On Picket Duty.

All people interested in Ireland's struggle for freedom are not always subscribers to Liberty should subscribe before the next issue, in order not to miss the first instalment of the new and thrilling novel, "Ireland," by Georges Santon, translated from the French original by the present editor.

The rapidly increasing drift toward Anarchism which is setting all classes was very happily evoked on the occasion of a recent address by Henry Appleton in New Haven. To make way for that gentleman the local lyricum, largely made up of Trade Unions and State Socialists, gave a reception to the orator. When Rev. Dr. Newman Smyth, the leading clergyman of the city, heard of it, he expressed the most intense desire to be present, and sent his regrets that ultimately his being obliged to preach a sermon on that Sunday. But his absence prevented his coming, as he had hoped. But in that little hall, among the revolutionists, Nihilists, and out-and-out Anarchists sat Professor Sumner, the distinguished economist of Yale College, and from the time Mr. Appleton entered the first word of his address till the last syllable was pronounced he sat with eyes close riveted upon the speaker, and at times almost rent with laughter Mr. Appleton drew a satirical picture of Mr. Sumner as a President, illustrating how the people of the United States are self-governing. At the close of the lecture, which was a close and unanswerable statement of the logic and method of Anarchism, several arose and declared that the屋子 conversed, and all were carried into a new line of thinking, which is sure to yet bear rich and lasting fruits. That Professor Sumner was at heart in union with Mr. Appleton's thoughts was evident from the intense satisfaction he seemed to take in his pointed and caustic rebuke of governmental supervision and direction. In social and industrial affairs, he was careful to get away before he was drawn out to question the speaker or criticise his views, as Mr. Appleton was hoping he might do. Having met with such success, our friends in New Haven are now about to crystallize into a Liberty Club, conducted on Anarchistic principles. I hope soon to see their good work repeated in other places, for whenever two or three intelligent and persistent Anarchists are gathered, they are sure to soon take the field and engage the best thought about them, with results which the near future will make patent to the blindest of statesmen and their dupes.

In a letter received at this office from Madame Ellen M. Delessote of New York occurs the following sentence: "I see now and then your breezy publication, and read it with great interest and attention, notwithstanding my belief that there can be no harmony in a household where Individualism is the established rule." Then Madame Delessote can conceive of harmony only where Individualism does not prevail,—that is, where individual lives are not crowded, where they are not interfered with, where Individualism prevails. Why, of course! To be sure! How simple! Why did I never see this before? I might have known that the only way to make people pleasant and sweet-tempered and equal in their dispositions and harmonious in their associations is to smooth them and soothe them by taking away their rights. I see now why the lamb gets along so well with the lion, and why men and women in the bodies of men monstrosity never quaver, and why the South feels so pleasantly towards the North, and why Ireland loves England so well, and why the Russian monarchs worship their "dear father," the Czar; in fact, a perfect flood of light has burst upon my vision since Madame Delessote's letter came along. I notice, by the way, that the lad in question had a debate on "Anarchy" last Sunday afternoon in Newark with S. P. Putnam, the opponent of anarchy and Mr. Putnam uploading it. I certainly pity Mr. Putnam. She probably used this argument on him, and, if so, his discomfiture must have been utter. How is it, anyway, that the secretary of the National Liberal League is championing anarchy in his own home, Brother D'Orsay? Is he all right? Are you going to stand that sort of thing? And how do you feel about it, Brother Palmer? Wouldn't a card in the papers be about the right thing at this time, consigning Mr. Putnam to the same limbo where you sent Mr. Mitchell? Anarchy means, among other things, a free love, you know. Or, perhaps you didn't know this. Or, perhaps you know it, but Colonel Ingersoll doesn't. Still, it's liable to show up and out, you know. And if he does, he'll be no more president of years. He'll not associate with free lovers, he won't! You may have to choose between Putnam and Ingersoll. And I advise you to keep Putnam. But, at the same time, I advise Putnam to do you.

LIBERTY.

And, as I look, Life lengthens, joy deepens, Love intensifies, Fear dies. Liberty is God. Heaven is here. (USA.)

0 Freedom, then, thou art perfection.
Sweet source of the brave and the free.
The choice of our hearts' deep inspiration,
We tender devotion to thee:
With reason thy consent forever.
And justice.
Thy kingdom shall be, O never,
No tyrant the power shall o'erwhelm.
CHORUS—Then cheer on the just and the true.
That hearts shall proclaim thee forever,
The queen of the just and the true.

0 Freedom, then, art our salvation.
Our hope and our strength is in thee;
Our joy our sorrow is with thee.
In the thought that our spirits are free:
We have bowed ourselves to the yoke of tyrants;
They have trampled on our hearts;
But now alloting sceptres:
No tyrant shall possess them.
CHORUS—Then cheer on the just and the true.
Three cheers for the just and the true;
Our ocean shall defend thee forever,
Sweet queen of the just and the true.
We have tasted thy soul-stirring waters;
We have breathed in thy life-giving air.
Like a rooster, our own and our daughters
Rise before us, god-like and fair;
All humanity are in that vision:
Like a monser who slips away bare;
Like one who escapes from a prison.
Like a crown and a crown is thy crown.
CHORUS—Then cheer on the just and the true.
Three cheers for the just and the true;
Our ocean shall defend thee forever,
The queen of the just and the true.
J. R. Lloyd.

Unpleasant Facts for Herr Most.

To the Editor of Liberty:

It gives me great pleasure to be able to communicate to your readers a fact, which, I am sure, will be of interest to all thoughtful and intelligent working men of New Haven. It was on a short time ago that I visited New Haven, and tried to induce some to read the new and thrilling novel, "Ireland," by Georges Santon, translated from the French original by the present editor.

The Germania is mostly Communists of the Most type, and the English element in New Haven. Now, the latter have organized an Equal Rights Debating Club for the purpose of hearing all sides. They have about forty or fifty members. They meet every Sunday and invite speakers of different classes and shades of opinion. Professors, clergymen, labor reformers, State Socialists, positivists, Communists, etc., are asked to speak, and discussed social questions. But, as is easy to conjecture, little good ever came out of it. Had we had among us readers of Liberty, men who could speak English fluently, there, we have been many a lively engagement between us. However, our friends have done what they could.

Last week they had the infinite delight and pleasure of becoming personally acquainted with Mr. D. D. Lam. He was their guest for nearly a week. They took him to the meeting of the club, and he was invited to speak. He stirred them up mightily. He made a good speech on "Evolution and Revolution," and gave them a chance to hear some sound, logical, and philosophical ideas on socialism for the first time in their lives. Perhaps you may well imagine what a storm he raised. He was extremely witty and happy in his answers to the many questions that were offered from all sides. He went away, but his influence is not likely to be forgotten. When the next Sunday we carried six copies of Liberty there, they were all gone in a moment. We could have sold at least fifteen copies more. You should have seen, Mr. Tucker, what they had to say about you, your paper, Anarchy, and Mr. Lam. We only smiled, and sought our way to the next place, where we could strike hits while we were hot. When we told them about our proposed meeting with Henry Appleton as the speaker, they unanimously voted to invite him to come from Providence. We addressed them on anarchy on Sunday next. I hope he will come. Be sure that this is only the beginning of the end. Of the fifty constant visitors more than half declared that the club will live after the Anarchists. We will work with a will, and, with the aid of able Anarchistic thinkers and speakers whom we will invite from time to time, we are confident that you will have new admirers and readers added to your list every day.

Mr. Most is dissatisfied with the state of things in New Haven. The State Society also, has reason to be pleased about it. What a triumph for Liberty! No sincere and thinking person can live long in the atmosphere of State socialism and Common-wealth influence when the light of Liberty has once dawned upon him.

Yours enthusiastically,

W. S. YARGEON.
Post 806, Birmingham, Conn., October 15, 1885.

Vigorous Perhaps, Veracious Surely.


As a humorist and writer of romance, our highly esteemed but vigorous friend Tucker, of Liberty, is an immense success. The little, piece concerning some of the people at the Aljyn Convention is positively charming in its airiness and in its offhand manner of misinforming the reader. Mr. Tucker should write a tale.

Wealth and Law Conspirators.

The rich devil every means by which they may in the first place secure to themselves what they have amassed by wrong, then take to their own use and profit, at the lowest possible price, the work and labor of the poor. And as soon as the rich decide on adopting these devices in the name of the people, then they become law.
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A LETTER TO GROVER CLEVELAND.
On His False, Absurd, Self-Contradictory, and Ridiculous Inaugural Address.
BY LYSDNER SPONER.
[The author reserves his copyright in this letter.]

SECTION XI.

But, in spite of all I have said, or, perhaps, can say, you will probably persist in your belief that the world needs a great deal of lawmaking; that mankind in general are a race of cramps, judges, and consciences, and that, if not very wicked, they are at least very ignorant and stupid; that they know very little of what is for their own good, or how to promote their own “interests,” unless they are forced to it by an absolute and irresponsible dominion over the less favored of their kind; must prescribe to the latter, in every way, and use them or do, and shall generally, manage the affairs of this world according to their discretion, free of all accountability to any human tribunal.

You are of course perfectly confident that, under this absolute and irresponsible dominion of the lawmakers, the affairs of this world will be rightly managed; that the “interests,” “welfare,” and “prosperity” of a great and free people will be properly attended to, and that “the greatest good of the greatest number” will be accomplished, etc., etc.

And yet you hold that all this lawmaking, and all this subjection of the great body of mankind to the arbitrary, irresponsible dominion of the lawmakers, will not interfere at all with “our liberty,” if only “every citizen” will but keep a “vigilant eye” on the lawmakers.

Well, perhaps it is all so; although this subjection to the arbitrary will of any man, or body of men, whatever, and under any pretence whatever, seems, on the face of it, to be incompatible with what is called “liberty.”

If, therefore, you really intend to continue this system of lawmaking, it seems inexcusable that you should explain to us what you mean by the term “our liberty.”

So far as your address gives us any light on the subject, you evidently mean, by the term “our liberty,” just such, and only such, “liberty,” as the lawmakers may choose to grant.

You seem to have no conception of any other “liberty” whatever.

And you may be arbitrarily taken from him by other men, of them may be taken by the lawmakers, or by the lawmakers, in every way, and under any pretence whatever, without the consent of the person of property or of B, his own property may rightfully be taken to any extent that is necessary; to make reparations for the wrong he has done to others, and to be an acknowledgment of his right to sell his own liberty.

This is the only qualification to which the natural right of property is subject.

When, therefore, a government takes a man’s property, without his consent, it is a denial of his right of property; and it is the right of property, which is absolutely subject to any thing that is naturally a subject of property, that is, of ownership.

It is a right against all the world.

And this right of property—this property of property—is absolute, and is naturally a subject of ownership—subject only to this qualification, etc., that each man must use so his own, as not to injure another.

If A uses his own property so as to injure the person or property of B, his own property may rightfully be taken to any extent that is necessary; to make reparations for the wrong he has done to others, and to be an acknowledgment of his right to sell his own liberty.

This is the only qualification to which the natural right of property is subject.

When, therefore, a government takes a man’s property, without his consent, it is a denial of his right of property; and it is the right of property, which is absolutely subject to any thing that is naturally a subject of property, that is, of ownership.

It is a right against all the world.

And this right of property—this property of property—is absolute, and is naturally a subject of ownership—subject only to this qualification, etc., that each man must use so his own, as not to injure another.

If A uses his own property so as to injure the person or property of B, his own property may rightfully be taken to any extent that is necessary; to make reparations for the wrong he has done to others, and to be an acknowledgment of his right to sell his own liberty.

This is the only qualification to which the natural right of property is subject.

When, therefore, a government takes a man’s property, without his consent, it is a denial of his right of property; and it is the right of property, which is absolutely subject to any thing that is naturally a subject of property, that is, of ownership.

It is a right against all the world.

And this right of property—this property of property—is absolute, and is naturally a subject of ownership—subject only to this qualification, etc., that each man must use so his own, as not to injure another.

If A uses his own property so as to injure the person or property of B, his own property may rightfully be taken to any extent that is necessary; to make reparations for the wrong he has done to others, and to be an acknowledgment of his right to sell his own liberty.

This is the only qualification to which the natural right of property is subject.
and cultivating it, without the consent of the government, than it is to punish him for breathing the atmosphere of the sunshine, without a special grant from the government.

In thus asserting the government's right of property in wilderness land, and in denying men's right to take possession of and cultivate it, except on first obtaining a grant from the government—which grant the government may withhold if it pleases—the government's right of ownership of the natural riches of the planet, by denying their natural right to the means that are indispensable to their procuring the food that is necessary for supporting life.

In this denial of men's natural right to take possession of and cultivate wilderness land is not altered at all by the fact that the government consents to sell as much land as it thinks proper to sell for so much that by the fact that, in certain cases, it gives outright certain lands to certain persons. Notwithstanding these sales and gifts, the fact remains that the government claims the original ownership of the lands; and the people are left without taking possession and cultivate them. In denying this natural right of individuals, it denies their natural right to live in the open air, and asserts that they have no other right to life than the government, by its own mere will, pleasure, and discretion, may see fit to grant them.

In denying man's natural right to life, it is of course denies every other natural right of human beings; and asserts that they have no natural right to anything; but that, for all other things, as well as for life itself, they must depend wholly upon the good pleasure and discretion of the government.

WHAT'S TO BE DONE?
A ROMANCE.
By N. G. TCHERNYCHYWSKI,
Translated by Henri K. Tucker.
(From No. 47.

Ah! there it is again the see that is in with herself that she is discontented, but why? She was too proud for that.

"What? Is this the past that she is discontented? That was the case at first, but now she notices that this discontent has vanished. How strange a character this feeling is!

As if it were not her, Vera Pavlovna Kirsanoff, who felt this discontent, but as if it were the discontent of thousands and millions of human beings reflected in her. In fact, if she had read and thought as she used to when she was about 16, it is probable that this feeling would not have shown itself so soon; but now, with the development that is thought of as the dawning of him in the midst of those other thoughts. That aids her much in determining the cause of her feeling. He has not been able to find the solution of the enigma: this feeling, obscure to her, is still more obscure to him. He wishes to understand how one can feel discontent without this discontent referring to something outside himself. This is a singularity a hundreds times more obscure to him than to her. Nevertheless she feels much aided by the fact that she thinks always of her husband, that she is always with him, observes him, and thinks with him. She has noticed that, when the feeling of discontent comes, it is always followed by a comparison (it is even contained in this comparison) between herself and her husband, and her thought is illuminated by the right word: "A difference, an offensive difference." Now all is clear to her.

VI.
How agreeable N. N. is, is Sacha! [The name spoken by Vera Pavlovna was that of the officer through whom she had desired to make the acquaintance of Tamberlik in her terrible dream.] He has brought me a new poem, which is not to be printed for a long time, but the author, an unknown author, has told me that he has the privilege of seeing three years before its publication.

"But do you know the lines which most impress me?" said Vera Pavlovna; for she had seen several times read passages from this poem. "It is even different from the lines which do not belong in the principal passages, but they impress me exceedingly. When Katia* was awaiting the return of her lover, she grieved much.

"And Katia is the dialectic of Kaletina."

*Katia is the dialectic of Kaletina.

Translation: Becoming would have been consumed by sorrow if it had had time to seize it. These lines are only the finest of the piece in the poem, but these lines do not occupy a prominent place. You find them so beautiful because they accord so closely with nature's laws, and you think that they are Katia's thoughts that are these two lines.

"Yes, this picture is one of the finest in the poem, but these lines do not occupy a prominent place. You find them so beautiful because they accord so closely with nature's laws, and you think that they are Katia's thoughts that are these two lines.

"These, Sacha. We have often said that it is probable that woman's organization, even if it is not, is a very different thing from man's, and that it is probable, therefore, that instinctually man will be thrown back by those who have left the earth and have no influences, whereas woman's organization is a very different thing from man's. Moreover, you rest this opinion on various anatomical and physiological details."

"Yes, well you treat men, Vronstik ! Fortunately, the time that you foresee is still far off. Otherwise I should quickly change my opinion to avoid being relegated back to a second place. For that matter, it is only probability: science has not yet observed the facts enough to be sure."

"But, dear friend, have we not also asked ourselves why the facts of history are not yet observed? Because we have not observed them, either."

"The reign of women is played by a minor part in intellectual life. The reign of women is already of course a thing of the past, but in the reign of women—here you see the difference—the reign of women is even greater than that of men. Moreover, you rest this opinion on various anatomical and physiological details."

"This is a question of the difference in native intellectual powers. Yes, woman's organization is more effective in its resistance to the destructive forces—climate, intense weather, insufficient food, illness; man, on the contrary, has many more qualities than woman."

"The fact that woman's manner of life is generally even less healthy than man's makes this all the more true."

"There is another convincingly considered woman by physiology. Woman's growth may be said to end at the age of twenty, and man's at the age of twenty-five. In these ages are approximately created the most differences. Admitting that out of a given number there are as many women who live to the age of woman sixty and as many men who attain the age of sixty, if we take into consideration the difference in the periods of development, the reproduction ability in the female organism becomes even more evident than the statisticians suppose, as the period of instruction. Seventy years is twenty times three and six-tenths; sixty-five years is twenty-five times two and six-tenths. Therefore woman's life is three and one-half times as long as that of man. In half of his being killed by disease. Seventy years is seventy and six-tenths as long as the period of his development, which is a little slower. Now, the reproductive strength of the animal organisms should be measured by this standard."

"The difference is greater than my readings had led me to believe."

"But, Sir, I say you; and the thought now strikes me still more forcibly—that, if the feminine organism is better fitted to resist destructive forces, it is probable that woman could endure moral shocks with the greater ease and firmness."

"Yes, it is probable. But it is only a supposition. It is true, nevertheless, that your conclusion is derived from indisputable facts. The vigor of the organism is very intimately connected with the vigor of the reproduction of the nerves are probably more elastic and more solid texture, and, if that is the case, they may, and should, live longer than men.

"In actual life we have too many examples of the contrary. Woman is very often tormented by things that man endures easily. Not much effort has been made to analyze death of woman show the opposite of what we are justified in expecting from the most constitution of the organism. But one of these causes is plain: it governs all historical events, and all the difficulties of life, is the force of bias, a bad habit, a false expectation, a false idea. If a person says to himself, 'I can do nothing,' he finds himself unable to do anything. Now, women have all the more right to say this, but there is one thing that the male temperament and purposes are weak. You know instances where men really in good health have been made to die by their own hands, and then it is easier to die from the single thought that they were going to die, and that there are more men than this in the course of great masses of people, entire humanity. One of the most remarkable is furnished by woman."

"Sacha, we are weak because we consider ourselves so. But it seems to me that we still another cause, I have two in mind. Does it not seem to you that I changed a great deal, that there is something in you?"

"Yes, you grew very thin and pale."

"And, perhaps, this is precisely what is making me proud when I remember that no one noticed that you were growing thin or pale, though you suffered and struggled and suffered with reasonable ease, because I had not much time to think about them. During the time that I devoted to my work, I suffered horribly, but my Urgent daily

Continued on page 6.

*Vronstik is the diminutive of Vronstik."

Continued on page 6.
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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 blinded or driven by oppression, nor deprived by consensus of his senses."-PRODROMOU.

"In the next number of Liberty will be the beginning of a new and thrilling romance, entitled:"

IRLAND,
translated especially for this journal from the French of the great novelist,

Georges Sandton.

The author weaves into a drama of unusual polymathy and moral intensity the story of one of the heroic struggles of the sons of Erin to lift the occursed yoke of the English,-the English who have stolen their lands, burned such cities as reside too vigorously, exterminated entire and inoffensive populations, and established as an axiom this monstrousity:

IT IS NOT A PENALY TO KILL AN IRISHMAN.

He also gives the bloody history of the repression of this noble attempt at deliverance, terrible, frightful, cowardly repression, by exile, "tarnishment," and execution without trial.

He lifts the curtain to the legitimate pinnacle of glory, and puts the conspirators in the pillory of shame.

Every Irishman and every lover of freedom should read this story.

Tu-wit! Tu-who!

To the Editor of Liberty:

Will you give dir: and explicit answers to the following question现已?

I certainly will, wherein the questions are direct and explicit.

Does the government recognize the right of one individual or any number of individuals to determine what is the action of one is just or unjust for others?

Yes, if the word unjust is meant invasive; otherwise, no. Anarchists recognize the right of one individual or any number of individuals to determine in what manner any one or a number of individuals shall invade the equal liberty of his fellow; beyond this it recognizes no right of control over individuals.

Does it recognize the right to restrain or control their actions, whatever they may be?

See previous answer.

Does it recognize the right to arrest, try, convict, and punish for wrong doing?

Yes, if the words wrong doing is meant invasion; otherwise, no.

Does it believe in jury trial?

Such a question is neither belies nor disbelieves in jury trial; it is a matter of expediency. For myself, I am inclined to favor it.

If so, how is the jury to be selected?

Another matter of expediency. Speaking for myself again, I think the jury should be selected by drawing twelve names from a wheel containing the names of all the citizens in the community,—jury service, of course, not to be compulsory, though it may rightfully be made, if it should seem best, a condition of membership in a voluntary association.

Does it propose prisons, or other places of confinement, for such as prove nuisances?

Another matter of expediency. If it can find no better instrument of restraint to invasion, Anarchists will use prisons.

Does it propose to taxation to support the tribunes of justice, and these places of confinement and restraint?

Anarchists propose to deprive no individual of his property, or any portion of it, without his consent, unless the individual in which the property is to be taken back will take enough of his property from him to repair the damage done by his invasion. Contribution to the support of certain things may, like jury service, rightfully be made a condition of membership in a voluntary association.

How is justice to be determined in a given case?

This question not being explicit, I cannot answer it explicitly. I only say that justice is to be determined on the principle of the equality of all, and by such mechanism as may prove best fitted to secure its object.

Will Anarchists wait till all who know anything about it are agreed?

This question is grammatically defective. It is not clear what "it" refers to. It may refer to justice in the previous question, or it may refer to Anarchism, and it may refer to some conclusion hidden in the present question, or in the word of the writer's brain. At a venture I will make this assertion, hoping it may hit the mark. When Anarchists are agreed in numbers sufficient to enable them to accomplish whatever policy work lies before them, they will probably go about it.

Will they take the majority rule? Or will they sustain a small fraction in their findings?

Inasmuch as Anarchistic associations recognize the right of secession, they may utilize the ballot, if they see fit to do so. If the question decided by ballot is so vital that the minority thinks it important to carry out its own views than to preserve common action, the minority can withdraw. In no case can a majority, however small, be governed against its consent.

Does Anarchists mean the observance and enforcement of natural law, so far as can be discovered, or does it mean the opposite or something else?

Anarchists mean exactly the observance and enforcement of the natural law of Liberty, and it does not mean the opposite or anything else.

If it means that all such as do not conform to the natural law, as understood by the mass, shall be made to suffer, to rough the natural authority, no matter what name it goes, it is human government as really as anything we now have.

Anarchists mean nothing about "natural law as understood by the mass." It means the observance and enforcement by each individual of the natural law of Liberty as understood by him-himself. When a number of individuals who understand this natural law to mean the equal liberty of all organize on a voluntary basis to resist the invasion of this liberty, they form a very different thing from any human government we now have. They do not form a government at all; they organize a rebellion against government. For government is invasion, whatever special label it is given, to invasion is the antithesis of government. All the organized governments of today are such because they are invasive. In the first place, all their acts are invasive; they either invade the individual incomes called taxation; and, in the second place, by far the greater number of this acts are directly invasive, because directed, not to the restraint of invaders, but to the denial of freedom to the people in general, industrial, political, and social, and individual lives. No man with brains in his head can honestly say that such institutions are identical in their nature with voluntary associations assisted by voluntary contributions, which confine themselves to resisting invasion.

If it means that the "undeveloped and vicious shall not be interfered with, it means that the world shall suffer all the disorder and crime that our present unhindered can consummate.

GRAVEMAN FLORIDA.

I hope that my readers will take in Mr. Blodgett's final assertion in all its length and breadth and depth.

Just see what it says. It says that penal institutions are the only promoters of virtue. Education goes for mere good of the good; punishment goes for nothing; social ostracism goes for nothing; freedom goes for nothing; competition goes for nothing; increase of material welfare goes for nothing; decrease of temptation goes for nothing; health goes for nothing; and if the only promotion of all these goes for nothing: all these are utterly powerless as preservatives or curatives of immorality. The only forces on earth that tend to develop the undeveloped and to make the vicious virtuous are our judges, our jails, and our giblets. Mr. Blodgett, I believe, repudiates the Christian doctrine that he is the only safeguard of religious morality, but he re-creates it by affirming that all a hell upon earth is the only safeguard of natural morality.

Is there anything wrong with him so persistently disregard the constructive side of Anarchism? The chief claim of Anarchism for its principles is the abolition of legal monopoly will so transform social conditions that in justice, vice, and crime will gradually disappear. However often this may be stated and however definitely it may be elaborated, the Blodgett will approach you, apparently gravely unconscious that any remark has been made, and say: if there are any criminals classes will run riot.' Tell them that, when the system of commercial cannibalism which rests on legal privilege disappears, outlaws will disappear with it, and they will not deny it or attempt to disguise it, but will view with a blank eye their own condition as an enviable, and then from out their mouths will come the old, familiar hoot: "Tu-wit! tu-who! If a ruffian tries to cut your throat, what are you going to do about it? Tu-wit! tu-who!"

Political Liberalism.

As regards the one vital issue of Liberty Individ- Sovereignty, history has been overlastingly repeating itself, and yet no considerable body of reformers seem as yet to have profited by the lesson.

The rise and progress of the thousand reform moves that have developed in the world is essentially the same. Each begins with a few scattered justice-loving and liberty-loving individuals. In its weakness, ilklepeute, and poverty of resources it opens wide its humble doors to all who love justice and fair play and bids all a hearty welcome to its platform. Soon becomes a moral force and swells its ranks.

But sooner or later the clever-footed beast of politics creeps in. It organizes. Committees, caucuses, and votes are introduced. Finally, it is a creed, a platform, or some other machine of propaganda, binding on others without their consent. Then exclusiveness is engendered, ruling cliques spring up, and the ultimate result is that the same bigotry, narrowness, ostracism, exclusion against which it pretends to stand as a protest. The whole thing finally sums itself up into the fact that human nature remains just what it was before, with the added hypocrisy universally engendered by all collectivist machines. You cannot make a quart pot fill a bushel measure, though you magnify it by the artificial glass of creed; and a little narrow ten-per-cent. soul, "perfecting the organization of lib- erty" by political methods, is engendered in not a spirit less contemptible work than are the hierarchies of the Roman church.

I was silly enough to help start the "Free Religious" movement in my town some years ago. "Come," said a few isolated men and women, "let us start a liberal platform, free to all,—Jew, Gentile, Christiant, and infidel." We started it, but soon the deadly spirit of politics sneaked in and took the business in tow towards despotism. A ruling clique of wealthy and respectable moralists, Courtlandt Palmer and order soon straddled it, and turned their "us" over free-lovers, Anarchists, and such others as had religious issues on hand which met the censure of the Pharisees, &c. Thus the church was finally as exclusive as the churches. Its salaried priest dressed in solemn ecclesiastical black, prates piously from a manuscript every Sunday about the shadowy nonentities of "ethical culture," and, after taking on the title
of "Rev.," has slyly asked the legislature to empower him to join couples in holy wedlock.

The glory of the Spirituists was for a long time the persistent individualization of their movement, but this spirit has fallen. To-day there are but two despicable ways of politics. Their temple, lately dedicated in Boston, smells ominously of ecclesiasticalism, and is said to be under the domination of a wealthy and exclusive ring. Whether the old spirit of individualism will ever return depends on the deified hierarchical order substituted remains to be seen.

From present indications, however, Spiritism seems to be partially captured by the same old demoll of politics that has throttled all the o. t. x. new movements.

The so-called Freethinkers, who lately held their yearly congress in Albany, are another pitiable example of the inevitable doom of all attempts to organize illogical fanaticism. A Freethinker, as weak as a newborn babe, was as apparent at Albany as though it had been a meeting of regular politicians, and the treatment of Boss Wakeman and Boss Palmer towards E. H. Heywood, Jesse Titon, and Seward Mitchell makes it evident to any honest person that their liberalism is only skin-deep.
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WHAT'S TO BE DONE?

Continued from page 2.

duties forced me to forget them the greater part of the time. I had to prepare my lessons and attend to my patients. In spite of myself I rested during that time from my bitter thoughts. On the rare days when I had leisure, I felt my stomach more aglow than usual. If I had abandoned myself for a week to my thoughts, I should have gone mad.

"That's it, exactly. Of late I have seen that the origin of the difference between us is very clear. I don't think much of your mind or your feelings, even. But I am not going to neglect or postpone, and one is incomparably safer against sorrow."

"But I had a great deal of evil feeling, and many duties to be sure, but I was not obliged to attend to them, and often, when my sadness was too strong, I neglected them to abandon myself to my thoughts."

"I think it's a great mistake. If you reflect on it, you'll see that it's least important. As soon as your feelings get firm possession of them, these drive all petty cares out of the mind. And there are these: more important; but I can neglect them when I like, and work is not interesting. I judge it only much more interesting, I choose my mind wanders during the lesson, no great harm is done. And again: do I live by my lessons? Is my position dependent on them? No, my main support is nothing but my work. It comes from you, but the money you're hot to flatten yourself of that I am independent, and are by no means useless. But then I get along without them, I was in order to drive away the thoughts which were tormenting me, to buy myself in the shop more than usual. I did but it only an effort of the will. I understood, though there was no one in the shop was necessary one for an hour or an hour and a half, and that, if I stayed longer, I was tiring myself down to a fatigue which, though certainly useful, was not at all indispensable. And then, even if I don't always attend to your dictation, even when I am, I always so much difficulty. The Rakhmetovs are another sort of people: they are so much concerned about the welfare that to work for public ends is a necessity to them, so much all the basic activities of private life. But we do not scale these; our activities are not Rachmetovs, and our private life is the only thing, perhaps, is that we are poor and our personal, urgent occupation of our life depends; such an occupation, considering my feelings and condition, would weigh more with me than all the impulses of passion; it alone could serve to support, to help. But in a way passion is controlled. Let me rest. I want such an occupation."

"You are right, my friend," said Krasnov, warmly, kissing his wife, whose eyes were filled with tears. "I think that it has not occurred to me before, when I have not been so simple; I did not even notice it! Yes, Verochka, no one can reproach you for this. If you wish to be beloved, you can be comfortable, think of yourself; no one can take your place. To love as I love, and not to have understood all this before you explained it to me! But, he continued, laughing and still kissing his wife, how ridiculous is this notion now? Are you becoming amorous inclined toward any one?"

Vera Plevnina began to laugh heartily, and for some minutes had laughter prevent her from speaking.

"Yes, we can laugh at that now," she said, after: "both of us can now be sure that nothing of the kind will ever happen to either of us. But seriously, do you know that I am thinking about now? Though my love for Dmitry was not the love of a completely developed woman, neither did he love me in one way in which we understand love. His feeling for me was a mixture of strong friendship, a fire of fiery passion, a fire of amusement. He had a great friendship for me, but his amorous transports needed but a woman for their satisfaction, not me personally. No, that was not the topic. I can understand my own thoughts! No, no more than I did about him. There was no real love between us."

"You are unkind to him, Verochka."

"No, it is not so. Between us it is useless to praise him. We both knew very well in what high esteem we held him; it is vain for him to say that it would only have been easy to separate from him; it is not so; you and I are not strengthened by your passion. Yet, however sincere his words and yours, they must not be understood or construed literally."

"It is the friend, I understand how much you suffered. And this is how I understand it."

"I don't understand."

"Verochka, you stifle me. Confess that, besides the force of sentiment, you also wanted to detach me from your muscular force. How strong you are, indeed! But how could you be otherwise with such a chest?"

"My dear Sasha!"

VIII.

But you did not let me talk business, Sasha," began Vera Plevnina, when, two hours later, they sat down to dinner.

"I did not let you talk? Was it my fault?"

"Certainly.

"Who began the indulgence?"

"Are you not ashamed to say that?"

"What?

"You began the indulgence. Fie! The idea of twice compromising a modest woman on the plea of coldness!"

"Indeed! Do you not preach equality? Why not equality of initiative as well?"

"Ha, ha, ha is fine argument! But would you dare to accuse me of being illogical? Do I not try to maintain equality in initiative also? I take now the liberty of continuing our serious conversation, which we have too forgotten."

"Take it, if you will, but I refuse to follow you, and I take the initiative of continuing to forget what you have said."

"But we must finish our talk, Sasha."

"We shall have time enough tomorrow. Now, you see, I am absorbed in an analysis of this hand."

IX.

"Sasha, let us finish our conversation of yesterday. We must do so, because I am getting really to go with you, and you must know why," said Vera Plevnina the next morning.

"You are coming with me?"

"Certainly. You asked me, Sacha, why I wanted an occupation upon which my life and strength, which I have not been to me, which I was to be as engaging as yours, and which should require as much attention as yours requires. I want this occupation, my dear friend, because I am very proud. I think that during my days of trial my feelings became as visible in my person as that other person who could analyze them, I am thoroughly ashamed. I do not speak of my sufferings. You had to struggle and suffer no less than I, and you triumphed. But that was different. In the end, it is all in everything. And I have found the way: I have thought a great deal since we left each other yesterday, and I have found it all along; you were unwilling to add me with your burden to your virtue for you. It is too late now. Yes, Sacha, you may be very anxious about me, my dear friend, but how happy we shall be if I prove capable of success in what I undertook."

Vera Plevnina had just thought of an occupation which, under Krasnov's guidance and her hand, she could engage in successfully.

When she had heard her husband had not hindered her at all; on the contrary, she was sure of finding support from him in all serious matters. But it was only under serious circumstances that he was as devoted to her as she was to herself. He had been alone since he had delivered her from her oppressive situation, he had sacrificed all his scientific dreams and exposed himself to the sufferings of human life. Yes, when he had sent her out to her own fate, he was afraid that it was wanting. Vera Plevnina, for instance, organized her shop; if, in any way whatever, his aid had been indispensable, Lopukhoff would have given it with pleasure. But why did he actually give almost no aid at all? He stood in the way of nothing; he approved what was done and rejoiced at it. But he had his own life as she had hers. Now it is the same. Krasnov does not wait for his wife to ask him to participate in any business. He is interested in everything that is dear to her as she is in everything that relates to him.

From this new life Vera Plevnina derived new strength, and what formerly made her gloomy, she now loved to have the realms of the ideal now appears entirely within reach.

As for her thoughts, this is the order in which they came to her: To be continued.

THEN AND NOW.

XXII.

CONTENTMENT AND AMBITION.

Boston, October 24, 1865.

My Dear Louise:

In course of conversation with Mr. De Dernoi recently, I remarked that I presumed contentment to be an essential element of happiness; as, indeed, it was entirely innocent in my affections, and had no idea of the storm that it would raise.

"Contentment? the thing that poops and fogs sight for; the thing that the rich and powerful wanted for the poor and weak? It was ambition—the opposite to contentment—that first brought organized life from inorganic protoplasms. It is ambition that has killed all development, that deadened and killed all men. I can tell you what it will be, except that it can never be contentment.

"Ambition is a tool. It is the hands of a few men, it makes all others slaves to them; put in the hands of all men, it gives plenty and happiness to all, and makes humanity constantly greater and grander."

"Contentment is not a desire of a department, a state, to rule monopolies, to become a millionaire,—it is a desire to improve, to advance, to move more and suffer less. Could there be more grandeur? Could there be more happiness?"

"Contentment ate its crust and drank its water while Gould and Vanderbilt piled up millions and ate and drank the best the world afforded."

"There is no place for contentment under Anarchy. It is a mould that the sunshine has killed. There are no germs of the unholy fungus left."

"There is but one thing with which we are content, and that is Anarchy. If that were not progressive in proportion to our ambitions, we should not be content with it.

"If this is true that Mr. De Dernoi says,—that there is no contentment under Anarchy, is it true that Anarchy is progressive, that it is contentment for the people of the world? And still he says they are happy, and I confess myself that they appear so. Can it be that in 1880 did not know the true meaning of happiness? Or is happiness, like most other things, a progressive state, whose fullest development may never be reached, yet whose influence may constantly be brighter?"

I will leave it for you to decide.

Josephine.
Mr. Spencer and Socialism.

The following are copious extracts from an essay which I wish I had room to print in full, written by Elizabeth B. Kelly for the "Contemporary Review" in answer to the series of articles printed in that magazine from the pen of Herbert Spencer and social rephrased in a volume entitled, "The Man and His Book," which I add to the essay was rejected by the "Contemporary.

A lie that is all lie is may be met and fought with outright, but a lie that built itself a habit and is a lover to spay,

That certain truths, when isolated, separatized from the other truths with which they form a coherent whole, may amount possibly to a second falsehood to which Mr. Herbert Spencer has taught us to believe. Not satisfied with a complete theoretic demonstration, and numerous illustrations cited from the material world, the philosopher appears to be resolved in forcing the truth upon us by the examples furnished in his own recent writings. That the series of articles by him, recently published in the "Contemporary Review," consists in the assertion of partit truths, forcibly wrenched from the natural relationship, a short examination will, I think, enable us to see.

In the first place, Mr. Spencer says that the "miseries of the poor are thought of as the miseries of the deserving poor, instead of as the miseries of the undeserving poor." So conservative a politician as John Stuart Mill has admitted, no, no, no, no, no, no, no, that no one that would be disappointed if he could imagine that in modern society the rewards are proportioned to the work, and that even those persons, common sense, "guilty" whose "guilt" with perhaps a trace of justice said to be due to their own fate, have done and do more work than those who enjoy the fruits of work, would imagine that we should insist upon the fact that poverty and misery are proportioned to the laziness of the individual. The ordinary mental, on becoming a great many more than a day, as they, as the business, and with good reason called, "long hour," or, completely false to the conclusion that man's work be worse, the smaller the measures, the worse his wages are.

Mr. Spencer is surprised at the number of laborers that stand from ten to fifteen hours and that are paid for the whole time. He says: "This is my fear, and if I am to be paid for it, and at once decide that these men are good for nothing, who never worked, and who do not work at all. I know something about work, that I am fully aware if they would only go out, as I mean, and the fact is, they are, and admitting that they are, are any worse than the tithed and honorable laborers who live in the same town. It is a small matter to Mr. Spencer that these men are in the streets; the life in the streets is not what you imagine it to be, and the man that is saved but be he saved! Mr. James Greencreed on this subject, who cannot be accused of "timid sentimentalism;": "To a man who has to drudge and struggle for his daily bread, the only contrast of life is the one between the lowly and the higher classes, and he is too often raised (faul) to the humble. He may be raised, and he may be raised, on account of the king, for the Church knows how to select, because an honest man of the most intellectual capacity must be seen in order to the man is in society. Is it with the slaves of today, black and white (for, as Carlyle once truly remarked, the only difference between the northern and the southern slave was in the difference of time for which they were sold). In the near future men will be able to take Mr. Spencer, "the philosopher" of the nineteenth century, could have allowed his devotion to the bourgeois to go so close his soul that would be a greater benefit (that was for the slave, and I mean, the same slave that was for the slave) as to come to him that the rich supported the poor. How do they do it? By standing by and seeing the rich, and sensible to all the pain and the suffering of the workers, and to make it to workers just sufficient to keep them in working order, in many cases not even as much as that; and, if sometimes the wages of labor are thrown away, if they are thrown away, but not to the extent that the children of the "unworthy" at the expense of those of the "worthy."..."

Being a follower neither of Mr. George nor of Mr. Hyndman, I do not think it necessary to take up arms in the defense of any of the old ideas that they have been attacked by Spencer are those who have taken the second. Spencer himself has been questioned, and from a laborer's standpoint it is possible to take for what it was originally a wrong to grow into a right. At what rate per annum do valid claims become valid? The only question that Mr. Spencer's "Contemporary" is, has any amount of time it make right? Has Mr. Spencer discovered the rate? Even with the fleeting morality of the old institutions (as, for instance, that a man and the handworking class, noble and bourgeois, we have not been "enrolled" by any means the extent to which the working- man's children have been enslaved by the capitalist class, and in the most degrading blanch on them. It is a pity that some people of many duties, and that is the case in which the capitalistic claims have to claim to cover expenses, i.e., what pays entirely for the time and labor expended in superintending, directing, etc., which labor is paid at a much higher price than the slave workers, but still the latter are not a few. What is the working-man in every civilized country is a slave. According to tables compiled by Carroll D. Wright of Massachusetts, and according to figures of the United States government, the working-man in three-fifths of his time for the capitalist and two-fifths for himself, for, according to the capitalists' own showing, there is nothing on which they claim this two-fifths of the workman's time, and food (for which they have taken the wrong way), and drink (for which they have taken the wrong way), and the rent the tenant pays them for the occupation (7) practiced in their youth. Admitting the justice of this interest (which we do not, as it is below the level of the laborer's duties, with the same respect with which they claim anything further, except that "brute force") which Mr. Spencer objects so much to having the working-man in his position. Spencer, in his note to the farmers and the handworking class, noble and bourgeois, we have not been "enrolled" by any means the extent to which the working- man's children have been enslaved by the capitalist class, and in the most degrading case, and with the answer to the question of what they are not a few. What is the working-man in every civilized country is a slave. According to tables compiled by Carroll D. Wright of Massachusetts, and according to figures of the United States government, the working-man in three-fifths of his time for the capitalist and two-fifths for himself, for, according to the capitalists' own showing, there is nothing on which they claim this two-fifths of the workman's time, and food (for which they have taken the wrong way), and drink (for which they have taken the wrong way), and the rent the tenant pays them for the occupation (7) practiced in their youth. Admitting the justice of this interest (which we do not, as it is below the level of the laborer's duties, with the same respect with which they claim anything further, except that "brute force") which Mr. Spencer objects so much to having the working-man in his position. Spencer, in his note to the farmers and the handworking class, noble and bourgeois, we have not been "enrolled" by any means the extent to which the working-
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