On Picket Duty.

Democracy has been defined as the principle that "one man is as good as another, if not a little better." Anarchy may be defined as the principle that one government is as bad as another, if not a little worse.

Alfred E. Giles has written an admirable pamphlet entitled "Marriage and Divorce," from which we should gladly (procrea) if we had space. He takes the most radical ground in favor of freedom. Published by Colby & Rich, 9 Montgomery Place, Boston.

In a lecture in Milwaukee a short time ago Clara N. Neyman of New York said that, "if women could have the right to vote, they would devise better means of reform than those of narrow prohibition." Yes, indeed; there would be nothing narrow about their prohibition; it would be of the broadest kind, including everything from murder to non-attendance at church.

The carriage which contained Alexander II. at the time of the explosion on March 1, 1881, has been placed in the museum of the imperial stables at St. Petersburg. It looks just as it did after the explosion. The lower part of the rear panel is gone and the upper part shattered. The inside seat is damaged and damaged. There are also some cracks in the coachman's seat. The successor of Alexander II. should pay frequent visits to this museum. He may learn useful lessons from it.

We receive with great pleasure the San Francisco "Truth." It is daring, energetic, and enthusiastic, and—better still—is gradually working its way out of the darkness and tyranny of State socialism into the light and liberty of Anarchy. It will soon be marching by our side. We were pleased to see in a recent issue, by the way, the following short but significant letter from Mr. John P. Kelly: "Enclosed you will find $25.00, one year's subscription for 'Truth.' Do not send me that capitalist abomination, 'Progress and Poverty,' as a premium."

Emile de Laveleye has been writing two articles on what he calls the "European Terror." One appeared in the April issue of the "Fortnightly Review," the other in the April issue of the "Contemporary." In the former article he says that Socialists are divided into two sects, one of which aims to realize its desires through the State and the other to abolish the State. In the latter article, correcting Prosser's alleged statement—that any one endeavoring to ameliorate social conditions is a Socialist, he states that Socialism necessarily involves the use of the State as an instrument of reform. Consistent, but it? Yet this is a fair sample of what the economists know about Socialism. And M. de Laveleye is one of the fairest of the sorry lot.

Conrado Tschakoisky writes us from London, under date of March 23, that Kropotkine and three of his fellow-travelers were removed from Lyons to Clairvaux a week previous to the demonstration in the former city on March 18, the anniversary of the Commune. A letter from Mrs. Kropotkine, who is staying at Clairvaux, says that her husband is still under the common regime of central prisons, though the sub-minister of the interior positively assured her that the government would allow no regulations. Kropotkine says that the cells are cold and damp. No light—not even a candle—is allowed for any purpose, and all literary work is forbidden. The food is rather above the usual prison fare, but no meat is allowed. In consequence of this prohibition, Kropotkine is suffering from the scurvy which he contracted in Russian prisons. Under such conditions our valiant co-worker cannot live out half of his five years' term.

The latest scheme of the French authorities to get rid of the troublesome Anarchists is a law, now under discussion, by which all criminals convicted of a second offence may be banished to New Caledonia. Of course the bill contains a provision nominally excluding political offenders from its application, but this amounts to nothing. We all know how easy it is for a judge—a especially a French Roman Catholic judge—to construe a political offence into a violation of the common law. If the law passes, every man twice convicted of belonging to the International, or publishing revolutionary opinions, or manufacturing explosives, or doing any other similar thing will be shipped out of the country. By this steady drain on the revolutionary forces Premier Ferry hopes to avoid the necessity of again adopting the Thiers policy of wholesale massacre, which otherwise will be felt at no distant day. How much longer will tyraeans condemn the folly of resisting the inevitable?

If Henri Rochefort is correct in his statements, the French Orelanists have hit upon an instrument for effecting a coup d'etat which has its advantages over the bayonets of the Napoleon and the bombs of the nihilists. Somewhat more expensive, truly, but less bloody. It is nothing less than the government bond. The French chamber of deputies recently voted to convert the five per cent. bonds into four and one-half per cents. For some days before the vote there was a panic in the stock market due to the prevailing uncertainty as to the action of the chamber. Bonds were thrown on the market in large quantities. Rochefort says that the sons of Louis-Philippe, in connection with their friends the Rothschilds, invested enormous sums in buying them up. By a vote of the chamber such bondholders who did not wish four and one-half per cents may have their five per cent. redeemed. It is the intention of the Orelanists—again we quote Rochefort—to present themes less at the French treasury some five May morning and demand fifty million dollars or so in redemption of their bonds. The government, it is expected, being unable to pay, will find itself confronted with the dilemma of repudiation on the one hand or Orelanist rule on the other. A very pretty plot, surely! The restoration of a dynasty by a run on the "republique!"

Josephine S. Tilson, in an interesting and well-written account of the Hoywood trial published by her to several Liberal journals, makes this statement: "Mr. John Storey Cobbs worked up and furnished important matter, and indeed to him is due the credit of the forming of the defense which hinged the successful issue of the trial." Mrs. Lucy N. Colman, in a letter to the "Truth-Seeker" makes this similar but more specific statement: "Mr. Cobbs suggested that the government must be called upon to prove that the obvious declarations were deposited in the mail by Mr. Hoywood, and really that was the card which, in the technicality of the law, was the winning one." Liberty has no desire to detract from the credit due to Mr. Cobbs, but he must protest most seriously against this throwing away of the victory which Mr. Hoywood's act has won. If what these holes say is true, then the very next man arrested on a similar charge, if he is unfortunate enough to have the fact of mailing fastened upon him, go to prison. A tremendous victory, indeed! No, Mr. Hoywood was acquitted on no such technicality. He was acquitted by the charge of Judge Nelson, especially those portions which declarative questionable. The evidence of a man who confesses, as Comstock did, his habit of deception, and that the government must prove that the article advertised was manufactured for the purpose of preventing conception. These decisions secure the libertics of the people to a very considerable extent. Miss Tilton and Mrs. Colman will see this, we are sure, and insist with us that Mr. Hoywood's victory shall be utilized for all that it is worth.

The letter in another column from Patrick J. Healy of San Francisco is noteworthy. We little expected to receive from California a criticism of "Max's" for his lack of liberality on the question of the Pacific states. We expect to hear him condemned for non-excess. There is one thing for which we are very grateful to Mr. Healy. Two years ago we crossed the continent on the "Max's" statement. Regarding the responsibility of monopoly for the decline of wages in California, "Max's" right, we think, and not Mr. Healy. Had there been no land or money monopoly, wages would only have been higher. In the Pacific states wages are paid out of the product of past labor (his own or another's)—that is, of accumulated capital. The trouble is that our present system, instead of allowing this capital to accumulate in the hands of its producers and rightful owners, drains it off into the pockets of usurers. But even if the laborers possessed the capital, they would still have to live upon it while working and waiting for the completion of new products; in other words, their wages would still come out of capital. The "Max's" statement is an attempt to make his position, therefore, distinctly different from George's, but he would have been still more accurate had he said that every man's wages under a just system would be an equivalent of his product paid in advance.
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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 hurried or driven by passion, nor deceived by erroneous opinions."—FROEBEL.

A Suggestion to Philanthropists.

The writer was lately witness of a brief colloquial encounter between an American mechanic enjoying his midday lunch on a dock in a neighboring city, and a representative of the respectability of middling American bourgeois.

"All right," said the latter; "those infernal 'communists' are both lunatics and knaves. Suppose they should succeed in killing off the Carr and all the other crowned heads, — they would only injure their own cause; for other czars, even more despotic, would immediately take their places."

"Well," said the mechanic, calmly, "as for myself, I would not harm a fly, and would rather give up my dinner to yonder dock-net than witness the cruelty of killing it; but I tell you, sir, that, if the Carr of Russia, or the Emperor of Germany, or the Prime Minister of England should set this moment to appear before me, I would kill either of them as soon as I could reach them. I would eat: my poor life cheap in such a service for humanity. Killing is the best use that these imperial and ministerial levees can be put to. Not that I really understand that others would immediately take their places; but whoever says that the assassination of tyrants does not put intelligence into anybody's head is simply mistaken. Dynamite in its infant career has already set more thought and intelligence in motion than the plain, naked wretches of labor would have brought out in a century. The poor wretches who kill an emperor, a Bismarck, or a Gladstone, exchange these bloody and worthless soundbrels for whole volumes of enlightened thought, which will surely follow the act. To what better use could they be put? I advocate dynamite, sir, on American principles — as an investment."

Upon looking over the current literature of the day, since it was pleasure to take up the late Emperor of R. to myself, the plain-spoken American mechanic is not so lightly to be set down among the knaves and lunatics. As capital, sacrificed in the act of investment, the departed Carr practically cost humanity nothing, since, as our educated bourgeois friend with great force averred, his place is immediately filled by another without additional cost. But the income on this investment, reckoned on the basis of the volumes of light-spreading discussion which has since rolled in from every quarter of the world, is something truly astounding to contemplate. Mark, then, the status of this capitulating position in scientific usurpity as applied to the disposal of imperial tyrants and boors. Under the bourgeois's own terms, as stated in his oft-reiterated proposition that the place of the fallen tyrant is immediately made good without expense, the invested capital is practically zero. On the other hand, the income realized in the consequent animated epide of light-spreading investigation and discussion is incalculable. One of the things, then, logically follows: — either the ready bourgeois argument, above-stated, against lifting tyrants, has some deeper subsidiary grounds never yet shown up, or else the disagreeable law-and-order bourgeois is persistently offering the most convincing mercantile and humanitarian argument for wide-spread investments in tyrant killing.

The justice or expediency of taking away the state's agents of tyranny and rob'ry with dynamite is not affected a feather's weight by the fact that others will immediately fill their places. Why are all the great popular press reviews today discussing social topics which they have persistently ignored in the past? Why are the great popular journals actively scouring about for articles on social topics and importing writers for contributions which five years ago they rejected? How did the wave in mushrooming the waste-basket when offered without money and without price? Why are the newspapers freighted every day with articles on socialism, communism, and anarchism, already half conceding the bottom wrongs that are the motives of the movements? What is it that has aroused the popular interest so suddenly? What has excited the thirst after enlightenment all at once? Chiefly the fact that in the happy accident of history the Carr of Russia, Lord Lefkrim, the Phoenix Park in America, etc., and an authority have been offered up as paying investments in behalf of popular education. To say that a rich income of enlightening discussion has not been realized would be wilful perversion of a notorious fact. These fruitful investments, according to the ready bourgeois argument, involved no sacrifice to humanity. The newest and dearest friends of the invested persons claim that God has taken them home to himself. To what better use, then, in the interest of all concerned, could they have been put? As one of the sure results of enlightenment, it will yet become clear (and in the near future, too) in the minds of large masses of enslaved peoples that empires and prime ministers have no more right to murder their subjects than the latter have to murder each other. If a pack of assassins from these legalized assassins, the standing wonder of posterity will be that they were not sacrificed as humanitarian investments sooner. We agree heartily with the disgust and dynamically-haunted bourgeois that there can be no substantial and lasting advancement of the masses except such extent that they become educated by education and enlightenment. The only question at issue between us binges upon a practical question of facts,—namely, whether the late investees in dynamite have not yielded a greater income of education and enlightenment than would have accrued had they been spared to live, even a century longer, in peace, with their dupes and useful slaves. If so, then, the minor objections to the dynamite will be conclusively answered by our bourgeois friends themselves. If God will only have the goodness to send for a tyrant, now and then in the interest of popular education, humanity will soon be in shape to fill the ordened and profited by the most favorable terms. To capitalists interested in sound, paying educational investments, the question may yet become a serious one whether it would not be wiser to pay some poor fellow a few hundred dollars for killing an emperor than to deal with material for perpetuating the cowardly fishulence which Wendell Phillips so righteously rebuked within its walls a year or two ago.

Un Deserved Criticism.

To the Editor of Liberty.

DEAR SIR,—Do you consider it either wise or just to criticize the solution of the social problem by stirring up racial prejudice as is done in the article entitled "Anarchism and Republicanism" in the last number of LIBERTY? I hoped for better things from the paper that so bravely defended the cause of the downtrodden in the discussion of the question of taxation by laborers throughout the country.

I am fully sensible of the many and grievous sins which may be laid at the head of the negro; but it certainly is utterly unfair to charge us with the entire social and political demoralization of the country. Has not the economic system of the majority, proportionately, for the largest number of public thieves and political bosses? Would the Republic be any better, Anarchy any less desirable, if all the States enjoyed a combination of the present election laws of Rhode Island with those of the slave States before the war, thus effectually excluding the vulgar gin-drinking Irish and negroes from the suffrage and concentrating the power in the hands of the more intelligent? If this precept of racism for political vice continues, we may have Liberty next, with "Lo Proviati," demanding the extermination of the Germans for their devotion to government, and then of the Irish, and so on until none but the pure-blooded descendants of the Pilgrim Fathers remains to inherit the earth.

Recently it would appear that the articles of the article in question were an anarchistic, not on principle, but because himself and the New England Brahmins are unable to monopolize the offices and an advocate of the Faith has come back on them. The writer should enroll himself amongst the clergy of some progressive community, where his sermons would be respected.

To me a government of the cultured appears as evil in principle, as foolish in bad results, as intolerable as any other kind.

I send this merely to give you an idea of how this sort of thing appears to a member of one of the outcast races. It is with regret I write for I have generally found myself in complete accord with you in teaching Liberty.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN F. KELLY.

LITTLE FALLS, N. Y., April 18, 1883.

The above communication comes from a gentleman whom Liberty has every reason to regard as one of her most intelligent, earnest, and enthusiastic friends. Under ordinary circumstances he would have seen the exact purpose of the article which he so violently and vehemently assailed. But he is an Irishman; and so numerous and outrageous have been the insults heaped upon his race that he, in common with all his countrymen, becomes unduly sensitive, and fancies that he sees insults where none are intended. Of that, had we designated Sambo only and left out big Miklo and McGuinness, his keen and uncowed mind would have told him that the article in question in no way favored the prescription of Sambo, but simply used him as a type of the illiteracy and ignorance which so characterizes the uncircumcised rascals, where universal suffrage prevails, can only serve to promote the purposes of systems such as those advocated by Mr. Kelly. It is the misfortune of the writer to frequently come in contact with the ward "bosses" and ward "stickers" who largely control the politics of Boston, and he estimates that three out of four are Irishmen. In consequence of this experience, wherever he thinks of political "bosses," the first figure to come before his mind is "McGuinness, the corner gin-slinger." So we refer him as a type. But in doing so we did not prescribe him or even blame him. We lay everything to the system of abuse of systems by systems. Irishmen are more immediately susceptible, on account of their temperament, than the more torpid Germans or Americans. Instead of charging the Irish with the "social and political demoralization of the country," we charge the country's system of government with the demoralization of all the people, and especially the impressive Irish. If Mr. Kelly were discussing a vice which he had seen most frequently and most perfectly typified among Yankees, he would not very likely use "Brother Jonathan" to symbolize his thought? And, if the editor of Liberty were to complain, would he not think him a trifle toney? Now, Mr. Kelly admits, if we understand his, that the Irish race is not perfect.

In supposing that our correspondent's assumption that our unfortunate pen has ever written a line in favor of restricted suffrage. Does Mr. Kelly not know that we have always advocated the utter abolition of suffrage? Did we not print approvingly the statement of W. H. C. Frémont that he had strayed Mr. Kelly, a sweeping article regarding the foolishness of voting? To point out the evils of universal suffrage is not to deny the greater evils of restricted suffrage. Why did not Mr. Kelly, instead of forming a system of arguments indefensible to the last drop of blood which has so often been shed for them by labor reformers throughout the country.

I am personally a friend of the many and grievous sin which may be laid at the head of the negro; but it certainly is utterly unfair to charge us with the entire social and political demoralization of the country. Has not the economic system of the majority, proportionately, for the largest number of public thieves and political bosses? Would the Republic be any better, Anarchy any less desirable, if all the States enjoyed a combination of the present election laws of Rhode Island with those of the slave States before the war, thus effectually excluding the vulgar gin-drinking Irish and negroes from the suffrage and concentrating the power in the hands of the more intelligent? If this precept of racism for political vice continues, we may have Liberty next, with "Lo Proviati," demanding the extermination of the Germans for their devotion to government, and then of the Irish, and so on until none but the pure-blooded descendants of the Pilgrim Fathers remains to inherit the earth. If this precept of racism for political vice continues, we may have Liberty next, with "Lo Proviati," demanding the extermination of the Germans for their devotion to government, and then of the Irish, and so on until none but the pure-blooded descendants of the Pilgrim Fathers remains to inherit the earth.
The Clinging Power of Dynamite

The appearance of the following editorial in a recent issue of the New York "Home Journal," the leading organ of fashionable society, and dependent for its patronage solely upon the privileged classes, is one of the most remarkable phenomena of these remarkable times. It is the best defence of the use of dynamite that we have ever seen, and was evidently written by some one who had thought deeply upon the subject. We commend these bold and philosophical utterances to the perky-aunties who fill the columns of the daily press with frizzly and superficial ejaculations about the "crookedly depravity of the modern revolutionist."

We may denounce dynamite with righteous indignation, but we cannot simply ignore the increasing and growing power of the governments of the world in the arts of offence and defence. As gunpowder and rifle fire changed the former methods of war, so this new weapon will again and again the reductors will further the supremacy of brute force and mere numbers. Great armies and vast cities are, indeed, a source of weakness in democratic nations, but, to the most vulnerable points of attack for its "widespread destruction."

A Barren rock in the secret mountains of Switzerland, with its dynamite laboratory and storage of gun powder, may act as a means of controlling a great army or a great man. The dynamite bomb, a compact charge of 500 pounds of dynamite, would destroy a small village or the warehouse of a great manufacturing concern, or down upon its walled cities at any hour by day or night. At this moment a single wayfarer, with dynamite and a high explosive charge, could cause a greater terror than would an army of a thousand hundred men having at Dover, with only the ordinary weapons of guns and sabers. The dynamite bomb is the badge of the releases are able to terrify all the Russians, forcing its Emperor to live the life of an exile, and making his very cordon a proscription of his position. Jupiter with his lightnings was more a master of the ancient world than is the mule with its bomb of dynamite the evading Fate of modern monarchs.

At first glance the dynamite bomb seems the least imposing of the weapons, but a closer view discovers in it a potent minister of...
All triumphs of science and invention work inevitably in the end for the people. It is these scientific victories which have made the population of to-day other than the slaves and serfs of yesterday. The serfs were the people who lived in the drudgery of toil, and the general welfare was the slave of the master. The masses were the slaves of the masters, and the masters were the slaves of the gods. Now the masses are the masters of the gods, and the gods are the slaves of the masses.

Indeed, I do not! You have no moral sense.

A few days later I happened to be at Mrs. W. G. D.'s.

"It is a sin, " she said, "since you saw Mr. E. F."

"Mr. E. F. I have not seen him since his marriage."

"Ah! What does that astonish you?"

"Why, yes."

"Are you not aware, then, that he married his mistress?"

"Well?"

"Well! I do not wish to receive Mrs. E. F."

"Why so?"

"Because she has been the mistress of E. F."

"But is she not now his wife?"

"That is nothing. She has been his mistress. That is sufficient."

I ventured to say, "If I were to receive mistress whom their lovers have married, I should have to receive those whom their lovers intend to marry! You think me stern!"

A little bit of safety.

"You have no moral sense."

On a subsequent evening, when I was calling on Mr. E. F., he in his turn said to me: "Would you believe that E. F. actually wished to introduce us to his friend G. H.?"

"Ah! And why not?"

"G. H. and his wife!"

"Well?"

"I do not wish to receive Mrs. G. H. Are you not aware, that before marrying G. H., she was his mistress, and that -"

At this point I looked at Mrs. E. F. with so stupefied an air that she divined my thought, and, interrupting herself, said:

"Oh, I know what you are going to say,—that I too, lived with my husband before marrying him. But I have lived with him since I first knew him. While Mrs. G. H. not only was once the mistress of G. H., but had previously been the mistress of several gentlemen. There is distinction.

"Do you see it?"

"Not very clearly."

"No! Then you have no moral sense."

"Faith!" she said, "since all these ladies, who agree so little with each other, agree in denying me the moral sense, I begin to believe that I really am devoid of it."

Moreover I have always known that G. H. and his wife also had no moral sense, or at least had acquired it.

For I found that she was unwilling to receive a couple who had lived together for ten years,—but were not married at all.

Finally, the other morning, I met Mariette on a street corner. It was very early. Mariette had come from her house for the told me she was there. She had her corsets in her hand, wrapped in a newspaper.

"How tired I am!" she said to me: "buy me, please, a cup of coffee."

At the coffee-house, while Mariette sucked botted bread and black coffee, I began to talk to her. I told her the little of conversation which I have reproduced above.

"Oh, well, I, I," she cried, "I am not like that. All those ladies, married or otherwise, work at the same office and at the church to the one who is not married at all, may come to my house; I will give them all a hearty welcome. If I were in funds to-day, I would even ask them all how they are."

A good girl, this Mariette! Not prudish. Without prejudice.

Unfortunately, I fear that she has no moral sense.

A Fee to His Own Cause.

Anthony Comstock, having been foolish enough to pass severe sentences upon Judge Nelson's conduct of the Hayden trial, the New York Times, in a recent number, thus describes the Judge:

"A discreet and prudent person in the place of Mr. Anthony Comstock could probably do a good deal of good in the defense and prosecution of the particular case of crime to which that notable advocate devotes his attention. The cause which he professes to have at heart, however, can never be promoted by such harangues as that in which he indulged at Boston on Thursday."

Speaking there before the New England Society for the Suppression of Vice, Mr. Comstock publicly declared that in the course of the Circuit Court of the United States, in that city, "the court was turned into a free-loving meeting."

The indictment, he went on to say, though it was perfectly elastic, was overrated on a technicality, and he distinctly charged the Judge with having "practically endorsed and encouraged" the prisoner's transactions in circumventing various literary literature.

Now, of course, no person familiar with his history believes that Mr. Comstock is competent to form an opinion worthy of respect as to the conduct of a court which has decided against his wishes. Intelligent people, whether they know anything about the man or not, will also naturally doubt the justice of such an attack upon learned and reputable judges, whose fitness no one else has ever questioned. But too many of Mr. Comstock's hearers are apt to receive his statements with implicit faith, and are thus led to believe that those who violate the laws for the maintenance of good morals are traitors to their trust.

Hundreds of prominent citizens in New York and elsewhere contribute money every year to enable Mr. Anthony Comstock to carry on his work. Do they propose to sustain him in baseless assaults upon honorable public officers, such as the attack to which we have called attention?