



A PERIODICAL OF ANARCHIST THOUGHT, WORK, AND LITERATURE.

VOL. X. NO. 17.

CHICAGO, SUNDAY, APRIL 26, 1903.

WHOLE NO. 411.

The Workers.

We plow and sow, we're so very, very low,
That we delve in the dirty clay,
Till we bless the plain with the golden grain
And the vale with the fragrant hay.
Our place we know, we're so very, very low,
'Tis down at the landlord's feet;
We're not too low the grain to grow,
But too low the bread to eat.

Down, down we go, we're so very, very low,
To the hell of the deep sunk mines;
But we gather the proudest gems that glow,
When the crown of the despot shines;
And when'er he lacks, upon our backs
Fresh loads he designs to lay;
We're far too low to vote the tax,
But not too low to pay.

We're low, we're low—we're very, very low—
And yet from our fingers glide
The silken flow and the robes that glow
Round the limbs of the sons of pride;
And what we get and what we give,
We know, and we know our share;
We're not too low the cloth to weave,
But too low the cloth to wear.

We're low, we're low—we're very, very low—
And yet when the trumpets ring,
The thrust of the poor man's arm will go
Thru the heart of the proudest king.
We're low, we're low—mere rabble, we know—
We're only the rank and file;
We're not too low to kill the foe,
But too low to share the spoil.

—Ernest Jones.

Thoreau on Government.

I heartily accept the motto "That government is best which governs least," and I should like to see it acted up to more rapidly and systematically. Carried out, it finally amounts to this, which also I believe: "That government is best which governs not at all," and when men are prepared for it, that will be the kind of government which they will have. Government is at best but an expedient; but most governments are usually, and all governments are sometimes, expedient. The objections which have been brought against a standing army, and they are many and weighty, and deserve to prevail, may also at least be brought against a standing government. The standing army is only an arm of the standing government. The government itself, which is only the mode which the people have chosen to execute their will, is equally liable to be abused and perverted before the people can act thru it. Witness the present Mexican war, the work of comparatively a few individuals using the standing government as their tool; for, in the outset, the people would not have consented to this measure.

This American government, what is it but

a tradition, thru a recent one, endeavoring to transmit itself unimpaired to posterity, but each instant losing some of its integrity? It has not the vitality and force of a single living man, for a single living man can bend it to his will. It is a sort of a wooden gun to the people themselves. But it is not the less necessary for this; for the people must have some complicated machinery or other, and hear its din, to satisfy that idea of government which they have. Governments show thus how successfully man can be imposed on—even impose on themselves, for their own advantage. It is excellent, we must all allow, yet this government never of itself furthered any enterprise, but by the alacrity with which it got out of its way. It does not keep the country free. The character inherent in the American people has done all that has been accomplished; and it would have done somewhat more if the government had not got in its way. For government is an expedient by which men would fain succeed in letting one another alone; and, as has been said, when it is most expedient, the governed are most let alone by it. Trade and commerce, if they were not made of india rubber, would never manage to bounce over the obstacles which legislators are continually putting in their way; and, if one were to judge these men wholly by the effects of their actions, and not partly by their intentions, they would deserve to be classed and punished with those mischievous persons who put obstructions on the railroads.

After all, the practical reason why, when the power is once in the hands of the people, a majority are permitted, and for a long time continue to rule, is not because they are most likely to be in the right, nor because this seems to be fairest to the minority, but because they are physically the strongest. But a government in which the majority rule in all cases cannot be based on justice, even as far as men understand it. Can there not be a government in which majorities do not virtually decide right and wrong, but conscience?—in which majorities decide only those questions to which the rule of expediency is applicable? Must the citizen, even for a moment, or in the least degree, resign his conscience to the legislator? Why has every man a conscience, then? I think that we should be men first, and subjects afterwards. It is not desirable to cultivate a respect for the law, so much as for the right. The only obligation which I have a right to assume is to do at any time what I think right. It is truly enough said that a corporation has no conscience; but a corpora-

tion of conscientious men is a corporation with a conscience. Law never made a whit more just; and, by their respect for it, even the well-disposed are daily made the agents of injustice. A common and natural result of an undue respect for law is that you see a file of soldiers—colonel, captain, corporal, privates, powder monkeys, and all, marching in admirable order over hill and dale to the wars, against their wills, aye, against their common sense and consciences, which makes it very steep marching indeed, and produces a palpitation of the heart. They have no doubt that it is a damnable business in which they are concerned; they are all peaceably inclined. Now, what are they? Men at all? or small, movable forts and magazines, at the service of some unscrupulous man in power? Visit the navy-yard, and behold a marine, such a man as an American government can make—or such as it can make a man with its black arts; a mere shadow and reminiscence of humanity—a man laid out alive and standing, and already, as one may say, buried under arms and funeral accompaniments.

The mass of men serve the State thus, not as men mainly, but as machines, with their bodies. They are the standing army, and the militia, gaolers, constables, posse comitatus, etc. In most cases there is no free exercise whatever of the judgment; or of the moral sense; but they put themselves on a level with wood and earth and stone; and wooden men can perhaps be manufactured that will serve the purpose as well. Such command no more respect than men of straw or a lump of dirt. They have the same sort of worth only as horses and dogs. Yet such as these ever are commonly esteemed good citizens. Others—as most legislators, politicians, lawyers, ministers, and officeholders—serve the State chiefly with their heads; and, as they rarely make any moral distinctions, they are as likely to serve the Devil—without intending it—as God. A very few, as heroes, patriots, martyrs, reformers in the great sense, and men, serve the State with their consciences also, and so necessarily resist it for the most part; and they are commonly treated as enemies by it. A wise man will only be useful as a man, and will not submit to be "clay," and "stop a hole to keep the wind away," but leave that office to his dust at least:—

"I am too high born to be propertied,
To be secondary at control;
Or useful serving-man and instrument
To any sovereign state thruout the world."

— O —

Soldiers are legalized murderers.

A Socialist Criticaster.

If Homer sometimes nods, the editor of *The Appeal To Reason* may certainly sleep; and some recent lucubrations of his concerning Anarchism, make the inference irresistible that he sleeps a kind of hypnotic sleep at times, a sleep in which all the ignorance about Anarchism which is prevalent in the popular mind, finds somnambulistic utterance; for certainly, no thoughtful man who is awake could be got to say what he says in a recent issue of his paper. Read, and smile over the following clairvoyant utterance:

The most common types of Anarchists are the following: The violent Anarchist; the intellectual Anarchist; the Communist Anarchist; the parlor Anarchist; and the capitalist Anarchist.

This utterance was made in answer to a correspondent who asked for the "difference between Anarchism and Socialism." Putting aside for the moment the patronizing and superior way in which the Anarchistic position is made to appear an indefinite one, let us ask ourselves why the editor did not rather say that the most common types of Anarchists were the Individualist Anarchist and the Communist Anarchist; a piece of information which was plainly called for in the question of his correspondent? The answer is obvious: he was obsessed by that spirit which is named, the *I Would Rather Not Know*; a spirit which, political Socialists have led us heretofore to believe, they would gladly kill. A task now presents itself to them; the exorcising of the spirit of ignorance from the person of the editor of *The Appeal To Reason*. The need is urgent.

A definition of Anarchism which would satisfy any and all Anarchists is, *the union of well-being with the absence of government*; and for the editor of a political Socialist journal to boggle or ignore this obvious definition is to admit that he is just another unconscious humorist. His Anarchists, the fanciful types which he marshals for consideration, or pity, are phantasms, dancing deliriously in his brain.

The difference between Socialism and Anarchism is this: Socialism is a theory of society in which collective ownership of the means of production is offered as a plan of securing the individual in well-being; authority, in the shape of government being the agent thru which industry is carried on and equity made sure; Anarchism is the theory that the more authority we have the worse off the individual is, and that freedom from government coupled with ample opportunity on the part of the individual to secure his own well-being, will result in that peace and that order which ages of government have failed to secure to the race. Let a man choose between things fairly presented, when he asks you to define a thing: this is the best plan, even for editors to follow.

After telling his questioner that the types of Anarchists which he names chose all sorts of inconsistent and indefinite ways and means of solving the social problem, our precious informant goes on to declare that Socialism means something definite, coherent,—a concise and agreed-upon thing. Hear him:

Socialism, on the other hand, is a science, a political movement, and an ideal. The science of Social devel-

opment leads to the formation of the political movement for the emancipation of the working class from capitalist slavery, and for the inauguration of the ideal society, the cooperative commonwealth.

An obvious and neat retort upon this editor at this juncture, would be that, the most common type of Socialists are the following: Christian Socialists, Revolutionary Socialists, State Socialists, De Leon Socialists, Gas and Water Socialists (as they call them in England) Saloon Socialists, and Morgan Socialists; and then one might go on to say that all these were pulling in different ways with different ideas, and having little in common except common foolishness. Offering this for what it is worth in response to our editor's first quoted words, let us leave him.

Only, let him remember that to misrepresent a thing is not to do it justice; and that if one's list of subscribers is made up chiefly of the names of those who do not think, it is still well to avoid listening to their chatter too much, lest one become obsessed by the spirit of their conceit and ignorance, and give utterance to it at an unfortunate moment; justifying on the part of the thoughtful the application to one's paper of the name, *The Appeal to Unreason*.

W. F. B.

More Critics of Mine.

In the last number of *Liberty*, Tucker calls me "a man whose lifelong accumulation of unassimilated learning has incapacitated him from thinking his way thru it" (the learning?)

Nevertheless I have assimilated the facts on which I had previously bestowed some study, sufficiently to teach Benjamin R. Tucker that for "the victims of the monopolists," "application of Malthusian checks" is among the "fundamental virtues." (First page and column of *Liberty*, same issue.) Fifteen years ago, a suggestion of this sort used to make him howl like an anti-vaccinator; and no one offered it in his paper, except, sometimes, by very grudging permission, myself. He could see nothing in Malthusianism then but an apology for things as they are; and a modest suggestion of mine to the effect that Malthus' motives had nothing to do with his demonstrations, was hopelessly confusing to this digester of all he knows; upon whose advance in comprehension of scientific methods since, I heartily congratulate both him and myself.

The ingratitude of Tucker annoys me as little as the wrath of Leverston, or Harman's impending geyser of small capitals. All I want to suggest is that before trying to kick down the ladder by which he has made such important intellectual progress, he ought to consider whether it may not be equally serviceable to others; and whether he cannot perhaps still find some use for it himself. I say, he remarks, "that co-operative coercion is objectionable because it is strong enough to enslave. Whence it follows, of course, that if you happen to be strong enough to enslave, you have no right to resist." A little more reflection—say fifteen years of it—on my "lifelong accumulation of unassimilated learning" may get the idea thru his wool that this talk about Rights is all logomachy; and that what

concerns us practically is to withstand the organization of dangerous Might.

In the same issue of *Liberty*, Comrade Byington takes me to task for saying Czolgosz has "made the public reader to receive Anarchism" (not exactly my words, I think). I refer him to his own, in the same article. "The deadliest poison to the progress of an agitation is silence; it is worse than any blunder you could make if you broke the silence." Czolgosz was not an Anarchist, I am happy to say. He was a Roman Catholic. I suspect, as is known, that he was a tool of the priests. I always thought he made a blunder in shooting McKinley. If he did it to avenge the blow dealt the Church by the Spanish war, and to throw the blame on Anarchism, I am sure he made a blunder. But, any way, he broke the silence. He "fired a shot heard round the world." "The conspiracy of silence" about Anarchism was defeated. The bourgeois papers published more about Anarchism during the next three months than in the previous fifteen years; and tho, of course, they published lots of lies about it, they published more truth than in their whole former existence—even going so far as frequently to receive letters by Anarchists in defense of Anarchism. Do you catch on?

If R. B. Kerr will refer to Tcherkesoff's "Pages of Socialist History," he will find that, there at least, the concentration of industry is disputed, no less than that of wealth, however, it may be with the author's article in *FREE SOCIETY* of Nov. 9, 1902. The law for both processes, according to Tcherkesoff, with whom, of course, I profess no absolute agreement on so complex a statistical question, but whose views are worth considering, appears the same. Tho ninety-five to ninety-seven per cent of active capitalists fail, (the basis of Marx law of concentration) their number increases as well as that of passive capitalists—annuitants, shareholders, etc.; (an alleged statistical fact, inconsistent with Marx's conclusion but not his premises).

Vainly hundreds, thousands, bleed:
Still hundreds, thousands, more succeed."

Agriculture, Mr. Kerr gives up, tho it alone is enough to disprove the fusion of capitals into a single easily expropriable one. But Tcherkesoff alleges (Ch. VI), an increase of employers in other trades. In England the number of land owners increased from 392,203, in 1885, to 409,422 in 1889 ("Statesman's Year Book"). The sizes of freeholds represented are as follows—over twenty acres, increase 1,064; 5 to 20, 2,566; 1 to 5, 8,449; under an acre, 5,140. In France, less precise figures give the freeholds of 1826 at 1,300,000; of 1871 at 1,700,000; of 1855 at 1,825,000. In 1840 England had 439 journals, the United States 1,210, the world (estimated?) 4,016. In 1891 the figures were, England, 1840; United States, 15,392; the world 38,036. In 1876, the number of banks in America was 6,611, capital, \$149,000,000; in 1899 it was 6,721; capital \$180,000,000. The fur trade is represented in London by a gigantic corporation, whose purchases are made equally in the Arctic regions and the equa-

torial. Its sales, in 1895, amounted to 7,800,000 fs.; and its principal customers (smaller dealers) are in Russia! Yet during the rise of this colossal business the number of furriers has increased.

If it be true, as R. B. Kerr states, that Socialist literature bristles with facts and figures, so much the better for it—but: Protectionist literature bristles with them too. If Anarchist writers neglect to support their views by statistics, that is to be regretted. But it may be their figures are rather better digested than those compiled in the express interest of a *a priori* theory. There is usually a considerable accumulation of grain in the gullet of a coup-bound hen; but the removal of a dialectical obstacle is necessary to the process of nourishment.

There is one misprint in my Vindication of Anarchism which occurs so often that I am afraid of being charged with it. The metaphysical word "antinomy" always gets into type "antimony"—whose meaning is slightly different.

C. L. JAMES.

Tucker and McDonald.

It has remained for those staunch defenders of restraint, the Individualist Anarchists, to out-do the daily press in their cheap sneers at the refusal of Voltairine de Cleyre to prosecute (restrain is their word) Herman Helcher for the attempt on her life. Messrs. Tucker and McDonald, editors respectively of *Liberty* and the *Truth Seeker* (N.Y.), are naturally quite upset over Voltairine's absurd conduct in trying to practice Anarchism as well as preach it. Some men reach their second childhood early, and if we refrain from comparing Mr. Truth-seeker McDonald to the "sere and yellow leaf" it is because we sympathize with a brother who has gone astray, but truth (seeker) compels us to say he is old enough to know better, and if he does not it is not our fault. As for Mr. Benjamin R. Liberty, his case has been diagnosed years ago—and declared hopeless. When the average man discovers a truth he is a hard man to get along with, when he thinks he has discovered a truth and has not—he is impossible. Ben belongs to the latter genus. Long ago he discovered that "the only good Injun is a dead Injun," and the best way to make people peaceful is to hit them over the head with a club (voluntary, of course), the best way to abolish prisons is to call them houses of restraint; in short, he has discovered the best way to abolish a thing is to strengthen it—and change its name. Anarchism to him is a philosophy to be discussed after a sixty-cent dinner, a cigar and a cup of coffee (why not velvet smoking jackets and silk tea-gowns), and I would warrant that the tenor of his articles depends entirely upon the state of his digestion. The best and the worst thing that can be said about the editor of *Liberty* and his misuse of the word "Liberty" is what Edelman once said, "Ben Tucker is much better than his philosophy." Meanwhile here is a pointer for the voluntary police libertarians. We shall continue to propagate Anarchism and—to practise it.—*Freedom*, London.

Observations.

When conformity to the dictates of orthodox morality is charged with producing results the most deplorable, and the same by a writer in the *Westminster Review*, the time has arrived for somebody to rise and inquire whither we are drifting. Dr. W. R. MacDermott is the author of the strange theory that a leading cause of insanity is strict adherence to the practise of that morality which is founded on scripture and the multiplication table, and which enjoys the sanction of President Roosevelt. Dr. MacDermott has canvassed a district in the north of Ireland for the purpose of ascertaining what conditions oftenest exist along with insanity in a family. He finds there are the most crazy and imbecile children where propagation is most industriously carried on. Women there who keep adding to the population as fast and as long as nature will permit produce a mentally and physically enfeebled progeny; and it appears from his investigation that such children are not borne because they are desired, but because religion and morality teach that all increase is the will of God, and that it would be wicked and immoral to evade the natural consequences of that association which marriage makes legitimate. Whether a woman is happily married or not, strong or weak, in health or out, she is enjoined by religion to render due benevolence, and is forbidden by good morals to intercept the penalty which acquiescence invites.

The writer whose views I am considering appears to be convinced that "the huge mass of predisposition to insanity and other diseases is the incident and outcome of family life strictly conformed to the conventional code of morality." He holds that a contract between a man and a woman, both healthy (he does not say married) to have one child would be clearly in harmony with physiological law, tho it would be unconventional—that is to say, immoral, as all must admit; while on the other hand, for a woman to be worn out bearing mentally subnormal children as fast as the natural process can be rushed, is wholly conventional and strictly moral, altho a flagrant violation of physiological law. Dr. MacDermott says truly that the aforesaid contract between the healthy man and woman "is proscribed, the father is discountenanced from acknowledging his child, the mother is ruined and insulted, and lifelong stigma legally fastened on the innocent offspring."

But with a matter like that I cannot deal further than to give the findings of fact. Just now it is not the unmarried but the married who are under fire, and the crisis calls for vindication of their right to raise small families. Every married couple should feel at liberty to do this without falling under executive criticism. That is where patriotism binds. Since Roosevelt published his views on race suicide it has been impossible for me to regard myself as a loyal American citizen, for there are but two kids in the family; yet when I cast my eye over that circle of two, and consider the breakfast food question, the lunch problem, and the supper proposition, and contemplate the velocity with which those heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ project their persons and extremities thru the fabric of clothes and shoes, I wonder where another

one would find anything to feed his face and clothe himself withal. This is no time to argue the right of the unmarried to illustrate physiological law; it is the hour for the married to assert their immunity from presidential reproach tho their home may not from the number of its inmates, suggest a founding asylum in a church-going community.

The only argument on behalf of intense productive industry that weighs with me at all is advanced by a newspaper correspondent who alleges that the more times you try, the more chances are in your favor of producing a genius. Anyone can test the theory, if situated as I am, by setting one hen on fifteen eggs and another on twice as many. If the thirty-egg hen hatches out a genius, you may conclude that the idea has something in it.

To return to Mr. MacDermott. The gentleman avers that the discredit attached to the physiological contract (where two healthy persons, tho unmarried, agree to have a child), and not the contract itself, produces the evils commonly attending it. He means that if the mother is ruined, the community, and not the man or the child, has ruined her; and that if stigma fastens to the innocent offspring, conventional morality, and not the child's parents, hitches it on. The thought has frequently crossed my mind that no one is ruined or disgraced in these circumstances but thinking makes it so.

Should President Roosevelt feel like continuing the discussion of the population question in his Thanksgiving proclamation he will find the closing words of Dr. MacDermott stimulating: "I have said enough to indicate that the physiological law and conventional morality are at issue, and that study of insanity is a study of that issue."

I hear that in gratitude for his recent utterances in praise of fecundity, ladies who expect to influence the census returns for 1903 will tender receptions to the chief executive at various points on his present tour. The report "lacks confirmation," but there is no telling what may happen west of the Cascades.

Not to change the subject too violently, a flagrant case of conventional immorality is reported from Springfield, Ohio. For months a couple lived in that town, and were on borrowing and lending terms with their neighbors. Then a newspaper announcement of their marriage caused a thrill to pervade the community, and when the reaction came the women held a talking-bee and appointed one, the sternest of her sex, to call the husband and wife to account for anticipating connubial happiness in the way they had done. On the way to discharge her duty the delegate stopped at her pastor's to wrestle in prayer; then she presented her face, frozen for the occasion, before the guilty pair, and, with her finger pointing at the marriage notice, demanding an explanation. She got it, and it was simple enough. They explained that when they first became attached to each other they were not sure they ought to marry. Their living together had been in the nature of an experiment to find out whether he was the right man for her and she the right woman for him. No serious inadaptation, local or otherwise, discovering itself, they were spliced. The delegate went away dissatisfied, as well she might be. All persons are dissatisfied when someone does as they would not do, and is neither paralyzed nor repentant.—*The Truth Seeker*.

FREE SOCIETY

Formerly THE FIREBRAND.

Published Weekly by..... A. ISAAK.

ONE DOLLAR A YEAR.

Address all Communications and make all Money Orders payable to FREE SOCIETY, 407 PARK AVE., Chicago, Ill.

Entered at the Chicago post office as second-class matter, October 29, 1901.

The publishers as such are not necessarily in agreement with any opinions expressed by the contributors.

CHICAGO, SUNDAY, APRIL 26, 1903.

411

If these figures correspond with the number printed on the wrapper of your FREE SOCIETY, your subscription expires with this number.

Notes.

All exchanges and correspondents should note our new address, and direct mail to 407 Park Ave., instead of 331 Walnut.

Society has not yet reached its ideal state, one in which money will no longer be used, and where everything will be free for everyone. If the comrades who read FREE SOCIETY would effectively work for that ideal condition, let them remember that one of the means to the great end is the support of the journals which devote themselves to the advocacy of liberty. Prompt payment of subscriptions is genuine and effective propaganda. Are you with us?

To anyone sending us \$2 we will send FREE SOCIETY one year and Dr. Greer's "A Physician in the House" or his new work "The Wholesome Woman." Also to anyone sending us one new subscriber and \$2 we will send the same. This applies to renewals as well as new subscriptions.

We call attention to the following letter addressed to the *Freiheit* by the Columbia University Library of New York:

"We are making a collection in Columbia University Library of Anarchistic and Socialistic periodicals. You will oblige us very much if you could tell us where we could get complete or broken sets of the following: *Alarm, The Rebel, Solidarity, Nemesis, Beacon, Truth, Anarchists, The Firebrand, Free Society, Freedom, Liberty*. You would also oblige us very much in giving us a list of the leading Anarchist periodicals that are now being published in the United States, and also their addresses, so that we might subscribe for them."

Unfortunately we cannot spare the first volume of *The Firebrand*, and the comrades possessing it should communicate with the library.

Men are not born equal in brain power, and never will be; hence the cunning and strong rule over the weak and honest. The problem of the race is to gain more liberty and better conditions for the under dog. The Anarchist and the Socialist dispute as to the remedy. On the side of the Anarchists are the greatest men of today, and of the past. Socialism has not produced one great man in America; not one, and she has been in business for twenty-five years.—*Mercury*.

Outpost Echoes.

Reason is revolution.

Life is an experiment.

Capitalism causes revolt.

Manhood! not "morality."

Thought blossoms in action.

Political action is reactionary.

Liberty has no sense of shame.

Demonstration beats dynamite.

He who loves will never despair.

The fruit is sweeter for the effort.

The postal robbery is true politics.

Time is money, but not your money.

If hope be an illusion, despair is death.

There is nothing too good for a real man.

A cause and a man, and the world gives ear.

One thing at a time is sometimes nothing at all.

Phrases are not ideas, nor are musings thoughts.

Hate remembers the offender, reason only the offense.

Custom houses are for the inconvenience of the poor.

Social decay may be peace, but it certainly is not order.

To try to be like others is to never discover yourself.

There are still American soldiers in Cuba. Is Cuba then free?

Do not rule others if you wish that others should not rule you.

First it was yellow journalism; now we have a yellow president.

Business is a form of thievery which has borrowed its reputation.

The elections are forgotten, with the promises of the candidates.

Baden Powell, the English general, is here learning how Americans kill.

The present administration may cause whitewash to become expensive.

Pearson's Magazine for May contains some entertaining lies about Anarchism.

Those who are most afraid of liberty are those who profit most by reason of slavery.

With due respect to the ultimate objects of *The Coming Nation*, its real name is *The Going Nation*.

Anarchism is forced to endure great opprobrium; but Christianity endured more without changing its name.

Some New York money-bags recently took dinner on horseback. They generally take it on the people's back.

The blind chaplain of the Senate died recently. Now we perhaps know how a Christian could stay in Washington.

Are those who deny that they are State Socialists satisfied to be political Socialists? What's in a name? An onion—

Every theory of government rests upon the idea that might makes right. Majorities, even, rule because they are *strongest*.

In Switzerland a referendum vote resulted in fixing an indorsed tariff on imports. What, can a referendum vote fail of being wise?

Man alone, stands for liberty; man in association may or may not stand for liberty, according to his environing influences.

Everything but liberty is being tried in this world in the pursuit of well-being; but old things finally refuse to be patched and mended.

The emperor of Germany lowered his flag to half mast on the anniversary of Christ's crucifixion. Was he sorry that Christ died to save man?

Roosevelt journeyed west, and left the poor fellows involved in the Customs and Postal scandals, without his helpful assistance. Ingrate!

The Boston Herald admits that popular government may become a failure. Now will it also admit that unpopular government may prove a failure, too?

It is beginning to look as tho the capitalists regarded all dissatisfied workers as Anarchists. When the workers know all about capitalists, they'll claim the name.

D. M. Parry, of the Manufacturers' Association, is just a little late in his reactionary and alarmist utterances about organized labor. The unions will not tremble at his words.

What men need is not land, nor yet capital, but liberty. With liberty, land and capital will come to men in a readjustment of things on the basis of mutual needs. Liberty is the great means.

The Socialists will "conquer" political power, and after that the majority, by virtue of its recognized intellectual superiority, will conquer any foolish objectors to its infallibility. Isn't it simple?

A master plumber's association was recently dissolved by the St. Louis courts. Here is a plain case of justice misdirected; the judge must have thought he was dealing with a wicked trades union.

C. E. S. Wood, a prominent Oregonian, says that "the whole drift of human progress" has been toward freedom. This is true. The Anarchists are those who would substitute for that "drift," definite, thoughtful action.

Sex freedom is still holding its own, tho branded all over with such names as lust, promiscuity, animalism, vice, etc. Sex slavery has been the fashion so long that its dupes are ready to drink poison in its name, and die smiling. AMERICUS.

By the Wayside.

The world is rapidly approaching conditions similar to those which preceded the downfall of the Roman empire: luxury and revelry on the part of the rich, and abject poverty and misery on the part of the toiling masses. Our millionaires give dog parties and banquets on horseback, and the wealth producers are imprisoned and shot down when they dare to demand a trifle larger modicum of their product than the slave-holders are willing to give. While

millions were being spent on the wedding of a Vanderbilt, a woman collapsed in a New York police court where she was being tried for the heinous offense of having asked for bread on the street. She died, as a result of starvation, in a hospital. Verily, Rome is burning while the money-bag Caesars play the fiddle.

The federal judge who issued the infamous injunction which resulted in the killing of seven miners in West Virginia, has admitted that at least one of those killings was a cold-blooded murder, and has named the murderer—Sheriff Cunningham. Now some trades union papers are surprised that no effort is being made to punish the murderer, as tho it were customary that highwaymen punish their accessories! Had Sheriff Cunningham been killed that would be a horse of a different color, as can be witnessed by events in Waterbury, where all means have been set in motion to punish the "lawless" toilers for the killing of a Pinkerton.

The trades unions in New Zealand, which have ardently worked for the compulsory arbitration law, are receiving one blow after another, and the measure is losing all its charms. At present the furniture workers are in a tangle which threatens to dissolve their unions. They demanded an increase in wages, and the arbitration board advanced the wages from twenty-seven to thirty-one cents an hour. The employers closed the factories rather than pay higher wages, and the workers dare not go back to work for less wages unless the arbitration board retracts its decision. Thus the compulsory arbitration law is defied by the employers with impunity, while workers are bound hand and foot by the law and heavily fined for the least infringement of this "wise measure," as it was heralded by the Socialist press of this country.

INTERLOPER.

At the Chicago Philosophical Society.

W. S. Dalton instructed the audience that Socialism was neither State Socialism, municipal and government ownership, nor free love, nor Anarchism; altho he freely admitted that he knew nothing at all about Anarchism. Then, after a lengthy portrayal of the present pernicious system of wage slavery, he stated that true Socialism meant the ownership of all the means of production and distribution by the people, administered thru majority rule. But he did not think Socialism was inevitable, yet after arousing class-consciousness among the workers, he was sure the latter would be victorious in capturing the political power, and manage affairs to suit themselves. And after the abolition of capitalism and private property, government—a tool of the rich to exploit the poor—would die of itself.

The critics showed little mercy with the speaker, and, judging from his concluding remarks, it had dawned upon him that even a "scientific" Socialist could learn some things from the Anarchists. He was shown that the advocacy of class-consciousness was destined to result in class war, and war being the origin of government and

tyranny, would simply shift the tyrants. Even if the government be captured by the ballot, the transformation of society would be accomplished merely by the brute force of the majority and not because the conquerors were right. Majority rule implied government, and it was mere sophistry to claim that he did not believe in State Socialism. To enforce its rules, the majority must have the police club—the State; and the latter having all the necessities of life under its control, the government would then be able to crush any and all opposition more effectively than any despotic governments had been able to do in the past. Such pseudo-Socialism would perhaps provide food and shelter for all, at the expense of freedom and individuality, but man is not satisfied any longer with bread alone. Freedom is the goal; a society in which man is given the opportunity to expand, and develop; where he can cooperate with those congenial to him, and choose the occupation that suits him best. Bread does not necessarily guarantee freedom, but freedom means bread and a spontaneous development of all that is best in man.

Sunday, April 26, William F. Barnard will speak on "The Woman Question."

REPORTER.

Here and There.

Comrade Pietro Gori, professor of criminology, is making a successful propaganda tour in Italy.

In France, Comrade Degreaf was sentenced to six months in prison because he distributed leaflets among the soldiers which tended to humanize them.

For distributing a new pamphlet, "The General Strike and the Social Revolution," Comrade Rohr, of Berlin, Germany, has been sentenced to prison for six months.

In Russia the "military union," composed of army officers, has issued a proclamation in which it is set forth that they will refuse to lead the troops against strikers and rebellious peasants. The manhood of the American army officers could perhaps be ameliorated if they would peruse the proclamation of their Russian colleagues.

Thru the untiring efforts of a liberty-loving woman, Solodad Gustavo, the last eight victims of the *Mons-Negra* trial, which was concocted by the police, have at length been released from prison in Spain. But they were immediately expelled from the country. "Certainly," adds the *Freiheit*, "the presence of such martyrs alone is already a propaganda against our infernal system."

Three new Anarchist periodicals have made their appearance in Sestao, Gijon, and Granada, Spain.

La Tribuna del Popolo is the name of a new Anarchist periodical in Genoa, Italy. *Der Anarchist* is a new Anarchist monthly in Germany. Its motto is: "Neither God nor master! Neither authority nor majority! Neither private property nor wage-slavery! Anarchy means order, freedom and the well-being of all." Address: R. Klose, 8 Liebigstrasse, O., Berlin, Germany.

A scientific proposition cannot be verified by a majority at the ballot-box.

Education.

The biographer of Huxley says that after a generation from the time when Huxley denounced the examinations system, nothing has been changed. "Education," he adds, "whether in academic or elementary school, is as bad as it can be. It belies its name. There is no 'drawing out,' but only a cramming in; no cultivation of observation, of reasoning or reflection; only the teaching of a crowd of facts." Facts, it may be added, of no interest or importance; facts, which are very soon forgotten, leaving no result but the serious injury of health, of too hard study, and distaste for study due to such hateful hardness. And then to take fifteen to twenty years of the most precious period of a person's life to get such an education as our schools and colleges afford. All machine work to make machine citizens for the governor.

J. WILSON.

LETTER-BOX.

M. T., Steger, Ill.—Concerning the "rascal" read the discussion, which is to follow, and judge for yourself.

M. S., Hammond, Ind.—The books ordered were sent last week. We are overwhelmed with work—hence the delay. We owe others the same apology.

R. G., City.—Your article "Is He a Rascal?" will appear next week, altho it takes up too much space altogether.

N. S. Berkeley, Calif.—Thanks for "filthy lucre" and encouraging words. If all readers were as prompt in paying their subscriptions we could not complain. Greetings.

A Vindication of Anarchism.

VI (concluded.)

"Our objection to the essay of Mr. Mill," (on government), said Macaulay, "is fundamental. We believe that it is utterly impossible to deduce the science of government from the principles of human nature. . . . Does Mr. Bentham profess to hold out any new motive which may induce men to promote the happiness of the species to which they belong? Not at all. He distinctly admits that, if he is asked why governments should attempt to produce the greatest possible happiness, he can give no answer. . . . Does Mr. Bentham's principle tend to make any man wish for anything for which he would not have wished, or do anything which he would not have done, if the principle had never been heard of? If not, it is an utterly useless principle. . . . What society wants is a new motive, not a new cant." The Utilitarians, especially their founder, deserve much honor for exposing the mischievous effects of such governmental fetishes as usury laws, barbarous punishments, and red tape. This was supplying a new motive to those who imagined the laws beneficial, the punishments required by religion, or the red tape a necessary inconvenience. But it could I suspect, have been done more quickly and easily if, instead of announcing in unfamiliar language a questionable theory, first of human motives and then of human society, the reformers had been content to say, "Let those who can, make out the benefit, the duty, or the need. We will show these things do practical harm."* When from

* The words "harm", "good", and others, their equivalents, I presume here to be used in a popular sense. The weak points of Utilitarianism is using them in a sense which leads to endless confusion by pretend-

repealing laws, which is always wise, Utilitarianism passes to making them by its (practical) rule of thumb, I conceive it has escaped being the fruitfulest mother of "crank" legislation in the world only thru a premature delivery and death, at which M. Dumont officiated as *accoucheur*.

There remains, indeed, a theory of government from which superstitious faith in it has been ostensibly dropped. The Individualist, who sometimes takes himself for an Anarchist, begins with what I potentially believe to be a truth of great importance. He asserts that Liberty is the one thing needful—the source of all prosperity, intellectual and moral culture, in short every blessing whether spiritual or carnal. He also says, undeniably, that many people are disposed to abridge, or as he terms it, invade the liberty of others; and that, since a king when he first establishes a new kingdom, is merely an over grown robber; this charge of "invading" liberty rests upon every common criminal, whose actions, if they were but a little more crafty and vigorous, would make a king of him, and therefore prove that he would be a king if he could. He who usurps the pavement lacks only ability to usurp a crown. Forgetting to inquire, as we did in the last section, whether the surest, quickest and most thoro remedy, would not be leaving them all to fight it out, our Individualist goes on reasoning thus: "Liberty, to be complete must be equal" [Evidently, it must]. "But invaders of others' liberty will not have it equal. Therefore, it is judicious in those who desire equal liberty to combine for the purpose of defense against such characters. And since it would be inconvenient for all the properly disposed people to act habitually as a police, they will do well to appoint for that purpose a committee, which, they make understood, they will all sustain when necessary. Government is such a committee; but too commonly it claims to be something more, and then becomes itself the chief invader of individual freedom." Whether it be judicious to combine for defense against such "invaders" of liberty as common criminals or no, is not to be decided in this *a priori* fashion; but by experience, which has taught us such combinations do harm. The Individualist sees, indeed, the evil of encouraging or allowing government to overstep what he calls its proper functions. But his method, still essentially metaphysical, neither furnishes government a motive to keep within

ing an impossible accuracy. If the Utilitarians had been content to say that the reforms they meditated tended towards cheap justice, reclamation of criminals, low rates of interest, it would have been quite unnecessary for them to convince the public, also, that these things are for the public good. The public was convinced of that already. It was very different when the Utilitarians undertook to show that all actions are dictated by selfishness, that judicious selfishness produces those effects vulgarly attributed to benevolence, or that judicious benevolence requires zeal for democracy. The first assertion shocked the feelings, the second revolted reason, the third offended vested interests too strong to be immediately attacked with prudence. Their being expressed in barbarous jargon made them ridiculous without making them so unintelligible as to escape odium. Thus sentiment, logic, the interest of a class, the multitude's sense of humor, were all arrayed against Utilitarianism, and therefore, quite unnecessarily, against the reforms proposed by Utilitarians, so far as these appeared inseparable from Utilitarianism.

these functions, nor a rule by which to determine in particulars how far they extend. Thomas Jefferson, whose early writings are full of Anarchism, was more than anyone else the founder of this mongrel kind. He repeatedly said he was much inclined to think no government better than any, and by no means universally impracticable. But deeming it incapable of immediate realization in his own country (he suggests at one time that it could be applied only to a small State), he set himself to limit authority after the Individualist ideal. He was the author of the first amendments to the Constitution; which are its best part. His influence is probably seen in that remarkable provision, sometimes cited as the only original feature of our polity, by which the courts are authorized to nullify unconstitutional legislation. What was the issue? Jefferson, as president, set the example of unconstitutional administration in the Louisiana Purchase. By this dangerous precedent, he introduced the utterly fatal principle of indefinite powers to serve the country, vested *ex officio* in the chief magistrate. The last atrocious result is seen in the Philippine Islands. Jefferson's political opponents boast that the institutions he helped to found, have steadily moved away from his ideal. How can we wonder, seeing he moved away from it himself? But this was neither an inevitable evolution nor the result of personal weakness. The fault was in the *Al Sirat* narrowness of this ideal. Its most distinguished exponent, since Jefferson, is undoubtedly John Stuart Mill. Herbert Spencer might be mentioned as his rival; but Mill was strictly an Individualist, while Spencer's Anarchism comes out thru all his efforts to dissemble it. Mill's famous book on "Liberty" may, therefore, be taken as the Individualist argument at its best. Compare the criticism in Fitz James Stephen's "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity." I need scarcely say that, as an Anarchist, I think much more with Mill than with Stephen. But Stephen is completely successful in showing that Individualism, stopping short of Anarchism, makes a muddle.

By what test are we to decide whether a given action "invades" the equal freedom of the actor's neighbors or not? Is it "invasion" to keep a gambling house, a brothel, a malodorous sink? Mill attempts to answer some of these questions; but his answers are the poorest part of his work. For it is evident that these are questions which different people, themselves averse to gaming, profligacy, and stench, will answer in different ways, according to the extent of their toleration for what they dislike; and equally evident that, since all depends on that, the questions admit no satisfactory answer. The government, wherever there is one, must answer them, according to its lights, and whether its answers are likely to favor individual liberty, let those judge who know anything of human nature. While no "invasions" of individual liberty appeal so strongly to the instincts of the masses as those which wear the mask of morality, none are more in favor with the intelligent than those which pose as sanitary reforms. A recent opponent of my own said he believed in some authority (tho very little) because the exercise of authority

in this way, was found to lower the death-rate. I infer that his view was typical from this, that no less a man than Mr. Buckle, in the very act of showing that government has systematically hindered every advance civilization ever made, yet pleads the necessity of some government for various purposes—one being sanitary regulation. My reply is simple. Sanitary regulations are just like all other well-meant meddlings of authority—like usury laws, for example, or like liquor laws. They seem to do immediate good; but eventually they do harm. To lower the death-rate this year is a public benefit very dearly purchased at the expense of making sanitary precautions unpopular. But anyone who doubts that is the price, must be unfamiliar with anti-vaccination literature. A high death-rate this year would be far more likely to result in banishing epidemics. "Christian Science" is the fruit of sanitary regulation by authority; that is to say such regulation has invested the vilest of imposters with the dignity of martyrs, and raised the apathy of a backward class into the enthusiasm of a fanatical religion! Are these results which a wise man who regards small-pox and diphtheria as a wise man must regard them, should desire? If he knows that human disease is a consequence of human ignorance only less deplorable than human sin, can he approve of what revives the old alliance between ignorance and zeal? And does not his wisdom teach him that every attempt to force the ignorance into acting like knowledge must do that? Folly is corrected by natural calamities. It is only made obstinate by artificial punishment. The fine paid by a blockhead too dense to see that he has deserved it, may make the log a firebrand. The divine scourge, which he cannot help seeing he has brought upon himself, is the only rod which will teach him the necessity of prudence; and to shield him from it against his will is not to protect his children but increase their danger.

The fundamental superstition of government-worship was happily stated by Mr. Gladstone in his early work on "Church and State." Government, he said, is in moral science what *to pan* is in physical. *To pan* (literally the whole) does not, however, mean the sum of the parts, but that which unites the parts in a whole, so that without it all would perish. In an animal *to pan* is the assemblage of vital organs, brain, heart, lungs, etc., whose dissolution would cause that of the whole, tho the amputation of the tail or a foot leaves *to pan* intact. To say that government is *to pan* in a "social organism" means that government is society, which may survive the loss of any member; but without which the members would all be scattered. The superstitious character of the doctrine is manifest. If government be *to pan* not only in social, but as Gladstone said in moral science, government must be God. Equally evident it is that this superstition extends as far as any belief in government. It lies at the practical foundation. Government was given by the ancestral Totem, among whose commonest titles is one equivalent to the Greek Thesmophorus (revealer of Law). Its minister is His Holiness (Egypt), Vicar of Christ (Rome), Sacred Majesty (England),

His Excellency (United States). It is "the light which lighteneth every man who cometh into" the society. In it "was life, and the life is the light of men." Anarchy, its negation, would be the greatest of evils. Rebellion is, consequently, the chief of crimes.

In the "Republic" of Plato, it is assumed that government by no means does its whole duty when only protecting the persons and property of citizens. Its high function is to form their souls. Legislation must proceed on the principle of making men virtuous—a program revived by penologists. But Plato, more consistent than they, would put us all in the penitentiary. State regulation, to make men virtuous, must extend to their thoughts. It must "prescribe what ballads shall be sung, what tunes shall be played, what books shall be read, what physics shall be swallowed." It must "choose our wives, limit our expenses, and stint us to a certain number of dishes of meat, of glasses of wine, and of cups of tea." Plato, adds Macaulay, shrank from nothing to which his principles led. His "hardihood in speculation was perhaps more remarkable than any other peculiarity of his extraordinary mind." Yet he was not much bolder than our governmental Socialists. Their proposals tend to all this; and some of them see that they do. Blackstone sets out with similar principles, tho he is compelled to nullify them by legal fictions. Carlyle's whole doctrine of Hero Worship in politics turns on the idea that government is something essentially above "the people and disordered multitude," not derived from but descending upon them. In his "Shooting Niagara," he becomes perfectly frantic over this dogma. The Church of England, in solemn Convocation, affirmed it long before his time. Every promoter of good habits by authority—the author of statutes for the perservation of morals and "suppression of vice"; the Maine Liquor Law advocate, the sanitarian legislator, the champion of compulsory vaccination, evidently reasons from the same premises. This is the "original sin" of "sociology," as the closely allied error of exalting the capitalist above the consumer is of political economy. "And this corruption of the flesh, called in Greek *phronema sarkos* doth remain, yea in them that are regenerate." Aristotle, who first treated "Politics" as a science; Webster in his famous reply to Hayne; Lincoln in his Inaugural of 1861, and in many of his letters and speeches, especially those written during the war; Jefferson in his practical administration; even Paine, in his "Rights of Man," give evidence that nothing will prevent occasional prostration before the bloodstained idol of Authority, except rooted conviction that it represents, not the Divinity, but the Devil! The original thoughts of writers like these afford us, however, the very means of correcting their vulgar error.

Aristotle, on the whole, treats government as a merely human institution, in whose best forms there are many faults. Vattel, "Law of Nations," stigmatizes the doctrine that rebellion is transcendently heinous as that of a sycophant or a cruel ruler. Macaulay, who repeatedly says the worst government is better than Anarchy,

gives excellent reasons for reducing the power of government to a minimum, in his essays on Gladstone's "Church and State," and Southey's, "Colloquies." Jefferson repeatedly said he was much inclined to think Anarchy the best social state; and, at all events, it admitted no comparison with most governments in Europe. Paine begins his "Common Sense" with these striking words. "Some writers have so confounded society with government, as to leave little or no distinction between them; whereas they are not only different, but have different origins. Society is produced by our wants, and government by our wickedness; the former promotes our happiness *positively* by uniting our affections, the latter *negatively* by restraining our vices. [Does it do that?] The one encourages intercourse, the other creates distinctions. The first is a patron, the last is a punisher. Society in every state is a blessing, but government, even its best state, is but a necessary evil; in its worst state an intolerable one; for when we suffer or are exposed to the same miseries *by a government*, which we might expect in a country *without government*, our calamity is heightened by reflecting that we furnish the means by which we suffer."

If we look over in detail the principal governmental superstitions, we shall have little difficulty in seeing they do actually spring from that confusion of government with society, which began when societies began to fight each other, and whose maxim might be "government is *to pan* in sociology."

Government, it was once generally assumed, ought to regulate trade. Privileges of monopoly should be granted to secure the best guilds against competition. Foreign goods should be taxed to keep gold at home. Increase of population should be encouraged to supply cheap labor and food for gunpowder.* The "Wealth of Nations" has so effectually refuted most of these delusions that they are no longer openly avowed. But what gave rise to them? The error of conceiving government a god, which can protect against competition better than good work, bestow value on gold (a commodity) by a stamp which makes it Money; find means to support an indefinite increase of population. Tho our protectionists dare not profess the mercantile theory, they reason in the very spirit of Mercantilism. During the first Bryan-McKinley campaign, a quotation from Lincoln was circulated by the Tories (they can no longer be called Republicans) under the caption "Common Sense." It amounted to this, that if we import goods we get the goods for money, but if we produce them at home we have the goods and the money too! Common sense, indeed! How quickly that faculty would have taught Abraham Lincoln that what proposed to give him something for nothing

* No one dare avow such motives now: yet encouraging propagation is a recognized part of public policy; so that any contract in restraint of it is invalid; and proposals to the same purpose may be criminal. See the United States' statute known as the Comstock law, on prevention of conception. Why this glaring inconsistency between our positive knowledge and practical feelings on one side, and the laws we live under upon the other? Rather obviously, because Law, representing the ignorant and barbarous past, must necessarily be an inheritance of ignorance and barbarism.

must be a humbug—if this humbug had not been called the government! Other governmental superstitions of just the same sort are the faith in usury laws (demolished by Bentham, "Defense of Usury"), and the idea that government should or can increase the value embodied in currency (upset by Ricardo's celebrated essay on "Bank Notes"). Both, however, like other superstitions discarded by all who are intelligent enough to rule, continue to maintain a Struldbrugian immortality among the ignorant class. Witness our own Greenbackers, and the frequent demand among us for more usury laws.

Nothing better can be cited than the works of the penologists Drahms and Wines (*vid. sup.*) in proof that the whole system of punishment rests on the idea of governments' operation being exempt from the natural law of causation, and has no other leg to stand upon.

Bishop's "Marriage and Divorce" may be recommended to those who would see glaring proof that the idea of sexual virtue's being promoted by laws to regulate the relation of the sexes reposes on exactly the same superstitious foundation, and is utterly refuted by experience.

Proudhon's "Economic Contradictions" is a good, tho to a reader unfamiliar with such dialectics, puzzling demonstration how the metaphysical muddle besets all orthodox economy, in consequence of the superstitious assumption that possessions would not be secure without laws to protect property. The same author's "What Is Property?" and Marx's renowned chapter on "Capital and Wage Labor," exhibit the same truth from a slightly different point of view. But for illustration of a widely unlike kind, read Grote's "History of Greece," Vol. II, Ch. XI. The author, whose scholarship enabled him to become *facile princeps* among historians of Hellas, was a banker. He was a Liberal member of parliament. He was an orthodox economist, wedded to the ideas that there should be no regulation of trade "except, of course, what is needed to protect the rights of property." But confronted with a particular case, that of Solon's reforms, he finds his principles break down beneath him. Solon cancelled the mortgage-debts of the Athenians, deprived the creditor class forever of the important security furnished by the old common law of slavery for debt, and debased the currency; of which three acts the first and last are as much opposed to the dogmas of the Manchester school as possible, and the other would usually be justified by that school on grounds of humanity rather than economic orthodoxy. But our representative of the Manchester school has to justify them all—only, indeed, under the peculiar circumstances, which, however, are common circumstances in history. "The rights of property" had become an evil simply intolerable. There was no question whether they should be violated or not, but only whether the eupatridæ could save their lands and their heads, which Solon managed for them. Legislative interference, never useful when it enacts, was beneficial, under these peculiar circumstances, because it only disenacted—a great portion of the rights of property.

C. L. JAMES.

AGENTS FOR FREE SOCIETY.

The following named persons will receive and receipt for subscriptions to FREE SOCIETY.

ALLEGHENY Pa.—H. Bauer 73 Spring-garden Ave.
ATLANTIC CITY, N. J.—M. Kisluck, 1108 Baltic Ave.
BOSTON—K. A. Snellenberg, 31 Beech Glen St., Roxbury.
BROOKLYN.—M. Metzkw, 174 Ralph St.
CHICAGO—T. Appel, 1228 Milwaukee Av.
CLEVELAND—E. Schilling, 55 Yeakel St.
COLUMBUS, Ohio—H. M. Lyndall, 416 E. Mound St.
LONDON, Eng.—T. Cantwell, 127 Ossulton St., N. W.
NEW YORK—A. Lopatiner, 180 Forsyth
PHILADELPHIA—Natasha Notkin, 242 N. Second St.

RECEIPTS.

Clark, \$2. Nastoupil, \$1.20. Ehrlich, Hurwitz, Schneider, Ettlinger, Schaub, each, \$1. Shapiro, Rice, Meyers, each 50c. Oliver, 25c.

One of the surest means of turning the heart of the world toward freedom is to appeal to individuals thru their experience of legalized love.—*Ironicus*.

FOR NEW YORK.

A picnic, vaudeville, and ball will take place on Saturday, May 23, in Glendale Schuetzen Park, Myrtle Ave., Brooklyn, asranged by the Radical Reading Room. All friends of freedom are cordially invited.

MEETINGS.

BROOKLYN.—The Social Science Club meets every Friday evening at Central Hall, 410 Stone Ave. Free discussion.

CHICAGO.—The Chicago Philosophical Society meets every Sun'ay evening at 72 Adams St., 8 p. m. sharp. Free admission. All strangers are invited to take part in the discussions. April 26, William F. Barnard will speak on "The Woman Question."

Workmen's Educational Club meets at 330 Polk St. every Saturday evening. April 18, Feldsher speaks in Jewish. May 2, W. F. Barnard will speak on a subject in English.

CLEVELAND.—Liberty Association meets every Sunday at 2:30 p. m., in Forester's Hall, 223 Champlain St. Free discussion.

NEW YORK.—The Radical Reading Room, 180 Forsyth St. Meeting every Sunday at 3 p. m. Lectures and free discussions.

SEATTLE, WASH.—The Progressive Club meets on Saturday evening, 8 o'clock, at the Theosophist Hall, 1118 Third Ave. Lectures on all pertinent social questions. Free discussion. March 28, Prof. J. Allen speaks on "Government." April 4, a member of the "Woman's Economic League" will speak before he club.

The Chicago Martyrs: The Famous Speeches of the Eight Anarchists in Judge Gary's Court; and Altgeld's Reasons for Pardoning Fielden, Neebe, and Schwab..... 25

BOOK LIST.

ALL ORDERS FOR THE FOLLOWING BOOKS

RECEIVED AT THIS OFFICE.

Essays on the Social Problem.....	05
The New Hedonism.....Grant Allen	05
Plain Words on the Woman	
Question.....	05
God and the State.....Bakunin	05
The Same. London edition.....	10
Whitman's Ideal Democracy and Other Writings.....Helena Born	1.00
Love's Coming-of-Age. Edward Carpenter.....	1.00
Prodigal Daughter: or, The Price of Virtue.....Rachel Campbell	25
The Worm Turns.....V. de Cleyre	10
The Emancipation of Society from Government.....Dallan Doyle	05
Roosevelt, Czolgosz, and Anarchism.....Jay Fox	03
Crime and Criminals....C. Darrow	10
Realism in Literature and Art.....	05
Hilda's Home. Cloth \$1.....	50
Moribund Society and Anarchy. Cloth 60c.....Jean Grave	25
Motherhood in Freedom.....Harman	05
Origin of Anarchism....C. L. James	05
Government Analyzed.....Kelso	50
Anarchism: Its Philosophy and Ideal.....Peter Kropotkin	05
Anarchist Communism: Its Basis and Principles.....	05
An Appeal to the Young.....	05
Anarchist Morality.....	05
Expropriation.....	05
Field, Factory and Workshop..	45
Law and Authority.....	05
Memoirs of a Revolutionist.....	2.00
Mutual Aid, a Factor in Evolution.....	2.00
Organized Vengeance.....	03
Paris Commune.....	05
The State: Its Historic Role....	10
The Wage System. Revolution-ary Government.....	05
Resist Not Evil. Cloth. Clarence S. Darrow.....	75
Social Democracy in Germany.....	02
History of the Commune. Cloth...Lissagaray	75
Conduct and Profession.....Darraw	10
Wind-Harp Songs....J. Wm. Lloyd	1.00
The Economics of Anarchy.....	25
Anarchy. (Is It All a Dream? Jas. F. Morton, Jr.)....Malatesta	10
A Talk about Anarchist Communism between two Workers.....	05
A Chambermaid's Diary.....	50
God and Government: The Siamese Twins of Superstition....W. Nevill	05
The Deistic Pestilence...John Most	05
The Pyramid of Tyranny.....	05
Mating or Marrying, Which?.....F. Domela Nieuwehuus	05
Evolution and Revolution.....Reclus	05
Tolstoy.....Clarence S. Darrow	10
Pure Economy.....J. H. Rowell	10
Pages of Socialist History.....	30
The Slavery of Our Times. Cloth.....Leo Tolstoy	75
Our Worship of Primitive Social Guesses.....E. C. Walker	15
Revival of Puritanism.....	10
Vice: Its Friends and Foes.....	15
What the Young Need to Know	10
The Ballad of Reading Gaol.....Oscar Wilde	10
Life Without a Master. 336 pp. Cloth \$1.50.....J. Wilson	1.00
The New Dispensation. Cloth.....	1.50
The Coming Woman...Lillie White	05
Anarchism and Outrage.....	03
Anarchy on Trial.....	05

History of the French Revolution.

— BY —

C. L. JAMES.

An excellent history of the French Revolution, well written by one thoroly familiar with his subject. Special care has been exercised to give the facts as they are, the author not having made himself the champion of any faction.

Justice, Wilmington, Del., says of it:

It is concise; it is accurate; and above all, it deals with essentials; the author has entered into the spirit of the Revolution.

Azariah S. Root, librarian at Oberlin College Library, Oberlin, Ohio, says:

I was much interested in looking over the work. It seems to me to indicate careful study of the sources, and to be the work of one profoundly interested in democracy.

It is neatly printed from large type on good book paper, with a substantial binding. There are 343 pages, with an index and bibliographical epitome.

Price, bound in cloth, \$1 postpaid; paper bound copies, 50 cents, 9 cents extra for postage. Send orders to

ABE ISAAK Jr., 407 Park Ave., Chicago, Ill.

A PHYSICIAN IN THE HOUSE.

IT IS THE BEST MEDICAL BOOK FOR THE HOME YET PRODUCED.

— BY —

DR. J. H. GREER.

IT HAS 16 COLORED PLATES SHOWING DIFFERENT PARTS OF THE HUMAN BODY

This book is up to date in every particular. It will save you doctor bills. It tells you how to cure yourself by simple and harmless home remedies. The book recommends no poisonous or dangerous drugs. It teaches simple common sense methods in accordance with Nature's laws. It does not endorse dangerous experiments with the surgeon's knife. It teaches how to save health and life by safe methods. It is entirely free from technical rubbish. It teaches prevention—that it is better to know how to live and avoid disease than to take any medicine as a cure.

It teaches how typhoid and other fevers can be both prevented and cured. It gives the best known treatment for La Grippe, diphteria, catarrh, consumption, appendicitis and every other disease. This book is not an advertisement and has no medicine to sell. It tells you how to live that you may prolong life. It opposes medical fads of all kinds and makes uncompromising war on vaccination and the use of anti-toxine. It has hundreds of excellent recipes for the cure of the various diseases. The chapter on painless midwifery is worth its weight in gold to women. It has a large number of valuable illustrations. The "Care of Children" is something every mother ought to read. It teaches the value of air, sunshine, and water as medicines. This book cannot fail to please you. If you are looking for health by the safest and easiest means, do not delay getting the book. It is printed in clear type on good book paper, beautifully bound in cloth and gold letters. It has 800 octavo pages.

FORMERLY SOLD FOR \$2.75.

SEND ORDERS TO FREE SOCIETY.

MORIBUND SOCIETY AND ANARCHY.

Translated from the French of

JEAN GRAVE

By VOLTAIRINE DE CLEYRE

CONTENTS:

The Anarchistic Idea and Its Development.—Individualism and Solidarity.—Too Abstract.—Is Man Evil?—Property.—The Family.—Authority.—The Magistracy.—The Right to Punish and the Savants.—The Influence of Environment.—"The Country."—The Patriotism of the Governing Classes.—Militarism.—Colonization.—There are no Inferior Races.—Why We are Revolutionist.—As to What Means follow from the Principles.—Revolution and Anarchy.—The Efficacy of Reforms.—The Experimental Method.—What Then?—Anarchism and its Practicability.—The Unvarnished Truth.	05
The book is printed in large type, and consists of 176 pages.	
Price, paper cover, 25c; bound 60c. Five copies \$1.	

Send orders to FREE SOCIETY.

FIELD, FACTORY AND WORKSHOP.

BY PETER KROPOTKIN.

This interesting work has now been published in a popular edition. No student of social and economical affairs can do without it.

The book contains the following chapters: The Decentralization of Industries.—The Possibilities of Agriculture.—Small Industrial Villages.—Brain Work and Manual Work.—Conclusion.—Appendix Price, paper cover, 40 cents, postpaid 45 cents.

Order from FREE SOCIETY.

COLLEGE of MEDICINE & SURGERY, Chicago

Four years Graded Course. Laboratories fully equipped. Abundance of Clinical Material. FEES MODERATE. Fall term opens in September Write today for Catalog to

FLORENCE DRESSLER, M. D., Sec'y 245-247 Ashland Ave., Chicago, Ill.