On Picket Duty.

In consequence of the Dublin murder, Mr. Gladstone has introduced a bill "for the repression of crime in Ireland." We wish this most excellent purpose might be carried out, and would suggest to Mr. Gladstone that the first crime he should attempt to repress is one of about seven hundred years' standing. Until this first and great crime shall be repressed, we think all his other efforts to repress crime in Ireland will be labor lost.

The "Index-Appeal" of Petersburg, Virginia, says that "there is no known belief, misbelief, or unbelief that has not a building erected in its honor in New England and called a church." The "New York Times" answers: "Oh, yes, there is one,—that slavery was a divine institution." True enough, but only because the churches of New England were at one time so nearly unanimous in defending or excusing slavery that there was no call for creating another one especially.

Liberty is glad to hear from Moncreif D. Conway that it "would be safe to say that the large majority of educated Englishmen (except those retained to maintain other views) are convinced that Charles Bradlaugh and Mrs. Besant, by discussing public knowledge of facts on child-bearing which do away with temptation to infanticide or abortion, are doing a service to England for which posterity will build them monuments when every politician and priest now persecuted will have been forgotten.

It is not often that a typographical error does anything but mislead, but such exceptions to the general rule do sometimes occur. For instance, in a poem lately printed in the Boston "Advertiser" descriptive of Emerson's letter the following line occurs: "The words of love were said, we laughed and sang together." The printer who set this up evidently had faithfully read the reports of the funeral service. We submit that, in consideration of his devotion to truth, in this instance, the much-abused "intelligent compiler" should be forgiven many sins.

Judge Jeremiah Black has been defending the Land League. In his defense he took occasion to say: "The title to the land is in the landlords, and cannot be questioned except with any decent show of truth. To take it from them and give it to the tenants would be naked robbery." Liberty ventures to say that among the speeches delivered by Judge Jeremiah Black in easy-fifty years ago it could find some such passage as this: "The title to the slaves is in the slaveholders, and cannot be questioned except with any decent show of truth. To take them from the slaveholders and give them to themselves would be naked robbery." The Land League is better off without any such defenders as Jeremiah Black.

A new labor journal, called "The Emancipator," reaches us from San Francisco. It does not command respect, though flying the noble motto, "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity." It illustrates its idea of Liberty by denying to the Chinese the Liberty to decide where they will live and toil; it illustrates its idea of Equality by advising white laborers to "command" yellow laborers to leave the country; it illustrates its idea of Fraternity by driving the people of California to "shoot down every Chinaman who steps his foot upon our soil, and shoot down every white man who attempts to stand in your way." The "Emancipator" clearly seems to be emancipated. To that and we shall add Liberty, the real article will soon drive out the sham.

A crazy citizen of Rochester, N. Y., named Lehman, who familiars himself entrusted with the "mission" of destroying obstinacy, walked into an art gallery the other day and cut to pieces a valuable painting which professed to be a "study" of the charms of a cross human form. He is now in jail. A perfectly sane citizen of New York, named Comstock, who professes a similar mission, but really desires only to make himself feared (as he did), has been committing offenses like Lehman's, and much grosser ones in the same line, for more than a decade. He is not in jail, but a prominent idol of Church and State, receiving a fat salary from one and holding an office from the other. Such is the difference between the awards bestowed by these "holy" institutions upon honest "cranks" and shameless hypocrites.

A paragraph in the last issue of Liberty contained the following sentence: "The Boston Globe says that "the votes have gone into the Land League for the purpose of capturing it." We are informed that the editor of the "Globe" considers that we have misquoted him. That no injustice may be done we submit his name without comment: "There is a large proportion of the people opposed to any peaceful settlement with England, or any adjustment of the difficulty which does not recognize Ireland's right to absolute separation. In America these men are chiefly represented by O'Donnell, J. J. Devoy, and P. Foran. They went into the Land League for the purpose of capturing it — for the purpose of turning it into a revolutionary organization. The old Fenian elements, the clan gaels, the etc., and the wild, rabid, Socialistic, Communist, and Nationalist, have followed.

In one of its earlier issues Liberty claimed Charles A. Dana as an Anarchist. The following from the editorial columns of his journal, the New York "Sun," entirely substantiates our claim: "We believe in free trade, and believe in universal peace. We believe in the abolition of armies and navies. We believe in a democratic, self-governing, on-free, and harmonious system of society organized in consonance with the nature of man, and free from poverty, free from police, and free from jails." How spurious can Liberty subscribe to each and every article, and adopt it as her own. But why is not the "Sun" at Liberty's side, battling to make these beautiful beliefs realities? Does it not know that, broad and universal, monopoly makes usury, and usury makes poverty, and poverty makes crime, and crime makes police and jails and armies necessary? Of course it knows these things. And yet it not only never says a word against the principal most police and political and social creed, however often and impartially revisited, will bear the impress of insincerity.

The erection of numerous palatial residences on Fifth Avenue by the money magnates of New York is a very alarming moral symptom in the eyes of Felix Adler, the progressive Hebrew who presides over the New York "Society of Ethical Culture." In a recent discourse upon it he took the ground that, no matter how wealthy a man may be, he has no right to consume his wealth in luxurious living. Why not, he should like to know, may not a man do as he likes with his own? That the possessions of wealthy men are not rightfully their own we are very well aware, but about that matter Mr. Adler does not seem concerned. How our millionaires spend their money is a secondary question, the vital point being how they get it. To this point Mr. Adler, if he is in earnest, must turn his attention. Let him ask, not what wealthy men do with their money, but whether there ought to be any wealthy men.

Never was the contrast between the politician and the reformer more strikingly exhibited than in the attitudes of Parnell and Davitt since they came out of prison: Parnell cowed, Davitt resolute; Parnell anxious to compromise, Davitt more exacting than ever in his demands; Parnell humiliated, Davitt advancing vauntingly to the fore. Here were two men engaged in a battle for the abolition of landlordism. One goes to prison for a year, and comes out to say that, if the government will relieve clients of a portion of the rents already due, he hopes to see the Land League agitation abated. The other goes to prison for a little longer period, and comes out to say that the Land League will never be so well advanced until landlords everywhere are completely abolished. One studiously himself by practically admitting that he has been demanding in the sacred name of justice and high morality that which his present attitude indicates that he is only entitled to beg for as a matter of charity. The other glorifies himself and his cause by writing Justice higher than ever on his banner, asking nothing of charity, and insisting that his own sufferings shall not be made of no avail by flagitious surrender of the righteous claims of the oppressed, but shall bear fruit in the inevitable abolition of the unrighteous privileges of the oppressor. According to Parnell, the land agitation has been an unprincipled scramble; according to Davitt, it is still one of the grandest of revolucions. It redounds to the glory of the Irish people thus in this crisis they are recognizing their true leader. In this controversy we are happy to quote with warm approval the following words from an editorial in the Boston "Advertiser:" "It is not of paramount importance, even if Mr. Parnell should get wrecked on his own premises or silent pledges." He will have a very competent and singularly consistent successor in Mr. Michael Davitt, who is a man not greatly unlike Gladstone or Kossuth, and by far the most considerable Irish nationalist now living. He is one of the very few Irishmen who refuse presents and honors. He is unwilling to sit in Parliament, unwilling to deal with the English government, unwilling to think of anything save Irish freedom, which he deems purchased not too dearly though it cost his life. Hence, the attitudes of Mr. Parnell are of very slender importance. If he fret away his prestige, very little is lost.
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A letter to Thomas Bayard.

CHALLENGING HIS RIGHT—AND THAT OF ALL OTHERS.
So-called Senators and Representatives in Congress—Whether or Not They are Delegates Over the People of the United States.

To Thomas Bayard, of Delaware.

Shall—I have read your letter to Rev. Lyman Abbott, in which you express the opinion that you are positive for a "true" Constitution (under the Constitution of the United States), and yet be an honest man.

This proposition implies that you hold it to be at least possible that some four hundred men should, by some process or other, become invested with the right to make laws of their own—namely, those already of their own devices, and therefore necessarily distinct from the law of nature, or the principles of natural justice; and that these laws of their own making shall be really and truly obligatory upon the people of the United States, and not, as a mere fiction, the people may rightfully be compelled to obey them.

All this implies that you are of the opinion that the Congress of the United States, of which you are, just, by some process or other, become possessed of some right of arbitrary dominion over the people of the United States; which right of arbitrary dominion is not given by the Constitution, therefore necessarily in conflict with the law of nature, the principles of natural justice, and the natural rights of men, as individuals. All this implies, necessarily, that Congress now possesses any right whatever to make any laws whatever, of its own device—that is, any laws that shall be either more, or less, than the laws of the United States; that Congress can make such conflict obtaining, by the best minds of Europe and America, has actually worked itself into the good graces of a highly respectable Boston publishing house, and under the protection of its good name, has sometimes come among the people at large and prepared for the execution of the devil knows what foolish designs upon the morals of our pure and innocent youth.

But at this critical juncture in steps the over-watchful State (oh, where should we be without it?) and says: "No, this shall not be; the budding moral natures now about to blossom under the influence of the literature, pure and undefiled, of Shakespeare and the Bible shall be saved by the tools of the hugging passions of the author of "Leaves of Grass." So District-Attorney Stevens warns the Osgoods; the Osgoods ask Whitman to eliminate certain poems, preparatory to the publication of a second edition; in the perversity of their nature, they consider such a proposition, knowing that it would defeat his insidious plot (for did he not say as much on a former occasion when, negotiating with another publisher; who desired him to omit an objectionable passage; he declared that he "wrote the whole book to get those six lines in")?; the Osgoods violate their contract, and turn over the plates to the author; the few copies remaining in the bookstores speedily disappear in the掌握了, and rapturous maw of a filthy-loving public; and we are saved.

But, seriously, it is not a shameful satire upon our laws that one of them should brand with the most disgusting form of criminality the man and poet whose whole life is admirable; or the most competent critics living. But, even were the brand deserved, still would its bearer be more honorable than they who fix it upon him. For, disgusting as it is the perversion of physical passion into law and life, it is much less dangerous to the public morals than the perversion of moral passion which finds expression in government. There is no desire, however low, whose satisfaction is not often possible and safe. But when we are so far under the discretion to rule, and its worst manifestation is seen when it is directed against the tongues and pens and thoughts of men and women. Abolish, that "the instrument of this desire, the State, and leave d. entity to run its course. Where will it end and who will stand the inherent weakness of vice when fairly plied against virtue and intelligence well known. But in any case it can expose the world to no dangers approaching those resulting from laws aimed at its virtue, so well indicated by a writer in "In transfigured," whose article appears in another column, and so alarmingly illustrated by this recent outrage upon the "Good Gray Post" and those who love him for his words and works.
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secret ballot—and not in any open and authentic manner; and therefore not by any man, or body of men, who make them, selves personally responsible, as principals, for the acts of those to whom they have been delegated. Any such delegated power, has been legally known, or can offer any legal proof, as to who the particular individuals were, who delegated it to him. And having no power to identify the individuals who professed to delegate the power to him, he cannot show any legal proof that any body ever attempted, or pretended to exercise the power whom he present, and the freemen of the commonwealth, bound themselves to obey it, or made themselves personally responsible for the acts of their delegates. They had no natural right to impose it, as law, upon a single human being. The whole proceeding was a pure usurpation.

In practice the Constitution has been an utter fraud from the beginning. Pretending to be "ordained and established by " by "We the people of the United States," it has never been submitted to them, as individuals, for their voluntary assent, nor have they been asked to sign, seal, acknowledge, or deliver, it as their free act and deed. They have never signed, sealed, acknowledged, or delivered it, as the simple, true, free, and legal act of an individual power or obligation, to obey it. Very few of them have ever read, or even seen it; or ever read or see it. Of its legal meaning (if it can be said to have any meaning, nothing and nothing; nor ever will, nor ever will, know any thing.

Why is it, Sir, that such an instrument as the Constitution, for the government of a great people for the greater part of whom, has never been known anything, has never been submitted to, to the free, for the last ninety years, and to be used for such anabolos to the Constitution as has been and is now being used by those who have been made to give them over. While the poor, the weak, and the ignorant, who were to be cheated, plundered, and enslaved by it, have no right even to believe it, and believe that it is a sacred instrument, designed for the preservation of their rights. They had formed, plundered, and enslaved persons have been made to see, if not to believe, that the Constitution had such indirect power, that it could authorize the majority, or even a majority of a majority, to pass the law, for murder, robbery, or any other crime, or to bring charge, and imprison, or execute, any of these instruments for death as this secret appointed, irrevocable codal, of so-called legislators, should see fit to resort to for the maintenance of any of the powers of government.

As might have been expected, and as was, to a large degree, at least, intended, this Constitution has been used from the time it was first promulgated, and even previously, by those who professed to understand, and whose names had been made prominent at this time, say, five million in all—to exercise, through their agents, secretly appointed, an arbitrary and irrevocable 4 omission over the properties, liberties, and lives of the whole fifty millions; and that these fifty millions have no rightful authority but to submit all their rights to this arbitrary power. Because, in matters of life, limb, and death, as this secretly appointed, irrevocable codal, of so-called legislators, should see fit to resort to for the maintenance of any of the powers of government.

You might think, Sir, that such a constitution as this can do any thing that the law of the property, and the individual property, and the people, taken together, whatever the end of statesman, or would have regarded it, as a moment, as conveying any right, or delegating any power, or as having the slightest legal validity, or constitution.

If such a constitution should be made by one private individual, against another, and had been signed, sealed, witnessed, acknowledged, and delivered, with all possible legal formalities, in the presence of an honest man, and as many respectable persons, as are his friends or his enemies, and who would have regarded it, as a moment, as conveying any right, or delegating any power, or as having the slightest legal validity, or constitution.

For all the reasons now given, and for still others that might be given, the legislative power now exercised by Congress, is, in the strict sense, a purely personal, arbitrary, irresponsible, snarped dominion on the part of the legislators themselves, and not a power delegated to them by anybody.

Yet under the presence that this instrument given them the right of an arbitrary and irresponsible dominion over the whole people of the United States, Congress has now gone on, for ninety years and more, filling great volumes with laws of its own doing, to pass, and to be passed, and never ever seen, nor ever will read or see; and of whose legal binding it is entirely impossible that they should ever know any thing of. If ever a man, a statesman, a lawyer, a tyrant, a robber, is not in all his stupendous blockheads, if they imagine that they are anything else than such a man, or such an act, or such so-called laws impose the legal obligation upon anybody.

If you have never before looked at this matter in this light, you have never before looked at the consequences of this instrument, and the power of the people, necessary to their own safety and preservation, and a new and untried one, or any other method to obey it.

And this moral, and legal, and political monstrity is the kind of law that Congress is under the Constitution to impose upon the people.

Sir, you can say that such an arbitrary and irresponsible dominion, of this kind, as is now exercised by Congress, is exercised by Congress, has been delegated to it, by the Constitution itself (Art. I, Sec. 5) prescribes that —

"For any speech or debate (or vogue) in either house, they shall be free from any legal procution, or in any other legislative in any other place."

This proviso makes the legislators constitutionally irresponsiibly to anybody, by themselves, by any contract whatever, to anybody, or to those who may have, either openly or secretly, attempted or pretended to delegate power to them. And men, who are so legally free from responsibility, who are legally, and in the strict sense of the word, to be the agents of any body, or to be exercising any power for their own: for all real agents are necessarily responsible to those on whom they act, and to those for whom they act.

To say that the people of this country ever have bound, or ever could bind, Congress, or anybody else, by any contract whatever, to anybody, or to any other, or to this Constitution, or any other—unto thus give away all their natural rights of property, liberty, and life, into the hands of a few men—a mere creature—and that they should make it a part of the contract itself that these few men should be held legally irresponsible for the disposal they should make those of rights, in the strict sense of the word, unanswerable for the actions of themselves, and that they should bind themselves, by an utterly idiotic and unpolitical contract.

If such a constitution should be made by one private individual to another, and had been signed, sealed, witnessed, acknowledged, and delivered, with all possible legal formalities, in the presence of an honest man, and as many respectable persons, as are his friends or his enemies, and who would have regarded it, as a moment, as conveying any right, or delegating any power, or as having the slightest legal validity, or constitution.

For all the reasons now given, and for still others that might be given, the legislative power now exercised by Congress, is, in the strict sense, a purely personal, arbitrary, irresponsible, snarped dominion on the part of the legislators themselves, and not a power delegated to them by anybody.

Yet under the presence that this instrument given them the right of an arbitrary and irresponsible dominion over the whole people of the United States, Congress has now gone on, for ninety years and more, filling great volumes with laws of its own doing, to pass, and to be passed, and never ever seen, nor ever will read or see; and of whose legal binding it is entirely impossible that they should ever know any thing of. If ever a man, a statesman, a lawyer, a tyrant, a robber, is not in all his stupendous blockheads, if they imagine that they are anything else than such a man, or such an act, or such so-called laws impose the legal obligation upon anybody.

If you have never before looked at this matter in this light, you have never before looked at the consequences of this instrument, and the power of the people, necessary to their own safety and preservation, and a new and untried one, or any other method to obey it.

And this moral, and legal, and political monstrity is the kind of law that Congress is under the Constitution to impose upon the people.

Sir, you can say that such an arbitrary and irresponsible dominion, of this kind, as is now exercised by Congress, is exercised by Congress, has been delegated to it, by the Constitution itself (Art. I, Sec. 5) prescribes that —

"For any speech or debate (or vogue) in either house, they shall be free from any legal procution, or in any other legislative in any other place."

This proviso makes the legislators constitutionally irresponsiibly to anybody, by themselves, by any contract whatever, to anybody, or to those who may have, either openly or secretly, attempted or pretended to delegate power to them. And men, who are so legally free from responsibility, who are legally, and in the strict sense of the word, to be the agents of any body, or to be exercising any power for their own: for all real agents are necessarily responsible to those on whom they act, and to those for whom they act.

To say that the people of this country ever have bound, or ever could bind, Congress, or anybody else, by any contract whatever, to anybody, or to any other, or to this Constitution, or any other—unto thus give away all their natural rights of property, liberty, and life, into the hands of a few men—a mere creature—and that they should make it a part of the contract itself that these few men should be held legally irresponsible for the disposal they should make those of rights, in the strict sense of the word, unanswerable for the actions of themselves, and that they should bind themselves, by an utterly idiotic and unpolitical contract.
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MORTALITY.

Full closely neighborhood, foot and familiar visits. In mortal, peace of the village, all the commerce, all the amusements, all the society, all the pleasures, all the work, all thedependence and all the enjoyment of a human being.

And visceral orders. Once the passing at all the commerce, all the work, all thedependence and all the enjoyment of a human being.

That banquet on the dead in charred ruins.

Love and the Law.

One of the oldest writers for the Paris "Figaro" whose pseudonym is "Ignorant," has been publishing some extremely conservative and anti-revolutionary views in his columns. But he says that it commands the assent of extreme radicals, thus fortifying the mass that "extreme meets." Gramont, the radical young duke who contributes so ably to the columns of Rochefort's "Francais," has been noting some of these agreements, and here is what he says of one of these radicals who pontificates about the law against adultery:

Here we meet again, in common ideas,—we who start from so opposite points. But it is this first time that men awakened at all by the consequences of any parallelity of views. Let us meet again. No. So are meeting. In the law the men of speculations. Because men of principle by the principle of being logical, and the ways or logic are mystical. The men with whom we are here, are in the direction of the legal principle, but they are only persons. Who said that? Vitrin, in his famous discourse at Rastignac. Vitrin was the first to formulate the principle that legal speculations are grotesques. Once more, then, we have found, in an article signed "Ignorant," many of the ideas which are our own, although inspired by very different systems and articles, entitled, "The Law of Adultery," begins with observations hostile to divorce. We, too, are against divorce. "Ignorant" opposes it because, in a Catholic country, it involves impossible marriage. We oppose it because we favor no marriage at all.

We should not content ourselves with words. Neither is it necessary that we be satisfied with the mere "divorce" is capable of being interpreted in the broadest sense, as the law of 1792, I believe, interpreted it. If the "divorce" were only a mere separation, or, rather, a statement of facts, which, if printed on a handbill, would avow to make the million think, and — what is of equal importance — to shift the responsibility of all the emotional matter from the thing that are given the reason.

After ten or twelve years of family life, the value of the man, as far as a second marriage is concerned, has usually increased, and the marriage stands on much surer ground.

What compensation will you give to your divorced wife for the wile that she has undergone? None. "Woman," says one of these pamphlets, "is the will of one of the partners shall suffice to sever a union, while respecting (an indispensable condition) the rights of the wife, divorce would be a mere nullity, and it would satisfy us. But we know perfectly well what is meant by the divorce which our law-makers contemplate, and that it will be directed exclusively against the woman, will give the reason.

Yet, there are many who have already from one to one hundred millions, and a larger number having many thousands, all with legal books in their hands whereby to grab more.

The wealth of the nation lies in an immense grab bag; its vast resources are a mere accumulation of the prices of all the goods, each getta, each little, and if, by chance or legislation, only a few, the price goes up.

It seems to me that the man who is the case in the above manner would reach and operate on thousands who still think there are a "fireman" for them. An illusory handbill stating the above makes them a mighty one. But I don’t look for anything of the kind from American "agitators." If the Irish fall to hold their grip, then the law will have been the start, however, that movement would prove to be the beginning of the end.

Universal prohibition of the slave trade. The law that will give the world an appetite for its natural food. When the millions who now are devoted with the idea that there is for a price for them what is not for the public good should be arrested. As is the interest arising from the value of the proposedaminer's land by the public guardian system will be corrected, then will their enemies and the numbers of votes which can be exchanged. Then, with less labor than they have expended to get what does not exist, they will have enough to make them comfortable and happy, which is more than they have now, or can have, as it is not in the bag.

Respectfully yours,

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA.

SIEGEL STANFORD.

ENGLISH TYRANNY AND IRISH SUFFERING.

By Averil Mowbray.

A PAMPHLET has been issued by the British authorities, denouncing the atrocities of the Irish agitation. We hereby present to the public a copy of a pamphlet that has recently been printed and is now on sale.

The British government has been urged to take steps to prevent any further outbreaks of violence in Ireland. The British authorities have been accused of complicity in the outrages, and it is believed that they will be compelled to take prompt action to put a stop to the disorders.

To the Editor of Liberty:

Dr. A. B. is a man of sound judgment, or, rather, a statement of facts, which, if printed on a handbill, would show how the million think, and — what is of equal importance — to shift the responsibility of all the emotional matter from the thing that are given the reason.

The value of the man, as far as a second marriage is concerned, has usually increased, and the marriage stands on much surer ground.

A good word for the Devil.

By Simon Palmer.


LIBERTY’S PORTRAIT-GALLERY.

For either of the following pictures, address, BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 3060, Boston, Mass.


C. THE RADICAL REVIEW: Vol. I, handsomely bound, containing articles by John Ruskin, William Morris, Thomas Paine, and others, on the most prominent radical writers, on subjects of the most pressing social, political, and religious subjects. 250 pages octavo. Price, 60 cents. Single number, 10 cents.

D. THE RAILWAY KINGS VS. FOR AN ENG. Do the English workers need a "Railway Hero"? By Edward Bell. A reply to an article by William M. Green on the International Railway Strike. 200 pages octavo. Price, 60 cents.


