On Picket Duty.

In the last number of Liberty I vigorously scolded those who do not belong to the Letter-Writing Corps; in this number I must scold as vigorously those who do belong to it, or at least those who belong to section A. As long ago as November 17 Mr. Byington assigned to the members of that section the duty of sending letters on voluntary taxation to Mr. Bolton Hall, who supplies sundry labor weeklies with two columns of sympathetic matter under the head of “Tax Reform Studies.” It happens that Mr. Hall is one of Liberty’s subscribers, and thereby found out that Mr. Byington had made him a target for Section A. I regret now to have to state that, if he had not found it out in a day or two, he never would have found it out at all; for after the lapse of some time he wrote to me, and very lately he has written to Mr. Byington, that now a single letter from any number of the corps has he received, although he stands in perfect readiness — and, I think I may say, eagerly — to give the benefit of his circulation of one hundred thousand copies to any meritorious letters that members of the corps may send him on the subject indicated. The question then arises: what has become of Section A? Of course, I am aware that there is a saving clause, “when possible,” in the pledge of the members to write once a fortnight; but it seems to me a very extraordinary thing that all the members of Section A should have simultaneously found it impossible to write upon a subject that lends itself to discussion as easily as voluntary taxation. Whatever the explanation, it is not too late to take advantage of the neglected opportunity, and I hope that this will speedily be “done.” But I am set to wondering whether this is a typical case — whether the other targets are never shot at. Possibly some of the members get discouraged because their letters seem to bear no fruit. They are wrong. No one can be sure that his letter in any given case has been without effect. And further, the theory of this method of propaganda is a scattering of the seed in all directions, with the knowledge that ninety-nine times in a hundred it will fall on stony ground. Then let no one be disheartened; let no one’s efforts flag.

Congressman Weadock of Michigan has introduced a bill providing that “any newspaper or other matter of the second class which advises, abets, or suggests the commission of any offence against any law of the United States, or any State or Territory, or any country with which we are at peace, shall be excluded from the mails.” The New York “Sun,” which has a weakness for advising the violation of laws which it happens to think unjust, unwise, or unconstitutional, opposes the Weadock bill on the ground that it would be an abridgment of the freedom of the press and hence unconstitutional. The “Sun” does not think the law excluding obscene matter from the mails an abridgment of the freedom of the press. It does not think that this freedom would be abridged by a law excluding from the mails newspapers suggesting the commission of offenses against the laws of the United States or of the States or Territories. But to exclude from the mails newspapers suggesting the commission of any offense against any law of any country with which we are at peace, — thus, in the “Sun’s” eyes, would clearly abridge the press’ freedom. Wonderful distinction! The freedom of the press, then, is simply the freedom to concern ourselves about those matters most remotely concerning us! I had always supposed that the freedom of the press was considered a safeguard chiefly because it promoted freedom of opinion and action concerning matters of vital interest to ourselves. If not, why have so many centuries of battle for it been thought worth while? Corroded in the narrow fashion of the “Sun,” the freedom of the press would not be worth a penny. The editor of the “Sun,” being a member of the brotherhood of thieves, wants freedom for his own press, and for the presses of his brother thieves, but would deny freedom to the presses of honest people. Now, this position cannot be logically defended, and the “Sun” knows it. Hence it takes no logical issue with Congressman Weadock. On the contrary, it favors the Weadock bill in principle, only insisting that the meshes shall be large enough to allow wriggling eels like itself to wriggle through. Here is a specimen of its squirming. It has had two articles on the subject. The two together include statements which it would not have dared to print in one article. The squirm would have been too obvious. In its first article it said: “The freedom of the press would not necessarily be abridged by a law excluding from the mails newspapers which advise, abet, or suggest the commission of serious offenses against the laws of the United States or of the States or Territories.” In its second article it said: “There may be times when duty will oblige an American newspaper to advise the commission of a technical offence against some law of the United States or of some State, — legislation, perhaps, hastily enacted, or wrongfully procured, or fundamentally unjust.” The squirm is effected by the substitution of the word technical for the word serious. Of course, serious offenses are those which other people commit or suggest; technical offenses are those which the “Sun” and its thieves pass as commit or suggest. The “Sun” dares not make a square issue in favor of freedom of the press, for thus it would oppose the existing laws whereby freedom of speech is often denied to the Anarchist. On the other hand, it wants no gag in its own mouth when such a law is passed as that which forbade newspapers to print sensational accounts of the execution of criminals. Consequently, instead of reasoning, it wriggles. For my own part, I hope that the Weadock bill will become law. If it does, an attempt will have to be made to enforce it against Liberty. No better fortune could come to this paper, for the attempt would inevitably fail. This law would be powerless to prevent me from printing Liberty on strong thin paper and mailing it in sealed envelopes to subscribers. I doubt if there is a subscriber on the list who would refuse to contribute the extra cost of postage, and the advertisement of the attempted exclusion would gain for the paper ten supporters for every one that it now has. This very number of Liberty would come under the proposed law, by reason of the closing sentences of my article to enforce its decision. Mr. Weadock, however, had not Liberty in mind. In answer to the “Sun,” he says that his reason for introducing the bill was the fact that a certain Anarchist sheet in New York city, shortly after the assassination of Carnot, advocated the use of the knife instead of the revolver in “removing undesirable persons.” I would suggest to the Hon. Thomas Adelis Emmet Weadock (what a deception of the name made historical by a great family of law-breakers!) that he amend his proposed law so that it will read as follows: “Any newspaper or other matter of the second class which advises, abets, or suggests the use of the knife instead of the revolver in removing undesirable persons shall be excluded from the mails.” This would leave the “Sun” and the rest of us free to use the revolver instead of the knife. Presumably this is no: the line of distinction that the “Sun” would draw, but it can be justified on general principles as well as the line indicated in the “Sun’s” articles; and the “Sun,” as is well known, is like Liberty in this, — that it is a great stickler for general principles and rigid construction. But the “Sun’s” strict construction is one big bluff.
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Inshall being read and inserted, the last vestiges of old-time despotism, the revolution abolishes at one stroke the sword of the concise—when the power of the government, the power of the executive, the power of the legislative, the power of the judiciary, the power of the departmental officials, all these instruments of power, which groups Liberty grinds beneath her heel—

Pamphlet.

"The appearance in the editorial column of articles under other signatures than the editor’s initial indicates that the editor approves their central purpose and general tenor, though he does not hold himself responsible for every phrase or word. But the appearance in other parts of the paper of articles by the same or other writers by no means indicates that he approves them in any respect, such disposition of them being governed largely by motives of convenience.

Single-Taxe Logic.

The Single Taxe starts with the proposition that “each individual has a just claim to the use of every part of the earth,” and, thus starting, he arrives at this conclusion: “When land has no value, that is, when only one man wants to use it, we would exact no tax, but, when it acquires a value, our principle that each has an equal right to the earth demands that its rental value should be paid into the public treasury.” These propositions are made, in so many words by Mr. A. H. Stephenson, than whom the Single Taxe has no abler advocate, not excepting Henry George himself.

And yet truth requires the assertion that a more absurd new rehearsal than this is it is not possible for the human mind to conceive.

It has the form of reasoning, but, instead of reasoning, it is flat and absolute contradiction. It is exactly paralleled in its essential by such an argument as the following: “This wash belongs to you; therefore it should be put into my pockets. This is plain, so far as logic and equity are concerned, from the Single-Taxe argument: “To the use of this corner lot you have a just claim; therefore the rental value of this lot should be put into the public treasury.”

If I have a just claim to the use of every piece of land on the globe, then of course I have a just claim to the use of any particular piece of land. If I have this latter claim, I, and I alone, have the right to sell this claim. Whoever sells my claim without my consent is a robber. Since every Single Taxer favors such sale of my claim, whether I consent or not, every Single Taxer is an advocate of robbery.

Again: since I have the sole right to sell my claim, I have the sole right to decide at what price it shall be offered in the market. Whoever sells it, even with my consent, is a robber, unless he exacts at great a price as that fixed by me. Since the Single Taxe proposes to sell it without even asking what I am willing to take for it, the Single Taxe is an advocate of robbery.

If my just claim to a particular piece of land is sold, the proceeds of the sale must go into my pocket. If, after putting them in my pocket, I then see fit to take them out again and turn them over to the public treasury in exchange for police or other services that I may desire, well and good. But this must be entirely optional with me. I may keep these proceeds, if I choose; I may spend them, if I choose; and, in the latter case, I may choose how I will spend them. Any one who attempts to substitute his proceeds in this matter is a robber. Any one who lays violent hands on the proceeds of this sale and deposits them in the public treasury without my consent is a robber.

Nearly every Single Taxe proposes to do precisely that, and therefore nearly every Single Taxe is an advocate of robbery. But even if we were to allow that it would not be robbery to deposit in the United States treasury without my consent the proceeds of the sale of my just claim to a particular piece of land (on the ground that I get an equivalent in the use of streets, etc.), it would still be robbery to deposit in the treasury of Great Britain or France or Russia or China or Peru. If I have a just claim to the use of every piece of land on the globe, then I have a just claim to the use of any particular piece of land in Peru. If this claim is sold, whoever lays hands on the proceeds and deposits them in the Peruvian treasury is a robber. But nearly every Single Taxe says that such a course as this ought to be followed, and hence nearly every Single Taxe is an advocate of robbery.

Bear in mind that I claim no right to any part of the earth. But right to every part of it is asserted for me by the Single Taxes. The objection that I am now urging is to their use of their own assertion: that a certain thing is mine as a foundation for stealing it from me. Their doctrine may be summed up in three words: Property justifies robbery. Proudhon’s paradox is eclipsed.

Why a Dilemma?

To the Editor of Liberty:

I fail to see that my answer (Liberty, December 1) places me in any dilemma whatsoever. You appear to ignore that I use the word “government” in its popular sense, and not in the accorded to the term by your definitions. If you have a right to contest my use of the word in any sense but that prescribed by you, the stand you take against me may be invulnerable. But I do not have you here this right. It is right to you that makes it right to your position to my endorsement of a government supervision of the issue of credit money springs from a misconception of that which I do advocate.

The broadest, and therefore perhaps the fairest, definition of “government”—the ruling social organization—fails to embrace the direction in which its power is exercised. The ruling power may be in the hands of a class, or in the hands of the body of the government. In the first case it is the embodiment of the institution of the order of the individual; or, it may, on the other hand, strictly confine its actions to the prevention of individual invasion, in which event the organization would merit universal endorsement.

In theory, the present government is a social organization for the protection of the equal freedom of the inhabitants of the territories which it controls. In practice it does not exist. On the one hand, it is invested with the performance of functions which are in accord with the law of equal freedom. On the other, it engages in that which either is a direct inhibition of freedom, or is designed to assist infringers. In the former capacity government is commendable; in the latter it richness deserves the condemnation of every honest man.

The question as to whether free competition and a social control of the issue of credit money are compatible depends on the expediency of a social control of credit money in a system of society founded on the law of equal freedom.

If money is wealth—which by mutual agreement is rendered universally acceptable in trade for the purpose of mediating exchanges—then money is obviously inseparable in the absence of such an agreement. When the money commodity is associated with the token, as it is in true coin, the requisite agreement may be of a tacit nature. But, when promises notes are used as money, this agreement must assume a more definite form. Those notes for which the notes are to circulate have a right to, and will, demand adequate assurance of the ultimate fulfillment of the promises before accepting these notes as money. And if the people are organized for the purpose of preventing individual infractions of equal freedom, they will naturally appoint this already existing organization to solicit their cause, by controlling the notes issued by the issuers. This function of the social organization is accordingly a legitimate one, and its assumption by the present government, however imperfect the same may be in other respects, is perfectly proper.

For this reason I fail to see why I must either declare against free competition or against a control of the issue of credit money by the people in their associated capacity.

I trust that the above will place my endorsement of a social control of the issue of credit money in its proper light.

HUGO BILGRAM.

When Mr. Bilgram says that I neglect to consider his use of the term government, he makes no answer to my criticism. To broaden the term only hurts his case. To help his case he must so narrow his definition of government that it shall include only what my definition of government excludes,—that is, voluntary and non-invasive association. For such an association could issue money without impairing the freedom of competition. But, when he uses the term broad, which takes in voluntary association at one extreme and imperialism at the other, he cannot then take the general and unqualified position that government may issue money, without at the same time denying freedom of competition. To save free competition, he must exclude from the banking business every form of government resting on compulsory taxation. But in none of his statements has he made any such exclusion; he has used the term government in its general,—yes, its popular and unrestricted sense, and it is this use that has placed him in his dilemma.

Up to this point all I have said is conditioned by the supposition that Mr. Bilgram desires the government to issue money.

But now, for the first time in the discussion, he tells me that he simply wishes the government to control and guard the securities against which banks issue money. Why hasn’t he told me this before? Here he makes a good answer, and relieves himself from the dilemma, provided this control and guardianship are to be such that they can in no way make the government either a gainer or a loser by the property or failure of the banks whose securities it guarantees. If the government guarantees these securities, but only furnishes proof that they exist, are pledged, have been deposited, and, in case of need, will be sold to redeem the issuer’s liabilities, and if it offers the favor of its guardianship to all issuers who wish to avail themselves of it, then, although I still oppose the policy on the same general grounds which cause my opposition to all governmental functions, I cannot
see that it in any way impairs freedom of competition.

I hope, then, that Mr. Bilgman will favor the readers of his book and of Liberty with a clear statement of precisely what he would have the government do in this matter. So far his writings, admirably lucid and profound in their treatment of the economic side of finance, have left the reader generally in doubt as to his political principles. Never has he been careful to free himself from all suspicion of authoritarianism. I hope he will take an early opportunity to do so.

Another Liberty Gone.

No court in this country has ever rendered a more iniquitous decision or one more far-reaching in its evil possibilities than that of Judge Woods of the United States Circuit Court in the Deb's case. Without the slightest compunction, it tamps under foot one of the plainest of human liberties, and, in trying to justify itself, shrugs off in part of its text brazon disregard of the inestimable worth of consistent honesty, while in other parts it has recourse to transparently false analogies between things totally unlike.

Here is the false principle which it lays down, stated in all its naked wickedness: "Any proposed restraint of trade, though it be in itself innocent, if it is to be accomplished by conspiracy, is unlawful."

This is a perfectly fitting counterpart of that ridiculous principle of democracy, — majority rule. The majority principle is that numbers can make that which is false true and that which is false true; but Judge Woods knows very well that most men will not watch the fallacy, but will suppose it just as proper to punish people who conspire to "refuse to move" cars belonging to others as to punish people who conspire to "secretly uncouple" cars belonging to others. But against this trick Anarchists will place the truth that to "refuse to move" is an innocent act, while to "secretly uncouple" is an invidinact, and that, though either employers or workmen may be rightfully punished for the latter, neither can be rightfully punished for the former.

After this jugglery, the court is ready to grasp the case in hand. The defendants are declared guilty because they ordered the workmen to strike — that is, to "refuse to move" Pullman sleepers — regardless of the court's injunction and knowing that violence would result. How they knew it, the court tells. "Last summer," says Judge Woods, "when there were very few men seeking employment, it was impossible that a strike that aimed at a general cessation of business upon the railroads of the country could result without violence, and the threat of fair or unfair acts on the part of the defendants and intended that this strike should differ from others only in magnitude of design and boldness of execution, and that the accustomed accessories of intimidation and violence so far as allowed essential to success, could not be omitted."

Of course the usual platitude about the right to strike is not omitted. It follows, but with the customary qualification regarding violence signalized broadened in its scope: "The right of men to strike peaceably, and the right to advise a peaceable strike, which the law does not preclude to be impossible, is not questioned. But, if men enter into a conspiracy to do any unlawful thing, and, in order to accomplish their purpose, advise workmen to go out on strike, knowing that violence and wrong will be the probable outcome, neither in law nor in morals can they escape responsibility."

If, after every strike and every violence which may be committed by the leaders are to be regarded as knowing that violence would be committed and are to be held responsible therefor, then that 'right to strike peaceably' upon which all the "devil's advocates," including those who sit upon the bench, who themselves granting in reduced, in the words of old Bill Allen of Ohio, to "a damned barren ideality." As Deb's very self, says, in commenting upon his sentence: "Until this decision is reversed there is no use attempting to have another strike. The decision is a fine invitation to the railroads to reduce wages, and I don't believe they will neglect to take advantage of it. If they should do so, God help the poor employer. He will have no recourse but to 'peaceably quit work' and peaceably starve. If he asks anybody else to join him, he will probably be confronted by an injunction and put into jail for a year or so. This will stop every strike."

The power of these United States judges is of the most autocratic character. They have the right to try a man, sentence him, and impose any sentence they see good and proper. This whole country is ruled by the railroads, and the United States judges only do the will of the railroad companies. Yes, it is true; one by one the authorities are stripping the laborers of all their peaceful and non-invasive weapons, determining to leave them only the ballot and the bomb, both of which are weapons of invasion and neither of which can help them in the slightest. What, then, are they to do? There is no hope for them save in learning the lesson of Liberty, ascertaining clearly what equal freedom means and what their clearest and most useful rights are under it, and persisting in the exercise of these rights in quiet but determined defiance of all so-called laws to the contrary, following one another to jail if necessary until the tyranny collapses of its own weight and from the pressure of the growing sense of its iniquity.

The spectacle of Deb's in jail will be an eye-opener to thousands.

The Balance of Trade.

To the Editor of Liberty:

For once the editor of Liberty is caught napping. In the December 1st "Picket Duty," you say: "The sudden abolition of custom houses, in advance of the abolition of money monopoly, would work harm by depriving the country of the use of that portion of the circulating medium that should be sent abroad to balance the excess of imports over exports."

The question is raised: where could the excess of imports over exports be sent? No, the question is: where could the excess of imports over exports be sent without a corresponding decrease in the purchasing power of the dollar? The abolition of custom houses would not tend to lower the value of the dollar, but would tend to raise it.
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But they also have a right to be heard by the government, as they do in all democracies. Just as the government cannot infringe on the rights of the people, it also cannot ignore their concerns. Therefore, the government should listen to the workers and take their demands seriously. This is the only way to ensure a fair and just society for all.
system possible simply because an interest-bearing currency exists.

We have a money circulation of about one-twentieth of the delinquents. In fact, it is barely enough to pay the annual interest.

The only objection against the abolition of interest

worth of notice comes from the old school of econo-

mists, who claim that it is not paid for the use of

money, but for the use of capital, and money was not


capital. In their view, capital consisted of tools, bu-

nies, and the different products used in the im-

mediate production of wealth. It needs but a simple

liberalization to expunge this fallacy. If this view were

the correct one, the owners of the different kinds

capital would get the interest. Is this the case? Not

at all. The holders of capital, no matter in what form,

one can use the tools whenever they want to borrow, and it is money they borrow, and it is interest they pay for its use and for nothing else.

For the repeal of the ten per cent. tax on State and private banks, and the protest for reform, whether from the government as a nominal rate of interest, are evidences of a growing intelligence of what is wanted. The first is a recognition of the political side of the question, the second is a recognition, by entirely different peoples, of the economic side.

The fusing of the two is the key to the situation. The demand should take this form: we want the restrictions on the money market removed, so that the debtor class, who are being made poorer by each successive withdrawal of the holders of monopoly money, will be able to pro-

vide themselves with a non-interest-bearing currency, based directly on this same kind of security. This would be the necessary step toward the solution of the later e-solution, for it would deprive the employer of his power to extort, forever.

A Non-Sportsman's View.

To the Editor of Liberty:

I cannot endorse the views advanced by Mr. Lloyd in his article in the Boston Transcript written in December 1

1, and in regard to some parts of the same it seems to me that these explanations are in order.

I think the writer over-estimates the "source of food" that would be destroyed by the general abolition of game; for, in reality, that is now about accomplished; and while I do not wish to cause or see any unnecessary suffering, even among dumb ani-

mals, I do not think that much extra suffering will be entailed one by each such extermina-

tion, even though it did save a few lives for those whose birth it renders impossible." I imagine

they will never know the difference.

In, so far as not hurtful with the sports-

man's love; for I have no desire to kill anything that is harmless or insensible; and I fail to see any necessary connection between the love of forests, rivers, and mountain scenery and the desire to kill something. As to the desirability of perpetuating the sportsman's instinct, I duly except. To me it appears but a milder type of the military spirit; which latter, surely, no peace-loving Anarchist could wish to see perpetuated. I say, "Proverbially, a natural savage," he says, which I think I understand; but I might add, with equal truth, that most unhealthy boys are unnatural savages. In the body of the letter, he proceeds to make a most admirable point.

"The only objection against the abolition of interest, in its name for employment. Those who do thereby pledge themselves to the entire welfare of every fortress, on Anarchism or kindred subjects, to the "target" assigned in Liberty for that fortnight.

"After all, whether members of the stock exchange, is no assurance of informing the secretary of suitable targets. Address, stephen T. byington, 350 people of the order of the dollar mark?

"Dear Sir: — Of course I don't wish to take away the time in which you earn your daily bread, if your employment requires you to work fixed hours. Nor would I take time away from you, while you are sleeping. If these things take up every minute of your time, and you cannot shorten your working hours without losing your job or starving, I excuse you. But most of us, even when we are not still find time for doing various things that we could keep life and in all. Without as long as this is possible, the phrase "of time" means simply that we prefer to keep our time in its present uses rather than give it to this business. The time in a fortress is really only a small per cent. of your time. Are you sure that you cannot find any use, which part of which your time is now being put, that you would be willing to have time off for something else? L. W. C.

"Perhaps you have time, but your work tires you so that you cannot afford to spend it in anything else.
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The Beauties of Government.

The remarks of Liberty are urgently invited to contribute to this department. It is open to any statement of facts which bear upon the phase of the subject of the field, capacity of food, soil, climate, and climate. Either original accounts based upon the writer's own knowledge, or apparently correct accounts clipped from recent publications, are welcome.

TRAVEL BREEDS TRAVEL.

[New York World.]

The barn of Mrs. Baylis, in Yonkers, was burned about 10 o'clock in the evening, Thursday, December 6. Mrs. Baylis and family, who were in bed, had seen some boys around the barn, and that one of them had told her the barn was on fire, and that she desired that they be arrested.

As a result of this statement three young boys—William Bay, seventeen years old, of No. 35 Neperhan avenue; Thomas Marsh, seventeen years old, of No. 13 Lake avenue; and Robert Dalfen, fifteen years old, of Neperhan avenue—were arrested at midnight and taken to the police station. On the following morning they were arraigned before F. X. Donoghue, city judge of Yonkers, where a complaint was entered against them by Policeman Gage, on the charge of disorderly persons, in that they were found wandering around Vineyard avenue, a public street in Yonkers, and not able to give a good account of themselves.

The boys were examined separately, and remanded until the following morning without bail. The same afternoon L. J. Beaulauria, as attorney for Marsh and Ray, appeared before Judge Donoghue and asked that bail be fixed in the usual sum of $200, which the judge refused, on the ground that the boys had presented himself, with Mrs. Marsh and Robert Ray, the parents of the prisoners, and freedholders in Yonkers, and offered them as bail for the two prisoners on the ground that disorderly conduct was only a misdemeanor, and bail was a matter of right.

The judge again refused, and the counsel applied to Judge Gage for a writ of habeas corpus.

On the 10th day of December the judge ordered that a new complaint had been made against the boys on Saturday morning, charging them with arson in the second degree. This complaint was made by Policeman Wood on information and belief. Judge Gage, after hearing the evidence, set the petitioners free and rendered the following opinion:

"The petitioners, boys living at home at Yonkers, were first arrested as so-called disorderly persons. The warrant was issued by the magistrate of the affidavit of a police officer that they were found wandering about Vineyard avenue and not giving a good account of themselves. Who called upon them to give an account of themselves does not appear, but presumably the policeman; but the magistrate leaves whoever it was as the judge at whether they could give a good account of themselves. It would be difficult to conceive of anything more outrageous. It leaves every police officer to his discretion, and he is to be judged as to his manners and his reasons for walking upon a public highway by the first policeman he meets.

"Never has anything like this been tolerated by the Anglo-Saxon race. Human liberty never was so cheap. A policeman has no more right to arrest persons without cause than has any other citizen. A club and a truncheon are not his authority, and, yet, unfortunately, they seem often to make him feel that every person he meets is his prisoner if he chooses to so do.

"The charge of vagrancy was trumped up. After this writ to produce the prisoner here was served, however, Policeman Wood made a further charge in writing, but wholly on information and belief, that the petitioners had set fire to a barn. The information which he says he has given concerns one of them, Ray, and contains not a scintilla of evidence against him. The law is that no one may be arrested and deprived of his liberty on mere information and belief, and everyone concerned in such an arrest, from the magistrate down, is liable to action for damages for a trespass.

"This is a police case, the like of which have grown to be altogether too common. Too many people have not made the police their masters or their oppressors. They do not hire and pay them for any such purpose. A policeman has the same right to arrest a citizen as a police officer as to arrest him; no more, no less. The conduct of the officers in hanging ball for the petty charge of so-called disorderly persons should be called to the attention of the tribunal having the power to remove him. If such outrages are allowed to pass publicly, it will not at all be long before the citizens come to pass, that no citizen is safe at the hands of the police. The burning of the barn is bad, but what the magistrate did in this case is far worse and far more dangerous to individuals rights and personal liberty. If anyone knows any fact tending to show that these boys have committed any crime, let him state it under oath. Until that time no policeman, no magistrate, even the highest authority in the land, may deprive them of their liberty. The petitioners are discharged."

[With invasive legislators and invasive laws it is illogical to expect non-invasive policemen and judges. But sometimes an accident agreeably disappoints us, and we find a man like Judge Gagey on the bench. The result is that in most of the cases that are brought before him sense of justice compels him to reverse the usual policy of placing the government or its agents in the dock and making the prisoner the prosecutor.]

YOUNG WILLIAM TO HIT ON THE SAFETY-VALE.

[New York Sun.]

BERLIN, Dec. 8.—The Reichstag Commission, which arranges the order of business, has fixed the first reading of the Anti-Socialist bill for Dec. 17. An analysis of the text of the bill has been made and allowed to become public property. It surpasses what any party of the Social Democratic party feared. It discloses a proposal to grant the government such sweeping powers as would menace every party and individual whose political opinions differ from those of the established authorities. The bill apparently is coercion in its widest scope. For instance, paragraph 130 provides a fine of 600 marks and imprisonment for two years for anybody convicted of inciting to violence; people assembled in public, or of publicly attacking religion, the nation, the government, the family, or the institution of private property, to the danger of the public peace. Another draft article proposes the same penalties for the case of anybody spreading distorted or false statements, bringing State institutions into contempt, or ridiculing government authorities. Still another offensive paragraph makes punishable not only the commission of crime, but also the intention to commit it. "Intentionality may not as yet have become manifest in acts involving the beginning of a criminal act."

The judge alone is left to decide whether the criminal intent exists. The Radical and Social Democratic dailies agree that the bill will prove virtually useless, as it attacks and antagonizes all parties with but trivial distinctions. The dyed-in-the-wood Conservative press, however, contends that the proposed penalties are not severe enough if they are aimed at Social Democrats and Anarchists only. The Conservative editors suggest that it will require a stricter definition of the terms "enemies" than is given in the bill.

Art. 3, 5, 6, 8, and 9, concerning the confiscation of property, they say, is directed against imported Social Democratic pamphlets. The "Forwitt," organ of the Social Democratic Central Committee, recalls the fact, in the last period of the Bismarckian republican law, it was found impossible to arrest the wide circulation of Social Democratic fly-leafs imported from England and Switzerland. It adds: "If this bill became a law, the prosecution instituted under it will not be limited to the Social Democratic. The journalists of other parties—Agrarians, anti-Semitic, and Clerical—and agitators of every tendency who offend the cabinet ministers will be brought under the weight of the repressive measures. Does the government for a moment suppose that the proposed persecutions will check the progress of the Social Democracy or crush it?"

BERLIN, Dec. 10.—Chancellor von Holstein has informed Herr von Lertwitz, president of the Reichstag, that the Socialists members of that body who remained seated and refused to take part in the elections for the emperor called for by President von Levetzow at last Monday's sitting must also be threatened with charges of disloyalty. The public prosecutor has requested President von Levetzow to give his sanction to the criminal prosecution of the deputies.

[This beats Jesus. He required the assaulted only to turn the other cheek. The German emperor requires him to cheer his assassin.]

A NEW METHOD OF BLACKMAIL.

[Ohio State Journal.]

Startling discoveries have been made at Cincinnati in putting to the test the limits of the department State food and dairy commissioner. The case of Assistant Inspector Luebbing of that city has evoked strong criticism among the dealers who have been made the objects of persecution. Complaint is made of Mr. Luebbing by Henry Meyer, a man at Eighth street and Freeman avenue, Cincinnati. Meyer sells milk which he buys from a Mr. Airy dairy. One day recently his supply of milk became exhausted, as he purchased two gallons of the passing milkman. Shortly afterward a man entered the store and asked for some milk. Meyer suspected he might be from the food commissioner's office, and hesitated about giving him a sample, but he insisted, and finally walked around the counter and got a sample which he took with him.

Two days later Meyer received a postal card, asking him to call at Mr. Luebbing's office. He did so, and Luebbing told him that his milk was not up to the legal standard. Meyer asked what the difficulty was, and was told that it did not contain the required amount of butter fat. When asked how much it was short on analysis, Luebbing gave him no satisfaction, and would not or could not show him a copy of the analysis which he said that Chemist Fennel made.

Mr. Luebbing then told Meyer that, as he had violated the law, he was liable to arrest, but, under the circumstances, as the milk was not from his regular man and was so little below the requirements, he could settle the case out of court by paying $5 for the analysis and $10 to Attorney Dye for legal services. He said that these were the smallest amounts that State allowed when a case was prosecuted in the courts. Meyer says that Luebbing told him that he could collect the $15 from the milkman who sold him the milk, or have him arrested. After some talk Meyer paid the $15 and got a receipt from Mr. Luebbing for $5 and one from Mr. Dye for $10.

Meyer in turn tried to collect the $15 from the milkman, but he refused to pay.

The story of Meyer's story, and acknowledged that other cases have been settled in a similar manner. He says that, where the milk is so near the standard that he might lose the case if he took it to the courts, he has sometimes allowed the party to settle by paying $5 for the analysis and $10 for Mr. Dye's fees for making out an affidavit.

[The professed purpose of the pure milk statute is to secure to each consumer his due proportion of butter fat, but it actually operates to give skimmed milk to the consumers and cream to the State inspectors.]

THE AUSTRALIAN BALLOT BEGINS WELL.

[Savannah, Dec. 10.—Two factional Democratic candidates are in the field for the mayoralty. The election took place in the first use of the Australian ballot system here. No one can vote who has not paid all his taxes, including those of this year. There must also be a registration. This has led to a scramble at first, and then, to pitched battles daily between men for choice places in the line of the tax collector's office. He can only issue about two hundred receipts a day. The registration closed.
yesterday, and it was inevitable that many citizens would be shut out. Each faction hired gangs of toughs, numbering about one hundred, and including the most desperate whites and negroes of the city. These toughs collected from ten dollars a day. At each given was a list of six names, the largest number the collector would accept for taxes from one person. Each morning for ten days the two gangs have shivered each other in front of and inside the Court House, hundreds of citizens gathering from all parts of the city, 'ally to witness the trials.

For two weeks no citizen paid taxes for himself, all instructed their negroes to the hired hecklers. At times nearly the entire police force of the city had to be called out to restore order, and for a week the presence of about forty policemen has been required at the tax collection.

The hearings were held at the rival headquarters, where many of them remained all night, going out early each morning to resume the battle. At the Court House beer, whiskey, coffee, and sandwiches were given them. Two or three times a day some of the workers skipped with their ists and money, disgracing many citizens.

It is thought that the cost of keeping up the two gangs, which in the last few days had been increased to about three hundred, to fight for poll-tax receipts, was $10,000. They were disbanded early this morning.

[When those political infants, the women, get the franchise in Georgia, they will be forced to learn, not only to walk, but to slug.]

Lock up for asking questions. [New York Sun.]

Lemuel Schultz, 32 years of age, of 511 South Seventeenth street, on his arrest in town early yesterday had an unpleasant experience. Schultz, who says he is an employee in a large clothing house in Philadelphia, uses crutches, having lost his right leg to the knee when a boy. He has for many years desired to visit New York, but, because of being crippled, hesitated to trust himself in the whirl and bustle of the New York streets. A friend suggested that he come here and spend Sunday only. Subsequently, he thought of going to Central park and back to Madison square he was hungry as well as tired; so he began looking around for a restaurant. Turning into Broadway, he began walking up that street, passing Delmonico's without knowing what it was.

On reaching Twenty-eighth street he saw such a kindly-looking old man that he ventured to accost him.

"I am a stranger in the city, sir," he said. "Can you kindly tell me where I can find a res—"

The old man gave one look at Schultz as he stood leaning on his crutches and gazing appealingly at him, and, thinking him one of the numerous professional beggars about town, without troubling, that he had no money for beggars.

"Darned uncivil beast, I should say," said Schultz to himself as he proceeded up the street. Presently, seeing a well-dressed man coming toward him, he stopped in front and said:

"Stop a moment, sir; I wish to ask you a question."

"I have no time to listen to tales of woe," answered the man curtly, hurrying on.

"Well, all of the uncivil people I ever met these are the worst," said Schultz, adding this time. He hailed two more passers-by, only to have them turn aside in disgust.

"Am I ever to find a restaurant?" asked Schultz of himself. "I am sure Philadelphia people would not act like this."

Seeing a policeman, his hopes of getting something to eat revived, and, approaching him, he asked:

"Can you help me to find a rest—"

"Certainly," answered Policeman Cosgrove of the West Thirty-sixth street station. "I have seen you begging from four men, and I will take you right over to the station, where you will find a good rest."

Schultz went. He was not looking for rest, but a restaurant; but he was looked up just the same, and later was arrested before Justice Hogan in the Jefferson Market Police Court and charged with begging.

As he was well clad, the justice asked him for an explanation.

With tears in his eyes Schultz pulled a roll of bills from his pocket, and said that if that looked like a beggar's possessions.

"I should say so," answered the justice. "Many of them have wealth."

"Well, I am a very much misunderstood man," said Schultz, telling his story of how he had been arrested as a result of all this. The New Yorkers are certainly the most uncivil people I ever encountered, and to arrest a man when he is trying to ask for a restaurant is simply outrageous. Nobody else has answered my question, I am going to ask you now to direct me to a good restaurant."

He then explained the object of his visit to the city, and talked so honestly that Justice Hogan discharged him, telling him to come before themandate neighborhood. Schultz said, before leaving court, that he was going to take the first train to Philadelphia, as he had had enough of New York.

[Every law, whether directed against invasion or not, increases the liability of error, and therefore the danger hanging over the heads of the law-abiding. Where there are ten laws instead of one, every individual is ten times as likely to be falsely suspected. If there had been no law against begging, Mr. Schultz could not have been arrested for begging. The impertinence of the innocent furnishes an additional argument against the needless multiplication of offenses.]

A rule that cripples the ruler. [New York Sun.]

WASHINGTON, Dec. 8.—An order issued several days ago by the Post-office Department placing restrictions on periodicals sent through the mails as second-class matter has been suspended until after the holiday season, so that certain legitimate publications which are usually increased in size during Christmas time may be allowed to go through as second-class rates.

[The result of this change will be that illegitimate publications, instead of spreading their distribution over the whole year as was their habit before, the restriction was put in force, will concentrate as much of it as possible into the period when the restriction is suspended, that is, the Christmas season, and will thus put a crushing burden upon the postal service at the very time when the ordinary rush of holiday business is already taxing it beyond its capacity. Bastard periodicals like Harper & Brothers' "Franklin Square Library" and "Printers' Ink" must be smothered, to the end that legitimate periodicals like the "Police News" and the "Daily Sewer" may be carried free, even if the people do not get their Christmas presents before the Fourth of July.]

The extreme left. [New York Sun.]

Lots of people think that John Donovan is going to have heaps of fun this winter. He's the only Demo elected to the Michigan legislature. It's mighty serious business, being the whole minority in Michigan. In the first place, there are the committees, thirty-five or forty of them. The law of Michigan commands that the minority shall be represented on every one of them. Is that fun for Donovan, or misery and trouble? I'll be fun pocketing all the jack-knives and paper cutters that come his way, for each committee. He'll have nearly enough to start a shop. But how will it make him miserable, even in cold weather, hopping around from room to room, watching the Republican majorities in the committee rooms and salivating mentally to foreclose of the op-sition when their schemes of chicanery and crookery are proposed.

[When one considers that Michigan legislators, like all other Solons, fancy themselves incredibly important, it is by no means surprising that they do not think it excessive to require one of their number to be omnipresent.]

A sure thing. [London Times.]

Our correspondent at Oporto writes: "In view of the spreading crisis in Portugal it is well for persons in England sending parcels to Portugal by post to know that unless the words pour être soumis à la demande [to be submitted to the custom-house] be written on the outside, the receiver will be called upon to pay a heavy fine in addition to the ordinary duty. Abolishment of the article is not allowed, and, in case of refusal to pay the fine, this is enforced by legal proceedings. No plea of ignorance or of any other circling has ever been allowed by the authorities."

[If any reader of Liberty has an enemy in Portugal, now is his chance. He has only to send him an endless series of parcels by mail without writing the prescribed words on the outside, and his enemy will be forced to receive one and pay a heavy fine on it, or go to prison. Again: the next nation that goes to war with Portugal will be saved the expense of mobilizing troops and fitting out fleets. It need only obtain the directories of the Portuguese towns and bombard all the inhabitants through the railroads. For a time, to be sure, there would be a great flow of money into Portugal's treasury, but eventually all the inhabitants that had not been killed in the divided between the jails and the poor-houses. It is evident that, when it comes to running a postal service, Portugal can give John Wanamaker cards and spades.]

Quilty of being a brother. [New York Sun.]

Various stories were current about the whereabouts of Samuel C. Seely, the bookkeeper of the Shoe and Leather National Bank who ran away after robbing the bank of $354, and eluding capture.

William Seely, a brother of the defaulter, was arrested on suspicion, to see what he knew of the bookkeeper's methods and whereabouts, but he was promptly discharged. "He is a very decent man," said President O'Connor, and knows nothing about his brother's whereabouts. He is as lost to the ab-}

"Government, in making such arrests as this, puts a premium upon isolation from relatives. And yet, according to the upholders of government, it is the Anarchists who are breaking up the family."

Municipal power of exile. [New York Sun.]

CLEVELAND, Dec. 8.—The escape of the murderer of W. H. Price in this city on Tuesday night has brought the authorities to the decision that the entire operation of the police force must be revolutionized. Every corporal, that is, the embryo of a corporal who serves an election area, is to be discharged as a result of which the county board of supervisors has been warned by a letter to a number of the police departments yesterday afternoon.

[Under what law can a municipality ex-]
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