On Picket Duty.

The recent statement by the emperor of Germany that "many Americans would be willing to pay any sum to live and travel in the same cabin occupied by his," in a recent steamship voyage has caused many to wish to swell and breed to have in this country. Everybody knows, however, that the Kaiser's words very closely approximate the facts, which double as accounts for the indignation. If the imputation of swindling were false, nobody would do aught but laugh at the Kaiser's vanity.

In recent years it has been dreamed that in this country all newspapers printed in a foreign language are immune from censorship, either postal or other; but now the labor troubles in the mining districts in Colorado have resulted in the seizure of the offices of "Il Trovatore Italiano." This was done by a squad of soldiers acting under orders, and they confiscated a whole issue of the paper, which was just ready for distribution. "The paper has been encouraging the laborers," tactically adds the press disparage. Serious offense, that,—in Russia and the United States!

The God-in-the-constitution party seems to have scored one in securing the recognition of God in the recently-adopted constitution of the Republic of Panama. This ought to be a still greater source of satisfaction to them in view of the fact that the United States tacitly stands sponsor to the birth of this new republic, and thus, even if only to a slight extent, God is nearer to our own political door. After all, however, the existence or non-existence of the word "God" in the constitution is about as essential to the people of this country as is the flying or non-flying of the American flag over the public schools,—neither is question of worth the scratch of a post-office pen.

The New York City board of health has a regulation which prohibits "any soiled or dirty articles of clothing or bedding, in baskets or bundles," from being conveyed or carried in any of the street or elevated railway cars of the city. The "baskets or bundles" clause is a saving one, for everybody knows that, if this provision of the board of health is intended to prevent the spread of disease, the board might find much more danger in the "soiled or dirty clothing" that is carried not "in baskets or bundles," but upon the bodies of the patrons of the transportation lines. And it may even appeal the board of health to contemplate what it would involve to enforce its regulation against all soiled or dirty clothing carried in the cars.

The New York "Times" and some of its correspondents have run a few of a serious problem, in ethics, arising from the action of a little girl who saved the "yes" of some panic-stricken women by lying to them about a fire which was raging in a building. None of them is able to decide whether the girl's action was "right," but the "Times" concludes that the end was "good," whatever may be said of the means, although it half believes that these latter, "all things considered, are not bad." What would have been the conclusion if the girl's efforts to save the women's lives had been unsuccessful is awful to contemplate. It's too bad that these good people are in such a predicament over a question that answers itself when it is rationally put: Did the girl injure the panic-stricken women by lying to them and thus saving their lives?

Max Beerbohm, writing in the London "Saturday Review" of a new play (Maughan's "A Man of Honor"), says: "The play was very well received,—with many hearty laughs in the wrong places. There, you perceive, is the best chance of success of a modern tragedy. The public is so very unsuspicious." How true of all ordinary Anglo-Saxon audiences! And perhaps of other audiences, too. Any person who knows, for instance, a play like Shaw's "Candida," and who goes to see it because he knows and understands it, finds his nerves racked many times during the evening by inopportune, lighter—laughter which shows that the playwright's pathos has fallen where there is not sufficient intellect to recognize subtle and delicate art when it is there. Then, too, during the same evening, one may experience a feeling of poignant disappointment at the stolid indifference with which Shaw's delicious Irish satire is received. But it must be remembered that the average person has still a long way to go and much to experience before he will have attained to that perception of things real by which he will learn that the superstitions of the past, and of which he is so essentially a part, are of to-day the things unreal.

Speaking of the obvious desire of congress to adjourn without discussing the labor bills before that body, the New York "Evening Post" remarks: "Putting off work that has to be done merely doubles it. Questions that you refuse to settle when you can, have an ugly way of settling you later on." So, then, while the "Post" urges congress to have courage and defeat these measures, it admits that these labor problems are not so easily settled. While the anti-injunction bill, which is one of those referred to, is simply a resort to the time-honored method of invoking legislation to quell the evils of legislation, end, being the work of politicians, has not the virtue of being a frank and direct abolition of that tyrannical power which courts possess, it is nevertheless the voice of a sentiment that is growing in this country—a sentiment that will eventually, let us hope, grow strong enough to make itself felt by even the politicians. It would not be killed, as the "Evening Post" seems to imagine, by the mere defeat of the anti-injunction bill at this session of congress; the evil must be stopped, and the roots lie so deep that they can be reached only by repeal. Those who know what freedom means will not encourage any attempt that does not promise to strip the judiciary of the power to imprison a man unheard and untried by a jury.

Since Teddy Gripped My Hand.

The Rev. Dr. Cortlandt Myers of the Baptist Temple delivered an address on "Destiny" before a large audience of men in the Orpheum Theatre in Brooklyn under the auspices of the Young Men's Christian Association. The Rev. Mr. Myers said that President Roosevelt was a man of character who had lived "under the sceptre of duty." This last week," he said, "when I was in his private office with him and had the honor—the supreme honor—of shaking his hand—I do not think I washed that hand with soap stones. [Applause.] I do not think I will ever wash the memory off that hand."

"I would like to take that splendid grip with me out of this world into the next and have it as part of my resurrection life, for the man who shakes hands with Theodore Roosevelt has shaken hands with a man, and more: he has shaken hands with a representative Christian man."

This world looks awful good to me, Since Teddy gripped my hand; I'm just as happy as can be, Since Teddy gripped my hand; No man I ever use again; I'll keep that hand from touch of men; I wouldn't even reach for "ten." Since Teddy gripped my hand!

I'll care no more what troubles come, For Teddy gripped my hand; I want to shout—I can't be "numb." Since Teddy gripped my hand; I'm going to press upon the text That all who ever get perplexed Will find that joy has been annexed When Teddy grips the hand.

I thank the Lord I saw the day When Teddy gripped my hand; "Twill give me joy along life's way That Teddy gripped my hand."

And when I don my heaven's crown, And on the dommed in hell look down, I'll tell the saints my great renown,— That Teddy gripped my hand!"
The word, Mr. Post writes, preserves, in some political discussion, the full etymological sense of government by all the people governed. But ev e a government by all may be undemocratic; as, for example, when all discriminate against some and violate their equal natural rights. The word democracy has connotations that break the confines of its etymology. It involves not only the idea of government by all the people governed, but likewise the idea of government in recognition of and harmony with the principle of equal natural rights in all other respects than the mere possession by each of an equal voice in the common councils. At any rate, this is our original idea of democracy. "Not merely does government derive its just powers from the consent of the governed, as that American Magna Charta [the Declaration of Independence] asserts, but, as it also asserts, government can derive no powers that are unjust, even from the governed themselves. For governments, says this venerated document, are instituted for the sole purpose of securing natural rights. Democracy, as propounded by Mr. Post, then, is government by all for the benefit of all, this benefit consisting solely in the safeguarding and securing to all of their equal natural rights. It is an "optimistic" definition, but is it scientific?

In the first place, "government by all" is merely a phrase, "a façade de parler." Democracy really means government by the majority, and "pure democracy" means government by the majority under universal suffrage and without restriction, checks, or balances. A voice in the common councils means that the minority is afforded the opportunity to talk; it is the majority that has the power to act and impose its will upon the country. Those who voted in 1900 against imperialism had a voice; but what policy is in force today? What became of the non-consent of the anti-imperialists? True, they had accepted the arbitrament of the ballot-box; but what would have happened if they had abstained and protested by staying at home? Consent of all the governed is not democracy, but Anarchy.

So much for the first half of the definition. Now as to the end and powers of democratic government. Who is to decide where justice ceases and injustice begins? Who is to decide where the majority, instead of enforcing equal natural rights, invasively enters the sphere of the individual? Why, the same majority. Democratic government means that the majority first decides what is just and righteous, and then proceeds to enforce it "for the benefit of all." It is a remarkable discovery, a wonderful induction from historic facts, that majorities are endowed by nature with the faculty of ascertaining truth and natural law!

Democracy may be inevitable. It is here. It has displaced autocratic and oligarchical rule—thanks to gunpowder, the printing press, and the capitalist system of industry. But it is a guaranty neither of greater freedom nor of greater security. It is not necessarily better than minority rule. Neither is a deduction from the principle of equal natural rights.

There is no objection to majority rule by the consent of all the governed. But we must set out with unanimity, with actual individual consent, and the powers of the majority must be defined and subject to the right of secession under conditions unanimously agreed upon. This political system would be Anarchy, not democracy.

Mr. Post closes his collection of optimistic essays with some doubly and specially optimistic reflections on the great order of things, the assured triumph of the higher law, and the ultimate defeat of the sordid and narrow utilitarianisms. "They [the political infidels] are doomed to defeat by those who, few in number though they be, attach themselves to the causes that harmonize with the great order of things." Unfortunately the great order of things does all its fighting through the very small creature who inhabits this earth. The few cannot defeat the many unless they first convert the enemy. So long as the few are few, harmony with the great order avails them little. When the many are with them, they have numbers as well as the great order.

What Mr. Post's optimistic conclusions really amount to is this—that the many, now in the wrong, will be defeated by themselves when they shall have joined the few who have outstripped them on the path to harmony with the great order. This does not sound optimistic, but it is accurate and scientific.

Jean Grave on Methods.

I have been reading "Les Temps Nouveaux," for the third week of January, and am interested in what Jean Grave says therein about methods of Anarchist work.

On the front page he has this:

In the case of groups [organized for revolutionary purposes] this happens: if those who lead them are sincere, if they are really working to realize the essential aim, there is finally created in this medium a special atmosphere which makes you take desires for little things like reading, little matters, get fantastic, brains get heated, people feel capable of pulverizing everything, and they rush into headstrong actions at the end of which there is nothing but catastrophes and deceptions. If, as too often comes to pass, the leaders take fright at their share of the responsibilities which would fall upon them, the exertions will go to cooling off enthusiasm, to tiring out willingness, to tacking.

To help in the evolution of brains is, according to some of us, the surest means of working for revolution. We have tried to do our best at this.

The thoughts expressed here are certainly not the same as those in Tucker's answer to Dyer D. Lum on pages 418-420 of "Instead of a Book." Yet there is a notable coincidence both in outward aspect and in practical effect. The settled distrust of attempts to manufacture the revolution to order, or to sit "in an immediate crushing blow against the St.-c., is the same; so is the exclusive confidence in educational methods. It seems fair to say that the editor of the foremost Anarchist-Communist paper and the editor of the foremost Anarchist paper are in practical agreement on the question of what work Anarchists need to do at the present time.

Passing from the first page to the last (in the supplement), I find a review of a book by one Courtois, a book of recollections of convict life in French Guiana; and here M. Grave notes the following point:...
Courts tells how he made the acquaintance of David there, and he takes this occasion to recall the
tribulations that David's arrest occurred in the revolutionary
press.
Setting aside David's personality (for he was a sin-
ners, but not a saint), the case for those who believe in a
higher-accredited pluristic authority.

But let us see. There are some who believe with Mr. Turner that there shoult be no
falsehood, no lies, no slandering of the innocent, no slandering of those who may be in
the civil war, for libel. Now, is this a "vague and inaccurate idea"? On the con-
trary, there can be no clearer conception of free
speech than this. The vagueness and inaccuracy
lie with those who attempt to place "the danger-
line," this side of a disbelief in government.
And, according to a ruling of a United States
court, disbelief in government does not even have to
be publicly expressed in order to bring the
"disbeliever" under the ban. It is enough to
secure the order for the deportation of an immi-
grant if it be known to the court that he disbel-
ieves in the right to coerce the non-invasive
individual.
However, if this were made the sole and rigid
criterion by which to determine the limits of
free speech, such chain might be made for clear-
ness and accuracy. But it is not so. Every-
body knows that the so-called "danger line" is
capable of as many locations as there are couris
and officials to find them. No one knows from
one day to the next what new conception of
dangerous utterances is going to appear. Even
if he definition were given out frequently
each day, authorities might with some show
of reason assert that there exist cleanness and
accuracy. But is there any approach to this?
The post-office department, which ascerts the
right to limit free speech to a greater extent than
any other department of government, absolutely
debases to give any definition, any criterion by
which the citizen may be guided in the publica-
tion of matter which he intends to offer for
transmission through the mails. He is not
given the opportunity to be certain that he is
avoiding an infraction of the laws. He knows
that the "danger line" is near only after he has
crossed it and the department has ruled that the
matter which he has posted is "unallowable."
And even then his prosecutors decline to point
out just where the offending word or passage
lies. Is this not the same vagueness and in-
accuracy? No one knows when he is safe. No
one knows when he has broken the law; he finds
it out only after it is too late to avoid its in-
fringement.

In comparison with this the libertarian con-
definition of free speech are as clear as
the sunlight. In view of that governmental
incomprehensibility in the post-office department with which the "times" so industriously
sympathizes, it ill becomes that paper to prate about the "vague and inaccurate idea" of
those who are sustained in their opinions by such
clear thinkers as Spencer, Thoréau, Emerson,
and many other eminent men who know that the
greatest of all freedoms is free speech.

G. L. B.

Anen the complaint of a New York clergymen that the choir boys of his church had pro-
tested against a reduction of pay and had re-
fused to sing until the former rate was restored, the editor of the "Sun" pointed out, quite per-

The Limits of Free Speech.
The New York "Times," commenting upon a speech made in New York by John Turner
since his release from Ellis Island, drops a few remarks which, in the clearest of his words at
least, call for a little elucidation from their writer, unless we are to accept the only obvious conclusion,
that the time is rapidly approaching when free
speech will no longer be granted in this country.
To quote:

While it was probably a tactical error to give Mr. John Turner an excuse for posing as a free-speech
martyr before those with very vague and inaccurate ideas as to what is meant by "free speech" in
civilized countries, there was nothing in the remarks he made to indicate that anything more becomes
Mr. Turner than does a freshly assisted silence. There
was nothing at all alarming in what he said on this
occasion, but the address was obviously cautious,
rather than certain on any point, and at several
points the danger line is closely skirted.

Since it has been admitted that there was a
"tactical error," and since that admission implies
that there is a systematic effort being made to
stifle the speech of those who have "vague and inaccurate ideas" about other people's definition
of free speech, it is clear to ascertain just
what are clear and accurate conceptions of free-

For saps it might be well for the
"Times" o define it for us, for such definition

* A crime. —In my view, by definition, a violation of the abstract justice, though a crime may, in exceptional circumstances, be defined as a public crime.

† An analogy of abstract justice, though a crime may, in exceptional circumstances, be defined as a public crime, which case, if abominable, it would, at any rate, be the least abominable of all the cases possible in the given circumstances. I do not say this for the purpose of taking exception to the general tenor of Mr. Irving's article, with which I am in sympathy. —Baroness.
The submarine boats used by navies nowadays give promise of being the best promoters of universal peace yet discovered. If they can be run down and sunk (with all the people inside of them) by ordinary merchant vessels, and without harmful results to the latter, it will not be long before even stupid people will refuse to be shut up in these war machines. If it were not that the failure of these craft to keep out of the way of innocent liners will probably lead to their abandonment, one might wish that all modern naval vessels might be converted into submarines, with the hope that they remain permanently below the surface, with as many fools as could be induced to go aboard.

Ever since the Chicago theatre fire there has been a very indolent inspection—or pretence of inspection—of theatres in all parts of the land. Many theatres have been closed by city authorities. Has it not occurred to our municipal protectors that the public is not obliged to patronise the theatres, that a very casual inspection of any theatre will satisfy any individual as to his chances of escape in case of fire or panic, and that, if he considers it dangerous, he can stay away?

Stickers as Starters.

To the Editor of Liberty:

I am sure I forgot how many years it is since I told you of my intention to produce the Anarchist Stickers, nor will I undertake to list all the causes which have successively kept me from carrying out the plan. But at last I can inform you, and I ask leave to inform your readers through you, that the stickers now exist. They are in the form of a sheet of twenty-five, (twenty-two of them different), printed in heavy-faced type, and adorned with the union label. The following samples will show the style:

Government is Crime.

Who is it that says, "God is the God who has been going on the path"? And if it is not true that he has been going on the path, then he is not God. Therefore government is not a respectable business.

Think what you would do if you had to live where there was no government, having the same neighbors as you now have, free to associate yourself with them for any purpose, but unable to establish a government over the country. Then think whether it would not be better than what your government is now doing with you.

The intent of these stickets is, to be stuck on al-most anything; whether as starters of thought. To stick one on a merchant's show-window, indeed, has in it so much innuendo that it does not produce a favorable impression of the cause thus advertised; and sticking them on money, though it has been very effective in using such material, is liable to a heavy penalty at law. It is, however, the best use of your legal tender. (To be sure, I never heard of the penalty being enforced when the currency was being refused in trade because of such an addition; but I can believe that the law might be more strictly applied against Anarchist Sticketers than it is used to against Single Tax sticketers.) But, on the other hand, you can stick them on a government car and carry them under the eyes of all the postal clerks to the address; you can also stick them on your letter-page; yo, can do this either in writing to a friend who will not take offense, or in writing a business letter; there you have money to send— the chance of having your good cash refused by an indigent trader—can being negligibly small. I have just been sending an order with cash to a department of 5c. goods. I wrote not a letter on my order, and one on the front of the envelope and one a letter of the back of the envelope, and I expect my order to be honored. Besides stationery, you can put them on express packages, baggage, bundles to be taken to the last stagecoach which, in the absence of letters in the Seeo d Grand Hall of the Comendesequidad Club. You can stick them in an old book or paper and lend it to a friend or present it to a free library. And I am sure I do not see what except fear of the law of solid restraint or local indecision of a local law—could persuade a person of any standing to stick self-admonishing labels on the bright-colored army and navy enlistment posters that wear us in the post-offices.

I will sell them at two cents each, three sheets for five cents, five sheets for a dollar, a hundred for a dollar. If I get back what they have cost me, I shall be more amused than delighted; if they produce a perceptible effect in starting Anarchic thought in unexpected places, I shall be delighted rather than amused. Steve T. Bringon.

"Onlooker"s Impressions.

Dr. Parkhurst preached on Lincoln recently. The "Sun" of the following day reports him as having said a number of interesting things on the subject. In fact, Parkhurst says: He has to be, else his salary would cease. No matter how "good" a preacher may be, his salary is always dependent upon his ability to interest his hearers—and is not infrequently in inverse ratio to his real goodness.

Parkhurst says God was "likely candidate for the presidency." That's interesting, if true. Parkhurst must know, for who else in this age as close to God as Parkhurst? Surely no other man enjoys such intimate association with God as he does. In fact, he admits it. So we have to accept Parkhurst's statement of the matter as true. Wouldn't it be more gratifying and satisfying, however, if such statements were made before even a nomination by some worthy candidate? Seems so to me. Then we'll be "dead sure" that God had really told Parkhurst about it before Parkhurst told us. It wouldn't then be simply a case of "I say it's so, and you won't prove it isn't so, and I won't accept the statement, and let it go at that"—at least Lincoln was God's candidate for the presidency.

Next, Parkhurst seems to think that Lincoln's "greatest quality was his humanness. I think so too—but how can one say that God would have told him—for he surely knows nothing about humanness himself?—Preschoolers—and especially such preschoolers as Parkhurst—probably know less of what

"I did indeed barely send two dollars to a certain nurse's mission in New York, and it was returned to me with the note: 'Cannot accept any money because it is a copy of my "What is Anarchism?" was enclosed without note or comment. That experient has my hearty regards for the sincerity of his convictions; but I shouldn't have done the same in his place.

I view with alarm the plight into which brave little Japan is getting herself. She must fight not only against herself, but against God also. The war, when he heard of the first naval
defeat of his forces, put on his finest and most bewilderingly-bespangled vest, and ordered a "mass," which he attended, carrying a palm in his hand (he had one in each hand, for that matter—and "so have we all of us," &c.), and as he walked "on foot," too—so the newspapers tell us. I hope God appreciated the honor done him. "A long train of ministers, functionaries, and military officers followed. The czar's bearing deeply impressed the onlookers, or householders. If a without hall would "impress" me, it would be to see a great big lump of a czar running about like a sleek monkey, clad in fantastic garb of the Arlon Ball order, supplicating God. I could have told them all to deliberately get himself, while his poor people at home were just a few laps ahead of starvation, and his soldiery and sailors were making targets of themselves for his (the said czar's) benefit! If the said "onlookers" had said enough in a few words, and made him do a little of his own fighting, with meals three days apart, and lots of marching between fights, it would have been "something like." Eh? 

ONLOOKER.

Safety in Liberty.
[Charles Erskine Scott Wood in "Pacific Monthly."—]
Secretary Cerverly is attempting that for which Charles F. and B. have long been striving. "The British steamer that left this port first, Mr. Turner will be deprived of the Teutonie sails first, Mr. Turner will be deprived of the Teutonie; we have been living for him to appear here for the past three months." So these precious Bullies come instead of "laying in" for a peaceable trade unionist for three months. It would seem, therefore, that this Anarchist is omnious not because of any Anarchistic theory, because he never uttered any, but because he is an advocate of organized labor. If we may take it that his deportation is at the secret behest of those who are opposed to organized labor. If organized labor is not dull-witted, it will take alarm at this attack on free speech and free press. The future will unfold and unmask the "representatives in congress must really represent the people, and it will turn to philosophy! Anarchy itself as a relief from oppression by government by so-called majority.

Tyranny depends upon power, not upon the form of government; it exists in a republic where the power is secured by a majority, as well as in a kingdom, where it is "God-given."

Fourth. The state, in authority grow more strenuous and militiamen, and expend the people. On battleships and world powerfulness, the people themselves grow more and more timid and less capable of self-help. The coming generations of this country will awaken and understand the all for the tyranny of government until a death stroke at the visible head of government, the consummation of their broodings, we ourselves have the only assassins who have struck at our presidents. Have we got to learn all over again what the world is supposing to have learned hundreds of years ago, that the greatest safety lies in liberty and the greatest danger in tyrannical repression? You cannot imprison ideas.

Third. That the statute is a restrictive and a penal statute and should be strictly construed, and must be interpreted by the evil sought to be remedied, and it does not apply to peaceable men discussing theories or organizing a labor union or any other similar society.

They talk of deposing Anarchists. If they mean philosophical and peaceable Anarchists, Warren, a descendant of Warren o. Bunker Hill, was the great American Anarchist. If they mean Anarchists who have been imported and unrolled upon the tyrannies of government until a death stroke at the visible head of government, the consummation of their broodings, we ourselves have the only assassins who have struck at our presidents. Have we got to learn all over again what the world is supposed to have learned hundreds of years ago, that the greatest safety lies in liberty and the greatest danger in tyrannical repression? You cannot imprison ideas.

The question is this: Is the ambition that the progress of humanity has been toward liberty, and those who would gain for the world more liberty are true prophets, and those who would take away anything of the liberty which has been so dearly gained are walking backward into a pit.

GOVERNMENT ECONOMY IMPOSSIBLE.
[New York Evening Post.—]
Every one in the pulling and hauling and plotting to secure money and appointments for his own district; he will barter his immortal soul for a harbor appropriation, a lighthouse, a public building, a post-office, or a deputy marshalship for a heeler. The mere fact that the outlay is an unwarranted seems to distasteful only novices at Washington. After a term or two, they become hardened sinners like the rest; they see everybody grabbing, and they cannot resist the temptation to secure a share of the booby for their own loyal fol low; even if the original motive be for allow areas that are not justified in reason to conspi ring for clerkships and salary increases that are for burden by law. Mr. Payne’s report contains many items, he for the business of the office and the rules of the department formed not a shadow of protect. Our latter-day statesmen never dream of adopting that motto from “Eikon Basilikos.” More than the law gives me I would not have to pay for every oyster, which is destroyed by asserting that he who steals an egg without being caught is justified in stealing an ox. When men of the standing of Congress-man Hill, of Connecticut, Senator Cleveland, Speaker of the House, President of the treasury, Congressman Payne, of New York, and Houghton, of Iowa, are taken red-handed, no one can marvel that Beavers, Machen, and the small fry of the Stuarts; and Adams and Franklin responsible for the blood of the Revolution.

First. That there is a spirit in our constitution beyond the mere words, and that spirit is indicated by the past history of England as well as America, from which our constitution was evolved. That the oath of allegiance was not a mere formality, but a declaration of belief in the principles on which the revolution rested. People free speach, a free press, the right to peaceably assemble and discuss grievances, the right to bear arms, and which makes treason to consist of some overt act, all indicate that the government itself, both in its acts and form of government, was to have a discussion, and that the citizens themselves have an inherent right to invite any man, from any part of the world, to join or aid them in their discussion.

The whole history of liberty from the time of the colonies has been that of an asylum for those persecuted for opinion’s sake, and that no magistrate has ever barred from this land because of his political theories; on the contrary, many driven from their country by the despots of Europe have been welcomed here. That the power given to congress to regulate immigration is a delegated power and must be strictly construed, and judging by the intent of the framers of our constitution, the discretion of congress is limited to matters of race, economics, and health, and it can not, under the guise of regulating immigration, bar any man from these shores because of his religious or political opinions.

Our constitution says treason shall consist in acts of levying war against the United States. But this foul law is in the United States, so that Anarchists being organized government, meaning of course, as organized, for no man advocates chaos. Nor will society ever submit to chaos. But there may be order and organization without a majority resorting to peacable means. We believe in the Anarchistic ideal or not, the doctrine of free speech, for which so much blood has been shed, means that any man shall have a right to voice any peacable doctrine that he pleases to put to use in a particular form of government beyond all criticism or discussion.

Our constitution says treason shall consist in acts of levying war against the United States. But this foul law is in the United States, so that Anarchists being organized government, meaning of course, as organized, for no man advocates chaos. Nor will society ever submit to chaos. But there may be order and organization without a majority resorting to peacable means. We believe in the Anarchistic ideal or not, the doctrine of free speech, for which so much blood has been shed, means that any man shall have a right to voice any peacable doctrine that he pleases to put to use in a particular form of government beyond all criticism or discussion.
Too Many Guarantors.

[Staged News Letter in "Le Boulevard."]

A war is being waged over the integrity of China,—a subject upon which the whole world is agreed. Russia guarantees this integrity; yet Russia is occupying Manchuria, the richest part of China, and deserts to leave. Japan guarantees this integrity; yet it was by no means a happy country that she did not damage a little, after conquering China. England guarantees this integrity; yet she takes advantage of Russia's embarrassment to install herself in Tibet,—which, if not a part of China, is at least a dependency of the empire, and perhaps also elsewhere than in Tibet. And even France, while, like the others, guaranteeing the integrity of China, has rectified the frontier of China to the detriment of China.

In this war Russia, Japan, and China, it is China, after all, that appears most threatened. A State whose integrity has so many guarantors is, indeed, a very sick State.

Army Life in Germany.

[Elizabeth E. Evans in "Truth Seeker."]

The recently-published story of army life entitled "An einer kleinen Garnison" (In a Small Garrison) by Lieutenant Bilte, has created immense excitement in Germany, not merely among the local soldiers, but has been made public through individual complaints resulting in a law suit, but still more because the narrative exposes great evils and abuses which are inherent in the military system and which therefore apply in a greater or less degree everywhere. The book is forbidden in Germany; its author has been sent to prison for six months and will be dismissed from the army on his release, which sentence has been carried out in accordance with the emperor's wishes. An article, in which the author endeavored to prove that the abuses mentioned in the book were general, has been suppressed. In the meantime, the book has been forming a small sensation in its way of getting through the subterfuge of reasonable agreement for military force in the settlement of international disputes.

War is Hell is "an aphorism which condemns the misery wrought by armies in activity into one word, aptness of which will be generally conceded; a more amplified lesson is needed to demonstrate the far-reaching and lasting evil attendant upon the maintenance of armies. The essence of the problem is particularly struck by the weariness and pettiness of the daily duties and occupations of the garrison, preventing any mental improvement in characters disposed to take an earnest view of life and presenting to the light-minded abundant temptation and opportunity for indulging in various forms of vice. Hence there are scandals without end in that secluded and exclusive little community; drunkenness, gambling, and profanity; through the way of postiltes; while arrogance on the part of superiors in official rank to those beneath them and general abuse of the common soldier betray the unhealthy influence of a theory which separates the military class from the rest of the civil organism and allows it to become a law unto itself. The frequent instances of shameful maltreatment of soldiers by their officers which are nowadays brought before the courts for trial in Germany show that this feature of military life is not exaggerated in the story, and the enmity of

the officers against a book written by one of themselves and undeniably authentic in its charges is thereby fully explained.

Since the publication, five other similar stories, bringing the same complaints, from as many different garrisons to the country papers, have appeared. One of these, who is not likely to repeat his attempt, especially now that the emperor has denounced Lieutenant Bilte and his epoch-making work. The scenes and situations described are more or less applicable to every foot and garrison and baracks the world over; while the depressing effect upon character and effect of life made up of mereious industry alternating with enforced idleness is universal in an army composed of comparatively well-educated soldiers and unrivaled in the training adapted to the exigencies and practices of modern warfare. Perennious industry! That is the right term for the varied and often severe tasks involved in the learning of a profession the sole object of which is to kill and main human beings and destroy the fruits of honest labor wrought in times of peace. Who that looks upon the parade of a regiment passing through city streets to daily exercise in the open fields can fail to be struck by the mornfulness of the spectacle, when the end and aim of such elaborate preparation is remembered,—the loud, defiant music; the throbbing drums; the measured march of the well-drilled men; the faultless elegance of the uniformed officers; the carefully groomed horses of the brilliant cavalry; the ominous rumble of wagons drawing the heavy cannon of artillery—all this noise and display in order to keep the armies in the observance of the army and the horror which attend such movements when made in earnest, as all concerned expect they will be, some time within the experience of the generation which now is and looks on.

So long-established an evil as a standing army cannot be abolished immediately under any government, and it will be a long time before the nations will learn to war any more; but experience shows that the next important task is the prevention against military force and ultimately establish universal peace. Religion, certainly, will not do this. The worst wars ever known have been religious wars, and even now the subjects of half a Christian kings and citizens of civilized nation as part of the holling sacrament ascribed to the teeth and ready to go from the Lord's Table to the field of battle. It is education, in the highest sense of the word, which has best been used to protect against possible way against murder by organized warfare; it is education which will dispense with the glamour which surrounds the pomp and circumstance of war in the eyes of the ignorant. . . . Therefore, whoever helps to increase among the various classes of men is working towards this glorious consummation which future generations will appreciate and enjoy.

Inspired Explanations.

[New York Daily News.]

The court biographer of the Roosevelt dynasty, Mr. F. E. Leupp, is diligent in his efforts to enlighten the public concerning the president's reasons for assuming legislative power and passing a service pension bill through Congress. Mr. Leupp has explained already that the plan of giving every veteran a pension for age does away with the trouble and expense of examining applicants, but that was not the real reason for its adoption. It would not have done for the pension commissioner to tell publicly all he knows; but the biographer is not hampered by official red tape or fear of losing his job, and he assures us solemnly that the measure was expected to cost millions of dollars in pensions and that the real purpose of the administration is to put a stop to their electioneering. If there is anything that the administration cannot tolerate it is the use of public officers for political purposes. A "pension functionary," whose identity is not disclosed by the discreet biographer, is quoted by Mr. Leupp as saying that the doctors are the greatest electioneering agents in the field. When the doctor makes a professional call, "an atmosphere of politics completely envelops the incident;" he chats with his patient on general topics, and insidiously drifts into talk about the campaign, "and the mischief's done." But worse than such direct inoculation of unsuspecting voters with the virus of politics is the nefarious practice of the doctors, thus described by the administration's inspired exponent:

Even sick women, who see hardly anybody but their family physician, catch the political infection and communicate it in turn to their husbands and brothers and sons. You who live in a good-sized city have only to ask any young girl to take the trouble and go out a few blocks, most of whom live in small towns.

The administration, it appears, was so shocked at the turpitude of the country doctors that it resolved to protect sick women from their political malpractice at any cost, and with a vengeance. The bill that the examiners to the day before the outset of the statesman without human fault or selfish purpose?

The suggestion that it might be good politics to throw overboard a bridge of doctors to catch the votes of a million or more veterans is unworthy of consideration. The court biographer himself treats it with the silent contempt that it deserves.

Roosevelt's Usurpation.

[New York. Evening Post.]

A senate inquiry into the executive order authorizing service pensions by decretum of was of course inevitable for some time; but the putting usurpation by the executive. If it is possible for the administration to measure proportionate disability for self-support merely by age, and to declare that all veterans of sixty-two and one fifth or the invalid list, what law on our statute-books can be regarded as safe should its perversion serve presidential ambitions? No wonder the Washington correspondents speak of "constitution" among the Republican senators. Mark well that the Constitution is not only a nullity after the fashion of whimpering magwumps. When they question the president it is not for any ordinary stretcher of his powers; the very form of the challenge suggests the iniquity it marks out. "How much will it cost?" the senate asks. Never before, we believe, has a president summoned to give away millions of the public money without a line in the statutes which clearly justifies that expenditure. No officer of the treasury should pay out a cent on this ruling; that he has not anticipated the president that will venture to have the case tested in the courts. It would be far less humiliating to make his retreat now, while public indignation is still only gathering; but no retraction can close the wound that a precedent once fixed has sanctioned a gigantic raid on the treasury in behalf of his political purposes.

Dewey Draws the Color Line.

[New York Evening Post.]

Admiral Dewey's failure to land in San Domingo had a queer look. There was some desultory firing from the town, but that was to the hero of Manila! That lame explanation! Men that were now, however, superseded by a more plausible account. It seems that the doughy admiral was not aware, until he reached Dominic waters, that our minister to the navy, a representative of the administration, then, the cornerstone on Dewey's ship when Mr. Powell came aboard. Horrid visions of another Booker Washington dinner affrighted the gallant orator. If he went ashore, he would surely have to call an alderman later, probably to invite him to dine! That was enough to break the face which the thunder of the Spanish guns left unmoved. Hence the hasty retreat; hence the strange story. There is a few days in the life of a man who had despised the Manila torpedoes, in right of a fortuitous flight, and had sailed in to singe the beards of the Don... No wonder that the Southern papers are chiding over the way in which one civilian negro put the admiral of the navy to flight.
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