

FREE SOCIETY

ENTERED AT SAN FRANCISCO POSTOFFICE AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER.

An Exponent of Anarchist-Communism Holding that Equality of Opportunity alone Constitutes Liberty, that in the Absence of Monopoly Price and Competition Cannot Exist, and that Communism is an Inevitable Consequence.

VOL. IV, NO. 1.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL. SUNDAY NOVEMBER 13, 1898.

WHOLE NO. 189.

MASSACRE OF MAY 3, 1886.

The eleventh anniversary of the martyrdom of the noble Parsons, Spies, Lingg, Fischer and Engel, to the cause of human progress and freedom, revives vividly in my memory the ghastly scenes of slaughter and bloodshed I witnessed near the McCormick reaper works of Chicago on May 3, 1886, which gave occasion for the memorable Haymarket meeting the following evening.

The mighty hords of discontented labor, swaying under the weight of economic oppression had entered upon a struggle for an amelioration of their miserable condition. The great eight-hour movement that had so long been agitated, had now culminated in a gigantic strike. Men marvelled at the enormity and spontaneity of the effort. Forty thousand toilers, embracing all branches of trade, had laid down their tools. Most of the large factories had been deserted by the industrial bees whose lot—so the preachers and lawyers had said—was to toil and be contented. But all such "learned" advice had been cast to the four winds, and labor awakening to a higher sense of freedom and human rights, and goaded by the weight of a constantly increasing pressure of toil, for an ever decreasing remuneration, began to feel its influence as a factor in the industrial sphere gradually but surely dwindling. He saw the magnificent palaces of his haughty masters increasing in number, and had contrasted their luxurious splendor with his own grimy, insanitary hovel. Everywhere was to be seen painful evidences of his ultimate degradation to the position of a mere chattel, did he not take steps to stem the tide of a cruel, relentless commercialism, alone responsible for his wanton miseries. But what was to be done? The eight-hour movement offered the only ray of hope for an immediate improvement: it gave opportunity for a united outburst of a discontent that had been accumulating since the close of the civil war, from which time the oppressive and dominating power of concentrated capital really dates.

The outbursts of 1877, crushed by the allied forces of city, state and national governments, at the behest of the capitalistic combines—whose plunderings to protect governments are alone maintained—had not been forgotten. But its lessons had not been heeded, and the workers as a result were poorly equipped to meet their economic masters in '86, and with even a less chance of success than they had in '77; for during the interval the capitalists had taken opportunity to strengthen their position by passing oppressive laws, increasing the army and militia and instructing them in a special riot drill that they might the more easily and effectively mow down the "vicious mob" of wage slaves who dared rebel against the will of their masters. Whilst the workers, ever careless of their own interests, had taken no measures to defend themselves when attacked by those hired minions, whom they must have known would use their gatlings and rifles as soon as the strike showed signs of success, and that such attack would be made under the guise of the maintenance of "law and order", a delusive catch phrase which rightly interpreted means for the workers, that they shall quietly submit to be plundered of their products, else force will be used.

The McCormick Co., of the many large employers in the vicinity succeeded in inducing a number of the unemployed to take the places of the strikers. To the hungry men whose loved ones at home were in dire need, the crime of "scabbing" appeared light. The highly communistic sense of duty to provide for those dependent upon them made the idle workers an easy prey to the capitalistic plunderers, who used them to crush the hopes of their fellows and plunge all labor deeper into the mire of modern wage slavery.

On the afternoon of May 3, groups of strikers were congregated in the open space fronting the reaper works discussing the various phases of the eight-hour movement, when some small boys started throwing stones over the high fence surrounding the buildings. Soon the throwing became general and a fusillade of

brickbats were hurled through the office windows causing the wildest confusion among its occupants who immediately telephoned to the police station near by, that a mob of 10,000 had attacked the works and were about to burn it down, which was a lie both as regards the size as well as the intentions of the crowd. Not more than three hundred were in the vicinity when the throwing began, and now that the windows were broken the "mob" manifested no desire to do further injury to the "property" of their former employer. Indeed they were showing signs of retiring from the scene when several patrol wagons loaded with police came thundering down Blue Island ave., not stopping until they reached the big gate where with drawn revolvers the "coppers" arrayed themselves in line of battle. The "mob" had now increased to about a thousand, a large number of which were women and children. Painfully realizing that the "law" was on the side of McCormick and the scabs, the workers began to manifest some uneasiness. The police made a few faint attempts to drive the crowd away. They were evidently waiting for re-enforcement which soon arrived to the number of about a hundred, making two hundred or thereabouts in all. Why the first detachment of police did not disperse the strikers which they could have easily done, and that without the aid of their firearms, for the angry throng offered no resistance excepting their yells and a few stones, was not clear to me then. It is plainly evident now that the capitalistic hirelings had but one purpose in view, that of making a terrible example of those misguided creatures who had so foolishly declared war against their masters without having first provided themselves with a means of defence. For a strike is war, and the sooner the workers realize that fact and proceed to act in accordance with it, the sooner will they have achieved their emancipation.

Immediately upon the arrival of re-enforcement the police opened a desperate fire into the surging mass of human beings: men, women and children alike becoming targets for the cruel piercing bullets of these inhuman brutes, whose humanity had been destroyed by their blind obedience to the authority of "superiors" and a fanatical reverence for legislative enactments.

This unwarranted attack was almost entirely unexpected by the assembled throng. Who but a fiend would have thought that two hundred trained marksmen would ruthlessly slaughter a mass of defenseless beings whose only crime was the breaking of a few panes of glass? Ah! but they had done something more, which the statute had not yet declared a crime but which was nevertheless the worst of all crimes in the eyes of the rulers: they had signified the intention to take themselves a hand in the conduct of their own affairs. The eight-hour movement was but a step; where might it lead to if successful? Would the next step be six, then four and finally complete emancipation? That was the spectre that haunted the McCormick's, Armour's, et al, at that critical time and forced them in their cowardice to urge their tools, the police, to massacre the workers as a bloody example of the power of capitalism and its determination to deal mercilessly with all who dare oppose it.

Repeated volleys were discharged into the fleeing mass. It is beyond the power of my pen to describe the terrible scenes that followed. The shrieks of frightened women, the screams of children, the moans of the wounded and dying, the frenzied roars of maddened and hounded men as they carried their dead and wounded comrades off the bloody field, vent the air with a terrible, revolting hideousness, the very contemplation of which causes the very fiber of my being to quiver.

Many of the poor fellows that were "winged" fell into the hands of the police, who with a sickening indifference to their own heinous crimes against every sense of human feeling, and strictly in compliance with statute law, dragged their bleeding prisoners off to jail. The total number of deaths resulting from this most dastardly and fiendish massacre will never be known. Seven were killed outright and more than three times that many wounded, some fatally. None of the police were hurt, which shows the utter defenselessness of the "mob."

Thus the first day's work for the suppression of the eight-hour movement had resulted in a complete and glorious victory for the friends of law and order.

JAY FOX.

PETER KROPOTKIN ON LUCCHENI.

The Danish poet Johannes Jorgensen, who has made himself known through his conversion to Catholicism and his fanatic glorification of it, has now published an article with the leading "The Real Criminal" in the "Nationalitiden (Copenhagen), in which he accuses Peter Kropotkin as theoretical Anarchist of being originally responsible for the murder of Empress Elizabeth. Jorgensen says: "At last we must point to this man as the real criminal, the real murderer." Pursuing this strain, the author designates Kropotkin as "a mixture of scoundrel and idealist" and he is sorry that Kropotkin will escape the police and the courts," as the right of asylum in England unfortunately prevents a punishment."

In answer to this the celebrated Scandinavian critic George Brandes printed a defense of Kropotkin in the "Politiken".

At the same time Brandes publishes a letter which Kropotkin wrote him in response to a request. In this letter Kropotkin emphasizes that as a man who sympathizes with all sufferers, he abhors bloody deeds, but as a sociologist he cannot help being cognizant that deeds like that of Luccheni of necessity must spring from our "social order," an order which rests upon blood and suffering.

Kropotkin writes:

"My dear George Brandes: I am so accustomed to read in certain papers, that I am the cause of every act of revolt that I have ceased to pay to it the slightest attention. I am only surprised that it has not already been said, 'The handle of Luccheni's file was made in London.' For such articles the Russian embassy pays well.

"Like you, like all good men, I felt my heart contract when I heard of this new victim of the social struggle, the poor Empress of Austria, who, an old woman, was long before the loss of her son unhappy and could only evoke feeling of compassion. The women and children at least should be spared in this terrible fight going on and in the more fierce fights now preparing. If by the sacrifice of my life I could have saved but a small number of the victims of this fight that have on all sides perished in the streets and on the gallows during the last thirty years, I would have given it without a moment's hesitation. But that would not have sufficed, for what decides is that which compels mankind to think."

Kropotkin then describes the life of the murder, to explain his deed. A child of the street, who afterwards as soldier "learned the art to kill, even without sparing father, mother, wife or child, when he receives command to shoot for the salvation of society." He cites how Luccheni took part in the African war and witnessed in Italy the street fights. What did he learn there? That in Milan they shot at the working people for three days, killing them by hundreds, without inquiring whether the children, who also fell by the bullets, were responsible for the riot.

"Well then, dear George Brandes," he continues, "just imagine our children subjected to such conditions, and say whether they would not be in danger of sympathy dying out in them and instead a hatred called forth against those who never think about the misery which is the price of their welfare?"

"There are people who believe in the magical, restraining power of an execution. Statesmen, clergymen, philosophers adhere to this belief. And then shall such a beggar have a higher conception of life?"

"As long as carnages like that in Italy take place, as long as mankind is taught disrespect for human life by being told that for the "commonweal" people have to be killed,—just so long outrages will be committed again and again, even if all were beheaded who study the psychology of misery and have the courage to say what they mean.

"That, dear friend, is my answer. In response to your kind invitation I had to say what I think." —Translated from the German for Free Society.

FREE SOCIETY.

FORMERLY "THE FIREBRAND."

Published Weekly by Free Society Publishing Co.

50 CENTS A YEAR.

Address all Communications and make all Money Orders payable to FREE SOCIETY, 43 Sheridan St., San Francisco, California.

Anarchy.—A social theory which regards the union of order with the absence of all direct government of man by man as the political ideal; absolute individual liberty.—Century Dictionary.

NOTE AND COMMENT.

With this issue we will discontinue sending the paper to subscribers who are far in arrears, but if they are out of employment or otherwise unable to pay for it, they may drop us a postal card and we will gladly send them the paper anyway.

There is one good thing in political action, and that is the revealing of frauds and how the dear people are fleeced and robbed by their elected servants. We hear now that senators use State funds for election purposes, that the office-holders (judges not excluded) "almost to a man" refuse to pay poll tax, and that even the bankers refuse to pay this tax. Says a tax collector: "An ex-judge of this county informed me that he had never even been asked for his poll tax in all the years he had been in Oakland. I doubt very much whether you could find a mechanic or laboring man in this city who could say the same." We hear now also that Senator Quay, of Pennsylvania, used State funds in stock speculations, confining his operations to the stocks dependent upon legislation for their value. In short, thieves and rascals are our law makers—the props of society.

According to the London Clarion "a new Montjuich has been instituted by the infamous Austrian government. The Munkas, a newspaper of Fuenfkirchen, reports of the suffering experienced by political prisoners in Croatia, Austria: "During the recent elections several persons, including some Socialists, were incarcerated by the government. They were given salted herrings, and allowed nothing to drink. They suffered so much from thirst that they drank their own urine. They were compelled to run round their cells until they fell from exhaustion, were beaten with a dog's whip, and tortured so that two of their number expired from their sufferings." The chief editor of the Sloboda, a paper published in Agram, reports that "of the 67 prisoners who were arrested with the editor, ten have died, and as many more are expected shortly to be relieved by death from their sufferings." And "all this inhuman cruelty took place in order to make the prisoners confess imaginary crimes." Such are the crimes of government, yet these governors are not called "the wild beasts of society." But should one of these victims kill the person who sanctions such cruelties, a hypocritical cry of indignation will be heard from all over the "civilized" world. "What fools [and cowards] these mortals be."

"If our labor reformers would be a little more temperate in their war against capital," says the Rockland Independent, "they would show themselves more fit for self-government. And when they have shown that, they won't have any more labor problems to solve." Of course there will be no problems to solve if we can be made so submissive as to take every lash with a sweet smile and to thank God for his mercifulness when capital starves us to death. Non-resistance is the name of a disease with which many modern reformers are afflicted.

Charles Russel Burke, a Standard Oil millionaire, is beginning to realize that he has been a robber and oppressor, and as a compensation for the injury done has written a book in which he tells American laborers how they could help themselves. The novel is called "Thistle Sifters," from which we quote:

You are being oppressed to the verge of slavery by your masters, the controllers of the great monopolistic corporations. There is no help for you unless you take these monopolies into your own hands: to do this you must have both brains and money.

You must remember that all the capital in the world is produced by your own toil. Every dollar that is controlled and used against you by the monopolists, every dollar that has been employed in the building of railroads and telegraphs, in the development of mines and oil fields, and in bringing to the yielding point all the great natural resources of the country, is the direct

outgrowth of your toil, or the toil of men who, like you, received only a pittance for their work, while all the vast profits have gone into the pockets of manipulators and schemers.

That the workers must have brains to conceive that they are plundered and robbed and ought to enjoy all they create is correct, but once they recognize this fact they need no money to take possession of the wealth they have produced themselves, and which has been stolen and arbitrarily taken from them. People would consider it downright nonsense if I would pay a thief for a horse he had stolen from me, and it is more foolish to pay for the wealth men have created by their own labor.

They tell us that laws do not make anything—that they make neither rich nor poor, good times nor bad times. Let us see. If the law does not prevent many from making whiskey, then the papers lie. If the law should say that men should not raise corn except upon payment of ten dollars a bushel I think there would be a scarcity of corn; if the law would take out of the public treasury two cents a pound for all corn raised, as it did for sugar, and pay it to the raiser of corn, there would be corn to burn. Thus it appears to me that the law does have much to do with the creation of wealth, though it cannot directly create wealth. It also has to do with the equal or unequal distribution of wealth. For instance pure whiskey is produced today at an expense for necessary labor of about 11 cents per gallon. Before the rebellion when every person could make whiskey with the same freedom they made vinegar; it sold for 20 cents a gallon. Now it sells for five to ten dollars a gallon to the consumer—all the operation of law. British law in India that laid a tax of four cents a pound on salt caused the death of thousands for the lack of that article, which produces a disease like scurvy. Did the law make the disease or not?—Appeal to Reason.

There was a time when in the minds of the people God was responsible for diseases, etc., and now it is the law—a god in another form, and men are thus made irresponsible for crimes perpetrated. The fact of the matter is that neither a god nor the laws are dangerous to society, but the belief in either are harmful. Not law caused the death of thousands in India, but the belief of the people that laws are "divine" and must be obeyed. Neither is the law itself responsible for such crimes, but the individuals who make and enforce it. Says Tolstoi: "Formerly tyrants were indicted and prosecuted for crimes committed, while today monstrous crimes—which would have been impossible in the times of Nero—are committed with impunity. Some demand, others have made the proposition; some repeal, others have resolved; some sanction, others have commanded, and others execute. They hang and torture to death men, women and innocent children—in Russia, in other parts of Europe and in America in combating the Anarchists and other revolutionists. They shoot and kill hundreds and thousands of men, or, as it so frequently happens, people are murdered through solitary confinement, through overwork in the factory and barracks, and nobody is responsible."

EPITOME OF THE SEX QUESTION.

What is sex? No one knows. The physical differences which denote sex in the higher genera of plants and animals are obviously superficial. The physiological are unexplained. Like other mysteries, the subject has been a theme for plentiful dogmatism: but the dogmas are mostly capable of easy refutation. It is not true, e. g., that sex pervades all nature, and is a property of the First Cause. Not to mention plants, the lower animals have no sex. It is not true that the female sex was created for the male. The evolution of the female precedes that of the male. The lowest animals are wholly structureless. They propagate only by splitting themselves in two. The amoeba have a nucleus, but no cavity. Most of them propagate in the same way; but some by conjugation, i. e., two individuals melt into one, in whose unity a third is engendered. There are some which generate their young out of the nucleus. Some amoeba, and all the gregarina (animals containing one cell), have a shell or skin. Through this, in the gregarina, buds protrude, which become new individuals; as is also the case with the foraminifera (shell-amoeba). Some degenerate vertebrates (the ascidians) multiply in the same manner. But among insects, no phenomenon is more common than virgin-birth. There are whole species without any males—at least none have ever been found. Among the molluscs, hemaphroditism is the prevailing condition. Many, as the common snail, though they have both sexes in each individual, require two to propagate. Thus, it is not true that

the sexes are made for each other. The evolution-history of sex shows that the male was "made" to assist the female in that process on whose perfection depends so largely the victory of each species in the general battle for existence. This subordinate position of the male is recognized by all his representatives except the tyrant Man. Among no other species does the lover ever become the master, or ever even cease to be the suitor. Among almost all other species the necessity for success in courting has made the male much surpass the female in that beauty which he holds at her service, like his strength and courage. There are a few species (bees particularly) among which the female is the worker and fighter. But it is only among ours that enslavement of the females, enabling the males to choose instead of being chosen, has made the female "the fair sex." To a man capable of sympathizing duly with the pain of his mother or the delicacy of his love, this must appear the most disgraceful fact in natural history. He can need no other argument to convince him that the total unconditional abolition of those laws made by men for women is the right of woman and duty of man. He must needs be roused to something like fury by the insults cast upon the affectionate women who are willing and the unfortunate women who are compelled to devote themselves to the happiness of men, not only by men, but what is, if possible, still more scandalous, by that servile class among the women who desire only a good private job. But I do not expect all men to be lovers of this pure and generous kind. Love is the most ambiguous word in our language. In practice it means the last extremity of selfish lust on one side and selfish cupidity on the other, engendering the most hateful of mutual tyrannies. When that voracious navigator, Lemuel Gulliver, was in the country of the Honyhuhums, the Honyhuhum he calls his master told him there were three things the Yahoos (men) as the vilest among creatures, videlicet: They were the dirtiest of all animals. They were the only animals among whom the males would fight with the females: and they were the only animals who did not respect the law of continence at proper times. "I thought," says Gulliver, "that if my master had known anything about hogs, I could have defended my own race against the first of these charges; but for the other two, I had to admit that they were just." Seeing, thus, that the Yahoo in sexual matters is generally below all brutes, we must not appeal to his magnanimity but to his interest. The laws he has made for women are suicidal. They cause, in particular cases, barrenness, disease, abortion, infanticide, and boundless misery. They are the fountain-head of general overfecundity, with its sequelae, bitter competition, war, slavery, inequality, prostitution, and poverty. Genius, the mainspring of progress, has been almost wholly due to their violation. And there is simply nothing in their favor but a superstitious prejudice, of which their existence is the only cause. Since the sexes were not made for one another, it is, a fortiori, untrue that individuals of each sex were made for individuals of the other. But this is what the only sexual law approved by any one here, assumes. The evil of those established under other civilizations, such as polygamy and polyandry, need no comment. We ought rather to enlarge on the truths that they are no worse than our own—that though strongly condemned in these countries, the corresponding practices have continued to be common, and have in no special manner injured any breed. The true sexual law, established by nature, can be learned only by experiment. The necessary condition of hopeful experiment is entire freedom of the least amorous sex.

C. L. JAMES.

THE ALTURAS SAVANT.

In my article in No. 49, headed "Boodle," I referred to a concoction upon Anarchism by William Thompson of Alturas, Cal., in his Plaindealer which he was uncharitable enough to inflict upon his innocent readers after having rejected my article upon the hypocritical plea that he had "not space for the discussion of such [!] questions." I herewith submit the clipping of his infiction with my comments and compliments:

ANARCHY AND ANARCHISTS.

The assassination of the Empress of Austria and the consequent action of the European powers in adopting measures to stamp out Anarchists in the old world is causing some agitation in this country. That stringent measures should be adopted to prevent the landing of this dangerous element (1) on our shores none, we apprehend, will deny. (2) The Anarchist is the legiti-

mate production of tyranny and oppression. He sees one class living in idleness and luxury—who produce nothing, but are the consumers of our unrequited toil (3)—who, like the lilies of the valley toil not, neither do they spin. (4) In his ignorance—brutalized by want and misery—the Anarchist sees only injustice and wrong in organized society. (5) His nature revolts against a system which enables one class to revel in luxury while he and his family are clothed in rags and his children are crying for food. In his blind, unreasoning rage he seeks revenge, and like the assassin of Elizabeth, "determines to kill somebody." (6)

He looks upon religion with hatred (7)—as an ally of that injustice and wrong which dooms him and his children to a life of misery and degradation. He sees in the teachings of modern Christianity only hope, salvation and happiness for the rich. The sky-reaching domes and temples erected to Him who from Olivet could weep over the misery and degradation of Jerusalem, are but a menace and a mockery of his own misery. Society is his enemy. He hates it because he sees only injustice in its workings. He is, in fact, an intellectual savage, who realizing his wrongs, applies a savage's remedy. (8)

The question arises, what shall we do with him? That he should not be permitted to land upon our shores all are agreed. (9) But does it ever occur to the American people that we are pursuing a course that will breed Anarchists in our own land? (10) Do they reflect that they are building up (11) a privileged class in our own country—a class that dictates the legislation of State and government—and then enforces or nullifies the laws as selfish interest dictates? (12) Do they reflect that the fostering of monopolies, trusts and combines, whose special privileges are protected by law—growing richer and more insolent year by year, while the masses are getting poorer—will breed Anarchists in our own midst? (13) Yet a continuation of the rule of monopolies and trusts will as surely breed these savages of modern society (14) as that the inexorable laws of God remain in force. (15)

If we would prevent the growth of Anarchy here, we must enact and enforce laws equally upon the rich and the poor. (16) All must share in their benefits (17) or suffer for their violation. Then the burden of the commonwealth should be shared by all alike. It should fall, like the dew of heaven, on the rich and poor. We must educate and prove to all men (18) that our laws are founded upon justice, and enforced with impartiality. Then we will eradicate Anarchy. (19) It can gain no foothold upon our shores, and will be heard of only as the case of Elizabeth or Carnot when some fanatic gives his life as a protest against society. (20)

1.—Dangerous only to boodlers, robbers and tyrants. 2.—I, for one, deny it. This country was not made for the special benefit of Thompson and consorts, but it is a part of the globe upon which every human being is entitled to move freely by virtue of his or her very existence; all geographical lines are an arbitrary farce. If anyone did possess a claim of priority to this country, it would be the now abused, harassed and robbed Indians and not the Thompsonian fraternity.

3.—Thompson has no business counting himself in, for \$5 is pretty good pay for a boodler card of half a dozen words; there is no "unrequited toil" about that.

4.—The lilies of the valley are of some benefit by their fragrance and beauty; it is an insult to the lilies to be compared with the idler class; some parasitical plant would be a better comparison.

5.—The Alturas savant evidently never heard of such persons as Proudhon, Bakounin, Kropotkin, Reclus, and scores of others of the same character who were and are above "being brutalized by want and misery" and by whose "ignorance" he might profit greatly if he deigned to read their works. If Thompson had intelligence enough to distinguish between organization and association, he, too, might only see injustice and wrong in "organized" society, for organization involves authority; authority breeds power, and power, as that other Anarchist Percy Shelley so beautifully says "is the bane of all virtue." In fact "organized society" is a contradiction of terms; society is a voluntary association of harmonious individuals, while organization is a forced conglomeration of uncongenial beings. Society means peace—organization means war. There is no peace now; there is war—the boodler and robber, the hyena standing upon one and the fleeced lamb upon the other side of what is misnamed "society," but what really is a huge battlefield.

6.—Thompson would certainly have been more careful in the selection of his rhetoric, had he thought of the Yankee skeletons we might produce to "haunt his memory." When an Anarchist turns terrorist and "determines to kill somebody," the "somebody" is generally one who has been fleecing the masses of the working people in some shape or other, or who has been prominent in lending his or her influence to boodlers or robbers like the Austrian profligate woman Elizabeth who had spent more in one day than a hundred poor seamstresses who work by the midnight lamp—and who are robbed indirectly by such ilk as

that Austrian profligate—can earn in a year. The Anarchist who turns terrorist has no personal grievances and is not actuated by "revenge," as the Alturas savant might have learned from Lucreti's own personal published statements, had he devoted some of his time to ascertaining facts regarding the subject in hand instead of running after boodles. The terrorist always aims at "somebody" whom he considers a "shining light" in the robber-world; one whom he considers prominent enough to attract, by his or her being taken off, the lethargic world and whose exit will cause the balance of the robber-world to "pause and reflect" upon their evil ways and will effect a general discussion of the social question and of their existing iniquities. The Anarchist terrorist seeks not revenge, but the purification of society. But a Yankee Guiteau who slays a Garfield for no loftier motive than boodle, —that is the fellow who "in his blind, unreasoning rage seeks revenge." Moment!

7.—No, he doesn't look upon religion with any more hatred than he does upon any other fallacy or superstition. The Anarchist is no sentimentalist; he cannot be reconciled to anything he can neither see, hear, feel, smell or taste like Thompson's god; he is a rationalist and only figures with that which can be explained by known natural processes—also termed "natural laws"—but he does not persecute or interfere with Thompson's creed, no matter how many gods, devils or angels they believe in, so long as the belief does not express itself in injurious, invasive acts.

8.—Thompson ought to remember that "there are others" right at home—right in "the land of the free and the home of the brave." When an Anarchist terrorist slays a robber or boodler or a representative of either, his consideration is the redemption of the human race from slavery. But when a Yankee Booth slays a Lincoln he does it in favor of slavery. Who is the "savage"?

9.—That is a repetition answered in No. 2. If Thompson took pattern after those "ignorant Anarchist editors he would not swell his "valuable" space with stale repetitions.

10.—Did the religious Alturas editor ever study the literature of "our own land"? A man who attempts to enlighten others ought to be fairly well informed himself. If he had studied the literature of his own country he would have found the name of the American Josiah Warren who, more than forty years ago, wrote the Anarchistic work "True Civilization." He would also have run across the Anarchistic work "The Science of Society" by the brilliant American Stephen Pearl Andrews. Indeed, if he knew anything at all about the literary characters of "our own land" he would know the Anarchist Wendell Phillips who said: "Government commenced in usurpation and oppression." "Government began in the feudalism of the soldier and the bigotry of the priest." "The law has been always wrong." He would furthermore be aware of the existence of scores of Anarchistic journals published in "our own land" and read by thousands of people, and that one of the oldest of its kind—Liberty—has been run over twenty years by B. R. Tucker at Boston, Mass., an American scholar whose profundity and learning might do credit even to an Alturas editor. He might know also the work "The Economics of Anarchy," by the American Dyer D. Lum, colonel in the civil war. The limitation of space prevents the enumeration of many more Anarchistic philosophers, writers and agitators as well as publications in America, but Thompson may rest assured that the philosophy of Anarchism is nothing new in "our own land," and that even conservative newspapers and magazines are becoming tintured with it.

11.—Here is a Thompsonian error of tenses. It should not read "are building up," but "have built up."

12.—If Thompson were given to acute reasoning he would realize that laws and governments are privileges in principle because they rest upon the theoretical rule of majority and the actual rule of an insignificant minority, both of which means inequality—privilege. Selfishness is natural. "Self-preservation is the first law of nature." If every human being had full control over his or her own body and actions—which means absence of government, or Anarchy—such selfishness would find its limit in and be balanced by the selfishness of every other individual, and hence no harm could accrue therefrom to anyone.

13.—Monopolies, trusts and combines are the result of laws and governments. The most basic and destructive monopolies are land and money monopoly, causing rent and interest. If there were no govern-

ments to protect both, the natural law of the free use and occupancy of the vacant soil and the free management of the industries by the workers would obtain and result in the wiping out of both rent and interest which are sucking the life-blood of the workers, causing human woe and misery, turning this earth into a veritable "valley of tears." The Mussel Slough case is a fair illustration. Here a number of settlers with their families transformed a wilderness into a comparative paradise, and the government, after twenty years, at the behest of this railroad monopolists, ousted them from their natural homes.

14.—"Modern" devilishness, not "society."

15.—If this benighted backwoods editor believes in the "inexorable laws of god," then he must believe that the act of the man who slew the Austrian profligate was one of the effects of such "inexorable laws" and that everything wrong that exists, is. Why, then, does he rail against them? Let him rail against his god or acknowledge himself to be either a hypocrite or a fool.

16.—The very existence of rich and poor is evidence of a wrong social state. Where there is justice or even comparative justice there are no rich and no poor, for nature spreads the table for all with her bounties. But the common people are divorced from the fruit of their toil by the very instrument this Alturas savant wants to remedy things by—laws and governments.

17.—There could be no "benefits" derived from laws even under idealistic conditions, for they would necessitate a lot of loafers called "officials," who must be fed by labor.

18.—How about the women? Presumably Thompson's woman is considered a non-entity by him, but that is no reason that every other woman should be such.

19.—Anarchy is a condition of freedom. It does not yet prevail, and anything that does not exist cannot be "eradicated," the Alturas savant's assertions to the contrary notwithstanding. But if he means Anarchism he might as well attempt to eradicate the philosophy of gravitation. Anarchism is a philosophy—a science of society. It is based upon pure reason and if Thompson would "eradicate" Anarchism he must change all rational minds in such of the inferior calibre of his own.

20.—Not "society," but modern cannibalism upheld by the "inexorable laws" of the brutal and boodle fraternity of Thompson. S. D.

WAS THE EMPRESS TO BLAME?

I wrote to a friend that I thought the Empress of Austria had reaped what she had sown; but that it would be a hard world to live in if all misdoings were strictly retaliated, and I did not see what good it did to kill the Empress.

My friend complained of my saying that the empress reaped what she had sown. The empress, said my friend, was not to blame for being an empress. She married for love, did good wherever she could, and never seemed ambitious woman. How had she deserved such a fate?

In answer to this I sent some of the following thoughts:

Without going far back just now, it is well known that for the last year or two the Austrian government has been avowedly responsible for a deal of criminal violence whose object was to maintain the existence of that government as a government over Hungary, Bohemia, Transylvania and other areas inhabited by different races. Without doubt the empress did to the extent of her power support the existence of this government. And she must have known that its existence involved such violence. If any one thinks it possible that she was ignorant of this, I reply that such ignorance under such circumstances is a guilty ignorance.

But, you will say, this would make out any ordinary law-respecting private citizen in Austria to be just as guilty as she. Well, that's so. If we are going to act by strict retributive justice, most of the people in Vienna deserve to be killed. They are voluntary supporters of the Austrian government—that is, they are responsible participants in the most revolting crimes. They may mean well in supporting the government. So did Berkman mean well when he stabbed Frick. But he was sent to jail all the same. Well-meaning doesn't come into consideration when one is found stabbing people, either personally as Berkman did, or through agents as the good burghers of Vienna are now doing.

I don't suppose that under the Austrian constitution the place of imperial consort is an office of authority. Hence I don't see why the empress was any guiltier than the rest of her husband's subjects in general, except for consenting to be supported in expensive style out of the national treasury. I think there's something to be said about that. She needn't have consented to that even while she was empress. There have been a good many people killed to collect the Austrian revenues since her wedding—smugglers, Polish and Italian nationalists, rioters against taxes, soldiers who fell on both sides at Magenta and Solferino, etc. If she had refused to live on this money, and so had saved the treasury what her establishment has cost, perhaps the taxes might now and then have been lighter, and there would have been fewer children dying of insufficient nutrition. It is very bloody money, and I don't think it an honest woman's business to eat bread, or wear jewels, bought with such money.

Now, as I said before, I think killing her was a useless crime, not only unjustifiable but inexcusable, and, if the published reports are true, apparently malicious. But don't come telling me she was killed without fault of hers.

The fact is that government is a very serious matter, and demands a lot of reflection from any one who thinks of being mixed up in it in the least degree. And if one doesn't give thought enough to "desecrate the horror and the guilt," that thoughtlessness doesn't make him innocent. The United States government kills several moonshiners every year in the Southern mountains to bring in the whiskey money to the national treasury. It strikes me that this is murder. If so, the guilt of murder is on the hands of every one who willingly supports the national government in doing this. It will be said that I, a single obscure citizen, am taking it upon me to make a very serious charge against a great many millions of Americans. That is true. The worst of it is that my terrible accusation is also true. And, from one standpoint, the more light-heartedly and thoughtlessly they join hands in these murders, the more shocking it is.

But there are plenty of people who will agree that all this killing is very sad, but will not give one hour by the clock of solid thought to the question—a very hard one it seems to them—how to do without it.

STEPHEN T. BYINGTON.

A FINAL WORD.

I cannot divine what question A. I. will next set for me to discuss, as he changes the main point at each writing. Formerly the point was whether our actions had a bearing on our influence as propagandists. Now it is whether we should criticize the actions of Anarchists. But being reasonably well satisfied with my efforts to locate this "consistency" will-o'-the-wisp, these few are my closing remarks.

As to the last-announced question, I do not see how A. I. can "consistently" raise it after having admitted that "our acts are just what they must be." Does he criticize the action or nature of "the plant that stinks or the reptile that kills"? Especially is it inconsistent in him to withdraw his own actions from criticism.

If A. I. were close in his reasoning he would see the difference between my saying that Anarchists of today are of necessity inconsistent in daily life and his supposition that we propose to keep it up after the necessity is gone, i. e. when "all inhabitants of the world are Anarchists in theory." It is quite a logical supposition that we will continue the slavery we hate when the necessity no longer exists! But if all the "inconsistent" Anarchists "retire from the movement," as A. I. and Kropotkin would have them, "all inhabitants of the world" will not soon be converted to Anarchism, for, notwithstanding my acquaintance with many, including A. I., I have yet to meet the first "consistent" one. But it has never been my wish to be understood as opposing the idea of living up to our ideal or as nearly as conditions will permit. The attractions of the ideal itself, however, is more potent to accomplish this than any amount of criticism or condemnation.

I am glad A. I. quotes from what I said in the Firebrand on Anarchist organization, and I want to assure him that I have not receded from that position. I am glad he can make the quotation approvingly, and I hope that the re-reading has caused him to reconsider his late defense of the organizing proposition. But I wish to remind him that the question involved here is one of logic. While the Anarchist cannot go before the world with an illogical proposition, necessity may

force him to submit to the wage system, and even compel him to commit direct invasion, in order to exist. For this, manifestly, we cannot hold him accountable, unless we hold that the human will is superior to the condition that determine it—in short, except we uphold the idea of "free moral agency." So in criticizing the actions of comrades we no more nor less than take it upon ourselves to decide whether or not such actions were necessary. Quite a different matter from considering a question in logic. When it is proposed to me that Anarchists determine matters of propaganda by vote, explaining that it is not majority rule, but "minority consent," I must reject it as a foolish and illogical proposition. I should certainly feel foolish in thus agreeing to be a fool in case the majority were built that way.

No, I do not need to be reminded that the living up to an ideal regardless of physical necessities is not martyrdom, and I made no such claim. But the demand by others that the individual so live is a demand—boost (not boast) I said before—for martyrdom. The vital point here is individual initiative.

This discussion originated in the criticism of a comrade for "dabbling in politics." Whether it is worse to be in league with a political party that aspires to govern than to be the recipient of favors from the existing government, might become a nice point for distinction. Let the Free Society publishers and the "political" comrade discuss it. Finis. J. H. M.

THE UNDERGROUND POSTOFFICE.

Time is too scarce with me these days to spend it making faces at Comrade Morris, but I want to add a few remarks to what Comrade Doering had to say about the underground postoffice.

The rudiments of such a communication service already exist. In nearly every city, letters, papers and packages are left at the "headquarters" for those who frequent them. Why not extend this service by getting a cigar store on a prominent corner in the city to fix up a receptacle for letters, etc., to be called for, and arrange accordingly at the cross roads grocery, and get the milk wagon driver to take letters, etc., from the cross roads grocery to the corner cigar store, and from the cigar store to the grocery? Any other points of easy access or common congregation, and any other means of transfer of things intended for the other point, that can be had gratis, may be used to advantage.

As before stated, the rudiments of a free postal system already exist, and if the comrades everywhere will encourage its development, a system that will be a mighty power in the transportation of society can be worked out and elaborated, little by little, quietly, but all the more successfully.

Numerous ways and opportunities for extending the "underground" could be pointed out, but if the comrades cannot see and appreciate the opportunities around them, I fear they could not utilize them if pointed out.

This is a practical matter, and it is easy to keep track of the development through the papers. I have long thought of how this system might be developed in certain localities, and I see no reason why it should not be developed universally. HENRY ADDIS.

MANIFEST TO THE PEOPLE.

Only a few weeks ago the daily press informed us that an Empress was killed.

Columns were filled by our "so-much-per-line" journalists, to express their grief. Crocodile tears were shed in torrents about this old lady. Politicians, ministers and "humanitarians" were endeavoring to demonstrate that society was postulated by the break down of one of its rotten limbs,—at the same time denouncing with wonderful unanimity the "dastardly" act of a "fiendish Anarchist."

The "thrill of horror" was the general subject for many days.

And who was the victim whose death caused so much sorrow? One of the most insignificant, unimportant, useless creatures on the earth—an Empress! One of those that only exist through the ignorance of the masses; one that never contributed anything to the welfare of mankind; one of a tribe of professional butchers, that smile and cheer when starving workmen are shot down in the streets, as occurred in Paris in '71, and in Milan during the bread riots last spring.

And the "assassin"? A young man of 25 years, poorly educated, from his earliest youth struggling for an existence, hunted down like a wild beast from place to place, knowing nothing but hardships and misery, driven to despair,

strikes a blow at one in whom he sees a representative of that class which he considers responsible for existing social evils...

But it is not your pity we wish to arouse! He does not care for it! Never a word of protest is uttered against the persecution his countrymen have to suffer all over the world.

And while this empress' mourning sentiment is kept warm, a number of workmen in Illinois are shot down like rats, because they dared to resist their plutocratic masters in their attempt to starve them. Widows and orphans are made by the score, but not a word of pity has yet appeared in the daily papers.

If destruction of human life is a crime—which we most strongly claim—why were not our soldiers induced to keep away from Cuba?

When did you ever pity those poor Spanish women that lost their supporters, and those children that lost their fathers?

Are you Christians that believe in the Brotherhood of Man?

Newspapers columns about a useless woman, all grief and sorrow for an empress, a non-producer, a parasite.

But nothing for a miner and his wife and children! Not one single word for a useful producer, a creator of all wealth.

Passionate editorials about a "murderous Anarchist," who strikes in despair, sacrificing himself, with the stamp of "criminal" as his only reward; but not a word of condemnation for those cool-blooded-dollar-per-day-assassins, those hirelings of capitalism.

Of course! the victims are "rioters," why did they not submit? Be peaceful and starve. Never show your teeth. THE ANARCHISTS.

[The above was published by our comrades in Boston, Mass., to show our oppressors that the Anarchists are still active—an activity that is worthy of imitation. A. I.]

Literature.

Theoretical Anarchism (Theoretical Anarchism) by Alfred Cress, Monterey, Calif. Price \$1.

The book is written in German, but in such poor style that the reader finds nothing of the charm of that beautiful language in which so many immortal works have been produced by great thinkers and poets. It is a pity how the author abused this language of classics by attempting to be profound and learned. Not less is the subject mal-treated. That which could be made clear in a few words is rather confusing, and to readers that are not acquainted with Anarchist literature the subject will remain a terra incognita. He does not discriminate between the different schools of Anarchism, and yet that is what one would expect to find, i. e. judging from the title of the book. He fails to picture the ideal of Anarchism in plain features, neither does he expose the conditions of today in the bright light of Anarchism. In short, the whole book is a failure in my opinion and cannot impress any man or woman with a clear head that Anarchism is worthy of consideration, and that is the worst feature of the book. A. B.

ERRATA.

In No. 51 of Free Society, page three, first column, line 26 from below read "span" instead of "space" and in second column of same page, line 38 from below, "shows" instead of "respects."

RECEIPTS.

Week ending October 30.

Western Pennsylvania Agitation Committee by H. Bauer, \$15.
Debatting Club, Chicago, \$5.00.
Fruetner, \$2.50.
Comarovsky, \$2.00.
Harschnek, Wilson, Arnold, Brust, Snellenberg, each \$1.00.
Hannon, Himler, Wagenseil, Isaacson, Bullard, Meek, Fulton, Graub, Tropp, Harkay, Lankis, Edelstadt, Westrup, Mead, Kleckner, Butters, Bruck, Geo. Ash, Wm. Ash, Pierson, Frye, Calderwood, Holmes, Evans, Kessler, Barnett, Adams, Crank, each 50c.
Danieliewicz, Clauson, Parsons, each 25c.
Behrman, Maisel, each 10c.

Week ending November 5.

S. Press, \$2.
Swartz, \$1.
DeVaux, Morse, Eugster, Wenzel, Mantler, Smiller, Meyers, Petz, Danieliewicz, each 50c.
Debellis, Feldman, Nekvasil, Sorge, each 25c.
Maisel, Behrman, each 10c.

For Chicago.

A grand concert and ball, connected with a fair of valuable and useful articles, will be given by the International Workingmen's Association at Old W. 12th Street Turner Hall, 251-255 12th Street (near Halsted), for the benefit of the Free Reading Room and the propaganda in general, November 26, 1898, 7 p. m. Admittance: 15 cents a person when paid in advance; 25c. at the door. All comrades are kindly requested to invite their friends and to assist us in selling tickets. THE COMMITTEE.

For St. Louis.

The Eleventh November celebration will take place on Sunday, November 20, 3 p. m. at Lightstone's Hall 11th and Franklin Ave. Speeches in English and German.