On Picket Duty.

Thirty thousand voters have petitioned the Senate for ward for stringent repressive measures against the Anarchists residing in the country. This doubtless shows that the Referendum makes men liberal and tolerant.

The Single Taxers are fond of describing themselves as very uncompromising individualists. How is it, then, that so many of them are joining the Populists and urging cooperation with that party in the coming campaign? Perhaps they think that, if the single tax is individualistic, it is not doing much violence to logic and language to go a step farther and claim that the Populists are also good individualists. If so, they are more logical than they suspect.

Ras Telang, a Hindu gentleman, writing in the "Forum" on affairs in India, describes the stagnation in that part of the world to the fact that religion is supreme and allowed to regulate everything in life. He observes slyly and profoundly that Christianity would have been just as fatal to Western nations if they had taken it seriously and made it a rule of life. The Philistines and hypocrites will not relish the implications of this remark of an imperiement stranger who sees too well and speaks right out. Visitors are expected to flutter and sing our praises.

I reproduce elsewhere some excellent remarks on "bimbo" from an editorial in the "Popular Science Monthly." Mr. Youmans, I am glad to see, is brave and logical enough to express his hearty approval of Auberon Herbert's position on the dynamite question. Whether he clearly understands Mr. Herbert's positive platform, is doubtful. Certainly Mr. Youmans does not believe in voluntary taxation and the total abolition of compulsory cooperation, while his reference to "the present unchecked action of bimbo" proves that he is either unconscious of the most fundamental aggressions which lie at the root of the present industrial system, or unaware of the most important corollaries of the principle of equal freedom.

The New York dramatic critics have actually shown some intelligence and acumen in their treatment of Shaw's play, "Arms and the Man." When it was produced in London, the dramatic critics of that intellectual centre were so puzzled and nonplussed that they refused to believe that Shaw himself could give an intelligible explanation of his purpose in writing it. Last, however, the innocent American newspaper readers should be inclined to boast that dramatic criticism is in the hands of more skilful and accomplished men here, it is well to disabuse them by pointing out that the American critics would undoubtedly have surpassed their English brethren in ineptitude and asinity had not Shaw himself saved them from this fate by an elaborate demonstration of the perfect realism of his play in a magazine article. The critics were wise simply because they had been warned and instructed.

Evolutionists and rationalists will read with delight Mrs. Linton's "appreciation" (to use the new literary term of Prof. Drummond in the "Fortnightly Review") for September. She shows that his "love" as defined and admired by silly and hysterical ladies is a humbug, quack, charlatan, and plagiarist. To gain popularity with the foolish public, he deliberately prostitutes himself and travesties science. His alleged discovery of "Love" as the great evolutionary factor is simply a vulgar appeal to the weak sentimentalities. Serious students, while fully aware of Prof. Drummond's antics and mischiefs, have preferred to treat him with contemptuous silence, but it is perhaps well that a word of warning should have been addressed to the stupidists who make up Drummond audiences. They will, of course, always run after quacks, but an occasional shock may do them good.

Superintendent Byrnes, the head of the New York police and detective force, declares that he has no faith in the theory that criminals are born with an irresistible tendency to evil-doing. Crime, he states, appears to him to be chiefly the result of environment. Byrnes seems more criminals in a day than the "scientific criminologists" see in a life-time, and his opinion is entitled to more respect than the notions and imaginations and jump-at conclusions of the bigoted cranks who talk about crime without knowing the A B C of social science.

Byrnes knows that the guardians of the law, the police and detectives, are just as corrupt, dishonest, and vicious as the men whom they are hired to hunt down. Depend upon it, he laughs at the hypocrisy or blindness of the people who pay one class of swindlers and crooks, whom they call "officers of the law," for protecting them from another class of swindlers and crooks, whom they call social outcasts and criminals.

The editor of the "Popular Science Monthly" bravely attempts to say something helpful on the labor question from the Individualist standpoint, and comes very near making some important discoveries. Thus he says: "Instead of perpetually canvassing the supposed rival claims of capital and labor, it would be better if our social reformers would apply themselves to the underlying question how it comes that there is so much competition among the so-called laboring classes for the kind of employment which capitalists supply." An excellent suggestion, but why does not its author set the example? What is his explanation of the curious phenomenon? And is it really possible that he is totally ignorant of the explanations which certain social reformers have advanced? If it is too much to ask him to study Proudhon, there is some English literature on the subject which would prove an eye-opener to him. He continues: "The labor organizations, which play so prominent a part in the modern world, seem to assume that labor will always be in excess, and devote their chief efforts to neutralizing by artificial means this natural disadvantage. . . . As long as the capitalist has only to blow his whistle, so to speak, in order to get all the 'hands' he requires, the condition of the 'hands' will be one of more or less dependence on him; and therefore the true policy of labor leaders is to try to so dispose of the laboring population that they will not be at the beck and call of capital, but will have a much larger measure than at present of social stability and personal independence." Were Mr. Youmans more familiar with the causes of labor's dependence, he would appreciate the impossibility of the task he points out. The existing monopolies and legislation stand in the way of any successful attempt on the part of labor to undertake anything of a "constructive character." Labor must destroy before it can build,—destroy monopoly and the legislation which supports and maintains it. Here, again, Mr. Youmans is not far from the truth. He says that what the workman "should long ago have seen is the desirability of their complete separation from mere party politics, which, so far as they are concerned, is a simple delusion and a snare. What the workman wants is the simplest and cheapest form of government, and, above all, one under which no exceptional favors will be accorded to individuals or classes. If he is not wise enough to see this, he falls a victim to the special pleading used on behalf of preposterous tariff laws, he cannot lay the blame on others; what he wants is understanding, and, until he gets it, he will suffer." When the Individualist talks about monopoly and privilege, he generally means the tariff. The far more injurious monopolies around him he cannot see. But it is so refreshing to hear an Individualist say something semi-rational on the labor question that Mr. Youmans' crudities may be overlooked.
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The position of Individualist attacks upon the humanitarian legislation which is really demanded and conceived as a sort of antidote to plutocratic, capitalistic, and monopolistic legislation? The State Socialism of the poor is singled out for denunciation, while the "communism of hell," to use the Cleveland phrase, is passed over in silence. The principle of the protected classes is con-
cerned, there is no distinction between aggression by the poor and aggression by the rich, between the robbery of greed and the robbery of compulsory charity, but let us not forget that we are tracing the causes of widespread industrial disturbances, of great class struggles, of revolutionary movements. It is indicative of the power of the central government to think or imply that humanitarian legislation is responsible for the present drift towards military despotism. Liberty always tells labor that the truth about the justice of the states and the country in which we live is the same as the country of which we are a part, that is the same as the country of which we are a part, and that the country of which we are a part.

Progress and Woman Suffrage.

To the Editor of Liberty:

"You' urge in reply to my letter that women suffrage is inadvisable because woman are more tyrannical than men: that is the basis of my argument. In
cidentally, he pleads that men have not more tyrannical than men, it is still inadvisable that they should not be permitted to vote, because, voting being a bad thing, the fewer the people that do it the better off we are.

Making no direct rejoinder, let us present another point of view. The tendency of the world today is toward democracy. In such countries as Germany and Russia the most advanced radicals can ask for anything further than constitutionalism and democracy. Because the ballot is an accompaniment of democracy, can it be that "Women' will urge that democracy is not to be accepted as an advance upon monarchy? Surely he will not! Even if the men be enfranchised, the less they are developed into that the province of women, the less they can be anything for regarding their enfranchisement as revolutionary? The Russian czar may very probably be more tyrannical, more dictatorial, than the ruling classes in the United States, and the czar is certainly a vast majority. Yet I hardly think that "Women' would regard the establishment of democracy in Russia, even with the accompaniment of other changes, as anything other than a step forward in social development.

So the enfranchisement of women is a step forward in democracy. As fast as the discriminations against women disappear, the less they are considered a distinction between them and men will also disappear; women, with the same environment as men, are very much more like men than they are considered as such. In the end we should still have nothing better than a democracy, but it would be a much better democracy.

The voting would be much the same, and the proportion of votes against liberty much the same, but a large class of the people who were formerly regarded as incompetents, only to deck themselves with ribbons and shackle themselves as equal individuals. As great an advance, yes, a greater advance, than the step from qualified to universal male suffrage.

In another way woman suffrage would be directly toward liberty: the dominion of the man over the woman, one of the most obvious forms of authority, would be much weakened. The path would be cleared for its abolition. Many a man who now regards it as his divinely taught duty to women at general elections, would have to renounce it when he found the despised women standing by his side to vote as equals under his own restored government. The matter of course assumption by the man of his superiority of judgment at home, with the accompanying assumption of his right to dictate in everything, could hardly be maintained with public admission of political equality. The domestic strand of authority would have to give way.

Even now a good deal of the tyranny of man is caused by the "home and mother" sentimentality. I shouldn't mind it myself, but the womenfolk ought not to see, etc., is often the cause. The tyranny of women would beget with their increasing need of freedom for themselves, and although at first they might be ecclesiastically controlled, their enforcement would be a severe blow at the very existence of the church.

If they still desire, let him ask why the all of the consistory is at this moment being used to prevent woman suffrage. Is there a church anywhere that advocates it? Surely with such a recommendation libertarians need not fight very hard against woman suffrage.

John Beverley Robinson.

Mr. Robinson's new line of defence is scarcely more successful than the one he has abandoned. Because political participation has followed a certain course, because "it has been so in the past," he signifies that "it must be so in the future." But there is no certainty that the future will go on as the past has. Thus the ordinary newspaper-reading and spread-eagle American is sure that in a republic there must be more liberty than in a monarchy; but the real libertarian knows that there is more personal liberty in England than in the United States. The form of government no longer serves as a correct indication of the degree of liberty enjoyed by the citizen. If Mr. Robinson were an English "subject," he would decline to work with the agitators for a republican form of government "on general principles," because a republic is, historically speaking, an advance upon monarchy. He would say, and wisely say, that he would favor anything, no matter how it looked, that would increase his personal liberty. In Russia, the libertarian would accept democracy because free speech and free discussion would come with it, not because he prefers to be governed by a large number of little tyrants. Were the Czar to promise a larger measure of personal liberty than he could hope for from a Russian parliament, the libertarian would certainly prefer the rule of the Czar. The form is nothing, the substance is everything. The truth that popular government and liberty are not synonymous terms is one of the recent discoveries, hence it is not surprising that in the past men were not influenced by it.

The enfranchisement of women, like the enfranchisement of the Jews, would be a step forward in democracy, as Mr. Robinson says. But is the libertarian, the Anarchist, interested in the triumph of democracy? Not at all. His aim is different from that of democracy, and his methods are therefore different. Purer democracy does not imply greater freedom, hence the enfranchisement of women is no more a tyranny under pure and ideal democracy, which doubtless involves woman suf-
Anarchism and the Popular Movements.

The popular movements for better conditions follow each other with such rapidity that it would puzzle the average agitator when to pick them up and when to drop them, were it not for the aptitude for change is even greater than his capacity for reconciling conflicting ideas and harmonizing warring doctrines and schools.

One week it is a Populist campaign, the next a Coonsey army is to be organized, then a railroad strike is to be encouraged. and, last but not least, a cooperative colony must be started.

The Anarchist is always invited to elope, and when he declines he is called a dreamer and a utopist; his lack of enthusiasm for these causes is mistaken for general apathy. But the Anarchist is in earnest, and that is why he will not turn aside from his work to join hands with the half-educated reformers who understand neither social progress nor human nature.

He will not help the Populists because he knows that the scheme of functions of government will make matters worse instead of better.

He will not tell men to go to Washington and ask congress for help, for he believes in calling those who are there, not in sending more.

He will not advise a worker to strike when every lesson teaches him that such a combat is at once a waste and an offensive. The worker is nearly always foredoomed to defeat.

Nor, finally, will he help organize a colony, since the cooperation he deems essential is not to be found in the joint-stock system of production and distribution, especially when it is attempted in a wilderness.

Is the Boycott Invasive?

To the Editor of Liberty:

In an editorial in Liberty of July 14 I noticed the unqualified statement that the boycott is in no circumstance an invasion, no matter what the boycotter’s aim and object may be.

This is perhaps the only point where I differ with Liberty (baring the question of copyright). To me liberty means tolerance; it means, that no individual shall interfere with me so long as I refrain from invading the liberty of others; it must therefore mean that I can think as I please, dress as I please, eat and drink what I please. Yes, according to Liberty’s position, I may be punished for doing any of the above things. I do not see any difference in the outrage, whether the prohibition comes from society in the shape of a judicial sentence or as a boycott, since the same end can be equally attained by another method. A judge may give me six months in a cell $8, with bread and water for food, and society can refuse to sell me anything but bread, or refuse to rent me anything but a cell $28, or refuse to buy my labor for six months. The only palpable difference would be that I would be allowed to show myself and be exposed to public scorn.

But the feeling of hatred this sort of treatment would engender would be just as likely to induce a man to throw a bomb among his persecutors as the other process. The sensations of society’s intolerance, and as such exactly alike. Whether they impose a death penalty by hanging upon a man, or a certain offense, for a certain offense, for a certain offense, or for a certain offense, is a distinction too subtle for me to grasp.

Granted that the boycott is cheaper; perhaps also the boycotter would not have any remorse for a crime he did not commit. But this shows for that to me hanging, electric chair, pillory, or starvation are alike.

You may say that no man is under obligation to affect the relative values of other commodities (whatever the price of gold may be), nor in any way restrict their freedom of exchange.

HENRY SWEENEY.

The Standard of Value.

The need or need of a standard of value has puzzled many ardent advocates of free money. I suppose Mr. Westrup is largely, if not altogether, responsible for the negative view, which, after all, merely rejects the idea of a commodity standard, money being, as Mr. Tucker has said, unthinkable without a standard of value. Mr. Westrup contends that, as the thing measured is as much the measure as the thing by which it is measured, a standard of value, or a monetary unit embodied in a commodity-quantity, is impossible. I confess, all the same, there is a plausible show for the contention; and under the influence of "Jevons on Value" I must plead guilty to having temporarily assented to the proposition myself.

But the statement of value as a commodity-quantity, or, as Mr. Biggar puts it, a concrete economic quantity, as against the fleeting will-o’-the-wisp of Jevons, reaffirms the commodity standard as the sine qua non of money, free or otherwise. It is a law of value that, the productivity of labor increasing; say, 50 per cent., or doubling the product in the same process, or as a reduction in the value of the product 50 per cent., roughly speaking. This suffices to show that labor-time is the common quality inherent in general values. "But how can time (value) be measured by weight (gold)"? the anti-standard advocate will urge. Simply enough. The price of gold (i.e., its relation to other things and the extent of its purchasing power over them) in a free market is determined by the quantity produced in a given time, just as the prices of other things are in relation to each other, or to gold. Ergo, if the average time consumed in the production of a table is equivalent to that consumed in the production of 1 ounce of gold (English sovereign, as the price of the table in gold is £21. If the productivity of the table it duty increases 50 per cent., £2 is the price of two tables henceforth. Apparently the gold producer has the best of the bargain, but such is not the case, for value is now, as heretofore, accurately expressed in time of production. Abolish the "wage" system, as the legal tender in the payment of debts, relegating it to the market as raw material for the arts, and its power to expropriate has gone forever. Nothing more than this. The price of gold henceforth will only affect the values in the metal. A free paper currency expressed in terms of gold (that is, in a gold standard, the sovereign or the dollar remaining as the unit of value) will in no wise

The boycott of 1887.

In the suburb hamlet where I live we have a voluntary defense association.

Having organized itself spontaneously, it has organized itself upon principles of individual responsibility. There are four or five men who are called policemen and clothed in brass buttons to awe the uninformed, but, owing to their position of office, they are not supplied with the inward and spiritual gift of "ass" that is needed to give brass buttons real dignity. They are hired, actually hired, by another individual, also polite and well-behaved, who calls himself "captain of police."

His enrolments are derived from contributions of fifty cents a week from householders for "protection."
sell me anything or to buy my labor; true enough. But when we talk of equal freedom, we mean that man has a right to enjoy it, and for that reason, when he punishes me for using such liberty, he becomes an invader, whatever his methods. But if he does not believe in equal freedom, he is under no obli-
gation whatever, and he may hang me, imprison me, or boycott me, without hesitation, according to his taste.

Therefore I say that any Anarchist should not endorse the boycott, for he endorses something at least as dangerous as any invasive punishment.

A. S. Matter.

[Mr. Matter seems to be misled by the term "punishment." He admits that no man is under obligation to sell anything or to purchase anything he has for sale, but he thinks that it is a violation of equal freedom to "punish" a man for using his freedom legitimately, and he makes the question-asking assumption that the withholding of patronage or the refusal of accommodation, called boycotting, is a "punishment." But he c. r. be allowed to assume thus the very point at issue. What, strictly speaking, is punishment? An act that would be for a man when inflicted on a man not guilty of any offense constituting a violation of equal liberty. We have no right to "punish" an offensive man; hence, in asserting our right to boycott him, we imply that boycotting is not punishment. Mr. Matter holds that boycotting a man without cause is as much an aggression as imprisoning him without cause. If so, he has not carefully considered the import of equal liberty. Every man has the right to exercise his faculties in every direction so long as he does not invade the equal sphere of any other man. If you prohibit a man from selling or refusing to sell to anybody, you interfere with him and wrongfully limit his freedom. To compel a man to sell to you or buy from you if he is to establish a monopoly and deprive him of his free choice. The fact that he has no substantial reason for ignoring you and preferring another does not alter the matter, since we have no right to stop a man and call him to account for any of his legitimate acts. Mr. Matter should reflect that there can be no excuse for boycotting. You do not boycott a man before with a man by ignoring him. "Passive intercourse" is a contradiction in terms. You have no case, under equal liberty, against a man who refuses to do something for your benefit unless he owes it to you to do the thing. But, objects Mr. Matter, practically the result is the same whether a man is boycotted or starved because of his refusal to do what you want him to do. That is not so. Those who boycott him do not prevent his going elsewhere, while those who use force do prevent it. One man or a few men may boycott a person without cause, but a boycott without cause by an entire community is inconceivable; hence no practical dangers are to be feared. —Edward Linley.]

The Newport millionaires have formed an organization for the prevention of slanderous articles and gossip about themselves in the newspapers. Assuming the right to enforce respect for privacy, the idea is an excellent one, and a movement for the enforcement of such a principle should be encouraged. But read what the law and-order New York "Times" suggests to the suffering millionaires: "The law ought to be made to cover his [the scandalmonger's] offences and to protect the right to privacy. Only in case this cannot be done, or prove not to be efficacious, would the people who propose to "do something" be justified in resorting to the wild justice of revenge. That would probably be effective. The imminent risk of a semi-weekly horse-whipping and an annual assault with deadly weapons would give the padron reason to pause. Meanwhile, every decent person can do his share toward putting down scandalmongers by refusing to buy or read the reports of their researches." The reference to the law is manifestly insincere, and the real intention here is to prevent the use of violence against the scandalmongers. Everybody knows that the libel laws have proved not to be efficacious, and hence the conditions already exist which, according to the "Times," justify semi-weekly horse-whippings and annual assaults with deadly weapons. If this is not inviting to violence, what is it? Obviously the "Times" respect for law and order, so profound when others are tempted to become law-breakers, is easily silenced when it is prompted by envy and jealousy to assail its more prosperous competitors in the newspaper market. In the last sentence of the quotation, the "Times" advises boycotting, a fact to which I call the attention of those editorial blots who regard boycotting as a hideous foreignism almost as revolting as dynamite.

In his introduction to "Outre Mer," a book of notes and impressions of America now running as a serial in the New York "Sunday Herald," Paul Bourget, French novelist, essayist, critic, and Academician, recommends to all Europeans "a stay of a few months in the United States," telling them that they would succeed in a perfectly natural way in diminishing their dread of the world which is being prepared for us by Democracy and Science—those two great artificers of our future destinies. For my part, he continues, "as you will see in these notes, I left France with a feeling of deep anxiety concerning the social future, but it was soothed and almost erased in the atmosphere of action that is breathed from New York to Chicago, and to get rid of which I write to you. This is either an indication of superficiality or an attempt at gaining favor by insinuate praise. Fancy Zola being guilty of such a silly and boyish remark! Has M. Bourget read nothing about Homestead, the Chicago executions, the great railroad strikes, the labor movement generally, and the present state of American politics? Or is M. Bourget a constant and unquenching reader of Dana's "Sun"?"

Certain fashionable women of an uptown ward of this city have announced that they will boycott all shopkeepers who vote the ticket of Tammany Hall. What do these people do those people do in our midst? They are in our sunlight, they breathe our air which they corrupt with their maladies of poverty. They encumber our almshouses as soon as they are sick, our prisons when they, who own nothing, pretend to appropriate something, and even our gulfsides when ancestral barbarism reawakens in them, to say nothing of our cemeteries in which we have the weakness to give them asylum. They wander in our cities, which they infect with their rags and pollutants with their vermin. We have to give to them lest they may take to us, who ask Nothing but to live in abundance and joy, the very sight of them is indescribable. Let us be rid of all these swarming and discontented vagabonds of Tammany, that order—that order by which we enjoy the blessings that they lack. After all, the Anarchists are right; the poor have no country. The Country is ours, since we possess its substance. With the soil of the fields, with the water of the rivers, with the woods, with the mountains, with the stones of which the houses are built, with the loom of the machines of iron or arms of flesh,—with capital which was once the wages of labor, we have acquired absolute proprietorship of the nation itself, with its history and its language, the tradition of our ancestors, our labor and of thought. Out with the people who have nothing: no treble, no country, no right to occupy as many feet of earth as they need in order to sleep! Hanse thee into the huts of ships, and let them disappear in the fogs of Oceana, in search of some lost rock, if there be one which does not reject them."
Such doublets is the inner, unconscious reasoning of the excellent general counsellors of laughter. Touraine, the Paris market, and good Christ, whosoever the social problem tormentors and who occupy themselves with the poor—will they dare deny it? In order to tell their own troubles. Dispute phrase or word they may the writer of the popular, public, my Toursians. There must be something else that can be done. Let us try. And perhaps some day the natives of Oceania, instead of me, good self through their rudimentary organization, dis-pairing of success, and moreover disgusted with the cannibalism of their fathers, will propose to send the most plausible message to the civilized world that there they may be taken care of in a manner possible only to peoples whose resources have been so powerfully increased by science. That would be perfectly reasonable.

And if perchance the Oceanians have ever heard of the Garden of Pleasure, there they will first apply. Doubtless the general council of Indre-et-Loire will wish to receive them with honor. When that day arrives, may there still remain some witness of the vote of yesterday, for I promise myself some joy in discovering "American" Ideas in Russia.

Godkin, Bierce, Holt, Hill & Co. will doubtless learn with the same intensity with which we are athirst for a truthful dealings with the proper method of dealing with the propagandists by deed and revolutionists is shared and vigorously advanced by the leading reactionary magazine of Russia, the organ of the party which has systematically and bitterly fought the progress of liberal ideas in Russia, and which ridicules the devotion of the bourgeois semi-individualists to freedom of speech and literature. I hope Godkin and Bierce will reprint the following extract from the "Bussky Viestnik's" article on Anarchism with "a song in their souls."

To fight Anarchism successfully, it is necessary to declare merciless war not only upon the Anarchists, but upon all forms of Socialism. Socialistic propaganda must be suppressed, and an end put to all agitation of labor and social questions. Labor unions, meetings, and strikes must be absolutely prohibited; Socialist literature must be suppressed, together with any and all means of agitation. This is the only remedy, if it is not already too late. But parliamen
tary governments will never have the courage to resort to this measure; only governments not restrained by considerations of prestige or by calculation of popular votes. In Western Europe has so great an influence, and Western Europe has no such government. Bourgeois parliamentarianism, professing a belief in "freedom of speech," is an assembly, cannot logically deprive its enemies of the same freedoms. The governments of Europe must unite and inaugurate a general campaign against Anarchism without the interference of any parliaments, and this war must be continued until the victory over Socialism is complete and final. Unfortunately the governments of Europe will never dare to use this means of self-defense. Apparently, Western Europe cannot avert the coming storm.

Why Quacks Thrive.

[Miss Lynne Links in the Fortnightly Review]

There is nothing which average people dislike more than precision of thought, the logical genius of the root-work of methods that delights them so much as picturelessness of statement irrespective of its importance. Do not reason by logic or reason by anything resembling common sense.

Anarchist Letter-Writing Corps.

The Secretary wants every reader of Liberty to send in his name and address. Those who do thereby pledge themselves to write, when possible, a letter every fortnight, in as many subjects, to the "target" assigned in Liberty for that fortnight. All, whether members or not, are asked to lose no opportunity to write to the Secretary.

Address, B. Strickland T. Brinton, 38 Council Hall, Berlin, Ohio.

The "Shoe and Leather Reporter" printed one of our letters, with editorial reply containing economic doctrines that were supposed to have been exploded by Mili, if not earlier.

I have still a few of those leaflets left.

Target, section A. — George T. Angell, president of the American Hydropathic Education Society, 10 Milk street, Boston, Mass. In the August issue of his paper, "Our Dembs Animal," he gave a list of ten classes who would rally to defend the government if attacked by Anarchists, as follows: (1) nearly all capitalist, (2) army and navy, (3) most of millers and police, (4) government employees, (5) every man who has a pension in his family, (6) most church members, (7) savings bank depositors, (8) corporation shareholders, (9) mortgagees and mortgagees of notes, (10) nearly all real estate owners. In the September issue he repeated this, and on another page, telling what he would do with $1,000,000, if the land, said he had found an interesting use for it. "Our immediate political and social health. Because official boards of health are so dependent on politics that they do not carry out the obligations we have to them. He is offering to take the land and make it into a peaceful settlement between capital and labor. Be as brief as you can, and write "Personals," in the envelope.

A. Section B. — The "Western Laborer," Omaha, Neb., has a free-for-all column, entitled "The People's Forum."

C. — The "National Unionist," 712 Second street, Memphis, Tenn., proposes to give special attention to the Labor question.

Stephen T. Brinton.
The Beauties of Government.

The circular of Liberty is eagerly invited to re-form the assembly of a large number of books which enable the State of Pennsylvania in many phases of its beneficent policy of law, order, and health. Either as a book or as a handbill, it is admirably printed, and the text is absolutely uncorrected from recent publications, and is given to the public at a small expense.

"JUSTICE AT PUBLIC EXPENSE."

[New York Evening Post]

"The Congressional Record" is now pouring out a flood of news which destroys the valueless parts of the "Record," making it difficult to find them. They serve also to bring contempt and anger upon Congress for allowing such publicity to pass in the public money for not only is it costly to print all this stuff, with hundreds of columns of figure-work but it must be all carried free through the mails as campaign literature. The only satisfaction is the damage by its excessive stupidity to the political party that sends it out.

SLEEPING WITHOUT CLOTHES.

[New York Post]

One of the wretched victims of the police raid in the Five Points district, a woman, was arraigned in the Tombs Police Court before Justice Bernard F. Maffee. She had been taken from her room in a crowded tenement house, and was arraigned on a charge of disorderly conduct by Perkin, a Sixth Precinct constable. The constable found the woman lying in bed in her own room.

"She didn't have a right to do so in her own room, where she had been living with her husband for six years. The woman is a police court lawyer, who had 'taken up' her case. "Oh, but she was only partly dressed," explained the "mammy," and I could see her when the door was open."

"People have no right to run about in houses without their clothes on," remarked Justice Martin, as he bent over his slip of commitment. "This is in hand. The wardman cast a triumphant glance at the woman, who headed against the bar wringing her hands."

"It's not true, Judge," she said, "and if you would only bring my husband—" But his Honor was not listening to her. His colleague, Justice Joseph Koch, had entered the court and slapped him on the back, and removed the papers. The judge sat down. "Now, what do you want?" added Justice Martin, jocularly, as he pointed his finger at his colleague. "I have to deal with this morning, and perhaps, give to posterity more information on the subject than it seems likely to afford us," said one of the papers. "Now I was on the front seat, and I understand this Judge, rising, answered, "All right; I am glad to know what stands. Much obliged, Judge."

With that he departed. "Turn round once more, Justice Martin behind the desk," said the tenent physician still wringing her hands before him.

"How about this, Judge, or, sergeant, or officer — could render useful help in the training of horses, must learn to foot it and become a mere 'know-nothing' during 365 days, only because the law has not foreseen the point. "Why not enjoy the joke, and probably the grim, stern commanding officer saw it, too."

A COMEDY OF LEGAL SNAFUS.

[Adventurer Guild]

A funny blender has been caused by the application of the Comstock law. Mr. Jacob B. Wise, of Clay Center, Kansas, has been arrested for mailing obscene matter. His defense is almost as serious as his trial. He is also a noted musician, of Industry, Kansas, to whom the postal card was directed. The fact that a layman could get the best of the argument seems to have vexed this alleged follower of the meek and lowly Nazarene, and he decreed promptly to "have the law" on his irreligious antagonist. Mr. Wise, on the mail in which his papers were mailed, wrote: "As a man of worth, and must answer for his hitherto crime at the next term of the Federal court.

Unless somebody has gumption enough to side-track this case and prevent the trial in October, a laughable dilemma will confront the principal actors.

If Mr. Wise is convicted, it will practically amount to a judicial determination that the Holy Bible contains an immoral passage, which won't do at all. If he is acquitted, it will prove that this precious law is not effectual for dealing with all kinds of offensive publications, both partly and totally.

Meanwhile, Mr. Wise, wishing to know exactly what language was used upon this famous postal card, wrote to obtain an accurate translation. One of the leading district attorney politely mailed him a copy, thereby doing the same thing which he claims is a violation of the law. The part of the law.

[New York Sun]

So that, if Mr. Wise is convicted, the district attorney must of a legal necessity prosecute and convict himself, or else all legal and moral sanctions will fall, for it is preposterous that an officer bound to maintain the law should by impurity commit the same offence for which he procures the conviction and imprisonment of another.

Such cases as this made all the more manifest that it is possible to have itself as a mere farce, which is to enable unscrupulous persons to get money out of the rascal and guttered under pretense of suppressing obscenity, and the phony climate of the law will never cease until we get a congress honest and clean enough to repeal it altogether.

A CRIME TO OFFEND THE PRESIDENT.

[New York Times]

Chlovis Hugues, the radical poet, was arrested the other day at a Vignon book store delivering an impassioned ode to Providence at the dedication of the monument to the poet Romainville. He was taken to the police station, searched, and his papers taken from him; but they were at once returned, with the exception of the manuscript of his poem, and he was set at liberty. The local papers had asked Mr. Hugues for the poem, and, as usual, they appealed to the mayor, who took this high-minded method to satisfy them.

THE NONVOLITION MUST SLEEP.

[New York City]

A mechanic, named C., was sentenced in Berlin, recently, to pay three marks or pass three days in jail for having sneezed loudly at night in the street. He was arrested just after the sneeze, as he was entering his room in the Zimmern tenement opposite against him was "gross misconduct," and, despite his plea of a cold, it was sustained fully by the court.

A BLEEDING IN DISHARMONIOUS.

[San Francisco Examiner]

A man can divorce his wife in France if she persists in going on the stage without his consent. But Portugal goes France one better. There, if a wife publishes literary works without the husband's consent, the law frees him at once.
Two Executions.

Of late the columns of the French journals have been overflowed chiefly to two topics: first, the cutting off of the head of a priest named Branneau, who had been convicted of murder and numerous offences against chastity; second, the cutting off of the official head of one Dr. Robin, the master of an academy in a small town, attacked by a private individual, but placed under governmental supervision, this Dr. Robin being a Positivist who had refused to teach the orphans that France is bigger than the world or that God is bigger than man, and who allowed them, boys and girls alike, to go into the water together in ordinary bathing costumes, as a result of which, it is said, a present day young man of the male persuasion, aged four, made a vigorous attempt to capture the virtue of a maiden too young to have consented even in those States of the American Union considered most enlightened by those Anglo-Saxon prudes whose ideal civilization would prevent a woman from legally parting with her virtue until she has reached an age at which by no possibility could any one be persuaded to take it as a gift. As a saintly, conscientious Henri Rochefort observes in "L'Insensat" of September 3:

"What a pity it is that popular exposition should have caused Cardinal de Pont-Sur-Seine to let Justice take its course in the affairs of this worthy Abbé Brunieu! Had this ecclesiastic, who died in such a Christian manner, been a Jew, he would have had the person to manage the orphan asylum at Cempas, having made enough orphans to fit him to bring them up.

No doubt this old patriarch of the dishonorable houses of Laval would have hastened to separate the sexes, knowing better than anybody the danger of uniting them. At all events he would have been given some of the good sisters from France for the purpose of having seated on red-hot stoves the little girls confided to their Christian charity.

And yet, on episcopeins, employed in the house of La Foulleuse — and whom our ever indulgent judges have punished with a few francs' fine, coupled with a penal letter of the Bérenger law, for having treated a number of them people — there have been placed for them in the administration of the establishment which Dr. Robin disdained at once by his atheism and his solicitude for his schoolchildren years ago, to teach the Jews from our educational institutions, and today it is the Freethinkers that are driven out. Thus it is easy to sum up the progress of a popular anti-catholic publicist in the path of Liberalism and reason.

Observe the predicament of those orphans in view of the notions of morality and religion successively instilled into their minds. You will also in time be convinced that Jean Christ was a poor devil who told to unfortunate fishermen as ignorant as himself stories calculated to make one sleep standing: tomorrow they will be assured that he is the son of a certain God who, doubtless through paternal love, sent him upon earth to get himself crucified in our honor.

And then it is explained to them that, although the son of God the Father, he was at the same time the son of a certain Mary who had deceived her husband with a second God called the Holy Ghost, which made this Jesus, the child of two parents, no other of whom had ever been married to this mummy.

They will be taught regarding the mystery of the humanist conception of this wonderful woman who conceived without sin, whereas other women conceive only sinfully, and who, at least twice an adulteress, was nevertheless a virgin.

And lastly, we will understand how the Abbé Brunieu, although an assasin, an incendiary, and a robber, enjoyed, even when his head was under the knife, the power of forcing, by the earnestness of a few words, and the subversion of Jesus to descend a bit of bread, excerable to swallow, since it contains neither yeast nor salt.

And the God Omnypotent, in vain would Jesus have protected against being manipulated by this conditionned numberer, for it was the latter's right to administer him to whomsoever he saw fit.

And many other fine things, quite as true and probable as these, will be examined, so as to make us believe, in accordance with the teaching of Dr. Robin, that two and two have always made four, will ask themselves if their new professional masters are not right.

And this is not all: accustomed hitherto to eat when hungry and to drink when thirsty, they will find themselves condemned to subsist on Fridays on what he calls chevreulian beefsteak, — which is nothing else but salt.

More or rather less — they will fast at every vigil that you know of. Do you know of a thousand? Thus neither do I during the week called holy, — for in France we have two famous weeks, Holy Week and Bloody Week, — and also at the approach of Ascension Day, Association of the Palms, and in general whenever the capricious fathers entrusted with the management of the assyrian shall feel the need of stuffing their pockets with a little of the money which will be allotted them by the city.

But then you may rest easy; the cabinet will never see it fit to meet in extraordinary session for the express purpose of investigating their conduct and declaring their dismissal.

The orphans, after several years of this educational system, will leave their lonely islet in a state of stupidity or an attitude of rebellion. They will tell the world that when Fanny, who was also brought up by the priests, or apostates and libertines like Jules Roche, who, reared by the Jesuits, has made known their devious ways to his colleagues of the same kind.

Unfortunately Cusanus, despite the solicitations of Leo XIII, was prevented from fear of riots from signing the pact of the association and something else. But he was obliged to compensate the Vatican in some way, and so he has executed Dr. Robin.

In "La Justice" of September 3, M. Clemenceau treats the same subject in a philosophical vein:

What horrors the sober-minded humanist in the Cempas experiment in religious education is that this teaching is given: to little unfortunates who have lost their parents and therefore have nothing else.

Tis lamentable to be prompted by a good feeling.

But tell me truly. M. Magnani, a friend of "Le Figaro," who chose in this life:

Surely no idea can be more grotesque than that of proposing to a child of six years to choose between Cempas and a convent school. And yet this would be less ridiculous than to make a child of two days, who certainly has not been consulted, a true victim of baptism. This involvement includes the gravest consequences for the future. Who then proposes to take the advice of a child of six years? Do you plan universal education? How absurd! The Catholic religion, to be sure, makes a pretence of universality, — as its name indicates, — but the religion so far embraces all is not a universal religion.

We are not unprepared to work for an education that will make a truly Christian citizen. It is not the philosophy of "Le Figaro," so great is the force of habit, but it does terrible violence to reason.

To be sure, the child will decide himself later, if he can. If he can understand the life in spite of our effort to prevent it; if he comes out victorious over fatal taxation; if he frees himself from our chains and from the chains of his ancestors; if he thinks with his own head and not with his religious head, after all will be in any case that prepared for him by his grandparents, — then the soul put upon him at his birth will perhaps one day be removed by the new motives, however, to that taking of posse occultum of which baptism is but the emblematic sign: By no means.

The child is followed, day by day, hour by hour, minute by minute. As fast as he makes a word he has to make the word he will be taught.

He will see, he is given ready-made formulas which, being the first to penetrate the virgin glades of his young brain, take possession of the authority of the existing concepts beyond dispute.

Terrible questions, those which the child asks: They are those of primitive man. He has no time to learn, to investigate, to analyze the universe, to create science, and yet, cost what it may, he must have a reason for things. His first sum- mony, as vague, as imposing, as the lesson of the thunderbolt was to the cave-dweller. The child does not ask for a book on physics or chemistry, any more than for a "Mécanique Céleste." He simply asks: "Where are we, and why are we here?" And we antici- pate his question with the physics and the chemis- try, and the mechanics of the laws of nature.

What is the result? That later, when he is con- fronted with another solution, it must be subordinate to the first, which will always dominate his thought, blow by blow, that life descending like a bit of bread, excerable to swallow, since it contains neither yeast nor salt.

In the universal constitution of causes we can con- ceive an atom, when pushed by its law into the series of combinations imposed upon it by the strong law to which it belongs, to say nothing of the universe. The evolu- tion of life means the penchant — with its compli- cations, but does not change.

Following the dispos- itions received from our emotions, thoughts will cause in us determinations and desires whose conscious combination gives us the sentiment of our personality. The force of evolution varies with the law, in order to give a field of action in which our highest conceptions can find play, permits us, by appropriate mental and moral gymnastics, by a national education of the individual and the numerous, to influence our development and create in our own eyes the amount of individual re- sponsibility necessary to the working of societies. But what force shall he give to this conflict between so many hostile elements, if not with the power of good and evil which has come to us from the inescapable combinations of a prodigious line of causes, or to go back to the action of eternal forces of which we are the passing product?

There is no education that will turn a black man into a yellow man. But there is an intellectual and sentimental discipline which, from a long series of canals, will produce some day a Sakya-Monal who, still more universal than the Christ who died for humanity only, but humanity only, and good for the body for the hungry litter of little pigs.

We do not choose our life any more than we choose to live. To hold the creature responsible to the crea- tor, who created, confounds actions and eternal acts. If you are not content with me, you had only to make me otherwise," and I defy him to answer.

To conclude: when nations love the servants of our care the ruling class endowed by ourselves or by others, let us add him. That is the precept. Let us ab him in body and mind. Let us then know the harmful, let us put before him the history of the human soul in the field of the unknown, let us arm him with the rule of justice which must be the condition of social life, and then: "Good luck, friend! The supreme consolation is that, after having tolled and suffered and cried, after having transmitted your toil and suffering and lamentation, you will return to that sweet repose which was yours prior to life, happy and tranquil, lived in order to have lived in living no longer that at last, after all your troubles, you may share in the sublime indifference of things eternal."

Laissez-Faire in Practice. (Sávigny is, I believe, not a personal name.)

Action and reaction, in the social world as else- where, are equal and opposite; and given the fact that man's instinct is to pursue that which is either beneficial or the happiness of each individual is largely dependent on the dispositions of others, the actions and reactions taking place in a society not at all by the actions and reactions of others. There would be no gain in the careers of the general welfare. Public opinion is, in all free communities, a powerful agent of reform; but it would be still more powerful if it did not too often seek to embody itself in its own hands.
MODERN MARRIAGE, By EMILE ZOLA.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH TEXT BY H. B. TUCKER.

In this latest story Zola takes for his subject — one from the all too familiar stock of the dowry, and all the things which go with it, and none of the working people — a cheery, easy-going, with all the liveliness of his usual grace and power. The result is that when each is inspired, how each is consummated, and how eachult. For the Philosophy of Anarchism Epitomized.

The Philosophy of Anarchism — A CONCISE STATEMENT.

To be had of the publisher. Twenty-five copies, 15 cents each; hundred, 10 cents each; over one hundred, 5 cents each.

Address all orders to the publisher.

LIBERTY'S LIBRARY.

For any of the following Works, address: BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1212, New York, N. Y.

THE QUINQUENARIUM OF LIBERTY.

By G. Bernard Times.

The Quinquennium of Liberty is a newspaper, of semi-monthly publication, and is devoted to the advocacy of universal freedom and individual rights. It is published at 85 William Street, New York, and is sent free of charge to every subscriber.

THE STORY OF AN AFRICAN FARM.

By Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr.

A novel, not of adventure, but of the intellectual life in the South. It is a touching and tender account of a young man's experiences, and of the influence of his family and friends.

TAXATION OR FREE TRADE?

A Criticism upon Certain Questions of Taxation.

By J. H. M. Joubert.

This work is a criticism of the various arguments brought forward to support the theory that taxation is a necessary evil.

SOCIALISTIC COMMUNIST UNION MUTUALITY.

New Form of Labor Union.

By C. T. Post.

This work is a criticism of the various arguments brought forward to support the theory that taxation is a necessary evil.

THE UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES.

By J. H. M. Joubert.

This work is a criticism of the various arguments brought forward to support the theory that taxation is a necessary evil.

IMMEDIATELY.

By J. H. M. Joubert.

This work is a criticism of the various arguments brought forward to support the theory that taxation is a necessary evil.

THE UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES.

By J. H. M. Joubert.

This work is a criticism of the various arguments brought forward to support the theory that taxation is a necessary evil.

LAW OF THE UNITED STATES.

The Law of the United States is a detailed study of the constitutional aspects of the Federal Government.
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