
NOT THE DAUGHTER BUT THE MOTHER OF ORDER.

On Picket Duty.

Manualy was right. Liberty is her own physician, and ears her own life.

A king once said, “I require a prudent and able man, who is capable of managing the State affairs of my kingdom.” An ex-minister replied: “The criterion, O Sire! of a wise and competent man is that he will not meddle with such matters.”

The somnet to Liberty in another column was sent to by that veteran reformer, John M. Spear, of Philadelphia. Speaking spirituallyistic, he tells us that Garrison wrote it. We prefer to attribute it to Mr. Spear himself. In either case it is a credit to his author.

Henry George has been the subject of our severe criticism, and is likely to be again. It gives us the more pleasure, therefore, to be able to say that, as correspondent of the “Irish World” from Ireland, Mr. George, so far as we present appears, is the right man in the right place. His views give a better idea of the situation than that unhappy country than any that we have seen. Liberty’s compliments to the Ford brothers on so valuable an addition to their staff!

Mr. W. S. Bell has issued new editions of his own “Outlines of the French Revolution” and the Bradlaugh-Besant edition of Dr. Knowlton’s “Fruits of Philosophy.” The latter is interesting from having served as a test of the question of a free press in England, and the former valuable as a convenient and approved compendium of the events that led up to, through, and away from the memorable era which marked a turning-point in human progress. These and other liberal works may be obtained by addressing Mr. Bell at 28 Upton street, Boston.

George W. Smallley, in support of a recent attempt on his part to belittle the influence of women in public life, cites the alleged fact that “the Irish cause has not perceptibly gained in popularity since Miss Ann Parnell and Miss Helen Taylor took to scoffing Mr. Gladstone on the platform.” This suggests the inquiry whether any perceptible loss of popularity has been suffered by the Irish cause since Mr. Smallley took to scoffing Mr. Parnell through the press. Will the Whig who writes London letters to the New York “Tribune” measure his own influence by his own rule?

One more reformer who keeps a level head! Samuel Leavitt of New York has uttered his protest against the Henry George craze. In a recent lecture before the New York Somebody Club on the “Sense and Nonsense of Henry George’s Book” he tells us some very hot shots into the theories of this suddenly popular philosopher, thus conceivably summing up and thereby demolishing his defence of usery: “Look and behold! because bees gather honey, and cattle increase, and corn grows while we sleep—because bountiful Nature gives us something for nothing—therefore we are justified in extorting something for nothing from those of our fellow mortals who have not the same access to her fertile bosom that we have! And this from the great champion of free land!” Mr. George has gone up like a rocket; he will come down like the stick.

Among the Japanese there is nothing of the nature of a legal oath. Witnesses in courts are required to tell all the particulars; but all the sanctions and penalties, divine and human, which among us are supposed to render an oath sacred, are totally wanting. There is no punishment whatever for hearing false witness. Sensible people, the Japanese! It would be interesting to know how much oftener they lie than we do.

The Land League appears to be spreading to the very ends of the earth. The native journals in India are beginning to republish Land League speeches, and in several of them in the Mahratta district a full translation of the “no rent” manifesto is given. Extracts from Mr. Parnell’s addresses are quoted approvingly, and there is a prospect of a Land League being started in Hindostan. Mr. Gladstone had best keep his eyes open. Otherwise, as in the case of Ireland, the coercion act will be applied too late.

A subscriber wishes to know why Liberty uses the word usury instead of interest. We do so for two reasons. First, usury includes all forms of unearned increase, except that which comes by gift or fortune, while interest represents only that increase which is obtained by lending money. Second, the etymology of the word usury brings out more prominently the essential characteristic of the thing it stands for,—namely, payment for use. The word interest has been adopted by modern usurers and their apologists to hide the true nature of their extortionate trade, and to make that which is but theft appear as a righteous act of commerce. It is Liberty’s purpose to tear off their mask and show them for the thieves that they are.

The worst act of the socialistic convention at New York was its best. In expelling Justus H. Schwab and his associates it dissociated itself from its most intelligent and only thoroughly honest and earnest element. That element, however, is now shaping its own course, and will do much more effective work by itself than when hampered by the timidity and policy and double-dealing of time-servers and self-seekers. Mr. Schwab was a good deal of an anarchist prior to his expulsion; we anticipate that his recent experience will transform his tendencies into firmly-settled principles. The road to social salvation lends directly away from politics. We hope to travel it to the end in the companionship of Mr. Schwab and his faithful co-workers.

That paragon of journalism pure and undefiled, the Boston “Herald,” says that “there is a growing feeling in every healthy community against the journals which make it their special object to minister to perverted taste by seeking out and serving up in a sensational manner the often sensational revolutions.” While the lamp holds out to burn, the vilenst sinner may return. But words alone are not meet for repentance. The fruits must be brought forth also. The columns of the “Herald” seem to be as heavy as ever they were. The paper begins to labor to calculate purity and sweetness by example; else its fine precepts are likely to go for naught. Meanwhile, if the above quotation be true, we are to infer that there is a growing feeling against the “Herald,” or that Boston is an unhealthy community?

About Progressive People.

A new street in Paris is to be named after Littre, the great positivist and lexicographer. The artist Calsier has just completed an excellent and life-like portrait of Charles Darwin. The name of Thoman has become extinct in this country. It is said, by the recent death at Danger, Ms. of Miss Martha Thoman, an aunt of the late Henry D. Thoman. The latter was the last male descendant of a large family.

A great-grand-nephew of Danton has subscribed five florins toward the monument which is to be erected to his famous ancestor. His descendant of the member of the Convention is Alexis Emile Danton, an officer in the Austro-Hungarian army.

It is reported that Karl Marx is dying. His wife, whose death was chronicled in our last issue, was a woman of brilliant talents, descended from an aristocratic and extremely orthodox Jewish family, allied, it is said, to the Scottish house of Argyll.

Professor Huxley had a cook that got so drunk and raised such a row over the house that he was forced to leave the house. As she was busting through the yard she let her tongue fly, and gave the professor a blast, of which the only words that could be made out were to the effect that he was a “damn atheist.”

The remarkable types of nihilist women are not unknown. Vera Sannizhit, whose shot inaugurated terrorism, was the most modest of her sex. In the court-room she blushed when in one place she had to deny that she had any knowledge of the noise made by the secret printing press in the next room. Anna Lobodeck, a priest’s daughter, in the disguise of the wife of a switchman, lived in a watch-house on the railroad, and was found on a box filled with dynamite, containing the name of Sophie Pervusha, the daughter of a general and senator, who declined the dignity of maid of honor to the empress and entered the nihilist fraternity by line of the last Czar’s assassination. Sophie Bultin, who was welcomed as a shining star in the literary horizon, wrote a few poems which, in the eyes of some of Russian atrocities, were treasurable, and the singing of them is a State crime.

It was generally supposed that the charges made by Henri Rochefort against M. Rosanor in regard to Tunisian affairs had got the famous radical into trouble, but on the contrary be, alone of those involved, has come out with flying colors. In the suit it was brought by Russian interests against some Roncovitch, a gentleman of distinction and of marked ability, after the death of his wife, who had been acquired on every point.

The New York “Tribune” thus describes the defendant’s appearance in court: “Rochefort’s boldness in refuting these charges the jury held in his favor. His attitude in court was also reassuring. Speculators, and one man may surmise jurymen as well, observed that his air was distinguishable. He was dressed by a fashionable English tailor, and did not look in any wise squalid. There was frankness in his manner, in his answers, explanations, and observations. He might have been mistaken, he might have been occasionally violent; but his good face was as natural as a smile, a term made possible by alluring to all the misery that Rochefort’s intrepidity as a journalist had brought upon him. He had never used his pen to accomplish mercenary ends, and went into the war against financiers-politicians with perfectly clean hands. Rochefort’s face is not so nearly so fat as when he came back from exile. It now looks like a shell carved in old yellow ivory, with two coals of fire to serve as eyes. The flash of the coals appears to light up the camera at the remote ends of which they are placed in the fatal case.” This is the last time we hear of the head, and it is arranged in a curious part of the Somali region. Rochefort showed presence of mind. His questions were full of meaning, and opened vistas which the opposing judge wished to keep shut to the jury. The Lauternier occasionally let fall a droll observation, which, in every case, had the effect of throwing Rochefort’s answers, as a piece of gold, on his brow. He was described as a beautiful man, with black hair and face. It is singularly distinct. The chin acts with a chapping motion when he speaks. Opana and aims of the fashion of Russian interest, his black shirt is of unusual gilt, what he says is heard a long way off. Changes says that Rochefort is wider around the shoulders than any other Frenchman that he knows.”
Liberty.

Lewed Forthnightly. * Fifty Cents a Year; Single Copies, 25 Cents.

RICH. R. TUCKER, Editor and Publisher.
Office of Publication, 18 P. O. Square.
Post Office Address: LIBERTY, P. O. Box No. 366, Boston, Mass.
Entered as Second Class Matter Noller.

BOSTON, MASS., JANUARY 7, 1882.

"A free man is one who enjoys the use of his reason and his faculties; who is neither blinded by passion, nor hindered or driven by error, nor deceived by erroneous opinions."—Procrustes.

Justice Gray.

The appointment of Horace Gray, as a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, adds more weight than to that bench. He weighs, we suppose, about two hundred and seventy-five pounds, but his light is not at all proportionate to his weight. We might as well expect to get light out of a hun- dred pounds of coal as to get light from a hundred pounds of clay. Nevertheless, all this is just as it should be; for it is weight and not light, that is wanted in Supreme Courts.

All governments, that assume to control their sub- jects arbitrarily, find it necessary to keep some sort of a check upon their power. Compul- sory factory legislation to-day makes the proud manufacturers and millionaires of the last century conscious of their power, and makes them feel that they are not only the masters of their own persons, but that the government, too, is their subject, and that they are as great a power over the government as the government is over them. This is a great boon to the government, for it makes them feel that they are not only the masters of their own persons, but that the government, too, is their subject, and that they are as great a power over the government as the government is over them. This is a great boon to the government, for it makes them feel that they are not only the masters of their own persons, but that the government, too, is their subject, and that they are as great a power over the government as the government is over them. This is a great boon to the government, for it makes them feel that they are not only the masters of their own persons, but that the government, too, is their subject, and that they are as great a power over the government as the government is over them. This is a great boon to the government, for it makes them feel that they are not only the masters of their own persons, but that the government, too, is their subject, and that they are as great a power over the government as the government is over them. This is a great boon to the government, for it makes them feel that they are not only the masters of their own persons, but that the government, too, is their subject, and that they are as great a power over the government as the government is over them. This is a great boon to the government, for it makes them feel that they are not only the masters of their own persons, but that the government, too, is their subject, and that they are as great a power over the government as the government is over them. This is a great boon to the government, for it makes them feel that they are not only the masters of their own persons, but that the government, too, is their subject, and that they are as great a power over the government as the government is over them. This is a great boon to the government, for it makes them feel that they are not only the masters of their own persons, but that the government, too, is their subject, and that they are as great a power over the government as the government is over them. This is a great boon to the government, for it makes them feel that they are not only the masters of their own persons, but that the government, too, is their subject, and that they are as great a power over the government as the government is over them.

In despotic governments, so-called, this service is performed by a State Church. The government gives great privileges, funds, and revenues to the Church, upon the condition that the Church will teach the people that the government is ordained of God; and that to disobey or resist it would be a great sin against God. In this way, the ignorant and superstitious people are kept in subjection to no arbitrary power that rob^ es, kills, and murders them at their pleasure.

We, in this country, have got rid of this superstition about the Church; and the consequence is that our government is not subject to it. And this is the only reason why it is in our Supreme Court. It sets up a court of its own; secures its own judges, pays them as long as they sanction all its doings; but incapacitates and removes them, if they fail to sanction them.

These judges, if re-elected, can continue all their doings; they are united, paid, and sustained for that purpose, and no other. They understand perfectly the tenure, by which they hold their places, and govern themselves accordingly. And the government, whenever its interests become straitened, and cause an outcry, points to the decisions of its Supreme Court, as if that settled the matter.

In this way, the Judges of a Supreme Court, in this country, serve the same purpose as does the dignitary of a State Church. The Judges can be as safely relied upon, by the government, in this country, to sanctify all its doings, as the dignitaries of a State Church can be to sanctify all the doings of the government, on which they depend for their privileges and revenues. The judges are so much part of the conspiracy, in the one case, as the priests are in the other.

In either case, the judges and priests are simply tools and confessors, employed by the government, to overlook, ignore, or destroy the people, and keep them in subjection. They are simply weights, which the governments "hrow upon the people," to prevent their rising in rebellion against the oppressions which the governments practices upon them. Now, it is just the man for a service of this kind. He has no doubt that the government is entitled to arbitrary, irresponsible power over the people; or that it is the duty of the people to submit blindly to every thing the government does. If, in any particular case, any question should be raised, as to the right or justice of any act of the government, he can tell you that, for hundreds of years back, gov- ernment has been doing this, or other things equally outrageous; but that the people had no alternative but to submit; and that, therefore, they have no other alternative now.

Now, this is exactly what is wanted of a judge of a Supreme Court. And that is why we say that Gray is the right man for the place. And it is the only thing he is fit for. And it is the only use that he will ever be put to, as long as he remains a member of the court.

His associates on the bench will, of course, welcome him as a brother. And they will all enjoy their dignities, and salaries, as long as they sanction all the usurpations and crimes which the government practices upon the people, and so long as they can keep the wheel of government moving, and the people from getting up to opposition.
time, more or less, in the court room, and in the jail, examining Guiteau, to get the data, the facts, the symptoms, by which to judge whether he is, or is not, insane now, and will be next week. He thus impartially confesses that the question is, at least, an obscure and difficult one to themselves. And when they attempt to communicate their reasons to others, they utterly fail to show any valid ones for their conclusions; that is, any reasons that are altogether conclusive on the subject to common minds. Common minds know almost absolutely nothing as to the validity, or invalidity, of the reasons which these experts give for holding that he is sane now, or that he has been sane at any time since he has been under their own care. If, therefore, Guiteau is to be hanged, on the testimony of these experts, he is to be hanged on faith, and not on reason; on faith in the simple, opinions or conjectures of these experts, and not on reasons brought home to the common and understanding minds of the just themselves.

But even this is not all. These experts not only give their opinions that Guiteau is sane now, but also that he was sane on the second of July; for six months ago.

Even if he is sane now, what do they know, or what are their opinions worth, as to whether he was, or was not, six months ago?

They apparently have no reason for thinking that he was insane in July, except that they think he is sane in January.

Would it not be just as sensible for them to say that, because he has fever, or delirium tremens, on to-day, therefore he could have had none on him six months ago?

This kind of reasoning implies that they hold that if a man was insane in July, he would undoubtedly have continued to be insane until January; or, what is substantially the same thing, that if a man is once insane, he cannot be cured. Now, this, we think, is very likely to be the rule in the asylum under their own control; that they sold or never cure any body that comes under their care. And we ought to be thankful for this information. For, then, you know where you may put your insane friend; we wish to have them cured.

In this theory of theirs, that once insane, always insane, the cases, in which they report the patients as "discharged cured," must be presumed to be cases, in which the insane patients have simply sent to them on "the certificate of two physicians," who knew just so much about insanity as it was necessary for them to know, or as they cared to know, in order to earn two or three dollars for certifying their patients.

If these experts have really any reliable knowledge—beyond that of other men—as to the operations of minds diseased, or not diseased, why do they not give us some reasonable explanation of the conduct of Guiteau, in his past, recent, and daily, and before a multitude of people, and making no attempt to escape; and all this, when he had no personal malice towards his victim, and no rational prospect of gaining anything by his death? Are such acts as this common to human experience? So common as to imply no disorder in the mind of the actor? Do all the experiences of all the Bedlams on earth explain such a phenomenon as this, consistently with the sanity of the agent?

When these experts are confronted with this question, they are confounded. Instead of telling us how a sane man could do such an act, they stammer out "wickedness," "depravity," "evil passions." What is a civil passion of avarice, or jealousy, or revenge, or any other particular "evil passion," that is known to in. soc men to commit murder? No. It was evidently none of these. But it was (as these experts would have us believe), simple wickedness, depravity, evil passions. They can give no answer more definite than that.

Such answers as these might perhaps pass in some schools of theology, which hold that a virtue of simple "wickedness," "depravity," "evil passions," was incorporated into the very nature of our first parents, and by them transmitted to all their posterity. But when they are offered in a court of justice, where a man's life is at stake, they are not merely shameful, they are infamous. Men are not to be hanged in this country, upon the say-so of theologians or others may hold as to an ancient transaction between Adam, Eve, and the devil.

These experts have had thousands of insane persons under their own care. Most of these patients have been convicted of commissions, or other violent assaults. All of them, or nearly all of them, were supposed to be liable to commit acts dangerous to themselves, or others. The insanity of no two of them showed itself equally, nor was it of the same kind. And doing just the same things, daily, that were just as absurd and irrational as was the act of Guiteau. And because their acts, whether violent or not, were so absurd and irrational, these experts have no doubt that the actors were insane. That is, they say, the insane and irrational act, they hold that he is not insane, but simply "wicked," "depraved," under the control of his "evil passions." And yet they give no reasons—that are capable of being comprehended, and judged of, by common sense—why Guiteau's absurd and irrational act is not as good proof of his insanity, as the absurd and irrational acts of others are of theirs.

Even the witches were not hanged on such absurd testimony as this.

The testimony of these experts tends to show how much science and reason are to be found among the keepers of our asylums for the insane. It tends to show that these men are either blockheads outright, and do not know that they are making fools of themselves, or are incapable of committing, or of committing, or of advertising themselves as physicians for the insane, almost any possible crime against justice and reason. It tends to show that many of them, at least, are capable of all the crimes, against both the laws and the usages of this nation, with which so many of them have been charged, and of which some of them have no doubt been guilty.

A Statue to Proudhon.

A movement is in foot in France for the erection of a statue to Proudhon. It may surprise our readers to hear that Liberty questions the advisability of the project, and asks its initiators to reflect a little before going farther with it. That a journal brought into existence by the consequence of the teachings of Proudhon, and which lives principally to emphasize and spread them, should hesitate to give its sanction to the perpetuation of his memory by a public monument must seem to us not only improbable, but is now to us the most reasonable. There are men who make their own monuments. Of those Proudhon was one. He made of his stuff more enduring than bronze or marble,—namely, ideas. It is to be found inside the half-buried city of the mob. But it is one of those ideas which, if so multiplied, would do more to change insensible to enshrine the author's memory in the popular heart. The first duty of his faithful disciples is to open these books to the eyes of the world. After that, build our monument! We do not mean that the readers of his works will pronounce all other monuments superfluous, and will think twice before subscribing toward the erection of a statue in memory of him who wrote these words:

What is a great man? Do the principles of the French Revolution and of a Republic founded on the right of man admit of such? Together with the right of man, we have recognized progress as a principle of the new society. Now, one of the principal workmen of a society democratically organized is the continual lessening of the distance between man and man. As the nation proceeds, as the masses improve, so the difference between art, science, and religion. In the thought of the revolution and in the perspective of the Republic the idea of great men is nonsense; their disappearance is one of the guarantees of our future. Those members of the Constituent who voted for the Plessiscle, and those members of the Convention who carried out the Père-Letour and Muret, were artisans in society, unless it was in the midst of ideas held among them that one day the entire people should be gathered there; in which case it would have been simpler to have left us under the mastery of loaves.

Right and Individual Rights.

Until somebody shall have formulated and demonstrated a correct science of justice, the way is ever open to constant confusion as regards the subject of right. The right of property is not the place to develop such a science; nevertheless, the matter is so important that we have determined, reconsidering our previously-announced purpose to drop it, to once more re-state our position. On several occasions our editors have been sharply criticized by parties who are supposed to know something of the principles of Liberty; not that they would differ from us, if they were carried in mind the disjunction that must necessarily be kept in view in discussing this subject. What we want to say is, that we have not a complete answer to every statement of right, but simply that they have got into the habit of carelessly defining acts without reference to the sphere of the individuals acting.

The right, to do a thing and the abstract right of a thing to do two essentially different principles. For instance, we have defended the right of individuals to make contracts stipulating the payment of usury, and should strike at the very essence of Liberty if we did not; but the defense of individuals in this particular case means to carry with it the defense of usury as an equitable transaction per se. In defending the right to take usury, we do not defend the right of usury. He who cannot see this has not mas— the A B C of social analysis. One of our critics challenges the defense of individuals who voluntarily choose to be parties to usury, strenuously defends "free run." Would he be like to be accused of saying thereby that it is right, as a matter of principle, to drink rum irresponsibly? No, he is a severe believer in the insalubritv of excessive rum-drinking. But he believes that the rum-drinker and the rum-seller have the right to execute a contract involving a practice wrong in itself, and that no third party has the right to prevent them by force, or by any means, from carrying out their contract. Our defense is simply that this is the case. This is an exact, and no more than, what Liberty affirms with regard to usury. Wher-en, then, have we so gravi-ously sinned?

To say that it is absolutely right to do a thing is to say that to do it is to do that which will adumbrate to the greatest possible good, when every possible element involved in the transaction is seen and weighed. But who possesses that sublime omniscience which sees both the greatest good, and the present, and the future, that enters into a transaction? And even if one could, who is to vouch authoritatively that his weights, measures, and balances are correct? In this dilemma the theologians, of course, find an easy way out by making us such contrivances with hand-"God" and stamped infallible. This trick, however, being "played out" with our critics, how do they propose to get at the absolute right of a thing? Is there, in deed, in practice, any absolute right? We do not solve the matter at all to bring in the cost principle, and say that that is absolutely right which is done solely at the cost of the individuals who act. There is no mentionable act, not even the drooping of a pinch in the middle of the Desert of Sahara, that can be said to be absolutely right at the cost of the individuals acting. The loss of that pin as a necessary surgical instrument to treat the disabled camel may cost its life, and with it the lives of the whole party. We believe, on the other hand, that the best at our service, but its observance can never result in the universality of absolute right, since no man or set of men can ever attain to the omniscience of foreseeing the entire bill of costs, and then to bear alone the united burden.

The only way even to approximatively solve the right and wrong of human acts is to leave every individual to judge his own acts and thereby to ask himself, by and by, to the sum of good. The fact of far greater transactions are executed at the cost of others will soon be evident in any case by the protest of those
LIBERTY.

To "Apex."

DEAR SIR,—I see that you "cannot determine what I say" and that you write it "apex" or "apexes," with which I am in complete agreement; but as you speak in favor of uncorrected folk, you have no right to turn their natural and rational explanation of the large increase of those debts that the farmer found it profitable to borrow. Those Indiana people are not fools as to admit their millions to their indebtedness in one year, if they did not find it to do so.

Among primitive peoples there was no individual ownership of land, and even among the savages I believe we should have some day resembled in those respects, but the coming of that day was not one, I venture to think by the primitive method of naming calls, or by trying to "take the lesson on it.

A Second Chapter on Usury.

All statutory laws that interfere with voluntary trade between individuals must be wrong. Therefore, so-called usury laws cannot be defended on any principle of justice.

Again, all such laws are made, because they attempt to deal with results. O.W. Holmes says that "it is useless to speculate on the symmetry of legal regulations," so inevitably on that author by such journals as "the Irish Free 1st"! and the "New York Truth."

Vast George demonstrates "the Remedy is so utterly absurd and ridiculous when clearly analyzed that I decided to write a pamphlet exposing its folly and exhibiting to the curious reader of that book the Ingots fatigue the author has followed down to the present period.

You, too, have overlooked the "error in his taxation and return of taxes for the purpose of making the land common property, and they proceed to make the defendant land "hotter" because it is a vast revenue system.

Do you perceive the inconsistency of the two propositions?

E. F. Boyd.

26 Second Avenue, New York, Nov. 14, 1881.

An Unsatisfactory Reason.

My dear Mr. Tucker,—At length I see a reason, given by "Apex," why the plow-leader is not entitled to pay the use of the plow's. It is that the use is of no value to the user. I think that "Apex" can have no knowledge of agriculture except within his farm house to the acre of land for the reception of seed, he would hardly have given such a reason. I do not see why a man would take the trouble to borrow a plow, if its use was to be charged for. I am more than this. "Apex" is not yet the apex.

Yours cordially,

J. R. L. Brooker.

LIBERTY'S LIBRARY.

For any of the following Works, address,

HENRY C. TUCKER, Box 306, Boston, Mass.


THE RADICAL REVIEW: Vol. I, handsomely bound in cloth, and containing over sixty Essays, Poems, Translations, Correspondence, etc. by the watchmen of the radical writers, on industrial, financial, social, literary, scientific, philosophic, ethical, by leading names in literature. Price, $4.00, net, 50 cents, postpaid, $4.00, net, 50 cents.


THE LABOR DOLLAR. By Stephen Pearl Andrews. Price, 10 cents.


WORK AND WEALTH. By J. K. Ingalls. Price, 10 cents.


THOMAS P. GASTON.

To the Editor of "Liberty."

When I was not 21 in the tea, what's the State demanded for that protection which I did not want, itself had robbed me; when I have asserted the liberty it is presumed to declare, itself has imposed it. That has happened that the Arch Flend himself has been in my way, but those tolls which tradition says were originally spun to obstruct him.—There's.