On Picket Duty.

In the next number of Liberty will begin the serial publication of a new essay by Dyer P. Lamp, entitled: "Eighteen Christian Centuries; or, The Evolution of the Gospel of Anarchy. An Essay on the Meaning of History." It will prove a very valuable contribution to the literature of the Anarchistic movement.

"Free-hall," the organ of the firebugs, says that no workman should ever be seen with a copy of Liberty in his hand. Does the workman who is translating out of Liberty for "Free-hall" Sophie Kropotkin's interesting novellette, "The Wife of Number 4237," that his own self in a closet with his dictionary or does he hire some bourgeois to hold the paper for him?

Instead of meeting my charges, "Free-hall" continues to discuss my motives. First it was jealousy that prompted me; now, it is said, it is because I am "accorded" to my "unwilling" duty. The real fact is that I am a man of peace and I have no interest in the "social revolution," as it is called. I am a man of peace and I am an American, and I am proud of that fact.

The Free-hall, however, is not only a free-thinking organ, but a hambug organ. Toherynowsky's wonderful novel, "What's to Be Done?" is concluded in the present issue, and will appear a few weeks hence as a large and handsome volume at a very moderate price. This romance occupies a unique place in literature. It is written with a simplicity and elevation of tone never attained, in my judgment, by any other writer of fiction. To the youth of Russia of both sexes it has been an inspiration and a guide to the unfulfilled and unwise. It is the only novel that is ever written, and it has been translated into many European languages, but never before into English.

The Credit Foncia de Siales, a calendar every month to its subscribers at the rate of 12 cents each day of the month, appears a quotation from some representative author. On Saturday, May 30, 1888, the readers of this paper are invited to meet at the home of Volume 46, No. 2, on the subject of "Anarchism," and for those who are interested, to come all day and return, to the satisfaction of all present and all in place, are invited to reflect upon the following remark that eminent Anarchist, Ralph Waldo Emerson: "The less government, the better."

The time has come to choose. E. C. Walker, by way of comment on Liberty's exposure of the firebugs, writes in "Lanford" as follows:

It is none too soon that the warning has been sounded. For a long time I have been satisfied that the revolution was going to precipitate a conflict upon us, but I was not prepared for the revelation of duplicity which Mr. Tucker makes; and yet I might not be surprised, for men who will deliberately invoke the arbitration of the sword and torch and bomb before they have made an attempt to establish a better order of things, are men whose faith in the humanity of human rights and human lives costs little. But as our existing system is, it is perfection compared with the iron despotism which we now struggle to establish. While from his denouncing the tyrannies of our present government, they know, many of them, nothing whatever of natural rights and individual liberty, the machine is the engine of the entire world. But to what a dead level of mediocrity this would reduce men, were such tyranny possible! But, thank Tugboat, this can never be possible among men who have the least conception of liberty. Tucker is right when he calls upon the Anarchists, who are the apologists for the exposure in his paper. "He who is not against their crimes is for them." The cause of true revolution cannot be forwarded by hitting such atrocities, or associating with their perpetrators. If any members of the International believe in such, and call them revolutionaries, that honest revolutionists can have no affiliation with them, and a revolt brought about by them would not be a benefit, but a curse, a reign of plunder and murder, like the reign of Robespierre and other demons of the French Terror, — resulting in sending thousands of innocent people to the scaffold and the prisons. An able, true Anarchist said once: "Correct ideas precede successful action. The Community of Chicago which calls themselves Anarchists have not correct ideas; the revolutionists of Denver, who do not know whether they are Anarchists, Socialists, or Communists, but believe that the revolution is necessary, as far as correct as the Chicago followers; and the Socialists of San Francisco, who are now fighting the people, have been badly need the light of Tucker's Liberty to dampen their spirits. Revolutionists who desire correct ideas, and are honest in their desire for a state of society founded on justice, should Read Liberty, the only paper in America that advances the complete emancipation of man. The "Aurora" (to the contrary notwithstanding), the paper that advances the abolition of all government of man by man, —perfect individual property, —perfect society, —perfect freedom, of the same, unalterable race.

For those who are interested in the affairs of state, the following is a list of all the important events of the past week in the nation and the world:

Quick sketch of the events which have taken place:

1. The credit Foncia de Siales, a calendar every month to its subscribers at the rate of 12 cents each day of the month, appears a quotation from some representative author. On Saturday, May 30, 1888, the readers of this paper are invited to meet at the home of Volume 46, No. 2, on the subject of "Anarchism," and for those who are interested, to come all day and return, to the satisfaction of all present and all in place, are invited to reflect upon the following remark that eminent Anarchist, Ralph Waldo Emerson: "The less government, the better."

2. The time has come to choose. E. C. Walker, by way of comment on Liberty's exposure of the firebugs, writes in "Lanford" as follows:

It is none too soon that the warning has been sounded. For a long time I have been satisfied that the revolution was going to precipitate a conflict upon us, but I was not prepared for the revelation of duplicity which Mr. Tucker makes; and yet I might not be surprised, for men who will deliberately invoke the arbitration of the sword and torch and bomb before they have made an attempt to establish a better order of things, are men whose faith in the humanity of human rights and human lives costs little. But as our existing system is, it is perfection compared with the iron despotism which we now struggle to establish. While from his denouncing the tyrannies of our present government, they know, many of them, nothing whatever of natural rights and individual liberty, the machine is the engine of the entire world. But to what a dead level of mediocrity this would reduce men, were such tyranny possible! But, thank Tugboat, this can never be possible among men who have the least conception of liberty. Tucker is right when he calls upon the Anarchists, who are the apologists for the exposure in his paper. "He who is not against their crimes is for them." The cause of true revolution cannot be forwarded by hitting such atrocities, or associating with their perpetrators. If any members of the International believe in such, and call them revolutionaries, that honest revolutionists can have no affiliation with them, and a revolt brought about by them would not be a benefit, but a curse, a reign of plunder and murder, like the reign of Robespierre and other demons of the French Terror, — resulting in sending thousands of innocent people to the scaffold and the prisons. An able, true Anarchist said once: "Correct ideas precede successful action. The Community of Chicago which calls themselves Anarchists have not correct ideas; the revolutionists of Denver, who do not know whether they are Anarchists, Socialists, or Communists, but believe that the revolution is necessary, as far as correct as the Chicago followers; and the Socialists of San Francisco, who are now fighting the people, have been badly need the light of Tucker's Liberty to dampen their spirits. Revolutionists who desire correct ideas, and are honest in their desire for a state of society founded on justice, should Read Liberty, the only paper in America that advances the complete emancipation of man. The "Aurora" (to the contrary notwithstanding), the paper that advances the abolition of all government of man by man, —perfect individual property, —perfect society, —perfect freedom, of the same, unalterable race.
WHAT'S TO BE DONE?

A ROMANCE.

Translated by Henri R. Tucker.

"No.

"Only you must say nothing about it. Afterwards, when you know her better, you can tell her that you saw her. But no one else. She does not like that."

The windows of the room were raised a little.

"It certainly is in the window where the light is," Mosoloff guessed at that direction.

"Yes, do you see?"

The lady in black was sitting in an easy chair, near the table. With her left elbow she was resting on the table, her hand lightly sustained her bowed head, covering her temple and a part of her hair. Her right hand was placed on the table, and her fingers were and fell mechanically, as if playing on air. At the lady's face an immovable expression of reverie, sad, but still serene. Her eyebrows came together and slightly parted again, and eyes cerned.

"Always this way, too," Mosoloff thought. "Do you see? But come; else we shall take cold. We have been here a quarter of an hour."

They were not feeling you are?" said Nikitine, looking steadily at his companions, as they passed by the refection in the ante-room.

"By constantly feeling one becomes unfeeling, my dear. To you it is a novelty."

The refreshments were brought in.

"The brandy must be very good," said Nikitine. "but how strong it is! It takes one's breath away!"

"What a little girl! Your eyes are red?" said Mosoloff.

Everybody began to make fun of Nikitine.

"Oh! that's only because I am choked up; were it not for that, I could drink," said he, in self-jusification.

They took note of the time. It was already eleven o'clock; therefore they could chatter half an hour longer; there was time enough.

Half an hour later Katerina Vasilevna went to awaken the lady in black. The lady came to meet her on the threshold, stretching as if she had just been asleep.

"Do you sleep well?"

"Perfectly."

"How do you feel?"

"Marvelously well. I told you before that it was nothing. I was tired, because I had been sitting so wildly. Now I shall be more prudent."

But no, she did not succeed in being prudent. Five minutes later she had already charmed Polonine, taking orders to the young people, and drumming a march or something of the sort with the handles of two forks on the table. At the same time she was urged a departure, while the others, whom her sweetness had already made quite gay, were not in such a hurry.

"Are the horses ready?" she asked, after having eaten.

"Not yet; the order to harness them has just been given." "Unendurable! But if that is the case, sing us something, Pavlova: I have heard that you have a fine voice."

Pavlova sang:

"I shall ask you to sing often," said the lady in black.

"It is your turn, it is your turn," they cried on all sides.

The words were no sooner uttered than she was at the piano.

"All right! I do not know how to sing, but to me that is no obstacle! But, ladies and gentlemen, it is not at all for you that I sing; I sing only for my children. Children, do not laugh at your mother!"

She improvised a few straws on the piano by way of pedagogue.

"Children, do not laugh; I shall sing with expression."

And, with a squeaking voice, she began to sing:

Un pigeon mort... (A dead dove.)

The young people shouted in surprise and the rest of the company began to laugh, and the singer herself could not help laughing too; but, after stifling her laughter, she continued, in a voice that squeaked twice as much as before:

Génialité (Génialité in nut et le jour; (True morning and day)

But I am not sure whether has just been given.

(pressed to me)

But this is a stupid "but," my children,—

Maitre la liberté de garçon est plus joyeuse. (But the teacher's liberty is more joyous.) This is no reason,—this reason is stupid,—and you shall know why:

Ne me marre pas, jeune homme, (Do not mock, young man)

Ecoutons! (Let us listen.)

Further on comes a piece of nonsense, my children; this too is nonsense, if you understand me, my children, both in love and marry, but only by choice, and without deceit, without deceit, my children. I am going to sing you of the way in which I was married; the romance is an old one, but I also am old. I am a bachelor, and in my cottage in the middle of the forest and the Bringle River are before me; some one stealthily approaches the door; it is certainly my step mother; but I am rich, the daughter of a baron; but I love him much, and I sing to him:

La râleuse de Bringle est belle, (The râleuse of the Bringle is beautiful)

Et vous en est belle aussi. (And you are also beautiful.)

"How do you feel?" Mosoloff asked.

"Oh, I am much better," Mosoloff said in an indifferent and tranqul tone.

Ten minutes later Katerina Vasilevna returned.

"Well?" asked six voices. Mosoloff asked no question.

"She went to bed, began at once to doze, and probably is now fast asleep."

"Didn't I tell you so?" observed Mosoloff. "It is nothing."

She is to be pitied, nevertheless," said Katerina Vasilevna. "Let us keep on talking, my dear. You stay with me, Vérochka, and Charlie with Sachs."

"But we need not trouble ourselves now," said Mosoloff, "we can sing, dance, shout; she is sleeping profoundly."

If she was asleep, if it was nothing, why should they trouble themselves? The impression made by the lady in black, which had disturbed their peace for a quarter of an hour, had disappeared, was forgotten, not yet, of course, but nearly.

The evening gradually became what former similar evenings had been, and soon they started asking the question over again.

"Or not a little, but five or six times the ladies looked at each other with an expression of fear and sadness. Twice, perhaps, Véra Pavlovna said furiously:

"Sachka, if that should happen to me? The first time Kirinov made no answer; the second he said: No, Vérochka, that cannot happen to you."

"Can't?"

"Yes."

And Katerina Vasilevna also fortuitely said twice in her husband's ear:

"That cannot happen to me, Charlie, can it?"

The first time Beaumont only smiled in a half-hearted and not very reassuring manner; the second he murmured:

"It is the same as that cannot happen to you."

But these were only passing echoes, and were heard only at the beginning. But in general the evening went off joyously, and half an hour later quite gayly. They chattered and played and sang.

"She sleeps profoundly," Mosoloff assured them, and he set the example. In truth, she did not speak or anything, but the room where she was lying down was a long distance from the dressing-room, three rooms away at the other end of the suite.

Therefore the evening's revelry was completely restored.

The young people, as usual, now joined the others, now separated from them; now in a body, now not. Beaumont had joined them twice. Véra Pavlovna had turned them away from Beaumont and from all conversation.

They bubbled a great deal; a great deal too much; they also discussed things together, but much less.

All were together.

"What is there of good or evil?" asked the young man who a little while before had assumed a tragic attitude.

"More evil than good," said Véra Pavlovna.

"Why so, Vérochka?" said Katerina Vasilevna.

"At any rate life does not go on without it," said Beaumont.

"An intelligible thing," affirmed Kirinov.

"Altogether evil,—that is, very good," decide he who had started the question.

His three companions nodded their heads, as he said: Bravo, Nikitine!"

The young people were by themselves.

"I never know him, Nikitine; but you seem to have known him?" said Mosoloff, inquisitively.

"I was then a mere boy. I saw him."

"How do your memories seem to you? Do they tell the truth? Do they not exaggerate your friendship?"

"No."

"Has no one seen him since?"

"No. Beaumont was then in America."

Indeed! Karl lakovich, I beg your attention for a moment. Did you not meet this American in this Russian of whom they have been talking?"

"No."

"What caprice has entered her head?" said Nikitine: "he and she would make a good pair."

"Gentlemen, come and sing with me," said Véra Pavlovna. "Two volunteers! So much the better." Mosoloff and Nikitine remained by themselves.

"I can show you a curious thing, Nikitine," said Mosoloff. "Do you think she is asleep?"

"The self—this is the
for I know that in the daytime he hides and changes his retreat every day,

Asile plus cher que la maison paternelle.

(A retreat dearer than the paternal roof.)

For that matter, the paternal roof was not indeed very dear. So I sing to him: I will go with you. How do you think he answers me?

To vous, vieille, s'occupez de vous.

(You old, vige, be mine.

Quitter mon abri et m'accorder la grâce de vous aimer.

(To forget your birth and your loyalty.)

for I am of high birth—

Main d'abond divin

(But first guest)

Quel est mon sort.

(What shall I do?"

"You are a hunter?" I say. "No." "You are a poacher?" "You have almost guessed it," he says.

Quand nous nous rassemblerons, envois des trêves, donnez-leur du pain, et leur donnera leur manger.

(And when we shall meet, send them trêves, and give them bread, and they will eat.)

for we, ladies and gentlemen, are children of very bad subjects,—

Il nous faudra, crois-nous,

(It will be necessary for us, believe me)

Deux qui nous chassent d'abord.

(Two who chase us first)

Deux qui nous assomme maintenir.

(Two who pine us maintenance)

he sings. "I guessed long ago," I say, "you are a brigand. And it is really the truth, he is a brigand,—yes, he is a brigand. What does he say then, gentlemen? "You see, I am a bad sweetheart for you."

O vige, je ne suis pas l'honneur dévoue des vœux;

(Oh vige, I am not a man worthy of your vows

Je ne suis que le pauvre de vos riez;

(And I am but the poor of your tears)

je ne suis que le mort de tes riez;

(And I am but the dead of your tears)

que j'ai vieilli les forts;

(And I have aged the strong)

et je n'ai que vieilli les forts;

(And I have aged the strong)

que j'ai vieilli les forts;

(And I have aged the strong)

que j'ai vieilli les forts;

(And I have aged the strong)

que j'ai vieilli les forts;

(And I have aged the strong)

that is the absolute truth,—"thick forests"—; so he tells me not to accompany him.

Pèlerinage n'est ma vie,

(Pilgrimage is my life)

for in the thick forests there are wild beasts—

Et ma fin sera blé et blanc.

(And my end will be white and black)

That is not true, my children; it will not be said; but then I believed it; and he believed it too; nevertheless I answer him in the same way:

La lune est belle,

(The moon is lovely)

Lenue et tranquille,

(And the moon and the tranquil)

Et vous et votre amour.

(And you and your love)

Quand je vous aime.

(When I love you)

when we shall gather, of children of darkness)

"Indeed, so it was. Therefore I could regret nothing; he had told me where I was to go. That one may marry, one may love my children,—without deceit and knowing well how to choose.

La lune se leve

(The moon rises)

Lenue et tranquille,

(And the moon and the tranquil)

Et vous et votre amour.

(And you and your love)

Quand je vous aime.

(When I love you)

C'est vous qui me parlez.

(You are the ones who speak)

Que je vous aime.

(That I love you)

"With such women one may fall in love, and one may marry them.""

(If all love is not right, I shall love to you)"" but I wish to tell you: I will listen to her;—whispers the other."

"I allow you to love such women, and I bless you, my children:

Avec audace, cher amour,

(With audacity, dear love)

(And be to your destiny)

I have grown quite gay with you; now, wherever there is gaiety, there should be drinking.

Hé ma cabaretière,

(Oh my hostess)

Vos mets de l'hydromel et du vin,

(Your food of honey and wine)

Pour me some mead and wine.

"Meal, because the word cannot be thrown out of the song. Is there any champagne left? You? Perfect! Open it."

Hé ma cabaretière,

(Oh my hostess)

Vos mets de l'hydromel et du vin,

(Your food of honey and wine)

Pour me some mead and wine.

Pour que ma tête

(For my head)

De l'eau fraîche;

(Of fresh water)

(May it be gay)

Who is the hostess? Ma:

(Oh my hostess)

Et là souriez les sourires menus.

(And there smile the small smiles)

And she drops, and she drops her eyebrows, and stamped with her heels.

"Pourquoi! Ready! Ladies and gentlemen, you, old man, and you, my children, take it and drink it; that your heads may be gay!"

To the hostess, to the hostess!

"Thanks to my health!"

She sits down again at the piano and sings:

que le chapot roule en danse!

(Let the hat roll in dance)

and it will fly away,

Et dans un cours rajeunis

(With a young course)

Chaque ronde vous liez toujours et est faite,

(Each round you tie always and is made)

Indure de la peinture infinie,

(Harden with infinite paint)

L'oeuvre de la rose croit sans cesse.

(The flower of the rose never increases.

CHAPITRE SIXIÈME.

Change of Scene.

"As passage!" said the lady in black to the coachman, though now she was no longer in black: a light dress, a pink hat, a white mantilla, and a bouquet in her hand. She was no longer with Monopoloff alone: Monopoloff and Nikitine were on the front seat of the barouche; the young lady was still; and beside the lady sat a man of about thirty. How old was the lady? Was she twenty-five, as she said, instead of twenty only. But if she chose to make herself old, that was a matter for her own conscience.

"Yes, my dear friend, I have been expecting this day for more than two years. At the time when I made my acquaintance (she indicated Nikitine with her eyes), I only had a presentiment; it could not then be said that I expected; then there was only hope, but soon came assurance."

"Permit me!" says the reader,—and not only the reader with the penetrating eye, but every reader,—becoming more stupid the more he reflects: "more than two years after she had made Nikitine's acquaintance!"

"Yes,"

"But she made Nikitine's acquaintance at the same time that she made that of the Kirsanoff and the Beaumonts, at the sleighing-party which took place towards the end of last winter."

"You are perfectly right."

"What does this mean, then? You are talking of the beginning of the year 1865?"

"Yes,"

"But how is that possible, pray?"

"Why not, if I know it?"

"Nameless! who will listen to you?"

"You will not?"

"What do you take me for? Certainly not."

"If you will not listen to me now, it is needless to say that I must postpone the sequel of my story until you will deign to listen. I hope to see that day ere long."

April 4 (16), 1866.

THE END.

A LETTER TO GROVER CLEVELAND.

on His False, Absurd, Self-Contradictory, and Ridiculous Inaugural Address.

BY LYSDANDER SPINNER.

(The author reserves his copyright in this letter.)

SECTION XXV.

But perhaps the most absolute proof that our national lawmakers and judges are as regards of all constitutional, as they are of all natural, law, and that their sentences and decisions are to be judged of all constitutional, as they are of all natural, authority, is to be found in the fact that these lawmakers and judges have trampled upon, and utterly ignored, certain amendments to the constitution, which have been adopted, and (constitutionally speaking) become authoritative, as early as 1870: only two years after the government went into operation.

If these amendments had been obeyed, they would have compelled all congresses and courts to understand that, if the government had any constitutional powers at all, they were simply powers to protect men's natural rights, and not to destroy any of them.

These amendments have actually forbidden any lawmaking whatever in violation of men's natural rights. And this is equivalent to a prohibition of any lawmaking at all. And if lawmakers and courts had been as desirous of preserving men's natural rights, as they have been of violating them, they would long ago have found out that, since these amendments, the constitution authorized no lawmaking at all.

These amendments were ten in number. They were recommended by the first congress, at its first session, in 1870, of both the houses congresses, and in 1871, they had been ratified by all the States: from that time they imposed the restrictions mentioned upon all the powers of congress.

These amendments were proposed, by this first congress, for the reason that, although the constitution, as originally framed, had been adopted, its adoption had been procured only with great difficulty, and in spite of great objections. These

Continued on page 6.
Stop the Main Leak First.
In answer to my article, “Free Money First,” in Liberty of March 27th, in which was discussed the comparative importance of the money and land questions, J. M. McGregor of the Detroit “Labor Leaf” says: “I grant free money first. I firmly believe free money will come first, too, though our critic and myself may be widely at variance in the conclusion to what would constitute free money.” I mean by free money the utter absence of restriction upon the issue of all money not fraudulent. If Mr. McGregor believes in this, I am hearty glad. I should like to be half as sure as he is that it is coming. From the present tempers of the people it looks to me as if nothing free would come first. They seem to be bent on trying every form of compulsion. In this current Mr. McGregor is far to the left with his scheme of land taxation on the Henry George plan, and although he may believe free money will be first in time, he clearly does not consider it first in importance. This last-mentioned priority he awards to land reform, and it is his position that regard that any article was written to dispute.

The issue between us, thus confused, hangs upon the truth or falsity of Mr. McGregor’s statement that “today landiuality, through rent and speculation, supports more livers than any other system of profit robbing known to our great commonwealth.” I take it that Mr. McGregor, by “rent,” means ground-rent exclusively, and, by the phrase “supports more livers,” means takes more from labor; otherwise, his statement has no pertinence to his position. For all rent except ground-rent would be almost entirely and directly aboloished by free money, and the evil of rent to labor depends, not so much on the number of livers it supports, as on the aggregate amount and quality of support it gives them, whether they be many or few, in number. Mr. McGregor’s statement, then, amounts to this, that ground-rent supports more than any other form of usury. It needs no statistics to disprove this. The principal forms of usury are interest on money loaned or invested, profits made in buying and selling, rent of buildings of all sorts, and ground-rent. A moment’s reflection will show any one that the amount of loaned or invested capital bearing interest in this country to-day exceeds in value the amount of land yielding rent. The item of interest alone is a much more serious burden on the people than that of ground-rent. Much less, then, does ground-rent equal interest plus profit plus rent of buildings. But to make Mr. McGregor’s argument really valid it must exceed all these combinations. When labor pays more in ground-rent than in interest plus profit, plus rent of buildings combined, the money question is of more importance than the land question. There are countries where this is the case, but the United States is not one of them.

It should also be borne in mind that free money, in destroying the power to accumulate large fortunes in the ordinary industries of life, will put a very powerful check upon the scramble for corner-lots and other advantageous positions, and thereby have a considerable influence upon ground-rent itself.

“How can capital be free,” asks Mr. McGregor, “when it cannot get rid of rent?” It cannot be entirely free till it can get rid of rent, but it will be infinitely freer if it gets rid of interest, profit, and rent of buildings and still keeps ground-rent than if it gets rid of ground-rent and keeps the other forms of usury. Both, however, have got to go. Give us free money, the first great step to Anarchy, and we’ll attend to ground-rent afterwards. We’ll send it to the limbo of all other frauds without the aid of Henry George or his theories.

Boycott the State.
So Jay Gould is to be boycotted by the Knights of Labor! Poor Gould! If there were weeds growing in your garden, would you snip off the top of one of them, expecting to exterminate them all, or would you dig them all up, root and branch? If you did the former, you would give more room to the surrounding weeds, and they would grow the ranker. If you pulled them up, every one of them, you would do about the right thing.

The weeds in the social garden are the monopolies, and the ranker of all is the monopoly of the State, from which all other monopolies get sustenance. Don’tlop off a little branch like Jay Gould, but pull up the whole rank growth and burn it.

Jay Gould, so far as I know, has got his millions according to law, and holds them with the sanction of the State. He has got more than others simply because he has taken more advantage of the opportunities afforded by the State. Knight’s of Labor, if you who are not knights, if you wish to make it impossible for men like Gould to exist, boycott the State! And in order to do this, boycott the ballot. This may look like a desperate remedy, but it is a desperate case.

Learn Before You Teach.
Will the editor of the London “Anarchist” accept an item of advice from the editor of Liberty? Namely, that, before issuing another number of his paper, he should take a vacation sufficiently long—whether one month, or twelve months, or twenty years—to enable him to study the questions he is publicly discussing and find out his attitude upon them, to the end that he may thereupon utilize his commendable zeal as a propagandist with some consistency and effect. He started his paper as an Anarchistic Socialist, standing squarely upon the principles of Liberty and Equity and advocating them with considerable intelligence and power. But in a recent issue he abandoned Equity by repudiating the Socialist theory of value and adopting one which differs but little, if any, from what he had before in the next issue after it, or the next but one, he abandoned Liberty by vaunting into communism. These two remarkable feats in intellectual gymnastics are not more inconsistent with the original attitude of their hero than they are with each other. If amid this network of inconsistencies any reader of the “Anarchist,” which now announces itself an organ, can find its editorial columns, he is an anomaly, a body of doctrine signifying to him of what it is an organ, his eyes are sharper than mine.

It had been my intention to reason with Mr. Seymour on his rejection of the ‘Anarchist’ title, but I am glad to hear that Mr. F. Kelly, of Hacken, got the start of me, and sorry to say that his experiment has shown me the futility of such a course. Mr. Kelly gave Mr. Seymour the benefit of a column and a half of as calm, as reasoning, as well as an expression of doctrines as well as an expression of doctrines as often finds its way into print, and it elicited from him not a few straggling sentences each seemingly struggling to surpass his predecessor in the extremity of its cruelty, or the difficulty of its falsity. Mr. Kelly quotes, not in Mr. Seymour of native intellectual power, but to a premature assumption of the functions of a public teacher. Attracted by the fundamental forces of ideas therefore unites themselves into a compact, and before his mind had thoroughly assimilated them and could withstand any and all assaults upon him. Now he finds himself confronted with arguments which he has never considered, and which a little quiet thought and study would enable him to meet; but, finding no time for this in the whirl of his revolutionary work, he runs up against one of them and is stunned into acquiescence, and, before he has fairly recovered, gets a buffet from the opposite direction, which demoralizes— or demoralizes— him more than ever.

It is immovable. Mr. Seymour is a most earnest young man, and his enthusiasm commends my admiration; but I am compelled to say that the present intellectual status of his paper positively dishonors and disgraces a cause whose foremost representatives and advocates have been towards the latter, the former, and by its bitterest opponents, to be possessed of more than ordinary mental grasp. I say this with the more reluctance from the fact that the “Anarchist” descended into an abode of思想 in direct conflict with the source of great pride to its ancestor. It is distressing to disown one’s progeny, but occasionally it has to be done.

Liberty and Compromise.
The longer I live and the more I see, the more firmly do I believe in the idea of reason and in the idea of civilization, after all, but strong reliance in the conviction that the central principle of the universe is perfection? Call it God, natural law, or whatever you will, the aggregate of those who have been towards the latter, the former, and by its bitterest opponents, to be possessed of more than ordinary mental grasp. I say this with the more reluctance from the fact that the “Anarchist” descended into an abode of思想 in direct conflict with the source of great pride to its ancestor. It is distressing to disown one’s progeny, but occasionally it has to be done.

In the above admission I see a sign of the times having the deepest and most gratifying significance. The so-called labor question is before the country. The papers are full of it. It floods the pulpits and surges upon every hearthstone. Railroad men and merchants tremble. It overflows into every thing and issue. Everybody is stirred. And yet never in the history of this country were poleres at so low an ebb as now.

The fact is that the industrial question is a social question, and that there is sufficient overweening of intelligence among the workingmen to conduct it largely upon social methods, without calling upon politics. Though it be true that the boycott and other of these methods are greatly ideal, it cannot be said without doing to my mind the penalty which liberty must pay to ignorance in this case is very tolerable beside the steady drift towards social methods in place of political methods. There are great issues that are coming to shake society will be social rather than political. This can mean nothing else than that a great tidal wave is in motion towards Anarchism. In its first stages there will not really be criminal crimes against individual liberty; but let us not lose temper on this account, and ignore the great revolution that is slowly developing in the methods of social amelioration.

The socialists are the first crude expression of the new social drift in this country. The order needs seasoning with ideas, and its platform in many respects proclaims a square assault upon individual right. Yet, in all, it is free from political ambition than any other reform organization in history. Whether politics will yet overshadow and capture it is the critical issue in its life. Possibly such will be its fate; but no matter. Profiting by experience, the next result of this organization will be what the stage will take a farther step away from politics.

Idea permeates the masses slowly. It is the individual who imprisons the mass with true germ. The aggregate expression of liberty will long be the cumbersome and contradictory, but the germ lives. He who holds a large-rounded faith in an irrepressible drift towards true foundation principles will not fly off and proclaim his creed. He who yearns into print his crusade of righteousness must cast the first crep and get off his swaddling clothes before it can stand erect upon the eternal foundation rock of individual Sovereignty. A steady insinuation with true
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THE BEAST OF COMMUNISM.

The article printed below was rejected by the Chicago "Alarming," in spite of the fact that its author, Dyer L. Lum, the "Alarming," and "La Libertad," asked in its insertion in that paper us a matter of Justice to himself.

The recent article from the pen of Mr. Tucker in the columns of Liberty, exposing an alleged conspiracy on the part of certain Communists of New York for the telegraphic commission of arson for the purpose of obtaining funds from insurance companies, calls for attention on our part. If the facts on which the charge is made be indubitable, then Mr. Tucker's scathing denunciation of these moral crimes is fully justified. Unfortunately, men in whom I have the greatest confidence, and in whose word I have unbounded trust, have reason to believe that the charge is true. Certainly no one who has had intimate acquaintance with Mr. Tucker and known him to be a man of strong principles, will for a moment believe that he has broken the "Freidel's" moral code or desire to please the police. If John Doe had said that Mr. Schwalbe had broken a criminal charge, I would have been deeply distressed, and so misled into servile connection with the "Freidel's," his dental might have been treated with compassion, but it appears that he has made no public accusation; as an Anarchist he has simply unmasked the racketeers, and has made no attempt to influence public attention by publishing articles and announcements upon his character and motives is not the proper method to establish innocence or to prove innocence.

Liberty, in its effort to copy the exposure and send it forth with the stamp of approval. For myself, as a writer for these columns, I feel in honor bound to denounce such actions as these.

judge the value of a man by the good he has done to others, and the harm he has done to his enemies. This is the moral of the story.

The instrumentality of the State is the instrumentality of the individual. The individual, who holds the power, is the one who proclaims the act.

I am not one of those who think that the abolition of the State is an end in itself. It is a means to an end. The end is the abolition of all forms of oppression and exploitation. The State, as an instrument of oppression and exploitation, exists to serve the interests of the few at the expense of the many.

The abolition of the State is the ultimate goal of the struggle for freedom. It is not a matter of destroying the State, but of replacing it with a society in which the individual is free to live as he chooses, without interference from any higher authority.

The abolition of the State is not a utopian dream, but a practical possibility. The conditions for its achievement are already present. The masses of people are already organize the struggle against the State, and are winning victories over it. The State is already in retreat, and will eventually be wholly overcome.

The abolition of the State is not a question of whether it will happen, but of when. The time is near. The State is in its death throes, and the end is in sight. The abolition of the State is the natural and inevitable outcome of the progress of human society. It is the end of the struggle for freedom, and the beginning of a new era of peace, prosperity, and liberty. The end of the State is the beginning of the era of the free individual.
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A LETTER TO GROVER CLEVELAND.

Continued from page 6.

The first eight amendments specified particularly various prohibitions upon the power of Congress; such, for example, as the security of the people's free exercise of religion, the right to keep and bear arms, etc., etc. Then followed the ninth amendment, in these words:

The enumeration in the constitution, of certain rights, [retained by the people] shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

Here is an authoritative declaration, that “the people” have “other rights” than those specifically enumerated in the constitution,” and that these “other rights” were “retained by the people;” that is, that Congress should have no power to infringe those.

What then, were these “other rights,” that had not been “enumerated” but which were nevertheless “retained by the people”?

Plainly they were men’s natural rights”; for these are the only “rights” that the “people” ever had, or, consequently, that they could “retain.”

And at no time ever made by the people, or by any considerable number of them, and as it would be obviously impossible to enumerate all, or nearly all, of their rights, it is evident, that in all the discussions arising out of these matters to the people, the necessary, the legal, the inevitable inference is that they were all “retained;” and that Congress should have no power to violate any of them.

In short, every man’s natural rights are, first, the right to do, with himself and his property, as he pleases, and to that justice towards others does not forbid him to do; and, secondly, to be free from all compulsion, by others, to do anything that that justice requires him to do.

Such, then, has been the constitutional law of this country since 1791; admitting, for the sake of the argument—what I do not really admit to be a fact—that the Constitution, as so-called, has ever been a law at all.

This amendment, from the remarkable circumstances under which it was proposed and adopted, must have made an impression upon the minds of all the public men of the time, and upon the other nine amendments, were proposed and adopted. He was thirty-two years old (lacking seven days) when the constitution, as originally framed, was published (September 17, 1787); and he was a member of the Virginia convention that ratified it. He knew what force these objections were urged by some of the ablest members of Congress to revitalize those objections as a body, without a dissenting voice, so far as appears, recommended that very strong measures, that had been called for, and if not taken, might lead to a complete revolution.

And he knew further, that, but for these amendments being recommended, the constitution would not have been adopted by the convention.*

These amendments were too summary, although they would be very instructive, as showing how jealous the people were, lest their natural rights should be invaded by laws made by congress. And that the convention might do everything in its power to secure the adoption of these amendments, it resolved as follows:

And the amendment do, in the name and behalf of the people of this commonwealth, enjoins it upon its representatives in Congress to act in all their influences, and use all legal and legal methods, to obtain a ratification of the foregoing alterations and provisions, in the manner hereinafter prescribed; and to all other persons, to exert all their influence, and use all reasonable and legal methods, to obtain a ratification of the said amendments, in such manner as is provided in the said article. —Eliot’s Debates, p. 2, p. 178.

The New Hampshire convention, that ratified the constitution, proposed twelve amendments, and added:

The New Hampshire convention, in ratifying the constitution, proposed twelve amendments, and added:

And the amendment do, in the name of the people of this State, enjoins it upon its representatives in Congress, at all times, until the alterations and provi-
sions of the 9th article, of the 5th section, of the Constitution, in such manner as is provided in the said article. —Eliot’s Debates, p. 2, p. 178.

* For the amendments recommended by the Virginia convention, see “Eliot’s Debates,” Vol. 3, pp. 411 to 412. For the debates upon this convention, see pages 414 to 415, and 498 to 500, and 549 to 550, and 574 to 577.

The Rhode Island convention, in ratifying the constitution, petitioned for a declaration of rights, and in eighteen amendments, proposed twenty-one amendments to the said constitution; and as follows:

And the convention do, in the name and behalf of the people of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, declare that the said amendments shall be carried out, and as follows:

The New York convention, that ratified the constitution, proposed a great many amendments, and added:

And the convention do, in the name and behalf of the people of the State of New York, enriched their representation in Congress, and their representation in Congress was increased by the Constitution; and in all laws passed by the Congress of the United States, as soon as to be submitted to the people, as soon as to be submitted to the people, as soon as to be submitted to the people.

The New York convention also addressed a “Circular Letter” to the governors of all the other states, the first two paragraphs of which are as follows:

From the Convention of the State of New York to the Governors of the several States in the Union,

Sir, We, the members of the Convention of this State, have deliberately and maturely con-

sidered the Constitution proposed for the United States. Several articles of it appear as if they

were incapable of being amended. Such articles, as they appear to us to be incapable of being amended, we do not propose to insert in the Constitution, but that the people, through their representatives in Congress, shall be enabled to, at any time, conform to the spirit of the said amendments as far as the Constitution will admit.

The first New Hampshire convention refused to ratify the constitution, and

the memorandum submitted with it, the people have an unlimited right to alter or to amend the Constitution.

The first New Hampshire convention, to wit, in those of Massachusetts, New Hamp-shire, Rhode Island, New York, Maryland, North Carolina, and South Carolina, the inadequate security for men’s natural rights, and the necessity for amendments, were proposed and adopted. He was thirty-two years old (lacking seven days) when the constitution, as originally framed, was published (September 17, 1787); and he was a member of the Virginia convention that ratified it. He knew what force these objections were urged by some of the ablest members of Congress to revitalize those objections as a body, without a dissenting voice, so far as appears, recommended that very strong measures, that had been called for, and if not taken, might lead to a complete revolution.

And he knew further, that, but for these amendments being recommended, the constitution would not have been adopted by the convention.*

The New Hampshire convention, that ratified the constitution, proposed certain amendments, and

And the convention do, in the name and behalf of the people of this commonwealth, enjoins it upon its representatives in Congress to act in all their influences, and use all legal and legal methods, to obtain a ratification of the foregoing alterations and provisions, in the manner hereinafter prescribed; and all other persons, to exert all their influence, and use all reasonable and legal methods, to obtain a ratification of the said amendments, in such manner as is provided in the said article. —Eliot’s Debates, p. 2, p. 178.

The New Hampshire convention, that ratified the constitution, proposed twelve amendments, and added:

And the amendment do, in the name and behalf of the people of this State, enjoins it upon its representatives in Congress, at all times, until the alterations and provi-
sions of the 9th article, of the 5th section, of the Constitution, in such manner as is provided in the said article. —Eliot’s Debates, p. 2, p. 178.

The New Hampshire convention, that ratified the constitution, proposed twelve amendments, and added:

And the amendment do, in the name and behalf of the people of this commonwealth, enjoins it upon its representatives in Congress, at all times, until the alterations and provi-
sions of the 9th article, of the 5th section, of the Constitution, in such manner as is provided in the said article. —Eliot’s Debates, p. 2, p. 178.

* For the amendments recommended by the Virginia convention, see “Eliot’s Debates,” Vol. 3, pp. 411 to 412. For the debates upon this convention, see pages 414 to 415, and 498 to 500, and 549 to 550, and 574 to 577.
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With one movement she snatched away the pall and uncovered the white coffin. She tried to lift the lid.

Two guards seized her by the arms, removing her gently.

"This matter is too sacred," the king said, "to be touched with the hand of a commoner."

"Let me see him, let me just embrace him one last time," implored Julie, struggling.

"Wretched! to kill a man, and not even permit one to give him a last look!"

"Come! come! no noise!" replied a guard, while the coffin, covered over with the grave-clothes, was closed and the lid put on in all the haste of a man anxious to hurriedly close an open door.

Without saying a word, Julie disengaged herself from the guard: she rejoined the procession, placed herself next to the dog. Her suffering face clearly showed that she had taken no food for two days; her clothes were torn, and her eyes were red and swollen. She had not been able to sleep, but the attempt to put on the coffin was no outburst here! You must keep quiet, if you wish to be permitted to follow the procession."

Julie suddenly comprehended the horrible reality. Since her Jean had entered those walls, he had belonged to no one. Even dead, she had no right in him; outside, brutal force had taken possession of him, and could even prevent her from finding him in the less crowded streets of Paris.

"I promise you, brave, exquisite woman: I owe myself to you; my life, I believe, is necessary to it; I have yet to preach the good word in various places, and I will double, like game, to escape the hunter, till the near day when we shall ourselves hunt the others."

"As soon as possible!" said Arklow.

"It is just that the Directory, as its name indicates, should judge the situation and decide the measures to be taken!" said the old sailor. Ender was moving about the officers in preparation to the mission, but he realized that he could not act in the role of a sedentary man.

At the head of the procession, a prisoner, in brown jacket and trousers, stood amid the wind, advancing slowly, carrying a great cross and trying to recite a Latin prayer in the dead man's voice. He was the one who had been committed before this file. The soldiers of the guard were walking on the left and right, their voices muffling the sound of the creaking doors of the coffins.

The Directory was disturbed by her absence, and her heart beat violently, as if the knowledge of the reality of her son and her husband, and the yearning for her native land, was not enough to keep her silent.

"Jean! Jean! if I could only see you!" she cried. With a heartrending cry, Julie threw herself towards the coffin. With a heartrending cry, Julie threw herself towards the coffin.
The Plum Line at New Haven.

To the Editor of Liberty:

Miss Gertrude B. Kelly's paper on "Anarchism and Exploitation," in the Plumb Line at New Haven, is the boldest and most widely publicized piece of Anarchist propaganda that I have ever seen. The article is written in a style that is both concise and effective, and it is clear that the author has a deep understanding of the subject matter. However, I must express my concern that the article may be misinterpreted by some readers who are not familiar with the ideologies of Anarchism.

In my opinion, the article's main point is that exploitation is a fundamental aspect of capitalism, and that it is necessary to challenge and dismantle this system in order to create a more just society. The author argues that the exploitation of workers is not a temporary phenomenon, but rather a structural aspect of the capitalist system, and that it is necessary to recognize and challenge this exploitation in order to create a more just society.

I believe that the author's message is important, and that it is necessary to challenge and dismantle the system of exploitation that exists in our society. However, I also believe that it is important to approach this issue in a more nuanced and complex manner, and to recognize that there are many different factors that contribute to the exploitation of workers. By doing so, we can create a more comprehensive understanding of the issue, and work towards creating a more just society.

Yours sincerely,

[Name]

To the Editor of Liberty:

I was very interested in the recent issue of Liberty, and was particularly impressed by the article on "Anarchism and Exploitation" by Miss Gertrude B. Kelly. The article is very well-written and provides a clear and concise explanation of the problems associated with capitalist exploitation.

I agree with the author's argument that the exploitation of workers is a fundamental aspect of capitalism, and that it is necessary to challenge and dismantle this system in order to create a more just society. However, I would like to suggest that in addition to challenging and dismantling the system of exploitation, it is also important to recognize the structural and institutional factors that contribute to this exploitation.

For example, the article mentions the role of the state in enforcing capitalist exploitation. However, in my opinion, it is also important to recognize the role of the media, education, and other institutions in perpetuating this exploitation. By doing so, we can create a more comprehensive understanding of the issue, and work towards creating a more just society.

Yours sincerely,

[Name]