



"The diseases of society can, no more than corporeal maladies, be prevented or cured without being spoken about in plain language."—JOHN STUART MILL.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, MAY 30, 1874.

IS ORGANIZATION DESPOTISM?

There is a class of honest reformers in the country who answer yes! to this question. This class is specially representative of the Warren school of individualism. In the intense desire its members have for each person to acquire the use of every personal right, they lose sight of that which must follow the acquisition. In liberty for the individual, they seem to think the ultimate is gained—seem to think there is nothing beyond that except individual progress in the sphere of freedom, and their arguments go so far, at least by implication, as to denominate the right which two people have to enter into any organized effort as despotism.

"*The Word*," E. H. Heywood, editor, is the organ of this class of reformers. In the number for May there are several articles of this kind, some of which have appeared in the WEEKLY together with answers to the arguments advanced in them. The articles referred to assume that children belong to parents and that there is no right outside of them that can interfere to change their rearing or promote the interests of the former. If this were true, of course any government that should undertake to arrange for the better education of children would be despotic.

But while admitting the conclusion we deny the premises from which it is drawn. *The Word* does not assert that children belong to parents absolutely, but it proceeds with its arguments just as if it did so assert, and in so arguing, also by implication, denies the right of society to have anything to do with them. Had *The Word* considered the replies that have appeared in the WEEKLY upon this point, we do not think it could have consistently permitted the article in question to appear without also printing the reply. This would have been just and fair to all parties. We maintain that children belong to themselves just as all other individuals belong to themselves, so then the real thing to be determined before *The Word* can consistently charge us with despotism is as to the ownership of the children. If they belong to parents, then *The Word* is right. If they belong to themselves, then *The Word* is wrong.

We hold that there can be no ownership in human flesh, not even in children. They belong neither to parents nor to society, but to themselves. Now the question is as to how these children shall be reared and educated so as to make them the best men and women. It is not a question whether "not one mother in forty would consent to deliver up her child" or not, but whether the child's interest can be best promoted, subjected to the blindness of ignorant affection, or conducted by an enlightened community. A hundred years ago parents voluntarily began to perceive that they, as a class, were unfit to educate their children mentally, and from this recognition our system of public schools originated. According to *The Word* this system is a despotism; according to us it is the truest liberty, because it best prepares children to assume the duties and responsibilities of adult life as freemen.

We say it is barbarous to leave children to the abso

lute of a law that is enacted to provide for any great or little public need. We do not condemn society for abating a public nuisance, nor for providing for the public comfort. We do not condemn public ways, nor the law which provides and maintains them. The people who constitute any community have certain interests in common, and all such should assist to promote those interests, or in the event of not doing so to refrain from making any use of them. If the intense individualism of a member prevents him from paying a tax to maintain a public street, then let him be consistent and not use the street. Let him remove from society into such places as require no streets. If this principle is so intense as to cause him to resist taxation, and he be robbed of his property, let him not invoke the power of the law to recover it. We have no objection to such action. We do not believe there is any power to compel any person to pay any tax; but if a person refuse to pay then let him not make use of anything that the money paid by others maintains.

The Word, in its Free Banking proposition, also seems to object to our views of a proper circulating medium of exchange. It says: "You propose to prohibit—or virtually to prohibit—an individual banking, either of issue or deposit." We are at a loss to conceive how *The Word* or any of its contributors has obtained such an absurd idea. We defy them to produce a sentence either in our speeches or writings that by any, even far-fetched construction, can be made to mean any such thing. Our demand is that government shall issue money to its citizens, without cost; to whatever extent they need and can secure. We never argued that individuals should not do the same, nor that individuals should be prevented from loaning money at whatever interest to whoever desired to borrow, but such borrowers should first have the privilege of obtaining it free from the Government. Therefore, we do not say: "Here is a branch of business into which you shall not enter," and to assert that we do is a despotic use of freedom to which we have a right to object, and to which we do object most heartily and earnestly.

If the advocates of free banking want to do a banking business let them do it freely, but do not ask that free banking shall be protected in any manner by law. If persons desire to patronize free banking let them do so at their own risk, not asking the community to protect their deposits or exchanges. We say let everybody bank who wants to do so, and let everybody make use of such banks who will, but do not ask a law either to limit or protect its functions and call it "Free Banking," since it would be legal banking.

No! Ours is not the "liberty of bondage." It is the freedom of organization. A mass of individuals, unorganized, is not a community but a mob, and this is no less true of society than it is of an army; it is no less true of industry, generally, than it is of the postal service specially. Now this service does not compel any one to commit his letters to the mails to be transported to their destination. Every individual may carry his own letters from Maine to California if he so desires, or he may send them by a messenger, but the postal service offers so great inducements over the individual's means that no one thinks of objecting to it as a despotism. This system could be carried on only as nationally organized. To limit it to states, counties or towns would be to destroy it. So would it be with a currency. We want a national money system, and then let whoever will issue and receive individual currency. If *The Word* can see despotism or any infringement of individual rights lurking in such a proposition it has a sharper perception than we have. If, however, it conflict with its ideas of free banking that is another matter, but not to be set down as despotism, or to be refuted by the charge that it is despotism.

If organization is despotism, then we have studied nature to no effect. Observing its operations we learn that the highest forms of nature are those that are the most thoroughly organized. The action of individualized elements, or simples, is a low order of development. So is an order of society, in which each individual is obliged to provide for all his own needs and comforts by his own hands, a low order. A society where each individual raises his own food, builds his own house, mends his own clothes, boots and shoes, fashions his own plows, rakes, machines—his axes, hoes, saws—his pens, ink, paper—his types, presses, paper, and reads the paper after it is printed, alone, is a primitive order. We see nothing desirable in a freedom that would remand us back to such a condition.

individual freedom.

For the Nation—not the State—rency than a number of individuals better system of education and nu there can be found in the isolated portation for individuals and merel nished by individuals, and which w upon justice now so generally true method of securing the use of land to occupy it and to use it; but yet will to make their own money, edu the right to prevent the education of them to suffer from an inability to provide for them; to transport the and to ride in their own or anybody all these is not despotism in any sens it, or that anybody else can render despotism in the sight of Mr. Heywo opinions we have held consistently, had any opinions at all upon these s conceive that to hold and advocate been demoralized by some man." I believe in organization, let him per the imputation, gratuitously besto and instead of denominating our pos meet argument with argument. In ready to contend for our views, and vinced of their fallacy; but Mr. reverse the order of nature and estab elements are a higher order of org system which represents all the pri can successfully establish his theory o Individual sovereignty doesn't mean must conquer and maintain an abs other individuals; but true sovereign which the highest interests of all ind common interest and purpose—in w each are represented in the brotherho each person holds every other perso "Don't you dare to administer to my because by so doing you will interfere make me false to my individual sover

ANTI-USURY

The Anti-Usury Reformers, of w President, held their annual meeting on May 10th. As the N. E. Labor movement as a component part of In its sessions was set apart to consid Opposition to the same is not now u countries. All educated Catholics a interest is and has been from time imm the papacy as "mortal sin," and in G creasing body of Labor Reformers (Mr. James Harvey, of Liverpool, fo received a work on the subject, for (thanks) are making rapid headway in e of the Unions and Granges to their an interest for the use of money is utterly med in the third and thirtieth chap money-lending business is monopoliz Christians in Turkey, who are the Turkish nation. It is believed that In there are some brave people who are walls of the modern Jericho, the inf and what is more important there are countries that the walls are commenci that have so long shielded the oppress nation of the wealth-producers whom so cruelly persecuted.

MAN ON HIS MET

The New York Herald is on the war Fifth avenue butterflies with a sledge the annual meeting of the woman suffer thing—it has unmasked the battery of is no fencing in the article we copy

SUBSCRIPTION.

IN ADVANCE.

\$5 00
1 50

RATES.

\$12 00
22 00
40 00

SUBSCRIPTION

THE AMERICAN NEWS COMPANY, LON-
DON, ENGLAND.

\$4 00
2 00

ADVERTISING.

From \$1.00 to \$2.50
by special contract.
cannot be permanently given.
from the office of this journal, and
nature of WOODHULL & CLAFLIN.

American News Company, No. 121 Nassau

editorial, must be addressed
Claflin's Weekly,
Box 3791, New York City.



can, no more than cor-
ted or cured without being
language."—JOHN STUART

DAY, MAY 30, 1874.

N DESPOTISM?

reformers in the country who
This class is specially repre-
of individualism. In the in-
for each person to acquire the
lose sight of that which must
erty for the individual, they
ained—seem to think there is
vidual progress in the sphere
go so far, at least by impli-
which two people have to
s despotism.

editor, is the organ of this
ber for May there are several
which have appeared in the
to the arguments advanced
to assume that children be-
no right outside of them that
ring or promote the interests
of course any government
for the better education of

usion we deny the premises
Word does not assert that
ately, but it proceeds with
so assert, and in so arguing,
right of society to have any-
The Word considered the re-
WEEKLY upon this point, we
tently permitted the article

lute control of parents. In many cases this control is, even now, outrageously abused, and thousands, aye, millions of children are turned loose into the world to become the pests of society thereby. It is then a question whether children can be better reared by an organized system of society, or, as in past ages, by their parents, and thus only. Beyond this parents have neither duty nor right. If this is admitted the other points involved necessarily follow. Society having a direct interest in the condition of children arriving at adult age has the best right to conduct the rearing of them previous to that age; and this becomes specially obvious when it is remembered that, in case parents fail to properly rear and educate their young, there is no recourse upon them for their failure neither by children nor society. But if society fail to do its duty in the premises it suffers the natural and inevitable penalty of being composed of undeveloped, uneducated and unprofitable members. Therefore, it would be more consistent for *The Word* to refute these positions than to continue to charge us with advocating despotism.

We do rebel against the tyranny of any law that in any manner tends to impair the great natural law of individual sovereignty. But we do not rebel against the so-called tyranny of a law that is enacted to provide for any great or little public need. We do not condemn society for abating a public nuisance, nor for providing for the public comfort. We do not condemn public highways, nor the law which provides and maintains them. The people who constitute any community have certain interests in common, and all such should assist to promote those interests, or in the event of not doing so to refrain from making any use of them. If the intense individualism of a member prevents him from paying a tax to maintain a public street, then let him be consistent and not use the street. Let him remove from society into such places as require no streets. If this principle is so intense as to cause him to resist taxation, and he be robbed of his property, let him not invoke the power of the law to recover it. We have no objection to such action. We do not believe there is any power to compel any person to pay any tax; but if a person refuse to pay then let him not make use of anything that the money paid by others maintains.

The Word, in its Free Banking proposition, also seems to object to our views of a proper circulating medium of exchange. It says: "You propose to prohibit—or virtually to prohibit—an individual banking, either of issue or deposit." We are at a loss to conceive how *The Word* or any of its contributors has obtained such an absurd idea. We defy them to produce a sentence either in our speeches or writings that by any, even far-fetched construction, can be made to mean any such thing. Our demand is that government shall issue money to its citizens, without cost, to whatever extent they need and can secure. We never argued that individuals should not do the same, nor that individuals should be prevented from loaning money at whatever interest to whoever desired to borrow, but such borrowers should first have the privilege of obtaining it free from the Government. Therefore, we do not say: "Here is a branch of business into which you shall not enter," and to assert that we do is a despotism of freedom to which we have a right to object, and to which we do object most heartily and earnestly.

If the advocates of free banking want to do a banking business let them do it freely, but do not ask that free banking shall be protected in any manner by law. If persons desire to patronize free banking let them do so at their own risk, not asking the community to protect their deposits or exchanges. We say let everybody bank who wants to do so, and let everybody make use of such banks who will, but do not ask a law either to limit or protect its functions and call it "Free Banking," since it would be legal banking.

No! Ours is not the "liberty of bondage." It is the freedom of organization. A mass of individuals, unorganized, is not a community but a mob, and this is no less true of society than it is of an army; it is no less true of industry, generally, than it is of the postal service specially. Now this service does not compel any one to commit his letters to the mails to be transported to their destination. Every individual may carry his own letters from Maine to California if he so desires, or he may send them by a messenger, but the postal service offers so great inducements over the individual's

In the place of this we want complete organization—organization of the industries—organization in everything in which the interests of individuals are identical, and in which no individual right is forfeited or impaired; but in which every such right is promoted and protected. To class such interests with love, where the interests are purely individual and impossible of general organization, is to play with reason and common sense. To say that love between men and women is similar to currency, which people require to exchange commodities with, is a position at once so ridiculous and so absurd that we are constrained to doubt the sanity of whoever assumes it. Love is something that is not public. It belongs specifically to the individuals who love, and nobody else has any right to interfere, either to dictate or to regulate; but for the people to construct a general currency, illustrating their faith in themselves as a people, with which to conduct their business arrangements, is so entirely an opposite order from love that the two have no possible relation. To say that an individual shall not utter or receive personal money, would be the same as to say that an individual shall not love, except as the law permit; but we have never either conceived or uttered what would be such a clear and such an unwarrantable interference with individual freedom.

For the Nation—not the State—to provide a better currency than a number of individuals can possible provide; a better system of education and nurseries for children than there can be found in the isolated household; better transportation for individuals and merchandise than can be furnished by individuals, and which will prevent the impositions upon justice now so generally true of transportation; a better method of securing the use of land to every one who desires to occupy it and to use it; but yet to permit anybody who will to make their own money, educate themselves (we deny the right to prevent the education of children or to compel them to suffer from an inability on the part of parents to provide for them); to transport their own letters, freight, and to ride in their own or anybody else's conveyance; to do all these is not despotism in any sense that we can understand it, or that anybody else can render it. Nor is it any more despotism in the sight of Mr. Heywood than with us. These opinions we have held consistently, we affirm, ever since we had any opinions at all upon these subjects; and we do not conceive that to hold and advocate them now is to "have been demoralized by some man." If Mr. Heywood does not believe in organization, let him permit us to do so without the imputation, gratuitously bestowed of demoralization; and instead of denominating our position as despotic, let him meet argument with argument. In this field we are ever ready to contend for our views, and to yield them when convinced of their fallacy; but Mr. Heywood will have to reverse the order of nature and establish the fact that primal elements are a higher order of organization than a single system which represents all the primal elements; before he can successfully establish his theory of individual sovereignty. Individual sovereignty doesn't mean that every individual must conquer and maintain an absolute freedom from all other individuals; but true sovereignty means a condition in which the highest interests of all individuals are merged in a common interest and purpose—in which the best interests of each are represented in the brotherhood of all; and not when each person holds every other person at arm's length, saying: "Don't you dare to administer to my comfort or happiness, because by so doing you will interfere with my freedom and make me false to my individual sovereignty."

ANTI-USURY.

The Anti-Usury Reformers, of whom Edward Palmer is President, held their annual meeting at Masonic Hall, N. Y., on May 10th. As the N. E. Labor League recognizes the movement as a component part of Industrial Reform, one of its sessions was set apart to consider the subject of usury. Opposition to the same is not now unrepresented in foreign countries. All educated Catholics are aware that usury or interest is and has been from time immemorial condemned by the papacy as "mortal sin," and in Great Britain a yearly increasing body of Labor Reformers (under the leadership of

Herald thereupon
man, admits his
ment for the pol
point gained, he
ought to cease
reins of power
and her noisy le
and tremble!

The Apostles
ing yesterday (C
from an account
ceedings were m
Susan still urg
against the dom
leadership of th
become a danger
oratorical lady s
ment like the
awful piece of
most serious par
longer recruited
repellent ladies
the young and d
enlisted. It will
ances of the lat
executing a cha
ornamental. Poi
and papas, and
silk dresses they
gramme we do n
able to the tyr
of this nature
much desired su
many politicians
find some mean
limits. Under t
ladies into the
by the commun
into a miniature
have proved dis
divided sovereig
versal anarchy
woman suffragist
vain, as the diag
mean to keep the
legions.

The WEEKLY
vulgarity and ar
article. The old
would advise ou
lay the "cotton w
for it is quite wo
pelled to perform
male printers an
ees in the cause
the dashing bel
sulted because t
they are rich. T
winces under the
flogged by his f
where to strike a
punishment the
higher!—lower!
of his friend, w
there's no pleasur
choly case of our

But there are so
which merit atte
ing belles of Fift
money discrimi
institutions, patro
are the messes of
birthright. Robb
hold that it is her
tions, apparently
True, there are p
bearing, nursing,
an enlightened pe
our debts to her
readings than we
conferred and did
face of the State.
of the above stat
who was the worth
madame, who has
children!" The c
to be the best reva

But the gist of t
let is, Coleridge

181 Nassau
New York City
STUART
874.



than cor-
being
STUART

874.

country who
ally repre-
In the in-
quire the
which must
ual, they
there is
sphere
imply
have to

n of this
several
d in the
advanced
children be-
them that
interests
ernment
ation of

premises
ert that
eds with
arguing,
ave any-
the re-
point, we
article
This
maintain
individ-

he deter-
with des-
belong
o them-
n flesh,
s nor to
to how
to make
whether
up her
the best
ection,
und
hey, as
and
minated.

ording
children
is free-
also

We do not rebel against the tyranny of any law that in any manner tends to impair the great natural law of individual sovereignty. But we do not rebel against the so-called tyranny of a law that is enacted to provide for any great or little public need. We do not condemn society for abating a public nuisance, nor for providing for the public comfort. We do not condemn public highways, nor the law which provides and maintains them. The people who constitute any community have certain interests in common, and all such should assist to promote those interests, or in the event of not doing so to refrain from making any use of them. If the intense individualism of a member prevents him from paying a tax to maintain a public street, then let him be consistent and not use the street. Let him remove from society into such places as require no streets. If this principle is so intense as to cause him to resist taxation, and he be robbed of his property, let him not invoke the power of the law to recover it. We have no objection to such action. We do not believe there is any power to compel any person to pay any tax; but if a person refuse to pay then let him not make use of anything that the money paid by others maintains.

The Word, in its Free Banking proposition, also seems to object to our views of a proper circulating medium of exchange. It says: "You propose to prohibit—or virtually to prohibit—an individual banking, either of issue or deposit." We are at a loss to conceive how *The Word* or any of its contributors has obtained such an absurd idea. We defy them to produce a sentence either in our speeches or writings that by any, even far-fetched construction, can be made to mean any such thing. Our demand is that government shall issue money to its citizens, without cost, to whatever extent they need and can secure. We never argued that individuals should not do the same, nor that individuals should be prevented from loaning money at whatever interest to whoever desired to borrow, but such borrowers should first have the privilege of obtaining it free from the Government. Therefore, we do not say: "Here is a branch of business into which you shall not enter," and to assert that we do is a despotic use of freedom to which we have a right to object, and to which we do object most heartily and earnestly.

If the advocates of free banking want to do a banking business let them do it freely, but do not ask that free banking shall be protected in any manner by law. If persons desire to patronize free banking let them do so at their own risk, not asking the community to protect their deposits or exchanges. We say let everybody bank who wants to do so, and let everybody make use of such banks who will, but do not ask a law either to limit or protect its functions and call it "Free Banking," since it would be legal banking.

No! Ours is not the "liberty of bondage." It is the freedom of organization. A mass of individuals, unorganized, is not a community but a mob, and this is no less true of society than it is of an army; it is no less true of industry, generally, than it is of the postal service specially. Now this service does not compel any one to commit his letters to the mails to be transported to their destination. Every individual may carry his own letters from Maine to California if he so desires, or he may send them by a messenger, but the postal service offers so great inducements over the individual's means that no one thinks of objecting to it as a despotism. This system could be carried on only as nationally organized. To limit it to states, counties or towns would be to destroy it. So would it be with a currency. We want a national money system, and then let whoever will issue and receive individual currency. If *The Word* can see despotism or any infringement of individual rights lurking in such a proposition it has a sharper perception than we have. If, however, it conflict with its ideas of free banking that is another matter, but not to be set down as despotism, or to be refuted by the charge that it is despotism.

If organization is despotism, then we have studied nature to no effect. Observing its operations we learn that the highest forms of nature are those that are the most thoroughly organized. The action of individualized elements, or simple, is a low order of development. So is an order of society in which each individual is obliged to provide for all his own needs and comforts by his own hands, a low order. A society where each individual raises his own food, builds his own house, mends his own clothes, boots and shoes, fashions his own plows, rakes, machines—his axes, hoes, saws—his pens, ink, paper—his types, presses, paper, and reads the paper after it is printed, alone, is a primitive order. We see nothing desirable in a freedom that would remand us back to such a condition.

utter or receive personal money, would be the same as to say that an individual shall not love, except as the law permit, but we have never either conceived or uttered what would be such a clear and such an unwarrantable interference with individual freedom.

For the Nation—not the State—to provide a better currency than a number of individuals can possibly provide; a better system of education and nurseries for children than there can be found in the isolated household; better transportation for individuals and merchandise than can be furnished by individuals, and which will prevent the impositions upon justice now so generally true of transportation; a better method of securing the use of land to every one who desires to occupy it and to use it; but yet to permit anybody who will to make their own money, educate themselves (we deny the right to prevent the education of children or to compel them to suffer from an inability on the part of parents to provide for them); to transport their own letters, freight, and to ride in their own or anybody else's conveyance; to do all these is not despotism in any sense that we can understand it, or that anybody else can render it. Nor is it any more despotism in the sight of Mr. Heywood than with us. These opinions we have held consistently, we affirm, ever since we had any opinions at all upon these subjects; and we do not conceive that to hold and advocate them now is to "have been demoralized by some man." If Mr. Heywood does not believe in organization, let him permit us to do so without the imputation, gratuitously bestowed of demoralization; and instead of denominating our position as despotic, let him meet argument with argument. In this field we are ever ready to contend for our views, and to yield them when convinced of their fallacy; but Mr. Heywood will have to reverse the order of nature and establish the fact that primal elements are a higher order of organization than a single system which represents all the primal elements, before he can successfully establish his theory of individual sovereignty. Individual sovereignty doesn't mean that every individual must conquer and maintain an absolute freedom from all other individuals; but true sovereignty means a condition in which the highest interests of all individuals are merged in a common interest and purpose—in which the best interests of each are represented in the brotherhood of all; and not when each person holds every other person at arm's length, saying: "Don't you dare to administer to my comfort or happiness, because by so doing you will interfere with my freedom and make me false to my individual sovereignty."

ANTI-USURY.

The Anti-Usury Reformers, of whom Edward Palmer is President, held their annual meeting at Masonic Hall, N. Y., on May 10th. As the N. E. Labor League recognizes the movement as a component part of Industrial Reform, one of its sessions was set apart to consider the subject of usury. Opposition to the same is not now unrepresented in foreign countries. All educated Catholics are aware that usury or interest is and has been from time immemorial condemned by the papacy as "mortal sin," and in Great Britain a yearly increasing body of Labor Reformers (under the leadership of Mr. James Harvey, of Liverpool, from whom we have just received a work on the subject, for which we tender our thanks) are making rapid headway in converting the members of the Unions and Granges to their anti-usury doctrines. As interest for the use of money is utterly forbidden by Mohammed in the third and thirtieth chapters of the Koran, the money-lending business is monopolized by the Jews and Christians in Turkey, who are the real opponents of the Turkish nation. It is believed that in every civilized country there are some brave people who are trumpeting before the walls of the modern Jericho, the infamous money system, and what is more important there are many indications in all countries that the walls are commencing to crumble and fall that have so long shielded the oppressors from the just indignation of the wealth-producers whom they have so long and so cruelly persecuted.

MAN ON HIS METTLE.

The New York Herald is on the war-path. It is after the Fifth avenue butterflies with a sledge hammer. This year the annual meeting of the woman suffragists has effected one thing—it has unmasked the battery of its opponents. There is no fencing in the article we copy from the New York

success of the latter class, unless, indeed, in executing a change of front and becoming ornamental. Perhaps they have taken and paper, and want to have the right silk dresses they look so well in. If grammar we do not doubt that it would be able to the tyrants. Indeed, we think of this nature would be necessary much desired suffrage to the ladies, many politicians and patriotic persons and some means of reducing this limits. Under these circumstances ladies into the political arena would be the community as calculated to into a miniature Arkansas. Two G have proved disturbing enough, but divided sovereignty in the home is a universal anarchy. For these good reasons woman suffragists will be for some time, as the disagreeable fellows who mean to keep them in spite of Miss legions.

The WEEKLY can afford to set aside vulgarity and aristocratic assumption article. The old copy says "variety would advise our contemporary to to lay the "cotton umbrella" aside in for it is quite worn out with the double-pelled to perform in the above paragraph male printers and the ladies with crores in the cause appear to displease the dashing belles of Fifth avenue, sulted because they are poor, and they are rich. There is no consolation winees under the double infliction liogged by his friend "Sam." Said where to strike and I'll obey you." punishment the sufferer naturally higher!—lower! lower!—until he of his friend, who replied angrily, there's no pleasing you?" The same choly case of our contemporary.

But there are some unpalatable truths which merit attention. The financing belles of Fifth avenue" is one of money discriminations between the institutions, patrons of industry, grant are the messes of pottage that are offered birthright. Robbed and wronged in hold that it is her duty to favor republicans; apparently in her favor but of True, there are periods in the life of bearing, nursing, etc., when she needs an enlightened people we should approach our debts to her under such circumstances readiness than we pay the public bonds conferred and did not receive honor in ance of the State. Napoleon the Great of the above statement. When Madame who was the worthiest woman in France, madame, who has given to her country children!" The conclusion is obviously to be the best rewarded and the most

But the gist of the article lies in its fact is fully revealed that fools and twisters strive to hide. There the admission power of man over woman is declared bible be correct the position is justified greater rights now than were granted to of Moses, and they, we are told, are changeable God. We disbelieve the statement women who are dissatisfied with the shut their bibles and keep them shut before freedom than they at present possess women hold under Christianity and M be legitimately traced to the rulings of Old Testament. In the New Testament laws are somewhat ameliorated it is Paul, who commanded women "to churches" would not be likely to act as called upon to preside at a meeting for chisement of the sex, much less would dered all wives to "submit themselves willing to endorse the greater demand for and social liberty.

As a human and fallible history of the fault with the Bible. As a legislator of ing to the Mosaic record, we respect M democratic community we honor the Je