



A PERIODICAL OF ANARCHIST THOUGHT, WORK, AND LITERATURE.

VOL. IX. NO. 30.

CHICAGO, SUNDAY, JULY 27, 1902.

WHOLE NO. 372.

Life.

The songsters of the meadows
Their tuneful notes prolong,
And radiant Nature smiling
Rejoices in their song;
The laughing sunbeams glancing
O'er fields of gorgeous hue,
See mint and pansies dancing
Till scents the air imbue.

The kine forget the clover,
The sheep with lambskins play,
The fish leap out the brooklet—
Eager for holiday;
While thru the boughs, the zephyrs
Beat time to melodies
That urge life's pulses onward
To softer symphonies.

But o'er the scene a mortal,
With reason's gift endowed,
Looks with ironic silence,
His head in sadness bowed;
For him the notes are discord—
Ghost-dancing of hopes dead,
For him life brings no blessing
When love and hope have fled.

The songsters of the meadows
Their tuneful notes prolong,
And radiant Nature smiling
Rejoices in their song;
But o'er the scene the mortal,
Self-poised, self-conscious, proud,
Bends 'neath life's heavy burden—
One of the human crowd!

—Dyer D. Lum.

Expediency vs. Morality.

The adoption of the above caption over these few remarks is suggested by reading Comrade Small's observations on "Two Kinds of Anarchy" in the issue of FREE SOCIETY just at hand. In my opinion the comrade has sized up the situation in a nutshell: "The question, then, resolves itself into one of expediency rather than of morals."

I have contended, ever since becoming an Anarchist, that Anarchists are justified in using any and all means to put an end to capitalist plundering, even to the taking of human life. They may be justified, too, on the highest grounds of morality and virtue. They may plead humanity, justice, the prevention of further outrages, and last, but not least, self-defense: for certainly it is humane to attempt to put a stop to wholesale plunder and murder, and is it not a righteous act? And if, as apologists of capital punishment aver, the taking of the life of the murderer prevents other murders, the deed of the avenger can be justified on that ground also. According to all tradition and custom, he who is violently attacked may take the life of his assail-

ant. Even in law this principle is recognized, and he who in self-defense or in defense of his family slays one who seeks to do him or them great bodily injury is not held strictly accountable. Very well; it is easy enough for the poor victim of social injustice to place the blame upon some powerful individual, and striking at that individual as the representative of a nefarious system, seek, in that way to lessen the evils which have produced his and others' suffering.

Let us look at this matter a little closer, and without prejudice or bias. I awaken at night to find a burglar crawling in my window with a deadly weapon in his hand. But I have a pistol, I am possessed of a steady nerve, and being now thoroly awake, I have a decided advantage. Shall I kill him or not? This is the question which presents itself to me, and it is purely a question of expediency. No question of the right of the matter enters my head. Of course it is right for me to shoot him in his tracks, for I have caught him red-handed, and not a jury in the land would convict me of crime. But I may be a humane man, and having "the drop on him" I may decide to capture him, or to scare him away without injuring him. Take another case: suppose that Mr. Livesey with his wife and children were traveling in a brigand country and the robbers actually succeed in capturing his youngest child. Mr. Livesey follows up the brigands to their stronghold, and finds that he can only regain his lost child by killing the chief, who is on guard. Would he hesitate to do so? I think not. Suppose, again, that he is uncertain whether by killing the chief he can recover his baby; would he not be justified in killing the bandit on the bare chance? But suppose he discovers that on their way the villains have brained his little one. Surely he would then be justified in killing not only the chief but his whole murderous gang, if he had them in his power. With him then it would become simply a question of expediency, and he would be governed either by his reason or by passion, whichever might be the strongest motive.

Very well, Anarchists claim, as Comrade Small justly avers, "that the people's heritage has been stolen from them." They insist that murderous robbers have again and again been caught red-handed in the act of plundering the innocent and defenseless; that robber bands have for years, aye, for centuries, stolen all they possessed on earth, and murdered, in cold blood and by whole-

sale, their loved ones. As an act of mere vengeance are they not justified in using violence? Surely, if this is so, on the ground of self-defense they are doubly justified.

But here the question of expediency comes in. Anarchists reason, and reason rightly, that violence begets violence, that "they who use the sword must perish by the sword," and that killing one tyrant only makes room for another and possibly a worse. They may consider, also, the question of time. Has the proper time arrived for a violent deed, for an insurrection, for a revolution? Then there is the effect upon the general movement to be considered: no Anarchist wishes to do that which he fears may injure the cause and possibly retard its growth. A dozen other questions may suggest themselves to him, any one of which or all combined may nerve his arm to do a bold deed or cause him to hesitate or abstain.

I think we should be very careful how we criticize the acts of a Bresci or a Czolgosz. While, in our opinion and at first sight their deeds may seem rash, foolish and productive of more harm than good, (and I was one who at first condemned the deed of Czolgosz,) we should withhold our judgment until we have carefully weighed and considered all the consequences. We never know what good may come out of an apparent evil. Let us rather judge conduct by its results than by appearances.

Of course Anarchy, as a school of philosophy, has nothing to do with revolutionary actions. Bresci may have understood Anarchism or he may not. I don't know. Czolgosz it now appears was a DeLeon Socialist, and did not understand the principles of Anarchism. But there are revolutionary Anarchists and there are peace Anarchists. The difference arises not in their acceptance of the theories and principles of Anarchism but in their views as to what are the best tactics to be employed to hasten the downfall of the capitalistic system.

As for me, as long as the highest expediency seems to demand soft methods, I am for peace, but when the time seems to have come for sterner measures I hope I may be found worthy to fight, if need be to die, for the Social Revolution.

WILLIAM HOLMES.

Your majesty may learn hereafter how nearly the slave and the tyrant are allied.—Junius to King George III.

Anarchy—Act of Congress to Suppress.

The act of the late, the 57th Congress for the protection of the president and others in the line of succession, as well as the sovereigns or chief magistrates of all other civilized countries of the world, and foreign ambassadors residing in the United States, is novel in all its features. It is the first time in the history of the United States that the Congress has attempted, unnecessarily, if not unconstitutionally, to confer special privileges of this nature, not only on a special class of American citizens, but on the heads of foreign powers.

While it is the duty of all governments to protect their own people, and foreigners within their borders, this is the first instance on record where any government has attempted to legislate for the protection of foreigners in their own country or in any other foreign country. In this respect our late Congress has undertaken the herculean task of protecting the kings, emperors and other potentates of all the civilized nations of the world. Quite an undertaking for a young country, or perhaps we had better say, for the American Congress and Mr. Roosevelt. This Congress is a prodigy in its strides for power not warranted by the organic act which gave it existence.

Our federal government, it must be remembered, is one of limited powers, it has the powers conferred on it by the constitution and none other. Outside of these delegated powers each State is supreme within itself. In other words, the powers not conferred by express words or necessary implication on the United States remain with the several States respectively.

The two leading questions presented by this act of Congress, are: First. Had the Congress power to pass the act? Second. Is it good policy?

It becomes our duty in this article to briefly answer these questions. But first, the act itself.

We have before us the act as it passed the Senate, also the amendatory act of the House, but not the act as it finally passed, which, it is said, does not materially change the House act.

§ 1 makes it a penal offense, punishable by death, for anyone to kill the president while engaged in official duties, or because of his official character, or official or non-official acts.

§ 2 containing the same words, applies to such men who may lawfully succeed to the presidency on the death of the president.

§ 3 applies to foreign ambassadors residing in the United States.

§§ 4-5-6-7 punishes aiders and abettors by imprisonment when the attempt to kill fails.

§ 8 punishes by fine and imprisonment, "all who advocate, advise or teach the duty, necessity or propriety of killing or assaulting one or more of the officers (either of specific individuals or officers generally) of the government of the United States or of the government of any civilized nation because of his or their official character, or who openly, wilfully and deliberately justifies such killing or assaulting with intent to cause the commission of any of the offenses specified in the first nine sections of this act."

§ 9 punishes by death, when death ensues;

by fine and imprisonment when death does not follow, the unlawful act, all who conspire, request, advise or encourage the killing within or without the United States of the chief executive of any foreign government because of his official character.

§ 10 makes the act apply in all cases when the unlawful act is done within any State or place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

§ 13 applies to trials under the act, and creates the presumption that the killing or attempt to kill the president, or one who may succeed him "was at the time of the alleged offense, engaged in his official capacity." Further, "That nothing in the act shall be construed as an admission, that during the term of office, the official was not engaged in the performance of the duties of his office."

The other sections, for the purpose of this article, it is unnecessary to consider.

The bill passed by the Senate, in general terms, provided against the killing of the president and those who might succeed him, without the words "while engaged in his official duties, or because of his official acts or omissions."

When the Senate bill came before the House, the committee to whom it was referred, cited several United States Supreme Court decisions to show that the Senate bill was unconstitutional, because the killing applied to the official as such or as an individual; the punishment for which, was conceded to belong exclusively to the States, not having been delegated to the United States government. It was also said, by the committee, that in order to give the federal government jurisdiction, the killing must be while the official is engaged in the performance of official duties, otherwise, if the crime was committed within a State, the federal court could not take cognizance of it, except on the ground that the killing impeded or stopped the government in the performance of its functions.

These questions will bear examination.

The man, as president, may be killed, but the president, as such, cannot be killed; the word president is a mere title, which cannot suffer death, be impeded or stopped as long as the government exists. On the death of one president another man succeeds to the office, who immediately steps into his predecessor's shoes and administers the functions of government.

If in this we are correct, then the reasons assigned, *impede and stop government functions* cannot stand the test. If the United States can hang the murderer for pretended stopping of the wheels of government, this will not prevent the State, in which the murder took place, from hanging him for the murder. Both cannot do the hanging, nor have they concurrent jurisdiction in such cases. While all this may be good logic for the 57th Congress, it is not good law.

It is claimed that this act as passed, with the words, *killed while engaged in his official capacity*, renders the act valid. To sustain this view of the case, several United States Supreme Court decisions were cited by the House committee: among them, the case *In re Neagle*, who was indicted by a California State court for killing Judge Terry for slapping the face of Judge Field while at dinner

at a railroad station when on his way from Los Angeles to San Francisco. Neagle was released by the federal court on habeas corpus, on the ground that even while at dinner, Field was performing federal official duty. The federal decision in that case, Terry being very unpopular, satisfied the public conscience; but was never regarded as sound law by bench or bar.

In none of the decisions cited by the House committee, was the question involved in this act, before the court. As before said, this act has no precedent; then how can those decisions apply? So much for this branch of the subject. Next comes up the question of the abridgment of the freedom of speech and the press.

Under § 8 all "who advocate, advise, or teach the duty, or propriety of killing or assaulting any officer of the United States government, or of the government of any civilized nation, because of his official character," "or who openly, wilfully and deliberately justifies such killing or assaulting, with intent to cause the commission of any of the offenses specified in the first nine sections of the act" are to be fined and imprisoned for advocating, advising or, after the act, justifying the act of killing or assaulting. As this offense can only consist of words spoken or published, what becomes of the constitutional guarantee of the freedom of speech and press? Like many other acts since our civil war, it is in excess of the powers of Congress, and will undoubtedly be so held by the courts. Under the constitution and declaration of rights, etc., we have been led to believe that all men in this country stand on political equality; but it seems such is not to be the case any longer, for this act picks out special individuals on whom it confers special and exclusive privileges; all because of their official character. In other words, it lifts the official, who is supposed to be a servant of the people, above the people. The most savory thing about it is, that these servants, by their own act, have done the lifting.

Under the provisions of §§ 8 and 9 not only foreign kings, emperors and other potentates, but all other foreign officials in their own countries and elsewhere are to come in under the protecting care of our government, or perhaps better say, our Congress and president.

Section 9 punishes with death all who aid or abet in the killing of any foreign king, emperor or potentate; nor does it matter on what part of the earth, under §§ 8 and 9, the killing, assaulting to kill, or where the conspiracy or plot took place, nor by whom. Should the plot be formed in Russia or in any other foreign country to kill or assault any foreign potentate, or other official, anywhere on the face of the earth where exists a civilized government, the offender would be amenable to our law. Whether the governments of Europe, Asia and the rest of the world will avail themselves of our proffered guardianship remains to be seen. Should a foreign potentate, or any of his officials, be killed by his own subjects, we should have to catch the offender before we could hang him. In the event his government should refuse extradition, or deliver the criminal to us, we might be compelled to go to war with such government to force obedience to our law.

Assuming the act to be constitutional, what good purpose can it serve? The federal government has already ample laws for the punishment of all offenses committed on territory belonging to the United States. If the offense be committed in a State, the State laws punish the offender. Anyone knows that if he kills or attempts to kill the president, death is sure to him under State laws if caught; then why should he more fear a federal law, for all it can do is to put him to death, the same as any State would do. But this is not all, for how can a conviction be had under the federal act? In order to secure conviction the prosecution must prove that the president, when killed, was engaged in the performance of some official act, or that he was killed because of his official character, or for some act or omission of duty. If it be said, the act creates the presumption that the president at the time of the killing was engaged in the performance of some official act; the presumption not being conclusive, its effect can only be a shifting of the burden of proof from the prosecution to the defense, where it would be a very easy matter to show that the president was engaged in other than official business. If the president be killed while off duty, such as hunting, fishing, pleasure seeking, or private business, etc., the killing would not give the federal courts jurisdiction. If killed because of official character, the main issue would be the official character; how is that to be proven? The reason for the killing, which would be the main issue, could be known to no one but the accused. If the reason laid in the indictment be not proven, or a different one be proven, there could be no conviction; besides, what figure can a murder's reasons cut on such a trial? Is he to be tried, condemned and hung for his reasons, or for the killing? If for the former, then a man may be hung for his mere reasons for an act. If for the latter—the killing, then the United States courts have no jurisdiction; the State, alone, in which the killing took place, would have jurisdiction. If the president be killed because of some official act or omission of duty; how is proof to be made? As in the former case, the accused can only know; besides, the trial, conviction and hanging would not depend on the killing; but on the doing or not doing of an official act by the president.

That part of the act which attempts to protect foreign kings, emperors and other potentates, as well as their other officials, being extra-territorial, is absolutely void; for no government can legislate for or against foreigners within their own territory, or within any other foreign territory.

As to that part of the act which attempts to punish for mere words spoken or published; it being in clear violation of the constitutional guarantee of the freedom of speech and the press, must, when brought before the courts, be declared void. While that part of the act which attempts to deal with the murder and assault to murder, committed within a State, we think is beyond the power of Congress to enact. If we are right in this, it too will share the same fate; leaving no part of the act valid except that which applies to the territory of federal government; but as that is so intermixed

and inseparable from the bad part, the whole law will have to be declared null and void.

All these childish subterfuges were injected into the bill, by the lower House, in the madness of the hour, with the vain hope of conferring on the federal government powers not warranted by the constitution.

In a trial under this act, the chances are largely against conviction; if convicted, then the Supreme Court will declare the act in excess of the powers of Congress; after which the offender could not be tried under a State law, because of a plea of once in jeopardy.

We wish it understood that this article has not been written in the interest of Anarchy, for we do not believe in a single tenet promulgated by Anarchists. No civilized people can exist without some kind of a government. Should the Anarchists devote their time and energy to reform our government,—federal, State, and municipal,—which are so much in need of reform, they would be working to some good purpose. Not only do the governments need reforming, but the officials stand in greater need of reformation, both as to honesty and capability. An exception to this can only be found in the 57th Congress, where the majority were entirely successful in holding up the American train and looting the passengers to the extent of 750,000,000 dollars to run the federal machine a single year.

Alameda, Cal.

PARISH B. LADD.

What Constitutes an Anarchist?

"A warm-blooded being who can comprehend and understand human passions, which find vent occasionally in a violent, desperate deed," as did Bresci, may be an Anarchist. And a person who "philosophically sits back in a chair and demonstrates that a human life is sacred, that a king has a life which should be respected," and be an Anarchist. A person may rejoice at the acts of a Bresci, a Czolgosz, a Guiteau, a Booth or any assassin and be an Anarchist or not an Anarchist. A person may deplore and denounce their acts as brutal, dastardly or insane and be an Anarchist or not an Anarchist.

But I think that fewer Anarchists than any other class of persons resort to or endorse violence of any kind, for the reason that they are more sympathetic and altruistic, being more advanced in civilization, and their theory being based on non-invasion of others' rights. Their philosophy does not admit of violent attacks of others.

I have as little respect for a king as a king, or of any officer as an officer as anyone. But I do abhor violence whether by an Anarchist or anyone else. Especially is a violent act by an Anarchist to be deplored by Anarchists, when every act of their's is scrutinized, criticized and made a pretext if possible for persecuting them. I have no sympathy for the king, and as little for the man who killed him. I think little of a man, from a private citizen down to a soldier or an officer, who carries a weapon. It is a disgrace to Anarchy for an Anarchist to bear arms, and much more to use them.

We can never attain to Anarchy by force. We must educate by precept and example.

When the people are educated to see the beauties of Anarchy, they will want it and it will come peaceably. No violent act can bring it. By Bresci and Czolgosz avowing themselves Anarchists, whether they were or not, has retarded the dissemination of Anarchistic truth.

The point I desire to make is, that an avowal of Anarchism and a belief in it as defined by the Century Dictionary, which is accepted by all Anarchists, does not imply violence of any kind. And that *Anarchy per se* is entirely distinct if not different from violence, and outside and independent of all violence, of any kind. A negation of government does not imply confusion, chaos, rapine and murder. The negation of night, in which we grope about, stumbling and feeling our way, does not imply a worse condition, but a brighter—a more hopeful and cheerful one. Our emergence into day is thru a gradual dawn. As Victor Hugo said: "The dawn cannot be vanquished. It will come. It comes. It has within it the outbreak of irresistible day."

Why assume, for it is all arrogant assumption, that a negation of government would necessarily result in chaos when ninety-nine things in a hundred we do every day is done conventionally without a thought as to their legality or illegality, and the one thing in a hundred we are compelled by law to do is oftener wrong than right?

If I turn under with my plow a field of foul weeds, does it naturally follow that a worse crop will come, or is it not probable that I sow wheat or corn in the field?

People have been so accustomed to trying to put down one evil by another evil that they are slow to learn that Anarchists propose to abolish government by gradually introducing good in its place, by dissolving it in society.

The sooner all coercion and violence are disassociated with Anarchy the better. And as people are educated in Anarchy the thought of violence will be eliminated.

Hindsboro, Ill.

J. C. BARNES.

For Boston.

Solidarity Picnic for the victims of the Paterson strike, to be held Sunday, August 3, at Buitta's Farm, away in the woods of liberty, Newton Upper Falls. Music by the Lynn comrades. International songs and social games. Admission 25 cents. Children free. Refreshments and eatables can be purchased on the grounds. Directions.—Take Subway cars to Newton Boul., there take Norumbega cars, ask for transfer (free) to Newton Upper Falls. Leave car at Oak Street and walk down to Pumping Station, then turn to the right to Highland Ave., where the farm is. Teams will wait for visitors from 12 till 3 p. m.

In case of bad weather the picnic will be postponed to the following Sunday.

All comrades who wish to make a success of this picnic for our propaganda, will meet Thursday, July 31, 8 p. m. at Comrade D. Mikol, 10 Auburn St., Roxbury, in order to make the best arrangements for this affair.

"Michael Bakunin and Karl Marx," by Victor Dave, has been published in the Bohemian language. Address: Novy Kult, 45, Praha-Oslany, Prague, Austria.

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, 331 WALNUT ST., 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.

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.

CHICAGO, SUNDAY, JULY 27, 1902.

372

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

Notes.

Comrade T. Appel is collecting subscriptions for FREE SOCIETY in Chicago. Those in arrears may expect a call from him at an early date.

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

William Thurston Brown, who resigned from the ministry recently, will make a lecturing tour this fall in the interest of Socialist ideas. A few weeks ago one of his sermons appeared in FREE SOCIETY. From this specimen it will be seen that he is thoroughly imbued with the spirit of liberty. Any associations or individuals wishing to arrange lectures should address him at Lake-mount, N. Y.

"Pages of Socialist History" by W. Tcherkesoff, is now ready. This book is recommended to Socialists of all schools, as it deals with the history of the "International," and the attitude of Marx and Engels towards Bakunin. Paper cover, 25 cents. By mail 30 cents. Send orders to Chas. B. Cooper, 114 Fourth Ave., New York, N. Y.

"Whitman's Ideal Democracy" has met with great appreciation. Helena Born's message is for simplicity and sincerity of life, and against conventions and shams; its "call is the call to battle and active rebellion." Into her life she carried her philosophy as few do, and its fulness, and the breadth of her experiences, bore witness to an ardent and unquenchable courage. She was able to express her philosophy with remarkable force and clearness, and the papers included in the volume that has just appeared cover a wide range, and constitute valuable utterances for the radical propaganda. The essays include "Ingenuities of Economic Argument," "Individualism vs. Organization," "Inequality in Divorce," "Poets of Revolt," "Thoreau's Joy in Nature," and others. The editor's biography of Helena Born is "masterly, if not a masterpiece," as one reader has put it.

Certain Comments.

The *Washington Post* is anxious to bear away the palms for servile sycophancy. It has the face to say of Edward the Inexcusable, whose long career of unbridled vice and dissipation bids fair to rob him of his coronation:

Edward has been a noble and high-minded gentleman always. During the long years—almost half a century—of his apprenticeship, he has set the example of a genuine chivalry of conduct. . . . An ideal prince, a man no less than a monarch, he has drawn to him not only the reverence, but the friendship and affection of his subjects. . . . His has been a fine and sweet life.

It is hard to believe that any American newspaper, however base an adulator of monarchy, could write so of such a man. If there has ever been any good side to Edward's nature, he has sedulously concealed it from the gaze of the world. His own mother, whom these same flatterers have vaunted to the skies, became so utterly disgusted with his vulgar riotousness, that she excluded him from her presence for long periods of time. His favorite associates were not only blackguards unfit for any decent society, but were not even admitted to the great catchall of court presentation. He was a most notorious gambler, drunkard, libertine and patron of prize fights and of all low and brutal forms of amusements. Toward women he invariably comported himself as the most finished scoundrel, tossing them into the gutter without compunction, when he had worked his will of them. His utter lack of the instincts of a gentleman was shown in his dastardly connivance in the gross insults offered by Tory rowdies to Gladstone, when the latter was his guest, and by every code of honor, under the shield of hospitality. In the Tranby Croft and other disgraceful episodes, he showed his caddish disposition by sneaking out of responsibility for his own acts, and making scapegoats of his less case-hardened companions. Despite the immense sums of money which the English people donated to maintain his parasitical carcass, his vices kept him constantly in debt; and he was not ashamed to fawn on the notorious Lily Langtry, in order to obtain from her a share of the wages of prostitution.

All these things are facts of record, perfectly well known to the general public. That he can find in this country one single apologist, to say nothing of an encomiast, proves how much power and position can blind men to the most elementary conceptions of honor. Such is the wonderfully moral (?) educative influence of government. Clap a king's crown, a president's hat, a pope's tiara or a judge's ermine, on the foulest wretch, reeking with every form of villainy; and straightway his praises shall be loudly sung from platform and pulpit; and the press shall lick the dust before his feet. The Anarchist, who refuses to allow these empty trappings to govern his judgment, is the only true moralist, because he alone dares to be strictly honest. The highest morality is only possible in a free society.

JAMES F. MORTON, JR.

Sunday, July 27, 3 p. m., Mrs. Myra Pappas speaks before the Anthropological Society at the Athenium Building, 26 Van Buren St., on the subject "Quien Sabe? Who Knows?"

A Word to Judge Ladd.

Judge Parish B. Ladd exposes the so-called anti-Anarchy law in this issue of FREE SOCIETY. Having an implicit faith in the courts, he does not hesitate to declare that such a law will be held unconstitutional. However, a layman will hardly feel assured, remembering that the New York courts upheld the sentence against John Most, without the law, whose case was essentially one of "mere words spoken or published."

As to the assertion that a civilized people cannot live without a government, the subject is rather too broad to take up in a limited comment like this. Suffice it to say, it has been irrefutably met numbers of times.

Finally, the judge advises us to use our energies in attempting to reform the government. Indeed the advice has a familiar ring to it; but the honored judge can rest assured that to most Anarchists it is quite superfluous. That is what many of them began in doing, and a close proximity has convinced them of the utter futility of such a task. It is not that bad men are at the head of the government. One set of men on an average are as pretty near like another set as possible. The Anarchist has discovered that the whole fault lies in placing the scepter of authority in the hands of men; that the principle must be entirely reversed; instead of governing others he should take care of himself.

If the learned judge and others who think like him will take the trouble to post themselves on Anarchist literature, I think they will find these principles upheld logically by able writers and profound thinkers. JR.

Home Defense Fund.

Previously reported, \$211.38. F. F., Minn., \$1. Total to July 15, \$212.38.

Expenditures.

Attorney fees.....	\$191.75
Paper for circulars.....	4.05
Stationary, postage, etc.....	8.25
Expense of indicted comrades at trial	8.00

Total \$212.05

Balance on hand .33
Home, Wash., July 17, 1902. O. A. VERITY, Tr.

The trial resulted in the acquittal of Mattie Penhallow on grounds of not knowing the contents of paper at time of mailing. Lois Waisbrooker was found guilty as charged.

On motion of Attorney Murphy to set aside the verdict, the judge ruled that the question of whether the article was obscene was a question of fact for the jury to determine, that he however felt free to say that the article was not obscene, and on that account would give the lightest sentence possible for him to do under the law, which would be \$100 fine. No costs or imprisonment to attach. The fine was paid by the comrades borrowing the money, and all returned to Home. OLIVER A. VERITY.

McGrath, the union leader of the Paterson strikers, emphatically denies the statement of the capitalistic press, that he said "the Anarchists were responsible for the failure of the strike." He visited MacQueen and Grossman in the jail and extended them his sympathy in their persecution, and will testify in court that MacQueen did not incite to riots and Grossmann was not in Paterson when the riots occurred.

What is Liberty?

I hope I shall not be considered disputatious in trying once more to get at what FREE SOCIETY means by liberty or freedom. My query arose out of a statement by the editor that he rejected the law of equal liberty. And I asked what sort of liberty he desired. Mr. James says you want liberty that can be enjoyed in the absence of human law, and we have his definition of law as a uniform rule of action imposed by a superior power. But believers in equal liberty repudiate "commands of superiors over inferiors"—to use the words of Austin.

But Mr. James rejects the formula, "Everyone has the right to do as he wills, provided he does not infringe the equal freedom of others." I infer that the larger liberty Mr. James demands is the liberty to do as he wills, whether it infringes the equal freedom of others or not. Am I right in that?

I am sure I have no time for, and take no pleasure in wordy disputes. Readers of FREE SOCIETY who are not yet Anarchists and who look to it for light on the question of liberty ought to be supplied with clear and concise ideas. I can hardly take seriously Mr. James' distinction between a group and an organization.

"No profession of any principle is necessary to the privilege of attending"—a group. Then according to that an Anarchist group may consist of attendants who have no principles at all, or have governmental and liberty-destroying principles.

(I have heard DeLeon say that Anarchist groups were made up of labor fakirs and political fakirs.) But an Anarchist organization, seemingly, would have some principles to bind it, and some concerted action, and an aim to work for.

Again, in answer to my question has the action of the women who stood outside butcher shops and challenged any (other Jews and Jewesses) who wished to enter, who destroyed by use of coal oil the meat purchased by others (other poor Jews), and who wrecked the stores, etc., was that a measure for the emancipation of the individual from government by law. Mr. James says, if they recognized in the trust a monopoly founded in the first instance upon law, and proposed to weaken law by breaking the trust, then their action was a measure for the emancipation of the individual from government by law.

But it was a violation of liberty, as propounded by FREE SOCIETY, he says, because it was war. Then, according to this, acts in violation of liberty may be acts for the emancipation of the individual from government, and so tyrants may be liberty lovers after all. There is no limit to which this defense of war may be carried.

Surely there is no clear thought in all this. This preaching of peace and kindness, and temporizing with force, is due to lack of clear principles. We know what to think of a Quaker or any other Christian who preaches an illogical doctrine, which he is ready to discard on the slightest pretext, as for example that he is not sufficiently sanctified. He is either a hypocrite and a fool, who can't see the illogical contents of his ideas, or an unprincipled rogue, like him who justifies benevolent murder. To say that the argument against fighting is unanswerable, and then to wink at war, is certainly inconsistent. But then Mr. James does not care to try experiments upon his own consistency.

The believer in equal liberty is committed to no such absurdity. The argument against use of all force is not unanswerable. Force in defense of equal liberty is justified. Tyrants have no rights that believers in equal liberty are bound to respect.

When Mr. J. says that the French National Assembly tried to carry out the law of equal liberty, and that the Reign of Terror was the result, I must question his sincerity. When a bourgeois tells me that Anarchism and Socialism was attempted to be inaugurated by the French Revolution, I pity his poor ignorance. When a Socialist, to make a point against me in debate says that Anarchism as a philosophy was tried and found wanting at time of French Revolution, I have contempt for his trickery. But when Mr. James, an Anarchist, tells me that the National Assembly attempted to apply the law of equal liberty—well, I'll simply say he is mistaken.

And now, one final question: Has any individual a right, or is he justified, in restraining any other individual for anything? A. H. SIMPSON.

The charge of wanting clear thought, clear principles, clear and concise ideas, etc.,

is a favorite charge with metaphysicians and reasoners of the antiquated syllogistic type, against those whose methods are inductive. The truth is that, outside pure mathematics, we possess no ideas allowing clear and concise definitions such as we give to the idea of a triangle or a section of the cone; and nothing but confusion ever comes from imposing the form of such definitions upon a substance which will not retain it. It may seem a simple statement why water rises in a pump, to say "Nature abhors a vacuum"—it may seem, and in fact is, a complicated statement, open to various wordy criticisms, to say, "Motion follows the line of least resistance, therefore if the pressure in the tube is lessened, that outside will force the water up." But if we inquire what either statement means, we find the first means—nothing in particular; because we do not know definitely what Nature is, nor what a vacuum is, nor what nature's abhorrence of a vacuum is, and have no way of knowing any more about them. But the other formula, however liable to be picked to pieces by dissectors of words, has the great advantage of not being mere words. It refers, in as good language as we have ready, to Things, which can be seen, and handled, and learned more about. Now I reject the formula of Individualism, as Mr. Simpson must have seen, because I neither know what actions do "infringe the equal freedom of others," nor how I can learn, except by the decision of some common judge among disputants—that is, a superior power, which I am glad to hear that believers in equal liberty repudiate. Yet I am afraid they will have to get around to that, if ever they put their ideas in practice. It seems to me the French Revolutionary legislatures did. They certainly began by asserting the Individualist formula very clearly and concisely; and, tho I have heard them accused of almost everything, I am not used to hearing their sincerity impugned.

Shall I tell Mr. Simpson what converted me from an Individualist to an Anarchist? It was a paragraph of Tucker's in *Liberty*, wherein he summed up the methods by which Anarchists proposed to maintain Anarchy; and after the usual exposition of reason, voluntary arbitration, etc., concluded, as near as I remember the words, thus, "and, in case of the last necessity, the dynamite bomb in the hands of individuals." I was not an Anarchist before, not because I did not approve of Anarchy, but because I did not see, how, if it were established, some Cæsar or Bonaparte could be prevented from overthrowing it, especially if he began as general of a patriotic army. But that "dynamite bomb in the hands of individuals" settled me. That was a proposition about Things; and "whereas I was blind, now I see."

So I fear that acts in violation of liberty sometimes are acts for the emancipation of the individual from government.

"They sang: 'Hurrah for Tubal Cain!

Our staunch, good friend is he;

And for the ploughshare and the plough,

To him our praise shall be.

But while oppression lifts its head,

Or a tyrant would be lord,

Tho we may thank him for the plough,

We'll not forget the sword!"

But "there is no limit to which this de-

fense of war may be carried . . . on the slightest pretext," says Mr. Simpson. "Yes, by St. Patrick, but there is, Horatio:—and great offense too." I speak again from experience, which is the basis of induction. I never approved of an act of violence in my life—till after it was done; and in the few cases where I found grounds for approving then, it was very qualified approbation—much like Phocion's on a similar occasion. "I admit the result of the battle was fortunate: but I still think it was bad generalship to fight the battle." The reason all acts of violence appear bad generalship to an Anarchist is that they are the weapons of his enemies, with which he does not feel familiar, and whose danger to his ulterior purposes he well knows. They can vindicate themselves only by signal results; and must not be on slight pretexts. How about the Individualist? Does he propose to maintain his liberty, somewhat curtailed that it may be equal, without using force? If so, how? And has he reflected that the most paltry quarrel between any two human beings (always a quarrelsome lot) at once raises the question which is infringing the other's equal freedom, and needs to be restrained by a superior power? Will he understand me if I answer his final question by saying that the more any individual makes up his mind not to restrain other individuals the better; and that here again I am not reasoning from any abstraction about what is "right" or "justifiable," but from experience? If Mr. Simpson will read Stickler's "Origin and Creed of Anarchism" in FREE SOCIETY, he will be apt to get some light on how Anarchist groups work in practise.

Can we draw a line between the cases in which violence justifies itself by the result and those in which it does not? In advance, probably none, which will satisfy a metaphysician. But Tucker's test about individuals is a good rough one (by the usual rule of experience) for a large class of such cases. When peaceable Anarchist individuals, having brains enough to succeed, and grit enough to immolate themselves for success; go into Monster Slaying; there is a right smart chance that the monster needed to be slain.

I purposely kept in reserve that stuffed-club question whether the larger liberty I demand be the liberty to do as I will, whether it infringes the equal freedom of others or not? But I will assure Mr. Simpson now that our inductive Anarchist is not easily brained with a paradox. Liberty, as Hosca Bigelow said, is "for every man to do as he damn pleases"—at his own risk and cost. I might favor a somewhat different estimate of an organization for the maintenance of "equal liberty" which sets out with such propositions as that the wholly undefinable class of "tyrants" have no rights. I rather think they have.

C. L. JAMES.

— o —

Comrade MacQueen is still in jail in Paterson, as the comrades have not yet succeeded in securing \$5,000 bail. *Freie Arbeiter-Stimme* states he is in a cell thru which a hot pipe runs, and in consequence has swollen eyes and suffers with terrible headaches.

FRIEDA SCHEY.

(A social sketch by Adam Heid. Translated from the German.)

At last it was Saturday.

Shortly after four o'clock the young boss had the foreman called, and said to him: "Listen here, Wiemer, today I will pay the girls myself!"

"'Il right, Mr. Reis, 'il right," said the foreman, turned around and—smiled. The cashier threw a meaning glance at him, and even the thin lips of the bookkeeper bore a mischievous grin.

Six o'clock. A shrill whistling pierced the factory. Slowly the jolting of the machinery ceased; the dust-gray windows were opened, and the fresh evening air breezed in—eye of a holiday! A deep sigh of relief seemed to pass thru all the rooms.

The young principal already sat in his cabinet. In an indulgent manner he leaned in his easy chair. Meanwhile his left hand was passing thru his well-kept beard, his right was resting on a pretty paper weight, a reclining Venus.

The disappearing sun threw a smiling parting-glance on the opened safe, the steel walls sparkled—glaring as the eyes of a miser, and the heavy oak case with the account books spread a broad shadow in the apartment.

Outside a gradual, motley hum of voices arose—a sharp, shrill whispering, quickly stifling the low tittering that was heard occasionally.

There was a knock at the door.

"Come in, come in!" the young man called, and set himself a little more rigidly in his easy chair.

The foreman came in. "The girls are all here; shall I—"

"Give me the list, please—just let me—!"

"Good evening, Mr. Reis, good evening," Wiemer saluted, and he betook his broad back out of the door. He left it open. The place was closely filled with the expectant girls.

"Does it begin at last," several ventured, as the foreman walked past them.

"Yes; it begins," he said, and laughed within himself.

"... Marie Wetzel!" the sharp voice of the young principal sung out, and a crowding toward the door ensued.

He again sat lazily in his easy chair, and called out the girls singly. Condescendingly he pushed them the money, the meager wage, which was wrapped in small a paper. At the same time he critically examined the tall forms with the glances of an expert (*Kennerblicken*). But none seemed to suit him today. Haggard forms and sharp faces, upon which the day's dust (*Staubschicht*) seemed to lie, appeared before him; fatigue-tormented human beings, whom the stifling factory air had robbed of every charm, all freshness.

Sullenly he hurried with the paying.

"Ah, finally the last one—Schey!" he called aloud, "Frieda Schey!—ah that is something—a new one!"

A tall form, a clear face, fresh as an apple blossom, blood-red lips, light locks on her forehead and a heart—a heart—

His hand quivered lightly, as he pushed her the money.

"How old are you then?" he asked at

the same time, assumed indifference in his tone.

"Next month I'll be seventeen," answered the girl.

"Seventeen! So—so—I only asked on account of the sick benefit fund."

Frieda turned around to go.

"Wait a moment!"

She looked somewhat surprised at the factory owner; outside her friend was waiting—

"Schey... Schey... Don't we have someone else here," continued the young man; "who is that there in the packing room, is that your—?"

"Yes, 'tis my father!" the girl said quickly.

"Quite right; and the boy, that Fred—that is perhaps your brother?"

"Yes!"

A pause ensued. Something fearful seemed to pass thru the room, something inexpressibly oppressive.—And now the young man leaned forward a little and said in a low, uneven voice: "Would you not come to my residence this evening—now, what time would it suit me best—at nine—yes?"

The girl startled—she had understood. A second she stood helpless, speechless—then she stammered painfully:

"But, Mr. Reis, I cannot do that! No, no, you cannot expect that from me—I—I—"

"So-o-o-o," interrupted the boss in a drawl, and then in a sharp tone: "And why not?"

"But surely I cannot do such a thing," now whispered Frieda as if to herself, "no, no—I can and must not—"

A blush rose to her face, her cheeks burned.

"Very well, then let it go."

The master rose from his easy chair and said this with cold brutality.

Frieda looked at the floor. Confused thoughts fluttered in her head—but the voice of her master quickly aroused her.

"Aye, aye," he said, "what I wanted to add—how old is your father?"

Frieda drew a long breath; she felt herself already half relieved.

"In November he will be fifty-two!" she said quickly.

"Aha!" and an unconcealed titter of triumph broke forth out of this exclamation, "he need not come along any more—please tell him—and your brother, the damned boy, yesterday he did everything wrong again at the custom-house!"

That had its effect—Frieda stood speechless in the middle of the apartment—she had become deathly pale, and her head sank to her breast.

"Well then at nine! You know now—child, be reasonable!"

Frieda was reasonable.

— o —

Individualism versus Organization.

As a result of the development of the individualistic ideal, it is not surprising to find a number of advanced people whose cardinal virtue is that they do not "join anything"; and the propagandist who is less a partizan than an idealist—a truthseeker, willing to revise his principles continually by the light of accumulated experience—is compelled to pause and weigh the advan-

tages of organization and the cooperative methods he recommends. The disadvantages have been glaringly obvious to many minds, and the contemplation of them has given rise to the present reaction. The domination of the weak by the strong, or by those ambitious of power; the modification of individual differences in conformity with a stereotyped "constitution"; the tendency to mental inertia, the society becoming a prop instead of a stimulus to self-reliance; the possibility of prolonged, half-hearted adherence, from force of habit or difficulty of secession—these, and such as these, are serious obstacles to the growth of individuality. On the other hand, we are beset by the inopportunities of people possessed by the club mania, with an exaggerated estimate of the strength of union regardless of compatibility, who feel that the efforts of two or three, "gathered together," are necessarily a blessing to the world.

Hence, with a lively sense of the pros and cons, we press for an answer to the question, Why should one join anything? Why should not one concentrate one's efforts on the enhancement of the brilliancy of one's own individual light, in order to become "a lantern of strength to men," separate and distinct, and irrespective of other orbs greater or less? The idea appeals to me. With Whitman, I shout, "Yourself, yourself, yourself, for ever and ever"—but he does not stop there; neither do I. When I come to consider how one may best enhance this brilliancy, I find that sympathy, cooperation, reciprocity, fellowship, solidarity, are most potent aids, that the individual self and the social self are one and indivisible, and that he who would be completely rounded must disown neither. In organized association the larger self may find satisfaction and contribute to the growth of the lesser self. It has been maintained that self-development and self-devotion are very nearly the same thing, since "we can only develop ourselves by devoting ourselves to objective ends"; while "the only valuable kind of self-denial is that for the sake of objective interests, by devotion to which we are developed." Thus, it may be inferred that individualism and organization are not inherently antagonistic; by deeper analysis the reconciliation is established, and they take their places side by side, with no interposing "versus" as above.

In estimating the important results of association, its value emotionally and in the evolution of sympathy must not be ignored. The mere "intellectual all-in-all" gives little and receives little. Furthermore, the unrestricted interchange of thought is a powerful aid to the attainment of definiteness and a clearer conception of practical possibilities. The more extensive the stores of experience contributing to the elucidation of life's problems the better. Definiteness is a valuable preliminary to strong, concerted action when the opportune moment arrives. Few persons deny the need of reform, but with endless diversity of method the process is painfully slow. Free discussion tends to unanimity in essentials.

The prejudice against any system of organized effort is chiefly due to confusion of thought in regard to the actual source of danger. It is not that organization is in

itself inimical to individual development; it is only so when it takes the compulsory form. The voluntary principle in organization is the safeguard of individual liberty.

Some people guard their freedom so jealously that they love only themselves. Their social development has not kept pace with their personal development. "To walk free and own no superior" is a brave ideal, but not to be misapplied into the repudiation of equals. The basic difficulty which has been lost sight of in recent periods of reaction (first, in the reaction, from the extreme of self-seeking and greed, and next, in the reaction from the extreme of majority control and State regulation) is the maintenance of a just balance between egoism and altruism, between the centripetal and centrifugal, between isolation and fusion, between identity and totality. We see things one at a time, and thus the two-sidedness of the laws of being eludes us.

Intense individualism, expressing itself in the passionate yearning for freedom, is not adventitious in origin. External freedom symbolizes the freedom of the soul. The soul of man defies coercion and brooks no artificial limits to the experience which its evolution demands. Of equally profound import is the social passion so powerfully manifesting itself today in the most varied forms. It is based on the essential oneness of all life, which makes brotherhood not a mere sentiment but an inherent fact, pointing to ultimate harmony.

Contributing both to individual and collective ends, social effort becomes, somewhat as love is, its own justification. It is an expressible delight to "throb with currents of attempt," heedless of results. But let it not be forgotten that the importance to the evolution of the unit of noninterference in personal concerns is a primary lesson in sociology. The cause of freedom suffers if any individual be restrained against his will, on any pretext.

The remedy for organization in which the old coercive spirit still lingers is to be found in association so infused with the free spirit that opinions of assent and dissent are treated with equal respect, in which individual variation and unconventionality in word and act meet with frank, unreserved welcome.—From "Whitman's Ideal Democracy," by Helena Born.

— o —

What is Freedom?

I am glad to see Comrade Simpson enter the arena, unsheath his blade in defense of Individualism, and fling his challenge at Communism. And I am more than pleased to find Comrade James a foeman worthy his steel. While I do not care to interfere in this contest, I feel impelled to indite my ideas on the subject.

The question seems to be, "Can liberty be inaugurated and maintained by organization," or, on the other hand, "is organization detrimental or subversive of freedom?"

Comrade Simpson assumes that liberty can only be defended by organization. He says of Comrade James, "I want to know if he is willing to defend the liberty he advocates by joining an organization for the mutual protection of that liberty." Well now, what is this liberty Comrade James

advocates? He tells us that it is the absence of man-made law, which is "a uniform rule of action imposed by a superior power." In other words, a man's liberty can only be restricted by other men assuming control over his actions. But how can invasion be met? Can the equal freedom of all be maintained without organization? Perhaps not. We know that it cannot be done by organization. The question is, then, is organization a help or hindrance? Anarchism is founded on the assumption that government organization is a hindrance. But some Anarchists would have the organization without government. Is it possible? I think not. What is organization? A comrade, F. Schuler, has issued a pamphlet on "The Relation of Anarchism to Organization." He says:

Organization has been defined as the taking on of organic structure—the formation or development of organs. Now an organ is a part capable of performing some special function which is essential to the life of the whole.

Sociologically, then, organization is a combination of individuals, and an arrangement or constitution of this combination into parts, each having a special function which is essential to the life of this combination.

Now, does this mean an association of free individuals? I think not. It seems to me rather the subversion of the free individual. This comrade argues on lines of nature, as shown in the following:

Organization and evolution have about the same meaning. . . . a series of changes under natural law.

Is not this the argument of the governmentalists? As our friend argues—"from a diffused, uniform and indefinite arrangement, to a concentrated, multiform and definite arrangement." This arrangement does away with the various and conflicting wills of the multitude. A centralized will and wisdom directs. But is individual liberty advanced? Certainly not. Our author tells us "in union there is strength, but in organization there is greater strength." Just so. When individuals surrender their individuality, allowing officials to act for them, their union is, perhaps, strengthened. They become organs of a central will, and this superior power may be stronger, but I deny it the name of Anarchism.

Mr. Tucker has defined government as "the subjection of the non-invasive individual to an external will." By striking out the word "non-invasive," that would be my definition of organization. I fail to see how any strength otherwise could be added to a union of individuals. I am aware that our comrades who advocate "Anarchist" organization make some distinction between their theory and government by defining government as only "an invasion of the non-invasive individual's liberty." They can combine and utilize the methods of government even to courts, police, and jails. Mr. Schuler says:

I may join an organization and agree to abide by the decision of the majority; so long as I hold the freedom to secede, the principle of liberty has not been violated.

What makes him secede if his liberty has not been violated? The fact is this definition of government cannot stand examination at all. It is only a part, a faction of government. Any attempt to define government other than sovereign authority—an organization of men to control and direct the des-

tenies of other men, will prove a failure. Government consists in the power of certain individuals over the masses, and this power is the essence of organization. Our author says:

What the Anarchist objects to in the State is not the element of organization, but the element of government. Take the element of government out of the State and no Anarchist will object to the remains.

Very true; but what would remain? If it was not for the organization there could be no government. The aim and object of organization is to control the organs—government.

Comrade Simpson says, "If I with others who believe in the law of equal liberty organize for the defense of that equal liberty and give it out that as a uniform practise we shall defend that equal liberty." I say that is all right; you are not invading nor restricting the rights of others by so doing. But when you adopt rules for other people; when you assume what is and what is not invasion; when you establish courts to decide questions; when you create police and jails to enforce the fulfilment of contract,—the distinction between your organization and government is too fine for me to distinguish much difference.

Mr. Tucker has said:

I think it accurate to say that Anarchism contemplates anything and everything that does not contradict Anarchism. The writer whom *Liberty* criticized had virtually made it appear that police and jails do contradict Anarchism. *Liberty* simply denies this, and in that contemplates police and jails. Of course it does not contemplate the compulsory support of such institutions by non-invasive persons.

Now I cannot see what difference it makes whether these institutions—methods of government—be supported by compulsion of non-invasive individuals or supported by voluntary invasive or non-invasive persons. My ideas most decidedly "make it appear that police and jails do contradict Anarchism." Police and jails are simply the tools of government institutions worked by an external will. How they can be contemplated by advocates of Anarchism passes my comprehension. I am not opposed to united action opposing invasion. I can readily conceive instances where such a course should be adopted. But organizing institutions, creating officials, instituting courts,—these things constitute government, and I claim are opposed to Anarchism. Another thought in relation to organization suggests itself. So long as a general government exists they must play second fiddle, being merely a sub-organization, and as such can do very little harm. But suppose government was abolished and these organizations had full sway. Does anyone believe that the power of these organizations would differ from the power of government? Is it not true that all power generates abuse? Is it not true that power destroys liberty? The selfish principle in man is all right when he governs himself, but let him as the head of an organization govern others, and he is bound to do it—that selfish principle will be advanced to the detriment of others. I want Comrade Simpson to contemplate the principle of organization, not as a necessity to further some scheme of commercialism, but in its relation to the principle of liberty. A. LEROY LOVELL.

— o —

My fatherland is the world.—Marc Aurel.

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, 54 Haskins St., Roxbury.
CHICAGO—T. Appel, 1228 Milwaukee Av.
CLEVELAND—E. Schilling, 4 Elwell St.
COLUMBUS, Ohio—H. M. Lyndall, 416 E. Mound St.
LONDON, Eng.—T. Cantwell, 127 Ossulton St., N.W.
PHILADELPHIA—Natasha Notkin, 242 N. Second St.
SAN FRANCISCO—R. Rieger, 322 Larkin St.

RECEIPTS.

Maroni, \$2. Dondero, Finkler, Gross, Kelly, Tegtmeyer, Stahl, Brayton, Teel, Young, Phelps, each \$1. Hoedle, Porter, Faessler, Fritsche, each 50c.

"It could probably be shown by facts and figures that there is no distinctly native American criminal class, except Congress."
—Mark Twain.

LESSONS in Language, Literature, and Business Arithmetic, command and meaning of words, their arrangement in sentences, correct use of hyphens and capitals, punctuation, conversational power, elocution, extempore, and studies of such works in ancient and modern literature as may be selected. Methods new, unique, attractive. Arithmetic only as used in business. Terms: One pupil, 50 cents per lesson. Discount to classes of more than one. J. M. CLARKE.
Chicago, 777 Walnut St.

MEMOIRS OF A REVOLUTIONIST.

BY
PETER KROPOTKIN.

This interesting autobiography of the well known Anarchist and scientist, is one of the most important books of the Anarchist movement, as well as one of general interest. "He is more anxious to give the psychology of his contemporaries than of himself," says the noted European critic Georg Brandes. "One finds in his book the psychology of official Russia and of the masses underneath, of Russia struggling forward and of Russia stagnant. And he strives to give the history of his contemporaries rather than his own history. The record of his life contains, consequently, the history of Russia during his lifetime, as well as the history of the labor movement in Europe during the last half-century."

The book contains two portraits of the author, and one of his mother. It is excellently printed and well bound; 519 pp. Price \$2.

Send orders to FREE SOCIETY.

THE CHICAGO MARTYRS.

THE FAMOUS SPEECHES OF THE EIGHT ANARCHISTS IN COURT
AND
ALTGELD'S REASONS FOR PARDONING FIELDEN, NEEBE AND SCHWAB.

This book contains a half-tone picture of our eight comrades and one of the monument erected at Waldheim cemetery to the memory of those murdered by the government. This is the best edition of the book ever printed. It contains 168 pages.

Price 25 cents.

Send orders to FREE SOCIETY.

BOOK LIST.

ALL ORDERS FOR THE FOLLOWING BOOKS
RECEIVED AT THIS OFFICE.

Essays on the Social Problem.....	05
.....H. Addis	
The New Hedonism.....Grant Allen	05
Plain Words on the Woman	
Question.....	05
God and the State.....Bakunin	05
The Same. (London edition.).....	10
The Proletarian Revolt, a History	
of the Paris Commune of 1871.....	25
.....G. B. Benham	
Whitman's Ideal Democracy and	
Other Writings.....Helena Born	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
Hilda's Home. Cloth \$1.....	
.....Rosa Graul	50
Moribund Society and Anarchy.	
Cloth 60c.....Jean Grave	25
A Physician in the House.....	
.....Dr. J. H. Greer	2.75
The Education of the Feminine	
Will.....Harlor	05
Motherhood in Freedom.....	05
Government Analyzed.....Kelso	1.00
Anarchy on Trial.....	05
Anarchism and Outrage.....	03
Roosevelt, Czolgosz, Anarchism,	
and Communism.....	03
Anarchism: Its Philosophy and	
Ideal.....Peter Kropotkin	05
An Appeal to the Young.....	05
Anarchist Morality.....	05
Field, Factory and Workshop.....	45
Law and Authority.....	05
Memoirs of a Revolutionist.....	2.00
Paris Commune.....	05
The State: Its Historic Role.....	10
The Wage System. Revolution-	
ary Government.....	05
Social Democracy in Germany.....	
.....Gustave Landauer	02
History of the Commune. Cloth.....	75
The Economics of Anarchy.....	
.....Dyer D. Lum	25
Anarchy. (Is It All a Dream?)	
James P. Morton, Jr.).....	10
A Talk about Anarchist Communism	
between two Workers.....	05
A Chambermaid's Diary.....	50
.....Octave Mirbeau	05
Commune of Paris.....Wm. Morris	05
Responsibility and Solidarity in the	
Labor Struggle.....M. Nettlau	05
God and Government: The Siamese	
Twins of Superstition.....W. Nevill	05
The Pyramid of Tyranny.....	
.....F. Domela Nieuwehuis	05
A Cityless and Countryless World.	
Cloth.....Herman Olrich	1.00
The Slavery of Our Times. Cloth.....	75
.....Leo Tolstoy	
Mating or Marrying, Which?.....	05
.....W. H. Van Ornum	05
Evolution and Revolution.....Reclus	05
Direct Action vs. Direct Legislation	
.....J. Blair Smith	05
Perfect Motherhood. Cloth.....	1.00
.....Lois Waisbrooker	
The Temperance Folly.....	10
Wherefore Investigating Co.....	25
Our Worship of Primitive Social	
Gestures.....E. C. Walker	15
Revival of Puritanism.....	10
Vice: Its Friends and Foes.....	15
What the Young Need to Know	
The Ballad of Reading Gaol.....	10
.....Oscar Wilde	
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
The Chicago Martyrs: The Fam-	
ous Speeches of the Eight Anarch-	
ists in Judge Gary's Court; and	
Altgeld's Reasons for Pardoning	
Fielden, Neebe, and Schwab.....	25

History of the French Revolution.

— BY —

C. L. JAMES.

Probably no historical period has commanded so much attention as the French Revolution. This history needs no commendation to those readers who have been following the serial in FREE SOCIETY.

It begins with a rapid sketch of history from the earliest times; the decline of the ancient empires, and the e of the French monarchy; and traces the causes which made the Revolution inevitable. The action of Revolution is narrated in detail: the most careful attention has been paid to chronology, giving the events in their correct relation. The mass of partisan evidence is carefully sifted to get at the facts as they are, and the author relates them impartially, not having made himself the champion of any faction. The traits of the people are portrayed in a simple manner, without prejudice or extenuation.

The prevalent idea that "the terror" was the result of Anarchy is most effectually exploded. The philosophic conclusion is unsurpassed; and the position taken, laying a foundation for the philosophy of Anarchism, is bound to attract the attention of thinkers; and makes the book important to students of history and the social question.

It proposed to issue the history in book form. It will be printed on good paper in large type, and neatly bound. For this purpose a certain number of advance subscriptions are necessary, and will received at \$1 for cloth bound copies and 50 cents for paper. Send orders to

ABE ISAAK Jr., 331 Walnut St., 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, diphtheria, 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.

PRICE \$2.75.

SEND ORDERS TO FREE SOCIETY.

MORIBUND SOCIETY
AND ANARCHY.

Translated from the French of

JEAN GRAVE

By VOLTAMINE 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 Colonizing Classes.—Militarism.—Colonization.—There are no Inferior Races.—Why We are Revolutionists.—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.

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., Se'ey
245-247 Ashland Ave., Chicago, Ill.