may misunderstand their American sympathizers, and suspect them of hypocrisy, humbug, and selfishness. And that would be too bad, too bad.

Santo Caserio's jury found him guilty, of course, and he will die. Even his enemies admire his boldness, courage, and cleverness. The London correspondent of the New York Times says "that the inevitable dialogue of epigrams between judge and prisoner did not differ particularly from the ordinary, save in that Case by seemed to score more than his share of the smart points made." With the exception of the statement of principles read by Caserio and parts of his advocate's address, the proceedings were fully reported in the French newspapers, yet this morning, we will do more than arm, from the standpoint of law and order, than the suppressed arguments could have caused. When Caserio told the judge that he had as much right to take life as the soldiers of the government, he doubtless found an echo in the minds of a good many non-radic-als. The judge's conduct of the trial was condemned by the Chief Secretary of the Minister of Justice. On the opening of the session he made an improper speech eulogizing the new President of France, and saying among other things: "Here, through the concourse of twelve citizens, honest, free, and just out from the body of the Nation, we shall punish the crime of yesterday and attempt to put an end, in the measure of our forces, the peril of to-mor-row." This unwarranted remark entitles Caserio to a new trial, but he refused to appeal.

Liberty was right in averring that the newspaper moralists and quietists could never act upon their own theory regarding the cure for what they call Anarchism. They hold it to be the duty of all good citizens to refrain from denouncing existing social relations and institutions, for such denunciation gives a sort of moral justification to dynamite. Yet day after day they indulge in it, and one who never sees a reform paper cannot help arriving at the conclusion that the government is full of rascals, frauds, and humbugs. The Republicans have explained the Democratic tariff differences as a war between the iron and coal trusts on the one hand, and the sugar trust on the other. Cleveland's assumption of virtue was ridiculed as much as Gorman's pretended devotion to the protective principle. The tariff reform papers told Sen. Sessions to appoint a highwayman, and that it "held up" the tariff in obedience to the command of its masters, the monopolists. Such talk makes the great papers accessories before the fact to all revolutionist outrages. How would they relish a law compelling them to approve every act of the government and every utterance of those in power?

The Boston "Advertiser" is a Republican paper whose devotion to law and order is above suspicion, yet it allows itself to use language against a branch of our glorious government which makes it an accessory before the fact to dynamite outrages. Speaking of the Senate, it says: "If there is to be a succession of legislative blockades, engineered by mercurial senatorial speculators, of silver-purchasing scandals and Sugar Trust scandals, of Russian treaty infamies and secret 'investigations' that do not investigate, if 'senato-al courtesy' is to constantly usurp the place of public duty, and the motto of the Senate be to be in tone and temper, if, in words, 'the public will be better off' pretty soon be a pretty radical change of some sort." Suppose the radical change should take the shape of a bomb explosion in the Senate chamber: would the "Advertiser" be punished for indirect encouragement of violence? How difficult is it for the champions of law and order to refrain from denouncing their own idol!

Dana, editor of the "Sun," was recently returned from Europe. To a reporter he stated that he had found Russia prosperous and quiet, nihilism being suppressed. Look out for another family and another conspiracy against the Czar. The penalty of persistent lying is inability to see things as they are even when there is no motive for misstatement.
The Defence of Jean Grave.

The following is the address made to the jury by Jean Grave’s counsel, M. de Saint Aubin, at the famous trial in 1843. It is taken from a written by a revolutionary book.

The address was greeted with applause, the barrister, the prosecutor, and the literary men present in court crowding round the advocate to congratulate him and press his hand. I copy the translation from London: "Freedom."

Gentlemen of the Jury: Those of you who have been present in the trial of l’Anisalier will verify my recollections.

Yesterday, at three o’clock, the Attorney General said: "Gentlemen of the Jury, l’Anisalier is a witch! He must be destroyed."

And his assistant for the trial of Jean Grave said: "Gentlemen of the Jury, you did not condemn l’Anisalier to death; you have done well. Your clemency is just!"

Which proves that everything in this world is relative, even the addresses of Attorney-General.

I fancy that the four and twenty hours which will follow this hearing will produce the same effect upon the brain of the Attorney General as the four and twenty hours of reflection given by the Attorney General for the trial of Jean Grave.

He will say tomorrow, if business leave him leisure enough: "The gentlemen of the jury did not listen to my argument. If Jean Grave was a witch, they did well! For, in short, it would be an everlasting reproach to me, a modern lawyer, a very advanced man (I mean to praise you, M. Attorney General), to have influenced a jury of their time to condemn a man merely because he thought and because, having thought, he had the courage to write!"

Gentlemen of the Jury, you will accept this reproach upon the Attorney General. You will acquit Jean Grave. You will acquit him for higher reasons, which will, I hope, force themselves upon your conscience and your heart.

It is to your brazen that I appeal; it is to your heart that mine solicits. Forget all prejudices foreign to the matter under discussion. The thing on its trial today is not a daguerreotype, a novel, a book. The thing is a book. It is a work of intellect; and as I see you are very calm, very kindly attentive, I may, even at the outset of my remarks, recall to you: the words of Joubert, who devoted himself to Justice as well as to Criticism: "The things of the mind must be judged by the mind, and not by tail, blood, and rumors."

And in the pantheon, the semblance of a book. It is not a melodramaturg hidden under the cover of a book. It is a real book, accepted seriously by all the people who think and reflect, a book in the doctrine of the greatest minds. And the scientific style, which shits off from the vulgar, gives it a rather repellent form, and doubtless at the present moment is actually up in the libraries or in the cupboards of noises if the law — mad with passion — of Dec., 1833, which has long claws, had not gone even into the paste to seize it in order to subject its craving for persecution.

Here is what a contemporary thinks of it. This is an article by M. Clemencon. It has this moment been passed to me. I borrow from it some lines which express my opinion.

M. Clemencon is not suspected of Anarchist; he has no interest in its triumph; for if Anarchist triumphs, it would be inconsistent with the interests of the landlords, the deputies, or those who wanted to become such.

"The law against the press," writes M. Clemencon, "works to the great satisfaction of M. Raynal. It is now a common, guilty, immodest, and shameless book. It is a real book, accepted seriously by all the people who think and reflect, a book in the doctrine of the greatest minds. And the scientific style, which shits off from the vulgar, gives it a rather repellent form, and doubtless at the present moment is actually up in the libraries or in the cupboards of noises if the law — mad with passion — of Dec., 1833, which has long claws, had not gone even into the paste to seize it in order to subject its craving for persecution.

But these two hundred copies, if they have inflicted any one, the persecution only one. Now, this is as dangerous as you yourselves, gentlemen of the jury! First of all, all the journalists have but scant time for reading the pamphlet sent them — there are sent too many! Furthermore, if it is sent to them, they are not interested, but little sensitive themselves to that kind of incitement; they are mad!..."

Notwithstanding, the Attorney General wants to make this book responsible for all the bombs that have exploded. He shows it to you as the cause of recent outrages. Let us consider, if the book is the cause of the police, as a fact, they have no power over the public.

"The law against the press," writes M. Clemencon, "works to the great satisfaction of M. Raynal. It is now a common, guilty, immodest, and shameless book. It is a real book, accepted seriously by all the people who think and reflect, a book in the doctrine of the greatest minds. And the scientific style, which shits off from the vulgar, gives it a rather repellent form, and doubtless at the present moment is actually up in the libraries or in the cupboards of noises if the law — mad with passion — of Dec., 1833, which has long claws, had not gone even into the paste to seize it in order to subject its craving for persecution.

But these two hundred copies, if they have inflicted any one, the persecution only one. Now, this is as dangerous as you yourselves, gentlemen of the jury! First of all, all the journalists have but scant time for reading the pamphlet sent them — there are sent too many! Furthermore, if it is sent to them, they are not interested, but little sensitive themselves to that kind of incitement; they are mad!..."

Notwithstanding, the Attorney General wants to make this book responsible for all the bombs that have exploded. He shows it to you as the cause of recent outrages. Let us consider, if the book is the cause of the police, as a fact, they have no power over the public.

The book in the pantheon, the semblance of a book. It is not a melodramaturg hidden under the cover of a book. It is a real book, accepted seriously by all the people who think and reflect, a book in the doctrine of the greatest minds. And the scientific style, which shits off from the vulgar, gives it a rather repellent form, and doubtless at the present moment is actually up in the libraries or in the cupboards of noises if the law — mad with passion — of Dec., 1833, which has long claws, had not gone even into the paste to seize it in order to subject its craving for persecution.
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But these two hundred copies, if they have inflicted any one, the persecution only one. Now, this is as dangerous as you yourselves, gentlemen of the jury! First of all, all the journalists have but scant time for reading the pamphlet sent them — there are sent too many! Furthermore, if it is sent to them, they are not interested, but little sensitive themselves to that kind of incitement; they are mad!..."

Notwithstanding, the Attorney General wants to make this book responsible for all the bombs that have exploded. He shows it to you as the cause of recent outrages. Let us consider, if the book is the cause of the police, as a fact, they have no power over the public.
THE BEAUTIES OF GOVERNMENT.

The readers of Liberty are urgently invited to contribute to this department. It is open to any statement of facts that may indicate any phase of the fruitfulness of freedom, noble, brave, and wise. Every original, unpatented, or unpatentedly published matter, and apparently accurate accounts clipped from recent publications, are welcome.

THE GOVERNMENT A PARTNER IN A MAJOR SWINDELE.

SUGAR, Iowa, Jan. 5. — Post-office Inspector Micer yesterday arrested B. H. Hiles and William A. Bell, both prominent citizens, and managers of State patent-investment companies, the former caused an sensation, as both men have been for years transacting a big business. The plan of the concern was to watch the debenture and follow it as a form of property. The victim was informed that he could trade his right for a firm, but that it would cost $40 to look up the title. The money was sent, and then, in due time, the victim was told that he had the trade, as the last word had been heavily encumbered. — Boston "Daily Journal"

Editor American Machinist:

The only remedy is to teach the police that there is no chance in a thousand that an offer from a patent-selling concern is anything whatever but an introduction to a "mean swindle," as mean as, or meaner, than the above.

It appears that "both men have been for years transacting a big business," and in truth the business is a large and prosperous one, the first and principal partner being a United States Senator. The government already owns the greater part of the property, but resists the appeals of the company, and refuses to act. The victim is simple and naive, and has his place in the history of patent swindles. The crop of patents issued each year is about five hundred, and not half of them are for genuine inventions. The bulk are for mere contrivances of lawyers, amateur inventors, and others, and a sufficient number of people of all sorts and ages, are not worth a copper each.

Take a sample case, not an imaginary, but a real and frequent example of patent swindle. A brekman invents a car coupler, and, but as every brekman knows, the country has invented a car coupler, the subject is worn thin, and there is nothing new to be had in that line. It is not a new invention, but some new quick, a big circus, above the ground, but not one patent a year shows an item of the smallest value. Of course, the brekman applies for a patent, and, of course, he has no patent; but he deals deceitfully with the solicitors, whose business it is to forge gimmicks into such formal shape that some sort of a patent can be worked over each case. He gets some sort of a patent on the car coupler, good or bad, but it has a red seal and a blue ribbon, and it is all the same to the brekman.

The skylter — and I use that term with care — cannot fail to get a patent on anything presented, he secures his share of the boot, drops the matter, and things are ripe and ready for a third partner — the patent-selling shuck. The government has undoubtedly got its $5,000,000 out of the country, there is no shade of difference between the car coupler and dozens of others already patented, but it does not require even that difference to secure a patent. The brekman hears of it, because the business is entirely between the government and the solicitor, and such a shuck as informing the brekman of the true position of his concern to the government, and the government acts on the cheap fiction that the solicitor is representing the brekman, while he, in fact, is simply beating him.

The brekman has various methods, changing his game as fast as found out; and this title-examining dodge is as good as any. It is thoroughly bluffed, very simple, and very safe. The brekman sells out his circle, and the brekman, after writing a dozen unanswerable letters to railroads and car-manufacturers, is a temple of confusion so that he can do through him. A little correspondence follows, and he receives a statement that the patent can be acquired for a certain sum. 

Brekman is not at all astonished at the offer of a farm for his invention, he expected more than that, and tells the shark to go ahead. Shark then writes the brekman that it is wise to have the title to some real estate, and as a stake of forty dollars, and the trick often works and yields the shark a "big business." The government has bought the brekman's farm, the solicitor goes, the shuck back, and proceed to do the next invention.

GEORGIA: R. GRANT.

EXTENSION OF THE COMSTOCK LAWS.

[Dr. Foo's Health Monthly.]

It is now above twenty years since the Congress of the United States was procured to enact a law for the regulation of morals through limitation of post-office privileges. It was a new departure in the line of Federal legislation, and the constitutionality of the statute is still a fair question for doubt and debate, but the ostensible object was the suppression of meaner confusions of obscen, and the disposition to use any effect for so good a cause made it difficult to see that a bad principle, method, and precedent was being established. So the "Comstock Mail Laws" went into the "Corps of Letters," and we have watched their operation ever since, with abundant opportunity to remark, as one abused followed another, "we told you so." The Hon. Elihu Wright was one of the first to argue that legislation of such an object was far too much limited. He had given a fine and full perversion of this law in its outrageous application to earnest reformers, such as Editors Bennett, Heywood, Harman, Lant, and Caldwell, and cannot take space here even to attempt to indicate the injustice and non-effect of such a law, but it will suffice to offer the last case as proof that this law is mainly employed illegitimately as a tool of personal vendetta.

Mr. J. B. Wine, of Clay Centre, Kan., was engaged in religious controversy with a Rev. Mr. Veneaux, each trying to convert the other, and quoting scripture in the effort. Mr. Wine, possibly ignorant of the law, and evidently forgetful that ciergymen may be mean and spiteful, was unwisely enough to send by mail a quotation from Isaiah xxxvi, verse 13, and Mr. Ven-

ableness was brought to the matter in the hands of United States District Attorney Perry, and thus cause the arrest of Mr. Wine on the charge of sending an obscene letter. Mr. Wine was tried at Leavenworth, Kan., awaiting trial. What the result will be we cannot predict, but this is the last, not by any means the worst or most outrageous, of the cases brought under this class of law.

In a celebrated supreme court decision Jurestice Field argued that this mail law could not be regarded as an enforcement of the constitutionally guaranteed liberty of the press, because the mails were not the only means of distribution, that the express and freight transportation left the way open for any matter ruled out of the mails. The former inference was that any United States law covering both mail and express deliveries would be unconstitutional, because a limitation of the freedom of the press; and now, what have we in prospect but just such a mail law, and the court decision was in June, 1894, favorably reported from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and passed by the Senate. It is now in the hands of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and it is, as itself has said, "a bill to prevent carrying of ob-

scene literature and articles designed for clandestine and immoral use from one State or Territory into another State or Territory" by any express company or other common carrier.

We doubt that there was any debate on this bill in either the Senate Committee that reported it, or in its passage by the Senate. It probably went through "on its face"; presenting a fair and attractive exterior, the over-busy Senate Committee without the usual principle or its ulterior consequences. They were not aware that in making this new law it simply remains for the correctness of Mr. Wine (if it is not expected to convict him, why he was arrested to exclude the Bible from the mails and all other means of distribu-

tion — thus paralyzing the working of the churches and Bible societies. There are other possible consequences that all fair and right-minded folks would acknowledge very objectionable, but we cite just this one as an argument likely to be appreciated by the greatest number.

DIED AT THE CLUBHOUSE.

[New York World.]

John Curley suffered a heart attack by delivering newspapers. He lived with his at No. 33 Adams street, Newark. On Friday night he had been drinking. Policeman Lon finally arrested him. Curley shouted right and refused to give his name and gave a few taps on the shins with his club. Then Policeman Smith came along, and what happened is best told by the policeman:

"I saw the officers club Curley," said John Man-
ning, of No. 19 Perry street. "Long wasn't so bad, but when Smith came along he sized it and gave him a good whack. Curley was very afraid of going to the police station. Curley stood up, in front of the desk and gave his name and address. Then he fell on the floor. They clubbed him as he lay there. After they had him in the cell they gave him an unfeeling beating. You could hear his heart rending cries break away. Curley did not attempt to strike the police. He simply struggled to escape."

James McCarthy and William Daley were in the police station when Curley was being locked up. They say that Policeman Smith clubbed him on the way to the cell and they heard him say, "I was out of sight. They protested to the Lieutenant.

Curley died in cell an hour an half after being locked up. Lieutenant Lewis immediately sent for Drs. Capitola and J. H. Smith and Dr. Vatican and Dr. Tuim. The doctors could not find any wounds on Curley's body that could have caused his death, and so Capitola said this was enough to clear the officers. He declared that Curley had asul-

mated them and tore their clothing, and that they had used so much force was unnecessary.

McFinnan, Curley's landlord, called upon Chief of Police Hopper during the afternoon, and de-
manded a full investigation. He gave the chief a list of names of those who had seen the clubbing.

"I don't blame Policeman Lon," said Mr. McFinnan. "I blame Smith was the man who did the heavy clubbing."

County Physician Ehrlich made an autopsy later on, and found a dot of blood on Curley's brain, probably caused by a blow. Curley's friends accept this as positive proof of the truth of their story. The result of the autopsy was reported to the prosecutor.

THE "ANTI-ANARCHIST" CAMPAIGN.

BERLIN, July 29. — The divestments of the ministers over the policy to be pursued toward the Anarchists have become acute. Count Botho zu Eulenburg, the Tory premiership, has, in a letter to the liberal group who demand exceptional laws to stop the spread of Anarchic and Social Democratic propaganda, Dr. Hirsopere, once the Emperor's tutor, is said to be advising all his influence to favor Eulenburg's policy. The Emperor is said to be undecided. While inclined to favor repressive laws, he fears to oppose Chancellor von Caprivi, who would undoubtedly sign the order to change the minister's order to any definite policy.

The new Swiss law against anarchists went into effect on July 1. The first case tried was that of Paul Strömer, a notorious Anarchist, who was expelled from France in 1891. He sought refuge in Switzerland, and there contrived to plot. Under this new law he was expiated and sent to prison, but not to contract such decisive a winsome of the free little republic in handling revolution is in the selfish policy of encouraging revolution, to please the most ravenous Prussian. It provides five years' imprisonment for everybody convicted of inciting to acts of wilful human life, or of working to upset the present social and political order. It penalizes heavily manufacture and the illegal pos-
session of explosives. It gives the government power to expel any native or foreign Anarchist, and to punish any one who may assist or give aid and comfort to those who are known to be plotting Anarchic crimes.

The editors of the German Social Democratic journals printed in Zurich and Basle are preparing to move to Switzerland, probably to London. Conservative journals here praise Switzerland for passing this law, which they regard as an example to Germany.

COMPLIANT ARBITRATION.

WASHINGTON. — Mr. Sprague introduced in the House a bill to create a National Board of Arbitration to settle disputes between employees and employers. The bill is drawn on the lines of President Cleveland's message of April, 1896. It establishes in the Department of Justice a National Board of Arbitration, to consist of three members, which shall be charged, among other duties, with the consideration and settlement by means of arbitration, whenever possible, of all controversies between employees and employers. The members of the board are to hold office for six years and receive $5,000 per annum; and the President may, in his discretion, designate the commissioner of labor for the time being to perform the duties of one of the members of the board, and in case only two shall be appointed.

Whenever differences or controversies arise between railroad corporations or other transportation companies engaged in the transportation of property or persons, or between laborers, or with foreign nations, or within the Territories of the United States or without, in the District of Columbia, and the employees of said companies, and whenever such differences or controversies arise between employers and employees engaged in the manufacture or mining of articles or products used in or essential to the carrying on of such corporations or companies, and their employees or their officers or agents, and whenever any person or persons, by any kind of restraint, coercion or conspiracy, shall hinder or prevent the transportation of property or passengers, or shall interfere with, obstruct or prevent, or attempt to prevent, any union or combination of workmen, or any labor organization, or any labor union, or any labor association, shall be liable to a fine of not less than $50 nor more than $500, or both fine and imprisonment in the discretion of the jury or court.

THE MODERN LAWS OF SETTLEMENT.

PORTSMOUTH, N. H., May 13. — This city has a problem in the passage of a law by the Maine legislature.

The law is:

Any common carrier that brings into this State any person convicted of a crime, and while on the State shall cause no removal beyond the lines of the State of any such person, except on the express consent of the convict. If removal is made a year after the conviction, the carrier shall be liable to a fine of $500 for each person removed beyond the lines of the State. Any common carrier shall be liable to an action of assumpsit for the expenses of the support of such person after such default.

A Maine man well acquainted with the law said: "I am not surprised that the law is beginning to attract the attention of the outside world. I know that the law has been taken advantage of by Maine officials within a short time. To the station agent of the Boston and Maine Railroad at Saco two persons were detained on the train coming into the city, and a demand was made upon the Boston and Maine to carry them out of the State. The station agent, acting upon instructions from superiors, so it is said, complied with the demand and furnished the couple tickets out of the state, and there is no doubt that they were dumped into Portsmouth, the nearest point. They are not thought of as New Hampshire people. I do not consider the law unjust. No doubt the Boston and Maine annually carries into Maine, as do all common carriers, many persons who become charges upon different stations. This is always a loophole for fraud, as there is nothing to prevent a person getting transportation out of the state if he cares to tell the authorities that he is a pauper and was brought into the State by a common carrier within the preceding twelve months. A rigid enforcement of the law would be a serious thing for New Hampshire. If the Railroads are obliged to haul paupers out of the state of Maine, they must drop them somewhere, and it stands to reason that they are not going to haul them through three states when they can get rid of them for a trifle."

A well-known lawyer said: "I do not see anything unjust in the common carrier as it is to New Hampshire. They are only required to make the demand, and send the man to the state."

We have long been accustomed to distrust the Hon. William E. Chandler in any public capacity, and as a result of the way he was born and brought up, with strong suspicion. The American Philological Association, or the friends of its "Twenty-four Joint Rules for Amended Spelling," do not share our prejudices against the statesman, and are singling him as an instrumentality for fastening these rules upon the government printing office. For a scholar in print he has never been accused of being a good American, and has not been exposed to the Hobart Lodge, but as a veteran protector of infant industries, Mr. Chandler had superior claims, the amended spelling being avowedly in the interest of the state. The House of Representatives of the community is not, indeed, passionately addicted to the study of public documents, does not cry for them, and has never complained of the quality of them of the neglect of our absurd English orthography. Still, for their sake, it is proposed to compel millions of adults, English-speaking and foreign, to learn to read and spell anew in order to avail themselves of the products of the government press. Mr. Chandler, be an adept in legal legislation, accordingly introduced in the Senate on February 19, 1898, a joint resolution to that effect, embodying the "Twenty-four Joint Rules," at full length, and the arguments by which they are supported.

Everyone who has watched the slow progress of the reform knows, of course, that the amend ment is ab initio a more logical, and more rapid the work of pupils in learning to read, and to reduce the cost of printing and writing." A paternal government which regards it as its province to hold up the price of silver, and to foster manufactures, and to furnish work to the unemployed and a living wage to every worker, may well take a hand in this new business, on an economic pretext.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING FROM SANDERS.

To tell a man he 'is incapable of speaking other than London English,' which cost the litigant who thus described the shortcomings of a lawyer's clerk $750 damages at the hands of a British jury recently. Major Baker, the agent of an American insurance company, was the man who indicted in the vile slander, and now he is wondering what town he should have named instead of London in order to turn the observation from a reproach to a compliment.

THE NEW NAVY'S RECORD FOR A DAY.

The annual naval reviews have not begun yet, but the mobilization of the fleet has commenced. Already the results are interesting. The Jaseur has broken down seriously, and has been taken by the Dryad, which broke down a few weeks ago. The Oney, sister ship to the Jaseur, has also broken down. The steering gear of the Medusa has gone wrong. The Pearl had signaled "Not under control," but happily it has recovered her faculties again. The Pique has broken down. Two first-class torpedo boats have broken down. The Speedy broke down some days ago and cannot go to sea. This is the list of casualties for one day.

APPROVE, BUT DON'T SHOW IT.

Franz Heidel's tragedy "Friedrich der Dritte auf der Bastille," is about to be produced at the Berlin National Theater. Prebiber von Hlohthofer, chief of police, has permitted the production on the condition that no scenes shall be withdrawn in case the audience be exposed to a demonstration by the political sentiments of the characters. The management of the theatre therefore requests all auditors to listen in silence.

FIVE DOLLARS FOR A CLIP.

George White, of this city, was up before Judge Williams, of the United States court, on the charge of stealing a week's salary of a Northern Pacific train. He proved to the satisfaction of the court that he was 100 feet from the train and that the rock could have done no damage, and was thereafter discharged. He has been a railroad hand, and the decision of the court, Judge Williams holding that chipping of hands under such circumstances was contempt of court.
That "Color Line."  

J. William Lloyd, writing in Liberty of July 28, makes an effort to draw the lines taut between philosophical, non-invasive Anarchists, and those who "by direct action and without concern for existing conditions are filling the gentle with horror," etc. His effort is not up to his usual standard. Compared with the excellent and logical editorial by Yarros in the same number, his argumentative lack of comprehension of the position occupied by those known as "revolutionary Anarchists," and also a sort of "back number" manner of existing conditions.

Carried out as Mr. Lloyd states his plan, I doubt if a dozen "plumbers" would step out from the crowd and form under his "heart gulets on a field of agony." Judged by his own polemics held with pious plumbers, I come to this conclusion.

First allow me to state the position of those whom Mr. Lloyd calls "sublimate Anarchists," and it will be apparent that he does not understand them. They are not, in the first place, deliberate choosers of violence and destruction; nor halet of established authority feel a natural love of fire, bomb, or destroy, or to see it done, if by conceivable means the prevailing injustice can possibly be abolished. They recognize the fact that in the intellectual age we may hope to secure any amount of human rights through the use of force, and will heartily rejoice when this age shall come. They say, as does the writer above mentioned, they are not the victims, the victors; Phryne may be not wise or just in all cases, but it is natural and inevitable.

Mark Twain, in "Yankie in King Arthur's Court," gives us an almost literal result, beginning with these words: "A thousand years of villany swept away in one tidal wave of blood, red, . . . a half drop of blood for each head of the pond had been pressed by a slow torture of out of the people in the weary centuries of wrong and shame and misery.

A long course of brutal oppression will engender a class, as certain as that lightening and storms follow a season of oppressor, heat and varying winds. There is no royal road over this stormy passage. The time of philosophic thought and calm considerations may be on the other side, but the whole unhappy, much abused world cannot jump over it in a single moment. Such poetical and gentle souls as the inventor of the passive emulser may be far past that crude, turbulent stage as to see no excuse for its existence; but men who have drudged ten hours of every day from early childhood and borne all the hardships of a biting satire of bitter poverty, are in no condition, mental or physically, to employers into a millenial state of equal freedom. If they are amused at all, it will be by the glock, and as first effective revolt will be a shock to some one else.

It is perhaps to be regretted that men are not reasonable enough to settle all disputes without recourse to violence. But the cold fact must be admitted — they are not. The human race has had to pass through a long struggle, from animal war to animal peace. The sufferings of the children of toil for the benefit of the rich is a subject which we have been accustomed to see no excuse for its existence; but men who have drudged ten hours of every day from early childhood and borne all the hardships of a biting satire of bitter poverty, are in no condition, mental or physically, to see any reason for it.

On the other hand, as we understand it, passive resistance Anarchists are not advocates of peace on earth and goodwill to men. I never talked with one yet who did not recognize the necessity of a fight. The fight means of course less violence than the Age of Reason now stands for, and while nearer to the time of universal equal freedom he would be glad to see them occur. He will also in war, as the man who is bullying small boy deliberately knocked down by some lower of justice, and with precisely the same feeling, he will read the punishment of some tyrant who has caused woe. The heart of the most refined person is not免 of suffering. These feelings are natural and cannot be checked even in the gentleness of philosophers. Mr. Lloyd bases his desire for a dividing line on sentimental lines alone.

Thus, it is naughty to strike and throw dynamite, so let us all, who love peace at any price, find a nice spot by ourselves and stand under a beautiful red, white, and blue banner, while we label-gang is engaged in having themselves described as advocating peace under all circumstances, and as always condemning "an appeal to force" from the beginning. With the Quakers, this is part of their religion. Is it a religious principle, a "thus saith the Lord" mandate, with Mr. Lloyd?

I would like to ask my friend to read over his paragraph, "If we do not do this, we shall continue to see, on the hand, the credit of our good deeds transferred to our dynamiting nankeens; and, on the other, shall only see the blight of their fanatical outbreaks and follies." Doesn't it sound a bit pathological, self-righteous, un-American? Mr. Lloyd is not a member of Yarros' church. What is claimed and emphasized is that, when working men do retaliate and force down their oppressors' throats a dose of our own medicine, it is not the fruits of love of equity and justice to demean them.

Yes, I have read and admired "No Flag" until tears filled my eyes; and I think the author's latest effort very inconsistent with that beautiful sentiment.

LILLIE M. HOLMER.

The White Flag.

To the Editor of Liberty:

I most heartily agree with Comrade J. W. Lloyd in his views on the same name Anarchist, as expressed in Liberty of July 28. I have experienced the displeasure of many friends to whom the copies of the paper, and in my opinion it was simply because they confounded philosophical Anarchist with the red flag Anarchist, which is the only healthy poison to our progress. The sooner we make the distinction clear the better. The design of the white flag proposed seems very appropriate as far as goes: but I would suggest that the red heart be changed to a design of green in the middle of the flag, horizontally, with the lettering over and beneath the diamond as Mr. Lloyd proposed for "Our Country the World, or the Planet Earth." The green diamond conveys more forcibly all we recognize in this color — youth, hope, growth, prosperity, healthy vision, etc., and the cutting quality of the diamond, known to cut the hardest substances in existence, in addition, — this last being symbolic of the true cutting power of the principles of philosophical Anarchism, and asserting our integrity, and confidence. Respectfully submitted to our friends.

C. J. ZEITINGER.

No Stills for Women.

To the Editor of Liberty:

I am a whole-hearted fighter for equal rights for both sexes, protest against the use of the ballot by women. I emphatically say with "Y" that woman suffrage would mean "more Comstock laws, more prohibition, more moralizing, more cant and hypocrisy, more big-brotherism, etc.; etc., the cutting quality of the diamond, known to cut the hardest substances in existence, in addition, — this last being symbolic of the true cutting power of the principles of philosophical Anarchism, and asserting our integrity, and confidence. Respectfully submitted to our friends.

C. J. ZEITINGER.

Law and Sexual Evil.

[Montreal Liberator.]

As for acts of fairly direct intercourse; as for a law fixing the age of consent — phew! Get out, you quackists and hypocrisies! Go and make laws for the tides or the rotation of the seasons! Let girls be helpless, and eternally dependent; let men need to secure their own safety, and let boys be early taught to respect their own sisters and early playmates; let man and woman be equally helpless in the duties and responsibilities; am, and above all, let them be taught to reasonably to decide to entraps or take advantage of girls, and if this does not rectify sexual evil, nothing will.

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 label-gang of every sort, on Anarchism or kindred subjects, to the "target" assigned in Liberty for that fortnight. All, whether members or not, have an opportunity of informing the secretary of suitable targets.

Address, STEPHEN T. BYINGTON, East Hardwick, Vt.

The "Home Advocate" published four of our letters, besides two letters indirectly connected with our work.

Suggestion No. 9. — When a paper containing a letter from one of the corps falls into your hands, clip it out and use it as a tract.

The agitator, section A. — Dr. John Kaye, northeast corner of Second and Arch streets, Philadelphia, Pa.

He is president of the Friendly Liberal League of that city. In a woman-suffrage lecture he said: "The difference between Anarchism and this government is that the Anarchists would allow all to act at their pleasure, provided they do not interfere with the liberty of another, the actor being allowed to decide upon the point of interference; while in this principle of this government to grant each to do as he or she pleases as long as that person does not interfere with the actions of any one else, but we, the people, draw the line of interference in each case. It is suggested that he be shown the injustice of majority rule.

Section B. — Henry Heaton, Atlanta, Iowa, has a letter on currency in the "Voice" of July 28. He says that to increase the volume of money would not make it permanently more plentiful, because the increased volume would be offset by increased cheapness; that "there is only one solid position on this question upon which all honest men can agree," to wit, that so long as the people can make the money question shall be handled by Congress, and the purchasing power of our circulating medium shall not vary from month to month nor from year to year. He would like to see government take control of precious metals at rates regulated by a commission, varying when the purchasing power of the metal varies.

STEPHEN T. BYINGTON.

Bastiat's Candelmakers' Petition.

[London Personal Rights.]

This remarkable jest is especially, which, if it stood alone, ought to redeem economies from the appellation of "the dismal science," is usually regarded as a mere parable. M. Frédéric Pasey has recently shown that it did indeed substance. A few words from a contemporaries of a century ago, some manufacturers and cultivators of the Department of Le Nord, growers of corn and oil fishes, complained to the government that people were beginning to use, for cooking purposes, product which, they admitted, was indigenous and even extracted from the soil of their own region, but of which they were not the producers and which threatened end them with serious competition. Gas — to call this new production by its name — gave, according to the petitioners, a better and cheaper light than could be obtained by the employment of vegetable oil. Here was a plain case for government interference. If — as was difficult to believe — government could not prevent individuals from preferring the light of greater illuminating power, it could put it in his employment in offices, and reduce to completing to the industry of the country, by supplying the gas for illuminating purposes; a new, illuminating medium, the necessary permission to constitute themselves. — The French Chamber of Peers seriously debated this petition.

Law and Sexual Evil.

[Montreal Liberator.]

As for acts of bodily and mental enjoyment, as for a law fixing the age of consent — phew! Get out, you quackists and hypocrisies! Go and make laws for the tides or the rotation of the seasons! Let girls be helpless, and eternally dependent; let men need to secure their own safety, and let boys be early taught to respect their own sisters and early playmates; let man and woman be equally helpless in the duties and responsibilities; am, and above all, let them be taught to reasonably to decide to entraps or take advantage of girls, and if this does not rectify sexual evil, nothing will.
"The Trial of the Thirty" in Paris. Thirty Anarchist Communists are now on trial in Paris. The reports sent to American newspapers are very meagre and fragmentary, but the following extracts from a letter to the New York "Evening Post," written a week or two prior to the opening of the great trial, will convey some idea of the accused and the charges against them. It appears that the prisoners, or some of them, are defended by Mr. B. J. Quay and another prominent lawyer. The letters are addressed to the New York "Evening Post," and are published in this issue of Liberty.

The great trial in August will be carried on under the old laws. The thirty persons under indictment are all accused in common either of being affiliated with an association formed with the end of preparing and committing crimes against persons or property, or of having participated in an understanding (entente) agreed upon with the same end in view. This word "understanding" was introduced into the law last December, to prevent the technical evasion of its provisions by Anarchists, who, if ever, do have any definite plan in advance, the government especially in the cases of the solidaires. The new law accordingly does not tolerate the expression of criminal Anarchism (incitement to violence) but merely a mere understanding. That is tantamount to saying that the Anarchists are not to be concerned with the object, merely with the means. Some anarchy is felt as to the arming of government with such insidious powers. The coming trial will test the practical character of the old law. Whether the Anarchists will follow the "understanding" which it supposes to exist among Anarchists. If the mere talking of Anarchist (rather violent at times) should be considered enough to constitute such an understanding, it would be impossible for any law-abiding citizen to frequent half the literary and artistic circles of Paris. The trial of the accused is headed by Jean Grave, who was sentenced to imprisonment last spring for his book on "Dying Society."

Paul Reclus, styled "engineer," is also on the docket of this great and momentous question. This flight of the most active and intelligent leader of French Anarchists—and perhaps of the foreign comrade as well—is one of the most mystifying spectacles of the year. He disappeared only after his arrest, and while a criminal, with Vaillant, who had just committed his crime, had become perfectly well known. Since then his family, has been living in seclusion, and his movements are more than compromising. He escaped from Paris when the police were fully alive to the importance of his capture. This is the greater mystery, since, in the province of Lille, which—is after London—is the centre of Anarchist plots, and he has been signalized elsewhere. People are getting to look on him as another "old man of the law" who will be covered up to forever. The law will take its course until now must be due to the protection of the Reclus family in high quarters.

Bernard, who is safely in prison, was active in Barcelona at the time of the explosion in the Teatro Liceo. He was suspected of a hand in the affair, but this could not be proved. He has been a friend, however, of several of those persons under indictment. He is on the indictment as a "commercial agent." Matha, who is down as "publicist," is another of these general friends of Anarchist criminals. He is also closely connected with theorists of the movement, like d'Enfond. The trial of all these men ought finally to show where theory ends and practice begins. For this reason it is to be hoped that the newspapers will not be shut off from a knowledge of any disclosures that may be made. It is already next to certain that the ill-success in tracing the underground Anarchists and in prosecuting them from the persistence of the police, the press, and the general public, in regarding it as a secret society with an outward organization. The present trial has all the marks of the movement of the movement and should show its religious character and methods.

Ortiz (without profession, accused also of theft) is the companion of Emile Henry. Sebastian Pau, who has spent much time in prison lately, is the eloquent and absolute ex-creditor and half-lawyer who has been a chief preacher of the movement through the South. Lautzi was one of his direct pupils, as appeared from letters found after the attempted assassination of the Serbian minister in the restaurant of the Avenue d'Opera. Vaillant left his daughter in charge of Fauré, who has been showing her in the drinking saloons, when she was in the company of the comrades. Fauré first brought out an Anarchist almanac, and very daringly put on the face of the book. Then he suppressed and has not yet been arrested. Alexandre Cohen is the Dutchman who translated Gerhart Hauptmann's plays for the Parian Theatre, among whom he had many friends. He was told to cross the frontier last spring and went off to London. Then the police captured some hundreds of letters in his rooms from Anarchists in Germany, especially in Berlin, and it is difficult to reach the deceleration of expulsion, which he had obeyed only too quickly. So he, too, is down for trial as a "publicist — en suite."

Correia, of the Catholic bookshop, who was mixed up with Vaillant's affairs, is also out of reach of the French police. He is the author of the "On the Tract," scattered everywhere in 1889. Ediot and Bataille, of the Centre Bookstore, a Swiss firm of the Beau-Arts. There are a printer, a lithographer, a machinist, a tailor, a cabinetmaker, and a coffee burner. There are four women, of whom three are Italians. Eight of the accused (three women) are also accused of theft.

Finally, sixteen of the thirty are under thirty years of age, while the leading man—Paul Reclus, Fénico, Fauve, and Bernard—are not yet forty. In education, activity, way of life, they present together a fair epitome of the Anarchist movement in France.

Officidom Objection to Criticism. [New York Evening Post.]

"Die Grenzboten," a weekly periodical published by Grimes in Leipzig, contains, in the number for July 28, some sharp and quite significant remarks on "Beteiligung," in which the writer animadverts on the growing tendency of imperial prosecuting attorneys to shield government officials from public condemnation. It is a logical extension of the principle of public and private trust. The government is the same, and the advocate of public safety is no more than a political agent of the government, and thus creating a deliktum su generis hitherto unknown to the statutes of the realm. An insult offered to the Emperor or to any of the confederate princes is an offense against the laws of the German Empire as "Machtsteilung" or "eine" majesty; and the frequency, and in many cases the frivolity, of the complaints have been instituted under this clause, and the gross abuse of the legal protection properly granted to the dignity of rulers have given rise to much injurious comment on the part of interested subjects and good citizens, who are instinctively inclined to show due regard to the power that be. The consciousness of their official importance, and the authority over subordinates, and often petty subalterns, have now existed in the higher class of public functionaries in Germany the desire to have a share in these rights and duties for themselves, especially as regards restrictions emanating from the press. Hence the attempt to revive the obsolete distinctions between grand and petit as formerly applied to a lawyer or to a servant, and to establish a new offense known as "kleine Machtsteilung," or petit laste majesty, for the safeguard of all servants of the State.

The Defence of Jean Grave.

This is Victor Hugo blasp homicide:

"What kind of society is it which, at this period, has for its base inequity and injustice! Would it not be well to be in every corner and send it peli-meli upon the ceiling, the cloth, the draperies, and the curtains; to the drunkards and the guests: those who have their two elbows on the table, and those who are on all fours under it, to spew the whole lot in God's face and to fling the whole world at heaven."

The Hell of the Poor makes the Paradise of the rich.

Not only has happiness come not, but honor has fled.

Faubert declares:

"With the development of capitalist production, European public opinion has stripped the last rag off conciseness and modesty. Each nation glorifies the pain that goes to hasten the accumulation of capital."

The same Faubert ruthlessly sums up the position of the modern world in these terms, which breed and split in society's face:

"We dance, not over a volcano, but upon the plank over a latrine which, to me, smells rather badly."

What would Faubert have said today, after so much suffering, corruption, and ruin? What colors this master of style would have found upon his palette to paint his picture of shame and ignominy

Here are the instigators of both book and bomb! They are the thinkers, philosophers, poets, who have described, who have sung, the despair of our century. Now let us be logical. M. Attorney General, Le., let us take these men their places in the Court of Assize, for M. Jean Grave has only repeated what they have said. You know well that M. Jean Grave, guilty or not guilty, in his book has fired no incendium. But this government imitates its predecessors. Its profits by crime to assassinate the idea. In this idea you may place many who are in possession. The possessor want to stay where they are: the idea wishes them to go on. A dagger struck down the Duke de Berry: immediately the Restoration presents the tribune and ways to a weeping country: "The dagger which struck the Duke de Berry is a Liberal Idea."

A bomb exploded: immediately the Third Republic ascends the same tribune and cries to a weeping country: "The bomb which has just exploded is an Anarchist Idea."

Then, in the midst of the smoke of the bomb, which in our time takes the place of the lightnings from Mount Sinai, M. David Haynal pays a frightful law, which is nothing else but the resurrection of the old crime of inciting to the hatred and contempt of government. Only the formula is slightly modified; it is the crime of inciting to the hatred and contempt of the bourgeoisie.

Théophile Gautier was right: what does it matter whether it be a sword, a holy-water sprinkler, or an umbrella, which rules us? It is always a stick! And a stick is a stick, no matter what the general! You charge M. Grave with having incited to theft? What, then is this new crime? Has M. Grave instigated the pillage of your houses? No. You do claim of him the characteristic of another's work.

But M. Grave is an upholder of Communism. He wishes to abolish bourgeoisie property, he believes that the State is the agent of the people, he demands the abolition of its institution; it is his doctrine—false, perhaps—but a doctrine, after all, or which he is not the first teacher; Proudhon and many others thought of it before him.

This, however, is the crime with which you charge him!

To dream of a society other than that which exists is to incite to robbery. It is to be a criminal!

So put Jean Jacques Rousseau beside M. Jean Grave.

It would pain you to do that, M. Attorney General. Jean Rousseau with his celebrated "Confessions of the new man," with his vision of which you are the son; Jean Rousseau is therefore your grandfather: you see, I have you in the family; don't be afraid, I will always leave you the same!

Jean Jacques Rousseau has said:

"The first man having an enclosure, a plot of ground, who took it into his head to make a mine," was the real founder of society. What crimes, misery, and horror would have been spared mankind if some one had first said, filled in the ditch, crying to his fellows: Beware of listening to this impious man: are we lost if you forget that the fruits of the earth belong to all and that the land has no owner?

The fine things! You bullet in the Assize Court the man who, faithful to your principles, wants to overthrow the landmarks set up by the usurper denounced by Jean Jacques Rousseau! You re-
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another great ancestor, M. Attorney General! for you may remark that I quote only irreproachable men,—members of the Convention, Girondins, members of the Convention Assembly. Eighteenth Century philosophers! I keep you in the family; do not fear, you will stay there always—Thomas Paine thus completes Chamfort's thought.

They who are the servants of man the trade of governing has always been monopolized by the most ignorant and the most rascally individuals of mankind.

You see, gentlemen of the jury, that we have not waited for either M. Englishman, M. Irishman, or to say that to the people. It is more than a hundred years ago since folks began to tell them this, and, you see, more than a hundred years later it is repeated to the thee.

The people are convinced about it. They know now that all shades of politicians, whether clad in white or red, whether wearing the same uniform and will add a new chapter to the book of human lies already such a long one.

They wish for no more of it. They have uneducated themselves—not more so about one set than the other—all, whatsoever they be called. What they abhor is politics, that bourgeoisie science invented to serve as a mask for the bourgeoisie parliament.

The worst of it is that which the State has fallen naturally recoils upon the army. In fact, in time of peace, the army seems like a sort of elective people, like a sort of government; and the more the State seems to oppress, the more it breeds a dull hatred against the army, the instrument of its oppression.

These words are not mine. They are not M. Grévy's. They are a charming poet's, a poet of the Tour d'Îles; they are M. Alfred de Vigny's:

"The modern army, as soon as it ceases to be at war, becomes a sort of police force. It feels as if it were ashamed of itself, and knows neither what to do nor what to desire."  
The word "shame" enchases the word "army." I feel no more tenderness for it.

Is not the germ of every mutiny contained herein? You want to give M. Grévy five years imprisonment because, if the soldiers had read his book, it would have been able to "disseminate them from bowing under a brutalizing discipline."

Will you prosecute the next edition of M. Renan's "Aventures de Jésus," in which he relates that he should never have been able to submit himself to military discipline, and that if he had been compelled to become a soldier he would have deserted.

"I am a passage is infinite, I assure you, than the one marked out in your indictment. For the prosecuted edition has not got into the barracks: you know that it has only reached the journalists, and is sold in the bookstores. It is sometimes to be found; and the soldier, who comes along the line referred to, to whom eight days of unmerited imprisonment has been given, and who is dismustered with his captain, such a soldier will think: "See here! Why, M. Renan is a glory to mankind!" The minister said that when unveiling his last bust. If a glory to mankind declared that he could not have submitted to the discipline, and would have deserted to escape from it, why should not I imitate this glorious person?"

The symbiosis is the best construction, and it might readily produce propaganda by deed, for it is easier for a soldier to desert than it is for him to stick himself under the fifth rib.

Has M. Jean Grévy ever said to a soldier to salute his captain under the fifth rib? He says, what is quite true, that to say him or to strike him in the face with another is the same thing; for, if the soldier shal, he will be condemned to death, and if he strike him, he will be equally so, according to the terms of the military code, which we are all unanimous in declaring to be somewhat excessive.

But let us once for all be done with this iniquitous matter that consists of imposing it on the people of France from an entire book to present as the diminutive note of a work which is only the feverish conclusion of a heated period."

You want to find an accomplice to murder for the soldiers of the French army, you should not seek it in Jean Grévy; you must look further and higher.
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Listen to this page: Victor Hugo is addressing the Belgians —

"People! There is but one people! If Bonaparte invade you, having at his back — that army, those Jacobins, who should have been heroes, but whom he has turned into brigands; if he come upon your frontiers, rush for your lives from the Adour to the Gironde, for your lives! Shar. — take to your knives, take to your guns, take to your staves, and kill all the bloody Louis, Batistes, and Simeons in the land!"

These horrid, these monstrous, these brigands, were the French army! For, if the French army is only respectable under the Republic, as we have for centuries of a century under monarchy, we might have despised the French army three out of every four years.

Well, now, I ask you if political hatred, party hatred, may be said to lead a great man to the pitch of crying out to foreigners: "Assasinate the French army!" — what is there astonishing in the social indignation of a young polish writer for having shown to red heat some lines, which are indeed but tame beside the frightful incitement issued from the lips of the great Victor Hugo.

And you want to condemn Grave to five years imprisonment to save the honor of the army. . . .

Oh, the logic of your justice!

You want to condemn Grave to five years imprisonment to save the honor of the army. And the end of a chapter in which he recounts the barbarity of certain employers who ill treat the human machine, who have a stone for a heart, dragon phlegm, or what you please; suppose that, if he follow my irony boldly killed one of those employers, the lesson, perhaps, would serve as an example to others.

Is it warmth of a thinker you tax with being just a jutilification? But why do you not prosecute all the other bursts of indignation?

There is, however, M. Attorney General: I take them from a journal which is not the journal "La Revolu. It is the journal of M. de Goncourt. One is surprised that the people, dying of hunger, remain quiet, while the bakers — he mentions one. I do not name him — are setting before the rich white bread and rolls, and the purveyors are setting game and poultry for them.

His surprise grows into irritation, exasperation, and in the end he cries:

"When I read in Manet's paper the infuriated denunciation of the 'People's Oracle' against the grocer class, I believed them to be the exaggerations of a madman. Now I see that Manet was in the right. It is a question of profit or loss, and no harm if they hang up to their shop-fronts two or three of these greedy rogues.

But this is the least of the evil. The moral injury, the moral injury, is in the revolutionaries, the only practical means of keeping the rising within reasonable bounds."

The incitement is a pretty one! The justification magnifies it.

And when the same de Goncourt thought of all those idle folk who live on the sweat of the people, he cried: "It would be a great bondance to stupid swindlers and elegant imbeciles. If some five or six infernal machine would kill all of Paris going round the lake in the Bois de Boulogne between four and six o'clock."

Does he not put it into murder?

When it concerns de Goncourt you smile; that is Literature! When it relates to Grave you shudder: that is Amory.

Well, I tell you, I do not know what it is; but what you are doing is not Justice!

Now, then, let us be frank. Tear away the veil! These are the feelings not the incitements of a thought which you arraign before the Assize Court: It is Thought itself.

It is not because M. Grave has written impenetrable or enigmatic, that the Attorney General impinges him before you. It is because M. Grave has formulated a scientific theory which is in contradiction to the Attorney General. Oh, if you prefer, M. Grave's crime consists precisely in the mere expression of his theory.

It is not a man whom you wish to imprison; it is an idea.

The modern jury is asked to condemn a political system which lays claim to being that of the future, just as Parliament or the Sorbonne was asked to condemn those who set forth the principles of modern society a couple of centuries too soon.

The Attorney General spoke to you: The theory which I attack, if it were realized, would abolish the bourgeoisie.

Preliminary as the bourgeois system, by its realization, swept away the nobility.

Whenever a thing is put in place of another, the first must be removed in order to put the second there. The Parliament of olden times undeniably condemned the principles of modern society.

Can you imprison for principles which are put forward as those of future society?

I say, no.

Why?

Because, in passing sentence, the old parliament was logical: its powers rested on right divine.

Whilst you, in passing sentence, do but belie yourselves: your powers rest on free investigation.

You are the sons of a revolution which was effected to make impossible the thing you are soliciting to do today.

You can condemn a man; you can condemn a crime; you cannot condemn an idea. You can only discuss it, or refuse it, if that be possible.

Be calm, gentlemen of the jury, and do not make a noise. You have, after all, not the monstrous fungus of which the Attorney General spoke to you just now; that would be spawned, without root, in a fin de siecle delirium. It is not of recent growth. It is two hundred years old. M. Grave has not enriched by his bombs the bourgeois martyrology, he has not even enriched by his book the intellectual repository of modern society.

What, then, is M. Grave's idea?

It may be summed up in two propositions: First, if man be bad, it may be imputed to the social apparatus; Secondly, its apparatus will become good; second to prevent this social apparatus being formed again, it is needful to go as far as the total elimination of the principle of authority.

The true 'element' of the principle of authority and the ins. powers that maintain it: these are the moyen and the ends of scientific Anarchy, the aim of which is the realization of the common good by the suppression of competition and by the harmonizing of interests.

I am not discussing. I am not refuting. I am explaining.

Is this new?

Take Bebel's and read his description of the Abbey of Thelam: No more government, no more constraint, individual existence everywhere where for collective; and above the gate, as principle, the sole law: Do what you wish — that is, Do as you ought; for you are bound, by hypothesis, find itself with his cell he did not.

Open Voltaire: His hero, Candide, visits Eldorado, the Eden dreamed of in the philosopher's mind. As in the Abbey of Thelam: No laws, no constraint; harmony, happiness everywhere.

"Candide asked to see the Court of Justice, the Parliament; they told him they had none, and that they never went to law. He inquired if they had any prisons, and they told him no."

This is the theory: It is a moral malady! cries the Attorney General.

Ah! When a new idea rises up in the world, do not be so readily to hang a moral malady!

What is occult science? It is unknown science. As soon as unknown science becomes known, it ceases to be occult to the lens official.

Former chemistry was called ‘alchemy,’ and alchemists were burned. Nowadays alchemy has become our chemistry, and the chemists are decorated. It is the same as it was with all the sciences. Every idea which is not consecrated, vulgarized, and become part of the impediments of our everyday opinions, which conflicts with our custom and our education, escapes.

We readily consider it as a moral malady, and we quickly make answer to those who propound it to us: You are out of your senses.

If someone had said to an old roman senator: "Slavery is a disgrace, slavery must be abolished," the old roman senator would have replied: "Destroy slavery! You are an Anarchist! Slavery! Why, it is the basis of society! It is the basis of all society! There can be no society without slavery, and, and...

And, when an Attorney General will indict in the Assize Court the writers who share your opinion. The whole of society will be founded on the discovery that I will build a temple which they will call the Stock Exchange, and which will be adorned with flowers, and even as cathedrals have filled the place of the temple of Venus or Jupiter. The priests serving in this new temple will be called Lev, Arion, Back, Hugo Oberdoendorfier. They will avindicate others out of all that evil which will ensue to them from communism. They will buy everything that is buyable, and some things that are not. And which will build their fortunale society will serve only to make more manifest its terrible solitude."

If one had prophesied that to St. Gregory, St. Gregory, who believed in the divinity of a human hand and his hands and cried: "Lord, deliver us from such a moral malady!"

The malady has run its course. From time to time, to testify to its evil virus, it has latched out Panama—those tertiary accidents of the body social which shatter and break down; and every day the cancer increases that soon will corrupt us all.

Ah! you do not hasten to say: this is a moral malady?

This, good or bad, this is human Thought. Don't put Thought into prison. It always escapes from it:

Do not kill Thought: it always comes alive again.

See! It has been hanged on every gibbet: yet it is murdered every pilory, it has been impaled on every gibbet with its rays, it has illuminated all the pillories with the fire of its haloes.

It has been decapitated, it burnt, tortured, crucified it!

Within walls, very similar to ours, magistrates, clad in the same purple and capped with headgear like the Attorney General's, have crushed it beneath similar social thunderbolts in similar murderous periods, or within like Lavoisier, or within like Candide, or within like every one...

For Thought the Courser is the antechamber of the Ptolemy! And the magistrates cannot go out without passing the statue of one of their victims.

The thought impregnates Thought's Thought emits light.

Every day, at the corners of the crossways, in public places where the magistrates, clad in the same purple and capped with headgear like the Attorney General's, have crushed it beneath similar social thunderbolts, in similar murderous periods, or within like Lavoisier, or within like Candide, or within like every one...

Smile in the morning splendors that greet the awakening of Paris!

Let Thought run its course, gentlemen: do not stop it.

Defend yourselves; do not persecute.

Gentlemen, it is my last appeal that I send forth to you from the depths of that infernal cell, with all the energy of my faith and my youth: Jurymen of the end of the century, do not be persecutors!
UNPARALLELED PREMIUM.
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