Onicket Duty.

"Freibert" has a witty wrapper-writer. Liberty's exchange copy now bears the address: "So-called Lib- erty." I would remind this embryonic freethoug that such little pleasures are but the superfluous incident on which they are inserted to be held for little "postage, in which case I should be deprived of the en- joyment of his ebullient humor.

John Most, finding that people will not believe that he is being imposed upon by Most's followers, is now the victim of the vildest personal abuse and slander for which Most's foul mouth can find words. I know not whether this be true, but I do know that such an act is exactly characteristic of my noble friend. And I further know that he furnishes bail only a few days before for Braunschweig, one of Most's lianis, arrested, like his chief, on a charge of incendiary utterances. Schwab is outspoken in his denunciation of the incendiary deeds of these men, but, when the question is one of incendiary utterances, that is, of free speech, he knows no enemy but the oppressor. His conduct is all the more praiseworthy because he is probably aware that, in heaping a load of fire upon them, his friends' heads, he is adding fuel to the flame of their hatred of him.

Gertrude B. Kelly in Liberty and John F. Kelly in "Lucifer" have driven my friend, E. C. Walker, into a very small corner. Unfortunately I cannot lay my hand on Mr. Walker's original paragraph in defence of Malthusianism, but I remember that it gave me a very decided impression that he regarded large families as a less dire fact than misery of the prevailing po- verty of the masses as a whole, and prudential limitation as a less dire remedy for this poverty than the ab- solution of misery. I may be wrong, and his words may not justify this impression, but I may be, he is at any rate forced to declare, under press-ure of the Kelly's arguments, that he did not mean that limitation would in itself destroy our social evils, but that men with intelli- gence enough to practise limitation necessarily have intelligence enough to find a way to destroy these evils. Well, I think they would; Mr. Walker is right. If the knowledge that, beside being able to get to Chicago from Boston by train in twenty-two days, one can get the "same" by traveling eastward for several months, makes one a Malthusian, then I acknowledge my con- version; I am a Malthusian, too. Mr. Walker's idea of the "law of wages" is that people in relation to the population of the earth seems to be something like this: "I have a problem before me which can be solved by the rule of three; my mind is unequal to the rule of three; therefore I will study the original or the third party."
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Miss Kelly's Criticism.

While there can be no successful denial of the fact that the population of the earth has increased beyond the carrying capacity of the country, nor that the situation is of grave concern, yet it is necessary to see the matter in a broader light than that of the "law of wages." It is not enough to say that the "law of wages" has caused the distresses; it is necessary to see that the distresses are caused by the "law of wages." The individual laborer's of the "law of wages" is not the cause of the distress, but the effect of some other cause.
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EIGHTEEN CHRISTIAN CENTURIES:  

THE EVOLUTION OF THE GOSPEL OF ANARCHY.  

An Essay on the Meaning of History.  

BY DUX ER D. LUM.  

CENTURIES OF PROGRESS.  

I.  

The morning dawns! The long dark night of mind,  
by priory and cult, at last gives way  
Before the dawn of mind! The rising of the sun  
With its cold, starlit, not-long confined  
With victory's light, its dark, endless steed.  

The soul, the intellect has felt the dawn  
The dawning, seeing things clearer and clearer,  
As wars with life, though grasping yet half blind.  

Light, a herald of the Age.  

Fifteenth of Christ, yet man's consciousness,  
It stirs now thoughts within Columbus' heart,  
In Dante's pope and king from printed page,  
And mines the dikes that dam the soul's advance.  

II.  

With wondrous strength the infant mind of man  
Tense off the sinews, which would bend its hold.  
The sacred bands which have for ages rolled  
Its length, there is no end to their roll.  

Of leadership he takes his place to scan  
The task which once his rising thought enjoined  
And hasting turns from pax by orders slaked —  
Silent, would the world stand still.  

To forest fountain, the Spirit of the Age.  
His conscience is an agency of the people.  
And earth is dry where freedom's martyr's fall;  
Sixteenth of Christ, appears on progress' page  
First of Free Thought, and won by human deeds.  

III.  

With garments dyed in floods of crimson rose  
Roses, that once were wild and untamed,  
Still wanes Caesar's war on Liberty:  
In summer's green, in November's snow  
On Luther's tomb unimpassioned victor's stem.  
With his happiness the soul of Rome.  
Control over thought denied is anarchy!  
And the crowns of Caesar, lost in Rome.  

Their common theme, — Thought, thought.  
While men record  
Progress has written with far keenest sight  
A new edition of this.  

The legend Toleration. Of our Lord  
Seventeenth had passed before free speech was wrought!  

IV.  

To arms! To arms! With the whistle's ring,  
Where progress plants it standard at the foe,  
And every nation is in arms to the song.  
As noon of freedom rises on arder's wings  
To swell a stadiums from his world's Birth-bed.  
Unsmirched of the shrines of priory lore  
That altar, where they were,  
Inscribed from God from whom all power springs,  
A veneration for the Christian name.  

Has passed in Rome and, Toul, and, and, and;  
The Age seeks not upon the Jewish creed  
To bestow the blessings of liberty, it may claim,  
When eighteen centuries have passed away.  
Of royal tyrant's dormant, dark, and desolate.  

The Spirit of the Age death never dwell  
In conflicts won, but to see, in the face  
To war, and life, and seeks to lead the race  
To freshen fields, the waters from its well  
For nations growing things and we forget  
From present problems striving craft, we give place  
To other themes than right divine or grace,  
Or church or king, censure hath no spell  
O'er rights achieved. Free thought, free speech, and battle won,  
Grin Labor turns to face his ancient foe  
In angry mien.  

To our modern states,  
The economic problem with us dates.  
And with all progress once to reach  
Coercion wanes the welfare grows.  

In the history of human progress centuries are the milestones by which we measure the distance covered. In the East even this method fails; so stereotyped are the forms of social life and the change that with the restless activity of the Aryan tribes in the West each century has grown more and more unlike the preceding. Greco-culture and Roman arms had broken down the narrowest of nationalities and tribal distinctions when the Christian era commenced, Roman administration had united vast and distant provinces into an Empire. One after the other they had succumbed to the invader. Where the vandals were they powerless to their dominion. Their fighting together in the French Revolution and the Napoleonic wars were instances of their capacity from familiarity the conv. ran easily to contempt. Yet in this social chaos Time reveals its constituent factors. The history of Europe is the record of struggle between conflicting principles; of antagonistic forces contesting for possession. These principles may be named Authoritarian and Liberal. As the result, we have had centuries of interaction between despotic with walls of orphans, shrines of ravished maidens, team of wielders of club, and cursed and desponded, and as the result of these processes, one erstwhile intellectual, political, social, and economic system, new born barren wastes; schools and universities destroyed, libraries given to the flames and their readers to the sword, the most of mathematics denounced as infernal, the learning of the past spit upon and trampled under foot, and awards bestowed on superstitious ignorance; the blighting effect of fire and fagot in suppressing original thought and race and gloom in deteriorating manhood, and lastly the artificial selection of those who possessed what knowledge did survive to leave no offspring; the restriction of invention to new instruments for human torture; the control and exploitation that natural enjoyment and progress were to be denied, enforced by suppression of Olympic games and festival games by Christian empire and the abolition of public and private baths; the sanctification of the growth of the religion of the Cross, watered by Charlemagne's sword and Inquisition zeal, and sorrow and tears installed in smiling nature with pleasure to the Annabel as man's new master.  

How is it, then, we may well ask, that out of such a tremendous outlay of living material we have—civilization? For a thousand years the word had lost its edge and significance. It is the fruit of society and individual right that makes the true principle and privilege which the genus of Authority had so assiduously sown, and on its ruins we see those hideous prophecies,—Tanys and Eulenspiegel in the twin dogmas of Cæsarism;—Church and State. All writer: on government seek to determine the position of a just line separating freedom and obedience; how far authority may encroach upon liberty for the preservation of an allegorical social order and the maintenance of existing social conditions. It is admitted that in the abstract they are irreconcilable enemies; that, where authority exists, it must involve a loss of a certain degree of personal liberty. In all ages men have sought and still seek to balance these—contradictory forces. True social altruism, they believe, may if they may be forced to yield half. As an emergent authority is, the world knows it. It is felt itself behind existing institutions, survivals of a past stage of progress, which our social altruism invariably and necessarily must come from its return. Its present-day claim is known by the name of Cæsarism: the claim of absolute and universal sovereignty. It ever seeks support in might, and justification in the maintenance of the status quo. But Americans have been made to express by the expression "Lost in Nestle" has fully expressed the animating thought of Caesar and Augustus.  

However, to define it to is to limit it; to materialize it by giving it a fixed form in a progressive social environment. It is ever privileges, that requires, that makes constitutional guarantees. In the following pages, therefore, we have made no attempt to delineate its features, though we have been able to seize its spirit. The true answer to the eternal conundrum can only be found by watching its course through the ages. To understand its tendencies we must go back to the seething crucible of the middle ages and analyze its conflicting forces. We must read the milestones of the age and the silver cord of progress winding through darkness to understand the present and catch inspiration from the eternal Zaehyph. I am not writing the history, or tracing the historic events, of these centuries. My purpose is one far more searching. It is to trace the underlying causes to the modern tendencies to subordinate the spirit of authority to that of liberty; not so much peoples and peoples have done, but may they have so done; what the spirit that shaped their roughened efforts.  

The question: "Our civilization—where?" We are brought to the great distinguishing features between European and other civilizations. In all the old civilizations of Asia, as well as that of Egypt, society had reached a fixed form which had once been held to have been come from within. In fact, the later and less versatile natural life, had full scope in all trans-European civilizations. While probably none of them were indigenous in origin, from the want of the necessary spur to activity, in Europe the same spirit had succeeded.  

In the history of Greece we first meet with two new facts in the intellectual history of the world. 1. Its geographic temperate nature, and the bodily activity of the Greeks to a greater degree than Egypt or Asia had ever known; 2, the general aspects of nature, by their greater uniformity,—the absence of the startling or terrible less strongly upon human thought. Consequently their religion had less of the terrible in doctrine or right, and a less negative influence upon the development of the intellect. Rome, somewhat similarly situated, early assimilated the Greek conception of the dignity of man, and the energy of the understandings suppressed the poetic instincts of the imagination. The Roman, finding himself in a calm and peaceful environment, grew less imaginative as the friendly aspect of nature grew more familiar. Bewigged nature in Europe softened the awful majesty of the Oriental gods, with their terrors of eternal woe. But the extension of the practical genius of the Roman people soon introduced a practical science. The uniformity which Greece was rapidly extending up the heights of Olympus, in Rome found expression in politics and the intellect fell before that of craft. And because dealing with men rather than with phenomena, and the weapons were called spiritualism, the study of man had always characterized the domestic life of Cæsar, under the further development of his idea, gave place to the pomp of a Caligula and a Heliogabalus, and under: Dioscorides, Galen, Constantine had a salutary effect. The same process inevitably resulted in the realm of religious conceptions; the imagination, again of the intellect, was again subordinated to nature. But in this case the intellectual world was, in the natural course of things too rustic to supply the environment requisite to the perpetuity of Asiatic sublimities; the assimilation of the natural causes of things was already in place, and the effects of the authority to reassert the supremacy of the understanding over the imagination.  

Buck in well said:  

Looking at the history of the world as a whole, the tendency has been, in Europe, to sub-ordinate the intellect to man; in Asia, to sub-ordinate man to the intellect. This is why we have in barbarous countries several exceptions; but in civilized countries the rule has been universal. The division is a natural one, the division, therefore, in the history of the world, is a natural consequence of the social division.  

It is the basis of the philosophy of history, since it suggests the important consideration that we would understand, for instance, the history of India, if we could trace it back to the circumstances, to the social division of the world in our first study, because it has influenced man more than has influenced it. If.
THE WIFE OF NUMBER 4,237.

BY SOPHIE KROPOTKINE.

Translated from the French for Liberty by Sarah E. Holmes.

Continued from No. 80.

She started in fact, and took a few steps on the road, but returned to seat herself on a little stone-post at the gate of the cemetery.

* * *

The wife of number 4,237 was a Jacobin Tisic in their village. That is a resemblance in names, and how easy to mistake the number! But they knew who was who, and no one else and tell me that it was Jean?"..."

But her thoughts became confused. Another idea has been born; it grows, takes root, obtrudes itself, and drives away all others.

"And if they have burnt him alive!" she asks herself. "They said that he was a cur and should have been thrown into a limekiln. In a minute, his plan had ripened with the rapidity of delirium. She will go and compose herself to her work; she will do it, she will eat and drink, and go on with her daily drudgery." And she will climb up on this stone-post; the railing is low; she can climb over it. She has seen where they put the shovels, and she can quickly clear away the earth. Her mother died in a field.

Poor Julie! You do not know that, if you could open the coffin, you would recall her to life, you would not let it be done! No, no, no! For you have had a tender Newspapers had the great war of the century. It was the war of the old and the old.

But this event as the unforeseen condition of the market for so many months, the farmers having anticipated a very large demand, and the dealers not being able to supply the quantity required. The result was that the price of flour rose to two shillings a bushel, and many of the small farmers were forced to sell their crops at a loss. This 19th century war, which was due to an unforeseen condition of the market, was a new and strange phenomenon.

The 19th century was a time of great innovation and progress. The industrial revolution had brought about a rapid increase in the production of goods, and this in turn had led to a rise in the standard of living. However, the price of food remained high, and this made it difficult for the working class to afford the basics of life. The 19th century war was a reflection of this fact.

The 19th century war was a war of the old against the new. It was a war of the past against the future. And it was a war of the poor against the rich.

The 19th century war was a war of the old against the new. It was a war of the past against the future. And it was a war of the poor against the rich.

The 19th century war was a war of the old against the new. It was a war of the past against the future. And it was a war of the poor against the rich.

The 19th century war was a war of the old against the new. It was a war of the past against the future. And it was a war of the poor against the rich.

The 19th century war was a war of the old against the new. It was a war of the past against the future. And it was a war of the poor against the rich.
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"A free man is one who enjoys the use of his reason and his faculties; who is neither blinded by passion, nor horrified or driven by oppression, nor deceived by erroneous opinions."—Principia.

Liberty and Violence.

It is always difficult for one not an eye-witness to write fairly and intelligently of conflicts that occur between the police and revolutionary elements of whatever stripe. That the police in large cities are, for the most part, brutal, unscrupulous, merciless wretches is unquestionable; but, on the other hand, it is impossible to place the implicit confidence in what is said of their conduct in special instances in the ravings of John Most or the harangues of such men as Spies, Fielden, and Parsons of Chicago. More than once has the writer been appalled by the worst thing that can happen at a bomb at the Chicago police with such destructive effect. No satisfactory information has yet been furnished us as to how the police really interfered with the meeting that was in progress, or how much was done in accomplishing the interference. It seems unlikely, however, that their conduct could have been such as to warrant the throwing of the bomb. It seems much more likely, though we have no direct information, that the bomb was in the habit of carrying dynamite bombs in their coat-tail pockets, that the individual who threw it was seeking an opportunity to throw it. I cannot understand either the desperation of Spies and his comrades or how much of the bomb would not have been thrown if the meeting had not been attacked. How do they know? Have they not been preaching for years that the laborers need no other protection than the steady opposition of capital to warrant them in wholesale destruction of life and property? Was not this very meeting held for the purpose of advising the laborers to pursue such a policy? Why, then, should they not expect some arrest? But the writer, in the act of approval and applause, and in the act of approval and applause, regarded with the most peculiar suspicion, that the bomb would be in small bodies and unable to concentrate, for the anarchists would hold the depot and the cars, and the amount of dynamite used at any one time was but a small part of the dynamite on hand. After all, that was the idea. Of course, they will justify themselves in excusing the railroad, their property. If a conflict is to convene where there is liberty to pick and choose, the fellows will find what fools they are, or were. They forget that it is brains, skill, long training, knowledge, and, above all, the advocates of the law. They forget, think they cannot intimidate the anarchists, who are mostly men of courage and superior to the masses as in whose opinion the anarchists think the law they have to contend with. Then, the rebels will be in small bodies and unable to concentrate, for the anarchists will hold the depot and the cars, and the amount of dynamite used at any one time was but a small part of the dynamite on hand. All this will affect the anarchists an excuse for a strong government, and the police will be able to compel them to give up the dynamite, and thus the police will have the pockets of manufacturers of guns and other war munitions, and a strong government, too. It is supposed to be impossible to stop the police without breaking the law they have to contend with. All these, and the police will have to pay the cost of the war. If I could control the men in all these labor organizations, I could, without even lifting a tooth-pick other than to write with it, in a perfectly quiet way bring capital to its knees, or, if I thought it just and wise, forced proprietors to sell their property at cost, or less. A resort to arms is suicidal to the side that initiates it. Moral force once clearly perceived as a social principle will be found to yield incomparably working power to defend natural rights. The simplicity of the thing is so apparent when you once strike a true lead that all brute force would be powerless to cope with it. When the Irish had to meet the delusions of landlords and politicians, and the strong party in the conflict with moral force, and would have shown the ease with which governments could be rendered powerless. What a fraud and shadow of life and labor there are, to be proscribed by God, he would never forgive Farnell and the priests for hurling the no-run banner. If we could but get out such illustration of power as a large whale, every one would be an accomplished fact.

I can add nothing to these wise words, nor can I make plain their valuable lesson. Leaving now the question of the actual throwing of the bomb, surrounding which, as I said, there is some doubt, let us glance a moment at what has happened since, regarding which there can be no doubt. The conduct during the last fortnight of the police, the courts, the pulpits, and the press, including many of the labor organs themselves, has been shameful in the extreme. Mammon's priests have "condemned" Anarchism, and the secular clergymen have frothed at the point of the pen; the staid graduates of the seminaries who are licensed and paid to swing shillalaws over the heads of unoffending men and women have shrilled for the insertion of judicial ermine on which there is room for no new spots have virtually declared their determination to know no bounds of right, mercy, or decency in dealing with any Anarchists. Spies and Fielden have been arrested and held for murder, though they are not known to have done anything worse than speak their minds; nearly every one in Chicago who has dared to afford himself an opinion has been there arrested and those who reach that haven without a broken head themselves peculiarly fortunate; houses have been broken into and searched by the "Arbeiter Zeitung" and the "Alarm," and, for aught I know, the "Budenoumuc," have been suppressed without a shadow of natural or legal right; to be a German is to be looked upon with suspicion, and to be a Pole or Bohemian is to be treated as a "dangerous" man; and it is understood the labor problem. He thinks the Knights could make money running railroad's railroad. One contractor said the railroad fellows, but also that the railroad fellows out of their hands. The socialists would do the same with this movement of the Knights. Indeed, the police had the right to arrest the railroad, etc. This is the case with railroad. They predict this uprising within a year. I think there is great activity among these advantage armed forces. Their statements are simply armed to command the respect of the capitalists and to prevent an attack. Like Garst, they are saying, "Not for it; we command you, therefore, not to make war for it."

The late "Freedom" the rights of the workers, and the "freedom" of the workers, and the "freedom" of the workers. Is this a real man now. One would think that the throwing of this bomb was the first act of violence ever committed under the sun. But the late "Freedom" two years ago spoke of the representatives of the town of the village. They are the real man now. One would think that the throwing of this bomb was the first act of violence ever committed under the sun. But the "Freedom" two years ago spoke of the representatives of the town of the village. They are the real man now. One would think that the throwing of this bomb was the first act of violence ever committed under the sun. But the "Freedom" two years ago spoke of the representatives of the town of the village. They are the real man now. One would think that the throwing of this bomb was the first act of violence ever committed under the sun. But the "Freedom" two years ago spoke of the representatives of the town of the village. They are the real man now.
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Coming to its Senses.

No longer ago than May 8 the New York "Herold" ran:

The whole land is filled with horror at the dawning deeds of liberty by the Anarchists of the West. Anarchism is a visionary and silly reproof, and only an iron heel should deal with it.

And on the 7th, 8th, and 9th of May, it had still more in the same strain.

But on the 10th it changed its tone so far as to say:

In a free country men remedy abuses by their votes; and if they are not intelligently, they see that abuses grow mainly because of bad laws, and that the remedy lies not in enacting more laws, but in repealing injurious laws. Wherever we see a mob or a class, we see a real grievance, and if we have found that this is a consequence of a law interfering with their liberty of action in some needless way; and that the remedy of this abuse is not in more law, but in striking off a law.

Now, such talk as this, very nearly to Anarchism itself, pure and simple; as least as this writer understands it. Reprinted above for Herr Most, or anybody else, but only for himself.

Such a change, as that of the "Herold," in a single day, is really coming to one's senses very fast. And it is a change in the right direction, we hope it will go forward fearlessly, liberally, and with plenty of sand, and enough of the people, which it so often tells us that it really is.

But it is going to procure the repeal of all the "bad laws," from which any part of the people suffer a real injury to their liberties and their liberty of action in some needless way, we can inform it that it has undertaken a very heavy task.

We hope, however, that it will not be disheartened at the magnitude of the labor before it. If it cannot do all that is needed, in the way of procuring the repeal of all "bad laws," it can, without doubt, do a great deal. All we ask of it is, that it will do what it can. And when it shall have done all it can, we think it will no longer have occasion to lose any sleep on the account of Anarchists or anarchists. We do not know of an anarchist—wonder if there be one—in this, or any other country—who asks for anything more than the repeal of all "bad laws." And if the "Herold" will but be honest with itself and the people, we would be almost willing to pledge ourselves in advance to chide by the "Herold"! own opinion of what are, and what are not, "bad laws."

Will the "Herold" now go on with the duty it has so plainly prescribed for itself?

This outbreak at Chicago, whether the actors in it were good or bad men, is a very small one, compared with what we have had from time immemorial in this and all other parts of the world; and a very small one, too, in comparison with those that will succeed it, here and elsewhere, unless the "bad laws" are repealed.

The people have a right to be averse to such laws, and it is not a duty which the "Herold" has very much neglected.

"The Boston Anarchists.

The so-called Boston Anarchists are opposed to violence.

It is for this very reason that they are opposed to the State, says the "Herold," a usurping fraud, conceived and committed by men who have no standing in this or other parts of the world; and a very small one, too, in comparison with those that will succeed it, here and elsewhere, unless the "bad laws" are repealed.

The people have a right to be averse to such laws, and it is not a duty which the "Herold" has very much neglected.

"The Wages of Sin is Death."

Landlords and Workers and Tradescants, the species you conjured have risen—Communists, Socialists, Nullitists, Rent-rebels, Strikers, rebels; behold! They are the roots of the tree you have sown—landlords and capitalists, the species you conjured have risen.

The Boston Anarchists hold an arborial, and an incendiary to be a presumptive man no more.

For this reason they hold the State to be an outrage, and an incendiary to be a presumptive man.

For this reason they hold the State to be an outrage, and an incendiary to be a presumptive man.

The Boston Anarchists are opposed to mob rule. For this reason they hold the State to be an outrage, and an incendiary to be a presumptive man.
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This amendment, equally with the ninth, secures to "the people" all their natural rights. And why? Because, in truth, no powers at all, neither legislative, judicial, nor executive, had been "delegated to the United States by the constitution of the United States". But it will be said that the amendment itself implies that certain lawmaking powers had been "delegated by the United States" to the United States by the constitution. It only implies that such lawmaking powers had been "delegated to the United States by the constitution".

But in this belief, they were entirely mistaken. And why? Because it is a natural impossibility that any lawmaking powers whatever can be delegated by the United States to the United States by the constitution—either in all innocence and inalienability; and therefore cannot be parted with, or delegated, by one person to another. And all contracts whatsoever, for such a purpose, are necessarily absurd and void contracts.

For every man, I mean, cannot delegate his own investments— that is, laws of his own invention—and compel a third person to obey them. Such a contract, on my part, would be a contract to obey with my natural liberty, to give myself, or sell it to another. Such a contract would be an absurd and void contract, utterly destitute of all legal or moral obligation.

2. I cannot delegate any such right as that, that is, laws of my own invention—and compel a third person to obey them. For example, I cannot delegate to A any right to make laws—that is, of laws of my own invention—and compel B to obey them. I cannot delegate any such right to A, because I have no such right myself; and I cannot delegate to another what I do not possess. For these reasons whatever power ever could be— and therefore no lawmaking powers ever were— "delegated to the United States by the constitution"; no matter what the people of that day—any or all of them—may have attempted to do, or may have believed they had power to do, in the way of delegating such powers.

But not only were no lawmaking powers "delegated to the United States by the constitution", but neither were any judicial powers so delegated. And why? Because it is a natural impossibility that one man can delegate his judicial powers to another.

Every man has, by nature, certain judicial powers, or rights. That is to say, he has, by nature, the right to judge of, and enforce, the rights, and judge of, and redress the wrongs of, any and all other men. This right is inalienable, and can never be surrendered by the consent of the individual. It is included in his natural right to maintain justice between man and man, and to protect the injured party against the wrongdoer. But, in doing this, it is only in accordance with his own conscience, and only subject to his own personal responsibility for any error he may commit, either through ignorance or design.

But, inasmuch as, in this case, as in the preceding one, he can neither delegate nor impair his own judgment or conscience to another, he cannot delegate his judicial powers to another, or subject them to the personal responsibility of any one man to do another.

But not only were no lawmaking or judicial powers "delegated to the United States by the constitution", neither were any executive powers so delegated. And why? Because, in a case of justice or injuries, it is naturally impossible that any one man can delegate his executive right to power to another.

Every man has, by nature, the right to maintain justice for himself, and for all other persons, by the use of so much force as may be reasonably necessary for that purpose. But he can use the force only in accordance with his own judgment and conscience, and on his own personal responsibility, if, through ignorance or design, he commits any wrong to another.

But inasmuch as he cannot delegate, or impair, his own judgment or conscience to another, he cannot delegate his executive power or right to another. The result is, that, in all judicial and executive proceedings, for the maintenance of justice, each individual must act in the name and conscience of the whole, and on his own personal responsibility for any wrong he may commit; whether such wrong be committed through either ignorance or design.

The same as to this personal responsibility, in all judicial and executive proceedings, would— or at least ought to be—that no one should give any judicial or executive powers, or do anything that would rob him of his personal conscience, even though such a man as he would be willing to be held personally responsible for any wrong he may commit, or the like.
Liberty. 81

A single individual could not reasonably be expected to delay, or forget, the exercise of his natural right to provide for himself, and redress his own wrongs, except in an extraordinary case. There is an association that will do it promptly, and without expense to him. But having paid his proportion of the expense necessary to the maintenance of his rights, he has a right to demand prompt and complete protection for himself.

It is, therefore, an inequality of the laws of my state, that a law is not an act of the legislature, or any other executive body, whereby a person may be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without the formality of a trial, and without the intervention of a legal process. It is a gross violation of the spirit of the Constitution, and of the principles of justice and human rights, that by such a law, a man may be deprived of his life, liberty, or property, without the formality of a trial, and without the intervention of a legal process.

SECTION XXVII.

Of course we can have no courts of justice, under such systems of lawmaking, and supreme court decisions, as now prevail. We have not the machinery of sixty to eighty millions; and not a single court of justice.

State or national?

But we have everywhere courts of injustice—open and avowed injustice—claiming the protection and justification of courts affecting men’s rights of both person and property; and having at their back brute force enough to compel absolute submission.

A more conclusive or infallible condemnation of the government, more of the evidence of which is caused to be obtained by employing an expert—or so-called lawyer—to enlighten him.

This expert in injustice is one who buys these great volumes of statutes and reports, and spends his life in studying them, and trying to keep himself informed of their contents. But even he can give a client very little information in regard to them; for the statutes and decisions are so voluminous, and are so constantly being changed, that it is necessary to have a law officer on their feet, if he is to be of any use. Indeed, it is not possible to have a law officer on their feet, if he is to be of any use.

But the point now to be specially noticed is, that in the case of either the civil or criminal trial, the client, who is his property, is his property, is to be tried by the judge, or the jury, or one of the secret tribunals of Russia, or even the Scythian Inquisition.

Thus in the supreme exiguities of a man’s life, whether in civil or criminal cases, all the people that have power over him, are really to be tried by, and under the direction of, a secret tribunal; a tribunal that is governed by what is, to him, the secret instructions of lawmakers, and supreme court decisions, and the secret instructions of whom care nothing about his guilt or innocence in a criminal one; but only for their own authority as uttering a verdict of guilt, or innocence, or both.

The bystanders, at these trials, look on amazed, but powerless to defend the right, or prevent the wrong. Human nature has no rights, in the presence of such an atrocious iniquity.

Is it any wonder that all men live in constant terror of such a government as this; and that every one of them, under the weight of the personal and public rights of person and property, in opposition to tribunals, to whom justice and injustice are indifferent, and whose ways are, to common minds, hidden mysteries, are so anxious to escape the curse.

But even this is not all. The mode of trial, if not as infamous as the trial itself, is at least so utterly false and absurd, as to add a new element of uncertainty to the trial, and make it doubly dangerous.

A trial in one of these courts of injustice is a trial by battle, almost, if not quite, as real as was a trial by battle, five hundred or a thousand years ago.

Now, as then, the adverse parties choose their champions, to fight their battles for them.

These champions, trained to such contests, and armed, not only with the weapons of their own skill, cunning, and power, but also with all the inquisitive laws, precedents, and technicalities that lawmakers and supreme courts can give them, for defending justice and accomplishing injustice, "can—if not always, yet none but themselves know how often—offer their clients such chances for success, that there is no court of common justice, that can be counted to go into court to evade justice, or accomplish injustice, not less often perhaps than the honest go there: it’s the hope to get justice, or avoid injustice."

I think, somewhat, that these champions who make it the business of their lives to equip themselves for these conflicts, and sell their advice.

Is there any one of those men, who studies justice as a science, and regards that alone in his professional exertions? If there are any such, why do we so seldom hear of them? They are not there; if they were, they would appeal to the courts, and see what are men’s natural rights of person and property. And why have they not told us how false, absurd, and tyrannical are all these lawmaking governments? Why have they not told us in what propensions and proportions our legislatures, judges, etc., etc., are? Why are so many of them so ambitious to become lawmakers and judges themselves, that if justice is not to be got, they will best be got out of the way, and be done as by mere statutorily, and transient, and in the name of the "State." They do not insult us by telling us that they are only exercising that authority to rob, enslave, and murder us, which we ourselves have delegated to them. They do not claim that they are exercising that authority to rob, enslave, and murder us, which we ourselves have delegated to them.

They do not tell us that they are exercising that authority to rob, enslave, and murder us, which we ourselves have delegated to them. They do not tell us that they are exercising that authority to rob, enslave, and murder us, which we ourselves have delegated to them.

These criminals are constantly committed by these courts of injustice, that would squelch them, without mercy, as unceremoniously as possible, and that would squelch them in the most insidious manner, if they could. In fact, bandits and pirates are highly respectable and honorable villains, compared with the judges of these courts of injustice. Bandits and pirates do not—like these judges—attempt to cheat us out of our common sense, in order to cheat us out of our property, liberty, or life. They do not profess to do anything but such villains as they really are. They do not claim to have received any "Divine" authority for robbing, enslaveing, or murdering us at their pleasure. They do not claim immunity for their crimes, upon the ground that they are duly authorized agents of any organized, or unorganized, or intangible, "State." They have no right to be agents of any such 'State." They do not insult us by telling us that they are only exercising that authority to rob, enslave, and murder us, which we ourselves have delegated to them. They do not claim that they are exercising that authority to rob, enslave, and murder us, which we ourselves have delegated to them. They do not tell us that they are exercising that authority to rob, enslave, and murder us, which we ourselves have delegated to them. They do not tell us that they are exercising that authority to rob, enslave, and murder us, which we ourselves have delegated to them.
The Facts Coming to Light.

In a recent editorial, speaking of my comments against the firebugs, I said: "It has never been my intention to try to live up to the name of a newsman."

The editor, on the other hand, said: "The facts will be told, and the names will come out."

I am, therefore, forced to the conclusion that the "facts" are going to come out, and that my name will have to be added to the list of those who have been "unjustly charged."