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On Picket Duty.

"Free land and free money make free men," says the "Journal of the Knights of Labor." Is that the reason why the "Journal" opposes them?

In an article in "McClure's Maga-

zine," E. P. Mitchell gives the public a new conception of Charles A. Dana. It appears that Dana "hates a slum." I had not been in the habit of thinking of the editor of the "Sun" as devoid of amatorious propensities.

How utterly the New York "Sun" has lost its influence upon opinion is seen in the fact that Tammany did not hesitate to nominate as its candidate for the New York mayoralty a man whose election the "Sun," which outdoes all other journals in unscrupulous loyalty to Tammany, was sure to oppose. Tammany has found out that Dana is powerless for help or hindrance. The chief is discredited even in his own brotherhood.

"During my long term of office," said Re,-cover Smyth, in accepting his renomination, "in which I have declined thousands of criminal cases, I never had any man who is called a politician approach me and ask me to do what my conscience and my sense of duty would prevent me doing." This remark, taken in connection with the Recorder's record, is ample proof that his conscience and his sense of duty allow him to do whatever the people called politicians ask him to do.

One of the latest developments of the Lexow Committee's investigation of Tammany methods is the statement of a witness, John Johnson, that, when he was in the Jefferson Market prison, one of the keepers, Michael Leach, urged him to employ as counsel the firm of Pentecost & Gailing, and that upon his refusal to do so the keeper indulged in much profanity. The keeper in question, being placed upon the stand, said that he had recommended no attorneys, but, when asked if he would swear to this, said that he would not. Finally he admitted that it was generally understood in all the city prisons that certain lawyers had access to prisoners and divided their fees with the keepers who granted them such access.

H. O. P., you are indeed a daisy.

There is another radical play on Gotham boards just now. At Palmer's "Theatre the lesson of disobedience to unjust law is being taught and applauded nightly. The title of the play is "The Transgressor." It is written by Mr. A. W. Gattis of England, a gentleman who is well known to English individualists and who has long been a reader of Liberty. The newspaper critics, with their usual combination of idiocy and malevolence, have done their best to tear the play to pieces, but, on the night when I witnessed the performance the audience seemed to like it nearly as well as I did, and applauded the star, Miss Olga Nethersole, with an earnestness and vigor that seemed to be proportional to the intensity of her efforts to bring the holy marriage institution into disrepute.

Arthur Kitson's "Criticism of Henry George's Single Tax Theory" in the October number of the "American Journal of Politics" is well worth reading. Besides giving some of the old arguments against the Single Tax, Mr. Kitson exposes some damaging inconsistencies in Mr. George's defence of the same which I have never seen pointed out before. Chief among these is the contradiction between Mr. George's statement, often repeated when he is denouncing the landlords, that the rent which they take is the product of the laborer and that their act is therefore robbery, and his other statement, repeated as often when he is defending the landlord, that the single tax, which he calls the confiscation of rent, takes the product, not of the laborer, but of the community, which may therefore rightfully seize it. In other words, Mr. George makes an arithmetical distinction between two things which he declares to be identical. The theory on which the Single Tax is based— that the wealth covered by the term economic rent is not the product of the laborer — is one of the absurdities that it is possible to entertain. Look at it for a moment. Suppose that the earth consists of three grades of land, A, B, and C, — a given area of A yielding 500 bushels of wheat, the same area of B yielding 250 bushels, and the same area of C yielding 1,000 bushels. According to the Single Tax theory, the product of the laborer, whether on A, B, or C, if all are under cultivation, is 500 bushels — that is to say, the laborer who extracts 250 bushels from B produces only 500 bushels, which amount represents a well the product of the laborer who extracts 1,000 bushels from C.

Now suppose further that some convulsion of the earth's surface should bury the land A under water, leaving only B and C for cultivation. Straightway, according to the Single Tax theory, the product of the laborer on the land B, which under the new conditions is the poorest land available for cultivation, becomes 750 bushels, the full amount which he extracts, whereas before it was only 500 bushels, or two-thirds of the amount extracted. And yet the land B is the same land that it was before, the man who labors upon it is the same man that he was before, the amount of labor expended is the same as before, and the result in wheat is the same as before. How absurd, then, to deny that the laborer's product is the same as before! And yet upon this denial the Single Tax theory rests. For, if it be once admitted that the 750 bushels yielded by B is as truly the product of the laborer as the 500 bushels yielded by A, then the Single Taxer comes face to face with Mr. George's statement that "that which a man makes or produces is not given as against all the world, and no one else can rightfully claim it." Whereupon he is forced to the conclusion that whoever claims and takes it, whether the private landlord who calls it rent or the landlord-State which calls it tax, is a robber.

An excellent answer to those who fancy that libertarian propaganda is hampered by the adoption of the name Anarchism is found in the appearance in a publication as the "New Review" of Wordsworth Doni-
thorpe's article, "In Defence of Anarchy," reprinted in full in this number of Liberty. This article, which is a bold presentation of the platform of real Anarchism, probably never would have been sought or accepted by the "New Review" but for the fact that the propagandists by deed carried on by the so-called Communist-Anarchists has made Anarchism a timely topic for the magazines. A similar article, teaching the same lesson but couched in the terminology of Individualism, would be rejected by a popular magazine ninety-nine times in a hundred, unless it were from the pen of a man like Herbert Spencer, whose name has a commercial value. The thanks of all Anarchists are due to Mr. Donisthorpe for his brave and intelligent championing of their cause. On one point, however, he is certainly in error. He cannot be familiar with the writings of the Communists; otherwise he would not declare them uphealers of property. Here lies hid his own shock attack in a way of which he himself would be ashamed. "The Liberty Review," has been quick to take advantage. Perhaps he has been misled by some such false assertion as that of Jean Grave, — "my comminism is that of Proudhon." But if he will read the chapter entitled "Expropriation" in Kropotkine's "Words of a Rebel," he will see that Kropotkine's assertion that property is robbery has a meaning precisely opposite to that given to the same words by Proudhon, and never again will he challenge Ankeron Herbert to "point out a single living [Communist] Anarchist who denounces property as theft."
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"In addition to art and literature, the last issue of old-time slav- ery is given to the care of one stroke of the record and gone.
In the end of the magistrate, the club of the policemen, the group of the expression, the creasing-shrift of the department stars, all these tokens of Politics, which you lie right liberty greeed beneath her last."—PRENDERGAST.

Problems in Political Mechanics.

Once there was a country where the people elected Congressmen who bosed the boxes elected them; but of course he was a fool. Call it the people. And in that country the issue of money was entirely controlled by these Congressmen. Nobody ever disputed that. At least once in twenty years, on the average, there would be Congressmen who, in the belief of corruption, stupidity, and carelessness were such that powerful schemers could, if they chose, to do their best, pass bills manipulating the issue of money for private profit, against the interests of the people. Somebody asked it "once in twenty years" wasn't rather a mild statement; but of course he was a fool. Call it the people.

When a bill was passed, it was likely to take at least five years to raise the mass of the people to demand its correction. Somebody wanted to know whether the people had uniformly demanded a sound and radical reform once in fifty years since that government was founded; but of course he was a fool. Call it the people.

Reds We Remain.

It is with some astonishment that I find a number of plow-liners are in favor of J. W. Lloyd’s suggestion to adopt a white flag for our emblem. Philosophic Anarchists seldom have occasion to use any flag at all. We are not engaged in a “united army for reform,” or any other whooping and hollering movement, where we can shunt our axe of hearts before the gaze of an admiring crowd of “earnest searchers after truth.” The object lesson to be gained from a flag that is so seldom unfurled is liable to be small indeed. Should we need a flag, let us use the red one. The same arguments which lead us to retain our name denote us from changing our flag. We are still Socialists, fighting the battle of the proletariat.

Let us continue, then, if any flag is necessary, to fly the colors under which its battles have been fought and won for thousands of years, instead of changing to the color of aridocracy.

The familiar “White-flag Anarchists” might serve to distinguish us from the revolutionists, were not that distinction made far more effectually by the use of the term Philosophic Anarchists. It is as easy to use one term as the other, but the latter is far clearer, more descrip- tive, and less symbolic than the former. I do not believe that the white flag is at all, but the ordinary man does, and the white flag is invari- able associated in his mind with cowardice and surrender, or else with virility and moral purity. It would take long to explain away these false conceptions if once they gained ground, but the term “philosophic” explains itself. Besides, many who have considered the words philosophy and Anarchism to be dia- metrically opposed are led to inquire how they can be reconciled when they first hear them used in conjunction. It is bad enough to confuse with the revolutionists, even to confuse the word that is better to be confused with the non- revolutionists and the white-ribboners of the W. C. T. U. P. D. T.

Starting Financial Heresies.

The monopolistic “Evening Post,” published a banker’s appeal for financial reformers, born along the lines of greater freedom, and proceeds the appeal in the following editorial, significant for its explicit statement and more significant for its implications and unconscious admissions:

Truth has its innings at last. This fact seems to be approaching a realization so far as the bank ques- tion is concerned. Increasing attention has been given to it since the Sherman silver act was repealed. There was a debate of a week’s duration on the subject in the House last June, and now there are stirrings among bankers which imply that they will not sk冷静 much longer. They may not at first agree among themselves as to what should be done, but at all events they will have their say. The greenbackers and silver- tines will not have a monopoly longer, but even longer than that is better to be confused with the non- revolutionists and the white-ribboners of the W. C. T. U. P. D. T.

The bank question, in its simplest terms, is this: In what way can bank notes be issued with safety to the note holders, in volume adequate at all times to the wants of trade and of agricultural necessities, and in not excess thereof? The phrase “wants of business” means the exchanges of the country, or rather that part of the exchanges which is not carried on by checks.

To take a very common illustration, the wheat crop or the cotton crop comes in at a particular time of the year. When it gets into the cities and the warehouses or on the ships, it can be handled by means of bank checks, but, while it is still in possession of the pro- ducers or country buyers, it cannot be so handled. Here we must have currency. Last year flourished a crucial test of this proposition. It was a very panic. Currency could not be had. The distress in the agricultural districts was unprecedented. All sorts of devices were resorted to for the supply of a circulating medium, such as small clearings certificates, small checks of well-known men, tickets of manufacturing companies, etc., all of which were in vogue. But there was no coin. The checks and certificates were answered the need of the hour in a very clumsy and unsatisfactory way.

If it had been possible then for the national banks to issue their notes without being secured by this particular pinch could have been avoided. The notes would have gone out in exchange for actual property,—to wit, wheat and cotton; no speculation, no gambling there. They are still handled by means of bank checks, but the distress of the agricultural districts was unprecedented. All sorts of devices were resorted to for the supply of a circulating medium, such as small clearings certificates, small checks of well-known men, tickets of manufacturing companies, etc., all of which were in vogue. But there was no coin. The checks and certificates were answered the need of the hour in a very clumsy and unsatisfactory way.

In a word, it is evident that what we need to make an elastic currency of this kind is not security deposited at Washington, but good banking. If you can make sure that the mercantile paper which the bank takes in exchange for its circulating notes is good, and not squandered or stolen, then the bank notes are just as good as though they were bank notes;

Kropotkin’s "Epistle to the People" has a moral to the effect that the man who will not put his money in the public treasury will not be redeemed without waiting for the windup of a receiver.

This can be determined with as much accu- racy as the average mortality of human beings. It is only necessary, therefore, to require the check of every bond that is put into the public treasury, and that the security for the currency that is needed at all times, and to have it just when and where it is needed.

Yes, truth has its innings at last. Here is the monopolistic "Evening Post" actually endorsing Anarchistic views of currency! For years it has been ridiculing the position of those...
who taught that it was possible to have a safe currency based on other commodities than gold or silver, describing as cranks and ignoramuses those who urged the need of an elastic currency and who maintained that the country was suffering from want of a sufficient volume of safe and good money. Now, without formally reciting its theories of yesterday, it boldly enounces the heresy of a currency based on what it calls "value," and admits that the bond-of-credit requirement is a cog and hindrance to industrial movement and growth. When we reflect that the "Post" has repeatedly and emphatically protested against the legal tender laws and the notion that it is the proper function of government to furnish the people with currency, we see how short the step is which the "Post" has taken in order to become a full-fledged advocate of Anarchistic finance.

But are wheat and cotton the only kinds of property upon which currency can be safely issued? There are clearly hundreds of other commodities fully as safe as these, and there is no ground whatever for discriminating against them. The question which occurs to the mind is why the owners of these commodities, instead of getting circulating notes from the banks and paying heavily for the accommodation, could not organize a mutual bank which should issue such notes to its members without interest charges.

It does not seem to have dawned upon the "Post" that the admission that currency can be based upon property and merchandise logically involves the surrender of the gold basis. The promise to redeem in gold, false and impossible under the present currency famine, would evidently become a transparent fraud and shan under such an improved financial system as the "Post" advocates. Why not abandon the hollow pretense and adopt the policy of redemption in products? This would require organization and cooperative mutual banking, but the practicability of such action must be plain to all men of business experience who know what private enterprise has already accomplished in finance in the face of legal prohibition.

Auberon Herbert and Anarchism.

Auberon Herbert fancies that he is not an Anarchist because he believes in voluntary association for purposes of defence. In an excellent letter to "Free Life" Wordsworth Donisthorpe points out the absurdity of Mr. Herbert's disclaimer. He tells Mr. Herbert what Mr. Herbert has no excuse for not knowing before,—that the Anarchists believe in such association for defence quite as thoroughly as himself, the only difference being that Mr. Herbert persists in censuring them while the Anarchists deny that this name can properly be applied to a purely defensive institution. And regarding this difference of terminology Mr. Donisthorpe declares himself with the Anarchists in the following sentence: "It seems to me that you are straining the English language when you call such a voluntary association a State, which is in its very nature an outside despotism, benevolent or otherwise, whereby the will of one or of a few or of a majority is imposed upon dissentients or non-unionists."

Mr. Herbert labors hard to answer this, and a pretty mess he makes of it. He begins thus:

"The question between us is whether there is any ground upon which a right of using force to defend individual rights. Here is an utter misconception at the start. This is not at all the question between Mr. Herbert and the Anarchists. The Anarchists do not deny, but expressly affirm, the rightful existence of the common machinery here described; hence this cannot be in question between them and Mr. Herbert.

The questions really at issue are two in number: first, is there in supposing that the Anarchist deny the rightful existence of common defensive machinery, and in disclaiming the name Anarchist on this ground; second, whether this common defensive machinery can properly be called the State."

Of this second question Mr. Herbert says nothing whatever except that a common defensive machinery may be conveniently christened the State. Very well: terminology is not a vital matter. We may promptly concede that, granting Mr. Herbert's definition of the word State, he is a believer in that institution; but none the less is he an Anarchist, for it remains as true as before that he does not believe in what the Anarchists call the State,—in Mr. Donisthorpe's words, an outside despotism imposing its will upon dissentients.

Regarding the first question Mr. Herbert is equally silent; but, assuming the point at issue, he elaborates proves to the Anarchists that they are wrong in denying what they have never denied,—namely, that the individual has a right to defend himself and delegate such defence to others. This demonstration he solemnly supplements with a several-column addendor to show that the individual who does not delegate his defence will be continually in hot water, and that there is a "great moral pressure" upon the individual to cooperate with others for protection. Very well, again; if this moral pressure exists, it will do its work, and neither Mr. Herbert nor the Anarchists need concern themselves about it.

If Mr. Herbert does not propose to back this moral pressure by a legal pressure, he is an Anarchist; on the other hand, the moment that he should so propose, he would be neither an Anarchist nor a Volunteerist (as he calls himself), and the whole justification with which his champions would become a contemptible sham.

The letter of S. H. Randall to the "Cincinnati Reprint," in an other column, wherein that gentleman gives an account of his refusal to do jury duty under existing conditions, is significant of the hold which the principle of liberty is gradually obtaining upon intelligent men. Mr. Randall has long been a subscriber to Liberty, and the editor of the "Cincinnati" declares that he is "the peer in intellectual, in honesty of purpose, and in sterling integrity of character of any man who was ever summoned to act as a juror. He is a successful business man of Cincinnati, a s.o.n.o. of unusual education, a college mate of Judge Ferris," the presiding judge. Propagandism by deed is sometimes foolish, sometimes ferocious, but, as practiced by him, it is judicious, peaceable, and effective. It must not be inferred, however, that I endorse all of Mr. Randall's grounds for refusing to act as a juror. The absolute principle of non-resistance to evil, which he seems to inculcate, would prevent him from doing jury duty even where the State had been superceded by voluntary defence."

Anarchist Letter-Writing Corps.

The Secretary wants every member of Liberty to send in his name for enrolment. Those who do so thereby pledge themselves to write, when possible, a letter every fortnight, on Anarchism or kindred subjects, to the "target" assigned in Liberty for that fortnight. All other members of the Society have the opportunity of nominating of suitable targets. Address, Stewart T. Byington, 38 Council Hall, Oberlin, Ohio.

Those whose names are allowed to wait a week or two need not infer that theirs are least valued. It sometimes happens that a target of less importance seems more in need of immediate attention.

Those who send targets should, if possible, tell me what attitude the targets take on such questions as we deal with, as well as sending me the utterances or circumstances which are to form the occasion for writing.

But writers who are inconsiderate of the lack of such information should remember that we sometimes find a target that seems unquestionably good, yet get this important information begging.

In such a case we have to shoot in the dark as well as we can.

Target, section A.—The "Commercial Advertiser," 39 Park row, New York, had last month a signed article, headed "Anarchy and Its Leaders," which classes among Anarchists "Bernard Shaw and the Ford reformers who preach a material socialism." The writer gives a definition which he professes to have received from Kropotkin, that "Anarchy is absolute individualism," and another from Louise Michel, that "Anarchists are a recognition of the fact that all force is a crime." For himself he complains that Anarchists never make a clear and comprehensible statement of their demands.

Section B.—The "Examiner," San Francisco, had on September 24 a symposium by five prominent business men on "Borre-Giving and Borre-Taking," a proposal of recent Sea FAir Conference, in which it was said that business cannot be done there on a large scale without paying tribute to the supervisors. One would hang briars and bribe by lynch law; another would hang briars and bribe by lynch law; and the third would elect better officers: one says that his experience proves that a man who squarely refuses to pay any blackmail "will soon be killed;" another says that his experience proves that a man who squarely refuses to pay any blackmail "will soon be killed;" section B.—The "Observer," San Francisco, which is a monthly magazine of democratic and socialist literature, in which it was said that a
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The Beauties of Government.

The poachers of liberty are so largely invited to our shores by the open invitation of the American constitution — by the great advantage of being free — that it is a question of great doubt whether the United States is in any degree of free ground upon which the poachers of liberty may be driven by the laws of the United States.

SIR JUDAH, the superintend of the post-office, wrote: "The post-office of the United States is a public service.

"A public service is a public trust, and a trust is a public service."

"A public trust is a public service, and a service is a public trust.

"A public trust is a public service, and a public service is a public trust."
award, was tried to induce Mrs. Schlund to yield. When Constable Machen served the decree of the chancery upon her, she threw it in the face of the officer and walked away. Finally Sheriff Toffey was ordered to bring proceedings dispossessing her. He tried peaceable means at first, and failed, of course.

The_biography_of_William_J._MacKinstry_was_put_at_the_head_of_five_constables_yesterday_and_told_to_assist_Deputy_Sheriff_McCormack_in_dispossessing_them. A load_of_implements_used_in_moving_houses_was_dropped_on_the_steps_of_the_home. Two_homes_were_given_to_Mrs._Sabloak_in_which_to_vacate. Her_answer_was_to_bar_every_door_and_window_in_the_house_and_to_lock_the_gate. All_these_proceedings_were_witnessed_by_a_large_crowd_of_people_to_witness_the_selling_of_the_Schulds. At 7:00 o'clock the deputy sheriffs were reinforced by Sheriff Toffey, his counsel, James Erwin, and Roundman McCormick, with six policemen and a patrol wagon. Constable Locke tore down the gate, and, while he was doing this, Roundman McCormick and Deputy Sheriff McCormick jumped the fence and hammered on the door for admittance. George Schuld, Mrs. Schuld's eldest son, opened it, and the officers forced their way into the house. George ran up stairs, shouting_to_his_sister_to_get_his_gun. He was captured and taken to the police wagon.

Mrs. Schuld, it is said, pointed a shotgun at McCormick. She was disarmed and the dispute was settled by a symptomatic scene, and an angry and aggrieved by the forcible entrance of her husband, who loudly abused the representatives of the law. Her husband, the daughters, and the smaller children, were seen running in a fit of passion. Her son George fought the officers, endeavoring to reach his mother. Sheriff Toffey then called in the police to assist him.

Two policemen seized the woman. It was an unexpected struggle. Several policemen restrained her husband, while the others held the daughters. Mrs. Schuld and her children were despondent. Her art was seized, and she was dragged toward the door. Falling on the floor before her, a seven-year-old daughter hugged her by the knees and sought to hold her back. The officers were forced to take the children from the police wagon.

Schuld was quiet for the time being. His four-year-old son clung about his neck. Both wept. Mrs. Schuld, who is an elderly woman, short and rotund, was dragged from the house to the police wagon. Her dress was torn from her. Schuld, finally arouses himself, fought when led out of the house, but not with the vehemence of his wife. The children refused to leave the parents. George tried to reduce the house, but was prevented. His sister tried to let him in at a window, but she was forcibly removed. Finally all the family were taken to Police Headquarters.

Sheriff Toffey called in Counsellor Rowe, and the home of the Schulds was practically a tangle of the best.

The Boulevard surveyors began to run a line; carpenters tore down the fences and steps and nailed up the windows; laborers began to remove parts of the foundation preparatory to moving the building. The house would be moved to one side, and the Boulevard, which is now nothing but a very dusty and very muddy road, will be widened and paved.

On reaching the Gregory street police station Mrs. Schuld and the six-year-old boy were escorted up to the police court room. The other children were taken below. Judge Potts, Sheriff Toffey, Chief Murphy, and John J. Erwin, Sheriff Toffey's legal adviser, were waiting their arrival.Roundman McCormick detailed the circumstances of the arrest. He told how the officers were obliged to break into the house, and about the double-barreled shot_gun which, he said, was pointed at him by Mrs. Schuld. He told the story of the collection with the case. He had received a writ of ejectment, and through his deputies had made several attempts to serve it upon the deputists and had been successful. Schuld's threats to shoot the first man who attempted to evict her property. Finally he was forced to make a complaint against the Schuld's to the police in the discharge of his duty. He called on Chief Murphy for assistance, because a policeman in uniform has more effect than half a dozen deputy sheriffs.

Judge Potts, sentencing Schuld, said he was charged with knowingly and willfully raiding the sheriff in the execution of a writ. "Whatever your grievance may be," said the judge, "I am a violation of the law, and the sheriff in the performance of his duty. You may have been wronged, but your proper method of getting redress is by an appeal to the courts. Your property was wronged, and you have no redress available by the court for that purpose. You appealed from the award, as I understand it, and the court reversed it. I must add that the process was served on you, and then you attempted to resist the offer of the law by force. That, you must know, as a law-abiding citizen, which I take you to be, was wrong. The sheriff was simply performing his duty, and you were violating the law in resisting him."

"They have done us a great injustice," said Schuld, interrupting the judge. "We have worked hard and saved our money to make a home for ourselves, and now they take it away from us. We don't want to give it up, Judge; it is our home. We haven't a place to lay our heads tonight. They told us we could move the house back, but we can't; there is no room for it. They give us $2,750, and they gave the man across the street $3,000 for property that is no better than ours; and they told us that we must pay them $2,750 for property next to ours which is only forty-two feet front." He added that "I call that highway robbery, Judge!" continued Schuld, becoming excited and提高了 his voice. "They are highway robbers. We have eight children, and they dragged us out like dogs. Where are we to go? That is our home, the only home we have got. We are not going to move, what are we to do? Where are we to go?"

Justice Potts tried to explain to him that the sheriff was not responsible for what had been done. He was only performign his duty under the law, but Schuld could understand nothing but that a great injustice had been done him. He has no right," said Justice Potts, "to resist the sheriff with shotguns.

"But what am I to do?" demanded Schuld. "And I stand by it by whom are they taking my house, my wife, and my children from over my children's heads?"

Justice Potts saw it was no use to argue with the excited man: he said simply: "You will have to pay the law, and I will require you to furnish $200 half for yourself and wife to appear for examination on Saturday morning. Have you a bondman here?"

August Stidw, proprietor of the Belvedere Hotel, stepped forward and offered himself as bondman. Justice Potts warned Schuld and his wife that they would be arrested if they did not get money and make any arrangements. Schuld would not promise not to go. Chief Murphy suggested that perhaps it might be wise to refuse to release him, because, if he went back, there might be more trouble. "But where am I to go?" asked Schuld, exalted. "That is my home; I have no other place to go."

Sheriff Toffey and Judge Potts tried to quiet him. Mr. Zengler offered to furnish the family with quarters in the Belvedere House until they could secure other accommodations, and Schuld finally consented to stay away from his home.

All this time Mrs. Schuld, who up to the time of reaching the court room was the most aggressive member of the company, sat quietly in a chair with her golden-haired boy in her lap. She said nothing, but looked venged. Occasionally she turned her eyes toward Judge Potts and Mrs. Stidw, a farm, came to the Board of Prefects, who sat on the other side of the room. Every look she gave him was loaded with anger and bitterness. It had been Judge McGrath's official duty to render the Schulds the award for their property and to defend their appeal from the award.

As the case was about closing, Judge McGrath ventured the remark that the Prefects were unable for weeks and were forced to furnish $40 for food. "It is all your fault," she shouted, pointing her finger at Judge McGrath. "You ought to be hanged as Allenbeerg. It is all your doing, but remember that there is a God above you! He is greater than all judges, and you'll be sorry some day for what you have done.

The judge tried to explain that he was in no way responsible, but the late woman would not listen to any explanation. She became hysterical, and was led away by her husband. Schuld was ordered to go to the police station.

When the Schulds were released, they returned to their former home. The house was removed within a few days. Thereupon the former tenants moved in, claiming a portion of it which is wanted for the Boulevard, and which has been condemned. The Schulds and their eight children spent Thursday night in the Belvedere House. They discussed the situation with friends, and concluded that it would be useless to resist the mandates of the law any longer. They had made a gallant fight for what they considered their rights, but were defeated in the end by the officers of the law.

Mr. and Mrs. Schuld held a conference yesterday morning with Sheriff Toffey. He proposed that they should go back to the house and make arrangements to have it removed as soon as possible. The couple signed a bond to have the house removed in a few days. Thereupon the former tenants paid the county for property, and the Schulds would make their own arrangements.

The orchard and flower garden which were prizeworthy so highly by the family will be destroyed. The court contains eight plows, which have been planted at the birth of each child. The family in general has become more reconciled to the situation, but Mrs. Schuld, who was head and front in the defense of her home, still grieves deeply.

Such horrors as this, too common already, are becoming more numerous. They are the relations of the State to the possessors of the land made more intimate than at present. Under the Single Tax evictions would be every-day occurrences. Laborers who had spent years in building themselves homes would be summarily pitched out of them by the Community as soon as the Community had kindly made those homes too valuable for those laborers to live in."


PROFANITY Á PRIÈRE FINE.

PITTSBURGH, Oct. 8. — A highly specialized act of the Police Committee of the Braddock Council was held today to take action on the complaint made by Prof. Samuel Hamilton, Superintendent of the county schools, that profanity was too common on the streets and that the police took no notice of it. The committee instructed the police officials to make arrests under the law imposing a fine of sixty-seven and a half cents and costs for each profane word. The police will begin making arrests at once.

WHO WILL SENTENCE THE JUDGE?

Samuel Hess, who was sentenced to the Kings County penitentiary recently by Police Justice Goetting, of Brooklyn, for two years and also fined $700 for insulting $5, was released yesterday, paid $50 for his fine and was released.

The judge violated the law of 1894 in imposing a sentence of more than six months' imprisonment or a fine of more than $500 for one offense. There are over twenty-five prisoners in the penal institution who have been thus illegally sentenced. They will probably be released.

[If ignorance of the law is no excuse for the robber, still less should it be an excuse for the judge. "Put Goetting in Hess's cell," says our visitor from the planet Mars.]
LIBERTY

The Experience of a Stranger.


He dropped one day in a parachute from the far-off
heights of Mars,
And swept through the air in an earthward course
Surrounded by the blazing stars.

For days and weeks and months and years he held the
midst of the L. S. A.

and at last he was seized by a rack in the middle
delevering the blinds.

A handy chap for a martial man, and of many
minds, a jack.

They do think queerly, he said, "down here, but I
guessed I'd catch the knack.

He should have sat it out, for he was in a small town,
looking for work to do,

"When I'm on the current," he said, "I think I'll
alsothem a wrinkle or two.

But they hoist him off from the labor marts with
man's a jerk and job.

"You can't do here," cried the foremen stern, "you
are only a tramp's sale.

There were no rules unions on Mars, you know, and
there were no law.

So he pawed it out five miles from a magistrate, and
the fisher got sixty days.

Once out of jail, this man from Mars went hungry
for a time, but do as the poor.

"I've nothing to your, each man of them said,
"you're one of the begging poor.

But the man said, "I do not work, and he could not live as
people, because I should have him do.

For claims were ample, the streams were fenced, and
moneys were disdained, too.

What wonder, then, that this man from Mars should
awful, wretched be?

He couldn't get work, and one day he attempted
feast de los.

The poison was m d, they pumped him out, and now,
rely upon me.

"I went straight to the hospital from the hospital to
the Peniten.lee.

Hollie W. Field.

Too Hot for Jury Duty.

[he Cincinnatian:
As the five English haffles of this city have attempted
to describe my conduct recently in our
Probate Court, and in the papers, that they have procured a
sense of agitation, and are thus, in fact, enemies to my
right to be heard. It has been said that I was not of the state, was
not a valid ground for excuse. I then said I was not
the committee of the court, I would read a state-
ment. Judge Ferris asked if it had legal grounds for
excuse. I replied that I had not. He then gave me
an excuse, which I did as follows:

"Yesterday, I am from my staff of the court, I am from
the court a s a result of the

On Sept 27 I requested the court to excuse me from
jury service, stating a a crime which forbade my ren-
dering it: but was told at my request was a valid
for the court, I said I was not

I then said I was not
and that my refusal was "final." The judge
unwilling, and held me for jury service. On the
the 8th I made no request, having no legal ground for
excuse, and not willing, it would be granted with-
out us.

At the proper time I rose, and said that, with
the permission of the court, I would read a state-
ment. Judge Ferris asked if I had legal grounds for
excuse. I replied that I had not. He then gave me
permission to read, which I did as follows:

"Yesterday, I am from my staff of the court, I am from
the court a s a result of the

In Defence of Anarchy.

Advocacy of the doctrine of Anarchy in no way in-
volves the defence of assassination or undue violence.
Extremism of type, extreme methods, no matter what social or religious systems they seek
to uphold and enforce.

Nevertheless, such the prevailing ignorance and
misconception of the movement are very keenly to ex-
amine and explain the attitude of what is called (or rather mislaid) the "party of action" to the Individu-
alist or Anarchist.

In this theory of social organization there is nothing
crude or offensive. Indeed, Anarchists are of all
men the least aggressive. Their whole political phil-
osophy may be summed up in the words "Let be."
They hold that every man has a right to do whatever
he chooses, so long as he does not thereby violate the
equal right of his fellows. This is the creed of liberty.
It is in complete harmony with our constitution, and
applies to every man, whatever be his condition in
society. And, of course, the protection of the
society against assassination and murder, and the protection
of private property against robbery, are in no way
contrary to the principles of Anarchism, as long as
they are not the result of violence or the
use of force.

It is true, what the French government, it has done, and
it will not be the result of the establishment of a regime of liberty,
but it will be the result of a system of private
property, the French state, the French people, the French
nation.

At the same time, those individuals who have
most attentively studied the subject are the first to
admit that the establishment of a regime of liberty
is fraught with many and real difficulties, quite apart
from the ignorant and selfish opposition of those who,
discovering own power, and in their interest
exploiting their neighbors.

First of all, it is difficult to ascertain where indirect
aggression ends and direct aggression begins. You
may strike a man for a scissors, but you may accept
his money for a pinchbeck watch, be believing it to be a gold watch?

You may use him for money on your own account, or
make him a slave, or kill him, or steal from him,
or cause him injury, or be the cause of the injury of
his liberty? Again, you may not set fire to his house,
but you may set him at work to call in your
own house, by which only trespassers can be
hurt? You may even sell an article for more than it
is worth to one who is reasonably ignorant of its true
value, as certain merchants on the Gold Coast sell col-
gold beads to the natives as jewels? You may run
away with another man's wife with her consent,
or cause his sin or unduly injury to him or his
possible injury of your neighbor's children? And if
not, is he to be the judge of the truth or morality of
your own acts? If not, then the case is not that of
freedom, and are not fairly met by an appeal to the principle
of liberty.

Anarchists maintain, and rightly maintain, that all
such direct and indirect aggressions on the person and
property of others, circle the equal freedom of all.
but some of them, such are individuals, and extreme
Anarchists, shrill the task of policing out for this to be done.

Then there is another large class of social functions
functions which must be performed somehow and
by someone, but concerning which it is hard to say to
whom they belong. It is a common and necessity
that fires should be extinguished. There are
modes in which this can be accomplished. All the
dweller in a town may be taxed, and fire engines
maintained, and the money thus collected used for
purposes which are intended to be supported by
the local community, or the matter may be left to
private enterprise. In such case fire insurance
companies will be formed, and it will be the interest
of these companies to do all the necessary work of extinguishing
fires. At first they may attempt to distinguish between
houses which are insured in their own offices and
which are not, and only demolish those which are.
But the difficulty of insuring against destruction
in a hurry, and on the spur of the moment, will
soon become apparent. Houses will be burned down and
private property will be lost which is not insured,
and the owners are not the owners of the
proprietors. Both methods have been tried in
this town, and the present system is a jumble of the
two. It is true that, under the system of private
enterprise, some persons receive benefits for
which they have not paid.

Yet, in spite of this drawback, Anarchists maintain that it works better on the
total than a municipal fire brigade. State departments are
less efficient and more expensive, and in the end (taking
into account the cost of labor) less just.

Who is to say, ask the State Socialists, for the
paving, lighting, and heating of the towns? Who
will contribute without compulsion? Every
block of houses will require its own philanthropist.

Is any man with a half-acre field to be allowed to start
a private cemetery of his own, and to charge who he
likes for the graves, irrespective of the wishes of his
neighbors? What satisfaction is it to them to be told
that the day is come when they are all liberty to
act as they please? Again, who is going to support the police? Is
every household to provide its own policeman? Here again,
the question is not that of the property, but that of the
bizarre as his inter-
locutor would expect. The problem is that of
the person against assault and murder, and the protection
of private property against robbery, are in no way
contrary to the principles of Anarchism, as long as
they are not the result of violence or the
use of force.
No anarchist believes in the infallibility of the tiger. He knows as well as the most confirmed Socialist that man is a gnawing animal, and that individual welfare is better secured by the welfare of the whole. Hence we anarchists believe that the state is quite as terrible an institution as has ever been dreamed of in the coldest schooldream. We believe that the state is quite as much justifiable by the necessities of the many as it is justifiable by the necessities of the few. We believe that all who are born into this world are born to share in the blessings of life; and that all who are born into this world are born to share in the responsibilities of life. We believe that all who are born into this world are born to share in the duties of life; and that all who are born into this world are born to share in the duties of life.
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