On Picket Duty.

"Le Père Peinard" is no longer published in London, but, under a new name, "La Sociale," will appear hereafter in Paris as an illustrated weekly. The editor's address is "E. Pouget, 23 Rue des Trois Frères, Paris."

"There the court stands, five to four, like a rock," said Dana in the "Sun," speaking of the decision of the United States supreme court against the income tax. Presumably it meant that, Justice Jackson's vote having placed the court on the side of the income tax, the shift of Justice Shiras rocked it to the other side. Certainly there is no respect in which the court's attitude reminds us of a rock, except that it is very "rocky." Each day the old-time distinction between a "Sun" editorial and a stump speech becomes less apparent. Dana is degenerating.

All progressive men rejoice, of course, over the signal defeat of the German government in the Reichstag, where the "anti-revolution" bill was rejected by an astonishing vote. The bill, if passed, would doubtless have remained a dead letter, but it is very significant that even a German Reichstag cannot, in these days, be dragooned into passing a medieval measure by the hue and cry of the reactionists that the pillars of society are in danger. Still, the German Social Democrats have no real reason for self-congratulation. Their cause would have been helped rather than hindered by the victory of the government. Free speech does not swell their ranks.

The decision annulling the income tax is a triumph for the strict constructionists. Generally speaking, courts are disposed to construe very liberally constitutional inhibitions and restrictions upon governmental powers, and of late federal courts have been particularly eager to extend the federal province in all directions. How are we to account for this extraordinary exception in the income-tax case, in which the benefits of all doubt, historical and economic, were eagerly given to the enemies of the tax and in which a fine opportunity of "modem" strengthening the federal government was delicately thrown away? The answer is simple: the plutocracy demanded it. When the plutocracy needs protection against boycotting and striking workmen, it demands a liberal construction of federal legislation; when it needs protection against congressional "strikes," it favors strict construction. The courts generally accommodate it, and herein is the key to their apparent inconsistencies and zig-zag, flop-over policies.

William Dean Howells has lately been earning the gratitude of all progressive men for his excellent propaganda work among the Philistines. He has been vindicating the new and fighting the old in a manner that has taken away the breath of a good many journalistic obscurantists. His assault on Nordau was particularly refreshing. But here and there Mr. Howells makes a remark which has the unmistakable stamp of Philistinism upon it, and which is so false and inept as to be utterly unworthy of a thinker of his rank. Thus, in discussing the new woman of actual life and the new woman of fiction, he says: "What is certain is that, if the new man ever does come, the new woman will be too good for him, just as the old woman is too good for the old man now, and always has been." Now, this piece of chivalrous nonsense is as insulting to self-respecting women as any of the shams and falsehoods with which, in the days of woman's slavery, man sought to cover up his low treatment of woman. The trick is cheap, vulgar, and transparent. True respect for woman has no use for such silly and insincere flattery.

Mrs. Fawcett, reviewing "A Woman Who Did It" in the "Fortnightly Review," angrily reasserts what she describes as Mr. Allen's "attempt to attack the fatal and pernicious bark of free love" to the "substantial craft" of woman suffrage and such things generally, for which she has long struggled in the fond belief that she was accomplishing something for a cause. Mr. Allen's attacks on marriage and the family she characterizes as the "incoherent cry" of the ape and the tiger in man, who rebel against the restraints of human civilization. No radical need take umbrage at this, since even the reviewer of the old, orthodox "Saturday Review" says good-naturedly that Mrs. Fawcett's article will be found very entertaining by everybody, including Grant Allen himself. This is an unkind and indeed. Mrs. Fawcett is terribly in earnest, and started out, not to amuse us, but to amaliglate Mr. Allen and his fellow-heretics, and she certainly counted on the warm support of such true friends of marriage as the "Saturday Review." Yet she is told by this traitor that she has made a spectacle of herself! Still, considering the provocation, the "Saturday Review" writer can hardly be blamed. Mrs. Fawcett, in her blind fury, denied the book all literary merit, and condemned the story as feeble and silly to the last degree, whereas most of the professional literary critics have been forced to admit that, as a work of art, "The Woman Who Did It" has strength, beauty, and imaginative truth. It is dangerous to go too far. Our Philistines should strive to be moderate, for extreme treatment of the new is resented even by many of our most inveterate enemies.

George Parsons Lathrop, the literary convert to Catholicism, reviews one of the modern literature against marriage in the New York "Heald," and earnestly pleads for mercy to that ancient institution. Admitting that women are beginning to throw off the yoke, he addresses to them the following reasons for resignation and acquiescence: "If there be slavery in marriage, certainly a very large share of the bondage falls upon the man. The difficulties, the burdens, the restrictions he has to submit to in marriage are innumerable and endless. Usually he takes them without a murmur, as a matter of course. Often he accepts them with great joy, as a part of the price he has to pay for unappraisable blessings of companionship and domestic surroundings. We never yet have heard of men banding together to break up the institution of marriage, which entails upon them so much of care, trial, and suffering." Of course, if marriage is slavery, men have suffered together with women, but they have not suffered to the same extent or degree. In the first place, the laws they themselves have made have not provided for equality of burdens and powers. The discriminations have generally been in their favor, and women have had to depend on caprice rather than on clearly-defined principles of justice. No doubt men have often been very generous to women, but they have also been very mean and tyrannical, both individually and collectively, and in this meanness and tyranny the law has protected them. In the second place, men have always taken excellent care to provide themselves with extra diversions and attractions, regardless of the legal and religious fictions which they have kept up for the sake of appearances. Their apotheosis of marriage has not prevented them from telling off tens of thousands of women for lives of prostitution. Their alleged monogamy has not interfered with the maintenance of a notorious polygamous régime. Being able to turn for consolation and relief to so many things, the burden of marriage was not so heavy and galling to them. Now that women are beginning to imitate them, they virtually point to their own pretended readiness to suffer without a murmur! No, it is too thin. The game is up.

Women will either command the same privilege, or else the marriage institution is doomed.
The Plutocratic Masquerade.

An anomalous and curious situation is brought to light by the decision in regard to the power of congress to impose direct and indirect taxes under the federal constitution. In his very able and compact argument in favor of taxes on rents, the attorney-general, Mr. Olney, conceived and maintained that the income from land is a direct tax, a tax on interest and dividends is also a direct tax; and he virtually told the court that, having exempted land, they are bound to carry out the principle of the ruling and exempt personal property as well. But Mr. Olney warned the court that such a decision would be a crushing blow to the government, a misfortune and disaster to the nation. With great emphasis he continued:

Such a result, if it must be, will, I firmly believe, when fully comprehended by the American people, be universally deprecated as a great public calamity. They cannot come to conceive the United States as the representative of an indivisible nationality, as a political sovereign equal in authority to any other on the face of the globe, adequate to all emergencies, foreign or domestic, and having at its command for offenses and defense and for all purposes all the resources of the nation. It will be an unwelcome awakening for them to discover that this thing of their faith and pride is but a maimed and crippled nation after all, invested with but a fraction of the most important of governmental powers, and weakest exactly where its strength should be the greatest.

Mr. Olney believes in a literal construction of the constitutional prohibitions, and he would stretch and strain the letter of the constitution in order to give effect to what he assumes to be its spirit and ultimate purpose. But, as a number of newspaper commentators well observe, the trouble with Mr. Olney is that he tends to ask the questions at the outset and argues from a radically vicious postulate. The framers of the constitution had no intention to establish a political sovereign equal in authority to any other on the face of the earth. On the contrary, they aimed at the creation of a federal sovereign with a minimum of authority over the independent and sovereign States. All their labors and anxieties were directed, not toward the building up and strengthening of the federal authority, but toward the safeguarding and protecting of the States from the federal power. The constitution was the result of compromises, deals, and concessions, and, if jealous and suspicious framers of it had been told that, after all, in spite of all their ingenuity, the result was the creation of a power equal to that of any other highly centralized government in the old world, they would have been mortified and disgusted. The fact, then, that the government now finds itself cornered and confined ought not to surprise or alarm anybody familiar with its origins and beginnings. Again, although the door is locked, the key has not been thrown away. If the federal government now needs larger powers, there are constitutional ways of securing such an extension of authority. Indeed, there would probably be little opposition to such an attempt. The so-called sovereign States have given up so much that they might as well "let the tail go with the hide."

Suppose, however, that the States decline to enlarge the federal authority, and insist on keeping the "maimed and crippled" creation
within the original bounds. Then we should have this result,—that, no matter what changes take place in political relations and needs, no matter how obsolete and inapplicable the old constitution may become under revolutionized conditions of existence, the few small, poor, and primitive States whose jealous delegations secured the galling restrictions will continue to impose their will on the present and future, and effectually prevent reconstruction and reform.

Of course, this is only another instance of the rule of the "dead hand." Paper constitutions are always bound to produce such incongruous consequences. Those who are in favor of evading and nullifying them by "liberal construction" would be more consistent if they opposed paper constitutions altogether. Without strict construction, they are useless; with strict construction, they are a perpetual stumbling-block.

But it is not remarkable that the very men who profess to adhere strictly and faithfully to the original compact should be the most blatant and ferocious "federalists" at the same time? The word sedition inspires horror in the East, and any reference to State rights is denounced as treasonable. Yet it is in the East that the income tax is most hated and the argument of unconstitutionality most solemnly urged. If the original compact is so sacred that it must be maintained at all hazards, why are other State rights, and prerogatives than this negative one bearing on direct taxation so lightly regarded at all? Why is there such absolute acquiescence in the flat right of the right of the States to secede? Certainly the framers of the constitution never intended to surrender this fundamental, all-inclusive right, and, if their wishes in minor matters are to be religiously observed, as we are hypocritically told by the anti-income-tax patriots, what treason and cowardice is it to surrender the right preservative of all rights? Our plutocratic friends care nothing for State rights, constitutions, or original compacts. The pocket is everything to them, and all the rest nothing but masks and disguises under which the old trade is carried on.

A Poseur Exposed.

I propose in this article to deal in my usual gentle fashion with Mr. Braggagolio Outreoufindant Flower, the editor of the "Arena," Indisputable evidence of his hollow humbuggery has come into my possession, which I shall now place before the readers of Liberty. They will remember that a few months ago the campaign which the editor of the "Arena," and his staff of assistants and contributors have been conducting with a view to raising the "age of consent," was conducted to extended and search ing criticism in the editorial columns of Liberty, and that a few weeks ago an article on the action of the Denver convention of the American Federation of Labor, which had appeared in one of the "Arena" editorial departments, was editorially dissected by Liberty, and shown to be a tissue of lies woven in the interest of State Socialism. It now appears that some of the readers of Liberty are readers of the "Arena," also, and that at least one of these was greatly surprised to find no attempt made in the "Arena" to refute Liberty's arguments and charges, which seemed to him so well sustained. Entirely without my knowledge, he wrote to the editor of the "Arena," asking him (I quote from a letter which he has written to me since) "If he could safely ignore such intelligent criticism as was contained in Lillian Harman's article upon the 'Arena' age-of-consent symposium, which recently appeared in Liberty's columns, I also called his attention to your correspondence, communication, published in the last issue of Liberty." This inquiry Flower could not well evade; so he vouchsafed an answer, which its recipient has forwarded to me with permission to publish it. Presumably its writer will take pride in seeing it in print. It appears below exactly as written,—in the correct and beautiful English which the editor of "the magazine discussing great issues of the day" would naturally use.


My dear sir,—Your esteemed favor received, and in reply would say: I cannot agree with you in your conclusion, but I am for the action taken. However, I do not turn aside to notice the contributions and alleged arguments of every little journal published in the United States that choose to differ from some of the contributions which appear in the magazine discussing great issues of the day, it is a great blessing to us. If we did so, we would without question greatly delight the numerous fault-finders, and, if we did so, it would also be necessary for us to publish a magazine three times the size of the "Arena." I notice the criticism of Mr. Hinton's article in Liberty. Mr. Hinton's editorial had merely stated the facts as they were published, and which, I believe, were exactly the case. The statement that the "arena" was domiciled at the labor men of the Denver conference, the Union men, etc., as a "new" publication and unlawful of the patronage of labor is unhappily false, and is characteristic of much that is constantly appearing in irresponsible journals.

The "Arena" had a contention with the Boston Typographical Union, which demanded that we should unionize our office. Our printer did not owe the printing office where the "Arena" was printed; that we compelled our printer to maintain the Union scale of prices, and not to discriminate against Union men, but that we felt we had no ethical right to go beyond that. Whereupon the Typographical Union, or some of its members, took it upon themselves to introduce a resolution in the Denver Conference, asking the convention to blacklist the "Arena." The resolution, however, was promptly defeated, and the matter was referred to the executive committee of the Federated Trades. I do not know what the executive committee will or will not do, but, as I have explained our position fully to them, and also the fact that we have no sense claim to be a Union publication nor the organ of any sect, party, or school of theorists, we shall pursue the course which we believe to be right, just, and fair.

Aside from this, it is important to take up our space in necessities of character of the series which appear in Liberty. Respectfully yours, B. O. FLOWER.

To show, first, the utter hypocrisy of this claim that Liberty is a journal of no importance, I print below another letter especially written to me by the Arena Publishing Company last February.


Dear Sir,—We take pleasure in sending you a copy of "A Scientific Solution of the Money Question" by Arthur Kinzie.

We believe this one of the most important works on this subject that has been published, and it has already received flattering recommendation from eminent persons. We should esteem it a special favor if you would mail us a marked copy of your paper containing review of this work.

CORDially yours,

A. E. C.

AreNA Publishing Company.

Please oblige us by quoting price: $1.25, cloth; 50c, paper.

It appears, then, that in the month of February, when Lillian Harman's criticism appeared in Liberty, the Arena Publishing Company placed so high an estimate upon the importance of Liberty that it was begging, as a special favor, for notice in its columns, but that in the month of May, when summoned to meet the arguments advanced by Liberty, the editor of the "Arena" finds it a little, unimportant, and irresponsible journal. The argument of the "Arena" toward flagrant and so clearly convicts Flower of insincerity that it is needless to comment upon it.

It is to be further noticed, however, that in answering his correspondent, the editor of the "Arena" takes some pains to refute one of the statements made in Liberty, which leads one to suspect that he would have attempted a refutation of the others had he felt equal to the task, and that his plea of Liberty's insincerity is put forward to save him from the necessity of exhibiting his weakness. The matter upon which he makes answer namely, the attitude of the American Federation of Labor toward the "Arena"—was introduced incidentally by Mr. Cohen in his reply to Mr. Hinton's article, and is of small importance; beside the main issue raised regarding the truth of Mr. Hinton's statements. Nevertheless we may consider it for a moment, especially as an attempt is made to discredit Mr. Cohen's reply by an insinuation that it proceeds from an irresponsible source. It was hardly to be expected that such a complaint would be preferred against an article written as a report of the proceedings at Denver by a man who was one of the half-dozen members of the convention's executive committee (on resolutions) and a most active participant in the convention's discussions. But this complaint having been made, I determined to refer the disputed points to the secretary of the American Federation of Labor, whose office gives him a responsibility in this connection that even Flower will not presume to question. In due course I received from him the following answer to my inquiries:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR, DE SOTO BLOCK, INDIANAPOLIS, IND., MAY 7, 1899.

To the Editor of Liberty:

DEAR SIR,—Yours to hand, asking if there are any inaccuracies in the story of "C" in the paper on the action of our Denver convention upon the political programme; (2) article of "R. J. H." in the "Arena" on the same subject correct; (3) what was the action taken at the same time on the "Arena"? In answer, would say: The article of "C" is an exceptionally clear summing up of the conditions surrounding the discussion and vote upon plank 16. I have compared the figures with those of the Denver conventions. To whether the article of "R. J. H." in "Arena" is correct or not, I cannot say, as I do not read that publication. The convention voted to declare the "Arena" unfair unless it was printed in a Union office, and instructed our executive council accordingly. This latter body has failed so far, but, in order to leave nothing undone, has instructed one of its number to call personally on "Arena" people, and, failing to effect a settlement before June 1, the wishes of the convention to be carried out.

Fraternally,

A. O. C.
Let me say at once that in the quarrel between the "Arena" and the American Federation of Labor my sympathies are entirely with the "Arena." If we view the Federation as an organization formed for the purpose of securing as high wages as possible for its members, there is, to be sure, no reason why it should not have the freedom to pursue the course it pleases when and where it will. But in doing this the members of the Federation are simply struggling for self-preservation, which they secure to a considerable extent at the expense of non-members. Now, on the other hand, the "Arena," in buying in the cheapest market, is similarly struggling for self-preservation, and is no more deserving of bitter words than the Federation members themselves. Moreover, its action is entirely in harmony with that principle of free competition in the extension of which lies labor's only hope, and the application of the epithet "rat" to it because of such action is inconsistent and unbecoming on the part of the Federation or its members as long as that body refuses to commit itself to State Socialism, and as long as its members individually do not seek to pay as high prices as possible for all the articles which they consume.

But this is a digression, entered upon merely to guard against any misinterpretation of my position. The real question in this matter is not whether the Federation is justified in its attitude toward the "Arena," but whether Mr. Cohen was right in declaring that the Federation voted to boycott the "Arena." Flower says that the Federation did not so vote, and in this he seems to be technically right, according to Secretary McCrath's version of the facts. But from this same version it appears that the Federation did vote that a boycott should be placed upon the "Arena" if it should refuse to comply with the Union conditions. Now, as Mr. Cohen referred to this matter only to show the feeling of the Federation toward the "Arena," it follows that he was substantially right in his representation.

But, if Secretary McCrath's letter shows that Mr. Cohen erred formally here, how emphatically it corroborates his statement that the Denver convention adopted the occupancy-and-use plank! And how conclusively it dispose of Flower's claim that Mr. Hinton's article was a true account of that convention! For, whether Secretary McCrath has read Mr. Hinton's article or not, his certificate of Mr. Cohen's accuracy in regard to the vote on Plank 10 logically carries with it a denial of Mr. Hinton's statement, which is diametrically opposite to that of Mr. Cohen. Mr. Hinton stated in the "Arena" that the convention rejected the occupancy-and-use plank (on the motion to substitute it for the Socialistic Plank 10) by a vote of 1,217 to 913. Mr. Cohen stated that the convention adopted the occupancy-and-use plank by a vote of 1,217 to 913. The secretary of the Federation, being appealed to, says that Mr. Cohen's statement is the true one. Does Mr. Flower pretend to dispute the statement of the Federation's secretary? If so, let him produce his evidence. He can no longer hide behind the plea of irresponsibility.

Now a few words as to the justice of the claim that Liberty is a journal too insignificant to be noticed by a magazine like the "Arena." Thata claim is a dishonest one has already been established by the letter from the Arena Publishing Company begging for notice in Liberty's columns. But, even were it put forward, would it be any more admissible in the present connection? In this connection we may properly inquire as to what estimation Liberty is held by men whom the "Arena" considers worthy of its publicity.

First, take Mr. Arthur Kitson himself. He is a man scientifically educated and the author of a book on money which, whatever may be my opinion of it, is pronounced by the Arena Publishing Company "one of the most important works on the subject that has been published" and is favorably reviewed in the "Arena" and "Australasian". What is Mr. Kitson's opinion of Liberty? I have in a letter written last February, in which renewing his subscription, he generously enclosed more than double the regular price, saying of its contribution: "I wish I could make it $5,000. Liberty is unqualifiedly the best journal published. I only wish it were a daily paper." I am sure that my severe criticism of Mr. Kitson's book has not led him to change his mind about Liberty; he is not that kind of a man. He undoubtedly holds substantially the same opinion of the paper that he did in February. He is not, to its ultimateylon, such a man himself might think of Liberty, he certainly would not be justified in dismissing as beneath his notice a publication which a man whom he lauds as one of the most important economic writers calls the best journal published.

Take another, Mr. Victor Yarros. The name of Mr. Yarros has been more steadily and consistently identified with Liberty than that of any other person, save myself. For a considerable period Mr. Yarros held the position of associate editor in this office, he has always conducted the paper in my absence, and at present is writing in the chief columns as regularly and abundantly as ever. But Mr. Yarros' political and economic writings are also acceptable to the "Arena." More than once has Mr. Flower purchased and published articles from his pen. No longer ago than April of this year there appeared in the "Arena" an article by Mr. Yarros on "The Palladium of Liberty," which the New York "World," in its review of the April number, spoke of as easily the foremost attraction in that month's table of contents. With what grace, then, can Mr. Flower ignore as insignificant a journal largely written and sometimes managed by a man whose writings he prints and pays for and the critics praise? And there are others. I am sure that Mr. Hamlin Garland or Mr. W. D. McCrackan or Mr. Henry D. Lloyd — all prominent writers for the "Arena" — would say, if asked, that Liberty's articles are characterized by an ability, a seriousness, and an independence that entitle them to the attention of any honest seeker after truth who has been made a target in its columns.

On what reasonable ground, then, can Mr. Flower meet Liberty with a sneer instead of with a reply?

Because it is small in size? Is the weight of an argument to be measured by its length? And, if it were, does Liberty on occasion print articles far exceeding in length the average magazine article, and would not Lillian Harman's review of the "Arena's" symposium have filled a dozen of the "Arena's" pages?

Because its circulation is comparatively small? For, in the "Police Gazette" might pooh-pooh the "Arena." I would willingly admit that the "Arena," if opposed with substantially the same arguments by two journals equal in all respects save circulation, might justifiably confine its attention to the one more widely read. But no such consideration affects the present case. The "Arena" is carrying on a campaign to raise the age of consent. In the press at large it meets little or no opposition. No review of its arguments in any way comparable with that which has appeared in Liberty has been printed in any other paper. This review was signed by a man and the "Arena" professes to be acting in the interest of women. It presented, with an ability that has attracted the notice of many competent judges, arguments that have not appeared in any journal of large circulation. The "Arena," therefore, if it aims to be scientific rather than sensational and is seeking truth rather than notoriety, is bound to cope with such a criticism, however humbly its source.

Moreover, and most of all, the quality of Liberty's constituency must be considered, the influence that it has had on sociological students, and the unique position that it occupies in periodical literature. Anyone who has lived in this country is well acquainted with the fact that the only important magazine which wilfully disregards them must thereby sacrifice its honor.

Then the editor of the "Arena" declares that Liberty is irresponsible, those familiar with the facts will know that he is a liar. When, to save himself from the necessity of meeting its unanswerable arguments, he blies behind a plea that Liberty is beneath his notice, they will consider him a coward. If he believes that such tactics can prevail against the truth, there is no doubt that he is a fool. And now I am done with Mr. Dragalgudio Outrecedtian Flower.

Pertinent Questions. To the Editor of Liberty:

I have refrained from asking some questions which occurred to me in reading "Instead of a Book" because I had hoped that I might find in Liberty short and comprehensible answers to them. They may have been answered, but I have not time to read everything in Liberty, and therefore rephrased them.

First: I assume that Anarchic associations will protect me in the "use and occupation" of an acre around my house, stocked as a chicken-yard. Is that correct (e), And, if so, will they protect me if the acre be on the corner of Wall St. (9)? Or is the use and occupation of one hundred thousand acres used
and stocked as a deer-park, which would otherwise be waste-land! (c)

Second: will they protect me in the "use and occupation" of a home-site, although I let out one room to a lodger for their protection me in the "use and occupation" of the Mills building? (b)

Third: if a girl finds it more profitable to work for me tending those chickens than to work for herself, will I still be protected in the use and occupation of my chicken yard? (c) If so, will I be protected in the use and occupation of a coal-mine as long as (by my power of organization, for example) I pay the miners more than they could earn working for themselves? (b)

Will I be protected in its use and occupation if I do not work it up to its full capacity? (c) Or if another could get more out of it? (d)

Fourth: you seem to believe in jury trial to determine what is invasion, and whether the invasion has been committed. Would not an average jury convict you of invasion, believing as they do (and as I do not) that you corrupt public morals, religion, and order? I am, yours very respectfully, Botrow Hall.

First: (a) yes, provided you do actually so occupy and use it. (b) Yes. (c) No; for the hypothesis, "otherwise waste-land," excludes the need of protection.

Second: (a) yes, but they would not collect your rent, and might not even evict your tenant. (b) If you personally occupied and used the land on which the Mills Building stands, that is, we will say, the basement and ground floor, you would be allowed to add as many more stories as you chose to add and to make your own arrangements with tenants. But your tenants would not be forced to pay you rent, nor would you be allowed to seize their property. The Anarchist associations would look upon your tenants very much as they would upon your guests.

Third: (a) yes, provided there was no obvious interest on your part to occupy more land than you could personally use for the given purpose, and provided it was not clearly impossible for one person to occupy and use so much land. Your own limitation of the area to one acre meets these provisions; so the answer in the given case is unqualifiedly in the affirmative. (b) As I have heretofore had occasion to explain to Mr. Byington, I do not know enough about my subject to point out its possibilities and impossibilities—to discuss this question intelligently. Hence I can make only the general answer that Anarchist associations would recognize the right of individual occupants to combine their holdings and work them under any system they might agree upon, the arrangement being always terminable at will, with reversion to original rights. (c) If you did not occupy your coal-mine as your sole residence; and if you limited your working of it to the taking-out of one bucketful of coal per day; and if you continued this practice until it became reasonably sure that such method of procedure was not a temporary matter, due to illness or some other incalculable cause, I fancy that, some fine morning, after you had taken out your bucketful and gone away, the Anarchist association would proclaim your mine abandoned. (d) Yes.

Fourth: drawn as at present, very possibly; drawn by lot from the whole body of citizens in the community, and judging the law as well as the fact, and bound to convict unanimously on the first trial or not at all, almost surely no. Have you read Spenser's "Free Political Institutions"? If not, please do so before question further on this subject.

Mutual Money and Its Props.

To the Editor of Liberty:

Your answer to me in No. 809 will probably satisfy me when its meaning has been made clear to me by the answers to two or three questions:

In the ideal community of tomorrow, what would it mean that certain mutual-book notes would be taken at par, if there were no contract to take them at par?

In the present world, what will maintain the value of a mutual-book note which has good collateral, if "all the props be removed," or if that particular prop be removed which consists in the contract to take the money at par? Not its convertibility, surely, for it is not convertible at the option of the holder. Nor convertible only in case the borrower fails to do something — to do what? What would the security be for security, in such a case?

STEPHEN T. BYINGTON.

P. S. In reference to this discussion a friend wrote:

"Excuse me for saying that there seems to me no necessity of regarding the mutual bank as a cardinal doctrine of Anarchism." It is certainly an important fact, which some are in danger of forgetting, that the mutual bank doctrine is no part whatever of Anarchism. But it is a valuable help to Anarchism, I think. Many earnest men hold that inconvertible paper money is very useful, and that it cannot be had by any other means. However, while there is to be no error in one position or the other, this cuts them off from seeing the good of Anarchism. In my judgment their first position is sound, their second is unsound.

The therefore the mutual bank is a necessary part of the way to make Anarchists of such men. I do not care so much for the mutual bank as an end in itself, even if a good thing, — as for the work it can do in breaking up the system of government.

In an ideal community of perfect men, from which, by the hypothesis, failure to meet financial obligations is absolutely eliminated, mutual-book notes would circulate, even if unsecured, because this very hypothesis implies a demand for these notes, after their issue; borrowers must regain possession of them in order to make the hypothesis a reality, and those from whom the borrowers buy will accept the notes from them in the first place because they know — again by the hypothesis — that the borrowers must in some way recover them. They will circulate at par because, being issued in terms of a commodity standard, and redemption by the system, as possible, there is no reason why they should circulate at a figure below their face. Or, at least, if there is such a reason, it is incumbent upon Mr. Byington to point it out.

In the existing indefinite world the collateral securing a mutual-book note would guarantee its holder that, unless the original borrower buys back the note in order to cancel therewith his own note held by the bank, the bank itself will ultimately convert the collateral into the commodity agreed upon for redemption purposes, and with the proceeds buy back the note. Therefore, as regards this convertibility, even though conversion is not to be had on demand, that will maintain the value of the mutual-book note.

The mutual bank will never show anybody that paper money which is never convertible can ever be made steadily useful in an anidal world, either with or without a government flat. For such is not the truth, and neither the mutual bank or anything else can establish an error.

Second: free banking is, it is true, not a cardinal doctrine of Anarchism. But free banking is. Now, free banking will lead to mutual banking, and mutual banking is the greatest single step that can possibly be taken in the direction of emancipating labor from poverty. Mutual banking, then, is as intimately connected with Anarchism as though it were one of its cardinal doctrines. Liberty is valuable only as it contributes to happiness, and to this end no single liberty is as necessary at present as the liberty of banking.

The number of controversies which Liberty now has on its hands makes it impossible to deal promptly with all of them. Contributors whose manuscripts remain for some time in the pigeon-holes are requested not to be discouraged or impatient.

The next number of Liberty will contain an extended reply from Mr. Arthur L. Wylie to the criticisms passed upon his book by Mr. Bilgram and myself. I make the announcement because Mr. Kitson informs me that there are those who consider these criticisms unanswerable owing to the non-appearance of a reply. I would not be too sure, if I were he, that the appearance of his reply will have any other result than to confirm them in their opinion.

Anarchists Letter-Writing Corps.

The Secretary wants every reader of Liberty to send in his name for enrolment. Those who do so thereby pledge themselves to write, when possible, a letter every fortnight, on Anarchism or kindred subjects, to the "target" assigned in Liberty for that fortnight, and to the signature of the 'anarchist writer." A failure to write to a target (which it is hoped will not often occur), or in case of temporary or permanent withdrawal from the work of the Corps, all members or part, are asked to lose no opportunity of informing the Secretary of suitable targets.

Address, Stephen T. Byington, 108 W. 11th St., New York City.

Cohen's reports of letters he receives show much delinquency among Corps members, not otherwise reported to me, that it seems necessary to reduce the number of sections. The members of Section C (which has been the steadiest) are divided between the other two sections.

Thanks, meanwhile, to those outside the Corps who have been writing to Cohen. I only wish there were more of you, and that you could indiscreetly hope, also, that more of the Corps members will find it possible to write Cohen extra letters, beside those called for by their regular Corps duty.

Please note another change of secretary's address. Targets section A — Henry Cohen, 1322 Welman St., Denver, Col. Send him letters for publication in labor papers, as already directed.

Some members, I understand, find a difficulty in writing so often to the same target; they can't furnish fresh ideas so often. Such forget that this target covers several papers, and that Cohen can make good use of three or four letters expressing the same ideas in different words by sending them to as many different papers. But you can also get a good deal of freshness by changing the topic. Write once on money, another time on compulsory arbitration, the next time on something else. Take up different aspects of the same subject; write first on the refusal of government control in money, then on its harmfulness. There are subjects enough before us for a long series of letters.

Section B — Wm. M. McCarty, Mooresville, Ala. He said some time ago: "Man's abstract right to the use of the earth cannot be conciliated of being applied to any aggregation of individuals except conditionally. Society is a whole derived from the conditions under which its individual members are stimulated or encouraged to the greatest exertion of their powers." Hence he thinks the present best condition does not allow full individual development or the free exertion of individual powers, and that a much higher condition in these respects is practically possible.

STEPHEN T. BYINGTON.
Another "Age-of-Consent" Symposium.
In the April "Arena" I find two contributions to a second "Age-of-Consent" symposium. Dr. R. B. Leach and Lila K. Glasser and Vielle H. Campbell ask "Why an Age of Consent?"
Mrs. Gardiner also makes some remarks upon the subject.
These articles, taken in connection with resolutions adopted by medical bodies and recent legislation and non-attempted legislation, call for a little critical comment.

Dr. Leach's article is one of the most remarkable that the discussion of this question has elicited.
"There is no question that it is wrong, in fact, but the good is so mixed with the irretrievably bad, and the writer's conclusion is so antagonistic to his premise, that the article as a whole most forcibly illustrates the need for a more advanced study of the problems of the age of consent to run into irreconcilable contradiction, into banes and inhumanity. His first paragraph opens with these sentences: "From the physician's standpoint, the 'age of consent' is a misnomer - a paradox and a proscription on nature; for nature has but one age of consent, alike in males as in females, and she has fixed laws, rules, and regulations for the consummation of her aims, desires, and efforts in this as in every other department of life."

Let us consider the age of consent of nature, the doctor leaves us in no doubt.
"Let women, then, before all others and before all else, recognize and acquiesce in the demonstration that the entire age for the age of consent is under which she cathectes at which is known as the age of puberty."

"Do not fail to note that Dr. Leach urges women to avow, in the age of consent, law of nature, which fixes the "age" at puberty. He is determined to make his meaning perfectly clear on this point; in the fifth paragraph, referring to the duty of mothers to properly instruct their daughters, he says: 'It is a deplorable fact that the majority of our girls know practically nothing of themselves or of nature's laws relative to their sexuality till after its assertion at the age of consent, puberty.' Again, in the eighth paragraph, the doctor speaks of the mother's duty before the age of puberty, of the age of consent.

In the next paragraph he goes a step further, and, while urging that infants be protected if it necessitates an act of congress or an amendment of the constitution, he adds, following no longer a pacific tint indicated by a semi-colon: 'remembering the while that nature's age of consent varies in different girls as does the climacteric in women, and that it depends much upon latitude and longitude and altitude, and, especially, climacteric conditions and personal temperament. For this reason emphasize this fact that nature's age of consent is puberty, and that, before this is developed, all females should be instructed as to its nature, justice to it.

PUBERTY, ALL FEMALES SHOULD BE MATURED, AS IN PHYSICAL FACT, AND THEN, AND ONLY THEN, JUST SUBJECT TO THE PENALTIES OF SOCIAL AND LEGAL RESTRICTIONS." In other words, after 'nature's age of consent,' the young woman aged seventeen years, eleven months, and twenty-nine days, should be held to be incapable of consenting to association, while the same young woman, when she has added one more day to her life, is held to be responsible for her own actions in this sphere. Contrary to the law of nature, the young woman is in the first case a criminal, and in the second case not a criminal. She can see no natural line of demarcation, and hence she wants all age of consent fixed as to marriage is to be always a crime, so far as men is concerned, and the act of an irresponsible infant, so far as woman is concerned. How complimentary Mrs. Campbell is to the idea of nature is recognized: We are never to become old enough to know what we want, unless informed by a priest or justice of the peace."

And yet, in the face of this advocacy of perpetual infamy for women and perpetual responsibility for men, his sympathies is single standard of morals! Such a "single standard" has its counterpart only in that established by the new age-of-consent law of Colorado (if Governor McNulty has signed the bill), which puts the age at fifteen, but punishes for rape a boy of fourteen who consorts with her before she has reached the "age." Looking at this law on one side, we see that she is supposed to be incapable of reasoning as a woman until she is eighteen, while he is accounted capable of reasoning as a man at fourteen, and all this despite the universally admitted fact that, on the average, girls mature, physically and socially, some years earlier than boys. Wonderful, indeed, is the standard of morals and responsibility as formulated by Christian women and Colorado legislators! But I must say to them all that a genuine utilitarian moral code for men and women should be to be attained greatly as well as not, not by making a slave a woman, with making a woman free with man, by making woman free with man, not by levelling down, but by levelling up. It is not equality in a community of sorts that any rational person wants, but equal opportunities in a society of free men and women.

Dr. Leach, in spite of his lamentable obliquity of vision, nevertheless is nearer the truth in most respects. It is his co-conspirator, Miss D. H. Campbell, who has seen how to mar in more and more stringent and life-defying legislation, he lays great stress on the importance of frank and fearless home instruction of the young. He would have the girl know all about her body, and, he would, in other words, make her the slave of official immorality.

With such instruction imparted in all homes, and equitable industrial conditions established, fourteen-twentieths of the real sexual evils of the time would disappear. But this would not satisfy the class of moralistic "reformers." No matter how happy dissenters are, the conventional conformers can never let them alone. To illustrate what I mean, I will call your attention to the obnoxious clause that a girl cannot marry before she obtains her legal majority unless she obtains the consent of her guardian. This point is made much of by all of the friends of a high age of consent. Now, in that matter in another light. It is tacitly admitted that the girl may rightfully marry under eighteen or twenty, if she have the consent of her parents. But would there be the same persons admit that she could rightfully marry before eighteen or twenty, if she had the consent of nature. Would there be the same consent of nature before eighteen or twenty? This is a question that the authorities have not answered.

Miss Campbell wants an age of consent; there must be no union with the sanction of external authority. Would she admit that a woman of fourteen or fifteen should enter into marriage, with the consent of her parents, outside the pale of marriage? Undoubtedly not. It amounts to just about this: no matter how well the mother may know her children, how close she may be in her confidence, she cannot give a valid consent to their love association outside of conventional marriage, that is, she cannot give a consent that would satisfy Mrs. Campbell and Dr. Leach. If with her consent a mother's nature demands, she should enter into a marriage, with the consent of the two Christian people I have named would hold up their hands in plow horror and talk about these self-centred and well equipped young women having "gone astray" and "gone bad" and "sullied away," her "purify sullied," her "crown of womanhood, her virtue," taken from her. But, some superstitious priest, some unscrupulous magistrate, who knows nothing of the prenuptial need for the motherhood, who does not understand the nature and needs of these young women, who has not their trust and is not interested in their welfare, gives his consent, it is all right. It is all right, even if the mother thinks the conventional marriage is the one not good men. Her dissent counts for nothing, if they are of age, against the consent of the incompetent stranger, - priest or magistrate, as the case may be.

This illustration serves to bring out strong reification that there is a struggle going on, a battle for the protection of the girls as for the safe-guarding of the institution of legal marriage. They regard sex and its manifestations as inherently impure, and think that nothing but the consent of the recognized authority - that is, authority recognized by "they" - can sanctify it and its relations. They agree in effect with Paul that it is better to marry than to associate otherwise, but that the "carnal" marriage is a terribly bad thing at the best.

Mrs. Campbell believes himself not to be her own mistress at any time in her life, so far as marriage is involved. Before she is eighteen or twenty one, even, and the rest of the eight years if an infant or a criminal, while inside of marriage she is always a sexual serf in the eyes of the law. Outside of marriage, she could not commit; inside of marriage, she could commit, and if the law does not not or you must. Never a moment of self-sovereignty.

Still, Mrs. Campbell wants to make woman free! Of course, I do not need to remind her that in no State will she be freed of the rape of the wife be exterminated. Why does she not demand the amendment of the law in this particular? Does she think that it is not a crime for the husband to force unwilling sexual acts upon the wife, but that it is a crime for a man and woman to enter into a marriage? And has she noted how persistent is the idea that woman owes certain services in return for pecuniary support? Most of our law-making imbeciles, and other sorts of moralists, seem to think
that marriage was ordained that men might have women and deputize them, and it does not appear to have occurred to them that under healthful conditions the love relations would be independent of financial considerations; that men and women equally need and enjoy each other's companionship, and that, if that companionship is not enjoyed, health and happiness and the man and woman must each be self-supporting. By one of those odd coincidences that so often present themselves, the ephemeral age of consent bills that distinguished themselves as one of the current political passing was accompanied by another epidemic, that of bills for the taxation of old bachelors for the support of sinks. The legislators reason according to the employment of marriage for the production of children, and to have the initiative for the customary exchange, they should be punished by being forced by taxation to help support the women they might have made arrangements to support on the conventional terms.

But there is the natural confirmation of my contention that the Grundtvigians expect women to remain the dependents of men, but in this instance it would appear that they are overdoing the business. For several years now various cities have been discriminating against women teachers who are married. St. Louis and San Francisco were the leaders in the movement, I believe. A bill forbidding the employment of married women to teach in the public schools was introduced in the legislature of Illinois. Of course, the idea is that the married woman is not a unit; she is part of a unit, the family, and the husband, as the "proverbe" for the family, should support her. So far as I want the want of food, clothing, shelter, etc., and will give him in return what may be necessary of flirtation and seduction, or of the latter's counterfeit. It will probably be found that legislation like this proposed in Illinois will be a boomerang, that an increasingly large proportion of the teachers will remain single. Then some Solon will come to their rescue with a bill for a law levying a heavy tax on old bachelors! But the whole business is in line with Mrs. Campbell's demand for the life-long minority of woman.

SOME OTHER IMBDUES.

Referring to the work of women legislators in Colorado, Helen H. Gardner speaks of the "honor" of the little girls being impertinent. I cannot admit this to be so. Their persons may be in danger, their health or happiness impaired, but not their honor if they were too young to have responsible judgments of their own in regard to their relations with men. In short, as a corollary of the proposition in Mrs. Gardner's mind concerning all of those who are under the "age" she would fix. Those who can not tell right from wrong, good from evil, are in no danger of losing either "honor" or "love" else they may have.

A "mistake in judgment" does not mean "entire outlawry" for a girl who has parents with hearts and common sense, and they will see it to that at that age when she is "sensitively and tirelessly" wrong. She has the guidance and care that all she needs, her heredity being fair. Suppression at this period has ruined millions more than has been "ruined" otherwise.

Mrs. Gardner seems to think much of the resolutions adopted by the New York State Medical Society and the New York State Homeopathic Society in favor of the bill presented in the New York legislature fixing the marriage age at eighteen years. The "new priesthood" of aedilectics is not likely to secure a very great degree of respect from discriminating thinkers. I do not see that the opinion of the members of the "young" and "old" so much more pronounced, and so much more available, in both cases, have usually come from without. I cannot forget that the scientific inquiry, vivisection, has its stronghold in the cindel of the physiologists and their allies, the doctors and surgeons, and it is that we are our own medical vaccination laws. In this State (New York) we build our children to school, and they must be vaccinated before they are admitted. These men are also anxious for monopoly laws in their own interest.

* This bill has since become a law.

and, in short, while they are a fairly useful class of citizens, they are not very happy, and in all their relations, it can not truthfully be said that as a class, they are qualified to make laws for their fellow-citizens. They certainly have now all the legal power that is conducive to the welfare of the general public, and it is for their use, and people who represent the various insanias back of the age of consent "reform," especially that phase of it for which Dr. Lewis and Mrs. Campbell have undertaken to speak. We can see how their legislation can work out to our own salvation. Only then can the race progress. We must be done with the cant that prates of "honor" and "virtue" and "purity" that have their roots in the "homes of toil," where the "foul crown of womanhood" must be something more real and valuable than the paste jewels of that fashionable society which, while it has lost none, has not found art, but artificiality.

LILLIAN HARMAN.

Mr. Ruedebusch in His Defence.

To the Editor of Liberty:

As E. H. S., in her review of my book, "Evie Menchen in der Liebe und dem Elch," misrepresents my position in some important particulars, I ask permission to right myself in your columns.

1. There is no sentence in my book which states that I have something in "advice" to offer. Several sentences, however, may be understood to express something very similar (indirectly), but this is of very little importance. The book as an entirety is certainly in no way calculated to make me rich, or E. H. S., has ever read. I do not care a snap whether any of the ideas are considered "original" or not; but I do care whether they are correct. Should we advocate in that direction?

2. I still assert that I have explored pretty roughly the "whole ground that has been gone over, both theoretically and practically," and am sure that E. H. S. could not show me a single important spot that I have not reached, or that in one or two places where I say: "All free-lovers have heretofore," etc. I should have added the words "with very few exceptions," in order to be perfectly correct.

3. "Variety of the extreme type." This cannot be called a misrepresentation, but, if mentioned with outside explanation, may be misunderstood. My studies gave me the firm conviction that perfect freedom from all love-suppressing influences must naturally lead to an almost general "variety" in sex relations, and I prove that there is not the slightest reason for free men and women to despise this fact. Logical thinking will little us from "true" or "false" beliefs, religion, and then (and not until then) freedom in love will be of great value.

4. "...who are not only attracted toward each other by physical attractions, by "friends," etc." This is a very incorrect statement. What I proposed to call the "marriage of the free" has no relation whatever to that generally called "physical attraction" or a physical union, while true friendship and comradeship will certainly be required for it. "In free society" there will be no physical union extending beyond the time of actual physical co-enjoyment. I condemn any and every sexual contract as harmful (except, if you prefer that term) if it is meant for life or for a week, — whether it is asked on the strength of any legal or moral law, or as a self-evident attribute to an expression of love.

5. I may quote a mere single expression meaning that I consider anybody "in duty bound, for the sake of the principle involved," to do anything whatever, then I will promptly withdraw the book and write a new one.

6. "Jealousy is reasoned out of existence with a quiet cool demonstration." As I know E. H. S., to be an intelligent person, I cannot find any other explanation for this ridiculous accusation than that she has not read that chapter of my book entitled "Jealousy and Possession." In this I investigate the different factors that cause jealousy at present. The logical conclusion drawn from these investigations is that nearly all the anguish and bitterness, the depressing and pernicious influence of jealousy, is not caused by love directly, but by the fight for the possession of human beings. Let us give up this idea of possession, which brings us no real benefit; then none but the surplus. Even marriage is a question of "surplus." A marriage that is unwilling to resign an enjoyment for the benefit of others, which, and probably show: "...the most severe in the case of selfish love."

7. I suppose we never will be able to eradicate "all way our weaknesses and utterities," but I can assure E. H. S. that I know a few (and I am among them) who have conquered this weakness and abut in regard to jealousy. As we have no reason to consider ourselves strong enough to face the temptation, we are doing well to intellectual power, we hope to find a more, although we must probably give up E. H. S., I am well aware that with many a person the old feeling will remain; even after this reason has faded into the distance. It is the same with the man who used to believe in ghosts and was suddenly struck by the light of reason. He now has the firm conviction that ghosts are an impossibility, but he may still believe when he gets near to the "haunted place" as the clock strikes twelve. I would say to this man: Do not be satisfied with solving the theory; try the experiment; march right into "haunted places" at the mysterious hour once or twice, and you will get over your trembling. For a similar reason I give that "advice" in my book which has caused such a storm of indignation (even with some so-called "free-lovers"). But remember, I also advise you to try the experiment. That is the theory perfectly before you try the experiment; otherwise the ghost will scare you anyway.

8. Among the next accusations, which need no answer, I note the reproach that my book has not had any economic and social freedom. Well, I thought that every intelligent reader could read between the lines that nothing but liberty would do for me in any field. I will admit now that it would have been better if I had at least mentioned these subjects, in order to avoid misunderstandings. I did not do so, because I had the feeling that many others had written upon this subject more clearly than I would ever be able to write, and that hence I should only weaken my cause by doing so.

9. I also consider Stephen Pearl Andrews' "Love, Marriage, and Divorce" a highly valuable treatise on subject. I am very sorry that E. H. S. did not point out the difference between this treatise and mine (or rather my addition to the same, as I would like to call it).

10. "How the women fear this arrangement in a matter of entire indifference to him." This sentence shows very plainly that E. H. S. has not read my book completely. If she had, she never could have published such a false statement. As her arguments follow, my statements apply only to women who consider as a "women's question," to day, they can be no interest to me. Such a woman will not think of entering into the "marriage of the free," which I propose, as long as she is subject to those "superstitions"; and, when she has conquered these, I can not describe must, self-evidently, disappear with them.

11. I certainly am a downright cistocrat, and do not claim to be anything else.

12. "Malicious would solve the labor question."

Another false statement. I never wrote that, or thought that. I say in my book that sex-freedom, together with the knowledge of the preventive check, will help to solve the labor question; E. H. S. will not dare deny that. Quite a number of Socialists and Anarchists have told me that I had too much weight upon this. E. H. S. had written the same, she might have forced me to admit that she might be right. Less would have been worse.

13. "...whose senses are convinced even before the intellect has quite grasped the doctrine of liberty, — it is fraught with danger."

If this is true of my book, then it certainly is true of mine. The pamphlet ever written in favor of "free love." Contrary to the others, I warn them of this danger. I warn them not to be lured into any experiment in "free love," except when you have quite grasped the doctrine, — i.e., before they have freed themselves from all superstitions.

14. All kinds of awful things have already been said about my "advice," but that it is the result of "sensitiveness" is such a strikingly new and "original" notion that I am really sorry that E. H. S. did not explain why it appeared to her as such.

I must tell E. H. S. that, in my estimation, she...
would have done far better to allow "her pot to simmer for a little while longer" before publishing a criticism of my book, she might then have served the public with a more disinterested analysis. Does it not appear as an absurd idea to use so much valuable space to inform the readers of Liberty of the wonderful fact that there has been published recently a book in a foreign language that has no value whatever? In instead of that she has selected some important parts of my book, which, in her opinion, showed my lack of "physiologies" insight into human nature, etc., and had cited to sell the fallacy of my arguments, that certainly would have had more value. Suppose that she had argued against any of my assertions as that "perfect freedom must lead to variety," or that "sexual passion is not necessary for a truly beautiful home," or anything that is not even in my book, then I would have answered her. Such a debate might have been of interest to all readers, no matter whether they had read my book or would ever read it. As it is, I am sorry to have been the cause of some controversy (by asking Mr. Tucker for a criticism in Liberty), and must apologize to the editor and the readers for such an unwarranted intrusion.

Emil F. Ruder

The Politician
The politician is a hybrid knife, the people's tyrant, but the boss's slave. Without a touch of the cut-throat ferocity of self. With nothing else to sell he sells himself; Yet, strange to say, the man is spotless quite, The keenest eye can't find a spot that's white. See him in power! He proudly takes his seat, A legislator, and his joy's complete. He talks of virtue, and makes laws 'gainst vice; Frates of his honor. As he drinks his poison, then Sell his vote, the vote of thousands more. But scorns a woman if an honest whore. For many ill's mankind finds some resource; Pain has its use, and philosophy has none, But ill there are men ariste to cultivate: So politicians swarm, and loot the State. The country suffers, and held the cause! The laws make nascals, and the morals laws.

J. F. D.

* As Mr. Rudebeck admits only a few watersports farther on that he had asked me for a criticism of his book, in Liberty, and I as had indicated to E. H. S. my desire to satisfy his request, this question is directly an improper one. There is an interest to suppose that E. H. S. would have reviewed the book in these columns, had it not been for his request to me and mine to hers... Excess Liberty.

MODERN MARRIAGE
By ÉMILE ZOLA
Translated from the French by Benjamin R. Tucker.
In this latest story Zola takes four typical marriages, one from the nobility, one from the bourgeoisie, one from the petty-bourgeois, and one from the lower classes. Each is described with all the veracity and exactness of nature, and each of its details, by what means each is inspired, how such a marriage comes, and how each results.

Price, 15 Cents.

MALE, post-paid, by the Publisher.

Benj. R. Tucker, Box 1212, New York City.

SLAVES TO DUTY.
By John Baddcock, Jr.
A unique addition to the popular literature of Anarchism, in that it states the grade and particulars of the scheme for the exploration of mankind. Max Stirner himself does not express the same or better fiction. 10 pages.

Price, 15 Cents.

MALE, post-paid, by the Publisher.

Benj. R. Tucker, Box 1212, New York City.

Wind-Harp Songs—One Dollar.
If you will take a copy of my book of poems when printed, please send us your subscription to the papers and papers.

J. Wm. Lloyd, Westfield, New Jersey.

INSTEAD OF A BOOK: A MAN TOO BUSY TO WRITE ONE.
By STEPHEN PEARL ANDREWS.
A well-printed book of 100 pages, consisting of essays on various subjects, and the actual cost of the book, the price is low. The author's intention is to show the advantage of self-education and of self-expression. The book is a valuable contribution to the science of sociology.

Price, 25 Cents.

PAID, post-paid, by the Publisher.

Benj. R. Tucker, Box 1212, New York City.

LIBERTY'S LIBRARY.
For any of the following books, address.

Benj. R. Tucker, Box 1212, New York City.

ANARCHISM: ITS AIMS AND METHODS. An address by Benjamin Tucker, read at the Boston Anarchists' Club, and adopted by that organization as its approved statement of principles. With the conclusions of the Anarchists' Club and explanatory notes regarding the title. By Benjamin Tucker. 20 pages, 20 cents, 10 copies, $1.00; 25 copies, $2.50; 100 copies, $10.00.

GOD IS DEAD. "One of the most eloquent pleas for liberty ever written. "Tolstoi's 'Age of Reason' and 'Nihilism of Modern Europe.'" By Michael Bakunin. Translated from the French by Benj. Tucker. 20 pages, 25 cents, 10 copies, $1.00; 25 copies, $2.00; 100 copies, $10.00.

MUTUAL BANKING: Showing the radical deficiency of the existing commercial money system of the world. By Michael Bakunin. Translated from the French by Benj. Tucker. 20 pages, 25 cents, 10 copies, $1.00; 25 copies, $2.00; 100 copies, $10.00.

INTELLIGENTSIA: Showing the radical deficiency of the existing commercial money system of the world. By Michael Bakunin. Translated from the French by Benj. Tucker. 20 pages, 25 cents, 10 copies, $1.00; 25 copies, $2.00; 100 copies, $10.00.

SYSTEM OF ECONOMICAL CONTRADICTIONS: Or, the Philosophy of Money. By P. J. Proudhon. Translated from the French by Benj. Tucker. 20 pages, 25 cents, 10 copies, $1.00; 25 copies, $2.00; 100 copies, $10.00.

THE ANARCHISTS: A Picture of Civilization at the Close of the Nineteenth Century. A poet's prose contribution to the literature of the anthropological and political sciences. By Michael Bakunin. Translated from the French by Benj. Tucker. 20 pages, 25 cents, 10 copies, $1.00; 25 copies, $2.00; 100 copies, $10.00.

A LETTER TO GROVER CLEVELAND ON HIS FIRST INauguration Address, the Embracing Liberty, Equality, and Full Liberty. By Benj. Tucker. 20 pages, 25 cents, 10 copies, $1.00; 25 copies, $2.00; 100 copies, $10.00.

THE QUINQUENNIAL ELECTION. By G. Bernard Shaw. A first-rate series of brilliant and pointed articles. The author has taken a clear and concise view of the political system in America, and has written in a style that is both entertaining and instructive.

Price, 75 cents.

THE THIRD INTERMEDIATE PERIOD. By G. Bernard Shaw. A brilliant and original political novel. The author has taken a clear and concise view of the political system in America, and has written in a style that is both entertaining and instructive.

Price, 75 cents.

THE STORY OF AN AFRICAN FARM. By Oliver Schreiner. A romance, not of adventures, but of the intellectual life of a young African who is seeking for a Better Day. The author has taken a clear and concise view of the political system in America, and has written in a style that is both entertaining and instructive.

Price, 75 cents.

WIND-HARP SONGS—One Dollar.
If you will take a copy of my book of poems when printed, please send us your subscription to the papers and papers.

J. Wm. Lloyd, Westfield, New Jersey.