On Picket Duty.

The Chicago "Vorlage" has appeared again, but with four pages instead of eight. Its appearance, however, by no means indicates a victory for the freedom of the press, for its editors doubtless realize that, if they pass certain limits in the expression of their opinions, their paper will be promptly suppressed, and are consequently avoiding danger. Censorship, no less than suppression, is a denial of freedom.

The long delay in the issue of this number of Liberty was unavoidable. Another publishing house announced its intention of publishing a translation of "What To Do About It," and if Wendell Phillips drops everything else and give all my time and energy to the immediate appearance and sale of my own edition. My efforts were rewarded. My book was the first on the market, the first edition was exhausted in four days, and the second is now ready.

Contributors whose articles have been waiting a long time, and publishers whose books and pamphlets have thus far gone unnoticed, must forgive me and be patient. I have been preoccupied with the "logic of events," to which my friend Lys is so prone to subordinate his own reason, has had a moderate strong grip on me for a few weeks past, and much matter that has been prepared for these columns I have been obliged (to use a printer's phrase) to "hang on the outside of the chases."

At the special session of the General Assembly, Knights of Labor in Cleveland, there was a great hue and cry about an alleged combination or ring known as the Home Club, formed within District Assembly 49 of New York, with the purpose of obtaining the discharged or the.Color, the leading spirit in the conspiracy being Victor Drury. I know nothing about the Home Club, but I do know something about Victor Drury, and have no hesitation in saying that he is the leading spirit in no enterprise for the feathering of individual nests. If there lives a man who thoroughly despises filthy lucre, that man is Victor Drury.

Present the theory of Anarchy to an inquirer or argue it with an objector, and nine times out of ten, the first and last question asked you will be: "If there is no government, how will you get to the railroad?" With this question, and that of "Corporations generally," Charles T. Fowler deals very satisfactorily in the third number of his "Sun," which, after some months of obscurity, has again made a raft in the clouds that darken the social horizon. Mr. Fowler shows how the people, by pelting their posers, may practically control the railroads and secure their services at cost without the intervention of the State. This number contains a notice advertising its appearance in Liberty's Library, from which it may be seen that I supply it at the same low price as its predecessors,—six cents for one copy and ten cents for ten copies.

The communications in the present issue upholding Anarchists in joining the Knights of Labor ought to have been printed long ago. The question of compromise, upon which they hinge, has been discussed at much length in Liberty since we were written that I do not think it necessary to make further reply.
EIGHTEEN CENTURY CHRISTIANS:

The Evolution of the Gospel of Anarchy
An Essay on the Meaning of History

BY DYER D. LUM

Continued from No. 81.

Rome conquered and remodeled. With Roman arms went Roman customs. Military success involved civil reconstruction and Roman organization. By the middle of the 1st century the Roman camp ground and the Indurated Tyrrhenian was replaced by that of the foreign tax-gatherer; in which, however, there was often the boon of law and order, or—less euphoniously—mechanized robbery, not seeking what it could, or could not, get without the gun. The law and order of justice, it is true, but often preferable to the arbitrary exactions dictated by capitulation.

We thus trace the origin of the modern State to Caesar’s legacy, but this is not all. The dogma of authority introduced by the imperial Roman was not confined to the realm of politics alone. God and the State are the twin dogmas of Caesarism. It extended its conquests from earthly princes to Olympic deities, and sought to subvert the human soul, and achieve a universal reign. The law and order of justice, it is true, but often preferable to the arbitrary exactions dictated by capitulation.
threats and robbers, might or might not have been checked by circumstances which, under another policy, lay hidden in the womb of time; still, it is difficult for human imagination to conceive of a more tragic ending to that bright dream of liberty and equality which had once been the dream of Rome in the days of its splendor.

The civilization of Rome had for its cornerstone—Authority, and freedom languishing in the bosom of the popular mind. The moral sense and the civic, not the individual, was the form of trade among the citizens. The grateful remembrance of the past was a bond, not a fetter; and the form of the government was popular, but not democratic, because it was not the will of the people that was supreme, but the will of the rulers. The people, as a rule, were content with the government that was established by their leaders. They were not free to express their will, but they were free to obey the laws.

The civilization of Rome was based on the theory of the divine right of kings. To the Romans, as to the Greeks, the monarchy was the natural form of government. The king was regarded as a god, and the people were his subjects. The government was not a thing of human creation, but a gift from the gods. The people were expected to obey the king without question.

The Roman Republic, which followed the monarchy, was a form of government in which the people were not free to express their will. The Senate, composed of the wealthy and the noble, was the governing body. The people were not allowed to participate in the government, and they were content with the government that was established by their leaders. They were not free to express their will, but they were free to obey the laws.

The principles of the Roman Republic were the basis of the Roman Empire. The Roman Empire was a vast and powerful empire, but it was not a free and democratic one. The government was not a thing of human creation, but a gift from the gods. The people were not free to express their will, but they were free to obey the laws.
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The asserted workings of heredity are true, but the sources of transmitted misery and disease are located in a few tyrants. Cut these off, if a sacrifice must be made, and spare the millions. Unless we perform this service for posterity and for all the generations of thoughtful people, the drudgery of the Malthusian blasphemy will continue to annoy Anarchists who go to the bottom of things, and this everlasting trade of crying misery and setting up patent moral machines to écart it will never go on.

A Book That Will Live.

In the English translation of Tocqueville's "What's To Be Done?" the radicals of America, to whatever school they may belong, have the most potent instrument of propaganda that has ever been created. In the hands of the readers who may be, if there is a spark of earnestness hidden anywhere in the recesses of his nature or hers, this book will find it, and turn it into a flame. Whoever comes under its influence will fall in love with high ideals. There are thousands of young people in this country who need only to have their faces set in the right direction to become Yev Pervounov, Kirsanoffs, Lopukhoffs. Then let us put this book in their hands. It will manufacture the elements of the new society to come. Let every reader of Liberty purchase one, two, three, five, ten copies,—all that his means will afford,—and distribute them judiciously. People will read it who would not know what other work included in the radical propaganda. An idea of the work it will do can be formed from the attention already given it by the daily press. Metropolitan papers have already given it a fair chance of good from one end of the country to the other, giving it three columns of review, and it is selling rapidly. It has in it all the elements of success. It appeals to the love of sensation by its remarkable history and the nature of the motion it advocates. It appeals to the purse by its remarkable cheapness; it appeals to the aesthetic sense by the beauty of its binding and typography; it appeals to the taste for fiction by its power as a love story; it appeals to the literacy by its lucidity and its moral fitness; it appeals to the philosophic by its keen analysis of human nature and society; and all who are susceptible to any of these appeals find themselves rapturously gazing, before they know it, at a picture of the world that is to be. It is a quickening book, a creative book, a book that will live.

"Greatly Mistaken."

The New York "Herald" of May 26, replying to an article in Liberty of May 22, thinks I am "greatly mistaken" in the matter of Anarchism as a panacea for mankind. Well, perhaps I am. I do not care to argue the point, as it has nothing to do with the matter I now have in hand, to wit, the duty of the "Herald" in regard to the "bad laws," which it so knows and understands, and to be the main causes of all the "abuses" and "grievances" from which mankind suffer. The "Herald" will pardon me for repeating its precise words: "Abuses grow mainly because of bad laws, and the remedy lies, not in enacting more laws, but in repealing injurious laws. Whenever any part of the people suffer a grievance, it will be found that the cause of it is a consequence of a bad law interfering with their liberty of action in some needless way, and that the remedy lies not in more law, but in repealing off the bad law."

Now, this, I hold, is very weighty, all-important truth. And all I have asked of the "Herald" is, that it will do what it can in procuring the repeal of all "bad laws." I did not ask the "Herald" to accept my opinion as to what are, and what are not, "bad laws." We might disagree on some, or perhaps many, of the laws that one or the other of us would call "bad. And I do not wish to pretend to any authority on that point. I only ask the "Herald" to be its own judge, and to act on its own judgment. When it asserts that "abuses" and "grievances" result mainly from "bad laws," it must not be presumed to have had an opinion of its own, as to what are, and what are not, "bad laws. Why, then, will it not go forward, and do what it can to procure the repeal of all laws, which, in its opinion, come under the head of "bad laws?"

My article presented this duty distinctly to the "Herald," and I am sorry to see that the "Herald" gives no promise of performing it, and no reason why it does not perform it. But, instead of doing so, it attempts to divert attention from its delinquency, by insisting that Anarchy is a very bad thing; that it means no law at all; that, in order to procure the repeal of "bad laws," it is not necessary to carry dynamite carcasses with you, as it is necessary to set the city on fire, or to create a riot leading in bloodshed.

I agree that it would not be necessary to do any of these things—and I am also of the opinion that nobody ever thinks of doing them, but, instead of doing so, it attempts to divert attention from its delinquency, by insisting that Anarchy is a very bad thing; that it means no law at all; that, in order to procure the repeal of "bad laws," it is because such papers as the "Herald" do not even attempt to procure their repeal.

The "Herald" says: When a law works a grievance, it is easy to go to the polls in an entirely new way, and have it removed from the statute books.

Is this really so easy a thing to do? If so, what excuse can the "Herald" offer for not attempting and having the work done at once? Does anybody know, better than the "Herald," the ten thousand vile influences and artifices, which the avance and ambition of a few beings bring to bear to procure the enactment, and prevent the repeal of "bad laws," by which they acquire their wealth and power? Does anybody know, better than the "Herald," that there are, in the country, hundreds and thousands of servile press, and tens and hundreds of thousands of servile and corrupt politicians, whose principal, if not only occupation is to procure the enactment of "bad laws," and prevent their repeal? And that, for these purposes, they are so employed, that, in describing the oppressed classes as to the injustice of these laws, and their effect upon their welfare.

If the "Herald," which is sending broadsheet a hundred thousand of its sheets daily, can do nothing to put an end to all this making of "bad laws," and enforcing them upon the people, how can it say that it is "easy" for the millions of poor men, who never see a statute, book, and know little or nothing of what is in them, or what is the particular operation of this or that statute, and who, moreover, are so widely scattered over the country that they can hold no consti-tutions with each other, as to the remedies for their wrongs, and who can say that it is "easy" for these men "to go to the polls in an orderly way, and have the bad laws removed from the statute books?"

I suggest to the "Herald" that it is its imperative duty to law every carefully considered list of all those "bad laws," by which it acknowledges that the people are impoverished and oppressed; that it lay this list before the whole country, and faithfully explain the particular operation of each one of these "bad laws;" that it then enlighten the oppressed classes as to how they are to proceed to procure the repeal of all these "bad laws;" and that, having put its hand to the plow, and looke not back till the work is done. If, now, the "Herald" really wishes to see these "bad laws" repealed, and the enactment of new ones prevented, does not see what an opportunity it has, all the time there is a for hold paper, with a large circulation, to take up this cause, and do a great work for the oppressed classes in this, and ultimately in other countries.

Will not the "Herald" now suspend its vituperations of the temporary and comparatively inimportant things—whether good or bad—as Anarchy, Social-ism, Communism, Nationalism, Democracy, Republicanism, Toryism, Whigism, etc., and strike some telling blow at the great and lasting "bad laws," which exist, and asserts to be the causes of all the "abuses" and "grievances," under which so many millions of mankind are suffering.

If, instead of doing this, it shall go on supporting
Mr. Lum Finds Liberty Wanting

To the Editor of Liberty:

I am waited patiently for Liberty in full confidence that it would speak in no uncertain tones on the outrageous procedure followed by the Suffus in the case of Mr. Lum. Nor was I disappointed, save in what you left unpaid. Philosophy as a science would have condemned the Chinese "Communists" (if you will place them at the hands more than dissertations or well-rounded and careful distinctions by X between "Boston Anarchists" and the "savage Communists of Chicago.")

If, as you say, there is a real menace to Liberty in the hands of the constituted authorities, it seems to me, that it is a practical duty for us to show our faith by our works, and take steps to see that the men under arrest in Chicago are defended and acquitted. Or would an effort be made in the courts be as objectionable to a "Boston Anarchist" as the more "savage" methods of the Chicago "Communists"?

The question is not—at least with men, however it may be with time-serving cowards who are afraid that their apo- lites may not be "regular" or "sane." But the men are ready to denounce the savage Communists of Chicago, as "X" puts it, but whether they are ready to calmly philo- sophize and criticise to their face the chief end of the "Boston Anarchist" is felt in building sepultures for men our fathers have stoned, or in pleading mightily for: "thank thee Lord I am not as other men are." In short, what is the practical duty of an Anarchist—even though one may use neither of the qualifying adjectives, "Boston" or "Philistine"—concerning men whom I do not ad- mit to have done wrong? Is it merely to carefully distin- guish between the authors and the calumni and cured but more unfortunate men? The "uncertainty" in my mind is not confounded to the circumstance which "suspended the throwing of a bomb at the "Boston Anarchist.

Heartily wishing "X" had said more (and I think it could have done so without over-running the page), and that "X" had said less (I remain Yours truly. DRY D. LUM)

The chief trouble with Mr. Lum's criticism is that he doesn't tell me what to say to. In a private let- ter I asked him to supply this deficiency, but for an- wers the letters may use neither of the qualifying adjectives, "Boston" or "Philistine"—concerning men whom I do not ad- mit to have done wrong. Is it merely to carefully distin- guish between the authors and the calumni and cured but more unfortunate men? The "uncertainty" in my mind is not confounded to the circumstance which "suspended the throwing of a bomb at the "Boston Anarchist.
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IRISHLAND.

(Continued from page 3.)

Ireland.

"If I had co-edited a rebellion, it would be to save him from his perils; but now, I have no wish to help him or his followers; to come to a decision on this subject, I await the next move of General Macpherson, and shall act accordingly."

The Britons, however, showed no sign of the least regret at the news of the defeat of the Irish. They were not disturbed in their march, but continued on their way with the same air of unconquerable courage and intrepidity. The news of the defeat of the Irish spread rapidly among the inhabitants of the island, and caused great consternation and alarm."

Regardless of the last words of the Britons, which still stood in their midst, the Irish were determined to meet them with force, and to try and drive them from their country. They were not afraid of the Britons, nor did they care for their antics or their threats. They were ready to defend their land with their lives, and they were determined to drive the Britons from their country.

The Britons, however, were not willing to give up without a struggle. They were determined to drive the Irish from their land, and to take possession of it for themselves. They were not afraid of the Irish, nor did they care for their threats or their attempts to drive them from their country. They were ready to defend their land with their lives, and they were determined to drive the Irish from their country.
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Use Them Instead of Abusing Them. I know it is not polite, to say the least, to ask admission into a home in order to throw stones at its members. But I will frankly face the fact that I am more than ever disposed to come into the present number of Liberty for. I want to find fault with the greater part of what has been said and done in recent times by its laboring leadership. It is true that there is an error in all this, a fatal error, that has most of the Anarchist method. Far be it from me to criticize excessively the thought of the leaders, although I have always been in Anarchry than I. Still it does seem to me—and I must tell you so—that they mistake in being so little disposed to take advantage of the very considerable and right conditions that can be found in the present state of things. It is hard enough to get the world along in the right direction, the best that can be done. Perhaps it is because the Anarchist is not so ready to make use of every possible opportunity of making people understand his philosophy of life.

Therefore, I say, instead of learning the Knights of Labor, use them. Of course, there is much in their methods and their intentions that is requisite to an Anarchist. But it is a wonderful, meaningful presentation all ready for use, for the spread of Anarchistic ideas. Its leaders and its members are deeply in earnest, and they are pressing along toward the best lights they have. Instead of carpeting at us, let them instruct us. Un- doubtedly, they are doing good—so much good could be done on so large a scale at the present time. But if their wonder- ful power could be given an impulse in the direction of less dependence on the slow, tedious, and often little little leaves of Anarchy could be put into that vast, ferti- lizing man,—what wonderful results might it come from if a few of them could make the one time of a thousand years for the growth of Anarchy. It is the spring of labor's long, long year, and labor feels the wonderful new life in its veins. They have to rush away, and make such wonderful growth so new it never made before, as never the world saw before. And Anarchy ought to have large shoulders to carry the triumphs of today's action. The time has come to her own some centuries sooner, I think, were Anar- chists to use them rather than abuse the Knights of Labor.

The Knights of Labor. (Winston Press.)

The Knights of Labor. (Winston Press.)

The rapid growth of the organization of the Knights of Labor is one of the signs of the times. The age is moving on with rapid strides toward a social revolution. As in all pre-revolutionary periods, men are blindly groping and associating together to discover some patent method of compromising light and darkness, authority and liberty, hoping to discover the happy twilight medium in which both can agree. This is the political platform of the Knights of Labor. I am intensely interested in the effort by the pressure of economic necessity, their hearts stirred by the unconscious flour- ick of the spirit of the times, blind to the logic of events that drive them to liberty to the death, and with their mutes thoroughly permeated with the vicissitudes of the quick nostrum of the day, it is no wonder that crude methods reign in their council halls. But Man is ever wiser than men. The uncensored leav- ership under which they are acting, sees more clearly, and will aid them all ways the same. What is the end? We are to form a new society.
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Mr. Walker's Neo-Nonsense.

I am sorry to see that E. C. Walker, having taken a position on Multinationalism, probably without due consideration, seems to be in a hurry to generalize the same for the sake of consistency, to maintain that position at all hazards. Consistency is a very fine thing but truth is far finer. Mr. Walker is still doubtful as to the soundness of his Multinationalism, though he signed the fundamental declaration of Multinationalism,—i.e., that the working-people would be better off, everything else remaining equal, if their nationalities were not clipped. Does Mr. Walker know that Multinationalism's "Theory of Population" was written by Condorcet to Condercet's "Eloge du Droit de l'Homme" and Godwin's "Political Justice," the two most Anti-compulsory of the works of the century, which demonstrated that the morality and crime were in a way the ill-quality of conditions, generated and fostered by each and every political systems. Both Godwin and Condorcet foresee that some day the nation would concede itself, and we see also, as we see today, that it was not the burning question, calling for immediate solicitude, not the question on the one which depended on the condition of all the others, but that it was a dependent question, secondary to that of condition. Condon sez highly has shown that with improper compulsion families will disappear from this improvement, the population question would settle itself, for no man would then desire to bring his gifts into existence, in his desire whose happiness he could not provide, and that recklessness in this respect today was due to the general degradation of the people. Multinationalism came to the rescue of the rich nations, and was one of the most noted signs of the emancipation of the race following the French Revolution. He endeavors to show that any trade ails to improve the conditions of the people. He says that his book will make it possible for a large population. Mr. Malinov's followers have since pointed with pride to India as a proof of their master's inalienable right. It has been conceded, was conceded, etc., to prove that population having been removed by the mother care of the British government, the Indian people have been reduced to a condition which was not the case with the primitive tribes that were before. They take no note of the part which the fostering care of the British mother has bore in the production of this poverty; it is not part of their book.

A large part of Mr. Walker's article is more suited to the column of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union pamphlets than to the column of Liberty. It betrays an attempt in regard to the population question,—the selfish Christian in this particular question. Mr. Walker probably admits that the condition of the "individual worker" is made worse by intermarriage habits, but nevertheless he would conciliate the question which confined himself to treating the intermarriage, but it is the poverty which produced the troublesome untempered. Intemperance and the large families are consequences of the conditions that produce them, and it is therefore to those conditions that our attention must be directed.

In his long endeavor to maintain the position which he has assumed, Mr. Walker has devised the 26 plane of the Anarchist for that of the ordinary bourgeois or trade of the present. He claims that "Is Living in the present, and not in some millennial future." In his criticisms of the ideas and actions of the trade-unions, Mr. Walker has devised the antagonism of the Anarchist, and in his opposition with the trade-unions, a really philosophical student of society would never have displayed, and just because of this very imperfection and this dishonesty of his attack, will discredit the arguments of the trade-unions. The trade-unions always tell us:—"Your theories are very fine, but what we want now are better wages and shorter hours." When we say that, when these become general, they will be better off than they were before, they answer that they are dealing with the present, and not with some millennial future. When we have higher wages and fewer hours, we will then have more intelligence to consider the labor question, etc., etc. Mr. Walker ought to join Mr. Atkinson in his improved system of domestic economy, and also to take lessons from Miss Gorham how to make a meal of beef last a family of six persons for three weeks, these subjects are highly important, and deal with "the here and the now."

But Mr. Walker has really begged the whole question of Multinationalism. Multinationalism says in proportion to the food, producing capacity of the whole at any time, the number of people living has been too great, and hence war, famines, and pestilence are absolutely necessary, and that the only way to equality (which is due to overpopulation) can be removed is by reducing the people to the number of the soil. Mr. Walker says that the individual workman is better off when his family is small, but admits that, if small families become general, poverty would exist, there would be less injustice, but that in all cases, from the training they had received in lessening the size of their families, would be more fitted to combat the difficulty. Possibly, he may have changed the discourse too Soon. Will the question of political economy to one of domestic economy, with which the question of the just distribution of wealth has nothing whatever to do with it?

As to France, France is a prize that Multinationalism,—that is, a restriction of the populations,—is a failure as a means of the development of poverty. It is the country district of France, if I understand J. B. Mill rightly, that the small-fami
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