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**NOT THE DAUGHTER BUT THE MOTHER OF ORDER.**

On Picket Duty.

"Père Pelaard," the most violent of all the Communist organs, has been revived in London by its editor, E. Pouget, who publishes it fortnightly in the form of a tiny pamphlet, each number bearing a new title. The editor's address is 23 King Edward Street, Islington, London, England.

The "American Journal of Politics" for November contains two thoroughly Anarchistic articles, one on the question of patents and copyrights, by H. Olerich, and the other on the question of strikes and boycotts, by Victor Yarros. Mr. Olerich gives a very able presentation of the arguments against property in ideas which have been repeatedly advanced in the editorial columns of Liberty, and reinforces them with weighty considerations of his own. Mr. Yarros's article is a reply to Prof. von Holst, that inflamed and over-rated writer on constitutional law having contributed to the "Journal of Political Economy" an article on the Chicago troubles of last summer which Mr. Yarros very properly characterizes as hysterical, rabid, intemperate, and almost ridiculous. But Mr. Yarros does not content himself with adjectives; as is his habit, he backs them up with arguments, and, if Prof. von Holst attempts to answer them, he will find that he has a difficult task before him. In my opinion, David has once more slain Goliath. The "American Journal of Politics" is to be highly commended for admitting such articles to its pages.

Another strike is on at Pullman. The dissatisfaction on this occasion is with Thomas H. Wickes, second vice-president of the Pullman Car Company and the man who was the most active and obstinate of all in the struggle against the strikers last summer. It is now complained that Mr. Wickes has been guilty of extreme cruelty. The complaint, and thus far the sole striker, is no less a person than Mrs. Wickes. She sues for a divorce on the ground that Mr. Wickes is in the habit of beating, striking, kicking, and otherwise cruelly abusing her. That is to say, she strikes because she has been struck. Now, would it not be one of the finest things that ever happened in the world if all the other wives in the country were to inaugurate a general and sympathetic strike? Wholesale indictments for conspiracy would be sure to follow; Cleveland, who has an old-time reputation as an upholder of the family, would speedily call out the troops; and historian von Holst would fill several pages of the "Journal of Political Economy" with exclamations of holy horror at the people thus presuming to paralyze reproduction and commerce.

Boston recently labored under a moral smarm. The ministers started it, and the police played second fiddle in a really admirable manner. The society which makes it its business to mind other people's are so over-worked about the eyes in spying around that many of them have found glasses necessary. Everything is being prohibited. Even the innocent little telegraphic ticker which supplies stock quotations, baseball scores, racing news, etc., to hotels, restaurants, and bar-rooms, has been hauled up as an instrument conducive to gambling. Of course, the courts will not uphold such seizures, but this is not compensation to the persons who are annoyed and whose business is damaged every time a few persons take it into their heads to run amuck. The sensational parson is becoming such a public nuisance that every good citizen should feel it his duty to sue him for damages.

I do not see the pertinence of Mr. Bilgram's article in another column commenting upon my criticism of him in No. 294 of Liberty. His rejoinder is directed against a fancied assertion of mine that crushing of competitors by under-selling is a bad thing; and, imputing this assertion to me, he hints that I have flapped over from Anarchism to State Socialism. If he will read a third time the paragraph which he has already read twice, he will see that it expresses no opinion whatever as to the badness or the goodness of the policy of crushing competitors. The ground taken was simply this,—that, when government, supported as it is by compulsory taxation, engages in any line of business, free competition in that business becomes an absurdity, and that Mr. Bilgram is therefore bound, as a champion of free competition, to denounce the State's entering into business. This was my sole contention, and Mr. Bilgram makes not the slightest attempt to meet it. What does he say is that he does not favor under-selling by the State, and that, if the State were to under-sell in the banking business, it would teach the economists a much-needed lesson. Now I have not charged him with favoring under-selling by the State, but have I disputed that such under-selling would have the educational value that he points out. But I do not think it just to teach economists at the expense of producers (even though they be producers of money), and since Mr. Bilgram, after all, does not favor giving the lesson, I assume that he agrees with me in this. And now I ask Mr. Bilgram this question: Does free competition exist when one competitor has and exercises the power to meet by robbery the deficit arising from the practice of selling below cost?

Time was when it was impossible to hint at the practicality of furnishing for almost nothing a paper currency based neither on gold nor on government bonds, but on individual credit, without raising thereby a storm of sneers from papers like the "Nation" at "the idiots who think that, in order to have money, it is only necessary to start the printing presses." But now these same papers, the "Nation" first of all, are telling us that, under the Baltimore plan of currency reform, "the currency will be supplied at a cost of next to nothing. This does not mean," the "Nation" kindly explains, "that we can all of us pick up money in the street. If we could do so, it would be worth nothing. We should have to pay one hundred cents' worth of our goods or labor for every dollar, whether it be silver or bank-notes; but in the former case society as a whole must begin by paying out fifty cents for the material of which the dollar is composed, while in the other case it pays only a small fraction of a cent. . . . . It seems something like a paradox to say that money which costs nothing is better than that which costs fifty per cent. of its face value, but it is true, because the bank-notes represent one hundred cents in bank assets." Which seeming paradox is nothing more or less than the good old doctrine preached by Anarchists and reviled by Godkinians ever since Proudhon wrote his "Solution du Problème Social," nearly half a century ago. "The bank-notes," continues the "Nation," "are swapping tickets. The Baltimore plan, as Mr. Hepburn tersely said, is a plan for swapping well-known credit for less-known credit." In formulating this conception of the banking business Liberty was years before Mr. Hepburn or the "Nation." In my essay on "State Socialism and Anarchism," written in 1886, I described the business of banks of issue as "an exchange of the known and widely available credits of the banks for the unknown and unavailable, but equally good, credits of the customers." Nor was the idea original with me; practically the same thing had been said by others at an earlier date. But at that time the "Nation" either could not or would not see this truth. In fact, journals of its stamp seldom recognize a truth when first announced by its discoverers. Before it can gain its sanction it must be uttered by some ape of high repute.
The Church and Woman Suffrage.

Without any desire to enter upon a discussion of the question of woman suffrage with either the editor or Mr. Robinson, I may perhaps be permitted to call the attention of the readers of Liberty to a misrepresentation under which one of the disputants is laboring. I think that it would be very difficult for Mr. Robinson to be more mistaken about any other matter of fact than he is in regarding the attitude of the conservative forces toward the political equality of woman. He asks if there is a church anywhere that advocates it. Fifteen years ago the minister who advocated giving the ballot to woman was the exception. Today the Protestant minister at the North (with the possible exception of the Episcopalian, who is not a very conspicuous factor in the discussion of political questions) who does not champion woman suffrage is the man who is rarely found. The title began to turn about ten years ago, and it has gathered volume every year since, and it still continues to swell. It began in the West, and the farther you go in that direction the stronger you will find it to be. So far as it is relatively weak in the South, and is not so powerful here as in the middle West.

The genesis of this movement is very easy to trace, especially to one who has lived in the prohibition states and is familiar with their politics. Mr. Robinson is well aware of the fact that in the case of all the Protestant churches the membership in and attendance of women is many fold greater than that of men. So notorious is this fact that it is a common saying that, were it not for the women, more than half of the Protestant churches would have to close their doors. They are sustained by the moral and pecuniary support which the women bring to the church. Many of the men who do go to church attend only because their wives and sweethearts are generally there on Sunday, while the number is still larger who give money to the church simply because their wives are members thereof and they must help support the conventicle if they would have peace at home. Could Mr. Robinson leave his office and go among the people and spend a few years in getting acquainted with them in town, village, and country, he would be astonished at the number of indifferentists and infidels who give with a more or less free hand to the church. Of course, the clergy know well where their friends are and which sex it is that they have the most influence over, and hence it was very natural that they should early grasp the idea that the ballot in the hands of woman would immediately and vastly augment their power and enrich the church. The first political use they had for woman was in the fight for prohibition, and they realize that they are likely to be ultimately benefited if they do not arm her with a vote. Next came the Sunday question, if it was not primary in the thought of the preacher, and from that point the vista of tyranny widened out until at this time the militant branch of the church expects nothing less from the assistance of "enfranchised woman" than the establishment of a theocracy in which religion, morals, and politics will be absolutely dominated by the reactionary principles of the most orthodox wing of Protestant Christianity. Before the clerical influence was enlisted on the side of the woman suffragists the ballot for woman was demanded, but when it was her right to vote because she was amenable to the criminal laws, because she was a taxpayer, and because one sex cannot legislate for another. But it was not long after the ministers came to her side before the tone of the women-suffrage advocates changed, and from that time on we heard less and less about equality of all other rights, but the sight of what a woman would do in the suppression business when once she got her hands on the reins of authority. She would suppress the liquor traffic, she would legislate the social evil out of existence, she would preserve the Sabbath from desecration, and now she is prepared to Christianize the Constitution and outlaw Free-thought.

She long since allied herself with the priesthood for the regulation of art and literature, and years ago in Kansas she had already been so corrupted by the ministers that, when she went into office in Osawatomie, she had an ordinance adopted prohibiting the presence of a station in any stable within the city limits! She has given the municipal ballot; and now, on the eve of her investiture with full suffrage, her and the clergy's influence has become so potent that the officials have begun the regeneration of society along more radical lines by the castration of the feeble-minded in State institutions. The minister can think of no other method of "reform" so beneficial, and no other statute law, and he, knowing his influence with woman, is only too eager to give her political power. Of course there are exceptions, even in the West, but they are becoming fewer every day.

There is another consideration which must always be borne in mind. The churches, as such, are much more religious already than they are political in their direct work. The greater portion of their scheming is done indirectly through the auxiliary societies. The differentiation of functions has been going on for some time, and, if you want to know what the live, aggressive divisions of Protestant Christianity are after, you must make yourself acquainted with the demands and plans of these societies. Among such organizations are the National Reform Association, the American Sabbath Union, the Divorce Reform League, the King's Daughters, the Women's Temperance Union, the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor, the Epworth League, the League for the Promotion of Purity in Literature and Art (a branch of the Y. M. C. A.), and the Prohibition party. The last contains a few people who are not Christians, but the others are wholly Christian. They are the pioneer political corps of the Protestant church, and they have for woman suffrage by the overwhelming majority of the membership of each. Although they are many societies, they are seeking the same general end, and there is the strongest bond of sympathy between the leaders of the most reactionary and the (apparently) comparatively harmless organizations. Frances Willard, the head of the W. C. T. U., is an ardent National Reformer (the God-in-the-Constitution party), and the department of Sunday observance of the W. C. T. U. is very active and successful in its field. Taken altogether, these societies stand for all that is bigoted and reactionary, outside of the economic domain, in American politics. That they also stand for woman suffrage is significant, too, because between them they are fighting for prohibition, for rigid Sunday laws, for the Bible in the schools, for one moral code and that the priest's for no divorce except for adultery and the prohibition of the remarriage of the offending partner, for a censorship of literature, art, and the stage, and the Constitution of the Constitution and the Constitution and the laws. And for some of these causes they are all united, and no one of them is alone in its propagation.

As to the Catholic Church, it has always permitted to its members considerable liberty of action in regard to most matters not directly affecting their faith. But the prohibitory idea has during the last few years gained a large number of adherents in that organization, and there are not wanting indications of a tendency in the Catholic Church to accept and act upon the Puritan principle. Once it begins to move with an accelerating momentum in that direction, it will not be long before its astute leaders will perceive the wisdom of giving the ballot to woman, as the Northern Protestants have already. The Catholic Church holds for indissoluble marriage, and its vote would be cast solidly for the so-called "reforms" of the Protestant authoritarians. The latter would make almost any concession to the Catholics to secure their assistance. It needs no prophet's crystal ball to see that in two decades the American Catholics will be as devoted to the cause of woman suffrage by the overwhelming majority of the Protestants now are, and for similar selfish reasons.

E. C. Walker.

Strikes and State Control.

"These railroad strikes will never cease," said the Pop. "They must be put down with all means of transportation are under State control."

"You think that will stop them?" asked the Anarchist.

Pop. — "Most assuredly it will. Look at our post office. Look at our streets. Look at our schools. Are they not all under State control?"

Anar. — "Yes. And look at our sewers.

""
Look at our garbage wagons. If the stench from those is not strong enough, look at our Senate. Are they not all under State control?

**Pop.** — "Your attempted sarcasm is no argument. Tell me, who ever heard of a strike in the post office? Yes, or in your garbage wagons either?"

**Anon.** — "Not my garbage wagons, but yours. However, I recollect the strikes to which you refer."

**Pop.** — "The strikes to which I refer! What do you mean?"

**Anon.** — "I mean that you have picked out the two worst possible examples. If you had asked me if I had ever heard of a strike in the Senate, it would have been difficult for me to give you an affirmative answer. I believe striking—at least, the particular kind of striking of which we are speaking—is not much in vogue among robbers of any kind. But with the post office and garbage wagons it is different."

**Pop.** — "Come, come, you don’t mean to tell me that the post office officials ever went on strike!"

**Anon.** — "That is exactly what I do mean to tell you. In July, 1890, the postmen of London went on strike. It was not for any paltry raise of wages, either; but for the right to organize. The secretary of the Postmen’s Union gives as his side of the story in the "Nineteenth Century" for July, 1890. He says: In the opinion of Mr. Raikes (then postmaster general) the postmen may have a union on condition that its secretary is appointed by the department, that it holds no meetings, that it makes no appeal to the public, and that it makes no attempt: to better the condition of its members. What would you say if Pullman or Carnegie wished to appoint the secretaries of their employees’ unions?"

**Pop.** — "The cases are entirely different. Anyway, one isolated case proves nothing."

**Anon.** — "On the contrary, it proves everything. It proves that the State denies its employees the right to organize, and that State control does not prevent strikes. But, if you desire more examples, I can give you three. The policemen at the Bow Street police station, London, went on strike at about the same time as the postmen, and for the same reason. The Grenadier Guards, the crack regiment of the British army, struck in the same month."

**Pop.** — "You can’t talk of that as a strike. In the case of soldiers it must be considered as rebellion."

**Anon.** — "And so it will be considered rebellion for a soldier in the ‘Industrial Army’ to manifest discontent. Probably he will be treated as the Grenadiers were. Five of them were sent to prison with hard labor for terms ranging from eighteen months to two years; the rest of the regiment was sent to an uncomfortable climate in the West Indies in the hope that they would die quietly."

**Pop.** — "That was in England, and has nothing whatsoever to do with affairs in this country. Such things would be impossible here."

**Anon.** — "My dear fellow, you show most lamentable ignorance. The regulations of the army, police, and post-office departments in this country are not very different from those in England. Do you suppose the United States would tolerate any union except the ‘Commonwealth of Police Among Us?’"

**Pop.** — "Your glittering generalizations amount to nothing. You can’t give a single instance of public employees going on strike in this county."

**Anon.** — "That depends entirely upon your definition of a public employee. If that term only includes high-salaried officials, I must agree with you. But if it includes the poor devils who drive the city garbage wagons, you are off again. In July, 1890, a month that seems to have devoted its whole time to proving the falsity of your ideas, the teamsters in the employ of the street-cleaning department of New York City went on strike for higher wages. They were almost unorganized, and the city authorities had no trouble in suppressing the ‘disturbance’ in a couple of days. But the Populist was moving down the street, muttering something that sounded like "No use talking to those fellows; they never want to do anything practical."

F. D. BURROW.

**Counterfeits at a Premium.**

To the Editor of Liberty:

James Monroe, LL.D., senior professor of political science and natural history in Oberlin College, lectured here yesterday on an experience of his at the time of the John Brown raid. He had occasion to tell something about the old State bank notes. At that time, said Mr. Monroe, to increase the use of coin, had prohibited the issuing of small notes. The result was not a perceptible increase in the use of coin, but a great scarcity of money of the prohibited denominations. A great number of counterfeited-one-dollar notes on the Northern Bank of Kentucky were in circulation, and were well known to business men everywhere as counterfeits; but, owing to the want of a one-dollar circulating medium, they were everywhere accepted at par by a tacit understanding. Nearly all notes of higher denominations, even on banks of known soundness, were at varying rates of discount; so that, of all the money Prof. Monroe had with him on the occasion he was dealing of, these notorious counterfeits were the only ones that passed current without question. Having just learned the facts about this currency, and being a man of tender conscience, he made it a rule in offering these notes to pay them at a discount. He tells us he told it was counterfeited; but that made no difference, they were always acceptable. How widely this excuse of things prevaild I do not know; Prof. Monroe’s story related to Ohio and Virginia.

He said in comment that this was the most remarkable case of flat money within his knowledge, seeing that these notes had been issued by the legal issuing parties and the public had not been able to distinguish them without question. The largest denomination of $50 and $100 were almost wholly counterfeited, so that a large portion of the currency of that description was sent to the melting pot. All the money was sold at the rate of $2.00, which I am glad the gentleman who administered the deserved repute, and that, whatever his opinion may be of the comparative merits of silver and gold, he is a great friend to Liberty (82.00) that I can numpy the gentleman who administered the deserved repute, and that, whatever his opinion may be of the comparative merits of silver and gold, he is a great friend to Liberty. The New York "Sun" is violently opposed to the proposal of the newsdealers that half-cents be coined. It bases its opposition on patriotic grounds, and thinks that the nation should not deme itself by imitating China. But the discerning reader detects between the lines another and more genuine reason for the "Sun’s" attitude, namely, that the "Sun," which is a two-cent paper, has already been sufficiently injured by the one-cent papers, and has no desire to be injured further by the appearance of half-cent papers.

**For Salvage.**

For always in thine eyes, O Politician: Shines that high light whereby the world is saved. And, being saved, is packeted by thee.
LIBERTY. 299

The Beauties of Government.

The words of Liberty are urgently invited to contribute to this department. It is open to any statement of facts that lovers of liberty are a set of people endowed with the highest capacity of soul, heart, sense, and strength. Either or both of the orators are known to the writer's own knowledge, or apparently reliable accounts clipped from recent publications, are肼one.

HOW THE SACRED MAJORITY IS MADE.

On the first floor at the southeast corner of Fifty-eighth street and Eighth avenue, Lemanley Ely Quigg, Republican candidate for Congress in the Fourteenth district against John Connolly, Democrat, sat yesterday with his stage manager, Mr. William Leary, lastly of the slaughter-house district. Lemanley had in front of him a paper bag such as Secretary Morton uses for sending out seeds at the expense of the government. The bag was covered with figures. The Congressmen chewed nervously on the end of a pencil.

"It's no use, Billy," said he. "If the women could vote, we'd have it in a walk, but - and he beaved a sigh.

The Hon. Mr. Leary in an absent-minded way picked up a calla lily bulb from a bushel basket full of them, and began eating it.

"Billy," said the Congressman a moment later. "If the women could vote, we'd be elected dead sure. It looks now as though these flower seeds would save us; by golly, Billy, it was lucky you got up my share of Uncle Morton's seeds, wasn't it? And I say, Billy, did you send that package of cyclamen to the gas-house district this morning?"

"I did," said Billy. "They grow down there."

And did you send that lot of hamamelis to the slaughter-house district?"

"I did," said Billy. "But what is it?"

The Congressman asked about some other plants. Billy said he had supplied the water front, the mixed axle flat district, Hal's Kitchen, and the brown stone front district with flower seeds and bulbs enough to cover them with flowers, and still had two cans more. The Congressman went back to figuration and while he was at it of one of his constituents came in.

"It's you, Mr. Quigg, isn't it?" said the constituents.

And you know, Congressman, it's me that's been all at the river front talkin' for yer. It's not a house of crime, miss 'talking for you, and ye know that every word you've said has been a solemn protest against this train of events."

Mr. Quigg thanked him and went on figuring.

"Lemuel," said Mr. Leary after a while, "that was a great fair, wasn't it? That ought to make us vote.""

"Oh, William!" returned the Congressman. "If the women could only vote."

Mr. Leary's reference to the fair was the first the reporter had heard of Mr. Quigg's canvass among the women. It happened on last Thursday when a demure young woman walked into the headquarters and haply:

"Please, Mr. Quigg, won't you come over?"

Mr. Leary, who is very susceptible, nearly fell over himself in getting a chair for her.

"Way, my dear lad!" he said. "Come! Of course we'll all come when we come along!"

"No; bring your friends," said the young woman.

"Now, please come."

The young lady went away. William sent out a general alarm for the boys from the various Assembly districts. The Congressman hired a brass band and a life and drum corps. John Gunner sent $50 of his men: Sam magazine sent what he had; and Quigg himself gathered up a lot. At 8 o'clock there were 500 on hand. The drums beat, and the procession started for St. Monday's Church, where the fair was.

"Women!" said Mr. Leary yesterday. "Say, there were a couple of 'em, an' the boys just fell in an' jolted 'em. Pretty Well, you couldn't get a better lot of onlookers in the city. This is an auction: an' we bought out their fair. Did we make any votes? Well, I'll give it to you straight. Baby kissing isn't in it."

Just then Mr. T. St. John Gaffney, who was driving in his drag, stopped and came in. Mr. Gaffney wore a box coat.

"How are you, St. John?" said Mr. Leary.

"Sit in, if you please," said Mr. Gaffney. "I was just 'goin' by the drag, y'know, in my drag, old fella, and I thought I'd stop in, don't you know, stop in. I didn't know, old fella, but I could help you, you know, help you. I'm driving around all day, you know, all day, in my drag."

"Well," said Mr. Quigg, "I'm making a campaign along the river front where the people live who have what."

"Well," said Mr. Gaffney, "that's right, me boy. I was just 'goin' by the drag, y'know, in my drag, and thought I'd stop - I'd stop, you know." Then Mr. Gaffney blew out.

There are two pictures on the wall in Mr. Quigg's headquarters. And the other is a Lincoln. Under Mr. Lincoln's picture is the quotation:

"You can fool all the people some of the time, and some of the people all the time, but you can't fool all the people all the time."

And meanwhile the liberties of sensible men hung upon the question whether Lemuel Ely Quigg can, by these and other persuasive methods, corral one more fool than John Connolly, or Connolly, by similar methods, can corral one more fool than Quigg. That is, they are supposed to hang upon this, but really they do not. The worst feature of the matter is that, whether Connolly or Quigg secures the Holy Majority, the liberties of the people continue to hang."

ARRESTED FOR BEING TOO ACTIVE.

[New York Sun.]

A pretty, well-dressed man leaned against one of the marble columns in front of the Fifth Avenue Hotel at seven o'clock Wednesday night smoking a perfecto, when a stylish little English woman halted in front of him. She had been walking at a quick pace and, as she passed, calmly noticing a cigarette from a dainty silver case, she placed it between her teeth, and said: "I beg your pardon, but would you be so good as to give me a light?"

The bewhiskered smoker regarded the woman for a moment as though he could not believe his senses, but, as she continued to hold out her neatly gloved hand, he blurted out: "I - er - really - oh - ah - excuse me, miss, and tendered his cigar. The woman took it lightly, her cigarette, thanked him, and sauntered up Broadway, with the lighted cigar in her hand. The unusual spectacle presented by the woman caused such a crowd to follow her that at Twenty-fifth street it attracted the attention of Policeman David Wilbur.

When he left the hotel he took her to the West Thirty-third street station, where she said her name was Florence Lige, but refused to give her address. Wilbur's charge was "Selling goods on Broadway," but Sergeant Haspin changed it to "drunk and disorderly," as the woman appeared to him to be slightly intoxicated.

The next morning, at the Jefferson Market police court, the prisoner told Journalist Voorhis that she had smoked on the streets of London and had not been molested. She had been married and had a son fifteen years old. The judge ordered her for attracting a crowd, and said, if she did it again, she would be punished. Then he discharged her.

[According to this rule of law, if a section of the street should be in and a crowd should gather around the hole, the police would arrest the hole and the courts would punish it. It would seem to an Anarchist that, if a crowd is essentially an invasive thing, the persons composing it are the parties to be punished, and not those human freaks who, being so abnormal as to mind their own business, thereby become objects of curiosity to an habitually meddlesome world.]
prices and under unfavorable conditions, in order that a privileged few may get better prices or better wages than they could command in a free market. It was labor that spoke, and it is held that in the long run will be hurt by it. When will labor get enough of this boomerang business? One would think that the lesson of that labor measure, the Inter-State Commerce Act, as rend in the light of Federal interference in the Chicago troubles of last summer, would be sufficient to convince the dullest that the remedy for injustice is not in law, but in liberty.

DIRECT LEGISLATION.

Tammany Hall's Executive Committee has taken a positive stand on all questions to be presented to the people at the coming election. All Tammany Democrats will be asked to vote according to the decision of the committee. Besides voting the straight Tammany Hall ticket from top to bottom, the faithful braves will be instructed to vote against every one of the constitutional amendments and for the municipal construction of a rapid transit railroad system.

The reason for instructing that an adverse ballot be cast on all of the five propositions submitted by way of amendments to the constitution is that it would be difficult for the voters just which of these ballots is that which provides for the Republican partisan reappropriation of the State. It is that amendment to the constitution which Tammany is specially deems of defeating, and to be sure that all good Tammany voters deposit a negative ballot on that proposition they have been instructed to do so in the statement of the legislation. In this election their mass ballots will be handed to the individual voter, unless he has special preparation regarding the manner of using them, he will be likely to be confused.

[All Hall, Great Referendum, Saviour of Mankind!]

TO KEEP MINORS FROM THE PATHS OF VICE.

[New York Sun.]

BERLIN, Oct. 7.—The United Press correspondent has authority from the Chancellerie to say that the bill concerning political associations will have a chance for passage, according to official announcements. The Reichstag reject the bill in question, it will be dissolved.

[Well, really now, young William, you might do worse. Almost thou persuadest me to become an Archist. But what will Mrs. Dying Edward your Fatherland, — a country where infants of neither sex are permitted to learn to walk?]

AN EXPENSIVE QUEST.

[Peabody's Newspaper.]

In a report just published by the citizens' auditor of Manchester, it appears that the total expenditure incurred by the Corporation on the occasion of the late Majesty's recent visit of a few hours to the city for the purpose of opening the Ship Canal reached the enormous amount of $1,801. Among the items in the account are: Four fancy boxes of bonbons, confections, chocolates, etc., for the Royal children, $1 12s.; vegetables and fruit (including 80 lbs. for asparagus at 4s. 6d. per bunch, 22 pints of peas at 3s. 6d. per pint, 8 pints at 12s. 6d. each, 6 melons at 18s. 6d. each, 25 lb. grapes at 8s. 6d. per pound, and 24 lb. straw-berries at 18s. 6d. per pound), total, $28 14s. 6d.; 3 live turtles, $17 1s. 6d.; cigars and cigarettes, $14 10s.; 104 silver gilt and camel badges for the members of the Comité, $14.60; scaffolding and keeping of Queen's horses, $2 19s. 6d.; board and lodging for sixteen members of the Royal household staff, £71 15s. 6d. There are numerous other extraordinary items, but the above will be sufficient for any prudent man's money in a space.

[More exasperating than the obloquy of the Queen's charges for her presence is the fact that the canal could have been opened just as well without it.]
Concerning Competition.

To the Editor of Liberty:

Happening to pick up Liberty of August 28, and re-reading your article on the fourth page at the foot of the second column, the argument advanced struck me as the best of place for an Anarchist paper. In the first place, I do not advocate that the State shall sell its services below cost and make up the loss out of the nation, robbing Peter to pay Paul. In this respect your criticism is indeed quite warranted. But this is not what I now wish to allude to.

You say: "Since government can afford to carry on at a rate lower than one can crush any competitor, etc. since when have the Anarchists dropped over to that absurd Socialistic argument that underselling others is a bad thing? It is the basis of the argument for the suppression of competition, for allowing no one to undersell others, for eliminating the labor-saving machines, for compelling every one to limit his time of labor to eight hours, etc., etc.

Let us examine the effect of such a course as you speak of, applied to the issue of money.

Let us eliminate discussion on risk, simplifying the argument by assuming that risk is totally absent. Let us assume an interest rate of 10 per cent (no risk) to get the same figure. The rate of interest is, that for every 100 dollars given to the government, we extend the right of issuing money to all, provided they would pay a tax of one per cent, a year. Under these assumptions, it is shown that generically excess of money would be issued on that plan, since such an issue would increase the current rate and make the government charge greater than that of the money lender. Interest remaining at four per cent, the profit-bearing capital (means of production) would continue as before. Next: let us now assume that the government reduces taxes on business to nothing, charging merely a small fee from issuer to cover expenses, as per my proposition. Capital will then, through the effect of competition, become profit to its owner, not a profit to its owner, go one step further, and let the government give to the issuers one per cent, bonus (representing selling of services below cost). Capital invested in business will then, according the same law, become a source of loss, wages rising to slightly more than the value of labor's productions; that which now causes an excess of supply of commodities would then be reversed into an excess of demand with inadequate supply. Would that not be a very desirable lesson to the present school of sophists calling themselves economists? Not that it is very well that would cause an undercharge as much as I now condemn the overcharge of government services, but I merely wanted to call your attention to the bearing of your "crushing of competition" argument. I think we shall be more consistent for an Anarchist to steer clear of the most fallacious argument of the Socialist school.

Yours truly,
Hugo Bloch.

Doesn't See that Point.

To the Editor of Liberty:

I don't think I see the point of Mr. Robinson's figures in Liberty for September 25. He assumes the imaginary case that in a day 1,000 men dig each 400 pounds of coal, and one man digs 500 pounds from another mine, the latter being so much better that 500 men equals 1,400 feet, that is, the other, each capable of 500 pounds underground, or 1,400 feet. He goes on to say: "The value in commodities of one is eight times that of the other. Yet the producer of the coal, the mine's worth only a day's work's worth of wages, the same as the other." From which he infers that equality is beautifully established. I should say that the man at the small mine gets enough to assure him to dig a day, while the man at the large poor mine got only the equivalent of 1 pound of coal, in which he does not equality enough to assure him to dig a day. To make the argument I am supposed to print, 500 for 20 at the daily product of the small mine; but then it will not fairly meet the argument he is making.

I am here as a student in Oberlin Theological Seminary, having failed to get a place as teacher this year on account of the hard times. I am now trying to find out how much sociological heresy this seminary will stand. I have commenced the customary subscription to a student's weekly sunday by lending the room liberty and subscription papers. In my semi-annual part in the "preaching exercises" of the seminary, I was appointed to present a "topic for the times," in ten minutes this afternoon. I took Anarchist as my topic, and stuck to it. Straight Anarchist doctrine, duly labeled with its name and endorsed with my personal recommendation, as I know how to put in the hands of both students and professors, whether I put anything into their heads or not. One of the professors said, in the usual public criticism of the exercise, that my remarks were too much in the way of having shown there was too much novelty in them for him to grasp. If anything not able to turn up in this connection, I'll let you know. I: this writing I am still out of jail.

Stephen T. Hyman.

Mr. Robinson Explains.

To the Editor of Liberty:

It is no wonder that Mr. Hyland is puzzled by the incongruities in the figures in my article, "Will Liberty Abolish Equality?" By the grim of the logic of the argument, one is brought to a smooth devil, an act of faith which should procure indulgence for me at least at Oberlin, figure a are totally muddled. It should be said that 100 percenters expect an inferior coal, while one man extract 500 pounds of the best coal. The better coal, being harder to get, eight times richer. the same, yet one man's product of 4,000 pounds extracted by the other's of 500 pounds; that is, each gets day's wages. It is impossible for the better coal to be either extracted by a man, being harder, or less the steam coal at all. J. H. D. Robinson.

The Crusade Against Clothes That Fit.

[George E. Marcellus in The Truth Seeker.]

In the midst of free nature it is only the free — why should we not say it — the noble, beautiful human form that is suitable; all drapery is subject to fashion and change; and human form, as it comes from the hand of nature, is alone fitting to stand in the presence of astounding nature. — Berthold Auerbach.

The Martin woman, wife of superintendent of the Puritan in Literature and Art Department of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, which is the female member of Comstock's society, has broken up against all of her family something more than herself, and has appealed to Superintendent Hynre of the police to abolish the living pictures shown in the theatres, and also the theatrical posters portraying the art of the tights. Taking the ground that each bimbo justifies another, she argues: "If Secretary Carlisle can prevent the casting of a metal because of St. Ossian's representation on it of a man's nude form, why shall we not say that our form shall not be exposed?" Indeed, why not? Mrs. Martin's form is her own; she is at liberty to dip it, and the person who would have it otherwise is a扫描幸福的chaste outlines, no one can contemplate them, without her consent, save the one — cared man who has purchased from some other man a license to appear in public, the persons who exhibit the living pictures have bought a license to show them, and the men and women who spectate pay the price to be entertained. The freedom to look once does not carry with it the compulsion to look always, and never elsewhere, perhaps the cases are not parallel. It is astonishing, as Carlyle pointed out in his "Sartor Resartus," how much depends upon clothes; and not only upon clothes, but upon the fit of them. Perfect fitting garments, it appears, are intended, although it is not. Martin is ashamed, and before whose work she makes an indelible expression of her mind, has decreed that we shall be clothed in the manner in which the freedom to look does not carry with it the compulsion to look always, and never elsewhere, perhaps the cases are not parallel.

She is a descendant of the Sartor Resartus, "how much depends upon clothes; and not only upon clothes, but upon the fit of them. Perfect fitting garments, it appears, are intended, although it is not. Martin is ashamed, and before whose work she makes an indelible expression of her mind, has decreed that we shall be clothed in the manner in which the freedom to look always, and never elsewhere, perhaps the cases are not parallel.

The way, how does she expect to find him appalled when, as reward for licelling that which he has made, she is ushered into his presence? Do his clothes fit him?

Down with the Game Laws.

[Orange County Farmer.]

Increasing interest is being manifested in the discussion of the game laws, and it is a good sign that the demand for their entire repeal is growing stronger. Those who look into the question the deepest are convinced that the interest of the farmers demand the speedy speedy out of all laws protecting game.

Some, while agreeing with this proposition, still think that the game department is not yet entirely reformed until repealed, the argument being that, so long as the law is on the books, it is the part of good citizenship to aid in their rigid enforcement. This is an erroneous argument, but I think we are more consistent for an Anarchist to steer clear of the most fallacious argument of the Socialist school.
The State and the Country.

There are two classes of people in the country,—those belonging to the State, who serve it in return for wages taken from the whole body of citizens, and the rest, who dominate the State, consisting of rich men, poor, exploited and exploited, peasants, manufacturers, merchants, artists, living by their labor or by the resources of their predecessors, who are not subject to the expenses of the State and its personnel.

The bourgois régime, as established by the Convention of 1793, placed the government, waging war against the government, in the state of war against the French nation, in the state of vendetta against the French nation, as the Spanish castes in Greece lived amid the Laconians and the Helots, but with less courage, stateliness, and virtue.

In the governmental, administrative, bureaucratic, and, in a word, "State" society may exist, it must offer a thoroughgoing resistance to the other society, and must observe discipline and respect for hierarchy, whatever condition or situation its members may be placed from the humblest employee to the most honored position of a menege.

The existence of the State society must be to its members, small and great alike, the superior principle to which every other must be sacrificed. Before considering its forms and condition, punishing, it must consider what is useful to the State which lives and sustains itself, personally only by exploitation of the country. Inefelicile logic commands it.

If one wishes, in order to be a man and a citizen, to have a conscience and an opinion, he must not be an official or a magistrate, a paid employee of the State under any title, a representative of the press, a lawyer. And when the voters elect to their representatives of the State, as if the Danes of England had taken Norman for representatives, as if the Gauls had chosen Roman, or if the inhabitants of Loraine should elect German as their delegates. It is their wish to be subjectified and exploited. Let their will be done.

We may fee a keen sympathy with such employees, officials, or magistrates as perform acts of independence at the risk of disgrace and governmental revenge, but it must be admitted that the government which still holds by the logic of its 29.

There is the same impossibility between the professional duties of the servant of the State and the duties of the citizen and the freeman that there is between the existence of the State itself and the exercise of popular sovereignty.

Self-Defense as a Safeguard.

To the Editor of Liberty.

I was in Syracusa recently, and could not help being struck by the fact that the main line of the New York Central Railroad runs through one of the principal streets of the city without a single locomotive or car. I could see, except in one place where three or four streets come together, there seem to be few accidents, and I take it that this is due to the engine-driver, who is obliged under the circumstances to be careful not to kill anybody, and that, on the other hand, the people must appeal upon themselves to keep out of the way.

What seems to me the real reason is, I. CREIGHTON.

MERIDIAN, COX., OCTOBER 23, 1904.

Why There are Social Problems.

You cannot set up a provocation to look after the world. It is because you have set up government, as such, that you have social problems. They are all created by the way of getting clear of them. It is not to set up another or to get some further interference, but to sweep away the legislation that gives rise to the problem. It is because we have not free trade in land, capital, currency, labor, drudgery, etc., that we have this question. It is neither the landowner nor the capitalist nor the "State" which is responsible, but the bank and game laws, the banking and pawnbroker restrictions, the State currency and post office, and the state unions regulations. It is these that have done all the mischief, and are continuing to do it. Man is given himself to govern, and not his neighbor. It takes him all his time to look after his own morals; and, if he neglect them, we can only pity him, for he will catch it, and not mistake. What he has a right to is to raise anyone who interferes with him in managing himself and his belongings, and, having the right to do this, he has the right to make this person do it, to cut and regulate his neighbor. Where can you get the law for this kind of business? You know all methods of getting such a thing, but you have not succeeded, for it is not to be got. Your statesmen and leaders have had fine pickings out of the devil's acres, which was exposed and their salaries stopped. They are not one whit better than the landlord and the medicine man, a mixture of the fool and the knife and the impostor, getting fat upon the money of the people.

What is a set of knaves and scoundrels get into office and power? It is the last resort of a good-for-nothing fellow who gets into the house, if a man is any use or we, he does not want your vote. He is too busy looking after his own morals and his own affairs to bother with you and yours. It is that the governmental swindle was exposed, and the vile and rotten old fooled knocked on the head and checked out to be burnt. The impudent imposture wants a slap in the face. It is shocking to think in what manner of cabinet ministers, M. P., P'S. and labor leaders, look what titles and salaries and positions they get, and what status and value they have, and what titles and salaries they have when they live 1! I tell you it is all nonsense; that the only good way ever old was when they happened to undo some of the frauds which their predecessors had done, and that there is no good legislation except that of repeal.

Reciprocity.

"Away in the years that used to be tied with skill for (said the pensioner, and laughed—hehe!)

And now my country bleeds for me.

P.

Anarchist Letter-Writing Corps.

The Secretary wants every reader of Liberty to send in his name for enrollment. Those who do so thereby pledge themselves to write, when possible, a letter every fortnight on Anarchism or kindred subjects, to the Secretary of the Anarchist Letter-Writing Corps. All, whether members or not, are asked to lose no opportunity of sending in a contribution to the cause. Address, ST. THOMAS, BROWNING, 30 Council Hall, Oberlin, Ohio.

Target, section A. — The "Ciné-ahim," 12 Monelle building, 63 W. 7th street, Cincinnati, O., on October 4 published a letter from S. H. It was entitled in full, "Anarchists have refused the position as a non-resistant Anarchist, and gives an account of his being excused from jury duty on the ground of his statement of his views. The editorial comment, after what was quoted in Liberty's editorial, goes on: "Now if such a man, because he believes that the individual has inalienable rights, which no other individual can infringe, is entitled to a right to invade or take away, is unjust for jury service, then what becomes of our boasted rights of freedom? . . . But if this is not true, if law is reason and right and justice, then Mr. Randall is fit to act as a juror, and no ignorant sarampall will prove otherwise."

Section B. — The Rocky Mountain News, Denver, Col., on October 14 published an editorial entitled "Anarchy and Capitalism," taking the current view of what Anarchism is, and declaration that both Anarchism and Socialism are the farthest thing from being prosperity of the poor, caused by the adoption of the single gold standard.

Section C. — Rev. J. H. Albert, of Grace Church, Chicago, presided on October 7 at the American philosophical society two months ago. He expressed strong sympathy with laborers, and emphasized the distinction between Anarchism on one side and labor agitation and Socialism on the other. He says: "With all anarchists the Funds mental principles are the same, — no private property, no State, no family, no religion. Their methods and arguments are the same,—anarchists and Socialists. The methods and conclusions of the two are wild and chimerical, so subversive of all that mankind holds sacred, that they can never gain much of a foothold.

Let us turn now to what I have named "organized anarchism." . . . And the anarchists the funds, we have no fear. . . . When the Reading Railroad combined with the national trust, country and people to buy the Reading, through which the road proceeds, — combined for the sake of forcing coal up, and so causing untold suffering and death among the poor, — that was an absolute and open form of unmitigated, undeniable anarchism when these same millionaires buy their way into the legislative halls, to be lawmakers for the people. In the United States it is the law that, if a person is found guilty of murder, he shall be shot on the spot. But the terrors of the law are spread abroad, and a man is found guilty of murder by a jury, but it is not so with the law of the tongue. The law of the tongue is the same as the law of the land. The law of the tongue is the same as the law of the land. The law of the tongue is the same as the law of the land. The law of the tongue is the same as the law of the land. The law of the tongue is the same as the law of the land. The law of the tongue is the same as the law of the land. The law of the tongue is the same as the law of the land. The law of the tongue is the same as the law of the land. The law of the tongue is the same as the law of the land. The law of the tongue is the same as the law of the land. The law of the tongue is the same as the law of the land. The law of the tongue is the same as the law of the land.
The Parade.

(Hackney.)

Hear the fife and see the drumming! Watch the pretty soldiers coming! See the valiant military! March in valor's minstrelsy! Watch the ranks of paces, mapular, Horsecap parading of the guard, Buffalos, galls for battle painng, While their gallant boots are shining!

Braver than their glory's sons! Glean their trinkets on their bonnets. Like, like the boughs, brimming very, Are the gaudy military. Watch them, Fred with martial passion, Each in warman's latest fashion, Still and solemn, like a steemple, Marching past the humble people! See the lea of misty, Ye who down to labor settle, See the gawgs glancing gladly, On the dauntless sons of daring! Terrible as looking-glasses Shines their steel, to awe the masses; And hear the breath of battle Frank for a massacre romantic.

Martial hearts are powerously bound, Martial hells are powerously pounding, Ready n'v'ry orphan-maker, Of the head and body searing! Of how grand, to rage in battle! Grand, to slaughter other cattle! Grand, the jewelry of glory! And, a bloody name in history! How sublime the soldier dying, It's in the arms of glory lying! Bitter, n'v'ry poet's, Butcher, butchered, how pathetic! And how proud the munter goary, On the camping-ground of glory, Where, on legs that weary never, N'v'ry petals forever! N. H. Readwell.

A Hand Contemplative at a Nose Flippant.

To the Editor of Liberty:

If we really must give this name of Anarchists, let me suggest the Carlyle has made familiar, as signifying a passion for liberty, the word Electrotunum.

Let us call ourselves, then, Electrotunumists, which on the one hand, to calm the perturbation of any timid capitalists. As for a flag for those who want one (personally I don't want any), why not keep the red flag, if it must be, and adorn it with a band, the fingers outspread and the thumb applied to the nose, and with the motto, "Who's Afraid?"

ELECTROTUNUM.

The Force of Habit.

An unconscious-tidied, while occupied in the practices of his vocation, was accosted and interrogated by a physician who:

I find upon reference that your cardstock acts are commonplace, as in the case of the FREE BILL or by previous arrangement with the department which it is your honor to represent. Why do you thus abuse both your reputation for honesty and the privileges of the department? To which the unconscious-thief replies:

"A blunder on my part, I assure you. I was formerly employed as customs officer, and I totally disremembered the necessity for my personal appearance in out-Jail work. Here is my check, with apologies—and, by the way, will you help me open this safe?—Thank you, good night."

More power to your arm, John W. Gold.

Get Tammis's sculp, if you can; but I'll thank you then if you'll turn about and throw stones at that Parkhurst man.

A FRAMMENT EXPEDITED TO THE LIBERTY'S.

I am sending you a copy of the following works, address, BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1312, New York, N. Y.
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