On Picket Duty.

G. L. Ward Sumner describes Liberty as "a lively paper, in which the usual proportions of a halfpennyworth of discussion to an inconsiderable deal of baldheadedness are reversed."

I bespeak attention for Victor's article on "The Woman Question" in this issue. Despite his invitation to a "patriot commerce," which he vessels in women's independence, of whom I am one, will not be moved by this usudal appeal to speaks at all on sex, but will wait at least till the appearance of the next number, which will contain a long article by Zena, submitting to this rough examination the position of Victor, rather vehemently reinforced at some points by Sarah M. Shipman, occupies.

I print the extract from Herbert G. (to be found in another column) chiefly because it aptly puts the case for the Egoists and shows that agnostics who talk of duty as against self-interest cut their own throats and bring their ethics into conflict with their religious views. I am not, of course, to be construed as a "patriot commerce," which he vessels in women's independence, of whom I am one, will not be moved by this usudal appeal to speaks at all on sex, but will wait at least till the appearance of the next number, which will contain a long article by Zena, submitting to this rough examination the position of Victor, rather vehemently reinforced at some points by Sarah M. Shipman, occupies.

In Mrs. Annie Besant's magazine, "Our Corner," G. Bernard Shaw has published the first of a series of two articles in reply to my paper on "State Socialism and Anarchism." After the buffoonery of the "Workmen's Advocate" and the superficiality of "Der Socialist," it is pleasant to be criticized by a man of brains and wit. The first article is intended as a refutation of Anarchism; the second (to appear next month) will be a defense of State Socialism. I await the appearance of the second before replying to either. From the fact that so much space is devoted to her magazine to an examination of my arguments, I infer that Mrs. Besant, who but a year ago "could support Mr. Benjamin Tucker's strictures with perfect equanimity," has discovered that equanimity alone is scarcely adequate to the task.

The London "Anarchist" and the Chicago "Alarm" have suspended publication. The former will appear again on July 1; the fate of the latter is uncertain. That the "Alarm" has not been better sustained is much to be regretted. Its treatment of Liberty has been such that it is scarcely in human nature that a person should feel very friendly to it, but perhaps my testimony to its high degree of excellence as an Anarchistic organ is all the more valuable because somewhat unwitting. It has done good service for Anarchism by warily driving the hordes of ignorance. I rejoiced at its revival, I shall mourn its death, if unhappily that fate awaits it. The fact is that it has having such a hard struggle for existence must be a damper to those who have fondly imagined that a large amount of earnest intelligence regarding economic questions was suddenly generated by the throwing of that bomb.

Will HullsJXKerman, the eccentric editor of the prairies, in connection with S. F. Wilson, George Francis Train's legislative agent, has come to the surface with another journal, "The Free-Lance." Written in the editor's cyclical rhetoric and set up in accordance with his typographical ideas, it is needless to say that it is bold, entertaining, and shapenHeroes. It is but wise that the most amusing of all to the flavor of absurdities in logic is to be found in the prospectus. After announcing itself as "the only newspaper that will print and trample on the old ideas and the writers of the 'Free-Lance'" it follows this Anarchist generalization with the following assortment of specific speculations: "The only newspaper that will fight the hell system which suffers men and women of unseamed body, it would be ideal to know: That law of nature that will destroy the dastardly custom of permitting the poor to procure fresh tramps, paupers, and Lazaris. The only paper that will defend the right of a man to drink water or act as suits him best; The only paper that will favor sending every innate of a house of ill fame a hundred miles from the great city."

A keen mental vision is not required to see that a revolution is in operation in the sexual realm. But the idea that all care and responsibility of children should be thrown upon the woman, and that all credit for child should be self-supporting, is pure folly, and I will fight it to the extent of my ability. Under such conditions the rule of love and reverence would fail, alike.

Sarah M. Chipman.

Fiat Money.

[F. E. B. in Social Science.]

How can you exhibit to a rather mind the conception of value except by corresponding value? How can you create the idea of value or ratio of value, except by some corresponding value? In physics, value is not one of the natural properties of bodies, nor form, extension, color, weight, etc. Value is merely relative and abstract. Emblems can have no more real value than a photograph or a stone statue can represent the real. The one can be no more representative of value except to the extent that these "representatives" of their prototypes. Their character as representatives is merely an assumption of our perception. The commercial value which paper money or currency or funds "represent," is simply a matter of credit, faith, or confidence placed in the written issuing them; faith in their solvency, integrity, responsibility, ability, and good intent in redeeming their promises. If this faith be destroyed the "representation" of value previously attaching to the money also. The standard of design remains as perfect as before, but the credit or faith having vanished, it ceases to represent anything. There can be no bond issue representative of value except as it is founded on credit, or faith in the fulfillment of a promise of intrinsic or commodity value. Fiat money, the hypothetical, ideal greenback cannot "represent" value, therefore, because it promises no intrinsic value, and is consequently debased of the element of faith or credit. It has no foundation for credit,—a castle in the air.

Greenbacks are accused of saying that their fiat money would be "backed" or guaranteed by every dollar's worth of property in the country, etc. This is bold, grossly insulting to the government, which will not agree to, and promise to pay, it is fair to infer it does not intend to pay. And, it must not be forgotten or overlooked that, if the government or if the Greencackers honestly meant that the government should make good, redeem, and pay an equable equivalent, consisting of intrinsic value, every dollar of fiat money they would have the government issue, then they would manifest their honest motives in the best manner by promising to pay a specified sum, fair and square, and end the doubt and dispute. Of course this would be to "throw up the sponge," abandon Greenback doctrines, and confess themselves without a basis.

Furthermore, suppose a government to go so far as to issue millions of fiat money; that is, stamp and prepare it ready for the money market. No one could obtain a dollar of it without paying full price for it in intrinsic valuables, or what is known as a premium for the money. If accepted for services, the latter are intrinsic valuables, and are entitled to intrinsic value or its equivalent, in remuneration. When it came to the test, even Greenbackers themselves would shrink from giving their real, intrinsic values in exchange for mere suppositions and imaginary "credit," represented by signs, symbols, or emblems.

All denominations of value issued by the government must be purchased at their face value, like postage stamps, and paid for in intrinsic value or its equivalent. Such tokens are not real values; they are credit currency for specific purposes.

The Two Fool Species.

[J. L. De Lasanea.]

Parsons's sheep, and men, are the only animals that carry servility and stupidity, to the extent of jumping into the water simply for the sake of following their leaders.
LOVE, MARRIAGE, AND DIVORCE,
AND THE SOVEREIGNTY OF THE INDIVIDUAL

A DISCUSSION

BY

Henry James, Horace Greeley, and Stephen Pearl Andrews.

II.

QUESTIONS TO MR. JAMES, BY MR. ANDREWS.

New York, Friday, Nov. 26, 1852.

To the Editor of the Tribune:

I have read with some interest a recent article in the “Tribune,” by Henry James, in reply to an “assault” upon him by Mr. Greeley, in his article entitled, “Observer,” on the Marriage Question. Perhaps it would be discourteous to say that, in relation to the issue of the conflict between these parties, I am quite indifferent. I shall not argue the principles involved, but let the question be decided by the electors and the contestants. My curiosity is piqued, however, by the positions assumed by Mr. James, to see how he will maintain himself, and I find myself given over to a sort of fiendish amusement, of a devilish kind of sport, for sport’s sake. The matter is, as I may perhaps be allowed, as a third party, the Socratic privilege of propounding difficulties and seeking for further information.

It was a saying of Daniel Webster that “the best thing is to be done, a wise man should be able to tell how it is to be done.” Hence, I cannot but hope that Mr. James may be able to remove some of the darkness which obfuscates my perceptions of this wise man’s words. It is, however, difficult to find a definiteness of definition in his earlier writings in the “Harbinger” and his “Observe” upon the subject with the somewhat hazy and factitious morality of a single French man’s writing. As I have written my name, I may perhaps be allowed, as a third party, the Socratic privilege of propounding difficulties and seeking for further information.

Who is to be the standard of proprieties? Is Mr. James’s definition of “a disorderly life” to be the same definition because it is his? If not Mr. James’s definition, whose? Then who is to be the judge to assert that which is a disorderly life, and right to exercise his own, without the interference of society, or—which is the same thing—of other individuals? This last, it seems to me, is about the most weighty question that human society, or any individual who, like Mr. James, attempts to lead the way in the solution of social difficulties, should be prepared to answer by some broader generalization than any which relates to a single individual or class of people. It is more than a general reference to humanitarian sentiment. There are some acts which the individual is authorized to do or not to do, at his own option, and in relation to which he has no right to order others to do or not to do them, whether he shall or shall not do them; as, for example, whether he shall personally to the post office or send a boy. There are certain acts, on the other hand, which the individual is authorized to order others to do or not to do, be they slaves, or common people, or common life, or any sort of restraint, on the part of others. If a man plant his flat in the features of another, he takes his nose, that is to be such an act. What, now, is the clear and decisive social science which makes such demands, as running between these two classes of acts? If that can be discovered, prececence it may settle the marriage question, not singly and alone, but along with every other question in the present? These questions, if they belong to society in a sense, and others by any knowledge he may have upon the subject, I submit my interrogatives.

Stephen Pearl Andrews.

III.

MR. GREELEY’S COMMENTS.

Having given place to the essays on Marriage and Divorce by Mr. Henry James, in reply to attacks upon him in the “Observer,” we have concluded to extend like honors to Mr. Greeley. The solicitors of Mr. James have already related to the essays of Mr. James. Our own views differ very radically from those of both these gentlemen; but we court rather than decline discussion on the subject, and are anxious to hear Mr. Greeley and Mr. James, and to have a general discussion eminently desirable, if not vitally necessary. Let us now briefly set forth our own idea of the matter.

In affording him to the while that he is saying as good a word for marriage as has ever been said beneath the stars. He indignantly repudiates all affiliation of his doctrines with the laxer kind of morality, or the systematic emancipation of individual and private as opposed to public and general morality. He fully pronounces destitute of common sense, for no better cause, so far as he enablies us to discover, than that their views differ from his, and whom, he informs us, he, the Socratic, is indelibly and always to order forthwith to “the good time coming” by reforming the abuses of the institution of marriage. The question is not one of the consequences, or the character of the features of his doctrine upon the subject. These doubts and difficulties are stated in the following list of queries:

1. Does Mr. J. understand to be the essential and determining essence of the most important characteristic of legal marriage? or sine non of the institution of marriage, after the complete removal of the characteristic feature of legal marriage? or "outward force," by
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Still Avoiding the Issue.

As I expected, Herr Most, in his controversy with me upon private property, Communist, and the State, is as reluctant as ever to come close quarters in an attempt to destroy my main position, and, for sole reason to my knowledge, create a general flack in the name of Marx, not daring even to attempt upon his own account the use of the weapons with which Marx has assailed it. Herr Most had promised to accept private property if I would show him that it is compatible with production on the scale we have discussed, without the exploitation of labor. He warned me, to be sure, against showing this by Proudhon's banking system. But I answered that he is bound to accept my proposal on the strength of what appears in proof I offer, or else demonstrate that the proof offered is no proof at all,--in other words, that he cannot reject my evidence without first rejecting it. My proof, I then told him, consists precisely in § 47 principle of freedom and organization of credit which is embodied in Proudhon's banking system and other systems of a similar nature, and I referred him to the passage in which I have explained the process whereby freely organized credit would abolish usury—that is, the exploitation of labor—and make production on the large scale easier than ever without interfering with the institution of private property.

Now it would naturally be assumed that, in answer to this, some examination would be made of the process referred to and the flaw in it be pointed out. But did Herr Most do anything of the kind? Not he. His only answer is that Marx disposed of Proudhon's banking system long ago, that it is fifty years behind the times, and that it is not at all clear that there is any foundation for the claim that, with the prevailing inequalities of property, all could obtain credit. No, Herr Most, nor is it clear that any such claim was ever made by any one champion of the organization of credit. The real claim is, not that all could straightforwardly get credit if credit were monopolized, but that, if all or a half or a quarter of such credit as could be at once obtained under a free system should be monopolized without it being given to production and enterprise which would gradually increase the demand for labor and therefore the rate of wages and therefore the number of unemployed able to get credit, until at last every laborer would be able to say to the capitalist, "You are a good business manager, and I am willing to continue to work under your superintendence on a strictly equitable basis; but, unless you are willing to content yourself with a share of our joint products proportional to your share of the cost, I shall give you the balance for my share of the labor."

The careful estimate of the amount of labor which I have now on my mind. Herr Most's statement of the claim made by the friends of free banking shows that he has no knowledge of their arguments or systems, which probably explain his reluctance to discuss them otherwise than by retaliation of the name of Marx. Professor's banking system may be fifty years behind the times, but it is evidently far in advance of the point which Herr Most has reached in the path of investigation.

Even more careful is the wily editor of "Freiheit" to avoid the following question, which I asked him a propos of his promise: "If Communism is really, as Herr Most generally claims, no infringement of liberty, and if in itself it is such a good and perfect thing, why abandon it in favor of a private property?" Because the possibility of the latter's existence without the extinction of labor has been demonstrated? To declare one's willingness to do so is plain to affirm that, exploitation and, private property is superior to Communist society, and that therefore Communism is chosen only as the lesser evil." Herr Most knew that it would never do to admit that Communism entraps liberty. Yet he could not answer this question without admitting it. So he prudently let it alone.

But what, then, does he say in his three-volume article?

Well, for one thing, he tries to make his readers think that I offered my incidental remarks, rather suggestive than conclusive, regarding the likelihood that the Communist position, being based on the supposed necessity of greater equality in order to produce on the scale large, might soon be undermined by the tendency, of which symptoms are beginning to appear, to a simplification and cheapening of machinery,—he tries to make his readers think, I say, that I offered the remarks as a warning.

"On such grounds," he says, "we are expected to believe," etc., giving no hint of my express declaration that I offered this idea for what it was worth and not as essential to my position.

Nor, in the least, do we see why he should regard this thought as so utterly chimerical, when he finds it so easy, in order to show Communism to be practicable, to assume that the time is not far distant when wealth will be so abundant that individuals will not think of quarreling over its possession, but will live as birds do in their hennepods. Of the two hypotheses the latter seems to me the more visionary. Certainly great strides are yet to be taken in labor-saving, and I do not doubt at all that a state of society will be attained in which every sound individual will be able to make his way without doing any laborious hours of toil daily. But that there will ever be any such proportion between human labor and the objects of human consumption as now exists between bird labor and hemp-seed, or that land and other capital will ever be secured in the same sense that water, light, and air are superabundant, is inadmissible. If, however, the means of life shall ever become so utterly divorced from human toil that all men look on all wealth as air is now looked upon, I will then admit that, so far as material enjoyment is concerned, Communism will be proved to be possible without violation of liberty. Until then, I must insist that a State will be necessary to its realization and maintenance.

But, Herr Most asks me, if respect for private property is not a condition of a State, why is not Communist so conceivable? Simply because the only force ever necessary to secure respect for private property is the force of defence,—the force which protects the laborer in the possession of his product or in the prevention of any interference with it, while the force required to secure Communism is the force of offense,—the force which compels the laborer to pool his product with the products of all and forbids him to sell his labor or his product. Now, force of offense is the principle of the State, while force of defense is a positive thing. The principle of Communism is the idea that private property does not imply a State, while Communism does. Herr Most seems to be ignorant of the real nature of the State as he is of Proudhon's banking system. In opposing it, he acts, not as an intelligent foe of Authority, but simply as a rebel against the powers that be.

What is the use, in fact, of discussing with him at all? Does he not confess at the outset of the article I am now examining this, although he has ranked his brains, say refuse to perceive my distinction between the laborer's individual possession of his product and the sum total of legal privileges bestowed upon the holders of wealth? Is there any hope that such a mind will ever grasp an economic law? The reason he gives for his inability to recognize this distinction is, that no one, not even his own private possession and hence it is inseparable. The man who calls his own, he says, the less others will be able to possess. This is not true where all property rests on a labor title, and no other property is of no favor. It is only true of the increase of property through usury. But usury, as has been shown, has no legal claim on private property. When the property of one increases through an advance in the productivity of his labor, the property of others, far from decreasing on that account, increases to an almost equal extent. This year A produces 100 in his own; B 50 in his, which are 50 in his own product, and exchanges the remaining 50 for the other's remaining 50. Suppose that next year A's production remains the same, but that B's, with no extra labor, rises to 200. In that case A's remaining 50, in spite of the exchange for B's remaining 50 as this year, will exchange for 100 in B's product. Under private possession, unaccompanied by usury, more for one man means, not less for another man, but more for all men. Where, then, is the privilege?

But, after all, it makes very little difference to Herr Most what I believe I can live on my own means. The test of fellowship with him lies in acceptance of dynamite as a cure-all. Though I should prove that my economic views, if realized, would turn our social system inside out, he would not therefore regard me as a revolutionist. He declares outright that I am no revolutionist, because I have thought of revolution (by dynamite, he means) I make my flesh creep. Well, I frankly confess that I take no pleasure in the thought of bloodshed and mutilation and death. At these things my feelings revolt. And if delight in them is a requisite of a revolutionist, then I am no revolutionist. When revolutionist and cannibal become synonyms, count me out, if you please. But, though my feelings revolt, I am not mastered by them or made a coward by them. More than from dynamite and bloodshed, I shrink from the thought of a permanent system of oppression involving the overthrow of the most industrious and deserving of its members. If I should ever become convinced that the policy of bloodshed is necessary to end our social system, the loudest of today's shriekers for blood would not surpass me in the depth of my horror while the inevitable. Indeed, a plumber-to-the-last, I am confident that under such circumstances many who now think no chicken-hearted would condemn the stone-heartedness with which I should favor the utter sacrifice of every feeling of pity to the necessities of the terrorist doctrine. Neither fear nor sentimentalism, then, dictates my opposition to forcible methods. Such being the case, how stupid, how unfair, in Herr Most, to picture me as crossing myself at the mention of the word revolution simply because I steadfastly set on my well-beloved belief that we cannot substitute truth for a lie in political economy!

Head and Heart.

It is a well-known fact that the feelings often, though perhaps unconsciously, speak the decisive word in questions that seem to pertain to reason alone. Undoubtedly the subject of Anarchist too has frequently been surrounded with a kind of mystique, as the heart, after having occupied the intellect for a long time, and even after the immense confusion caused by the name has given way to some clearness, and the principle of complete individual liberty in political and economical matters is accepted by the most industrious and deserving of its members. If I should ever become convinced that the policy of bloodshed is necessary to end our social system, the loudest of today's shriekers for blood would not surpass me in the depth of my horror while the inevitable. Indeed, a plumber-to-the-last, I am confident that under such circumstances many who now think no chicken-hearted would condemn the stone-heartedness with which I should favor the utter sacrifice of every feeling of pity to the necessities of the terrorist doctrine. Neither fear nor sentimentalism, then, dictates my opposition to forcible methods. Such being the case, how stupid, how unfair, in Herr Most, to picture me as crossing myself at the mention of the word revolution simply because I steadfastly set on my well-beloved belief that we cannot substitute truth for a lie in political economy!
tions stop forward with the question: "Can we find a home in this new country? Can we, in any way satisfy our longings and needs?" It is perhaps but natural that the answer to this question should influence the acceptance or rejection of the principle not a little; how it is, however, that the decision should so often be in our favor.

There can only be this reason why the intellectual recognition of the principles of Anarchism should occupy second rank in their final, unconditional acceptation, —that in their practical application they call for a complete new revolution in the way we act, and because of the difficulties arising from it.

These new habits, how hard it is to abandon them! The habit of feeding over our surroundings, on the one hand, and the habit of patient submission and of dependence on the other,—that these have to be given up appears natural enough, but the two disagreeable sensations, although in reality we shall find it a much more difficult task to rid ourselves of either of them; but also the habit of devotion, of fellow-feeling, the sweet sense of belonging together, which promises to prosper but: in a state of mutual dependence,—these preoccupations of pure humanitarian instincts we fear to lose as we progress toward that perfect liberty which the Anarchists demand and which seems to mean: "Every one for himself, and the devil take the hindmost.

But r-ture has made her provisions against the devil's taking the hindmost, in that she has made man's need for love and sympathy one of her laws, and so strong, indeed, that all human laws, sprung from man's lust of power, have been unable to quite counteract it. Man will always love, and always yearns for one another; and whoever has come in contact with that new type of man who has chosen individual freedom for their device will know that they too are capable of highest devotion, of sympathy and love toward their fellow creature.

While they may and do give their sympathy freely, they undoubtedly make greater demands on their love. They wish to keep it free from lowly interested motives; they want, for the sake of their own self-respect, to be able to respect the object of their love as a sovereign individual. It may be that, because the ideal is a higher one, we cannot at once put our trust in it. Everything that is new and unrestrained seems at first; even it chills us. We cannot straighten out our bias with a sudden jerk. We can not transplant our whole mode of thought and feeling from the soil in which it has sprouted and grown into a new field, and expect it to take firm root at once. Some, with all its defects, is dear to us. Place the native of a desert in a sunny valley, and the very sun will appear cold, the flowers and birds will have nothing charming, and he will be left unsatisfied for his barren plain. After years of absence he returns, his native desert is but a desert, and the fertile vale will have become dear, not only to his good sense, but to his heart as well.

To the Christian also who feels the ground of his belief beginning to shake under him everything appears to be in a state of dissolution. His sentimental poison joys of life. He is at variance with himself and the world. He asks himself anxiously: what is to become of his society, his love for the good, and the beautiful, if my faith is gone? Has life any attractions after this, or is it indeed not worth living? But with perfect intellectual clearness, when no doubts can any longer shake his unbelief, his inner peace, his joy in life, return. He finds that the hearts of his fellow-countrymen are always as warm as Christian hearts, and he takes new courage.

Can we then expect to do away so easily with our opinions on State and society, which have become our very flesh and blood, and especially if the new opinions which are opposed to旧秩序 make their place in the public mind, in their radical destruction of everything that once was sacred? Even chains do not break without leaving wounded, and "the great right of individuality to everything that it needs in order to become everything that it can become," are necessary to every man, in order to any authority to gain this right," makes such severe demands on the heart and seems to make the taking of new affections impossible from the start. To do so upon the same ground upon which the old bonds have tightened into fetters will indeed be impossible, but to believe that in the new social order all common interest, all enjoyment of social home life, all tenderness, and all devotion will have disappeared from the world, that all proungings of the heart, called love, will at least be but a superficial, transitory change, is to falsify human nature as completely as the believing Christian mistakes it who expects the utter moral ruin of mankind to follow upon a decline of Christianity, and as those mistook it who foresaw in the intellectual development of woman the destruction of human moral fine qualities.

But although the absence of all enthusiasm for and the repugnances towards this new school of thought, even after the intellect has exhausted its arguments against it, can be accounted for as natural, it is not, we think, a truly thoughtful person, no real lover of truth is without perfect faith in truth, the faith that it cannot do violence to human nature; if it does, it is not true, and we must look for it elsewhere.

And is there anything simpler, but that in a state of perfect liberty, where man's nature is his only ruler, the needs of this nature, and especially the emotional needs, can be better satisfied than under any other condition? Be of good cheer, then, fearful heart; put forward your claims, and plead your own cause.

E. H. S.

Coinage of the Heart.

Dear Comrade Tucker:

My salutation is not to the Anarchist (except with sundry reservations), but to every man who has the courage to accept his convictions,—the true exemplar. For two years I have not been merely a reader, but a student, of Liberty,—in my opinion the best text-book of fundamental principles of all human faculties, joined to good taste, that makes Liberty the exceptional periodical it is.

And there is another I will call comrades, if I may. His name is J. Wm. Lloyd,—a true apostle of "sweetness and light," and in all ways above me. I have been more deeply impressed with his writings, and searching the real meaning of his words and the power of his convictions, the true exemplar. For two years I have not been merely a reader, but a student, of Liberty,—in my opinion the best text-book of fundamental principles of all human faculties, joined to good taste, that makes Liberty the exceptional periodical it is.

And there is another I will call comrades, if I may. His name is J. Wm. Lloyd,—a true apostle of "sweetness and light," and in all ways above me. I have been more deeply impressed with his writings, and searching the real meaning of his words and the power of his convictions, the true exemplar. For two years I have not been merely a reader, but a student, of Liberty,—in my opinion the best text-book of fundamental principles of all human faculties, joined to good taste, that makes Liberty the exceptional periodical it is.

And there is another I will call comrades, if I may. His name is J. Wm. Lloyd,—a true apostle of "sweetness and light," and in all ways above me. I have been more deeply impressed with his writings, and searching the real meaning of his words and the power of his convictions, the true exemplar.

C. H. S.

Anti-Eugtic Morality a Contradiction.

[Herbert Coutts in Our Corner.]

The agnostic adults—indeed insist—that both right and wrong are correct and natural, but correct only in their condition, and that the necessity tolive with every authority to gain this right," makes such severe demands on the heart and seems to make the taking of new affections impossible from the start. To do so upon the same ground upon which the old bonds have tightened into fetters will indeed be impossible, but to believe that in the new social order all common interest, all enjoyment of social home life, all tenderness, and all devotion will have disappeared from the world, that all proungings of the heart, called love, will at least be but a superficial, transitory change, is to falsify human nature as completely as the believing Christian mistakes it who expects the utter moral ruin of mankind to follow upon a decline of Christianity, and as those mistook it who foresaw in the intellectual development of woman the destruction of human moral fine qualities.

But although the absence of all enthusiasm for and the repugnances towards this new school of thought, even after the intellect has exhausted its arguments against it, can be accounted for as natural, it is not, we think, a truly thoughtful person, no real lover of truth is without perfect faith in truth, the faith that it cannot do violence to human nature; if it does, it is not true, and we must look for it elsewhere.

And is there anything simpler, but that in a state of perfect liberty, where man's nature is his only ruler, the needs of this nature, and especially the emotional needs, can be better satisfied than under any other condition? Be of good cheer, then, fearful heart; put forward your claims, and plead your own cause.

E. H. S.

The Convict's Farewell.

A boat is rowed along the sea,

Full of souls as it may be;

Their dress is torn, their hair is shorn,

And every vessel faces storms

Is full of sorrow and late alarms.

What is it? It is the Convict Boat,

That over the waves is forced to sail;

Beating its wicked furnace

The ocean to a distant shore;

Man awakes upon it, but the sea

(The soul is horror,) as she goes free

Drowneth beneath it heedlessly.

Slowly the boat isborne along;

Yet they who row are hard and strong.

Their eyes and tears are made of stone;

To one who sings (and clanks his chain,

That thus to hide the pain!)

A bitter banished rhyme:

He sings; and all his mates in woe

Cradle their thoughts as they go.

How low are we, a felon bound,

Further out to sea.

Till we lose all sight of land;

And then— we shall be:

How low are we, and lose our fetters;

You're a dead man.

Let's have a good-bye unto our betters,

And hey for a brighter day!

CHOIR

How we fast! How we fast!

Tricks o' war and evidence past;

Here's a whistle for those who tried to blind us,

And a curse on all who left us behind!

Farewell, judges—fellows—friends

(Traders to the close)

Here the fellow's danger ends,

Farewell, bloody food!

Farewell, Jenny coal! We are quitting

Now thy dungeon doors;

Take our blessing as we're sitting—

A curse upon thy shores!

Farewell, England—honest nurse

Of all our wants and sins;

What to do with thee now?

What to those who win?

Murder thrusts in thy cities,

Pandemons through all thy ways;

One may cause a dozen ditties,

'Tother scares a smile.

Farewell, England—tender soil,

Where love and justice are;

From morning into midnight till,

That pride may be proud no more,

Where's who's right and who's wrong?

Meet at the goal the same;

Where one hath what he deserves,

Not even in empty fame.

So fare thee well, our country dear!

Our last wish, ere we go,

In your case as clear as ever

From tax, nor tilthe, nor war.

May they who owe 'er respect for Others

The handkerchief for the one

May friends grow faire, and twin-born brothers

Each hate his mother's son!

May pains and storms still fence the place

Possibly just might be the case;

So be he who's poor must hide his face,

And who thinks his things safe.

May Night or Right be crowned the winner,

The head still over the heart,

And relation to ourselves,

You'll not know them apart!

May your tramps grumble when bread is high,

And your farmers when bread is low,

You are poor like we are;

Learn more than your seeds know.

May your sick have frosty or foxy weather,

And your crops be scarce and low.

And your blood-cove'ered baskets all hang together,

Like a bed of broken notes!

And so—with hogs in dirty laws,

And pern within your breast,

A bar of gold to go your laws

May they be your strength and your peace!

Farewell to England's won and weal—!

For her better's so bold and lillent,

May those who wish to see a want a meal,

A person to take their tiles!

Barry (forward).
The Woman Question.

Possibly at the expense of my reputation as a radical, but certainly to the entertainment and interest of Liberty's readers, I intened to express in this article some conservative pleas on the women's question. I could, in fact, have written an entire volume about what I consider essential to the well-being of our society. The issue of women's rights is too crucial, too complex, to be reduced to a few simple points. Nevertheless, I believe that my readers will find this essay both enlightening and thought-provoking.

The problem of women in society is vast and multifaceted. It is not something that can be easily solved or dismissed. The issue of women's rights is not just about equality; it is about justice, fairness, and human dignity. It is about the recognition of women's contributions to society and the respect they deserve as individuals.

The problem is not only one of legal rights, but also of societal attitudes and behaviors. Women are often undervalued and underestimated, and this can have a profound impact on their lives and opportunities. It is time for change, and it is up to all of us to work towards a more just and equitable society for all.

In closing, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to those who have supported me in this endeavor. I hope that my readers will take my words to heart and join me in the fight for women's rights. Together, we can create a brighter future for all.

Yours sincerely,
[Your Name]
Pursuit of Happiness by Proxy.

I am told that it is for my good that I am governed; now, as I give my money for being governed, it follows that it is for my good that I give my money: which is possible, but call it not "free will", since it is the case that the man who gives me my money is answerable for it.

Moreover, in addition to the fact that no one can be more familiar with himself than myself and that the means of judging myself are not to be limited to the happiness of those whom they do not know, and I declare that I have not the honor of being known to the men who govern me.

Hence I am justified in saying that from my standpoint they are really too good and, I fear, somewhat indolent as regards themselves. It is not possible that they will ever have the leisure to go into the matter absolutely. I am not to believe that they are capable of pursuing its realization myself.

Arabic Proverbs.

1. Men are four:
   a. Who knows not and knows not how;
   b. Who knows not and knows how;
   c. He who knows not and knows how;
   d. He who knows not and knows how.

2. What is needed is knowledge of wisdom:
   a. To the man who knows not and knows how;
   b. To the man who knows not and knows how;
   c. To the man who knows not and knows how;
   d. To the man who knows not and knows how.

3. He who knows not and knows how.

4. The man who knows not what he knoweth; he is wise, for he knoweth not.

5. He who knoweth and knoweth not; he is wise, for he knoweth.

6. He who knoweth and knoweth not; he is wise, for he knoweth not.
Three Dreams in a Desert.

by OLIVE SCHREINER.

An allegorical prose poem beautifully picturing the emancipation of woman and forecasting the results thereof. Price, 5 cents; 6 copies, $0.18; 100 copies, $1.00.

Address the Publisher:

SARAH E. HOLMES, Box 3006, Boston, Mass.

FROM PANDEMION TO ELYSIUM.

by JAMES THIERRY.

Men and Women the immortal Gods and Goddesses, of the Earth, their eternal Hound and the Pandemon fill them constantly into real Elysium.

"This is a remarkable book, treating of Anarchy: . . . one of the most instructive books published in a long time. . . . much more than two, or three, or forty years perhaps! A poem to Elysium and a poem to the death, a poem to a translation, a poem to a revolution, a poem to a love, a poem to a curse!"—Power Labor Enquirer.

Price, 50 Cents.

Address: Author, Laramie City, Wyoming Territory.

SOCIAL WEALTH:

The Sole Factors and Exact Ratios in Its Accumulation and Appropriation.

by J. H. O'GALLAGH.

This handsome second volume of 200 pages treats of the principles of Capitalism, showing that Land and Labor are the only natural capital, and that the allocation of the total of existing movable and immovable values as one, and explaining the true meaning of Value at Exchange. Price, 1 cent.

Address: Author, 4001 Broadway, New York.

THE RADICAL REVIEW.

Vol. I, handsomely bound in cloth, contains, every six weeks, essays, reviews, and discussions of the most prominent radical writers, on industrial, political, social, and religious subjects. Price, 5 cents.

Address: BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 2366, Boston, Mass.

THE REIGN AND THE WHIRLWIND.

A poem written in prose by very a man's literary work, and especially . . . a novel which is the only one of its kind. Price, 1 cent.

Address: Author, 630 Broadway, New York.

THE FALLACIES IN "PROGRESS AND REACTION".

Under the title of "An Adult" the author presents an essay on the fallacy of the "Fallacies" of the fallacy of the "Fallacies". Price, 5 cents.

Address: Author, 300 Broadway, New York.

THE GREAT FRENCH ANARCHIST.

Dangers of the present, and dangers of the future. By the author of "The French Revolution," a book which has been popular ever since its publication. Price, 5 cents.

Address: Author, 4001 Broadway, New York.

THE SCIENCE OF SOCIETY.

by Stephen Pearl Andrews.

This work, long out of print, is now republished to meet a demand which for years has been steadily growing. Price, published forty years ago, and yet its teachings still far in advance of current thought on the subject, practically as a new book. The present work is the only one of its kind. Price, 5 cents.

Address: SCHREINER, Box 2366, Boston, Mass.

THE SYSTEM OF ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS.

by P. J. PROUDHON.

Translated from the French by BENJ. R. TUCKER.

An elaborate system of economic considerations, and the only one of its kind. Price, 1 cent.

Address: Author, 4001 Broadway, New York.

THE IRON LAW OF WAGES.

by HUGO HILGAM.

An inquiry into the effect of monetary laws upon the distribution of wealth and the rate of wages. Price, 5 cents.

Address: BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 2366, Boston, Mass.