On Picket Duty.

A Boston firm announced a cut-down in the wages of its workmen in the following original way: “Next week your wages will be raised to fifteen dollars per week.” The word “raised” was neither quoted nor italicized. Evidently that firm thinks that there is a great deal in a name.

The Boston “Labor Leader” quotes some “true and epigrammatic saying” of Maxinni against Proudhon’s banking theories. Maxinni was a noble-hearted and sympathetic man, but his knowledge of economics did not quite match the level of the intellectual power of the “Labor Leader’s” editor as an equipment for the comprehension of Proudhon. Laurence Gronlund is very severe on free traders, and claims that protection will be the policy under the “cooperative commonwealth.” The Chicago “Labor Enquirer” says, before he has sold a candle, and pretends that Socialism naturally implies absolute freedom of trade. Both Gronlund and the “Enquirer” are champions of “Scientific Socialism.” Further corollary unnecessary.

Liberty has lately referred to Rev. H. O. Pentecost’s anti-Georgian position on the question of free trade. It must now chronicle another point of disagreement between him and his former master. In recent sermons Mr. Pentecost placed himself squarely on the agnostic ground, while Mr. George is still on good terms with theology, and continues to talk with great confidence about God’s intentions and preferences in relation to the settlement of the land problem.

It is one thing to admit the possibility of revolution; it is a second thing to point out that, in the presence of certain conditions and in the absence of certain other conditions, revolution is inevitable; it is a third and entirely different thing to so vivaciously foresee revolution that vision in every other direction becomes more and more obscure. When a man’s “foresee” of revolution has arrived at this dazzling pitch, it is safe to conclude that in his heart of hearts he desires revolution, clinging against his reason to a superstitions belief in its economic efficacy, and would openly urge it instead of “foreseeing” it. Did he not know that he could not defend such a course against reasoning men. Knowing this, however, he contents himself with “foreseeing,” but “forsees” so constantly and absurdly that his prophecies have all the effect of preaching, while enabling him to dodge the preacher’s responsibility.

Ingersoll and the Tariff.

[On Monday Nov. 7.]

The New York “Press,” a high tariff organ, publishes a long interview with R. O. Ingersoll, in which that orator lets not some of his bosom thinking in favor of the spoil system commonly called protectionism. Mr. Ingersoll does not utter six words in his defense the small cavity. He thinks, because immigrants come from Europe to this country, that is some evidence that protectionism is helping to make this country the best place. Now, emigrants come from the highest tariff countries as well as from the low-tariff countries, and it is for the protectionists to show that there are no other attractions more than our taxes on the necessaries of life. Mr. Ingersoll is reported to say as follows:

People who believe in free trade are always telling us that the laborer should be paid more in Germany than in the United States, and yet nearly every ship that comes from Germany carries within it men who, for some unaccountable reason, prefer to leave a place where they are doing very well and come to one where they must do worse.

This is either an ignorant or an intentional mistake. Germany has a high tariff with low wages; it would seem as if such an assertion as the one quoted by a man so intelligent as Mr. Ingersoll would be on account of a quaint scream. Free trade, are not always telling—indeed, they are never telling—what the reporter makes Ingersoll say. Next he says that “to the extent that the tariff keeps the foreign article is a direct protection to American labor.” This blithely notion is the product of an abstract view of labor as something which is only labor,—a producer who is not a consumer. The man who labors for making a protected article—-and who might therefore get a higher price for his product if he were the proprietor of that product—wants to buy hundreds of other protected articles, and in doing so he is paying to increase the profit of other laboring men’s employers.

Further Mr. Ingersoll says:

If free trade could be adopted tomorrow, there would be an instant shrinkage of values in this country. Probably the immediate results would equal $200,000,000,—that is to say, one-third of the value of the country. No one can tell its effects. All things are so interwoven that to destroy one industry cripples another, and the influence on prices depends on the circumstance of human interests.

What is a shrinkage of values? That means that the people can buy more with the money which they possess. Is that not the general misfortune? Does it mean that fire or flood has destroyed anything good to use? Not at all. Certain high prices come down so that people can buy at world’s fair prices. Truly, all things are interwoven, but let it be supposed that the industry to be destroyed is luxury. In some countries the highways make quite a market for certain villages. The luxurious industry is interwoven with other industries in this country. The confidence game, the bunco industry, and the drug shop are interwoven with the industries of American cities. Most all industries fear their decline so much that fostering laws will have to take care of them and perpetuate them. The train-robbery, blackmailing, and gambling industries have a hearing, when it is admitted that a manufacturer pays ten cents for a pound of cotton and two cents to a woman to spin it can have a law to give twenty-five cents for the product when it is worth only fifteen cents. The fact that extortion is associated with an industry does not prevent it from being extortion, and the fact that the victims are prevented by national power from buying from the manufacturer only proves that the national law-makers have sanctioned robbery by proprietors of certain industries, whereas they would not sanction robbery as a policy disconnected from an industry. This is the policy. Whoever will build a mill shall be licensed to extort. But all things are so interwoven that, looking on the other side of the question, the State of industry from states the law. In the same way, the influence on prices depends on the circumstance of human interests.

This is the truth which Mr. Ingersoll has not received. One not forced to trade at a high-priced store will make economies today, but he will have money left to spend, and it will buy more and still more goods at work, and they will turn to buy. Production can not go on freely without freedom of exchange. Production and exchange constitute prosperity. The tariff has crippled many industries to enrich a few men. The liberation of the country from this burden is the substance of the question before the courts, and, those who do not share the liberty and favor restriction have reason to quarrel and defend whatever they are. They take a great responsibility.

An Old Dogma and its Latest Revelation.

[Henry Maret in Le Radical.]

You wish to know by virtue of what revealed dogma the people are forbidden to assemble themselves before a man? Well, I will tell you. It is by virtue of the dogma of human liberty, a dogma as old as republics and citizens, and whose most extravagant sanction was the Shal of the Convention, amid thunders and lightnings.

THE MAN BORN BLIND.

[San Francisco Examiner.]

A man born blind received his sight by a painful operation. And these are the things he saw in the light of an instant observation.

He saw a merchant, rich and wise, and greatly, too, respected. Who looked, to these imperfect eyes, like a swollen under-tale.

He saw a patriot address a noisy public meeting. And said: “Why, that’s a calf, I guess, and for the lot is bleeding.”

A doctor stood beside a bed, and shook his headitonely. “He’s that fool again,” said the doctor to the man who saw so bally.

He saw a lawyer pleading for a thief whom they’d been jailing. And said: “That’s an accomplice, or my sight’s already failing.”

Upon the Bench a Justice sat, with nothing to restrict him; “I’ll strangle,” said the observer, “that they revered to unmask him.”

He saw a prawn pound the box. As “were an urchin brother; “He serves Abelson, and he has a look As if he were another.”

With theudge works supplied, he saw that self-same preacher. “A burglar with his kit,” he cried, “to rob a fellow-creature.”

An honest farmer next he saw with a pipe and pipe. And said: “What! is there no law To punish men for pilage?”

A dance, tall, fair, and stately, passed. Who many charms united, he thanked his stars that his hat was cast Where Raphael was seated.

He saw in splendid attire Some “Grand Supreme Commanders,” “A preacher’s plumes I don’t admire,” He swore, “upon a gander.”

To saw a soldier, stiff and stern, “Full of strange ets” and tody, But was unable to discern A wound upon his body.

Twenty square leagues of rolling ground: To one great man belonging Looked like one little gray mouse With worms beneath it thronging.

A palace’s well-carved stones, Where slaves dwelt contented. Secreted within a human bones With human blood cooled.

He watched the yellow, shining thread A silk-worm was spinning; A vestiment a clothing gold,” he said, “To pay some girl for singing.”

His eyes were so unstrung and dull, All politics, religions, Arts, sciences appeared to him Such facts as pleases poppy-gods. And so he drew his final breath. And thought he saw with sorrow Some persons weeping for his death. Who’d be all smiles tomorrow. -Andrew衍生. -
"Learned from the servants for whom you may find employment there all that goes on in this house, where many liberals are received.

After reading this, she closed her book.

"Says," said the Gripon, "you will come to see me often, will you not? We shall soon be two friends, and you will see that I shall enable you to earn a good deal.

And, to trap her more surely, she added:

"Your little one shall lack nothing."

"Ah! so much the better," said the poor mother.

The old agent imposed silence upon her with a gesture.

"Here is the address . . . A godsend! . . . Upon my word, two dollars is nothing for it; less by the transaction."

Louise was all ears.

"Berville's mansion, Rue du Louvre," read the Gripon.

"Oh! never, not there," cried Louise Didier, in a tone of mingled repugnance and indignation.

"Well, where then? I do not want that place," repeated the widow, energetically.

"Not there!" cried the agent, containing herself no longer. "Why, you acquainted lady, you don't know what I offer you. It is more than silver, it is infinite, for you would be in the honr only of the barker, but of the police, of the government. Idiot, there is a fortune to be shared."

The old woman, stopped, crying with anger and already regretting having said too much, and then continued:

"You will die of hunger, beggar, you and your . . ."

But Louise, without hearing more, had run out of the little closet into the hall and thence into the street, away from the Gripon-Gavard, Jew and Christian den, authorized and honored by the State and stigmatized by the People in these words with this brand: Cannaille & Co.

CHAPTER IX.

IN PARADISE.

The furious Gripon, stammering and grinning, was still threatening the widow with her fist, when the door opened again before a woman dressed in pale-colored silk, a white apron, and a lace cap.

In this frightful three-story house, with a crone for every story, where for no other cause than hunger and thirst for gold, our sacré famés, without preference of faith or race, circumcised and baptized, savour of the damned and massacrer of the innocent, with leaf and even on account of the Rue de la Montagne, the Parisian, the foreigner, the outcast, all day long, b- the day and by the job, at home and in the r-ty. undertaking at a fair price and being well paid."

"Well!" said she, in a tone of interrogation and surprise.

"What is the matter with you?"

The old woman was choking.

"What is it?" again asked the Gavard.

"A horror . . . an abomination . . . Ah! my poor sister . . . You see . . . it is enough to disgust one with the profession . . ."

So serious as that?" exclaimed the midwife.

Mme. Gripon, calming her agitation, was able at last to explain her professional mortification.

"Raising her hands toward the ceiling, she said:

"Would you believe that I have just pitched a goose out doors! . . ."

"Without provoking it," said the midwife.

"No," replied the other.

"Oh! that's all right, then; I was going to say . . ."

The commission agent continued, hissing like a viper rather than speaking:

"A sort of widow, a pauper . . . more stupid than her hands . . . a good-for-nothing . . . would you believe it? I offered her a place at the Berville's, an ad

"Very well," said the midwife.

"Let there is no need of too many of them. . . . To be imbibe in such a degree as that! She, the only one of the lot whom I did not want to victimize, this: will teach me! Fortunately I shall get her watch and ring with those I shall secure my revenge! She will find herself in a false fix. I shall not let her have less than ten per cent.

"Ten? That is the usual rate. You treat her as a friend," said the Gavard.

"But let us leave her care for another and better one, that of the girl whom you sent up to me; I have come down in regard to her."

"Ah, yes, I had forgotten her."

"Come now, try to make out of it!"

"A good thing. Listen. Placed with fourteen, in a family of magistrates, she is with child by the son of the house. . . ."

"And we could threaten them with a great scandal!"

"Exactly."

"You believe it will succeed?"

"They are pisous and rich. They will be frightened and will shew out. Be easy, I know these people. We have only to go and say to the papa: Monstre, your young man, the State's attorney's substitute, is going on at a great rate. But for you we would find he was a criminal! You would pull everything down about your ears. Your former servant is with us, and wishes to give publicity to the story with which you are familiar. Enough said. Pay, and we shall keep quiet, and so be, without being seen or known. you will get the money, and good peace."

"Well, well!" observed the midwife, "but these are magistrates. We shall have to look out for ourselves."

"No danger. Are we going to send in our cards? We are not such goons. Just have your boarder write a word that will be understood, and we will start."
A few minutes later she came down, holding in her hand a sheet of paper covered with lead writing.

"There, will that do?" she asked her sister.

The old maid smiled approvingly.

I declare that it is in consequence of my misconduct with a collet de chambre of the establishment that I have been discharged. I am about Berlin or his son is simply falsehood and cruelty, for which I humbly ask pardon.

"A little too correct, but that's nothing. It will do as it is, and we shall get fifty dollars, at least."

"No more than I thought, that?" said Mme. Gavard. "We shall see."

The two women went out quickly.

As they passed by Abraham Grippon's shop, they opened the door, and the young woman said to the old Jew, with a wink:

"We are going out on urgent and profitable business. A few hours of confinement. You will look out for matters up-stairs, will you?"

"All right," said the Jew, "I will keep the house with Israel. The child will repeat his four rules."

"Two and two make five," cried Israel, "and two and four make three."

And he burst out laughing.

As they walked along, the two women began to talk like the two good sisters that they were.

"Let us agree carefully upon our facts," said the Gavard, lowering her voice.

"Shall we send the child to the Board of Public Charities? Or..."

"That will be better," said her sister. "We will give them to understand that foundlings may be found again, while..."

"Yes, but then it is more expensive."

"Undoubtedly. We must push the matter to the extremity," insisted the Grippon.

"And with the Italian whom you took the other day..."

"I have a market for my products; you are right. Paolo has made a bad stroke at the Hotel d'Ulmo; I have confessed him a little. He holds me. Each day makes it "angry." Things are progressing famously now, and I am overrun with business; frankly, I needed somebody."

"Then it is a good thing."

"In Paradise," said the Gavard.

"Hush!" whispered the employment agent. "There is my widow."

Louise Diéder was walking with her mother down a step under her load of something, and fatigue, and want, reduced to the last extremity.

The Grippon pointed her out with a gesture of contempt.

"It is good enough for your poor woman."

And she passed by, leading the midwife after her, who approved her words with a wicked smile.

"Let us take the steward the exhausted widow, when the two knives had passed.

"Truly, I cannot die here and leave Marie alone, her father dead, Oh bread! bread! No false shame! That would be pride. Yes, for my child."

At that moment, a poor woman, a widower of the good God of armies, proud of his position and consequently haughty, attracted the attention of the widow.

She seemed to advance toward him, and, with an effort to put fineness into her voice, said:

"I should like to speak to Monsieur the priest."

"To Monsieur the priest," repeated the Swiss, astonished at the enormity of the request.

"Or to a vicar," continued Louise, seeing her mistake.

"For me, in the name of your poor daughter."

"No: for help."

The Swiss turned upon his heels.

"Speak to the beard," said he, with a disdain that bordered on disgust.

The widow obeyed, and was sent by the beard to the sexton, who sent her flying to the churchwarden, very busily engaged just then in twirling his silver chain with his fingers.

"Monsieur..."

"Well?" exclaimed the sexton's subordinates, without raising his eyes.

"To whom should I apply to sollicite..."

"To me, first."

"My husband has been killed... I have... little girl... no work... rend-day is at hand..."

"Have you your last year's certificates of confirmation? Monsieur Querlen's daughter?"

"I received the sacrament only at Easter," ventured Louise Diéder, and..."

"At Easter! Well you shall have your help at Trinity."

"But I follow my religion strictly," insisted Louise. "My daughter is baptized."

"The only point left for you to fail in," exclaimed the beadle, with horror. "Your daughter is not baptized."

"And since, it is necessary..."

"Pahaw! Pahaw! We have our poor who come to mass every morning, confess every week, and receive the sacrament once a month at least."

"But, Monsieur, generally I am at work."

"Work, then, and leave the aid for the faithful who do not work. Moreover, you have only to write to Monsieur the priest; he will answer you."

She reached the portal, she met the Swiss, striking the flag with his heavy gold-headed cane, before Monsieur the priest who was collecting: For the poor of the parish, with a very pronounced and very considable If you please.

CHAPTER XI.

AT THE BOARD OF PUBLIC CHARITIES.

Determined to struggle against fate to the end, the widow started for the department of Public Charities, the last station of her cross.

Her religious convictions and her belief in the existence of a re-course to public charity, to civil benevolence, to social and official aid, hoping to finish there her (golgotha of pain and shame.

She inquired the way to the Charity Office, reached there, and was at last admitted into a waiting-room, a Calvary full of the sorrow of civilization, a delirium of both sexes or rather of no sex, of shabby and decrepit old people, so old that death seemed to have forgotten them, so ugly that they seemed to have frightened death away.

There Madame Diéder again had to wait her turn amid this needy crowd, which, his right hand pressed to his heart and embittered by fear of want, already required its aid, and his money, his wife, his eyes, gesture, and voice, as a companion, an enemy, coming to cut down the shares of the multitude.

"This is a mendicant," the word was passed round.

An applicant, a good fellow like his chief, whose duty it was to keep order in the room, noticed the widow as she advanced, trembling and with lowered head.

"I have a new one," said he, "One has come with me. Silence in the crowd, do you hear, subscribers? Otherwise your incomes will be cut off."

"The threat had its effect. Needy and lazy, paupers and paupers, beggars professional and beggars occasional, all became quiet. The recriminations died out in a sudden groan."

Mme. Diéder followed her escort toward an office situated at the end of a long gallery.

There she found herself before a stout gentleman seated at a double desk. Opposite him was a young secretary, with pen raised and eye attentive, ready to write in the name of the office.

The poor woman could not have felt a more poignant emotion in presence of an examining magistrate.

She lifted her eyes humbly upon the man who was about to decide her fate.

The face of the chief inspired her with confidence.

"Monsieur," said she, "I come to you in despair."

And in one sentence of frankness she told the story of her misfortune, omitting no detail, insisting on her child who was "dying by a slow fire," to use the popular expression. She finished by sinking into a deep silence.

"I have brought the papers," said the chief of the department who had listened with a certain benevolence.

Continued on page 6.
From the West Indies, the number of prisoners is 1 in 117 of the white inhabitants of the Spanish islands in this country; of the South Americans, 1 in 197; of the Chinese, 1 in 198; of the Italians, 1 in 200; of the Armenians, 1 in 238; of the Spaniards, 1 in 411; of the French, 1 in 432; of the English, 1 in 456; of the British Americans, 1 in 500; of the Russians, 1 in 596; of the Germans, 1 in 1180; of the Poles, 1 in 1175; of the Belgians, 1 in 1905; of the Swiss, 1 in 1251; of the Hollander, 1 in 1383; of the Scandinavians, 1 in 1599; and of the Austrians, 1 in 600, the Hungarians and Bohemians, 1 in 1838. The Hungarian and Bohemian make the best showing, in respect of crime, of any nationality; this is probably contrary to the popular opinion, which seems to be based more on superstition than on any other supposed superiority, justified in ignorance.

Now, in what class of foreigners in this country do the Anarchists and Socialists figure most largely. Certainly not among the Chinese or the Irish or the Cuban or the Spaniards or the Italians or the Australians, or the Scotch or the French or the Canadians. But these are the only foreigners except the Russians who make a poorer showing in point of criminality than the native Americans. To find in this country any considerable number of Anarchists and Socialists of foreign birth, we must go to the Russians, the Germans, the Poles, the Hungarians, and the Bohemians. The statistics show, however, that the Russians are almost as orderly as Americans, the Germans exactly as orderly, the Poles more orderly, and the Hungarians and Bohemians more than twice as orderly.

Moral: If the defenders of privilege desire to exclude from this country the opponents of privilege, they should see to it that congress omits the taking of the eleventh census. For the eleventh census, if taken, will undoubtedly definitely increase the imported foreign population as follows: first, that foreign immigration does not increase dishonesty and violence among us, but does increase the love of liberty; second, that the population of the world is gradually divided into two classes, Anarchists and criminals.}

Theoretical and Practical Labor Reform.

Dr. McVey's "scheme for getting city tenants to band together, refuse to pay for their houses and rooms more than a fair building rent, and by their numbers make evictions difficult, if not impossible," Henry George pretends to regard as "ridiculous," "crazy," "demagogic," and even "dangerous." Mr. George is evidently in a great rage. The glu-"oung politician who gets thousands of dollars for "the propaganda" of free trade must needs feel very unnecessary, fortal and ashamed of the vulgar agitation which his foreign friend and ally has been waging for such energy in New York. But isn't it rather delightfully cool for the cock-sure reformer George to tell about the honest and enthusiastic doctor's "having utterly lost his grasp upon principle"? I think the editor of the "Standard" is relying too much on the primitive simplicity of his readers. To be sure, he has been exceptionally juicy thus far, and his "reform," in all its various transformations, has not failed to be full of material advantage to his person, but the man should not go so far as to denounce those who do stand by the unpopular issues as crazy and dangerous. When the dings of Mr. George and Dr. McVey are contrasted, the suspicion that there is a difference in the character of the two men is repeatedly assumes more and more the color of a certainty.

However, Mr. George does not content himself with calling the doctor man. He argues that the tenants have no more right to a landlord to the free use of their labor than "the white man has to the slave," which is so condescending and so lofty to principle that he can't be satisfied with anything short of absolute and universal justice. Believing that land values belong to the community as a whole, he will substitute one landlord for the many landlords and demand that the landlords as a give to the tenants, but hopes and prays and strives for that perfect solution which will do justice for the juste the existing right existing without creating or planing new wrongs. Ought we not to kneel down and w-ship this ideal purity of heart? Why, even Jesus "brought a sword" to be used against a certain class of men; and all who succeeded him in the task of elevating mankind acted upon the notion that it is not possible for men black as sin to become suddenly white as snow, and that gradual and slow improvement must be the necessary road to the final point of perfection.

"No, only those who lose their grasp upon principle can lower themselves to be carriers of reversionary rights to the land.

I fight landladyism, call the landlords robbing, and make the stupid tenants who feed these idle usurpers ashamed of their cowardice and folly; but I will not allow or encourage the tenants to stop paying tribute, which is the only way to get them to the community upon those lands, and the benefit should go to the whole." Thus would Mr. George have us interpret him.

Gladly would we gratify him, but really we must ask him to explain a little difficulty that causes us some uneasiness also about his consistency. If we understand him rightly, he favors political methods and believes that his theories about land-ownership and taxation must be practiced through the enactment of laws by the representatives of the successful majority. Now, if he ever made a mass of voters only, and they force his schemes upon the unwilling and protesting minority, how is absolute justice to be rendered to the whole community? Suppose landlords remain in a minority, or both a part of the landlord class and a part of the present tenants, what becomes of the "whole community?" If his idea is just and proper, why is Dr. McVey's so obnoxious? It will not do for Mr. George to say that his method is constitutional and legal, while the doctor's is illegal and revolutionary, for, in the first place, Dr. McVey claims that his method is constitutional and legal, secondly, Mr. George, as a reformer and Jeffersonian, cannot hold any such obedience to government obliga- tion or ever commendable. Jefferson maintained that citizens not only have the right to rebel, but are bound to do so, when government opposes to minis- ter such public goods; and, therefore, a man is not afraid to lift his finger without the permission of constituted authority.

Mr. George will see the necessity of making this point clear. As it is, his violent condemnation of Dr. McVey's "laid on canvas that he cares very little about the lot of the landlouse and would rather resist than help a practical method of re- lief, bent only on the personal advantages of his position as theoretical reformer and on securing for his writings as wide a market as possible both among landlords and tenants.}

Yarbo.

Liberty and Responsibility in Babyland.

I was intensely interested in reading the views of Victor and Zelm on the domestic relations. Although reared in a most harmonious communal home, and having, for nearly a decade, married an equal, I have seen enough in these two examples, to say nothing of others, to condemn that system as fatally defective. And in tracing out the logical consequences and corollaries of the principle of individuality, I arrived at the conception of the independent home, or, as I termed it, the individual's home, some time before I knew other Anarchists had affirmed it.

The central idea is the autonomy of the relations of parents and children. All plausible arguments urged against the individual home system, and indeed against free love in its most radical form, is a mere weapon which sheathes itself here (the argument that, because a child needs government, therefore child-like adults need to be looked after as the Anarchists). I am conscious of but one important point of difference with Zelm.

I claim that in the financial support of the child the father is equally responsible with the mother; responsible, that is, to the child, to whom the parent owes support until it can support itself, and, secondly, to other individuals that the child may need to them.

My argument is that: Liberty consists in doing as one pleases at one's own expense; therefore so Anarchist can consistently throw the expense of his child's support. If I begot a child conjointly with a woman, I must bear the ex- pence of its support (up to the age of its self-support) conjointly with her. If I do not do so, the expense of my act on her, I act contrary to liberty; if she deserts, and throws the expense of her act on me, she acts contrary to liberty; and if we both desert and throw the expense of our acts on others who have no connection with the matter, we act still more contrary to liberty. All this appears to me self-evident, and I affirm it as the line of justice—that is,
of harmony — in the parental relations. Of course I am not considering any variations which this might produce by annual consent — as the father's assuming the whole expense, or the mother's doing so, or adoption of the child by a stranger. The father's responsibility is further proved by the fact that he is not an unceasing care to his child, is a double, in case of the death or inability of the mother, that he was responsible for the child's support. I am sorry to observe with too frequent frequency, that the father is made to pay, and the mother is not.

I am met with the questions: "To which parent then does the child belong? — to both?" I answer, in the sense of property to none. It was once a maxim, that the child belonged to the parent, and not to the offspring. While the child hangs upon the parent for support, it belongs to the parent, and is really a part of the parent, and is rightly by the parent's intellect, just as the arm and foot of the parent are. This is not government of one individual by another, for the child is not yet an individual, not being self-sustained, but held under the last vestige of individuality. So in adult life, if one individual depends upon another for support, he has, to the extent of that support, abdicated his individuality, and becomes a part or appendage of the one upon whom he depends. The apple belongs to the tree on which it hangs and from which it draws nourishment. When the apple falls, it begins its independence, or in other words, becomes an individual. While the child hangs upon the parent for support, it belongs to the parent, and is really a part of the parent, and is rightly by the parent's intellect, just as the arm and foot of the parent are. This is not government of one individual by another, for the child is not yet an individual, not being self-sustained, but held under the last vestige of individuality.

In view of this, I consider that nature decides that, after the initial step of begetting, all the rest of the obedience sides mainly in the mother; the father's belonging becoming mainly latent, as it were, only proper to become active in case of the mother's death. In that case the natural property usually compels the father to transfer the child to some foster-mother. Of course there is nothing to prevent the father's being and adopting a principle of self-support, and being one of the self-sustaining of the offspring, consuming it in earning a living. As the child becomes an individual, just so fast, and to that degree, his progressiveness and development becomes manifest, and the offspring begins to care for itself, and is responsible to equal liberty. Once fully an individual, it of course establishes a separate home.

The argument is not for a or on its own account, which he can, exercise no no city, and from which he can receive no return for his pecuniary sacrifice, and is no longer free from the powers of slavery. It is either a gift or a loan. If it, the compensation is in the pleasure of giving, and, probably, in love and gratitude returned. If it be a loan, the child is to be expected to return, or, if present, to be returned at some future time. If there is not sufficient inducement to beget in the young mother's thought that you have given life, consecrated life, consecrated...
Concluded from page 2.

"Uncle Buck, . . . I do not say no, . . . Didier? . . . To be sure, . . . I read of the crime in the newspapers. That is, the way, why do you not apply to your lawyer's employees?"—M. Bervilly, I asked.

Mme. Didier shook her head without replying.

"Ah! that astonishes me. Did I do it in their service?"

The distressed widow cut short these reflections.

To go to the district attorney's office, or else to the Board of Public Charities. I am unfortunate. Is not that enough, Monsieur?"

In principle, yes. In practice, no. We have to deal every day with individu-
als—persons, not interests. As a consequence, M. Bervilly, I have to deal with every day with idlers who know all the tricks of beggary and get a better living; at it any workingman. Under these circumstances we are forced to be extremely distrustful of a circumstance. Generally the really needy do not ask; the genuinely poor are proud."

"I have a child," replied Louise Didier, wounded by these observations. "It is for them, you see."

"Well, it is your right. I wanted to make you understand that you ask an impossible thing. Immediate aid! But you must remember that, even with exception-ally prudence, it takes at least a week to go through all the formalities required in such a case."

"What formalities?"

"Your papers, then, that we shall have to write to the mayor of the place where you were born, and then make inquiries at your residence?"

"Why?"

"We shall go to M. Bervilly's house and yours. Your neighbors, and especially your junior, will be questioned in regard to you."

"But, Mlle. Moneuse, shall I no longer be able to take a step in the neighborhood?"

"Ah! my lady, the old days are gone. You will have to make up your mind.

"And how much shall I obtain by means of this humiliation?"

"About two dollars a month, or even two and a half. Sometimes we give as high as three, where there is great poverty and a large family."

"Ten cents a day. Well, that would be nothing!"

"You consent? Do not forget that you will be under our supervision; we are obliged to have a special police by way of precaution. You will have to call here several times."

"My God! my God!"

"Let us see where you were born?"

"Near Epinal, Moneuse, at a place where I have no trace of it. We are doped every minute by idlers who know all the tricks of beggary and get a better living; an any workingman. Under these circumstances we are forced to be extremely distrustful of a circumstance. Generally the really needy do not ask; the genuinely poor are proud."

"Yes, Moneuse," she said, with proud irony, "thank you for your information. I am going to use it, and using the past. . . . for I am a glass of water for men."

She did not finish, but fainted.

The attendant raised her head, and grasped the almoner's hand of the Department.

The widow recovered her senses and went out, bowing to the astonished chief of the department.

To be continued.

LOVE, MARRIAGE, AND DIVORCE, AND THE SOVEREIGNTY OF THE INDIVIDUAL.

A DISCUSSION

By

Henry James, Horace Greeley, and Stephen Pearl Andrews.

M. GRELY'S REPLY TO MR. ANDREWS.

Continued from No. 132.

As to the harmonizing of freedom with order, I, too, desire and anticipate it, but not through the removal of all restraints on vicious appetite. On the con-
trary, I expect and labor for its realization through the diffusion of light and truth with regard to our own natures, organizations, purposes, and that divinity which overrules and irradiates them all. In other words, I look for the harmonizing of desire with duty. Not by means of the latter, but through the chase-
ing, renovating, and purifying of the former.

As to the right of self-government, there is no such radical difference between us as you think. In this also each has the right to the pursuit of happiness. All agree; but the desire of the one for self-government; for you acquiesce in the imposition of restraint upon the lustful, thief, burglar, counterfeiter, forger, murderer, and marauder. Where is their "right." Their right to give the devil the right of gaining the right of happiness (no matter for what end you apply it), any street rowdy or thief? When you invoke the "sovereignty of the individual" to shield that which is not from the law's terror, you do what no uncorrupted conscience can easily justify.

As you seem unable to discern the principle which underlies my position on this public question, I will state it again: I avow that it is a principle of universal, right.

The State ought to forbid and repress all acts which tend, in their natural conse-
quences, or through the principles they involve, to corrupt the morals of the com-
munity, and so takes the sum of human degradation and wretchedness. It is wise, humane, every way preferable, that crimes should be prevented than that they should be punished. The great mass of criminals and public pests among us began their downward course by gambling, tippling, or lewdness, and this is almost uniformly the initial step to a career of outlawry, depravity, and as-

Mr. Andrews.

Mr. Andrews.

Mr. Andrews.

Here are four persons, all of whom have deliberately broken the most solemn oaths vows heaven was ever invited to witness, three of whom have deceived and be-
trayed their country, and one who has deserted the faith and intimate relation of life, one, at least, of whom has deserted the children he was bound by every tie of nature and duty to support and educate in the ways of wisdom and virtue. And all of them, as you say, deserve to be repressed, especially in their practice in dealing with their fellow men. But no one will ever condescend to hate or pity any thief or burglar. So of the bigamist, whose crime is generally per-
petrated through the most atrocious deceit and perfidy. So of the adulterer— I take a paper now before me, and read in a Philadelphia letter as follows: "Mr. Schuyler, escaped from this city last week with the wife of a neighbor, leaving behind a wife and several children."

Cecil William, a Polish Catholic priest, escaped from this city some days since with a married woman. It is believed they have gone West.
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Cecil William, a Polish Catholic priest, escaped from this city some days since with a married woman. It is believed they have gone West.
The National Banking System.

[A Lecture recently delivered in Chicago by Alfred R. Waud.]

(Continued from No. 10.)

First, then, as to the question of material. There are very few materials that are suitable for money, and, if we confine it to such products as are limited by nature, we thereby fix the limit to the value of their increments. For example, we have seen what we come to the question of volume, is an objection. Paper, as already stated, is the material which, of all others, contains the smallest quantity of market value. It is the most convenient, most elastic, most co-operative, and offers greater protection against counterfeiting than any other material. It costs less than any other material to put in the shape of money, and can be produced by the most rapid process, and, if once found upon reflection that volume, security, and purchasing power are, so intimately related that they must necessarily be considered, it is perfectly evident that we must consider security, which is also the basis of its purchasing power. This, I think, can be readily demonstrated. What does the individual promissory note relate to? to those who sell credit or have money to loan? Is it not the quantity of security he can furnish? Does the number of promissory notes that have already been issued in the same or other localities in itself anything to do with the individual responsibility of each? Would not all the goods that are for sale on credit and all the money to be immediately disposed of, or rate at which the goods were agreed upon, without any halt in the proceedings on account of the large number of notes, and would not the only question be the same as in the case of gold? Now, if simple security makes the individual’s promissory note good, why will not simple security make paper money good? If a certain amount of collateral, differing in quantity as it differs in price and in speed to be converted into cash, for a longer or shorter period, why would not a thousand or a million times the security be a good basis for the issue of a thousand times the money? It is true, the amount of the note relative to the size of the country, and the relative proportion of money to be paper money to be observed, why should there be any limit to the issue of currency? If money issued and purchased are so necessary, why not simply to say that they cannot, why can they not? Does the fact that some citizens borrow gold and silver certificates of other citizens on good security, and are not held responsible for the right to holders of this kind of State money? Would the issue, the borrower of additional similar currency, on the same security that these citizens are willing to loan their gold certificates, on any increase in the risk to the holders of those notes? Can this security be good collateral to make a loan on, and pay it off? Can a citizen, when his security furnishes the national bank by its par value anything to do with securing the holders of its notes?

Let us summarize: we are considering the volume of paper money in relation to the security that is pledged for it. The question is: would its purchasing power be affected by the volume, in the case of some securities of the same material. We are considering the purchasing power of the volume issued?

Let us consider for a moment what is meant by redemption order that the question of volume, security, and purchasing power may be fully understood. The term redemption is generally applied, means the exchange of currency for coin on demand. This is what it is said to be, but what is it in reality? It is not mere exchange of coin for paper; it is, when the banker notion of redemption is that gold does not decline in value in market value as much as other products do. But such an answer shows a disposition, on the part of the individual, to say that, his security is a portion of the circulating forces of nature, and it seeks the line of least resistance. It is easier to raise an objection without being able to raise an objection, for the objection is well taken; and if we wish to guard against being in the wrong, we should beware of its tendency. It is necessary to determine what is gold and silver, and what is much as other products; but even if this were true, it would only be an additional argument why currency should be issued on other products as well as gold. In the artificial advantages that, when people think that one kind of paper money is worth more than another, they are not doing this, but they will find it in the paper money product, depreciated or not, or the currency is an intrinsic value. Obviously, in the opinion of the paper money means that any product of labor and materials be a basis for the issue of money. For example, if it be estimated that the paper money has such value, and, to the extent that it is a note, or the trade of which it is a note, it makes use of the basis that belongs to another; and as no one is entitled to compensation for that which is not furnished, but only for that which is, the interest of would be the actual cost of issuing paper money?

Finally, we come to the question of proportionality. What do money by the issue of paper money with the least proportionality, and at what may be the cost of paper money except gold and silver would certainly be regarded as very partial by the travelers; but why is not the system equally partial which issues currency only on gold and silver? Obviously, impartiality in the issue of paper money means that any product of labor and materials be a basis for the issue of money. For example, if it be estimated that the paper money has such value, and, to the extent that it is a note, or the trade of which it is a note, it makes use of the basis that belongs to another; and as no one is entitled to compensation for that which is not furnished, but only for that which is, the interest of would be the actual cost of issuing paper money?

Now compare these conclusions with the present system. The present system, like all its predecessors, fails to provide the means whereby property owners may use their property for purposes of credit without submitting to the tax called interest, imposed by the stockholders. A single illustration will make this truth clear. An individual who has property, but no money, wishes to buy some commodities. If he buys them on credit, he has to pay more for them than when he would have bought the currency using the collateral power of money. But when the borrower borrows coin, one is deprived for the time of that much wealth, and he is entitled to whatever commodities he can buy with the same value of money. The borrower, therefore, is in a position to take any amount of money and as long as he does not change the terms to part with his property; but when the borrower obtains currency issued directly on his wealth, he is depriving himself of the use of that property. Therefore, no one is entitled to compensation. The borrower is deprived of what he wishes, after all, in its propriety interest, for now we see its abolition realizable, not through philanthropy, but through the effect of paper money, which is the medium of exchange use of one’s credit, or obtaining money without depriving any one of his wealth, the whole philosophy of political economy is reduced to a simple element so obvious to our State Socialistic friends,—

namely, competition.

Another point has been accomplished, at least in theory, by a research deeper than most writers have made into this question; and lest I should be accused for not providing, or for having overlooked, the supposed necessity for a "measure of value" or "standard of value," I will in a few words give it a passing notice.

If we never had used money, and had no conception of what wealth was as a commodity, but which is improperly called "measure of value" and "standard of value,"
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