On Picket Duty.

I been expects to have a new play ready for publication and production before Christmas. Whether it will belong to the group of his social dramas, is not known.

Both Jean Grave and his counsel, M. de Saint Aubain, referred in their addresses to the "Communism of Proudhon." But brutal brutality and dialect unknown to better. Kropotkin seems to be the only Anarchist-Communist who appreciates the impropriety of claiming Proudhon as an apostle of Communism.

The clericals of Bologna objected to the public performance of an alleged sacrilegious drama entitled "Christus" and desired to prevent it. Instead of adopting the American method of appealing to the police, they tried an interesting experiment. They bought all the seats and kept away, so that on the evening of the production of the drama the only spectators present were the critics, who were black, and a few policemen, who were stupid. Thus morality was saved without invasion. This innocent method will never be popular with our voters, who manage to expose their will upon others without any personal sacrifice.

In a new book on China, I find this observation: "There is no country in the world where practice and profession are more widely separated. The empire is preeminently one of make-believe. A system of high-sounding pretension to lofty principles of morality holds sway, while the life of the nation is in direct contradiction to these assertions. No imperious edict is complete, and no official proclamation finds currency, without protestations in favor of all the virtues." It is not true that there can be anything worse, more iniquitous, and more thrilling than the multitudes of contradictions, shams, and lies represented by so-called "Christian civilization." It is the great merit of Tolstoi that he clearly perceives this fact.

Think of our great monopolists, brutal clergy, writing and visual editors, and corrupt lawmakers pretending to follow the example of Christ! Think of the ethics of the average Christian's life,—of his religion, politics, business, domestic relations!

The vice-reformers of England have started a campaign against the "living pictures" fad. Lady SomerSET is shocked at these exhibitions of unclothed women, and says: "This letting women make public merchandise of the beauty of their bodies is the gravest insult and dis-
the Spencerian principle to the Anarchist (by Anarchist Mr. Holt means revolutionary Communist), one step is indicated at once: "Since the Anarchist acknowledges no duty to government, he can claim no right from government consequently, when a man is duly convicted of Anarchist sentiments and the government a once announce that it no longer extends its protection to his person or property, — that he is an outlaw, with no defence but his own strength against any hate or greed of whi a he or his may be the object."

Let us dwell a moment on this proposition. We may neglect for the present the inconsistencies and self-contradictions of the Anarchist Communist, who is at bottom a govern mentalist, and assume that he is a genuine / anarchist.

If Mr. Holt had proposed to punish the Anarchist for ignoring the State — for refusing to pay taxes, respect tariff laws, bank laws, etc. — by withdrawing the State’s protection from him, he would have remained true to the Spencerian principle ecolidated, but would have received the cordial thanks of all Anarchists. Such punishment would welcome; they are entirely willing to be taken at their word and made to face the consequences of their acts. The right to ignore the State, to dispense with its benefits, a precisely what they demand and would punish them by granting their demands, the question would be solved beautifully. The Anarchists would know how to protect themselves, but that need not concern Mr. Holt and his friends. But does Mr. Holt clearly realize what the act and the consequences would lead to in practice? The Anarchist would ignore the State completely, and live, labor exchange, and love in their own way. So long as they refrained from directly injuring the men in Mr. Holt’s State, they would hold the state to its bargain, — absolute non-interference. If Mr. Holt is familiar with Spencer’s first work, he knows that it is no crime to ignore the State, and hence the question of personal liberty enters here. It is simply a question of tacit contract, of fair exchange. If the State is ignored, it has a right to ignore the bolter and peaceful seeder in turn.

What does it. Holt think of this flank movement? As he is writing, not about peaceable sects, whose case he has probably never considered, but about revolutionary Communists, the withdrawal of protection by the State would not end the controversy. (Note, in passing, at the crime for which Mr. Holt would punish them is the mere profession of "Anarchic le" sentiments, — a doctrine not in harmony with certain other luminous principles of Spencer’s and evolution. Communist would come to demand the expropriation of the capitalista and the establishment of a prohibitory Communist order, and would, in the way of progress and otherwise, apply the bomb cure at certain intervals. Mr. Holt knows this, and therefore he does not propose to wait until they are acted upon by authorities. He says, "Will you know that he [the bomb-thrower] is ta’ing, it is absurd to wait for him to act."

For, that outlawry would not be a sufficient punishment, Mr. Holt thinks that, consistently with Spencer’s principle, government can go far than outlawry, and sentence to exile, as being as follows:

The Anarchist proclaims himself an enemy of the State — ready to proceed to, or at least to encourage, any degree of violence. The absurdity of any conceivable harm such demonstration. Do not load him on other civilized communities, but warn them of his character; give them his photographs, measurements, and description; and force him to the place that he has chosen for himself, — outside of organized society. This would at first seem to render a state of outlawry superfluous, but that statute would not only have a deterrent effect, but would help enforce the sentence of exile. These penalties, he it remembered, are an entirely natural consequence of Anarchist views.

Exile is clearly no more a natural consequence of Anarchist-Communist views than of any other that happen to clash with the existing form of government. Suppose people were to conspire to re-establish monarchy in the United States and declare themselves ready to proceed to, or at least to encourage, any degree of violence in the interest of their cause. They would be as much enemies of the existing State as the Communist-Anarchists are. Would the Spencerian principle justify their outlawry and exile? Would they be willing to live in their case? Obviously it would, for there is nothing to base a distinction upon. So here we have the proposition to punish with outlawry and exile everybody who, being an enemy of the existing State, declares himself ready to encourage violence. Russia and other semi-barbarous countries have acted upon this theory all along, but without any pretense of following Spencerian luminous principles and scientific criminoLOGY. Freer countries have, after long and bitter struggles, succeeded in securing the right of free speech, but scientific criminoLOGY brushes aside these shallow notions of political freedom. Indeed, scientific criminoLOGY does more for us — I had almost said for tyranny.

Follow Mr. Holt:

But outlawry may not be a strong enough sanction to enforce the exile. We have no Siberia for such cases; and, if we had, they might be nearly as troublesome there as at home. If outlawry fails to keep the Anarchist within the state, shall the sentence of death be enforced? Erection is the only cure; and delay, even hastily, is cruelty. If you put him in prison or exile, there is no use would you expect to keep him there. It is a peculiarity of the Anarchist’s case that his own opinion regarding his cure is the only one that can be taken. But to take that is practically impossible. His prevent dissemblKation, and all that he has to do is to profess a change of heart and stick to it. To entrap him, through argument, irritation, surprise, or espionage, into a statement of his true sentiments, would be often rendered incapable of by the ferocity or exaltation that seems unbroken by his crime. But if you wait for that, the damage is done. Before he gets so far as an attempt to commit a murder, he is a man who has committed a murder — a man who has cut a throat or scotched a ship. But that is the very thing to shut him up: it is too late when his ferocity is unbroken. Yet see the paradox — before his ferocity is unbroken, it is wasted trouble to shut him up, because he can dissemble himself out; but to wait till his ferocity is unbroken, is absurd. I say it is ridiculous to try to catch him up at all. Why temporize, then, with confining him at public expense? He has no claim to support by the government that he denies, whatever claim other criminals may have. Mankind is not of a kind to temporize with. It is one of the kinds that, as offenses, fairly fall under the maxim, de minimis non curat lex, and there is at least one open question whether enthusiasm, guaranteed by reasonable restrictions, is not the best remedy for all dangerous kinds. Against the possibility of recovery must al-
ways be set the fearful tragedies that have resulted from waiting for it; and we shall hear in mind that outcomes, in the modern sense, was unknown when our systems of jurisprudence were established. Outlawry and exile falling, and confinement being demonstrably impracticable, there is nothing left but to kill him.

The whole programme is now before us,—the programme of modern scientific criminology. Mr. Holt is not unmindful of the fact that the idea of death as a preventer of future crime revolutionizes all our inherited principles of punishment, but he appeals to the "new principles," with which this idea is perfectly combined. The principles of positivist criminology really prescribe or enjoin such methods as Mr. Holt proposes, it would be unprofitable to discuss. As a matter of fact, positivist criminology is just what the self-styled positivist criminologists choose to make it. The more ignorant, narrow, intolerant, brutal the exponent, the more barbarous his doctrine. The ideal scientific need not feel anybody with awe, since it testifies to nothing more than the author's opinion of his own discoveries, and advertisers are known to be somewhat extravagant. But two things are clear: Spencer would certainly repudiate with disgust and indignation this proposal of an American author, which justify the killing of men for their opinions and utterances. Between the principle that punishment should be as nearly as possible the natural consequence of the act, and the proposal to kill a man for preaching violence, there is no discoverable relation. Mr. Holt drops the Spencerian principle at the very point where its greatest virtue is: modern criminologists are the offspring of very little knowledge and a good deal of brutality and ill-liberality. Spencer's principles of punishment are corollaries from his principles of social progress and social equilibrium, of which modern criminologists are profoundly ignorant. Mr. Holt, in his ignorance, has confounded opposite and irreconcilable things.

Positivist criminology must remain a delusion and a snare as long as it ignores the ethical and economic problems whichagate modern society. It is futile to discuss methods of dealing with criminals when the very question of what crime has never troubled the gib metaphysical criminologists. As a practical, working, realistic, professional and amateur, study Spencerian sociology and ethics. It is worth while, perhaps, to say a word about the effect of the adoption by government of the Holt method. How puerile it is to imagine that revolutionary warfare can be terminated by the threat of exile and death! Since Mr. Holt proposes to punish men for expression of opinion and mere declaration of principles, the simplest means of defeating his scheme is to refrain from preaching violence. Would that stop bomb-throwing and propaganda by deed? On the contrary. Underground conspiracies would become more general, because those who are now content with writing and talking would join the ranks of the men of action. Free speech is really what saves modern society from systematic and ruthless attacks. The more reactionary it becomes, the more unsafe and precarious the position of its representatives is rendered. Society has no worse enemies than the Holts and Godkinds, whose savagery and fanaticism render the task of the philosophical reformers well-nigh hopeless.

The Apologies for Governmentalism.

Among the arguments used to support the institution of government, the precedence of seniority is apparently due to the doctrine of "divine right." But now many have given up belief in God, and many of those who believe in him have given up trying to decide questions of practical action by an appeal to his will; and those who are practically controlled by the idea of divine right commonly want to have on hand an argument from premises more generally admitted, and depend mostly on the latter in public debate. Without going into the question of consistency, where something might be said on both sides, it is clear that the divine-right argument for government has seen its best days. It will continue to have an important influence, but it will not be the central point of the contest. Truly gave my reasons for considering it untenable, even from the standpoint of belief in divine right in general.

Next comes the principle of government by consent. This, as opposed to Anarchism, may be stated in a nutshell: Government is all right, for nobody opposes it; and if anybody does, he's nobody. In other words, the number of those who object to government is so slight that it is not worth while, for their sake, interfering with the convenience of those who desire government. This argument may be answered by showing how little any honest convincing can do with the abolition of government, or (morally) by asking how the convenience of the majority justifies invasion of the rights of the minority. But, aside from all theoretical answers, the argument will be practically answered, and will fall by its own weight, whenever the number of objectors becomes considerable. Those who rest their case here ought even now to acknowledge that government must be given up whenever a reasonably large minority demands it. This argument, then, though it may be an important one for some time to come, will drop out of sight before we reach the end of our struggle.

The argument which is doing the real work of holding back our cause now, is the first objection which comes to the mind of the average man, is that "it wouldn't work": that if police service were not in the hands of a monopoly, there would be continual misunderstandings and conflicts between different defensive forces, and intolerable general confusion. This is the argument of those who interpret "government" as a new thing on the ground of its strangeness. When the average man has had the Anarchistic idea brought before his mind often enough to wear off its strangeness, his horse sense will show him how it is at least practicable, whether desirable or not; and I think that most men, as soon as they perceive the practicality, will acknowledge that it "might be a good thing if we could get it." The next step will be to want to get it. But I may be too sanguine on this point; but it seems to me that general familiarity with our programme, which familiarity is to be secured by mere repetition, is all that is necessary to give us a very great body of supporters. Our policy, then, is to conduct the most extensive possible agitation and to concentrate our efforts on individual victims by the Letter-Writing Corps and similar methods. When we have twenty-five thousand adherents and one thousand more or less faithful agitators, we shall find unexpected converts coming in at a rate that will make us imagine we have a majority. This argument also, then, though now the most troublesome of all, will be got rid of by our mere growth.

Many will squarely claim that it is our duty to make our neighbors moral by all means, including force, and that we must have government for this purpose. But the "spirit of the times" declares that this is "not the province of government," and the reasons against it are familiar to the most conservative individualist. Possibly the prohibition agitation may yet bring this argument to an end, as I think it will. At present, certainly, it is one of those which are least appealed to.

One other argument is rarely heard as yet, but is pressing itself forward, and will yet, I believe, take the first rank of all. It is often used by State Socialists and governmental individualists, but is turned against Anarchists. It is, that, man being essentially a "social being," all separations between men, of whatever sort, are contrary to the law of nature, and all schemes of society which admit of such separations are in so far to be condemned. Therefore government, an institution which brings together in one organization everybody within its reach, whether they will or not, is a great step toward perfection; and its sphere ought to be continually enlarged, till all men on earth are united in one body, acting together in every concern of life where any sort of cooperation is possible.

It is true that man's nature requires him to unite in society. It may also be conceded that the theoretical perfection requires that all be free, so that whatever any one does for the general good shall be a purely voluntary action. But while men are imperfect we must give up one part of perfection, either liberty or universality. Why must it be liberty? Give us liberty, and human nature will assert itself. Men will come together as thoroughly as nature demands. This argument (which is used also about marriage and other things) is false, because man's instinct leads him to act in a certain way, therefore he must be forced to act in such, as is the height of absurdity.

Indeed, government, by maintaining national legislation, is really a bar to the working of the instinct for union. The annexation of Canada for instance, would be a step toward the desired "federation of the world." Labor unions, religious societies, and other voluntary organizations have already annexed Canada; it is only government, and those societies which choose to follow the track of government, which pay any attention to the boundary. If men were left free to unite as their natural wishes and busi-
ness convenience direct, that boundary would lose its importance within ten years. The most important truth of our time, you say, is that men's instincts and needs require all to unite. Well, then give men's needs and instincts a chance to assert their power, and take away the separating force of government.

All this is very plausible, you answer; but the fact remains that Anarchists assert a right of individual secession. Now, any man who would wish to withdraw from his fellows is an abnormal man, is, in a mild way, insane, and should not be left free to carry out the monstrous doctrine of a diseased brain.

Would you have a law to prohibit monks and nuns, then? For that is what your argument comes to. Or is it so sure that a man is abnormal for wishing to break off a certain part of his relations with a certain large number of others, if those others have been using those relations in a way to injure him? And if it be so, do specialists in nervous diseases say that crack-brained men ought to be restrained by force from following out their fancies, so long as they do not make themselves dangerous to others?

But, you say, the benefits of the State are so much greater than any possible injuries it can inflict that no one can find it profitable to secede.

Why, then, as soon as your statement has been proved true by a fair experiment, no one will want to secede, except for whim's sake, and the State will stand firm without the support of force. As to the men with a whim, can you prove that this whim would be more harmful, either to them or to society, than many whims which are allowed free course?

But you take it yet another way. It is plainly God's will that all men should unite. Union implies government, for there can be no union without a central controlling authority. Therefore no man can wish to secede without God's will, and any scheme of society that contemplates such secession is condemned by God.

A revival of two arguments that we thought we were done with. I can only repeat, there is no evidence that God wants men to be made cooperative by threats and violence more than that he wants them to be made faithful churchgoers by threats and violence. And a union that is not maintained by threats and violence is not a government.

When will you see that man can be trusted to get for himself what he needs without the stimulus of your fist, and that a good thing is all the better for being enjoyed under freedom?

Stephen T. Bryant.

The Atchison Railroad management is accused of fake broadcasting, judging with figures, and fraud of all kinds. This is a matter between the stockholders and the officials. What the public is directly concerned with is the threat of systematic violation of the interstate commerce law by the road, which has granted millions of dollars in rebates and concealed the transactions in various ways more or less ingenious. The interstate commerce act may be said to have been passed chiefly to prevent the different forms of discrimination, but now the law is only used against railroad workmen. Inasmuch as the labor and farmer organi-

ations worked hard to get the law enacted, there is some poetic justice in the present turn of affairs; but our friends, the moral reformers, who are so anxious to eliminate lawlessness and criminality, can find no ground in any such conceptions for complaining at the crimes of railroad managers and powerful corporations. Yet when it is suggested that the Atchison managers should be punished for their defiance of law, the law and order champions are apathetic while the accused openly declare that the law is a farce and sham which all railroads systematically and regularly violate. Will you, they ask, single out a few men among the many who are guilty of the same thing, and when it is absolutely certain that nobody will ever observe your absurd law? I wonder if those who talk so learnedly about crime and criminals have in mind railroad presidents and managers as well as tramps, Cozyites, strikers, boycotters, and critics of government.

The Treasury's bill for the exclusion and deportation of "Alien Anarchists" from this blessed country is not law—at least. The Senate passed it without division and debate (being nothing if not loyal, safe, and patriotic), but in the House its passage was prevented by a few progressives who amuse their allies on free trade making it a question of public policy. These few unpatriotic wretches objected to the enactment of such a drastic and unprecedented law without discussion, and as unanimous consent was, in the absence of a quorum, necessary to its passage, the pernicious and ignorant piece of legislation was defeated. The chief objections to the bill, as pointed out by Congressman Warner, were that it omitted to give a definition of the crime against which it was aimed, and that it put too much power into the hands of administrative officers. Some panic-stricken congressmen, eager to pass the bill, got the committee to report an amendment defining an Anarchist as "any person who states the destruction by violence of all government as the movement of the United States," but Mr. Warner and a few others insisted in their obstruction. The press, ignorant, reckless, and unprincipled as usual, found the objections to the bill too trivial for consideration, and abused the decent congressmen who exhibited some regard for American traditions as lemming allies of Anarchists. But there was a dissenting opinion, voiced by a few independent and Democratic newspapers, among which I am surprised to discover the radical and vicious New York "Evening Post." Its utterances (reproduced elsewhere on this Hill bill are so sane and refreshing, so consistent with the editor's campaign against free speech and resistance to social evil, that I confess myself at a loss to account for them. However, the ways of our newspapers are mysterious, and we must be duly thankful for their lucid moments.

It is a great satisfaction to me to publish Mr. Wordsworth Donisthorpe's letter on the pseudo-Individualist "Liberty Review." The report to which the letter refers has not reached Liberty or its readers, and would not have been credited if it had reached us. Mr. Donisthorpe's experience while editor of "Jus" has not been forgotten by the friends of Liberty,
The "Woman's Journal," the leading organ of the woman suffrage movement, calls David Obermyer, the Democratic candidate for governor of Kansas, "an anti-suffrage and anti-prohibition crank." Since the anti-suffrage and prohibition proposition people been the cranks of the community? A crank is one who ventures to disagree with the majority. Are the prohibitionists and woman-suffragists in the majority, then? If so, what are they fighting for? A Maine newspaper, writing about the corruption and inefficiency of the police, says that matters have come to such a pass in some cities and towns that, when a man's house is robbed, he must hire a private detective if he wants any real work done for the apprehension of the thief. Yet, when one suggests that the compulsory support of the police should be abandoned, and protection of property and other rights entrusted to private agencies, he is considered crazy. What could we do without [paying] the police? And who would club and arrest strikers and peaceable boozers? When you join government ownership of all natural and artificial monopolies with the single tax, what is the result? Why, State Socialism pure and simple. Yet Philadelphia's "Justice" endorses the statement, made by some uninitiated sheet, that the result is "all that is valuable in Socialism", and all that is desirable in individualism." This astonishing lapse on the part of "Justice" must not escape the attention of G. F. Stephens, who is doubtless preparing a new edition of his "The Single Tax as She is Spoken," wherein all the exceptions to the "rule" of the Single Taxers are recorded and explained.

Henri Rochefort could not have made a better argument, despite his brilliance and genius, against the new press laws of France than was contained in a recent object lesson of his. He expressed his views in his Paris organ on the question in the most logical way. His usual leading article consisted of a column of miniature representations of human hands, with the fingers bent to represent the language of those who are deprived of the power of speech. At the end Rochefort duly signed his name. The readers doubtless enjoyed the hit, but the smile of the authorities was sickly.

Recorder Smyth, in enraging the grand jury, referred to the unusually large number of prisoners in the jails and declared that the hard times accounted for the fact. "In the course of a long experience," he added, "I have observed that criminal cases multiply in the courts when persons are out of employment." What does the plutocratic press think of this admission? Is it not perilously near the danger line? Hard times increase the number of criminals, but with tens of thousands of people times are always hard, even in the most prosperous period, the army of the unemployed is very large. Now to say that men become criminals through poverty and enforced idleness is to condemn the present industrial system, which, according to the best conservative authorities, necessarily involves the existence of a reserve army of unemployment, and to incite the victims to crime. Besides, the Recorder's theory is outrageously false. The plutocratic press knows that criminals are born, not made, and that the honest citizen will die of slow starvation rather than violate the sacred laws of property or any other law equally sacred.

Elizabeth Cady Stanton, the foremost champion of woman suffrage, tells the editor of the "Sun" that the defeat of her cause in the New York constitutional convention was caused by the "sordid and ignoble" methods of the opponents, whose "blessings of civilization" have nothing to do with the case; we all want to get a maximum of enjoyment for a minimum of trouble. Is not this one of the postulates of political economy, old and new? It is curious that every defender of monopoly, no matter whether he calls himself protectionist or individualist, is forced to preach the gospel of dearness. Harrison and McKinley had no use for cheap goods, and insisted that the workmen ought to pay the highest prices for everything; the "Liberty Review" is pained at the attempts to lower the prices of gas and water and lighting. Neither of these "schools" is willing to trust to free competition to settle the question of dearness and cheapness. Each holds a brief for certain favorite monopolies.

Repudiating a Pseudo-Individualist.

To the Editor of Liberty.

A notice has been going the round of the English press to the effect that I am the proprietor of the "Liberty Review." In justice to myself I will respectfully ask you to allow me to contradict that statement in your columns. I have never had any connection with that weekly organ of the Liberty and Property Defense League. And although I observe that my name appears in its list of contributors, I can say that I have never written a single line in it. Since it took its present shape I believe I did contribute an article to it when Mr. Cranston was one of its editors, but this was prior to the establishment of the Liberty Review. I am not even a subscriber, nor do I ever see a copy, except when some friend forwards me one in order to draw my attention to an article or an article of mine that has happened recently, and it makes me anxious not to be associated with it in any way, especially in the minds of readers of Liberty. So far as I can gather from what I have seen of it, the "Liberty Review" is made up to support the detestable action of the French government with respect to Anarchists and many other doings of State with which no lover of liberty can have any sympathy whatever.

WORKWORTH DONOHUE.

Anarchist Letter-Writing Corps.

The Secretary wants every reader of Liberty to send in his name for enrolment. Those who do so thereby pledge themselves to write, when possible, a letter every fortnight, on Anarchist or kindred subjects, to the "target" assigned in Liberty for that fortnight. All attention members not a letter and to lose an opportunity of informing the secretary of suitable targets. Address, STEPHEN T. BYRNES, East Hardwick, Vt.

Target, section A.—Col. A. S. Odlair, 400 South Spice street, Nashville, Tenn. In a recent letter to the Nashville "Sunday Times" he declared that silver has been demonetized, and that the price of every ounce of gold is payable in gold, at the bidding of the money power and Ernest Seyd, with the intent of robbing the millions. He says: "Any manipulated fluctuation of the coin, or other money of a country, is to the creditor or debtor class, when the government determines what, and how much, the people may use as money is an offense for adequate publish

Section B.—The "Good Citizen," published by the Columbian College of Citizenship, Highland Park, Ill., says in the July number: "We request communica

Section C.—"Who is the Anarchist?" To be published in subsequent issues.

STEPHEN T. BYRNES.
The Beauties of Government.

The readers of Liberty are urgently invited to con- tribute to this department. It is open to any statement of facts which exhibit the State in any phase of its fourfold nature. You describe its facade, you depict its passions, you describe its passions, you describe the passions which move the State. You may but words, clipped from recent publications, to illustrate your views.

NEW ORLEANS BRANCH OF THE BROTHERHOOD OF THIEVES.

[Press Dispatch.]

New Orleans, Aug. 16. — A political revolution is threatened in New Orleans soon, which will probably produce important political results in the State. This is the struggle between the present city government and the citizens, which means the complete ruin of the former, and the latter the destruction of the police laws. The citizens are already discussing the question. What will be the effect if a majority of the city council and other officials resign, are impeached and dismissed from office, or are convicted of bribery and sent to the peniten- tiary?

The trouble arose out of a grant to the Illinois Central Railroad, which is estimated as worth a million dollars or more, but which was given for nothing. The present council, which was elected in 1892 for four years, and all the members of which are Demo- crats, had already voted away several valuable street franchises. This aroused some suspicion, but when it unanimously gave the Illinois Central Railroad the right to build tracks on a half dozen residential streets it raised a storm which has not yet subsided. For a time it looked very much like one of those popular outbursts for which New Orleans has become famous. At last a meeting was held to protest against the grant there were hundreds who wanted to march at once on the City Hall. A better spirit prevailed, how- ever, and a week was given to the council in which to repeal the ordinance. The citizens announced to a mass meeting to be held in Lafayette square, immediately in front of the City Hall.

A committee was appointed to wait on the council, demand the repeal of the objectionable ordinance, and report to the meeting. There were no threats, but it was felt generally that if the council refused, trouble would break. The ordinance remained unchanged to the last moment, and then surrendered to avoid trouble. The ordinance was unanimously repealed, and the citi- zens, who had assembled in the Washington Artillery Armory to elect new councilmen, were termed sus- tained by theNever Wipe the Tears of a Fool with the Wipes of a Wise One.

THE TRADERS.

In Chicago the aldermen have carried through what is known in political vernacular as a "cold spell." An ordinance was declared null and void by a vote of 53 out of 68 members, scrupulously refusing even to consider im- portant amendments submitted by him which were plainly in the interest of consumers and of the munici- palITY. It is believed that a majority of the aldermen who voted for the scheme have been paid or are to be paid for this, they snap their fingers in the face of the public and ask, "What are you going to do about it?"

HOW CHILDREN ARE CARED FOR BY THE STATE.

The following story told at the North Looms Police Court recently, together with exposures of the manner in which the State treats the children entrusted to its care, should make every parent's heart leap for joy at the prospect of the Socialists' ideal being realized when all families will be broken up, and every child will be brought in barracks such as those at Brentwood:

Mr. Brown, the President of the Council and Acting Mayor, Irwin Jones and five out of a total of thirty aldermen have already been indicted for receiving or giving money to grafters, but the verdict of the jury is not yet half given. Most of these indictments are in connection with a single fraud — the construc- tion of a new jail — in which the city has been badly swindled.

Nor are the indictments all. The Constitution al- lows the impeachment of any official on the petition of twenty-one citizens, and it is likely that the proceedings against him. The Citizens' Protective Association has decided to begin impeachment pro- ceedings against the corrupt officials; and the resis- tances is so general that it is said that sixteen out of a total of thirty aldermen will be impeached. If this is done it will leave the council without a quorum, and it will be impossible to pass any bills until vacant places are filled. The impeachment proceedings will probably be a battle royal between the council and the Citizens' Protective Association. The latter is expected to cost a large sum, and the Protective Association has started a popular impeachment fund, which is be- ing largely subscribed to. The councilmen, it will be said, are holding up the impeachment proceedings from the citizens, which will remove them from office, and criminal proceedings by the State, which is the penalty.

All this has caused considerable excitement and demoralization in the City Hall, and many resignations are promised to escape the consequences. Already one of the most prominent members of the council, Mr. Thirlby, has resigned, as he explains, at the solicitation of his family, and because he is so annoyed by the bad name the council has secured; and there are others likely to follow his example.

The feeling is general that the present city adminis- tration is going to pieces. Even its friends recognize this and are loud in their denunciations of these offi- cials, whose deeds have brought discredit on the whole municipal government, on the honest as well as the dishonest.

THIEVES WHO ARE NOT AFRAID.

In Chicago the aldermen have carried through what is known in political vernacular as a "cold spell." An ordinance was declared null and void by a vote of 53 out of 68 members, scrupulously refusing even to consider im- portant amendments submitted by him which were plainly in the interest of consumers and of the munici- palITY. It is believed that a majority of the aldermen who voted for the scheme have been paid or are to be paid for this, they snap their fingers in the face of the public and ask, "What are you going to do about it?"

The following story told at the North Looms Police Court recently, together with exposures of the manner in which the State treats the children entrusted to its care, should make every parent's heart leap for joy at the prospect of the Socialists' ideal being realized when all families will be broken up, and every child will be brought in barracks such as those at Brentwood:

The Hackney Board of Guardians summoned several persons for not main- taining the children in the barracks, and then sent them to the state. One of these was Charles Nocquet, who had two children in the Brentwood Schools. He said he was a widow and in very poor circumstances. He had been fourteen years in a solicitor's office, but now was working on the roads. He had, through his pov- erty, been compelled to go into the workhouse, and his children were sent to the Brentwood Schools. He got work, and tried to keep them there when they were in a very bad condition, — the girl with opthalmia, and the boy with the head in a shocking state. His chil- dren are under one hundred and fifty years of age in the schools suffering as they were, and no attempt was made to isolate them. When in this con- dition, as it was necessary they should have fresh air, they were turned into the sheds adjoining the school after dark, and then were very much frightened.

ARRESTED FOR LIKING CERTAIN PICTURES — THE "MALE DOG" AGAIN.

[Press Dispatch.]

MONTICELLO, N. Y., August 16 — Frank B. Teal, a photographer of Hurleyville, and Clarence F. Stratton, the mail carrier between Monticello and Fallsburg, were arrested yesterday afternoon by Anthony Com- stock for dealing in obscene pictures. Mr. Comstock has been collecting evidence against them for the past year and has had men writing from different places in various States in New York. But they denied that they had ever been very far, and it was not until a few weeks ago that a man residing in New Jersey succeeded in get- tming one. United States Marshal Sevis accompanied Mr. Comstock when he made the raid. They found 3,400 improper pictures in Teal's house. Teal and Stratton were lodged in jail overnight. This morning Mr. Comstock took them to New York, or the uncom- merseable "living pictures" which he nightly exhibited at the music halls and theatres. Suppose the Lexow Committee take hold of Mr. Comstock and find out how far he permits any go free and restrains another, and exactly what the induce- ment is which enables him to modify his opinion about certain shows and certain firms.

[New York Tribune.]

PHILADELPHIA, Aug. 21. — Charles C. Rickeerson, 219 of the seventeen years, who was arrested yesterday in Lancaster, Pa., at the instance of Anthony Comstock, for sending obscene literature through the mails, was arrested before United States Commissioner Craig here today. He waived a hearing and was held in $5,000 bail. M. L. Deffuzzie, age twenty-two years, also of Lancaster, who was arrested by Mr. Comstock at the same time, on the charge of printing obscene pictures, will be tried at Lancaster, his offense not coming under the jurisdiction of the United States courts.

Mr. Comstock stated today that the arrests were the most important he had ever made, and he was satisfied that the former head of the greatest publishers and distributors of vile matter in the country had been unmasked. Young Rickeerson told Mr. Comstock today, as the larger of the two, that his wife sold the objectionable books and photographs, and that H. J. Good, night clerk in the Lancaster post office, sold them. Mr. Comstock was also able to pin down a man of distribution. No further arrests will be made at pre- sent, but that has been discussed from the postal service.

Assistant Postmaster Albright, of Lancaster, in addi- tion Mr. Comstock in the prosecution of young Ricke-
son. The arrest of a man named Teale, in Harwley, N. Y., last Friday, on a similar charge, led to the arrest of the Lancaster violators. Teale admitted that he obtained the pamphlets from them.

ELASTIC LIBEL LAWS AND THE STAGE.

There is a law in France which embitters all the life of every dramatic author, as it confers upon every French citizen the right of having a novel or play immediately published without a license. The author is not even required to mention it. If a character in a comedy bears the name of Dupont or Dubois, all the Duponts and Dubois are enabled to insist on a change of the name, or, if the manager refuses, of the removal of the play from the bill. In their anxiety to avoid unpleasantries the parodists of the Cluny Theatre de- cided to designate these characters in a recent piece more by number than by name. The effect thus produced is some what peculiar, as for instance:

"Ah, claiming 192, you are the most adorable of all women."

"And you are a flatterer, Count 18." While the two were thus exchanging compliments, an elderly gentleman suddenly appears, and calls out in a voice of thunder:

"I have caught you now, Count 18: Are there any cowards in your family?"

"Gloriously!" exclaimed Count 19, trembling in his shoes.

"Gloriously!" exclaimed Duke 53.

"Gloriously!" exclaimed Count 97.

"Gloriously!" exclaimed the duke, "turn this gentleman out of my house!"

But at this point a fellow in the audience springs to his feet. "That is really too bad," he shouts in the direction of the stage. "I will send you a summons."

The duke answers in surprise: "What have you to complain of? Seventy-four is only a number."

"That's just it. It is the very number I bore when in jail, and I am going to be degraded by having a servant dubbed with it."

Everybody had to give into that argument; it was the law. The play was stopped there and then.

THE FREE-PASS FORM OF BRIBERY.

President Grant submitted to the Constitutional Convention yesterday a letter on the subject of free passes from J. T. Brooks, second vice president of the Pennsylvania Railroad, in which he says:

"I have had a personal experience on the question for a quarter of a century in connection with the lines of the Railroad Company. For about eight years I have maintained, single-handed, a contest against the issue of free passes to persons occupying official positions in city, county, State, and Federal Government. The only exception to the impression that I have made the only evidence that I have that the passes made at the time of their arrests just mentioned were made, most of the arrested persons and others defered Jupiter Arnold and his reconstructed statute. The New York "Times" says that when one arrives in the town are engaged in an effort of money, the ability always be-

"S. W. Nichols, assistant editor of the "Weekly Messenger," sat, with door wide open, preparing copy for the next edition. The correspondent said that he heard the actual facts about the clergymen."

"Good for the knight of the quill!" Jupiter Arnold said that as long as summer visitors "behaved themselves quietly" they would not be troubled, and he told the newsmen they would be. Good for the correspondent. "The law says that business people shall have only 100 free passes to impress," said the correspondent. "What right do you have any other grand jury to limit the hours of a man's work or to say when and in what manner he shall go to work?"

"Oh, I guess our association can fix that. John Light says it is all good, and they have done it over in South Norwalk, so we will do it, or the officers will be fined."

That is the way such bigoteasting enable little local gods to play fast and loose with justice and equal freedom. If the law was capriciously enforced, Raymond, who serves the writs, would be arrested and fined for playing the church organ on Sunday. But, of course, the church is exempt from all law. It gets exacted for the gratification of the people.

THE POLICEMAN AS CRITIC OF NEW TRIALS.

The right of public meeting in open places is being duely re-established in Manchester. Four weeks ago, a false step the vanished, and on Sunday another unfortunate incident occurred in Stevenson square. A meeting of Socialists was held, and a fairly large number of speakers, often, for questions of interest, seemed to have condemned the action of the watch committee in interfering with former meetings in the square. To offer such a criticism the Stevenson square committee, only engaged to offer it from the platform of the Free Trade Hall or in the columns of a daily paper. But as soon as the watch committee came under criticism of a social committee, the chairman who was present seemed to have stopped the meeting on the spot and removed the speaker from the square. It does not seem that the meeting was dispersed on the ground that the speakers were Socialists, for a well-known Socialist had already spoken from that party's point of view for a quarter of an hour when the interference took place. The police inter- vened, and he would seem to have condemned any of their superiors was condemned. It is said that this was done on the responsibility of the subordinate officer on duty at the scene, while the chief constable had admitted to the chief committee of indirect responsibility. The subordinate, we have no doubt, was trying to carry out his duty as he understood it. And how was he to understand it? Well, a few weeks the watch committee had passed a resolution forbidding all Anarchist meetings; the Stipendiary Magistrate had bound two men over to keep the peace for insisting on watching the meeting till nothing to do with either political or social questions of any kind; the chief constable, writing for the watch committee, had told the correspondent that any discussion of "Anarchist" policy would be suppressed; the chairman of the watch committee had told the city council that this letter was due to "an unfortunate and regrettable confusion of ideas;" and the police committee had ordered the police to interfere with no meetings which do not cause serious danger to the life of the state. All of which is out of the way. But the police committee had ordered the police to interfere with no meetings which do not cause serious danger to the life of the state. All of which is out of the way. But the police commit- tees have a duty to perform, and, if they do not carry it out, it is the duty of the public to see that the duty is performed."

THE STATE MAKES US REST.

The New York "Times"—"Democrat"—has taken up the case of W. K. Capps, an Adventist of Dreesville, N. J., who was fined five dollars for violating the Sunday law. His case was appealed to the supreme court of the State, and there the decision of the lower court was affirmed. The fine and costs amount to $1100, which he must serve out in prison at twenty-five cents per day. Mr. Capps has a wife and four children, the eldest only six years of age, and one sick at the time the fine was imposed, an instance of imprudence or impera-

AND HOW MANY WILL REMAIN?

Their numbers are not going to cool much time on An-

archists in Italy. It is reported that 2,000 of them are to be sent out of the country forthwith.
White Anarchism, Force, and Sentiment.

I am grateful to Mrs. Holmes for calling attention to my "Color Line" by criticizing it. Knowing pretty well where her sympathies are, I did not expect her to approve it.

She compares me very unkindly with Mr. Yarros as a student of the present conditions, but as I am really making the best, and conscious of my deficiencies, and sincerely admiring Mr. Yarros' recent editorials, we shall not quarrel.

My "millitant Anarchists," she accuses me, "are not, in any sense, the drones of violence and destruction; but instead of active partnership feels a natural inclination to kill, burn, and destroy, or to see it done, if by possible means the prevailing injustice can only be so abolished."

As I copy these words, I lift my eyes to a little German paper sold me by one of Justus Schawb's friends at a meeting in sympathy with Emma Goldman, held at Clarendon Hall, New York, last winter. I was assured that this was an Anarchist paper, and I know those were Real Anarchists, because that banner was freely displayed.

The title of the paper is "Die Rache," "The Revenge." I can read but little German, but this little paper has black-and-white and significant paragraphs and war-cries, which are difficult to understand, and which, if they do not reveal a "natural inclinations to kill, burn, and destroy," at least indicate a spirit of "second nature" in that direction.

I quote:

"Die Rache.
"Die Rache der Unterdruckten.
"Die Sexual革命.
"Herrsch für diesten Bomben; solche zu 25 Sept., 1896, der Alte in die jetzt die dritte "Herrsch für diesten Bomben, solche zu 25 Sept., 1896, der Alte in die jetzt die dritte
"No Flag.""Herrsch für die dritte "Herrsch für die Propaganda der That!"

Rie., etc., etc.

All this on the first page, but fairly representative of the rest of the contents.

In short, this, from beginning to end, one prolonged shout for dynamite, expropriation, and revenge, and of exultation over the wounds and death and ruin already wrought by dynamite explosions.

If it be objected that these are Germans, and that Americans do not feel so then I reply that Dyer D. Love, who was an American of the Americans, wrote very much such fireworks in the old "Alarms." And I am certain that no competent jury will say these are the utterances of men who regard violence as a sad necessity, but as something of "human nature"; I know that it has a "natural inclination" to revenge, a "natural inclination to kill, burn, and destroy," and get revenge, and a "natural inclination" to enjoy the result when once crossed.

And I feel equally certain that I do not slander the Anarchists of the red when I say that those utterances do not unfairly represent at least one side of their propaganda. They do not, as a rule, represent war as a sad necessity, but as something to be embraced with enthusiasm and exultation, as the certain and only remedy: they stir up class hatred and continually imply, and often directly assert, that the rich are the delirious and intentional torturers of the poor, that a ferocious revenge is just, and that there is nothing short of that which will ever turn their minds to justice.

That the Anarchists of the red include some of the most brilliant intellects, and some of the finest natures, I freely admit. Some of my dearest friends have held their views. But when they come to this subject, they seem to be eased with a sudden insensibility and dilute with passion and excitement. Strongly I agree that their own self-reports seem to most premonitory over their logical faculties, they are most prone to call me a "sentimentalist" if I urge the superiority of the white flag.

Let us look at this formidable accusation.

Webster defines "sentiment" as "a thought prompted by passion or feeling." Let any one read my "White Flag Anarchism" and compare it with any article in "Die Rache," and tell which is the most "prompted by passion or feeling."

The Webster's definition: "Hence, generally, the decision of the mind formed by deliberation or reasoning;" this, after a quotation from D. Stewart, that the "word sentiment, agreeably to the use made of

the word by our best English writers, expresses, in my own opinion, very highly those complex determinations of the mind which result from the cooperation of reason with emotions and natural feelings."

As a sentimentalist on this line I gladly plead guilty.

My decision that peace is a much wiser condition than war, and that the world in general will say where social problems are to be satisfactorily solved, is not based on passion or feeling or tender susceptibility, but "formed by deliberation and reasoning."

And this is the bottom line, the decision formed since I became one of the Anarchists, and as a logical result of their teachings. Really, I believe Nature intended me for a soldier. My natural tastes are decidedly military, and I rather am a look upon war as the "great medicine." But as soon as I became convinced of the superiority of intellectual methods and liberal processes it, I at last, all my senseless faith in bloodshed as a solved of scientic problems. But all this is aside from the main question. Whether the Anarchists for whom Mrs. Holmes speaks are apostles of passion and revenge, abyss for blood to slake their hate, or angels of mercy who fight only by plying hearts, all those who believe in bloodshed as a necessary and expedient remedy have an appropriate place under the name of Anarchists of the Red, and all those for whom I speak, whether tender sentimentals or cold-blooded scientists, who believe that violence to terrorize is the only means of solving problems, and the education of self-interest are alone efficient are appropriately Anarchists of the White.

That is the line I want to draw, that is the distinction I want to make. I discovered in drawing such a line, which everyone would recognize, and in establishing a name which every one would use in discussions about Anarchy, my object would be accomplished.

The flag itself is with me only a means un

ingly wanted to apply to that. The poem "No Flag" expresses my preference. Flags are really tools of war, improvised and multi-colored, which works worship and to which they offer human sacrifices, of little value and shorn of all dignity among men who are sane and who intelligently love themselves.

I must thank Comrade Zeitinger for his kind endorsement. I am quite willing his device be adopted, if the comedians prefer, but personally I believe the flag as I devised it would be artistically more beautiful, and that the fewer and simpler the symbols we employ the better.

A good deal has been written about human nature in this discussion, and I would like to continue a little further under that head.

It is not human nature to be just to an enemy. Before we have any conception of a natural and self-supporting basis, and nothing else deserves the name, — we must have a general inclination to do justice between ourselves, a general conviction that self-interest is best served by agreement, and a general knowledge of what justice requires. Human evolution has now progressed so far in the social direction that human beings generally are inclined to do justice to each other and to regard justice to others as self-beneficial, except where those others are enemies. Between foes, Socialism ceases and antagonism begins; the social tie is forgotten, and each becomes a cruel and selfish savage. At present there is generally between the rich and the poor a justice of feeling, but an injustice of survival. The poor are painfully conscious that something is wrong, and the rich vaguely conscious, but neither know what all them with any clearness, nor the remedy. To that which is wrong, because it is wrong, and the rich vaguely conscious, but neither know what all them with any clearness, nor the remedy. To that which is wrong, because it is wrong, and the rich vaguely conscious, but neither know what all them with any clearness, nor the remedy. To that which is wrong, because it is wrong, and the rich vaguely conscious, but neither know what all them with any clearness, nor the remedy.

The poor are painfully conscious that something is wrong, and the rich vaguely conscious, but neither know what all them with any clearness, nor the remedy. To that which is wrong, because it is wrong, and the rich vaguely conscious, but neither know what all them with any clearness, nor the remedy. To that which is wrong, because it is wrong, and the rich vaguely conscious, but neither know what all them with any clearness, nor the remedy. To that which is wrong, because it is wrong, and the rich vaguely conscious, but neither know what all them with any clearness, nor the remedy. To that which is wrong, because it is wrong, and the rich vaguely conscious, but neither know what all them with any clearness, nor the remedy. To that which is wrong, because it is wrong, and the rich vaguely conscious, but neither know what all them with any clearness, nor the remedy. To that which is wrong, because it is wrong, and the rich vaguely conscious, but neither know what all them with any clearness, nor the remedy.
France, London, and Chicago down to the present day, — being the symbol of the sun, which through labor fructifies the earth, of the blood in all men’s veins, which looks on yellow, the symbol of fraternity and the common origin and destiny of man; although, for these reasons, it has always struck terror to the organ- ism as the symbol of the sun, and the Protestant, and has been more respected than it is today, — as why should it? — the fierce emblem of the down- trodden, for justice has always required blood, and not book, and the past, in spite of the philosophi- cal conviction of its fullness: Despair and suffering being seldom philosophical; and while it seems a heavy undertaking to break away from those ancient traditions that reject the simple and obvious symbol of militant labor, yet the reasons for so doing seem weighty; and, if of an ephemeral nature, still no less imposing: and the past, in spite of the philosophi- cal conviction of its fullness: Despair and suffering being seldom philosophical; and while it seems a heavy undertaking to break away from those ancient traditions that reject the simple and obvious symbol of militant labor, yet the reasons for so doing seem weighty; and, if of an ephemeral nature, still no less imposing.

N. B. The improvement referred to would be to have outside the green diamond a club yellow, and within the red heart the ace of spades in black. Then hoist our banner, comrades.

"A heart girt with a club and spade on a diamond
versant above a yellow club on a field argente.
"

WILLIAM BAILIE.

No Such Crime as Blasphemy.

In the "Echo," C. C. Moore, referred recently to in the department "Mutual Propaganda," a letter was published by Judge Parker sustaining Mr. Moore’s demurrer to the indictment, which fortunately takes the case out of that department. So remarkable and refreshing is the decision that it deserves to be repro- duced here in full.

The defendant, C. C. Moore, is charged with having committed the offence of blasphemy. It is alleged in the indictment that defendant, in uttering words with offensive levity and ridicule the scriptural account of the divine conception of birth, and to bring contempt against Almighty God and his divine pur- poses, has used the word of birth, did maliciously and blasphemously publish in a newspaper known as the "Blue Grass Blade" the following words:

"When I say that Jesus Christ was a man exactly like I am and had a human father and mother exactly like me, it is quite possible I call it blasphemy. When they say that he was a God and I am not, the only truth in their position is that he died."

This defendant has been accused with singular ear- ness and ability by counsel both for the prosecution and the defense, and the question has been very well as a new one in this State, the court has given the case un- usual consideration.

We have no statute against blasphemy, and our Courts have no law to go upon this or any similar question. We must, therefore, in our investigations have recourse to the com- mon law and to the judicial decisions of other States and countries.

Blackstone, in treating of offenses against God and religion, speaks of this offense as "blasphemy against the divine being or providence," a thing being prevented by contumelious reproaches of our Savoir Christ. "The punishment, he says, is by fine and imprisonment or other infamous corporal punishment. The ground upon which this power is claimed rests upon a decided affirmation of the "Christianity is part of the laws of England." The leading case in this country in which the crime of blasphemy was tried was that of the Puritans in the Boston, decided by the Supreme Court of New York in 1810, Chief Justice Kent delivering the opinion. In that case it was decided that the common law against blasphemy was still in force, and a fine of $500 and imprisonment three months was af- firmed. The court in this opinion cited with approval a number of English cases, in which the right to pun- ish blasphemy had been vigorously upheld, and quoted the words of Lord Bacon: "It is not for us to define what is little and big, but it is the reverence for religion and two principal causes I have and know of Athietic- curous controversies and profane scoffing. Whilst this opinion of the propriety was part of the law of the State of New York, but expressly disclaimed that there was an established religion in that State; yet the common law with which it is not the definition of a law by Black- stone, and the great reliance placed upon the English decisions, makes us hesitate to walk in the path trod by Chief Justice Kent. In England there was an established church. The Church was part of the State. Apostasy and heresy were punished; the first commission of either offence disqualifying the offender for holding any office, and the second leading to punishment by three years' imprisonment without bail. Even witchcraft was claimed by Blackstone to be an offence against God and religion, and to deny the existence of such a thing, he said, was "at once to flatly contradict the revealed word of God," though he appeared to think it well that the punishment of this crime had fallen into disuse. The crime, he thought, had no well authenti- cated modern instance of its commission. In this country, where the divorce between Church and State is complete and final, we should examine with care and respect the law framed and intended for a country where Church and State are one. The difficulties in reconciling religious freedom with the right to punish both apostasy and heresy against any given religion are manifest. From the opinion given in the People vs. Ruggles, we may deduce as conclusions of the court that the people generally in this country and the community is engraven upon the morality of the country; that all religions are tolerated, but that this tolerance, as to false religions, means immunity from test oaths, disabilities, and the burdens of church establishments; that to revile the Christian religion is an offense, but that to revile other religions is not an offence punishable by law. In the bill of rights of the Constitution it is declared that all persons have "the right to wor- ship Almighty God according to the dictates of their consciences;" that "no preference shall be given by law to any religious sect, society, or denomination, nor to any particular system of ecclesiastical polity," and that "the civil rights, privileges, or capacities of no person shall be taken away or in anywise disabled or infringed upon or in any manner abridged by the abolition of any religious tenet, dogma, or teaching." It is difficult to conceive how language could have been used which would tend to place all religions on an exact equality before the law, they appear to have employed language well calculated to express their purpose. They recog- nized that a law was necessary, but that they held there were different religious views, that some had no religious faith, and, granting the fullest religious freedom, they declared that the rights of none should be "diminished or engrafted on account of his belief or disbelieve of any religious tenet, dogma, or teaching."

Under this constitution no form of religion can claim to be under the special guardianship of the law. The common law of England, whence our law of blas- phemy is derived, did have a certain religion under its guardianship, and this religion was part of the law. This great and generous liberty was the right of learned persons to decently debate upon controverted points. The essence of the law against blasphemy was that it was not to be punished by monetary and he- roy, was against blasphemy, and it was to uphold the established church, and not in any sense to maintain good order, that there was a law against blasphemy. The most superficial examination of the chapter in Blackstone treating of offences against God and religion, must convince any mind that the sole aim and object of these laws was to preserve the Christian religion, and that the Christian religion was accepted by the established church. It may seem to us that the punish- ments for those offenses were severe in the time of the Blackstone. But we may be sure the Puritans, as the stake and faggot had been of too frequent use in propagating what was deemed to be the true reli- gion. Even Blackstone complains that the definition of heresy is "a hazy and uncertain, and that the subject had been liable to be burnt for what he had not understood to be heresy until it was decided to be so by the ecclesiastical judge who interpreted the canonical scriptures. To deny any one of the persons of the tri- ous, who alone was the Holy, was the soul and body, was a heresy, and was punished in the same manner as apostasy.

Blasphemy is a crime grown from the same parent stock as heresy and licentiousness. It is one of the class of off- enses designed for the same general purpose, the fostering and protecting of a religion accepted by the State, the religion whose facts it was thought all good subjects should observe in the code of laws a country enjoying absolute religious freedom there is no place for the common law crime of blasphemy. Unsealed is the spirit of the age, the law- enforcement would be in contravention of the constitu- tion of this State, and this crime must be considered a stranger to the laws of Kentucky.

When we add that the demurrer be, and it is hereby sustained, the indictment is dismissed, the defendant’s bail bond is quashed, and the defendant is dismissed hence without day. To this ruling of the court the Commonwealth of Kentucky excepts, and prays an appeal to the Court of Appeals, which is granted.

Free-Currency Propaganda in London.

Comrade G. O. Warrick is doing excellent work in the London "Echo," which he regularly contributes articles on current questions under the pen-name of "Eldorado." In the "Eldorado" of August 22, he had the following article on the association recently or- ganized by our London comrades for the propaganda of mutual banking and free credit.

This is an association whose object is the establish- ment of an equitable monetary system as an essential factor in the equitable distribution of wealth. The movement in which it proposes to take part is an object by establishing mutual banks at as many places as possible, such banks to issue paper money, in defiance of the law, and to lend the same to members upon pledging-their property, thereby reducing class-collateral security. For this accommodation one-half of one per cent. commission only will be charged to cover working expenses and possible losses.

This association asserts that in assuming control of money and declaring what shall be, what shall not be money, the State has prohibited competition in bank- ing, and has established a monetary aristocracy, that there is no valid reason, nor is there any authority in the Constitution, for doing so; that the right to liberty, and the pursuit of happiness includes the right to own property, and that these rights necessarily includes the right to exchange that prop- erty, and the right to exchange it includes the right to determine what it shall be so changed for, be it any article of commerce, and that the right to exchange it includes the right to determine what it shall be so changed for, be it any article of commerce, and that the right to exchange it includes the right to determine what it shall be so changed for. Free-Currency Propaganda has an absolute moral right to put their ideas into practice if they can — to test them against the universe, and see whether they agree with its laws or not; and if another man, or any body of men, have the faintest shadow of right to say them nay.

I must think of it. Here is a man, Mr. Smith, to think: Mr. Smith says he has invented something — or is in the way to invent something — that will produce power. He says he can make a machine that can be put in the tunnel. Then he says he will build that sort, and that we shall be able to work on it, and without any power being applied to it. Most people think Mr. Smith is a little out of his mind, that he do not think of it. But if he is so good, and if we can get him to make a machine that can be put in the tunnel, then we shall be able to go on it.
The Detroit Alienation of Affection Cases.

In No. 292, in the beauties of Government department, Liberty reprinted from the Detroit "News" a report of the proceedings in a suit brought by plaintiff for the recovery of damages from defendant for alienating his wife's affections. It will be remembered that in this report mention was also made of an esteemed and brilliant contemporary, the "Arme Teufel," by the unfortunate wife. In court the prosecuting attorney sought to create a bias against the defendant. Robert Reitzel, the editor of "Der Arme Teufel," suggests that if it was worth while to republish the false and silly "News" report of that trial, it ought to have been accompanied by a translation of the "Arme Teufel" article on the same affair. Well, better late than never. Reitzel's article is certainly well worth summarizing.

Reitzel says that this was the third time that the "Arme Teufel" was produced in a Detroit court, "unfortunately, however, never in a way calculated to give a correct idea of the work and scope of the paper, or to justify a libel action for it." Speaking of the plaintiff, Reitzel says that he was one of those husbands who, when they become insolvent as such and are unable to save, make a last attempt to strike a profitable bargain out of the losing enterprise. That is, since the man in the case before us on the verge of idleness, this legal sort of love revenue was preeminently enjoyed by Christian and respectable experience in such things, or by some greedy lawyer. For a long time this honest man willingly accepted pecuniary aid for himself and his family from the defendant, but when his wife no longer wants it, he becomes a man, he demands, as a plaster for his bruised heart, heavy legal damages. The trial was the briefest, continual the "Arme Teufel." Nothing was proved, not even a "criminal" relation between the defendant and the plaintiff's wife. But it appeared, from the defendant's own testimony as well as that of his Christian friends and neighbors, that he preferred going on the water or in a saloon to attending church. That he often spoke disrespectfully of the authorities. He often was a reader and a subscriber of the "Arme Teufel." It's a queer thing about this latter. Experience has shown that one does well to avoid all conflict with the police after one has once secured the confidence of this company of dangerous vagabonds. The defendant was stigmatized as an anarchist. And in these times one needs only to say anarchist to be at the bottom of all his woes. The conundrum was read as such to the defendant. "Arme Teufel" was described as a weekly which champions free love. To this Reitzel objects.

The newspaper and legal rabble understand by that the frequenting of houses of ill-fame, seduction and ruin of poor girls, and rape. That is the free love which they comprehend, because it arises with their natural feelings, and who can say that human life is too free? Love. Liberty is the essence of love. Love from a sense of obliga-

Dr. Quide and His Critics.

[New York Evening Post.]

No sooner had the names of Quide, "Caligula," appeared in pamphlet form than it was severely denounced by the Berlin "Kreuzzeitung" on account of what might be called its harsh strong coloring and the unfortunate parallelism of its intimate, private details to the first and German Caesarism in the nineteenth century. In this criticism the organ of Prussian conservatism singled out the autocratic apostles of the young Roman emperor as peculiarly insatiable and offensive. To this attack Dr. Quide replied that the pamphlet is a historical study, both in form and content, and asserts sincerity. In the present, he has not been guilty of any distinction or misrepresentation, but has worked with genuine fidelity to the subject in regard to the press in general. Several copies of the pamphlet are on sale and in the hands of those who have seen them. In the present, Dr. Quide has replied that, while it is not proper for individuals to publish for the destruction of other people, it does not concern them in their corporate capacity. The Review of the Press was invited into the press with the assurance that the pamphlet in question is not a criticism of the authorities, but an illustration of the abuses and vagaries of the censorship of the press whom admirers of press freedom regard as indubitable officials. Even the Bavarian Academy of Sciences could not repress the spirit of justice which usually accompanies such learned bodies, and has shown more zeal than discretion in discussing the affairs and expressing its disapproval of the publication from this point of view. Strictly speaking, this could only mean that injustice has been done to the character of Caligula, or that the allusions to Xing Ludwig II. are irrelevant, since there is no re-

The Science of Journalism. [New Waterman in the Chicago Journal.]

You may talk about your editors who sit in easy chairs and try to boss the whole machine and put lots of ideas about. And seek to make the people think it's what they have to say. That keeps the business on the move and makes the paper pay. But don't you ever think it, for the whole truth simply is, that it's not in it with that huge conceit of his. For there's only one essential in the whole newspaper plan. Success depends alone upon the advertising man.

Religion in French Schools. [The Manual of Unsectarian Instruction, a hand-

book in daily use in the State-saided public elementary schools, contains in the form of this letter the following remarks from the following dialogue between teacher and pupil:]

Teacher— What is God?  

Pupil— We cannot tell.  

Teacher— Do you acknowledge a superior or controling Being?  

Pupil— Why should we?  1 prove to the necessity, and show Him to us.  

Teacher— It cannot be proved that such a Being is indispensable.  

Pupil— Then it is a waste of time to talk about the matter.  

Teacher— The term "God" has no signification. It means nothing at all.
Signs of the Times in Denver.

The Rev. Myron W. Reed, of Denver, is a popular preacher, who for ten years had been lecturing the members of the First Congregational Church. Occasionally he would take some or other of his friends and go up a notch. The patience of his congregation was exalted last Sunday last June, when he made an eloquent defense of the printing press, published the State Socialists, and wound up by saying that Jesus Christ was an Anarchist. This caused a row which ended in Mr. Reed’s retirement.

And the question whether Jesus was really an Anarchist has been interestingly debated in the Denver newspapers.

One gentleman, who rejoices in the redoubtable cognomen of Andrew Jackson Rogers, took up nearly a column of space in the “Rocky Mountain News” to display his rate ignorance of the subject. One of his particularly retrograding theories was that “Anarchy is the doctrine of greed.”

The reader will thoroughly appreciate this when he learns that Mr. Rogers is a Populist official holder, who, far from being greedy, is a very self sacrificing work of drawing the a thousand dollars a year salary for filling the very useless office of Fire and Police Commissioner.

The next issue of the “News” contained a remarkable reply to Mr. Rogers, written by the Rev. T. H. Maloney, a Catholic priest, who is also editor of the “Colorado Statesman.” He uses a definition of greed, that, strictly speaking, Christ was neither a State Socialist nor an Anarchist. After stating very correctly the Marxian position, Father Maloney has this to say about “Anarchy.”

“Anarchism, as a system of economic philosophy, traces its origin to Pierre J. Proudhon, a most voluminous and in my opinion a most fascinating and in all departments of the minds of the in their utmost aims. They both claim to be naturalists, and inspiration from the nebulous writings of Proudhon. They are designated respectively the theoretical and the practical Anarchists.”

The other school of Anarchists is the individualistic. It is not revolutionary. It seeks to destroy the wrongs in the present system by purely peaceful means. It is called individualistic because it teaches that the individual is everything and the government nothing. It seeks to destroy government. It is based on the hypothesis that government is soon to come to an end. This is nothing less than a bid from the advocates of this school. They are simply led astray by their intense fear of any favoring of government. It may surprise some, but it is true, nowhere in the entire body of documents formulated in the writings of Herbert Spencer and the historian Buckle. "No God is all-powerful," can it be said that Christ was an Anarchist? In the revolutionary, Communist sense? Certainly not; for was he not the prince of peace? Was he not an individualist in the individualistic sense? And how can we tell the difference between Caesar and the things which are Caesar’s, thereby recognizing the necessity for human government?"

Father Maloney’s desire to give the various schools of thought a fair hearing appears to have borne fruit. If he will but continue his studies, so well begun, he will no longer be in doubt as to which school has the right to claim Proudhon. Father Maloney is greatly mistaken when, in speaking of individualistic Anarchists, he says: "There is nothing to fear from this school. It is not revolutionary from this school, and from no other, that there are those who must anticipate its overthrow, because it is the only school that will abolish privileges, all the others merely proposing to redistribute them."

Mr. Donithorne on the French Reaction.

Sin:—The tragic fate of her justly popular presi-
dent has left France in a natural and parous state of listlessness; but why England should join in the chorus of lamentations is harder to explain. The most probable explanation seems to be that neither the French nor English people have any idea of something of which they are afraid. May I venture to throw some light on the subject through the medium of your columns? We may then form an opinion as to how far the tyrannical bill introduced by the French government into the Chamber on Monday is a just and prudent measure, and how far it is the reactionary outcome of panic.

It begins by what we should call the suspension of the right to a habeas corpus, so far as Anarchists and their apostles are concerned. That is to say, persons charged with the offence of "propagating Anarchist doctrines" are to be held by a jury. Thus a new offence is created, and anyone charged with the offence already forfeits his right to a habeas corpus. The maximum penalty is two years’ solitary confinement unless the judge sees fit to fix a discretionary power of sentencing the convicted person to transportation. Last, in the absence of a jury, the public and the accused may both remain till the general election of France, which is among other things is the law of the land, which is absolute in its power, and the provisions of the law shall not be changed without the consent of the legislatures, and to provide for new laws as the need may require. The method of procedure under this bill is that which is known in Russia as administrative process. The superintendent of immigration is the person to whom the administrative process in the United States of America. It provides that whenever this officer is satisfied by the oath or affirmation of anybody that somebody or some alien is an alien anarchist, shall be considered as a warrant for the suspected person and cause him, to be taken into custody, and forthwith hear the evidence upon the charge, and if he is satisfied upon the hearing that such person is an alien anarchist, and that his presence in this country is a menace to the government and the peace and well being of society in general, he shall cause him to be returned to the country whence he came. A declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States is declared to be no bar to proceedings under the act. Appeals are allowed to the superintendents of the treasuries, whose decision is final, but the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus is granted to the prisoner, — probably because the cause is not one of personal violence.

It is a strange and also an alarming bill. It is a bill which would be most welcome in this country if it were a crime, the offender would be entitled to a trial by jury. But if it is not a crime, what is it? Are we to be hibopsed for no crime? Nobody knows or can know. There is no definition of Anarchism either in this bill, or in any statute, or in the common law. If a man were arrested under the Anarchist, the first inquiry would be: 'What is it?' Prof. H. L. Osgood published an article on "Scientific Anarchism" in the "Political Science Quarterly" a few years ago. It was then also characterized as a "dangerous and high, in the abasement of anything in the law dictionary," the severest superintendent of immigration would not have the heart to deport a scientific Anarchist, because he is as different from Caeoel to San as Mr. Howells is from John Mott. Supposing, however, that we had a recognized definition of Anarchism, and that the question of. what class of persons is entitled to be dealt with by jury for that offence, would not the early experiment of the alien and sedition laws of 1798 teach politicians to fear public opinion. It is not the promulgation of an opinion that this bill proposes to deal with, but the holding of it; and the fact that it is held is to be ascertained by parade of500 men or others with the mailed fist, or a court of law, — in fact, by Russian administrative process. Such a confection of tyranny and absurdity has not been brought to light in a hundred years of our history, if ever.
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