The position of the woman suffragists, when thoroughly understood, is simply that women have a right to make fools and villains of themselves, and we do not dispute it. But is the right to be a fool worth fighting for, and has it either man or woman the right to be a villain? The ranks of American socialists have received an important accession in the person of Robert Winston, a member of the London Trades Council, who has left England and is now living in Boston. He represents industrial and commercial conditions in England as a very bad way, and says that a great financial crash may be looked for at an early day.

Liberty is not disappointed at the Car's success in getting himself crowned. We never expected that the Rhinelands would be foolish enough to make their attempt on the very day of all others when every possible precaution would naturally be taken against it. But the blow will fall yet, and when it is least expected. Alexander III. is no safer with a crown on his head than he was before.

Alfred E. Giles, of Hyde Park, Mass., who has done much useful and necessary work of late as a pamphleteer, has prepared a formidably indictment of Vice Societies and their agents, which is published by Colby & Rich, 9 Montgomery Place, Boston. Mr. Giles was formerly a vice-president of the Young Men's Christian Association, a deacon he so has seen from the inside the working of the machinery of superstition. Mr. Giles, Henry, of Salina, Kansas, has published the first of his six essays on "Death and Funerals," which have already been announced in these columns. It is well written reading, and is a sufficient rebuke of some Christians who habitually picture death as the terror of the infidel. The truth is, as the author shows, that there is no better test of the superiority of Invidelity to Christianity than a fair contrast of their respective attitudes toward the great fact of death. Mr. Henry mails his pamphlet to any address on receipt of twenty-five cents.

We should like to believe that the Paris "Figaro" has good grounds for its sensational statement that France is in danger of being cut into small pieces by the triple alliance of Germany, Austria, and Italy, and parceled out among the surrounding nations. Anything to distinguish the nations and set the people against their rulers! Patriotism is one of the chief obstacles to the Social Revolution. When people begin to hate their governments, they will also begin to love one another. Then Liberty and Justice will be near hand, for it will gradually become impossible to distract attention from economic evils by foreign wars. The boasted unification of Italy, though wrought by some of the grandest of men, was really a step backwards, which we should be glad to see more often by the disruption of France or some other great nation.

Enumerating recently some of the tyrannies which women would support with the ballot were allowed to use that instrument of oppression, we placed "greenbacks" in the list as the opposite of free money. One of our western readers asks us to explain the distinction between greenbacks and free currency. The Treasury notes receivable for voluntary taxes, if issued only in payment for services rendered to the government and in competition with other varieties of currency, would not violate freedom in the least. It is greenbackism that Liberty and Justice, in their first and fundamental principle, as urged by its champions and its platforms, is that it shall be a criminal offense for any individual or association to issue currency for circulation, and that there shall be no money except that issued by the government. In other words, greenbacks is a monopoly in its most extreme form. Free money, on the other hand, means free trade carried into finance, unlimited competition in the business of "making money," and, as a result, the utter ruin of inferior and usurious charges of persons to be voted for, to form an independent party of the union, and to carry out its policy of independence and progress.

Somebody, for some purpose or other, has taken the trouble to send us a copy of a pamphlet entitled "Theory and Practical Workings of Our System of Government," by General W. S. Rosecrans. We give a specimen of its profound political philosophy. On one page occurs this statement: "The power which desires the law and enforcing conformity to them is the government. . . . Since the object of its existence is the good of the governed, it seems most reasonable that it should be controlled by a majority of those for whose benefit it is instituted." Then three pages further on: "Voting is the exercise of a trusteeship, the right to which is to be determined by the law-making power on the principle of creating such trustees as will produce the greatest good to the greatest number." That is to say, the government, which should be controlled by the votes of a majority of the governed, should have the right to decide that no votes shall be cast except by such fraction of the governed as it may see fit to designate. This would do credit to an owl. The main purpose of the author, we suspect, is to gather, seems to be to lessen the rule by which the cause of the society by having the State "furnish each trustee with authentic and timely expressions of public opinions and public intelligences as to the character and qualifications of a candidate attempting to carry out his trust, we shall have a mighty interesting time of it. Imagine it in force in Massachusetts next fall,—the legislature flooding the rural districts with "public opinion" about Governor and General, and saying, "public opinion" about the members of the legislature, the whole being done without the machinery of campaign committees and paid for out of the public funds! It would be nuts for the printers, but, mightn't the tax-payer think he was paying a little too dear for his whistles? E. H. Heywood has been arrested again on an obscene literature charge,—this time, however, under a State law, instead of for an offense against the United States mails. He was arrested at Worcester a few weeks ago, when the district attorney made an investigation into the controversy. Judge Pitman would not allow this, and consequently the trial will take place either in August or October at the discretion of the district attorney. The special offence charged is the distribution of a tract written by Mrs. Angella T. Heywood upon the right of woman to prevent conception, in which the sexual organs are spoken of as "the sanctuary of womanhood and in a style which Liberty would neither adopt nor recommend. Still the argument is legitimate, sober, and earnest, and contains nothing lewd or lascivious in the least, and it would be a most contemptible outrage to punish any one for circulating it. For one reason we are glad the arrest is made under a State law. It will test the quality of the devotion to Liberty professed by those Liberal League leaders who have elaborated ingenious arguments to show that the States may regulate morals but that the national government cannot. We shall now see whether Mr. Thaddeus B. Wakeman and his friends object to the substance of tyranny, or only to a certain form thereof. Mr. Heywood, by the way, desires to print pamphlets form the stenographic report of his recent trial. It is a commendable purpose, and any friend of Liberty who wishes to aid in its execution may send his contribution to "E. H. Heywood, Prowtect, Mass." Our amiable and admirable contemporary, "Le Rêvôlé," says with truth: "The Anarchists can have but one well-defined rule of conduct,—to break down all barriers which prevent humanity from marching forward, not only those which exist, but also those which some would like to create in place of those destroyed. Humanity can progress freely only when each individual is left to follow out his tendencies." Exactly so; but in this case, what will become of the barrier which "Le Rêvôlé" proposes to create between A. B., the shoemaker, and C. D., the tailor, to prevent the exchange of the shoes made by one for the costs made by the other? Is that to be allowed to stand? If so, what will become of the freedom of the individuals A. B. and C. D. to follow out their tendencies, and consequently of the progress of humanity? These are grave and vital questions, and we should like to have "Le Rêvôlé" reply to them. If we understand "Le Rêvôlé," that excellent journal, in spite of its commendable opposition to Authority, almost always concludes its attacks upon it by advising the people (who the people are and how they are to manifest themselves do not appear) to exercise Authority to the extent of forcibly compelling all individuals of all their tools and materials and administering the same collectively (whatever that mysterious adverb may imply). Whether such obstreperous individuals as may refuse to be thus summarily "collected " are to be imprisoned or shot or starved we do not know; certain it is that they are not to be allowed to produce for, and exchange with, each other in their own way. Now, it seems to us that this would be simply to substitute for the present State one even more objectionable, and that the régime thus inaugurated, far from being Anarchy, would be one of the most tyrannical Archives imaginable. Under it (to use a favorite metaphor of French radical) laborers would continue to be cooked and eaten, but with a slightly different sauce. Liberty thinks twice before criticizing "Le Rêvôlé," but maintains nevertheless that the task of intelligently guided anarchy is to free the hands of the working classes, to establish their capital, and to abolish the privileges and monopolies which make capital an instrument of theft from labor; and that whoever maintains the contrary is not an Anarchist, but an autoritaire.
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A free man is one who enjoys the use of his reason and his faculties; who is neither blinda by passion, nor hindered or driven by passion, nor deceived by erroneous opinions.—Proclus.

Memorial Day and its Mockeries.

The vast machine through which the masses are victimized and bled by their industrial and political masters is known as the State. It is poised on three main pillars,—fray, force, and superstition. Very naturally, such a contrivance must needs invat largely in advertising schemes by which to counteract the growing encroachment of new light upon its "true invasions."

Previous to the late war, Fourth of July sufficed to keep the people well seasoned in humbug. But when, after the Rebellion, the Republican party found itself in the potency and promise of indestructible rule, the political machine seized upon the happy idea of an annual show which should be animated by all the sacred associations and memories of departed friends. Of course, to refined and elevated souls this vulgar display and tomfoolery over the graves of kindred and loved ones is as offensive to good taste as it is disgusting to native sensibilities; but the masses naturally "catch on" to a scheme of political advertising under this hypercritical guise. The dodge has thus far proved a complete success, and the resources of political ignorance and superstition will doubtless prove equal to many repetitions of the show.

Let us look for a moment at the enormous crimes which, having been created by this so-called "government" of the United States, its rolling political knives now ask the victims to memorialize from year to year by mingling praise and thanksgiving to itself with the sad memories of their loved ones.

The government’s first crime (if we except the crime of its existing at all) was in persistently protecting the monopoly of the Federal monopoly. To this, and to this alone, was the perpetration of chattel slavery due. When Garrison cried to the American government to take the bayonet from the breast of the slave and leave the master to take his chances with the victim, he was answered by the educated mob of Boston with the halter and scouted by politicians of every stripe as an outlaw and madman. To refuse to furnish slavery with its only sure protection, the bayonet, was arch treason to the law and order upon which this government stood.

The government having forcibly protected slavery and sanctified it with the mantle of constitutionality, the slave power naturally counted upon its governmental guarantees and became arrogant and bigoted when a party arose whose power which threatened to encroach upon these guarantees. Its resolution to withdraw from the Union, the constitutionality of which has never been successfully questioned, turned the heads of the North. It needed but an attack on Federal property, and the demon of war was let loose.

The terrible sequel need not be told. The total of men called for and enrolled under President Lincoln’s proclamations amounted to nearly three million. Of these, a hundred thousand fell in the line of duty in hospitals. The national flag now floats over Andersonville, while thirteen thousand graves lie along the hillside to tell their silent story of horror to the visitor. The volume of men set to work by this slavery-protecting government to kill their fellow-men aggregated a number equal to the combined populations of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Connecticut, and Rhode Island, with nearly half the population of Massachusetts thrown in. A population equal to the entire inhabitants of a city like Fall River was swallowed up in the one battle of Gettysburg.

If any individual or any group of individuals outside the State had persistently defended an institution by force and then compassed the lives of three hundred thousand of their friends in battling down a monster of their own special creation and nursing, said individuals a few years ago would have cut their own throats in remorse or called upon the rocks and mountains to bury them in everlasting shame. Yet scoundrels who present themselves as the representatives of such a governmental association not only thrive upon the graves of their ancestors and strut before the public, but call upon the widows and orphans of their victims to follow them to the grave and mingle praises to the American State along with their tears and garlands. At their side are willing advocates and political dwarfs to extol such a shameless swindle and invoke the blessings and favor of Divinity.

When these things are contemplated by one who has pricked the foul sham of political government to its grins on the duplicity and duplicity of the masses in a very painful light. When this is added the thought of the crushing national debt which is to grind the descendants of the murdered victims in the endless toils of us all, the vastness of the crime and the memory of the victims in December Day is indeed startling. Such humiliating and sly zonings exhibits may well nerve the Anarchists to increased zeal, boldness, and out-spokenness in the pressing duties which his conviction calls for. The sobering truths there is, but it is imperative, lend us a hand if your heart is right and your head level.

Pounce & Co.

Mr. Benjamin E. Woolf, who has written several successful comedies, presents, for the pressing blues, "Pounce & Co." and called it a satirical comic opera. He attempted to satirize the struggle between labor and capital, but, having not the slightest perception of the true nature of the struggle and knowing absolutely nothing of the principles of justice upon which the demand of labor is based, he merely succeeded in voicing the dull-witted self-complacency of the money-worshipping bourgeoises.

The motive of this alleged satire is glorification of benevolent capital. It aims to draw easy lines and teach the working classes their "station." The character who the author evidently designed to be the model laborer is a working girl who is extremely grateful to be allowed to live at all, who knows her place, is content with any wages capital may condone, and, not doubting that she will be perfectly employed, tells the great unwashed in this "satirical" opera say: "Capital is never honest;" "Capital has no rights;" "We are the hard-handed sons of toil. What would capital be without us?" etc. Good, honest doctrine, this; not at all satirical.

And then the model working girl is supposed to expose the ingratitude and fallacy of these remarks by inquiring what the worker would be without capital, meaning the capital that exploits labor. Mr. Woolf is, in his turn, vitiated with an assurance of ignorance, that it is the rough, uncultured, vagabond type of man who has ideas of equality and preaches the rights of labor. His whole opera depends upon that notion for its intended satire. Nasty, Mr. Woolf; in truth quite other than so. You are the satire upon the class of men who affect to preach the delights of poverty, the embarrassments of wealth, and with detestable snobbery touch the "drudges" their station in life. Your "Pounce & Co." is a heartless, brainless piece of vilification, concocted and presented in the most colossal, as might be supposed, but with no more, but try, with whatever glimmer of light thorn canst get, to see the realities of this world and recognize a brother in the worker grapping in the darkness for some way out of bondage.

No Sovereignty But That of Right.

"Le Journe des Economistes," the French organ of the Bastiat school of political economists, has an article in its April issue, entitled, "A Contradictory Talk" (une discorde), which was recently adopted by one school of French socialists. This platform has two divisions,—one political, the other economic. The political division squarely favors individual liberty of all sorts and the abolition of taxes, and the economic division asks the State to furnish labor to every able-bodied citizen, credit to every laborer, education to those not yet able to labor, and support to those who have outlived their ability to labor. E. Martinez, in the article referred to, brands this programme as inconsistent with itself, and clearly shows that its economic division invades the individual whom its political division declares sacred from invasion. To be sure, in doing this he incidentally says many foolish things about credit, wages, etc., but when he writes, "Pounce & Co." and the theories of Proudhon, but liberty is willing to forgive him much in view of his closing pages upon the stupid doctrine of the "sovereignty of the people." In reprinting them, we commend them to the attention of all State socialists and to that of such anarchists as are so short-sighted that they cannot see that, if they were to succeed in depriving individuals of their freedom to produce and exchange, they would simply have substituted one State for another instead of having nothing. The doctrine of the sovereignty of the people will not bear careful and serious examination. Whoever says sovereignty says omnipotence, and those who maintain the omnipotence of the common citizen should beware lest they thus lift certain mortals into demigods whom any- thing is permitted and who know no limit other than their own capricious will. The good sense of the masses, which identifies a law with right and lays upon the legislator the obligation of respecting justice as a limit, protests against this false idea. How happy was the man inspired when he cried: "Right is the sovereign of the world."

The sovereignty of justice, that is the true formula, and just as for the liberty of the nations. There is no right against right, and if one man has the right to violate the liberty of another, man, no more have a hundred millions of men. . . . If my personality and my liberty belong to me, no one has a right to touch them, and I do not recognize the right of any majority whatever to violate my right or deprive me of my patrimony. The number of the oppressors does not make law, and the system of the sovereignty of the people is judged and condemned as a certain error.

The sovereignty of the king was the principle of absolute monarchy, and was expressed in this celebrated phrase: "For such is our good pleasure." Under such a régime there was no justice, and but a truce there was. Men were subjects. This régime was odious, no doubt, but it was not absurd, for the sovereignty was attributed to a single man, no longer the people. This same sovereignty at last cornered into a false position. . . . But the sovereignty of the people,—what does that mean? Does it mean that the people is a living entity? Does the word signify anything more than aggregation of individuals who compose a State? The people is not a real being, and therefore to make it a sovereign is to crown a myth and a phantom, to establish a sovereign of the fancy and beneath a people of subjects.

Singular step in evolution! The progress of the human
mind is so slow that it cannot free itself at a stroke from the yoke of despotism. Monarchy was odious to it, and it made a revolution to destroy it, but, instead of abolishing sovereignty, it confined itself to restricting it: from this it transferred it to the people; the despotism of an individual it changed into collective despotism. That famous signature: "For such and such reasons," was synonymous with: "in such and such a manner, we suppose to the people; and now it is no longer the king, but the majority which holds the pen, and puts the monstrous formula at the bottom of its decrees.

Well, the truth is, that in this half-evolution; it is necessary to advance further, to take another step in the path of progress. It is not enough to displace sovereignty, it must be abolished. The man who must bow the knee should, either in one man or in a majority of men. It is necessary, in short, to proclaim the reign of justice, to say with Sibylle: "Right is the sword of the people." Everything is justice, but there will be no satiety; and each may say with more legitimacy than the ancient Roman: "I am a citizen of a free republic.

To sum up, a flagrant contradiction exists between the two sections of the socialistic programme: if the political section is inspired by liberty, the economic section is inspired by despotism; from the doctrines of authority and the Cossarian State. Between these two antagonistic doctrines, between thesis and antithesis, there is no reconciliation, no possible synthesis; the contradiction stands, and suffices to condemn the programme.

The Value of the Heywood Victory.

To the Editor of Liberty.

In your last issue you comment upon letters which have been written by Lucy N. Colman and me respecting the Heywood trial, and take exception to our estimate of the value of the case as a vindication of free speech. You say that the book was avowedly made. (1) I have, as you say, every desire (and I am sure that L. N. Colman has also) that "Mr. Heywood's victory shall be utilized for all that it is worth." I think, however, that you have placed that worth at too high an estimate. There is nothing in the decision that can keep from prison "the reverence and the gratitude of a country, and the verdict of "not guilty" was given because of the absence of such proof. (3) The judge did not charge that the article advertised must be true, or the purpose of the advertisement must be to prevent the truth from being obscured or for the purpose of prevention. He said that the government must prove that it was designed, intended, and adapted for the purpose named. (4) Mr. Heywood will be liable to another arrest if he print a work before another court of competent jurisdiction.

(5) As he himself writes, the "savage statute remains, threatening "legal" torture to all the investigators of social evil." The Wisconsin "Press" states the matter well when it says: "It is no less dangerous than before to send Whitman's poems, 'Cupid's Yokes,' or the sycophancy advertisement by post. The rises above the press, not taking its place, and, besides, the rights of all rights, free speech, is in no sense denied. Mr. Heywood is free, not because he was arrested wrongfully in the exercise of his rights, not because on all the days which he cannot publish if proved guilty, but because the change was not proven. This is not victory for principle; it is mere good luck for Heywood, and will simply teach Comstock to be more careful in the future." (6) I do not think that for the time you will perceive that both of your judgments of this trial — first, that there was not sufficient ground to prevent Mr. Heywood's arrest on the same charges embodied in more perfect indictments, and, second, that the victory renders impossible the future arrest of anyone who may do as Mr. Heywood did, will be left as erudite as the one offered as far as below as the other rises above it's true estimate. (9)

H. E. Heywood.

Whosoever may be in error in this matter, it is scarcely worth while to devote further space to it in this tiny sheet; so we close the discussion here. — Editor Liberty.

Almost an Anarchist.

To the Editor of Liberty:

I honor duly Mr. Cobb and all others who sided with right against obscenity in the late conflict, but, in reply to the words which you have addressed to distend the principles of the law for all rights, free speech, is in no sense denied. Mr. Heywood is free, not because he was arrested wrongfully in the exercise of his rights, not because on all the days which he cannot publish if proved guilty, but because the change was not proven. This is not victory for principle; it is mere good luck for Heywood, and will simply teach Comstock to be more careful in the future.

Dear Sir: — I have for some years been connected with the Socialist Labor party, but within the last two years I have found myself one of the most active contributors of funds. This is a fact which I had when my mind was more a stranger to the study of social philosophy. I cannot tell whether I am under- standing a kind of monism or not, but I think that the idea of fifteen years ago a trade unionist; then I became a Greenbacker, then a Social Democrat (State Socialist), and where I am I do not know. The word labor is not the best name for the party. The State Socialists have the majority the minority, which is a political one. The State Socialists would have the majority rule the minority, the Anarchists would have the majority rule by non-cooperation, and the minority rule by non-cooperation. That is to say, if you come to the question of forming a party, you see that the people of the world are divided into the rich and the poor, of the fact that these will be among the last interests to come under its influence, principally because competition cannot be brought promptly to bear in a business so difficult of establishment as that of long-distance transportation. This is, however, the condition of the voluntaryism will probably appear in the banking world in the form of an organization of credit. This will make competition very active and promote individual and associative enterprise to an extent far beyond anything to which we are accustomed. As to our friend's hypothetical cases of individual
CHAPTER I.

And lo, there came a great darkness over the land. And the people would not take to shaving, too. And the darkness reigned a spectre of potato famine. Having two long legs ago, a body which went up and down like a horse and resembled a potato, of course it was a specter. And the spectre lay on the ground, like a potato, and the specter gnawed at the potato. And the specter took to shaving: oh! it was a vigorous barber, who knew all about barbiturates. And beards were then a down to the neck. And when the money changers of the Temple of Wall and the partiers of the second row saw that they were being a great help to the process, they regretted that they had ever had the shaving process.

May my head be a little lamb, and my face South in Distress.

VICTOR DIBRY.

CHAPTER II.

And it came to pass that the bondman of this carpenter, which in those days was called employer, and all men who were employed, were the attractive boss carpenter, who in those days was called employer, making inquisitive inquiry of the party of the secon...