On Picket Duty.

The clericals and capitalists in France shirking for the liberty of the Jesuit to teach, and the capitalists and clericals in America shirking for the liberty of the “scab” to work, while both are technically right, do ought but exhibit two phases of one and the same eternally-recurring phenomenon,—the stealing of the livery of heaven to serve the devil in.

If there is any really good thing, thoroughly in line with the fundamental doctrine of this paper, which will surely win first the attention, and then the admiration and assent, of the most thoughtful thousand people in the world, through the same time it may for the moment shock, horrify, prejudice, madden, and alienate all others, that is the thing which this paper most wants to print, and wants to print most conspicuously. If any one has read the paper year after year and failed to realize this fact, his reading has been to little purpose, and has yielded him a most inadequate conception of the paper’s policy and of the essential character of its editor as a man. All criticism of either that does not take into account the intention now so positively declared is of necessity absolutely futile.

When a small and weak minority of the people join in notifying a merchant that, if he deals with their enemies, they will not deal with him, the press angrily denounces their course as “cruel, cowardly, and un-American interference with the rights of the individual”; but, when a large and powerful majority of people, through their chosen representatives, join in notifying a merchant—that is, a dealer in postal service—that, if he deals with any one whomsoever, except under restrictions that amount to prohibition, they will impose on him a large fine for each offense, this same press sees nothing in such interference with the rights of the individual, save what is brave, kindly, and American. And yet the aforesaid minority is overlooking the law of equal liberty which the aforesaid majority is violating.

Dr. Butler, the president of Columbia University, etc., raised collectivism with Anarchism in a recent lecture, rejected both as unsound and impossible, and proposed a happy medium which he called institutionalism. The term means nothing—or anything. Collectivism is institutionalism carried to the extreme, or regimentation. Anarchy does not object to institutions per se; it insists only that they shall be voluntary. Dr. Butler declared that institutionalism stood for “freedom of speech, a free press, protection of private property, respect for individual rights, and liberty for all.” Excellent, excellent. No doubt this is radically different from collectivism, but now is it to be distinguished from Anarchism? If institutionalism stands for nothing else, nothing antagonistic to the things named, it is but another name for Anarchism. If it stands for something else, — aggression, for example,—then of course it is not Anarchic, but neither is it what its inventor represents it to be. Dr. Butler cannot get rid of Anarchism without stripping his institutionalism of its best (alleged) attributes, — respect for individual rights and equal liberty.

Prof. Jenks, who, according to the New York “Times,” “fills the chair of political economy at Cornell University” in Ithaca, told the recent meeting of the Civic Federation that “any attack, direct or indirect, upon the government, except to reform it, since order is essential to growth, is morally as well as legally wrong.” This being the case, what is a poor fellow to do who, agreeing with Prof. Jenks that “order is essential to growth,” happens to believe also that government is the chief sustaining cause of disorder, and therefore desires to “reform it altogether”? If the author of the remark quoted really fills the chair of political economy at Cornell, it must be a very small chair. I venture to say that my friend Henry Boul of Ithaca, who is engaged in the manufacture of first-class furniture, will agree to build a full-size chair for Cornell, free of charge, if Cornell will undertake to find a man broader than Jeremiah Jenks to fill it.

At one of the sessions of the coal strike commission a priest, Father O’Donnell, being asked by Judge Gray, chairman of the commission, if he believed in boycotts, replied that he believed he had the right not to deal or associate with a person who did something that he did not like or was contrary to his interests. “I go along with you that far,” said Judge Gray; “how much further would you go? For instance, have you a right to boycott me, if I should deal or associate with such a person?” “No, sir,” answered Father O’Donnell, whereupon Judge Gray declared: “That is right; we draw the line at the same point.” This remarkable colloquy shows simply that a judge may be as illogical as a priest. John Smith deals with John Jones, my enemy. In so acting John Smith does something that I do not like, something contrary to my interests. According to Father O’Donnell, I have a right not to deal with John Smith, and I have no right not to deal with John Smith. And Judge Gray agrees with him. The two “draw the line at the same point,” and then — turn somersaults across it. Equals in precision, equals in agility, but judge far surpassing priest in the gravity of his buffer, these two professionals and their ilk are indispensable to the gaiety of nations.

The Sick God.

In days when men had joy of war, A God of Battles sped each mortal jar; The peoples pledged his heart and hand, From Israel’s land to Isie’s far.

His crimson form, with clang and chime, Flashed on each mark and murderous meeting-time, And kings invoked, for rape and raid, His fearsome aid in rime and rhyme.

On bracelet and blood-hole, for hear and seam, On blade and bolt, he flung his fulgoid beam: His harlees rayed the very gore, And corpses wore his glory-gleam.

Fashen an early King or Queen, And storied hero onward, saw his sheen; Two glimpsed by Wells, by Nye anon, And Nixion on his blue demense.

But new light spread. That god’s gold nibb And blason has waned dimer and more dim; Even his flushed form begins to fade, Till but a shade is left of him.

That modern meditation broke His spell, that person’s pleadings dealt a stroke, Say some; and aloe that crimes too dire Did much to surfe his crimson cloak.

Yes, seeds of creasive sympathy Were sown by those more excellent than he, Long known, though long ex-named till then— The gods of men is amity.

Souls have grown — era, and thought on beings The momentous many-sidedness of things With foes as friends, enfeebled free And fury-fires by galingrings!

He scarce impressions champions now; They do and dare, but tensely—pale of brow; And would they fail uplift the arm Of that faint form they know not how.

Yet wars arise, though zest grows cold; Wherefore, at whites, as ‘twere in ancient mould He looms, bespreechd with paint and bath; But never bath he seemed the old?

Let men rejoice, let men despair, The sturdy Deity of bereftures Succumbe to one of any rod; The Battle-god is god no more.

Thomas Hardy.
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A Proposed Pamphlet.

Numerous correspondents urge the immediate printing, in pamphlet form, of the address on "The Attitude of Anarchism Toward Industrial Combinations" which appeared in the December number of Liberty. The issue of such a pamphlet is contemplated, the price to be five cents per copy, and three dollars per hundred copies. To test the demand, subscriptions are invited for hundred-copy lots. A special rate of two dollars and fifty cents per hundred, carriage paid, will be made to all persons subscribing before February 1, 1903.

The publication of the pamphlet will depend on the number of substantial orders by hundred-copy lots that may be received during January. Now that the truth question is uppermost in the public mind, it is highly important that the Anarchist solution should be made readily accessible. Subscription pledges may be addressed to LIBERTY, P. O. Box 1312, New York City.

Two Types: Patriot and Anarchist.

Son—nothing more than thirty years ago a young Englishman came to this country to seek his fortune. He was a carpenter by trade, and he settled in the beautiful town of Ithaca, N. Y., possessed only of his tools, his trade, keen natural intelligence, and uncommon force of character. By his industry, his honesty, his economy, and his good nature, he speedily gained the confidence of his neighbors, launched one enterprise after another, prospered in them all, and, when, two years ago, he retired from most of them on a modest competence, he was the possessor of one of the largest stores in Ithaca, a busy furniture factory, a farm of considerable proportions, a flourishing dairy business, and very extensive greenhouses of the most modern type, for the production and supply of flowers. A great reader, and taking especial delight in the literature of advanced thought, he arrived in America with marked libertarian tendencies, which steadily developed until, a dozen years ago, as a reader of Liberty, he became an outspoken Anarchist. Since then Anarchism has had no stancher or more vigilant champion than Henry Bool. And in the crisis precipitated by the tragic events of September 1, 1901, a well-nigh single-handed, almost alone even among Anarchists, made heroic efforts to stem the tide of insanity that swept the country. He printed leaflet after leaflet, in editions of thousands of copies, containing well-chosen matter setting forth the true nature of the Anarchist movement, and spent hundreds of dollars in circulating them among intelligent people. In the madness of the moment many of his old friends turned away, and the leading journal of Ithaca, edited by one of his former intimates now a Republican official, went so far as to recommend his ostracism. But he never flinched, and now his courage and his loyalty are never at a discount, and the respect of all those whose respect is valuable.

Among the onslaughts of which he was the object during and after those days of stress, one—"the shape of an anonymous letter from a patriotic Ithacan, is especially worthy of record, presenting, as it does, an illuminating contrast between the patriotism of the sender and the Anarchism of the recipient. At the request of the editor of Liberty, to whom it had been forwarded for his private perusal, Mr. Bool has consented to its publication.

Ithaca, N. Y., Aug. 11, 1902.

Mr. Henry Bool:

Dear Sir—I am in receipt of a Pamphlet entitled Liberty Luminaries, published by yourself. I am very glad that you sent me this for it serves to confirm my idea, that this 20th Century is developing a lot of Lunatics. Some of the Type of the slackers of Goldfield, Nevada, Mr. Kinley, and some of a mildler type like yourself.

Your idea of Anarchy, viz:—the absence of all God's shows conclusively that you are slowly but surely sliding into the dangerous Class.

If you should lack the courage to yourself, remove some ominous Official, there is no doubt, but your teachings and those of your ilk, will eventually lead some poor devil to the Electric Chair. It would be a mistake, for I think the time is not far distant when the Teacher, instead of the dupe, should be hustled into direct contact with about 2000 Volts—Mr. Bool, I say to you, last when I read Pogue 37 or certain portions of it, "Cousellor:—ừng Root's Backtracks!" I felt that I would like to express to you, with the Water Cure that you speak of, with you for a subject.

It is but a few years ago that you came to this Country, and City—apparently with a view. I can remember when used to go to my back Door, soliciting the framing of Pictures. It seems to me, that it ill becomes you, to use the language, which you do, as applied to the President of this Country, A Country in which it would be for you to acquire the competency, which you obviously possess in so short a time.

My Great Grand Father was a Soldier in the War of the Revolution, and a Soldier in the War of 1812. Both did thine duty, thank God, and assisted in thine humble way, in giving the British a good sound licking, and I gave three Years to my Country, during the War of the Rebellion. With all this in view, it makes me ask any individual John Bull, presume to speak slightly, or disrespectfully of this blessed and most glorious Country the Sun shines on in spite of British, Empery, and Jealousy, and especially when such expressions as you use, comes from one who has prospered as you have, under the protection of the Dear old Stars and Stripes.

No Mr Bool it want do—intelligent people size you up for what you are, A would be disturber of the public peace. An agitator, whose feedle rods and insane Vagaries are like the morning Fog-concealed by the Sunbeams of intelligence and common-sense scene. I bet echo the idea of hosts of people who deplore the fact that you are gradually sinking into a condition of mind, that will eventually lead to your once prepared for such poor unfortunate as you at Wiltard. So John, mend your ways—while there is time, perhaps if you would at once, return to your native Chalk Hills—dost you know, and throw your insane Ideas Overboard in mild Ocean—you might recover a normal condition of mind—with these few remarks I leave you to your meditations—

Yours Truly.

An American Born Citizen.

International War.

The world has been full of fighting for some time; now comes a momentary pause, so far as concerns the chief civilized nations of the temperate zones. Let us take a trial balance to see what goes to profit and loss.

As to the nominal parties of the wars: Crete will never be henceforth be governed by its friends, instead of its enemies. Greece, if I remember right, has lost a bit of frontier to Turkey. Cuba will be governed mainly by the Cubans, under an American protectorate; incidentally, the United States has the discredit of a broken pledge under c.c. circumstances that furnish too excuse. The Philippines pass from a bad foreign master to another whose treatment of dark-colored races has always hitherto been bad. Doubtless the higher offices in the Philippines will attract a more respectable class of men than are America's Indian agents; but wish I could see the assurance that the small offices, which will have much to do with the every-day life of the Filipinos, will be better filled. Porto Rico and Guatemala have had worse laws. Cuba is now less connected with the Chinese emprise, nor closed to foreign intercourse; it has become a bone of contention between Japan and Russia, one of the likeliest causes of a new war. Manchuria has two owners instead of one, with a jealous neighbor wanting to fight over it. Formosa, a colony of Chinamen with a large native race on one side of it, is subject to the Japanese. The territorial rights of foreign powers in sunny Chinese cities are slightly extended. A number of missionaries and their Chinese friends are dead; a good deal of their property has been destroyed, and after a cord for by the destroyers and their neighbors; a few of high Chinese officials are degraded or dead; various expiatory ceremonies, supposed to be very impressive to the Chinese mind, have taken place on account of murdered Europeans. The "mutual protectorate " of Italy and Abyssinia has been interrupted by the attempt... conquest of Abyssinia and the destruction of a large Italian army. The last important subject of Arab slave-trading power in Africa, the rebellious Egyptian Sudan, has been brought under British control. The western Sudan has passed, if from a Mohammedan tyrant (about the worst of native rulers) to the French (none of the best of foreign rulers). The Transvaal, formerly under a very corrupt and illiberal government with great possibilities of improvement by experimentation.
Vain Pleas for "Union."

In a recent issue of "The Free Comrade," J. Wm. Lloyd made an appeal for reconciliation and union of all Socialist idealists, and offered a platform upon which all such reformers might stand. What prevented co-operation between Anarchists and the Architic reformers, he pointed out, was the spirit of aggression in the platforms of the latter schools, and, if this were dropped, the obstacle to harmonious and united action would vanish. And he logically suggested the recognition by the aforementioned Archists of the right of individual secession and of the freedom of competition. We learn from a subsequent number that Mr. Lloyd has received several encouraging replies from representative men. He quotes a few, as follows:

Ernest Crosby thinks it the word that needs to be spoken, but an ideal whose realization is yet afar off. Bolton Hall says one's "dream" of unity is good—but... the fact is that but few, as yet, desire liberty either for themselves or others. Most persons are restrictionists and prohibitionists, and have no confidence in freedom, because they think men are bad." Leonard Abbott affirms his acceptance of the principle of free secession as a fundamental right. E. C. Walker likens my programme of the non-advocacy of violence and the fundamental recognition of liberty, but without faith in the power of political parties, to his breath. Thos. E. Will, vice-president of Union College and general manager of the Western Cooperative Association, cordially approves the spirit of my move, and says that he also has been working for a re-adoption of Single Taxes and Socialists... Chas. W. Kerr and R. B. Kerr, in "Ludlow," express International Socialism as already admissible of the doctrine of free secession and the autonomy of the group.

Commenting on these, Mr. Lloyd says that Bolton Hall has put the finger on the true difficulty; and he adds:

v. the country—cannot the stupidest board of health predict the result?

But to come back to Czolgosz. From the fifties to the seventies the world was full of wars—Japan, China, India, all Europe, the United States, Mexico, South Africa, etc., I know not what and—of assassinations of presidents, emperors, sultans, prime ministers, and the like. This, then, is the situation to the middle of the nineties. The world had comparative rest from war, and dignitaries from assassination. Next comes the recurrence of war which I have been discussing, and with it a most notorious recurrence of assassination. And in both periods the assassin nations have mostly come in or near those countries which had just been at war. The periods of assassination drag a trifle later than the periods of war. Such facts demand attention. For myself, I see no puzzle in them. The existence of a contagious psychological "war fever," whereby the sight of nations at war makes nations willing to go to war, is notorious. Let this sort of psychological suggestion act on a man whose tendency is to isolated and erratic action, and what can you expect but assassination? The idea of affecting great public interests by a bullet seems to be an essential part of the suggestion, for private murders in the United States decreased during the war period. Perhaps this is because those who have an appetite for slaughter join the army. I should think it likely.

STEVEN T. BYINGTON.

Mr. Hall has put the case in a nutshell, but Mr. Lloyd misunderstands him. If all reformers desired liberty and had a due comprehension of it, unity would of course be possible—for the very simple reason that they would all be Anarchists. There would be nothing suggestive of compromise or concession on anybody's part in the resultant "basis" of co-operative action. Men who agree naturally work together. Mr. Hall's remark amounts to this—that Socialists and Free Thinkers are Architic Reformers. Certainly whatever governments do not unite with Anarchists cannot be they are respectively Socialists and Single Taxers and Architic Communists. Not exactly a wonderful discovery, nor a special (or general) indorsement of Mr. Lloyd's scheme or effort toward unity!

The "first step" indicated by Mr. Lloyd would also be the last. He invites the Architic reformers to commit suicide, and he calls that compromise! The collectivist who says "Amen!" to his programme is no longer a collectivist. Common ownership of the means of production and exchange for those who voluntarily choose that form of organization, with private enterprise, private capital, and free competition for those who object to collectivism, is not the collectivism of the State Socialists. Communism plus group and individual secession is not the Communism favored by the Most-Kropotkino school. And taxation of land values for the benefit of those who consent to apply the "uncarned increment" to a common object, with full freedom to remain outside of, or to withdraw at any time from, this pool, is not the Single Tax as taught by George and his followers, including Bolton Hall. Can't Mr. Lloyd see this?

As to his diagnosis of the trouble which divides reformers, it is entirely unsound. It is not a distrust of human nature that makes the group afraid to drop the affirmation of inclusive authority. And it is the history of human aggression that justifies this fear. And, as long as this fear and its justification continue, human society is impossible. The one-step approach, then, is that the acceptance by all parties of the principle that each individual must have liberty and opportunity to work out his own ideals in his own way, and that each group of co-operating individuals must have like liberty and opportunity—each and all invading not one the other, etc. To secede from any or all the others at any moment of inclination.

Mr. Ball has put the case in a nutshell, but Mr. Lloyd misunderstands him. If all reformers desired liberty and had a due comprehension of it, unity would of course be possible—for the very simple reason that they would all be Anarchists. There would be nothing suggestive of compromise or concession on anybody's part in the resultant "basis" of co-operative action. Men who agree naturally work together. Mr. Hall's remark amounts to this—that Socialists and Single Taxers and Architic Reformers do not unite with Anarchists because they are respectively Socialists and Single Taxers and Architic Communists. Not exactly a wonderful discovery, nor a special (or general) indorsement of Mr. Lloyd's scheme or effort toward unity!

The "first step" indicated by Mr. Lloyd would also be the last. He invites the Architic reformers to commit suicide, and he calls that compromise! The collectivist who says "Amen!" to his programme is no longer a collectivist. Common ownership of the means of production and exchange for those who voluntarily choose that form of organization, with private enterprise, private capital, and free competition for those who object to collectivism, is not the collectivism of the State Socialists. Communism plus group and individual secession is not the Communism favored by the Most-Kropotkino school. And taxation of land values for the benefit of those who consent to apply the "uncarned increment" to a common object, with full freedom to remain outside of, or to withdraw at any time from, this pool, is not the Single Tax as taught by George and his followers, including Bolton Hall. Can't Mr. Lloyd see this?

As to his diagnosis of the trouble which divides reformers, it is entirely unsound. It is not a distrust of human nature that makes the group afraid to drop the affirmation of inclusive authority. And it is the history of human aggression that justifies this fear. And, as long as this fear and its justification continue, human society is impossible. The one-step approach, then, is that the acceptance by all parties of the principle that each individual must have liberty and opportunity to work out his own ideals in his own way, and that each group of co-operating individuals must have like liberty and opportunity—each and all invading not one the other, etc. To secede from any or all the others at any moment of inclination.
Taxers) is incompatible with economic equity and social equality.

Thus the appeal for reconciliation and union is based on two fundamental fallacies. Reconciliation will become possible when either the Archistic or the Anarchistic reformers shall repudiate their present views and embrace those of the opposite side. The collectivist who adopts Mr. Lloyd’s free-recession plank ipso facto proclaims himself an Anarchist. A la bonne heure! More power to the peace-maker’s elbow, provided he converts what they are committing themselves to, and mean to stick to the terms of the capitulation.

There will be no stampede in Mr. Lloyd’s direction, and that his appeal, carefully and intelligently interpreted, will fall on deaf ears. We shall have to worry along without the unity will o’ the wisp.

"We believe," says the New York "Evening Post," that are many cases in which a union should meet its ways under penalty of being outlawed by society." In another sentence: it specifies as one of those many cases the case in which a union is "unreasonable in its stipulations." Undoubtedly, then, the phrase "outlawed by society" is not used by the "Post" in the sense of suppression by law; for the "Post" cannot yet have so far departed from its old-time political philosophy r: : advocated legal suppression of everything "unreasonable." Then it must have used this phrase in the sense of ostracism by boycott by (if that be not a pleonasm). But the boycott is one of the "bestest sins of unionism" at which the "Post" is continually railing. No sooner does a union declare a boycott than the "Post" brands it as cruel and cowardly. By its own showing, then, the "Post" is itself cruel and cowardly in proposing to boycott certain unions. Evidently the real position of the "Post" is one of hostility to boycotting by unions and approval of boycotting of unions. It is always a question of whose ox is gored. Some years ago, when the ox chosen to be John Wanamaker’s, the "Post"'s horns were as sharp as another’s. Its moralizing of-to-day should always be read is: the light of the fact that it once devolved columns, day after day, through weeks and months, to a systematic boycott of certain New York merchants who were so "unreasonable" as to refuse advertising in its pages. How "cruel" "how cowardly" how "un-American"! And yet, comparatively speaking, the "Post" is an honest newspaper. What a reflection on its contemporaries!

In the examination of John Mitchell before the strike commission the question of boycotting received considerable attention. "Does the miners’ union sanction boycotting?" Mitchell was asked. He answered that he believed it in the right of any man to boycott his patronage, and where he pleased. This did not satisfy the coal trust’s attorneys or the commission, and Judge Gray sternly told Mitchell that he was dodging the question. The right to withhold one’s patronage, he said, was not in point. Did the miners approve of so using the boycott as to deprive a man of the necessities of life, and thus condemn him to starvation, etc.? No, answered Mitchell, "emphatically." Of course he was either illogical and inconsistent, or too discreet to tell the whole truth. But were the plutocratic lawyers and the commission less inconsistent? If Judge Gray admits the right to withhold one’s patronage, his question was absurd. The effect of such withholding may be starvation; that depends on the value of the boycotters’ patronage and the anxiety of the merchants in the community to retain it. But, starvation or mere inconvenience, the principle is the same; the boycotters do nothing beyond bestowing their own patronage where they please. The significance which the newspapers and pretended champions of liberty discovered in Judge Gray’s austere cross-examination has no real existence. The trouble is that these lawyers, judges, and editors use terms without understanding, and assert principles which they have not the sense or courage to follow to their logical conclusions. A strike, like a boycott, may condemn some people to starvation, but that does not affect the right to strike. The consequences do not concern us in either case; the nature of the act is the controlling consideration: It is (presuming to know that Mr. Gompers and the organ of the American Federation of Labor vigorously and consistently upheld the right of boycotting in its extreme manifestations. Their inconsistency appears in loudly and bitterly denounced the blacklist, which is simply the employer’s boycott.

Ernest Crosby, in his magazine, "The Whirl," rebukes Lord Wolseley for declaring, in a manual for soldiers, that the man who is unwilling to spy and lie in war had better shear his sworfor forever. Now, of two things: one: either Lord Wolseley believes in offensive warfare as a profession, and then he is to be rebuked chiefly, not for the methods employed in the vocation, but for the vocation itself; or else he believes only in defensive warfare, and then his belief in the admissibility of spying and lying as means thereof cannot be successfully controverted. A witness in a certain political investigation declared to his cross-examiner: "A lie is a false statement made to one entity to know the truth." It may be questioned whether this is a correct definition of a lie, but it certainly defines with precision an unjustifiable lie. Now, an invader forfeits, by his invasive act, all claim to knowledge of the truth from the invaded, and, if the invaded feels under obligation to acknowledge such claim, he is a pitiable victim of specious-sounding arguments, and a splendid opportunity to expose what Mr. Crosby properly calls "the low standard of military honor" without depriving the oppressed of one of their most effective defences against oppression. There are times when to tell the truth is to sink to the foulest depth of cowardice and disgrace.

The Chicago "Public," a paper which I find, on the whole, so admirable that its existence went far more than anything else to reconcile me to the recent suspension of Liberty, protests very justly against the charge of recantation brought against Mrs. Eddy, the Christian Science leader, because of her recent advice to her healers to allow the employment of physicians in the treatment of infectious and contagious diseases. But the "Public" goes too far in the other direction when it says that Mrs. Eddy was moved to this course by respect for the rights of others. It is only too manifest that Mrs. Eddy’s motive was simply fear. Her concession, coming as it did on the heels of a indictment of one of her healers, indicates clearly that she thought it more prudent to retain her grip on the major portion of the income which she obtains by her pecuniary per se, because, by over-reaching, to run a risk of losing it all. She has had no new light respecting the rights of others, and, if regard for their rights were a motive at all, it had been of another sort. Then there is the motive of danger to take the course to which she was moved. It must not be inferred that I approve either the indictment of the healer or the law under which he is indicted. For any law that would deprive Mrs. Eddy’s patients of their clear right to employ her and her healers to the exclusion of all other physicians I have even greater contempt, if possible, than for Mrs. Eddy herself. But it warms me not a little to see a usually judicious journal crediting this greedy impostor with generosity and love of justice.

President Roosevelt, in a letter written to a Southerner in defence of his appointment of colored men to office, says: "How any one could have gained the idea that I had said I would not appoint reputable and upright colored men to office when objection was made to them solely on account of their color, I confess I am wholly unable to understand." A later sentence in the same letter reads as follows: "It has been my consistent policy, in every State where their numbers warranted it, to recognize colored men of good repute and standing in the king appointer to office." It is a legitimate inference from this last sentence that, in States where their numbers did not warrant it, it has not been the president’s policy to recognize colored men to office. In other words, in such States it has been his policy to ignore, simply because of the objection to their color, the claims of colored men to office. This being so, it is perfectly easy for any rational person to understand how any one could have gained the idea that the president “would not appoint reputable and upright colored men to office when objection was made to them solely on account of their color.” If President Roosevelt is “wholly unable to understand” this, he cannot be a wholly rational person. It is rather to be supposed that he simply pretends to be unable to understand it, this supposition harmonizing better with the many incidents in his career which reveal I’m as a very artful and designing person.

The "Saturday Review," assailing the doctrine that commerce is a peacemaker between nations, links to a certain extent, by establishing the undisputed fact that commercial greed has been the cause of nearly all modern wars. But the two propositions are not antagonistic. In every instance where the “Saturday Review” cites, the trouble originated in governmental effort to place restriction on e-commerce, this effort being inspired by a desire for commercial advantage. Of course every authori-
tarian restriction is liable to breed a fight for liberty. But how does this controvert the proposition that, given a condition of free trade, the resultant interweaving of interests develops a tendency to preservation of the peace, or the other proposition that the substitution of training in the shop for training in the camp makes man less and less a soldier? Of some fanatical autocrats, never, by the spirit of persecution instead of by the spirit of greed, were to order his subjects to destroy all works of art in their possession, and the entire modern world moved by a feeling of indignation at this act of vandalism, were to unite for the forcible demolition of this monarch, would the fact establish the doctrine that practice of the fine arts fosters the war spirit?

Speaking of the lease of the Manhattan Railroad Company to the Interborough Rapid Transit Company, Mr. August Belmont, one of the directors of the latter, says: "It is believed that this plan, when perfected, will work out a prompt and satisfactory system of interborough transit, both lessor and lessee being thereby engaged in a common effort to stimulate, increase, and develop facilities for transportation, rather than—as would have been the case if the properties had remained separate—being engaged largely in the effort to divert traffic the one from the other." If lessor and lessee were pure philanthropists, they doubtless would engage in the "common effort" specified; but, as the Goulds, the Sages, and the Beltmen are reputed to possess the commercial instinct in a more than ordinary degree, it is much more likely that their common effort will be to carry the maximum of passengers in the minimum of space. If so, the people of these boroughs will be no better off for their famous rapid transit system.

One of the lawyers of the "independent" coal operators who exist by the grace of Bar & Co. imprudently referred, his cross-examination of a witness before the strike commission, to the idea of "Teddy Roosevelt." He was gravely rebuked by two commissioners, and the lawyer condescendingly said: "We will call him the president of the United States." That's right; the retainers of the benevolent lords of our present feudal system must not be too hasty. The magnates are not ready to take off their masks and dispense with the forms of "popular government." They put their men in, and know them as Teddy, Tommy, Billy, Johnny, etc. They make this one president, that one governor, senator, judge, etc. But appearances must be kept up—for the present. Matters are not quite ripe for proclaiming the reign of "benevolent feudalism." But only "benevolent," Mr. Groat. The new barons have to profess benevolence; to practice it there is no need at all.

The taming of the rough-riader would make fine material for a bouffe oper"in. In the 1901 message to congress Roosevelt used, lectured, preached, and demanded; in the message of 1902 he was as deferential, and considerate, and careful not to offend congress, as the smooth politician to the manner born. The second message was less impertinent, and it is not for Liberty to encourage presidential impudence and presumption. But in Roosevelt the change of tone betokens, not discretion and respect for propriety, but retreat and surrender to the bosses and plutocratic agents in congress. At one time the trust magnates actually hated and feared him—though the fear was groundless. Now they probably laugh in their sleeves, and consider him quite safe and harmless. Soon they will like him, for a president who can humble the restive and discontented elements in the Republican and Populist parties is a valuable asset.

M. Georges Lorand quotes in "L'Aurore" from the "Outlaw," of New York, which numbered M. Roosevelt among its collaborators up to the time of his call to the presidency. It is singular that Roosevelt, who began his first message to congress with one of the most historical diatribes against Anarchism ever penned,—a diatribe, by the way, which, having passed unheeded by press, he remembered to forget in his second—saying, should have been thereby a collaborator to Anarchistic, as to lead no less a person than M. Lorand, a well-informed Belgian publicist, to mistake its title, the "Outlook," for the "Outlaw."

Says Ironica in "Lucifer": "Socialism is coming. So are cyclones, earthquakes, and tidal waves. What then? Simply this: things are not good just because they are coming." True enough. But there is an important difference between Socialist and cyclones. The latter are unavoidable; they come regardless of our will. But, if the former comes, it will do so at our invitation. Socialism may come, but it will not come to stay; it will come merely as a visitor, foolishly hidden. We shall be made very uncomfortable before we get rid of our guest, and it will suit us right.

That immaculate sheet, the New York "Times," which prints "all the news that's fit to print," finds smutty stories fit to print when Mark Twain tells them.

Zola's Spiritual Unity.

The "Conservateur" prints a collection of tributes to Zola specially written for it by Comte Lovel Triggs, Edwin Markham, Francis Howard Williams, Benj. R. Tucker, and the editor, Horace L. Yablud. Mr. Tucker's contribution appears below.

The death of Zola and the impudent presumption of the American press and people in condensing to condone, in view of his later sublimity, what they profess to look upon as his early depravity combine to prompt me to the chance of a sort. Over a life was spiritually integral, that life was Edma Zola's. Those who split it into two parts, labelling one Hyde and the other Jekyll, thereby show themselves incapable of appreciating the highest heroism. The necessarily conscribed, the ephemeral and exact individual Zola, great though it was, shrinks into comparative insignificance beside that obscure and dogged, but gloriously triumphant, struggle of twenty years for which they revile him, and b, which his dauntless and indomitable spirit brought a hypocritically unwilling world to its knees, in face of the appalling revelation of its own rottenness, before that unparalleled opprobrium, which begins with "La Fortune des Rougon"

and ended with "Dr. Pauwels." The greater includes the less, and to the man who had so stubbornly traced the history of the Second Empire in the lives of the Rougon-Macquart, it was an immense task to play the part that he did in the history of the Third Republic. His civic achievement in restoring liberty to Dreyfus was but the flowering of his long and literate warrring for a whole presenting a consistent and unifying growth of essential and high nobility. Whose admires the beauty of the blossom should have the decency to at least respect the gnarled and knotted trunk through which beauty came, and even though its own and picturesque grandeur be beyond his ken.

A Bishop's Objections to Divorce.

To the Editor of Liberty:

In one of the Godly-Heretic's papers a short time ago there appeared an article by Bishop H. Gabriels on the subject of divorce, and, as I have seen no reply to it in any of the public prints, I wish to call the attention of the readers of Liberty to a small portion of it:

He begins by stating that "Divorce is the agent of evil that parts forever hearts which once were welded together by love, but an agent more cruel than death." Without pausing to wonder at the strange position of bishop who refers to death as an "agent," and at other times as the entrance into a higher and happier life, I will simply note that he errs in saying that divorce is the agent that parts the hearts of those once wed. The parting had occurred before; else there would be no desire for the divorce. Divorce is desired only by those who no longer find it satisfactory to be together—or at least one of the parties concerned finds the union unsatisfactory. It seems, then, that what the bishop really objects to are the hearts "once welded together by love." In so far as that is concerned, I know of nobody who does not wish the same thing. But that a condition antedating divorce, and not one caused by it.

Then the bishop says: "Divorce keeps the one loved, but now hated, near enough to embitter his or her existence, shunned or detested by the very children that owe him their life." Perhaps in this utterance we may find an inkling of why divorce is desired; for one (either man or woman) who could change love is to hate simply because of a desire on the part of the other to be freed from an unsatisfactory condition of human association would not likely be a very lovable or charming person to many people. If it were my case, I am sure I would consider it a blessing to have such a person shun and detest me. And I should not have any wish to hate in return, either. I could see nothing hateful in either of us in such a course. But then, I'm not a bishop.

Let me quote again from the bishop, as follows:

What can be more diabolic of human society than to have in its midst men and women, devotedly married by the strongest natural ties, become immersed and each other, expelled from their former homes, widowed of living former partners in wedlock, who have contracted new bonds, deprived of the present, driven upon whom God doth, when we visit the life of a widow or a husband, like a raging fire, or to be driven from each other? A marriage is no more, in the strictest sense, a contract, a marriage, a war of individual life, a condition of affairs, doesn't it? But let us regard that ward of verbiage, and see how it looks. Does divorce destroy "natural tie"? Can law make a daughter destroy anything else than sea or daughter? Can law give a right to destroy? No, divorce does not destroy the natural relationship. Nor can marriage create, nor divorce destroy, affection.

Nor does it follow that people who are divorced for the death of one of them or for divorce of any other cause are necessarily to be considered as having no affection. Many, if not all, will continue to cherish that affection when separated. Others may always hope that it will be of use in the future, if not to express it here. Divorce is sought to protect a new relationship, not to destroy the natural relationship. Nor can marriage create, nor divorce destroy, affection.

Now, such an involved question is too complex and condition of affairs, doesn't it? But let us regard that ward of verbiage, and see how it looks. Does divorce destroy "natural tie"? Can law make a daughter destroy anything else than sea or daughter? Can law give a right to destroy? No, divorce does not destroy the natural relationship. Nor can marriage create, nor divorce destroy, affection.

Nor does it follow that people who are divorced for the death of one of them or for divorce of any other cause are necessarily to be considered as having no affection. Many, if not all, will continue to cherish that affection when separated. Others may always hope that it will be of use in the future, if not to express it here. Divorce is sought to protect a new relationship, not to destroy the natural relationship. Nor can marriage create, nor divorce destroy, affection.

Now, such an involved question is too complex and
for the bishop's implication involves a denial of such a settlement. Possibly the children are killed, as was done in old Testament times, when women and children were slain at the pleasure of the ruler—or bishop. (For one reference, see Numbers 31:17th and 18th verses.)

On the question of "living former partners" it seems to me there is nothing involved but geography. If the one woman is in China, or India, or any other tangible locality, with no intention of ever returning, it would be wrong, from the standpoint of the good bishop, for the one left behind to marry again. Even if she has gone to heaven to hell, it is all right, as the bishop sees it, for the one left behind to take another "life partner." And yet I am sure that one sees deep in "the faith" as the good bishop will not for a moment deny that heaven and hell are separate places that we have gone there (however reluctantly) are living. To deny that would be to upset the theology that draws all the funds; and then how would bishops and other self-appointed agents of an omnipotent power get away with it?

The most fear of our good man is that "no one, any longer, wherever divorce prevails, can account himself sure of the wife of his bosom or of the children of his love." Possibly the bishop's experience has led him to that conclusion. For I will admit that, whether or not divorce prevails, one cannot always feel sure of "the children of his love"; but it seems to me that divorce has nothing whatever to do with the ability of a husband or wife to retain the affection of the other. A continuous process preceding marriage, when such was carried to be considerable of the feelings and tastes of the other, will do more to kill all desire for divorce than can be affected by all the legislation of all the legislatures of all. And nothing else is yet known to do it. All matters of affection are as entirely outside the realm, and power, of legislation as is the color of one's eyes.

Now we come to the root of the whole matter, as the bishop thinks. I do not know if he is not a bishop? Can you guess what that root-trouble is? Well, I'll tell you. It is—"the independent interpretation of the scriptures." That is the little insect that is eating the hole in the bottom of that ship called the human race, and we will all go to the bottom, sure, unless its borer is broken off—or, at the very least, badly blunted. So, conceding that we must give up the "independent interpretation of the scriptures," anyone who works us? But here the friendliness of the good bishop is shown, for he admits, freely and frankly, that the great Catholic church is willing to do it, and, in point of fact, is the only agency able to do it. That's a severe reflection on Mr. Hun and Mr. Bradstreet, but I, for one, am willing to turn over to the good bishop and his church my share of the said interpretation. I am forced to admit that I've tried hard to do it for myself—and failed. But can the bishop guarantee success? I fear my faith is not of the stern and rugged Roussetian quality, as regards that; for in two adjoining sentences he speaks of "the standard so unfailingly borne yet for nineteen centuries by the Catholic church," preference to one Miss Tawkes to wed again, after having being divorced! In the old days the people, it seems, could defy even the Royal Eagles, but nowadays even the Hawk have divorces! Too bad, or had, let us hope that in the next world, in that same, way will be provided whereby all people who are miserable as the result of having made unfortunate sexual associations shall be forced to remain in their misery forever. Then we can sing, without interruption, our hearts and hardships, if that be the condition which she is in, that she should be divorced? Well, I am still able to thank Fate that I'm not a bishop.

Consciences of Another Sort. [Mrs. Sweeney in "La Journal"]

In the month of December, 1900, there was at Verdun a young named Petit, in the fifth company of the one hundred and sixty-second of the line.

After having submitted with docility to the pre- liminaries of military instruction and given proof of subordination and good will, suddenly one fine morning he flitted away from the regiment.

"My conscience," said he, "forbids me to learn to kill my fellow-man."

There was general surprise, for Petit, I repeat, was far from having a wilful disposition. They watched him. They reasoned with him. They threatened him. All to no purpose. He contended himself with shaking his head and formulating his sole reply:

Then he put him in a cell. To his guards he replied:

"See, I undergo this treatment because I do not wish to become a murderer."

He appeared before the court martial of the sixth corps. His attitude remained the same, without bravado; pleading "conscience." He was sentenced to three years' imprisonment.

In November, 1901, the soldier Gontaudier, profiting by that provision of the law which relates to those having a family dependent upon them (and by the benevolence of the minister of war), was sent back to his \\n
Hence the case was one of the most singular.

Having returned from America expressly to partici- pate in the drawing for military service, and being therefore anything but refractory, he had, shortly after August, the date of his incorporation in the army, declined to receive a gun on the ground of conscientious scruples.

It was not his intention to refuse any other duty; he begged to be utilized in administrative or hospital service, at any task, however menial or repulsive.

Military justice inflicted two years' imprisonment upon him. He served them. After which he was sent back to the regiment to complete his period of military service.

Once more they handed him a gun; again he refused it. "My religious convictions," he declared, "cannot be modified in any way."

The dungeon saw him again, and also the court martial, who had always been the same as before. For two more years Gontaudier had an opportunity of reflecting in secret on the difficulty of harmonizing the teachings of the gospel with the commandments of the code.

On the other hand, the case aroused some feeling, even among the steadfast. There were intercessions, the more remarkable and effective because of their unexpected origin.

The sentence was shortened a little; the original petition was listened to; for the twenty-seven months of service still due Gontaudier was placed in a section of military nurses at Lyons.

The sentence, in a final release, it having been discovered that he had a family dependent on him. Beside a year of military service, he had served four years in prison.

Thirteen months later, at Belfort, in the barracks of the sixth battalion of foot artillery, a "blue" named Grasellino, born at Glomagany (Haute-Rhin), in 1875, likewise refused to learn the manipulation of cannon.

Here again there had been no premonition of such a decision. At the outset he had complied gracefully with all the requirements, and seemed likely to serve as an example to all his comrades.

But now he said:

"My conscience forbids me to bear arms against my fellow,—to learn to kill them."

They read to him the articles of the military code dealing with refusal to obey and concluding in the usual way. He listened to them sadly, without a shadow of bravado.

He answered:

"I cannot. Jesus Christ has said: 'Thou shalt not kill. Love one another.' I do not wish to injure others."

They put him in the dungeon. An inquiry was instituted as to his sincerity and responsibility,—whether he was not acting under influences external to his own will.

Atavism and education! His father wrote from Tarn to the commander of the six battalion of artillery, declaring, that as an Alsatian and an old soldier of 1870, he denied his son.

Previous tendencies? His employer, M. Martin, of Lyons, had for him nothing but praise, notifying solely by reproach of his humanist, an and evangelical asceticism. He set apart a portion of his wages for the aid of those poorer than he. In short, a little madman, excellently concluded the manufacturer.

Military decision? Grasellino, formerly summoned before the council of revision as too slender, had been placed under observation at the Bosançon hospital, from December 22 to January 6, Major Olivier being assigned by the health service for his examination. Then, in his report, affirmed most positively the perfect health of the subject, both physically and morally. His concluding sentence is worthy of preservation. "The accused simply draws exaggerated inferences from the principles of Christian teaching." Such was the diagnosis upon the court martial of the seventh corps, which tried Grasellino on January 28.

They learned what his readings were, not very or- dinary for a small farmer: Ecclesiastics, Eckermann, Chatrin, Victor Hugo, Tolstoi.

The presiding judge, Colonel Christé, was affable with him. But, when the judge said: "You had no occasion to discuss; you had received an order," the accused replied: "Above my superior, who are men, there is Christ!"

Frédéric Joseph Grasellino was sentenced to two years' imprisonment.

Between his act and its expiation there occurred the Doleb incident, in the thirty-fifth of the fine, at Belfort.

Always the same reply:

"No weapon! Nothing with which to kill!"

Sergeant Ribaud, Sergeant-Major Tarby, Adjutant Fleur, Lieutenant Pierre, Captain Ménest, Lieutenant-Colonel Baud, Colonel Soubré, and even General Deslauriers failed to dissuade him. Then they sent for his father, who also vainly implored him to yield.

"Well, what have you to say in your defense?" instead the presiding judge of the court martial be- fore which Deslauriers appeared, prior to the trial of Grasellino.

"Nothing. I want no weapon; I do not wish to kill!"

He was sentenced to two years imprisonment.

On February 9, 1902, in the Reservoir barracks, at Brest, the soldier Soubré, of the ninth company of the nineteenth infantry, relative of the senator from Finistère, who had died shortly before, answered Captain Bonnot.

"I do not wish to make use of any murderous weapon capable of destroying one of my fellows. You can keep me until the age of fifty-five, but then you will be obliged to give me back my liberty."

This one, pushing his principles to the extreme, never met, because he did not aim at he had a right to destroy any living creature.

The military tribunal of the eleventh corps, sitting at Nantes, must have decided his case, but I do not know of the length of the sentence.

Probably the tariff remained the same,—two years' imprisonment.

Petit, Grasellino, Debol, and Soubré, severely punished, are still in prison. I venture to rely on
Subsidy as a Tool of Tyranny.

(From the Public.)

In his report the postmaster-general describes the mailing rights of periodical publishers under the law as a subsidy. If this is true, and we agree with the postmaster-general that it is, there is no reason why the postmaster-general proposes. He asks for the privilege, practically antedated, of distributing the subsidy himself. Nothing more dangerous in the way of bureaucracy could be proposed. It is bad enough that "Harper’s Magazine," for instance, should receive an enormous postal subsidy, amounting to thousands of dollars a month, while the share of the "Cross Roads Gazette" is only a few cents a week. But, if the postmaster-general were empowered to pick and choose, allowing a share of the subsidy to this publisher and denying it to that one, the situation would be infinitely worse. If low rates of post-age for periodicals are in effect a subsidy to publishers, the remedy is to abolish them. Publishers would then have no more right to subsidies than farmers have, or contractors, or hod-carriers. Let a fair estimate be made of the cost of carrying publishers’ mail; then let the post-office be unfit to do simple and obvious work, such as delivering mail in bulk instead of affixing stamps; and you have a just arrangement, and one which has the merit of curing the censorship of the American press which the postal department assumes to exercise.

The evil in this matter would not be removed by discriminating between newspapers and magazines, as the postmaster-general also proposes, and granting the former at one cent a pound and the latter at four cents. Such a distinction would enormously increase the power of the postal autocrat to exclude papers he did not like. All he would need would be to decide that they are not newspapers, but only magazines.

Moreover, a subsidy is no more entitled to a postal subsidy than is a magazine. The postmaster-general is wrong (except from the point of view of paternalism) in advocating on educational grounds a postal subsidy for newspapers as distinguished from magazines. The discrimination of what is called "newspaper" is no more educational—-it is often less so—than the circulation of instructive magazines. But, if a distinction of this kind were made, "populistic" weeklies could easily be jammed into the magazine class, because they lack the prestige of the Associated Press, and so be compelled to pay higher postage than their plutocratic competitors. And this doublet is one of the objects of Postmaster-General Poinsett’s reform.

Is it imagined that the postmaster-general would make no unfair discrimination? Rough experience is a better witness than confiding expectation. Town in town there is a paper called "Freedom." Its teachings are not agreeable to the postmaster-general. Other papers in the same city are the same as every other paper in the country. A year or so ago the department denied it publishers’ rates. There was no hearing, no legal process of any kind, no consideration whatever of whether the citizen who put it out was a bureau-crat,Josefist. A by-passing was subsequently ordered at Washington, and the original order was revoked. There had confessedly been no cause whatever for denying ordinary publishers’ rights to the paper.

Yet nan time since the postal mail was required to be pre-dipped to safe conduct posture at first-class rates, as the condition of being allowed to continue the publication. Since the examination was prolonged, the delay required was heavy. It would have been enough to necessitate suspension, had the publisher been well off. Recently the department again attacked this paper. In one of its issues it printed an illustrated description of the town in which it is published, Sea Breeze, something that has long been common with newspapers. For that reason, and apparently for that reason alone, the department has again denied "Freedom" the publisher’s mailing rights. This only one instance that happens to be unusually prominent, but it is typical. It is an indication of what a corporation tool in the post department can do, if its opportunities for censorship were legion.

Fortunately the courts are now intervening to protect publishers from the high-handed policy of the postal bureau. Within the week, in the case of the "Monthly Official Railway List," which was ousted arbitrarily from the mails a year ago, the court of appeals of the District of Columbia has decided that, when a paper is once admitted to second-class privileges, it has a property right therein which cannot be withdrawn except by due process of law. This is good legal doctrine and sound political policy.

The Missing Lady.

(From the Public.)

The official emblem of the St. Louis Exposition is out, with the following ladies present:.—Columbus, Louisiana, Progress, Beehive, France, Agriculture, Commerce, and Science.

It is understood that Liberty would have waited. She then sheds a tear, the more as she grows older.

Eminently Fitted to Succeed.

(From the Public.)

My son, although only eight, already likes a sporter better than the best of books. A boy of eight. Rights on the slightest provocation, seems to be naturally cruel, and has no respect for anything. What shall be done? O, O.

So many careers open for your precocious boy that it is extremely difficult to choose, and you will have to wait and let him decide for himself. He might easily be a financier, a lawyer, a politician, a United States senator, or a yellow journalist.

INSTEAD OF A BOOK:

(From the Public.)

BY A MAN TOO BUSY TO WRITE ONE.

A FRAGMENTARY EXPOSITION OF PHILIPPAL ANARCHISM.

Called from the Writings of BENJ. R. TUCKER, of Boston and Philadelphia.

With a Full-Page Half-Tone Portrait of the Author.

A large, well-printed, and excessively cheap volume of 750 pages, containing much new and important matter, and classified under the following headings: (1) State Socialism and Communism; (2) The Individual, Society, and the State; (3) Money, State, and Kellogg; (4) Labor and Capitalism; (5) Methods; (6) Miscellaneous. The whole elaborately clothed, one dollar; paper, fifty cents. Mailled, post-paid, by the Publisher. BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 133, New York City.

What is Anarchism?


LINOTYPE & HAND COMPOSITION

Scientific and Technical Works

Examination Papers

Grammars, Dictionaries
The Ideophonic Texts
for Acquiring Languages

Edited by

ROBERT MORRIS PIERCE

German Texts for English Readers

Schiller's WILHELM TELL Act I. Four parallel texts, as shown in the following reduced facsimile of two facing pages. Editorial Critic: "George Heupli"
Professor of English Philology and General Linguistics in the University of Michigan. 144 pages, $1.00 net or $1.00 to any part of the world.

Schiller's WILHELM TELL Act II. Same arrangement as that of Act I. Editorial Critic: "George Heupli." Cloth. $1.25

French Texts for English Readers

Ludovic Halévy's L'ABBE CONSTANTIN Part I. Four parallel texts, similar in arrangement to those mentioned above. Editorial Critic: "George Heupli." Cloth. $1.50

The Study of Modern Languages in Boston, Mass.

From Le Maitre Phonétique for March, 1901

The publication of the Ideophonic Texts for Acquiring Languages . . . shows a zeal at once rare and determined in the teaching of languages by the phonetic method.

On the following pages appear four parallel texts of the subject-matter: a phonetic foreign language, an ordinary foreign language, a foreign-word rendering of the text, and a freer rendering of the text.

Students of phonetic systems are to be congratulated that the editor has not followed the usual custom of inventing a new system which they have to practice on before really starting in.

October, 1900

James Genoa, Professor of Romance Languages in the University of Boston

Greek Texts for English Readers

 Xenophon's ANABASIS Book I. Four parallel texts, similar in arrangement to those mentioned above. In the phonetic text the attempt is made to represent the actual Athenian pronunciation of the time of X.ophon. Consulting Editor: "George Heupli." Cloth. $1.00.

The issuance of the three volumes last mentioned will depend somewhat upon the number of the advance orders received for them. Other Series are contemplated, as of Anglo-Saxon, Chinese, Hebrew, Italian, Japanese, Latin,梵文, Sanskrit, and Arabic Texts for English Readers; as well as Series for other than English readers: at French Texts for German Readers and English Texts for French Readers.

John Locke:

"And to make the knowing and understanding of it..."

Edmond Demolins:

"In short, the only practical and rapid way of learning a language is..."

For WHAT Remarkable

For Its Fundamental Principle that languages are to be learned just as much by execution or habit, that idiom and vocabulary, to become sufficiently associated in the mind, only..."

For Its System of Phonetic Notation, the Universal Alphabet of "Le Maitre Phonétique" used in all the different countries. This alphabet has already been applied by all the different countries.

For Its Phonemic German Text giving the exact pronunciation and stress of each word as spoken in a particular country which it occurs. Pronunciations as commonly given in text-books are inaccurate.

For Its Ordinary German Text corresponding line for line and word for word. The texts are printed in large, clear Roman type.

For Its Verbal English Text, a word-for-word rendering of line for line with the ordinary German and phonetic German text, which student or instructor to find at a glance the literal meaning of each word in the particular context in which it occurs.

For Its Prose English Text giving the literal idea and spirit of the German, and often a literal rendering of the lines.

FACING PAGES OF "TELL"

What have I seen, then, a life is here, A wise and child at home or as well, I am bound to reason, and have my will. Let the whole world open in all its depth, Right gladly. I am not an unhappy man, Yet, he is happy, so you must see.

For WHOM Designed

For All Students of German, whether having had class instruction, or studying by themselves only, who wish to start right, not start wrong, to be conversant with the whole, not con-

For All Teachers who are Un- certain as to Pronunciation or rendering, or who have a local or imperfect, pronunciation, and who are accustomed, such as the phonetic text and the forword-word rendering for their own use at home or in the class.

For All Students who Read Aloud, and who students not read aloud more or less; in class only.

For All Teachers of German Phone-ology, who now confide to their teaching to me.

For All Students of General Phonetics and Philology, who are interested in the structure of the German language.