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"For once in thine eye, O Liberty!" "Shine, oh, high light, whereby the world is saved!" And through this day we will trust in thee.

JOHN HAY.

On Picket Duty.

The Rev. W. D. P. Bliss, in his new role of a smart Abeck, is an "amosin little cuus."

Mr. Saltz promises me his response to Mr. Yoros's review of his book for Liberty of May 2.

"A New Orleans grand jury explored the widespread belief that to be an office-holder is to be a thief and rascal, and concludes that "men of unimpeachable integrity decline to run for office because they fear the stigma of "politician' would attach to them and injure their reputation and business. But what is there to be done about it? The community has not invented the prevalent conception of politicians and office-holders; it has simply recognized facts, and given them due publicity. Does the grand jury wish to hide the truth, to blink at the facts, for the sake of inducing a few good men to serve? This is not the way to reform politics, and, as long as politics has not been reformed, good men will prefer to hold aloof from public affairs.

Fortune has been dealing unkindly with my friend Lloyd. A fire broke out lately in the premises of his publishers, Peter Paul & Co., of Buffalo, and it is probable that the entire edition of his "Wind-Harp Songs" was burned. This is not as severe a loss as that which John Henry Mackay suffered through the stealing of his manuscripts during his visit to Chicago, for money can replace the burned books, but not the stolen manuscripts. Still it must be very disheartening to Mr. Lloyd, coming so soon after his long effort to bring out his little book had been crowned with success. It is to be hoped that the disaster may be repaired. There are poems in "Wind-Harp Songs," which should not be suffered to be forgotten.

Defending "Americanism" and patriotism, Theodore Roosevelt, the man whose Chicago admires so intensely for doing in New York what she would never allow her authorities to attempt, made this peculiar comparison: "Some reformers may urge that in the ages distant patriotism, like the habit of monogamous marriage, will become a needless and obsolete virtue; but just at present the man who loves other countries as much as he does his own is quite as noisy a member of society as the man who loves other women as much as he loves his wife." If this means anything, it means that Roosevelt believes in variety as the ideal condition of sexual life. It is only "at present" that love of other countries and other men's wives is vicious; in the ages distant both patriotism and monogamic relations will disappear. What do the moralists and religiousists who applaud Roosevelt's anti-Sunday saloon crusade think about this revelation? Can they trust a man who hints that he believes in variety for "ages distant"? The man who entertains such beliefs is more dangerous than a liquor-dealer who violates Sunday laws. Of course hundreds of moralists and religiousists practice to-day what Roosevelt believes will be proper only in ages distant, but they take care to say nothing about it. Their theories are as austerely and moral as possible. They will never weakly admit that strict monogamy will ever be superseded. Oh, no, monogamy is ideal and eternal.

The New York "Evening Post" believes that the only way to save the United States from political and economic disasters is to encourage "public discussion" of the great issues by the leading thinkers of the nation. Legislators, it says, are ignorant, demagogic, and irresponsible, and, if they are suffered to continue to poison the public mind, American civilization will be doomed. Whom has the "Evening Post" in mind when it refers to leading thinkers? Those who have convictions and are not afraid to avow them have not shown any disposition lately to hide their light under a bushel. Books and magazine articles continue to be published, and there has been no lull in the discussion of any social question. The trouble is that the politicians never read or learn anything, and that the same thing is almost as true of the voters. Politicians are doubtless cowardly, but they are also very ignorant, and, even if they never stopped talking, precious little good would result. The competent and educated are not in politics, and could never gain the ear of the crowd. McKinley, Reed, and Quay, to be sure, do not indulge in "public discussion" just now; but could their deliverances on any subject save the nation? The "Post's" suggestion is absurdly inept. The nation will not be saved by discussion, but by liberty, and, since it will not adapt it intelligently, it will have to blunder into it.

A Kansas City judge, in granting a divorce to "an injured husband," delivered himself of the following extraordinary sentences: "The only fault I can find with you is that you have been too much inclined to leniency. If you had taken a shotgun and vindicated the honor of your home, you would stand better before this court and this community." The judge who told the husband that as a murderer he would stand better before him and the community is a venerable jurist and an ex-judge of the Missouri supreme court. Under the law of Missouri adultery is not punishable by death, but the man elected and paid to administer the law lectures citizens for abiding by it, and incites them to murder! What respect must we have for law and order? Some of the stupid newspapers, I see, call him a "judicial anarchist." He is, of course, nothing of the sort. No Anarchist believes in legal marriage, and no home can be "dishonored" by sexual relations freely entered into by any man or woman. The judge is simply a barbarian, a fanatical Archist. He is also a hypocrite and a humbug. He is less civilized even than the law of his community—and that is not in a very high or advanced state.

Great was my surprise and delight to receive the other day from John Henry Mackay a volume of short stories from his pen, issuing from a prominent Berlin publishing house and printed from type set with a "justification," after the typographical style employed by Liberty for the last two years. At the end of the volume is an acknowledgment of the pioneer step taken by Liberty in this matter. The page presents an admirable appearance. Among my acquaintances is a gentleman who has spent a long life in the publishing business, and who imagines that the new typography is a grave offence to his eye. I laid Comrade Mackay's book before him with the remark: "The world moves, you see." He looked at the book for some moments, and then demanded an explanation of my remark. His eye had not discovered that the book was set in the new manner. This goes far to establish the truth of my contention that the aesthetic objections urged against the abolition of "justification" are purely fanciful, and prompted by a prejudice deep-rooted in habit. For their courage in practically assailing this prejudice Comrade Mackay and his publisher, S. Fischer, are to be warmly congratulated. With the exception of a small pamphlet issued in Cincinnati by the inventor of a new type-setting machine (one which does not "justify") as an illustration of its work, this, so far as I know, is the first specimen of book-work, in any language, in the new typographical style. Its title is "Der Kleine Finger und Anderes in Prosar," and it is the first of a series of volumes projected by its author under the general title of "Zwischen den Zielen." I shall be much obliged to Comrade Mackay, if he will send me any comments that the German press may make upon this innovation.
The appearance in the editorial column of article-length signatures like the editor's initial indi-
ated that the editor approves their central and
salient tenor, though he does not hold himself respon-
sible for every phrase or word. But the appearance in
other parts of the paper of articles by the same or other
writers made me apprehensive that he disapproves
them in any respect, such disposition of them being
governed largely by motives of convenience.

"Voluntary State Socialism" Once More.

It is a great pity that our happy friend, Mr. Bliss,
cannot devote a little more time to the
discussion of the interesting points brought out
ing this controversy. If he had reflected more
before making his decision, he must have per-
ceived the unwise and inconsistent nature of his
choice. Here we have been, as he says, too,
too good to him; we have made admissions
which have caused him to jump; we have filled
him with delight by recognizing that his
scheme is meant to be perfectly voluntary; and
we have treated subjects which "involve a
whole theory of philosophy." Is it right for
him to abandon the controversy at this point?
Since he has found us so fair, reasonable, and
genorous, why does he despair of converting
us to his views? What a historic victory it
would be for his "voluntary Socialism" if he
should succeed in annexing us and causing the disap-
nearance of philosophical Anarchism as a
distinct movement! His excuse that it is more
important for him to fight our "practical
allies," the trusts, is flimsy and inconsistent
with his own optimistic philosophy. "Vol-
untary Socialism," which can be firmly built
upon the foundations of usury, as he tells us,
renders all assaults upon trusts foolish and
Quixotico. Why fight them, when they can
be entirely ignored and indirectly under-
minded by the new method, overlooked by all
orthodox State Socialists and discovered by Mr.
Bliss? The duty of Mr. Bliss and his disciples
(if he has any, which I doubt) is perfectly
clear. It is, simply, to introduce gradually his
"voluntary socialism" in the way outlined by
him, with or without regard to the vain and in-
significant efforts of the blind reformers who
still imagine that the abolition of monopoly
or usury is an essential condition of the
solution of the social problem. I am afraid
Mr. Bliss does not yet realize the wonderful
scope and effect of his marvellous discovery.

Having said so much by way of general in-
troduction, let me now proceed to deal with
Mr. Bliss's points erva titm. In
the first place, he is entirely mistaken

with regard to the effects produced by his little
letter in our camp. Mr. Bliss happened to
make certain claims in relation to "municipal-
ization," and this subject, collateral to the
main issue of the merits of "voluntary Social-
ism," is a very interesting one. To discuss it is not to discuss Mr. Bliss at all,
as he himself recognizes. State Socialists,
municipal Socialists, Socialists-of-the-Chair, and
many schools of unclassified reformers are now
persistently urging municipalization and point-
ing to the work done in Great Britain as prac-
tical and conclusive proof of its practicability
and advantageousness. If "voluntary Social-
ism" were submerged to-morrow, the munici-
palization movement would still remain as a
conspicuous phenomenon requiring study.
Liberty suspects that the facts, if intelligently
presented, would fail to sustain the claims of
the municipalizationists, and it has asked its
friends to collect data, not for the purpose of
refuting Mr. Bliss, but for the more important
and general purpose of verifying the state-
ments of such writers as Dr. Shaw, Professors
Ely, Small, and Bemin, and Fabians Web and
Shaw. Mr. Bliss's extravagant and (as I have
shown) baseless assertions with reference to
taxation in the "reform" municipalities merely
suggested the advisability of an inquiry into the
facts of municipalization. Furthermore, one of
my articles dealt with the simple ques-
tion of fact whether taxation has had to be
raised and enormous debt burdens incurred by
the British municipalities to which he had re-
ferred us, and that article, which Mr. Bliss
(wisely enough) prefers to pass over, dis-
credited him both as reporter and generalizer.

It takes very little to make Mr. Bliss happy.
He is happy to see Liberty interested in muni-
cipalization. bTrs : be proved a careless and untrust-
worthy writer on questions of fact, and
have to bear his having to be obliged to
him to pass over his absurd and ridiculous. I en-
vy Mr. Bliss as I am ashamed of myself, for, if
measured by his standard, I should be voted a
most unreason-
able man.

Mr. Bliss professes to think that I give my
position away by admitting that he rejects
every element of compulsion. Would he, then,
have me decline to believe him on oath? I am
bound to accept his solemn averments. He
emphatically tells us that, when he says vol-
untaryism, he means it, and that he intends
to reject compulsion of every kind and form.
He tells us that he will have no compulsory
taxation, no monopoly, no interference
with private enterprise. The State is to
borrow money in the open market, go into
business in competition with private agencies,
pay its expenses, interest, and instalments
of the principal out of earnings, and in every
way conduct itself like a private concern.

Now, I know that Mr. Bliss is a sincere and
well-intentioned reformer, and I am sure he
means to fulfil his promises. I add, however,
that his plan is no more "Socialism through
the State," and that I regard it as impracticable
as the point of absurdity and childlessness.
Yet he is happy, and asks the editor to print
the words embodying my "admission" in big
letters!

Now let us see how Mr. Bliss meets my point
that his plan would not be "Socialism through
the State." Passing by snores and attempts at
creasem (remembering that he laughs best who
laughs last), what is the gist of his "affirm?
This: that I beg the question and rea
... in a circle in defining the State as the embodiment
of the invasive principle and arguing that the
movement ceases to have useful distinction as
a State and becomes a voluntary society;
that all competent political philosophers reject,
yet that, while the State generally
has, and does use, force, it does not
follow that it must always use it and that it
cannot consistently undertake to do things
on the voluntary plan; and that it is no more
ab-
for the State to refrain from the use of
force than it is for the individual, who is ad-
mitted on all hands to have the right to use
force under certain conditions.

Regarding the Anarchistic definition of "the
State," Mr. Bliss flatly contradicts himself.
First he asserts that all competent writers mean
by "the State" social organization, ridiculing
as peculiar and arbitrary my definition of the
term; then he "admits" that "many writers
—all writers, indeed—consider the State neces-
sarily to have sovereignty, which we may de-
fine as the right to use force." Any man with
a grain of logic will see that Mr. Bliss has
given his own away by this "admission." If
all writers insist that the State necessarily
has sovereignty, then all writers tacitly accept
the Anarchistic definition of the State as the
embodying of the invasive principle. They
do not question the legitimacy of the invasion,
but they recognize the fact. They all declare that
a society which did not have the right to use
force whenever it saw fit, no matter how well
organized, would be a voluntary body, not a
State. The right to use force is of the essence
of the definition. Whether the State is neces-
sarily sovereign is a different matter, which
questions the distinction in issue between Anarchists
and Archists; but there is absolutely no difference
of opinion with respect to the nature and scope
of the institution called State.

If Mr. Bliss were a trifle more logical, he
would perceive the irrelevant nature of his
citations on this point. The unconscious trick
consists in giving incomplete and general de-
scriptions rather than precise and scientific de-

cussions. Of course the State is claimed to be
all that his authorities say of it; but what
they say in the extracts quoted does not exhaust
the description. Each of his authorities, if asked
to define the State strictly, to distinguish be-
tween it and a voluntary association, would
promptly refer to the element of sovereignty.
It is not size or number which differentiates
the State from voluntary bodies; it is so-

cracy. I advise Mr. Bliss to read Mr. Sal-
ter's chapter on the idea and meaning of the
State; he will there find his own authorities
cited in proof of the correctness of the Anarch-
istic definition. I may reproduce for Mr.
Bliss the definitions of sovereignty made by Mr.
Salter from Professor J. W. Burgess:

"An organization may be conceived which
would include every member of a given popula-
tion, or every inhabitant of a given territory,
and which might continue with great per-
manence, and yet it would not be the State.
If, however, it possesses the sovereignty over
the population, then it is the State. . . . The
State must have the power to compel the subject against his will; otherwise it is no State, it is only an Anarchic society."

This bears directly on the point under discussion, and ought to prove enlightening to Mr. Bliss. It disposes of his assertion that my definition is peculiar and question-begging, and shows that he is incapable of distinguishing between scientific definition and general description. Not a single authority, even among those cited by him, supports his absurd, peculiar, and arbitrary definition of the State as social organization merely; each emphasizes the element of sovereignty as the most essential part of the definition.

But, freely and foolishly asks Mr. Bliss, must the State always continue to use force? His own authorities would answer: "Of course, as a State." When the State ceases to use force, it abolishes itself and is converted into an "Anarchic society" (as Professor Burgess says). Not satisfied with this, Mr. Bliss still more freely asks: "But must the State use force in every relation and undertaking which it assumes; might it not voluntarily refrain from using force in a particular relation, and agree to abide by the rules of free bodies or agencies?" His own authorities would again tell him that to the extent to which the State divests itself of its sovereignty and concedes to act on the plane of competitive societies, it figures, not as a State, but as a voluntary organization.

This is so clear and simple that further elaboration would be a waste of space and time. If Mr. Bliss still fails to see the point, I cannot, with all my "generosity," do anything for him. If, however, he does see it, he will also begin to understand the merit of my distinction between "Socialism through the State" and "Socialism through the same body that, in another aspect and capacity, acts as a State." It was not doubt which prompted me to draw this distinction, but the desire to be generous to Mr. Bliss, and to show him that I thoroughly understand his position. I knew what he meant by "voluntary Socialism," and I informed him by the State, and took pains to convince him that "voluntary Socialism through the State" is a contradiction in terms, an absurdity. He who asks the State to do something, great or small, without using force in any form, asks it to act in some other capacity than that of a State.

As for Mr. Bliss's remark about individual sovereignty not necessarily implying the use of force, it is extremely puerile. We are fond of mistaking that the individual shall be sovereign,—but we mean, as Mr. Bliss well knows, sovereign over himself. We grant him the right to use force in defence of this self-sovereignty whenever his rights under equal freedom are infringed upon,—that is, whenever others attempt to exercise sovereignty over him and overstep the limits of equality of liberty. Sovereignty of the State, on the other hand, means sovereignty over the entire people,—the right to use force for any purpose it might deem necessary or desirable. The individual does not abolish himself by ceasing to use force against non-invasive fellow-men, since force with him is only a means of defence. The State rests on and lives by force, and, if it ceased to use force against non-in violators, it would cease to exist. It would have to begin by relinquishing compulsory taxation, which is suicide.

Now I think I have fully covered the first half of Mr. Bliss's reply. If he is still inclined to laugh and to view triumph from any distance at all, he is peculiar, and has far more "faith" than logic.

The second half of the reply is, if possible, even more disappointing to a generous opponent, who likes to have strong arguments to deal with. It is evasive, shuffling, trivial, and pointless from beginning to end, and one generally has to apologize for commenting it at all.

For instance, Mr. Bliss thinks it was inconsistent for me to devote "six columns" to an argument which I declared to be beneath serious discussion. Now, the trouble with men like Mr. Bliss is that they are so loose, incoherent, and careless that in one short paragraph they generally misstate a dozen matters of fact and make half-a-dozen errors of logic. You must either ignore them entirely, or else you must control your impatience and slowly dispose of the tangle of assumptions and false claims. I had to deal with several matters of fact and of theory, and the point which I said could not be seriously treated occupied, not six columns, but one column, and was discussed, not for its own sake, but because Mr. Bliss, a discoverer, reformer, editor, and public guide, had advanced it with a flourish of trumpets and a display of fireworks. One often has to treat things seriously which really do not deserve serious treatment, and Mr. Bliss's "voluntary Socialism" is one of them. It is difficult to discuss it with patience, but there are reasons which render it necessary to master one's feelings and calmly consider nonsensical propositions.

Mr. Bliss—to give another illustration of irritating confusion and shuffling—says I have unnecessarily collected facts to show that English municipalities use invasion. But why did I collect these facts? That Mr. Bliss did not claim that those municipalities were Socialists or voluntary I fully recognized and freely stated. But he did claim that the "manufactory" of industries of a certain kind did not entail additional taxation, and this claim I have overthrown by the facts collected. Mr. Bliss has probably even forgotten that he has made this claim; but the "record" is against him. He now says that he never denied that tax rates had to be raised to carry out the municipal reforms; but this is exactly what he did deny, and it was to expose the recklessness of his assertion that I collected the facts he refers to.

But the chief question is whether "voluntary Socialism by the body which, in its other capacity, acts as a State" is possible. Mr. Bliss asserts that it is, and again seeks to prove his case by the examples of English and other municipalities. Admitting, he says, that taxes have had to be increased in most, if not all, cases, yet since, according to a witness produced by me, "most of these [municipal] undertakings are already remunerative," it follows that "compulsory Socialism is by no means necessary to Socialism." If all municipalities are as healthy and superficial as Mr. Bliss, the great victories of municipalization can be easily accounted for, and no investigation is necessary. Let us assume that the undertakings are now remunerative, as alleged, although a number of important questions occur to the mind in this connection upon which no light is thrown. Does that prove that the State can go into business without compulsory taxation? Will Mr. Bliss kindly tell us, in the first place, where the municipalities obtained the capital to start the industries and establish the plants? Will he tell us, in the second place, how a commercial test can be applied to an establishment which is independent of competition? When salaries and prices are arbitrarily fixed, and there is absolutely no check upon the management in an industrial sense, what does "success" mean? Do the municipalities allow competition on the part of private companies? Has it been ascertained that the prices charged are not higher than private ones would exact? Before Mr. Bliss can make any claims, he has to answer these questions. (1) How were the funds originally raised? (2) By taxation, increased or otherwise? Then there is nothing further to discuss, for there is compulsion at the start. (3) By issue of bonds, capital and interest been paid entirely out of the proceeds? If not, then compulsory taxation has played an important part. (4) Is perfect freedom of competition allowed, or has the municipality a monopoly in the products manufactured for the local market? The answers to these questions, I venture to say, will show that there is little that is "voluntary" about the "municipal Socialism" of Mr. Bliss's cities.

Let us, however, dismiss the municipalities, and consider Mr. Bliss's plans in the abstract. Determined to reject compulsion, he would have the State raise money by issuing bonds. With the money thus raised the State would purchase the existing railroads or build new lines. Since, he says, railroads running for profit cannot compete with railroads run at cost, the State would speedily become master of the field and control the entire industry.

This is positively childish, and only a man wholly ignorant of industrial conditions, methods, and processes could utter such nonsense. Why, Mr. Bliss, have to be sold in the market, and capitalists will not purchase them unless they get a fair rate of interest and are sure of the ability of the borrower to pay the principal at the specified time. The first question is, can the government obtain the money to buy or build the railroads of the country? Any business man will tell the innocent Mr. Bliss that it cannot; that there is not enough idle capital in the market to supply such demand. The second question is, assuming that the government obtained the money, how could it run the lines "at cost"? It would have to pay the interest on the debt, and save enough to gradually call in the bonds and extinguish the debt. Could it do this and still pay employees higher wages, or give the public lower rates, than the private railroads? If not, where is the "Socialism"? Who would benefit from the change?

But the most fatal objection has yet to be stated. Let us concede everything to Mr. Bliss, and rest our case on this single, but crushing, point,—namely, that the moment the State ceased to employ compulsion and announced that, within certain limits, it is to be a
voluntary, competitive organization, its ability to borrow is completely, absolutely gone. Why do capitalists invest their money? Because the power of government to tax is practically unlimited. They know that the government has nothing and cares nothing, but they know that the country's wealth is constantly increasing, and that the government will continue to levy taxes and raise all the revenue it needs. But suppose the government should accept Mr. Bliss's plan and have the secretaries of the Treasury make some such announcement to the public as this: "We, your sovereign people, have determined nationalization the country." In other words, a voluntary plan. While we shall continue to use force for the purposes in which we are now engaged, we hereby solemnly state that the new undertakings we are entering upon are not in any way to rest on force. We want to buy or build railroad lines; we need money for the purpose. Will you buy our bonds, which we promise to redeem, not from our general, compulsorily-raised fund, but from the profits of our new business? Knowing our wonderful business ability, you have no doubt that our railroads will be a source of extraordinary profit to us, and we promise to pay you everything, principal and interest, out of our net profits. Come, submit your bids." Does Mr. Bliss imagine that such a proclamation would yield a red cent? Jokes, laughter, cat-calls, and hooting would be the only response. What! to trust the ability of the government to cover money, and have no security at all, not even the "faith and credit of the nation"? One or two lunatics might come forward, but the capitalists, great and small, would know better. Mr. Bliss would then find out what happens when the State acts in some other capacity than its ordinary and natural one, when it divests itself of sovereignty and tries to borrow money without the security which is afforded by its exercise of the taxation power. I repeat: I am willing to admit everything claimed by Mr. Bliss, including the post-posterior statement that private industry cannot compete with government industry (for which there is not a shred of evidence), and rest my case against "voluntary Socialism through the State" on this single consideration. Let Mr. Bliss stop fighting windmills—I mean, trusts—long enough to meet this objection. A word or two concerning the concluding paragraphs of Mr. Bliss's letter. Because "progress comes by evolution through existing institutions," he assumes that it must come through the State acting as a voluntary association! He forgets that there are other agencies and institutions in existence, and that we have at least as much reason for our assertion that progress must come through these free agencies, as he has for his assertion. Freedom exists to some extent to-day, and we claim that more freedom is as essential to further progress in industry as it is to further progress in thought and social relations other than industrial. We are not calling for a miracle, but relying on a substantial, tried, known, and solid reality. The credit for the caption deemed so brilliant by Mr. Bliss is mine. It is I, and not my friend Tucker, who was so generous as to describe Mr. Bliss's plan as a Socialist paradise based upon usury, and to me my warm thanks are due,—that is, if thanks are due at all. But, really, I don't see what Mr. Bliss is so grateful for. He evidently has failed to grasp the meaning of the word "based." Has he heard of the fate of the house built upon the sand? A worse fate is in store for anything based upon usury. Usury and Socialism are incompatible; it is the object of all Socialists to destroy usury, not to base anything upon it. It is because the present system is based upon it that it has been condemned as impossible. He who proposes to base Socialism on usury cannot possibly comprehend either. Mr. Bliss uses terms without reference to their meaning. Would he refuse to be told that his religion is based upon ignorance, his morality upon vice, his love upon prostitution? He would contemptuously declare such dicta to be self-contradictory, empty, and absurd. Well, if his scheme is aptly described as a Socialist paradise based upon usury, then his scheme is absurd and impossible.

A suggestion to Mr. Bliss—to be generous to the end. As he claims to be a Fabian, let him submit his great discover to such Fabian economists as G. Bernard Shaw and Sidney Webb. He may find it difficult to understand Anarchist reasoning; he will find it easy to believe the statements (which, I fear, are likely to be rather emphatic and charged with more impatience than my arguments) of his own comrades. So anxious am I to aid Mr. Bliss that I earnestly urge him to "arbitrate"—agreeing to the selection of any prominent Fabian economist as the arbitrator. I am sure he would thank me for having been cruel only to be kind.

A municipal reform movement is on foot in Chicago, and a lively mass meeting has lately been held to urge citizens to elect honest men to the city council. Nearly every speaker frankly admitted that municipal government in most great cities was an organized system of blackmail and robbery, to one end an agency for点缀 various interests to corrupt them. All of which is very true, and I am glad Mr. Darrow, who has plenty of courage, by the way, expressed these ideas at the meeting. But will he tell us how he can carry out his own programme without abolishing government and compulsory taxation altogether?

It would be interesting to know what the editor of the "Engineering Magazine" now thinks of the consistency of its financial guide and authority, the "Evening Post." Mr. Dunlap, in a leading article on finance, talks about the necessity of retarding the greenbacks and stopping the working of the "endless chain." He apparently is unaware of the fact that the "Post" no longer adheres to the endless chain theory. True, for months, if not years, it had insisted that the greenbacks were the only obstacle to confidence and prosperity, and that the endless chain would continue to operate as long as they were suffered to remain as a part of our monetary system. But Mr. Dunlap's authority, as seen now, light. It told us some weeks ago that there was too much currency in circulation, and that, as soon as a certain amount should be locked up in the treasury, the chain would cease to operate. The "Post's" war on the greenbacks is over, therefore, and Mr. Dunlap and other disciples are left in the lurch. The trouble, it appears, is that there is too much currency in circulation. That the Federal Reserve Board, which would succeed by "Engineering Magazine" to modify its platform; another week, and the authors of the greatest work on finance will doubtless turn round again.

The Boston "Herald" notes with satisfaction that "a wave of depression has passed over the rank and file of Anarchists and Socialists." If it means that the noisy and revolutionary agitators have subsided, it is doubly correct. But the intellectual propaganda of radicalism is as active as ever, and it is from this movement that the "brotherhood of thieves" has most to fear. Is it possible that the bourgeoisie society is ebbing for excitement and misses the bomb-thrower? The "Herald" thinks that "honest labor has taken the place of loud-mouthed vaporizing," but in this it is unfortunately mistaken. If that were the case, the "Herald" writer would be employed at some useful trade, and have no opportunity of writing himself down a fool in attempting to discuss social movements.

Professor Parsons, who is agitating for governmental ownership of railways, finds considerable difficulty in devising methods of acquiring the existing roads. He makes several suggestions, but the one he lays special stress on is the new currency should be issued to buy them. Is it possible that he hasn't heard of Mr. Bliss's great discovery? I urge Mr. Bliss to write to Professor Parsons at once and convert him to "voluntary Socialism through the State." Every plan of the reactionary professor is bottomed on compulsion, and it is Mr. Bliss's duty to stop fighting trusts and open the eyes of the compulsionists to the new, free, deistic method.

I am informed that, when the Rev. W. D. Bliss was at college, political economy was the one study in which he failed to get through at his examinations. "Apparently," added my informant, "he is not through yet."

Meredith and His Style.

To the Editor of Liberty:

I think you are quite right when you state that the only man who can adequately criticize Mr. Meredith is Mr. Meredith himself. Perhaps Meredith might also translate himself into English. The result would reflect little credit on him. All his alleged "power," like that of Browning's later verse, comes from its "quickness" and afebrility. There are always people in the world who think things good or remarkable when they are grotesque or fantastic. But I often find that these same people belittle themselves by admiring, very frankly and sensibly, the honest art of the world, whether it be literature, painting, or sculpture. I think even such an attitude as Carlyle would confess to the sublime and sincere sublimity of Michelangelo's "David," which I watched here for a
The Nature of Pity.

[Translated from the German of Nietzsche by George Schramm.]

"NO LONGER TO THINK OF ONE'S SELF."—Let us thoroughly ponder the question: why does one jump to the assistance of a man who falls into the water, even when we are not neighbours to him? "From pity," says thoughtlessness: "under such circum-
stances we think only of the other." Why do we ex-
perience pain and discomfort at the sight of one who is suffering? "Then one is moved instantly and 
not merely plant a pious heap of bones. Shun those who cry out against 
fashion, and have no taste for elegant writing. For to have 
without a sympathetic mind is not to have 
a mind: it is a trait.—Tragic Comedians.

"Then, ah! then, moreover, will the novelists' Art, 
now neither so picturesque nor so gracious, 
attained its majority. We can thus be facetiously 
historical, honestly transcriptive. Rose-pink 
and dirty drab will alike assure the 
beauty of both, and their silly caculating context, 
perpetually renewed in a shuffe of extremes, as is always 
when a phaenomenal felicity reigns, will no 
longer baﬄe the contemplation of natural 
ﬂesh, another no longer the soul haunting out of our 
inesistent strife. Philosophy bids us to see that we are not so 
pretty as rose-pink, not so repulsive as dirty drab. And though 
the last of the species are still in the striving for its 
reappearance of having a pure decency in the place of 
shorn; real flesh; a soul born active, wind-bent, but 
sacred; the art of the dead, then again the 
illustrious, a bounty of life, an aid to life, quick 
with our desires, and with our allowances, with 
you love it—

and you will not encounter it—We are not 
sure of pity. Those who are not pious 
relent with the manifestation of pity. In is there may be a 
line self defence, or also revenge. That at bottom we 
strong skins—skin gathered from the 
decision at which we arrive in all those cases in which 
we can avoid the spectacle of the suffering, 
needy, the lamenting; we decide not to do it when we 
can approach them and do them good, 
forever, and we are certain of applause, when we wish to 
experience the reverse of happiness, or also when we 
the hope to escape ensnare through their aspect. It is 
missing to call the suffering which we experience un-
less in the conditions, a varied 
character, pity or fellow-suffering, for it is under 
all circumstances a suffering from which the sufferer 
before us is free: it is our own, as his suffering is his 
own. It is only our own suffering that we 
set aside when we manifest pity. However, we never 
do anything of this nature from one motive; as certainly 
with a dozen for audience, for a commencement. . .
A great modern writer, head-on, 
departed, capable in activity of composing thoughtful 
women, thinking men, grooved over his pottery—
would be, if he could be, by his nature, self-sufﬁcient; 
not, if they were, with the fear of positive brutishness. He could 
have done it, and he would have done it. But he 
daried, he would (for he was Tittius enough) have raised 
the Ira in dignity on a level with History, to an 
intensity surpassing that which could be called, as 
vivacity as man’s heart and brain in their union exed 
his plain lines of action to erotion. —Diana of the Crosses.

"Your condemnation may be correct in itself; but 
you say, ‘He coils words;’ and he certainly forces the 
argument and the prerogative of the point to 
be considered is whether fiction demands a perfectly 
smoothly a style. Under the work does, and a philosophical treatise should. When we ask 
for facts simply, we forget the intrusion of a style. Of 
diction it is a part, in the other any medieval plantation of 
cloth. —Stanford Belloni.

"We are still fighting against the Puritan element, 
in literature as elsewhere. . . Our language is not 
rich in subtle, idea for prose. A writer who is not seri-
bous and has insight into his own mind. In poetry we are 
rich enough; but in prose we owe 
everything we have, we have taken in the 
teeth of critics. —Stanford Belloni.

"It is about its greatest, so it must be 
with the rest of them, or we shall have a Transatlantic 
sea-sickness. Yet, sec: when a piece of Transatlantic slang happens to be 
tellingly true—here we must make the same 
experience: from a ﬂight with the elements— we cannot 
resist it; it lavates us. In the same way poetic rash-
ness of the language requites the enrich. —Stanford Belloni.

"Such is the construction of my story, however, that 
today the Philosopher is stipulated for when with his assistance I conceived it would ren-
der our performance unintelligible to that acute and 
homeopathic mind. The mask—which is attacked 
with apolriphisms and sentences and a fantacis 
delusion of the perception, I must permit him to come forward occasionally. We are 
indeed in a sort of partnership, and it is useless for me to tell him that the mask is not him. —Stanford Belloni.

"The Nature of Pity.
[Book Reviews.]

An important work, "The Coaling Individualism," by 
A. Egmont Hake and Otto Wessell, is published by 
Macmillan & Co. In its attempt is made to combat 
the theories of collectivism. It carries the war 
against socialism and monism. The authors en-
unacrate that collectivism means retrogression, leading 
to depression, poverty, and social chaos; that the 
amanities of our civilization spring from collectivistic 
forces; and that personal liberty is the indispensable 
condition of happiness and prosperity, and the im-
mediate goal of all progress. This volume also deals 
exhaustively with economic and social mistakes in the 
past, to which the authors attribute the distrust in lib-
erty. The authors endeavor to prove that, when economic liberty has been accorded to the masses, all excuses for collectivism have disappeared.

An Eye to the Future.

[Feast.]

Anphemist Gisehard. This bill is sure to be un-
popular. Do you think it should be passed?

Anphemist Branches. By all means! We can re-
pel it next session by way of Reform.
With Nature.

To his papa’s walks the Hindoo oh!
To bow the head before his images,
The swarthy: Arab makes a pilgrimage
To know the god upon his people’s tomb;
I rather seek the old unwooded grave,
The pathless cliff, the tranquil sunny dell,
And all alone in pleasant solitude
Confess my human errors to myself.

The old unwooded grave alive with birds,
The pathless cliff o’ergrown with moss and fir,
The tranquil sunny dell with flowers and pike,—
They do not speak, and yet they’ll—so much.

The priest persuades me to be a slave;
A senseless weight religion bids me be;
Eternal Nature is a slave.

Imposed naught upon me, bids me naught.

When I disparked of our corrupted world,
I went to Nature to conceive itself.
Her blooming beauty in the prime of spring,
Her sweet mild sadness in the autumn-tide,
Her tranquil slumber in the winter-time,—
Have calmed my grief and pacified my mind.
Rebuked my heart with energy and hope,
With youthful strength, and youthful love of life.

When all alone I stand upon a rock
And see the vast expansion of the sea;
When on the massing clouds my eye is fixed
And mingle with the grand the fatal flood;
When through the aerial imagination float
And views the planets rolling in their orbs,—
How mightily I am then, and yet how weak!
How little am I then, and yet he great?

When through the boggy the waving sunbeam gleams,
And on the mountain peaks a purple lies;
When through the valley s scented breezes blow,
And herb, and bud, and leaf, arced d to sleep;
When in the sky the evening star appears,
Bright as a meteor of glorious times,—
How clearly I perceive the aim of life.
For full of love and peace my heart is then.

I like to look at paintings old and rare,
To see how nature yields to human skill;
But more I like the old original,
The vivid hues of earth, and sea, and sky.
The greatest art and depth of feeling is,
Can never thrill my heart with childlike joy
As doth the cadence of a gilding book,
The silk rustle of a stirring stream.

I love the breeze as one doth love a child,
The breeze invisible and frolicsome.
And when it gambol with the flowery bea,
Plays with the taste as at hide-and seek,
And curls the streamlet in the wood,—
I long to be a little child again,
To gambol on the meadows with the breeze,
The breeze invisible and frolicsome.

With Nature.

To his papa’s walks the Hindoo oh!
To bow the head before his images,
The swarthy: Arab makes a pilgrimage
To know the god upon his people’s tomb;
I rather seek the old unwooded grave,
The pathless cliff, the tranquil sunny dell,
And all alone in pleasant solitude
Confess my human errors to myself.

The old unwooded grave alive with birds,
The pathless cliff o’ergrown with moss and fir,
The tranquil sunny dell with flowers and pike,—
They do not speak, and yet they’ll—so much.
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A senseless weight religion bids me be;
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When I disparked of our corrupted world,
I went to Nature to conceive itself.
Her blooming beauty in the prime of spring,
Her sweet mild sadness in the autumn-tide,
Her tranquil slumber in the winter-time,—
Have calmed my grief and pacified my mind.
Rebuked my heart with energy and hope,
With youthful strength, and youthful love of life.

When all alone I stand upon a rock
And see the vast expansion of the sea;
When on the massing clouds my eye is fixed
And mingle with the grand the fatal flood;
When through the aerial imagination float
And views the planets rolling in their orbs,—
How mightily I am then, and yet how weak!
How little am I then, and yet he great?

When through the boggy the waving sunbeam gleams,
And on the mountain peaks a purple lies;
When through the valley s scented breezes blow,
And herb, and bud, and leaf, arced d to sleep;
When in the sky the evening star appears,
Bright as a meteor of glorious times,—
How clearly I perceive the aim of life.
For full of love and peace my heart is then.

I like to look at paintings old and rare,
To see how nature yields to human skill;
But more I like the old original,
The vivid hues of earth, and sea, and sky.
The greatest art and depth of feeling is,
Can never thrill my heart with childlike joy
As doth the cadence of a gilding book,
The silk rustle of a stirring stream.

I love the breeze as one doth love a child,
The breeze invisible and frolicsome.
And when it gambol with the flowery bea,
Plays with the taste as at hide-and seek,
And curls the streamlet in the wood,—
I long to be a little child again,
To gambol on the meadows with the breeze,
The breeze invisible and frolicsome.

Socialism and the State.

My dear Mr. Tucker:—

The first month of the year is a good one in which to settle old accounts, and I am sure I owe you one.

In reply to Mr. Yarros’ criticisms of my defence of voluntary Anarchism, his article appeared some months since, but so much has been written since lecturing almost every night, and I did not see Mr. Yarros’ article until recently, and since then have had scarcely a moment in which to write.

Perhaps in the city and for fear, on looking over my files of Liberty, I find that my poor little letter of less than one column has been honored with two long replies, containing nearly six columns, besides several several replies, that you have asked your correspondents on both sides of the water to collect facts to answer my position. Verily, my little letter seems to have created quite a disturbance in your little world.

"The State must be the medium for writing a little more at this length, but am sure you intention paper will allow me some space after so much upon the other side and I know not how much more to come in answer to this letter. I will promise, how-
The quality of their anarchist-communism may be gathered from the following extract from "La Voz," written by an influential organ, on the question what shall be done with doses in the future society:

But if after some time anybody wished to live at the expense of the rest (we repeat that it is not credible this should be necessary) of the city, the government of government, judges, police, or jails, we would say to them: "You cannot make a life of it the same as all the rest to have to satisfy all your desires; therefore try to occupy yourself in something useful, as we, all do.

Who will not prefer to spend a few hours in the work which suits him sooner than wait till they have to do so to give him notice?

If I understand the right of the case, in case of obduracy on the part of those who do nothing that his neighbors consider useful, some way will be found to make them work for a living—in other words, either the Anarchist or the universality of the Communist movement breaks its principles.

Our friends of the "Firebrand" are more consistent, and declare that they can both afford to feed the drones in idleness than to be bothered with coercing them.

Most of the Argentine propaganda, however, if it is fairly represented by the papers I receive, disdains such details, and confines its economic prophecies to the broadest generalizations.

The best prospects of Argentine propaganda have been inquiring free from the curse of Anarchism, till last fall they were suddenly wakened up by a labor meeting in Buenos Ayres, where the orators for Anarchy and the bishops for the Socialist politicians dominated; and then, the latter has been a good deal of police activity, and the public mind has been stirred up.

Now, in papers dated December and January it appears that the exiles in Argentina, comes news that the attorney-general has issued a proclamation declaring Anarchist propaganda to be a crime, and apparently promising that it shall be repressed. The Anarchist papers reply by saying that "When Anarchism is not a crime, it is not a constituted a crime and been punished as such," and saying that they think well of their own privileges, and having saved the outrages of the police so long; but that now, with their progress coming by evolution through existing institutions, and not by the struggle of one for one? This seems to be the whole question, one of method, for which one which is of infinite importance and to which all experience seems to bear, that the more progress comes by evolution through existing institutions, the more difficult it is for the small to individual sovereignty can lead only to the sovereign despotic of the shrewdest and smartest individual.

One word for yourself, Mr. Tucker. I presume it is your faculty which characterized my plan as "A Socialist Purism, Based upon Usury."

I really think you very much. You and Mr. Yarros have both been cruel to me, but I am not interested in the use of your words. You are really too good. I have long suspected that you Anarchists believe the idea of Socialists to be a Paradox, but I did not quite think you would admit it. Please let me thank you again. As for its being founded on usury, you are again quite right. Socialism has a solid basis in the present system, which is usury, and it proposes to develop out of this, from usury, through usury, to usury. Your philosophical Anarchism is not based on usury, based on a peculiar definition, but, if it ever get near enough to earth to have any substantial basis, it would, we see, develop usury and the triumph of the small, you see, become your wisdom, I am sincerely your friend, the enemy.

W. D. P. Biss.

Argentina "Anarchism."

To the Editor of Liberty:

A little news from Argentina may be of interest. Anarchist-Communism has been flourishing there for some few years, and is now represented by a round dozen of periodicals in Argentina and Uruguay, besides a fairly rapid succession of tracts and pamphlets. When I say "periodicals," I do not mean that they appear at stated periods; the usual announcement as to that is, "Appears when it can; price of subscription, every one according to his will."

Still, they manage to come out with a tolerable approach to regularity, and one of them, "El Perseguido," has now reached Vol. 6, No. 98.

The principle of liberty in every country, the principle of the state, is to be the business of government, judges, police, or jails, we would say to them: "You cannot make a life of it the same as all the rest to have to satisfy all your desires; therefore try to occupy yourself in something useful, as we, all do."

Who will not prefer to spend a few hours in the work which suits him sooner than wait till they have to do so to give him notice?

If I understand the right of the case, in case of obduracy on the part of those who do nothing that his neighbors consider useful, some way will be found to make them work for a living—in other words, either the Anarchist or the universality of the Communist movement breaks its principles. Our friends of the "Firebrand" are more consistent, and declare that they can both afford to feed the drones in idleness than to be bothered with coercing them.

Most of the Argentine propaganda, however, if it is fairly represented by the papers I receive, disdains such details, and confines its economic prophecies to the broadest generalizations. The best prospects of Argentine propaganda have been inquiring free from the curse of Anarchism, till last fall they were suddenly wakened up by a labor meeting in Buenos Ayres, where the orators for Anarchy and the bishops for the Socialist politicians dominated; and then, the latter has been a good deal of police activity, and the public mind has been stirred up. Now, in papers dated December and January it appears that the exiles in Argentina, comes news that the attorney-general has issued a proclamation declaring Anarchist propaganda to be a crime, and apparently promising that it shall be repressed. The Anarchist papers reply by saying that "When Anarchism is not a crime, it is not a constituting a crime and been punished as such," and saying that they think well of their own privileges, and having saved the outrages of the police so long; but that now, with their progress coming by evolution through existing institutions, the more difficult it is for the small to individual sovereignty can lead only to the sovereign despotic of the shrewdest and smartest individual.

One word for yourself, Mr. Tucker. I presume it is your faculty which characterized my plan as "A Socialist Purism, Based upon Usury."

I really think you very much. You and Mr. Yarros have both been cruel to me, but I am not interested in the use of your words. You are really too good. I have long suspected that you Anarchists believe the idea of Socialists to be a Paradox, but I did not quite think you would admit it. Please let me thank you again. As for its being founded on usury, you are again quite right. Socialism has a solid basis in the present system, which is usury, and it proposes to develop out of this, from usury, through usury, to usury. Your philosophical Anarchism is not based on usury, based on a peculiar definition, but, if it ever get near enough to earth to have any substantial basis, it would, we see, develop usury and the triumph of the small, you see, become your wisdom, I am sincerely your friend, the enemy.

W. D. P. Biss.

Anarchist Letter-Writing Corps.

The Secretary wants every reader of Liberty to send in his name for enrolment. Those who do so thereby pledge themselves to a little disseminating the Anarchist propaganda every fortnight, on Anarchism or kindred subjects, to the "target" assigned in Liberty for that fortnight, but not by writing letters to the editor or by writing articles of failure to write to a target (which it is hoped will not often occur), or in case of temporary government withdrawal from the work of the Corps. All, whether members or not, are asked to lose no opportunity of information. Address, Benjamin T. pye, Switching Institute, Flushing, N. Y.

Why I believe in the Anarchist Letter-Writing Corps.

First reason—because this is the way to get most work out of the average man. It is a well-known fact of experience that almost anybody, by making a rule of setting apart a certain definite part of his income to be given to any cause in which he is interested, will give more generously (and at the same time feel it less) than if he gives without system whenever he feels so disposed. Just as a man will work to make better and better for a cause by setting himself a regular task to be done at regular times than by simply resolving that he will in general be helpful to the cause. Want Laura Ingalls Wilder to go no farther than an idea has its attractive aspects, especially to the socialist, who likes to think of himself as a wild bird of the forest. But, if he is to make his way in the United States of America, he must learn to recognize himself as a business man. How to serve the wild bird of the forest? /no has chance alongside the business man. The course of evolution gives the preference to those who, by method and industry, manage to get through the greatest amount of work. Therefore, when we find a man with a certain amount of willingness, but little opportunity, we want to coin that willingness into the greatest amount of solid work that so little willingness will produce. Now, by setting the average man to do a regular stint of work on any regularly required for the least amount of work as much work from the same amount of willingness as if he worked the same man to working without system. (In my own case the number of visitors was too low, it was necessary to rewrite the articles."

The anarchy movement is not directly accessible to the majority of Anarchists that will set us at work so regularly as the Letter-Writing Corps. Moral: Join the Corps.

Target, both sections.—Very Rev. C. T. Brady, Manhattan, Kan., is reported in the Philadelphia "Evening Telegraph," March 18, as having on that date read before the Clerical Brotherhood (in Philadelphia) a remarkable paper on "Anarchy—A Problem of the Day."

Of late as many men of more or less eminence, including a few "ministers of the Gospel" whose reputation is such as to entitle their opinions to the respect of thoughtful men, have publicly proclaimed themselves Anarchists, and have announced with a pride that would seem to rest upon conviction that Jesus was an Anarchist also, that an inquiry into Anarchy, and the position of the Bible in the scheme of human order.

Society and its devices, instrument, government, is founded upon individual concessions. To found social organization a sanction is effected by the individual individuals, by voluntary or involuntary ratify and give validity to the acts of some determinate body which owns its own acte to those conventions. The rational forms of a meaning rule of action, unless to the same determinate rupture or, government, or government, delegated, or surrendered, by the determining members, full authority upon the recoil of the action. These last have we as always to give over us to control people than the peace, the authority, the security, the law, the liberty, the government, the authority, the government, the society, and the court of appeal is always the constituting body.

The principle of submission introduces and depends upon the establishment of authority. Authority may be at one moment, the power of the people, at another, the power of the state, and the people separably with authority to enforce. It makes no nonsense for a government in its attempt to make the law of the land, and the court of appeal is always the constituting body.

Who sanctions and authorizes this principle of concession and authority? Almighty God. And who rejects it? The people. Authority may be defined as a state of existence without any order or government. An Anarchist is one who refuses to recognize any authority in society or government; one who rejects entirely the principle of authority. One who refuses to be bound by any convention into which humanity may have been induced. Just as the Anarchist, who accepts the rights by him for any purpose or in any degree. An Anarchist is one who, is at one time God, and on another day, man, including in his beliefs, for them with he only all tied on his pleasure, to their desire. Anarchist renders it impossible for him to recognize any authority, even in those whom he deems, they are directly and practically connected with a conception of a common and diabolic idea. And herein is the weak point in Anarchistism. Every Anarchist movement carries in itself the seeds of its own destruction. (Call this paper remarkable as a sign of the times, not for the remarkable quality of the idea expressed.)
Note the inconsistencies between the first paragraph and the last two as to whether believers in God can, or over a. Among the latter absence of guilt for the statements that authority (as defined) is necessary to the working of the principles of conscience, and the logical inconsistency of this statement with the sentence above it, show the misleading definition of anarchy as absence of order.

Section A will please write to the "Telegraph," remembering that letters to city editors should almost invariably be unsigned. Mr. Leblanc Choquette, a 100 acres of land, who probably cannot be won over, but may be induced to misrepresent us a little less.

STEPHEN V. THOMPSON.

From a Corps Target.

To the Editor of Liberty:

Your paper some weeks ago quoted several paragraphs from an article written by myself to the "South West." In consequence of your quotations, several letters have reached me from subscribers of your paper, approving my sentiments, and urging my acceptance of individual sovereignty as logically deducible from claims of sovereignty for all men. Permit me, through your columns, to thank your subscribers for their interest in my opinions, and assure them from myself that it is only because I am a firm believer in individual sovereignty that I have claimed, and do defend, the right of independence for States, and also for communities still smaller, wherever these find separate independence practicable and desirable.

J. I. TRUTHMAN.

POTTSOWN, O., March 10, 1866.

THE BALLOT.

BY WILLIAM WALSTEN GORDON.

A short poem illustrating the absurdity of majority rule. Printed as a note in the Weekly Calendar of Liberty on the propagation of what is called "liberal reform." Excellent for pamphlets.

Price, One Cent Per Hundred Copies.

Mail, post-paid, by BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1323, New York City.

SLAVES TO DUTY.

BY JOHN BADCOCK, JR.

A unique addition to the substantial literature of Americanism, in that it reveals the moral supremacy as the foundation of the several systems of slavery and polygamy. The reader himself does not expect the doctrine of freedom in child labor.

Price, 15 Cents.

Mail, post-paid, by BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1323, New York City.

LIBERTY'S LIBRARY.

For any of the following works, address BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1315, New York, N. Y.

FOR THE RAILWAY KING "THO' FOR A EM-

SON, "Pray dre.," BY A "Bail-His-er's" chum, OF Scranton, Pa. A peculiar blend of Scrooge and Mr. Scrooge. A delightful series of "Railroad Reviews." 10 cents; post-paid, $1.75.

Price, 10 cents.

Mail, post-paid, by BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1323, New York City.

ANARCHISTS' MARCH:

Tune: Hebranischen March (Pulitzer's 10 cents), Words by J. W. E. Price, 10 cents.

Price, 10 cents.

Mail, post-paid, by BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1323, New York City.


Price, 10 cents.

Mail, post-paid, by BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1323, New York City.

THE SCIENCE OF SOCIETY.

BY STEPHEN PEARL ANDREWS.


Price, 20 cents.

Mail, post-paid, by BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1323, New York City.

MODERN MARRIAGE.

BY EMILE ZOLA.

"Trivialized and scoured from the French by Benj. R. Tucker.

In this last story Zola takes four typical marriages,—one from the picturesque countryside, another from the little town, a third from the big city, and one from the working people,—and describes, with all the power of his wonderful art, how each ordained, how each coasts, its consumption, and how each results. The author has a large and well-paid.

Price in cloth, $1.00; in paper, 50 cents.

Mail, post-paid, by BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1323, New York City.

A VINDICATION OF NATURAL SOCIETY.

BY W. P. STONE.

"Trivialized and scoured from the French by Benj. R. Tucker.

A sentence containing the statement that authority (as defined) is necessary to the working of the principles of conscience, and the logical inconsistency of this statement with the sentence above it, show the misleading definition of anarchy as absence of order.

Price, 10 cents.

Mail, post-paid, by BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1323, New York City.

HEROES OF THE REVOLUTION OF '71.

BY G. F. TRUMBULL.

A more plausible instance of the perfections of the American experiment as a social and political system than this book contains. It is the story of a great marching of the people, and adorned with illustrations from the best artists of the age. Price, 15 cents.

Mail, post-paid, by BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1323, New York City.

A LITTLE BIOGRAPHY OF CHARLES L. LOWELL.

BY C. M. WELLS.

"Trivialized and scoured from the French by Benj. R. Tucker.

A sentence containing the statement that authority (as defined) is necessary to the working of the principles of conscience, and the logical inconsistency of this statement with the sentence above it, show the misleading definition of anarchy as absence of order.

Price, 10 cents.

Mail, post-paid, by BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 1323, New York City.