On Picket Duty.

Legislation is unnecessary.

Those who would abolish poverty by reducing the hours of labor put the cart before the horse. The people are poor, not because they receive low wages, but because they give their credit away and buy it back.

Liberty owes her readers an apology for the slight delay in the appearance of this number. Hereafter our mailing day will be Friday, one day later than heretofore.

One of our Greenback exchanges says that "every man who has a ballot and fails to use it in defense of American liberty is responsible if those liberties are abridged." Every man who casts a ballot necessarily uses it in defense of American liberty, being the chief instrument of American slavery.

"Bullion" speaks the truth in saying that "the benefit of credit is overbalanced by the disadvantage of debt." But to a capable and honest person the only disadvantage of any debt that he is liable to consist in the steady drain of usury. Make credit gratuitous by organizing it, and its blessings will be unlimited.

The New Bedford "News" was the victim of the worst case of brush desarrollo by the death of the president. Its words are not ours as we write, but our question of them does not differ materially from the liberal, if at all. "You cannot have liberty, law, or the protection of a rich or powerful people, but there are two things you must not lose: your liberty and your independence."

The outcry against middlemen is senseless. As E. H. Hoywood puts it, "middlemen are an important and essential link in the chain of production. And they are as truly producers. Distribution is a part of production. Nothing is wholly produced until it is ready for use, and nothing is ready for use until it has reached the place where it is to be used. Whosoever brings it to that place is a producer, and as such entitled to charge for his work. The trouble with middlemen is that they charge consumers not only for their work, but for the use of their invested capital. As it is, they are useful members of society. Eliminate usury from their methods, and they become respectable members of society."

"The hanging of Guiltine is a pleasure and duty which belongs solely and exclusively to the people of the United States." The brutal barbarian who says this is named S. F. Norton. He edits a paper in Chicago called "The Sentinel," and desires to enjoin the rulers of this people of peculiar "pleasures" with the exclusive power to manufacture the tool by which all products are distributed. All the monopolies go together, of which we have fresh proof in this claim of the would-be monopolies of money to a monopoly of murder. This same editor has the shamelessness to admit that the tool referred to, i.e., the greenback, is a "forced loan," and to attempt to justify it as such, yet he complains in the name of the people of the want of a body of robbers who recently contracted a forced loan with the passengers of a Western railroad train by presenting pistols at their heads and compelling them to deliver us.

"All these things are to be expected from a member of a party that relies on the law for the accomplishment of everything. Law is its God, and makes its morality. Robbery through the instrumentality of a legal tender note is right; robbery through the instrumentality of a revolver is wrong. Murder sanctioned by statute finds no favor in this Greenbacker’s eyes, but murder done on the scaffold is to him, not only right, but sweet.

A third idea of the state of things that engenders nihilism is conveyed by the statement of the Russian delegates to the International Literary Congress at Vienna, who, in combating a motion of a French delegate to petition the czar for the pardon of the Russians, argued that the Czar had for eight years for tugging his writings with socialism, declared that, if the petition should be adopted, it would be impossible for them to return to Russia. We commend this fact to D. A. Wason and all other slanderers of the nihilists. After hearing of it, we will doubtless be moved to write another article for the "Free Religious Index," glorifying the Alexanders as apostles of liberty.

Liberty congratulates herself, and Anarchists generally, on the republique whose principles are obtaining a foothold in the world. An indication of their progress is seen in the following, the statements of two prominent journalists: a newspaper as the Boston "Daily Globe" on the long continued disability of the president: "The Republic is not a failure. The great governmental experiment of the new world has demonstrated that men do not need rulers; that they can govern themselves. It has passed through a crisis unassisted by its founders and unprovided for in its constitution, and it still lives, the world’s grand beacon light on the road to Liberty. The only real strength of government is the cohesive power of the masses and the confidence of the people in their ability to govern themselves in the absence of all official representatives of authority and power. This strength the Republic possesses, and is it a success. It shows the world that a measure of self-government is a thousand times better than all the military power and divine right that ever existed, and more powerful for good, for peace, for the maintenance of human rights."

The attitude of the American people in the face of what would have been a crisis in any other country has advanced the cause of humanity, proved the expediency as well as the justice of popular government, and ought to allay those who have expressed the belief, fostered by the wish, that the great American experiment must ultimately fall through lack of strength. The American people, in their exercise of power, the permanency of their principles, and their unswerving loyalty to liberty and justice in this period of doubt and uncertainty, and given hope and courage to oppressed humanity to struggle onward and upward. Those are all the friends of the nation that has led the march of human progress, and will be, a hundred years hence, as far in advance of the present as the present is in advance of the ideas of a hundred years ago. It is only remain true to government by the people, and resist every effort to shackle it with its strong government of centralised power and exaggerated official authority." Well said, the "Daily Globe."
Liberty.
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"A free man is one who enjoys the use of his reason and his faculties; who is neither blinded by passion, nor lacerated or driven by oppression, nor deceived by erroneous opinions."—Pope.

Sinister Sorrow.

Died or alive, all's one to me, with miscellaneous persons, but alas! how very generally all's two to me, when they are helpful and noble ones. — John Ruskin.

No person of proper human feeling would insult a sincere mourner standing at a grave. Doubtless there are many mourners in this hour of what is called "the nation's sorrow" who, however mistaken, are honest in their grief. This article is not for them. Indeed, we share our sorrow Garfield died manfully after many weeks of patient suffering, as many another man dies every day. With all of these victims we have sympathy in their sufferings for them is their fortune; and for the Garfield family as the rest and not

No to those beloved who are led to shed dutiful tears by an idolatrous worship of rulers and governments we have a word to say to-day. True, it is a man's part to sooner or later convulse them of their error; but, cherishing them honestly, let them respect its forms.

Our iniquitous denunciation is of the heartless soundnads whose tool Garfield has been, who, with sinister purpose, have put a complete stop to all this machinery of woe, hoping thereby to intimidate or terrify the late president's successors into following his example. Garfield died manfully, we said above. Did he live manfully? That is the main question. He appears to have been an amiable man, a good husband and father, and a hard though rather superficial student. But he was not the stuff of human grandeur. A man who, at twenty-five or thirty, writes sonorous poetry, presents prayers, and sings penitential hymns in Ch'istian conventions, who, in his mature years, consorts largely and lovingly with priests and indigents in their religious gush, is not the kind of man that is apt to do much in helping the world out of its perplexities. The expropriation of men putty is a large ingredient; and so it was with Garfield. All his later life he has been led by the note by designing villains, schemers against the people's goods. He has helped them, more or less inno-

ently, more or less guiltily, yielding to their proffered temptations and sometimes betraying the people's trust. A very convenient man for our purposes, think the schemers. His place must not be left vacant. Others might take his place. So, taking advantage of the undue respect for the office which he chanced to hold, at their bidding the word went forth.

Tell the bells! Fire the minute-guns! Bestow riches on his family! Bear his body through the country with funeral pomp and circumstance! Hang upon the outer walls the gloomy trappings of woe! And all is promptly done. The commercial world responds in his name. In milinery, each member of it is trying to advertise his interests by surrounding his neighbor in the ostentation of sorrow. Processions fill the air with lamentations, and poets sing the martyr's praises for a price. Messages of condolence and grief are exchanged over the ocean between the crowned heads of Europe and the uncrowned despots of America, Victoria, William, and Alexander recognizing insistently that in the death of a president no less than in that of a king, a fellow-

other. And by this manufactured manifestation a public sentiment is created to shield them a little longer in their grinding of the oppressed. How long shall this thing last? Let the victims abandon their prayers, wipe away the blinding tears, and look with enlarging eyes on these priests and plotters. A clear vision is all that's needed. The rest will follow.

Capital's Claim to Increase.

Liberty's stoic, in her last words, proposed the proposal of the Massachusetts Greenbackers, adopted as their Worcester convention, to ask the legislature to compel all corporations to distribute their profits in excess of $50 per cent. among the employees in proportion to their wages. J. M. L. Babcock, the author of that singular project, to a defense of it, which we gladly print in another column. In defending it against Liberty, he is obliged to do so in behalf of capitalism. It seems a little odd to find this long-time defender of the rights of labor in the role of cia apion of the claims of capitalism; but we remember — that he is one who follows the lead of justice as we see it, take him where he may.

Before going further, he gives us two minor points to settle. First, he very pertinently asks why we "grieve" at his course. We answer by taking it all back. As he says, Liberty should rejoice, rather than grieve, at the honest exercise of the right of self-defense. We need hardly say that otherwise we said a very foolish thing: Yes, worse than that; in so far, we were false to our own standard! Mr. Babcock has Liberty's sincerest thanks for recalling his attention to a point of your own view. May he and all never suffer to fail to warn us, whenever they similarly catch us napping!

Second, he assumes that the profit idea cannot be ridiculous (as we pronounced it); since its converse is not well generally accepted. To say that the non-profit theory is not well established is to beg the principal question under discussion; to say that, because the theory is not generally accepted, a few friends that it has not are not entitled to riditously the position of its attackers, is not in accordance with the nature of ideas or the custom of Mr. Babcock. How often have we listened with delight to his sarcastic dissertation and merciless exposure to the light of common sense and well-nigh universal delusion in religion, politics, finance, or social life! He is in the habit of holding riddling all those things, whoever supports them, who his own conscience pronounces absurd. And he is right in doing so, and we and he should be on the same side. And in all literature and all the world, instead of having only a small fraction of the wealth in the world, should have all the wealth.

To effect this, all monopolies must be terminated,—all combination of any sort of single individuals or "majorities," and laborers recognized as the measure and limit of price. If Mr. Brown sticks to these words and the Greenbackers to their platform, they're going to be a coalition, and Mr. Brown will keep the trap here, and Mr. Babcock's contention that labor should not pro verifiable, we refer Mr. Babcock further to one of his favorite authors, John Ruskin, who argues this very point on Mr. Babcock's own ground, and that his illustrations are his position by a plane in a single line. Ruskin may find his words under the heading, "The Division of Wealth," immediately following his own letter to us. If he succeeds in showing Mr. Brown's assertions to be groundless, we must add that Ruskin's arguments are illegiti-

The Voltairean Warfare.

Voltaire and Paine found themselves face to face with a world steeped in a degrading superstition called Christianity. It was proclaimed as religion. But the fact is no one sees that which disinguished it from other so-called religions was not a special refinement of, or superior emphasis given to, the religious idea, but a dissimilarity in the catalogue of miraculous and superstitious dogmas. Humboldt asserted that "all peoples have their own religion: it contains three distinct parts: first, a code of morals, in fine and nearly the same in all; second, a geographical dream; and third, a myth, or historical novelties, which last become the most important of all." — T. W. Higginson, quoting the same author. The essential truth of this observation may be seen when we compare the different religions of the world, side by side. The main difference lies here,—that each fills some void in society or meets some need of its creed with the name of a different teacher. For example, the Orientals & Parsees repeats the four main points of his creed as follows: To believe in one god, and hope for mercy from him only; to believe in a future state of existence; to die as you would be done by; To the Parseesi keeps on the universal ground of religion, and then he
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believe in Zoroaster as law-giver, and hold his writings sacred. The creed thus furnishes a formula for all religions, is in a broad sense a creed; or, leaving one of the closing names to be filled in. For Zoroaster read Christ, and you have Christianity; read Buddha, and you have Buddhism; read Mahomet, and you have Mohammedanism.

Mr. Bigelow, in his "American Woman," has drawn a long array of "sects," which show how exactly alike all the religions of the earth have produced, each one of them deep-rooted in human ignorance, and supported from age to age by tradition, superstition, sacred books, and the lordship of a "divine person," whose supposed words stand as limits of all thought, reason, experience, world without end. In short, each religion is established by a "revelation"—God (the imaginary) speaks, using the human voice, and that speech, good or bad, true or false, backed up by reputed miracles, is for all time, on the issues presented, to be received as the only "wisdom" man could or might entertain. It is the "revelation" made once and for all.

Now, in this respect Christianity stands precisely where all the other religions stand. It is called Christianity because its hero was the Christ, and not Buddha of the Buddhism, nor Zoroaster of the Zoroastrianism, nor the Hebrew tribal god of their own local coloring. Christianity is the shading off of the Hebrew idea. The Old Testament Jew looked for a temporal Messiah, king, deliverer, whom the God of the Jews sent down in the person of the throne of David. They were watching for the Christ, the God-appointed great man, believing such a person would come and restore their nation. The Jews of Nazareth claiming to be that Christ they rejected him. The disciples who turned away from the greatest of Prophets because he was an impostor. But as it was, he grasped the idea of a world-governed without force, and yielded himself to be its martyr. Little, however, did his immediate followers enter into the great thought that he had foretold in his mind. They seized on his mistakes and not on his truths, and built thereon a spiritual despotism called the Church, which no Statecraft had surpassed. The Jews would have had a Christ on a throne whom they could see, a man of wisdom and goodness, doing his decree by the authority of God. The Christian put the Christ on an invisible throne, called him the God, and bowed, mused and spirit, to his supposed divinity. Unable to overcome the sublime idea of liberty that he conceived, they fastened upon all the absurdities of belief he had received by inheritance, and have proclaimed them ever since by fire and sword, and by every unhallowed invention of torture their wit could devise,—a most damnable record.

It was against this system that Voltaire and Paine set themselves in battle array, and with an intensity of conviction and life-long persistence that would honor the Chris, ten cent, and the great anger, they made a breach in the hitherto solid wall. They struck blows which made the old superstition reel. Christianity turned pale with rage, and splen renoun, cowering with its hideous features at the feet of men. But to no purpose. The breach was made. It has grown larger and larger, until to-day thousands of men and women are pouring into the free land of Canaan, where they undertake, by hard thinking and experience, by their own inward promptings, to live the life their natures proclaim—life of Liberty. What Liberty may yet be a question; but to undertake, one and all, to solve that problem is a task magnificent, a spectacle swelling the grandeur of creation. It is to be expected, however, that the old superstition will die hard. One thing is engraven on the world's memory: notwithstanding their Lord and Master was a non-resistant, a man of peace, Christ and his disciples are the fighters of the world. From theBigoted and most ignorant up to the so-called "liberal" and enlightened, all retain (when they are actively Christians) the warlike statistics. Hence, we are not surprised to find the modern Liberal Christian giving his little stab into the heart of such men as Voltaire and Pauly. One of the latest of these thrusts that has come to our notice is an article by the Unitarian "On the Infield Outlook." The one point is that Voltaire and Pauly did only negative work, when they ought to have done positive work. As if to beat down the last of the world's prison were not something quite as positive for that world's everlasting good, as anything now visible as the result of our much-vaunted modern "scholarly criticism.""We demand for mankind freedom to become liberty and property to Voltaire and Pauly reinitiated all their lives. Will that wotld on not one day appreciate this great service? We think so. But only as it is freed from the Christian superstition and immorality.

Government and the State. Probably, if four-fifths of those who subscribe for liberty, and are asked to subscribe for it, could reach the ears of the editor, they would ask this question—Why do you abhor government? If you do abhor government, what do you propose to put in its place, to secure the blessings of life, liberty, and property? Of course such a question would never occur to a person trained to scientific habits of thought. It is akin to the idiot who asks, "What do you propose to do with four millions of ignorant niggers? If you abolish popes, priests, and organized religion, what do you propose to do with the rulse and vicious nations? If you abolish slavery, what do you propose to do with the children of these races? etc., etc., etc.

Thinkers, drilled in scientific methods, of course pay no attention to such irrelevant questions. Their interest is in the business of the man who stands out from the crowd, the one who holds the real true law and the true facts. Whose pet machines is smashed, and whose superstitions are offended is not their business. The responsible parties must take care of that,—not they. When Darwin was reminded that his theory would overthrow the book of Genesis and undermine salvation, he treated the reminder with a contempt becoming the man of science. It was not his business to nurse and defend the book of Genesis, and he justly treated it as a piece of whining impudence to ask him to do so.

But unfortunately, the average man is not a thinker, and only here and there a man has sufficient mental training to abide by the canons of science and logic. We will attempt, therefore, to answer the above question with as much completeness as our space will permit in this issue.

And we answer, in the first place, that Liberty does not propose a government, is as far as by government is meant any social arrangement looking to a regulated well-being of the beings concerned, provided, however (and this is the all-in-all of our philosophy), that there be no arrangement that hings on choky scores, selection, and voluntary assent, and on anticipated needs of constitution-making complications, backed by repressed brute force, to coerce and crush dissenters and offenders to his central government in nature. Turn twenty hornet corner into a field, and without much political going they, by unconscionable assent, select a leader and protector. Every well-regulated family is a government. The same feeling holds up to better and mother, and, although the direction of the bond parent has the effect of a stern command, the gov-

ernment is in one of love, esteem, yes, pleasure. Whatever a company of people come together in, in high life or low, there is government. Left to themselves, somebody will soon be recognized as the fittest in his sphere, and he will lead, direct,—yes, governo who if you will,—through voluntary recognition of his fitness to do so. Against such arrangements Liberty has no war to wage. On the contrary, it is government in this sense that we wish to see take the place of the old despotic swindle. It is the State against which we contend and a war, and to those who will follow us from issue to issue we promise to show conclusively that the State has nothing in common with the above-mentioned arrangements.

Perhaps, however, for the present, the shortest way to illustrate, in so much, what we mean, will be to state two cases briefly:

CASE I. A thousand persons meet in an open field. Their purpose is to secure life, liberty, and possession. As they stand there, ready to go to work, a latent feeling possesses them that some kind of regulated association would conduce to their best well-being. Suddenly a kind but resolute-looking individual, with noble brow and persuasive mien, plants himself before the assembly and raises his voice: "Men and women," says he; "having had large experience in the concerns of life, I volunteer a proposal to you. It is that you separate, in such groups as selection may direct, and go to the neighboring lands, of you own and as you can occupy and cultivate and there is enough for all. If any number of you, by experimental contact with me, should conclude that I would make a good leader, adviser, and director, I am at your disposal; but meanwhile let us see upon what kind of ground we should settle. Bear in mind, however, that I do not speak with authority, but only as an individual, like all the rest of you. I think my advice is good, and I invite those present to join me who may desire, are perfectly free to go their own way, and I can assure them that, should my party prove the strongest in numbers, no manner of molestation or coercion will be visited upon them, except they should force the laws of their party to us, deny us the same rights as individuals which we freely accord to them.

It is very probable that this individual would become the accepted leader (governor, if you will) of the new association, and that landlordism could exist in this civilization, let him go to the shores and watch a thousand rude clans-diggers, who never usurp each other's territory or tread on each other's toes; or where a thousand people, unconnected in political economy, are gathering berries. The facility with which even the rudest classes adjust their differences, distribute equitably natural opportunities, and behave themselves generally, if let alone, is wonderful. And it always comes through government, but not government after the manner of the State.

CASE II. A thousand persons meet in an open field. Their purpose, as before, is to secure life, liberty, and possession. But, while they stand hesitating, half a dozen designing rogues meet in caucus. They there, in convention, concoct a so-called constitution for the government of the assemblage. The consummation of this main business is, while four-fifths of the assemblage vote for it, the remaining fourth shall be forcibly compelled to be governed by it, against their will. To this end executive officers are provided for, with artillery to coerce dissenters. The constitution recognizes many, large-grabbing, and all the deadly prerogatives of property. Then, fortifying themselves with the superstition that a majority has the sacred right of sovereignty over the minority, the spokesmen of the conspirators presents his constitution to the people, and the four-fifths vote for it, and the other fourth dissent. This conspiracy, when put into practice, becomes the State. Now, when the people separate and go into the fields to raise land and build up their civilization, a different order of things is soon apparent. Certain greedy and shameless schemers get ahead of the rest, and stake off great tracts of land. When the unsuspect-
Yes, the right!
A fight for life or death to the knout, to the teeth.

With my wishes.

There was a time when it still was in your power to avoid it; there was a time when you might have spared me.

Like a wild beast you have thrown us all, and the beast from which you are to be saved is yourself.

The wild beast has developed itself. May the blood of the beast be on your head.

You are boiling over with your numerical strength, blind as you are to your great weakness.

Do you know that the goodness of your work is due to negligence of your life? That you consider the further advancement of your party as a matter of course?

You look with joy and tranquility in the face of your greatness, and you believe in your strength. This is madness.

A whole army of keepers, and a set of keys, are kept under this flag for the sake of the triumph of our ideas.

Yes, we are on the road to stronger, furious battles.
Then, on to the fight!
Out from their saloons your wands! No longer will Labor bow here.

A Defence of Capital.

My Dear Mr. Tucker:—Why do you go “grove” as a dif-
ference of opinion between us? Am I to be dealt with as a
veiled friend by the fear that he will interfere if I do not?
I would say, impose no such burden on freedom of thought, but, rather, rejoice in its fullest exercise.
It is necessary that this world be a model, not a national,
that it should be as it should be, not as it is.

The position of your idea is that they are richer and have
more ability to work than they have.

Neither is it clear that you are the only 

The picture is that of the symbol of national capital, and the plan is the symbol of all
the labor.

If this be an abridgment, what a graceful piece of
brilliant writing literature the original story must be! I take
the liberty of abridging it a little.

James makes a plan, but he is to be taken is by John on an
January for a year. James gives him a plan for the idea, to
wears it out, and makes rudder for James, which he gives
in on January. James makes a plan
the new one; and the arrangement is repeated continuously.
The position of William therefore is, that he makes a plan
for every new one of the orders, and the next day, and pays James a plan annually for the privilege of lending
it to him on that evening. This, in future investigations of capital and interest, we will call, if you please, "The Position of William."

You may not at the first glance see where the falacy lies in the story evidently counts on your not seeing it at all.

If James did not lend the plan to William, he could only
give it to someone else, and we would have had a

This is to say, clearing the story of its nonsense, that
James makes a plan annually, and sells it to William for its property.

What you call "wages," practically, is the quantity of food
which the employer of the land gives you, for work for him.
What you call "wages," practically, is a grant to the employer of the land for his work.
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