The Prophets of Revolution.

I dream—and lo, before my wondering eyes
There passes by a great fantastic thing:
All wretches are ready, they move along
Against the dusky's dimming sunset sky;
Woe, haggard faces, under crowns of thorns;
Heads, bowed "death dust and ashes; eyes that shine
As stars from heaven with light of love divine;
And bodies that, by inward light consume.
And I demand: "Tell me, who are ye
Who, becometh to me, smiling, past me go;
Sickened beings in the saddest place of all—
Of yonder setting sun?"—The heroes we.

"We are the tragic, the inspired host,
That on the battlements, the barricades,
Mid ringing, fervent hymns and clashing blades.
Offering our breasts to death, gave up the ghost.
Lo, the ill-starred host! We of the thought,
Th' exhausted phalanx we, who still unrest,
Our lives in args as fears escape agent.
In futile search of truth, unfruishing sought.
Soldiers and martyrs we, with iron will;
Stirred, sanctified, and shamed our reward.
Our brave rest upon by the hostile sword,
And yet we sobbed in falling: Forward still!
By an inarticulate moan to be
Imbibed, smeared, and mocked on every side.
We lived but to be tortured, crucified;
We had no rest, no home—The heroes we.

I rose and cried: Oh, why so many sighs?
Why should we strive? Have we a broken life?
Why so much suffering and so much strife?
Why an unending round of endless cries?
What nobler than an ideal rose?
What as a flash appeareth but to die?
Why should the soul in tears and weeping be
Consumed with vain desire, desire, love—
Oh, why—And still before my dreaming eyes
There passes by that great fantastic thing:
All wretches in rusty light, moving along
Again the June's lingering sunset skies.
A calm that is not of this earth doth lie.
Upon their radiant faces, and they raise
Their great dilated eyes in rapturous glance,
And, smiling, upward point to heavens on high.

—Ada Negri

Barbaric Relics.

Some time ago I read that six white men were to be hanged during the month of February in the State of Georgia for the crime of burglar. Will someone, acquainted with the laws of Georgia, please explain in Free Society how the monstrous enactment became a law; that human beings might be legally murdered for the act of "housebreaking at night with intent to steal," this being the definition of burglary. I am well aware of the terrible crimes committed in the name of law against human beings in all so-called civilized countries, but I confess that this news item staggered me. I can hardly believe that on the threshold of the twentieth century men can be legally murdered for stealing.

Aylmer Maud, in the introduction to Tooley's "Slavery of Our Times," states that "there are placards where it is now impossible to get anyone to become a hangman; and even in England, comparatively brutal as we are, it would be impossible to reenact the penal code of George III., under which one hundred and thirty criminals were punishable with death." Stealing was one of those crimes, and it seemed that the barbarous penalty inflicted by the English of a century and a quarter ago still survives in darkest Georgia. Capital punishment is the supreme disgrace of our age; yet it is never assailed by the pillars of society; and when those poor forsaken mountains the scaffold to demonstrate, by their death, the sacredness of property in Georgia, their last moments will be enlivened by the attendance of sycophantic hypocrites, who will impress upon them the awfulness of their sin, the justice of the law, and the love of God, who is the author of the justice that is about to fasten the rope about their necks. Then they will shake hands with the sinners; the drop will fall; and when life has passed out of the poor struggling form, all concern, the pious gentlemen included, will go home wearing that "holier than thou" air which is so becoming to their work and position. The executioner and the clerical gentleman, how the mention of one calls up the other, how lovingly the ages have they rubbed elbows on the scaffold, bestowing their last attention upon the unfortunates whose faltering steps are ever heard, an endless procession on the way to the gallows. Between the law and the gospel humanity is crucified again and again; and the hangman and the priest are the representatives. Perhaps some day human sympathy will be an ideal guide for human action, in the place of God and the law, and these things shall cease.

There is an instrument of torture used in the Kansas State penitentiary, which I call the "wooden virgin," because of a slight resemblance to the iron virgin used in the Inquisition. The latter was made of iron, shaped like a coffin, with daggers fastened in the door in such a manner that when the victim was placed inside and the door closed, the daggers would pierce the eyes and vital organs. Thus the iron virgin was an instrument of death, while the Kansas virgin is only an instrument of torture. The description of the latter was given me by an intelligent man who was employed in the penitentiary. It is a wooden box shaped like a coffin, but larger, the door being made of wooden lattice work to admit air. When the virgin is placed in the box, he is first placed in a straight-jacket, a sort of leather vest, inside of which they fold his arms, which they then cannot move; his legs are fastened in the same manner. It takes an amount of imagination to realize how a man would suffer after a half-hour of such confinement. But to add to his misery he is then placed in the wooden virgin and the door closed so that the number of hours his jailors are pleased to inflict upon him.

A year ago there was a revolt of the convicts at work in the mines belonging to the prison. They captured their guards and held possession for forty-eight hours, demanding better food and an hour's less work a day. They were finally betrayed by a treacherous convict, and captured. I am told that one of the ring leaders, a colored man, was sentenced to the wooden virgin.

At that time he weighed 170 pounds; when released his weight was 130 pounds. Is comment necessary? And does it not seem truer to say:

"Every prisoner is manif.
He lives with bricks of shame.
And bound with bars, but all shall see
How men their brothers treat?"

Any system that men have built, under the protection of the government or state, that they are protecting their interests, so long as its operations and effects shock natural sympathy and that the sense of what we owe a fellow being must be a false system. It is a natural still small voice speaking within us, that all the platitudes of learned (?) ignoramuses concerning what is due justice and society cannot alter it. That our prison system is shocking and repulsive is proven by the efforts many good men and women make to reform prison methods and make the condition of the prison more pleasant. But their efforts may be likened to those short-sighted individuals who in the days of chattel slavery spent all their energy in trying to abolish the evils of slavery, not seeing that slavery itself could continue until it was too late as long as it existed. So it is with our prisons. Our so-called criminal class is but an effect of a cause, government, which from time immemorial has managed to deprive and rob the mass of men by enacting laws that create
and sustain a privileged class. Thus legal privilege, the power to monopolize land, factories, mines, transportation, and control of modern inventions, has sprung from this economic system that enables a few men to win from the working class all they produce above a bare living. This is the slavery of our sweatshop workers, and it is the basis of our political and social structure. Government, which means slavery, produces criminals, the worst and most mendacious types being found among the ruling classes. Therefore when we do not stop the growth of trade unions, and abdolishing government stop the production of criminals; and turn prisons and halls of legislation into schools and places of amusement. So long as a prison stands, it means human suffering, and tyranny and all the crimes that flow from power over one's fellow; and because it means these things, it is the condemnation of government.

Cappleman Mills, Mo. KATE AUGSTIN.

Lombroso and the Anarchists.

In a former issue of Free Society I commented on an essay in Everybody's Magazine as far as he criticized the theory of Anarchism. Let us now turn to what he has to say about Anarchists.

"The worst of it is," he says, "that a peaceful man, the making of whom gets under the skin of any inquiring and scientific person, looks on the idea of property and the government as being the supreme remedy for their ills to be the destruction of property and proprietors, and even the government!"

In this sentence you will find, upon close analysis, a moral ambiguity, and a logical fallacy. In what way does he refer to those believing in the destruction of property and proprietors, and even the government of society as Anarchists? How could they be: Anarchists otherwise? And further:

"But by this means they hope to bring about the radical changes they wish for at one sweep.

Now, this again is not true, professor. We cannot expect to bring about those changes at one sweep. We are well cognizant of the fact that nothing in human society is accomplished permanently by improvisation or a change. Nor is it the ideal of all evolutionists. We also know that "success gained by crime only provokes counteraction from an opposite source." And for this very reason we oppose government, which is nothing but the violent domination of the few over the masses, always using force and coercion in order to hold the nations in subjection. The most heinous crimes have always been committed by the rulers against the ruled, and put down by the rules against the bosses.

Anarchists do not wish to coerce anybody at all. No Anarchist believes in force per se. We all want peace, harmony, and universal brotherhood; but we also want everybody to get off our backs. And if they do not get off, we are compelled, as a last resort, and as a matter of self-preservation, to shake them off. Freedom absolutely cannot be bought. One cannot buy freedom. One has a right—indeed-obligation—to rule us without our consent and against our will, a right that even the Declaration of Independence repudiated.

Have not all governments gained their success by crime, violence, bloodshed, and extermination? What are the united powers doing to poor peaceful China? What are the 200,000 British soldiers doing in Transvaal? And "our own" 40,000 debauched re- cruits in the Philippine Islands? Are they not slaughtering thousands of innocent men, women, and children? These wars are wars of aggression, and will go down in history as the most successful results of crimes ever committed by the governments of our twentieth century civilization. Now, then, most not success gained by such crimes also "prove that the most powerful are the masters". "There is some truth," Lombroso again hastens to admit after all the rubbish he has heaped upon our poor heads, "in the Anarchist idea, especially in the criticism of the government, which latter is given to a more individual initiative." But as to the means supposed for carrying out the improvements, "they are absurd!"

But he does not make the least effort to prove who is the real villain, or whether any other radical changes in history have ever been achieved other than by revolutionary means. Here he gets nearer home riding his own dear hobby of degeneration, madness, and crime, and proceeds: "And when one comes to examine personally, not the theories of Anarchists, but its soldiers—not so its executioners—one is confronted by a mass of naked and startling evidences of how the times and conditions in which we have to have reached this militant stage a tremendous degeneration must have taken place, not merely of the intelligence, but also of the moral sense."

The question naturally arises, Why are not the militant governments—which all of them necessarily are—degenerate and immoral?

With the militant Anarchist "crime and action are the same thing, and human life is not sacred." This again is not true. Just because we think human life sacred we aim at the abolition of all government, with its militarism, wars, and galleys. You would not have more than the life of a tyrant than of theferocious hyena that is about to devour you. The people always act on the defensive and the government on the aggressive. If they do use force, it is only when the oppressors of the times has reached beyond their endurance.

"There is, in fact," continues our critic, "a large number of madmen and criminals among the Anarchists. We have regular criminals, like Pini and Burckardt."

Now, everyone who has actually come in contact with Anarchists must have been struck by the fact that there are proportionately very few cases of insanity among them. Regular criminals are rare, but political ones frequent, especially in countries where absolutism and tyranny hold sway. But let us hear what Lombroso has to say about educational rules that we may some day note. Basing his researches upon models, he comes to the conclusion that all the crowned heads are more or less afflicted with insanity or imbecility. The case is a melancholy idiot, and a very flexible tool in the hands of his flatterers. The head of King Edward VII shows general degeneracy, incapable of considering anything abstract or weighty. The Sultan, the Emir, and the Sultan are both irresponsible, born incorrigible criminals, and had they been thrown in contact with a law-abiding people, the sultan would have become a band robber, and the kaiser would have become the greatest scandalist, who would have inevitably ended either in prison or on the gallows."

"Even Jean Grave, who was (?) no criminal, wrote: Appropriation by force must be the Anarchists' prelude to the wholesome instruction which they will sooner or later enact."

So because Grave wrote this he is in the eyes of this critic an exceptional man. But if there was no criminal before! And if this is so, why podemos Lombroso make matters short and apply his rule to all the revolutionary Anarchists as a class and be done with it? Why let us see a few words only when we all believe in expatriation!"

"Commonwealth wrote: Theft is the recovery by violence from the rich of that which the rich have taken by violence from the poor. Is not this a very common fellow. Kaiser Wilhelm and the sultan are both responsible, born incorrigible criminals, and had they been thrown in contact with a law-abiding people, the sultan would have become a band robber, and the kaiser would have become the greatest scandalist, who would have inevitably ended either in prison or on the gallows."

"He has himself told us we have such criminals. I tried to make a point of it. When we do, the people of all countries do not live in the hunderd Italian Anarchists, and in forty percent among fifty North American Anarchists."

I heard of a joke some Anarchist in Germany played upon this professor by sending him a photograph of the emperor and the beautiful lady and telling him that, as she was a rabid Anarchist, he would like to hear his opinion as to what type of criminals he would explain her with. To which Lombroso promptly answered that he studied the model carefully, and found it to belong to one of the most dangerous criminals living. The lady mentioned happened to be of the royal family, and the greatest society leader of Berlin.

I do not guarantee the accuracy of this story, but it is very characteristic of those hobby riders in psychology, who see no art pathology and degeneration in everything and everybody, and who are not interested in the Anarchists."

Listen for a moment to his proofs. The first "proof" is that he himself found so many and so many criminals among the Anarchists he examined personally. "Further proofs of their criminal proclivities," says he, "are their use of thieves' jargon, their songs peculiar to jailbirds, and the addiction to tattooing."

Well, I give it up. And I have always thought I knew something about Anarchism and Anarchists! I have to confess I know
absolutely nothing. For the last fifteen years I had the good fortune of meeting thousands of Anarchists both in this country and in Europe, and I have never heard one of them using thieves' jargon, singing jailbird songs (what sort of songs are these, anyhow?) and never saw a tattooed Anarchist anywhere.

Is Lombrado talking wild, or is he a plain everyday charlatan who caters to John Wayne withdrawal from the world of God-In-We-Thunder-dollars? Else why is he wilfully telling such wretched falsehoods?

Then he goes on to tell us that there are some Anarchists who use alcohol and tobacco, and that he believes themselves persecuted, and when carried away by a paroxysm of their malady, or stung by poverty or ill-treatment, and by committing.

So that everybody who commits a crime after being stung by poverty or ill-treatment is a wall-witted imbecile, and as almost every common mortal would end by committing a crime of this sort of time—the professor included—the whole human race is nothing but degenerates and madmen.

Some Anarchists are victims to alcoholism. Young boys are victim to it, too. In fact you will not find one-tenth as many drunkards among Anarchists as you will among a corresponding number of non-Slipping conservatives. I have never found my acquaintance among Anarchists in all my life.

He knew a man, he says, who became “fearfully Anarchistic[1] against his prison guard after drinking a quart of wine.” And that man is classed among the criminals, Anarchists, so that every common “drunk,” who kicks a policeman or a prison guard, is “fearfully Anarchistic[1].”

“Sickly and muddy, the criminals,” says the criminologist. And if you cannot comprehend this curious phrase, ask the professor. He will inform you that it means one who kills a king because he is glad to find the opportunity of being put to death for it.

“By a majority of them are criminals by temperament. Some of these even have fine faces, like Bakunin and Sasset, and are the criminals of America. Parsons, Spies, Lingg, Fischer, Schwab, Needle, and Schaeubel (Schneubel), had ample foreheads, clustering hair and beard, short, soft eyes, and altogether genteel men. Most of this category are very young. They never have decomposed.

The police endeavored to find in the cases of Oliver, of Sönder, of Passamante, of Moureu, of Brezzi, and of Gogouz, but they did not succeed. It is a fact that the alleged Chicago conspiracy, which cost so many Anarchists their lives, was an invention of the police.

Italics mine. It is curious to hear such words in the mouth of a man as a maker of the ‘People’s Magazine.’

Now, why are the police who invented that conspiracy not punished for having deliberately caused the murder of five innocent men? Why doesn’t Lombrado dissect and analyze the brains of a Gogouz, a Gary, a Schub, and a Bonfield? Why doesn’t he try to classify the type of crime.

* Sasset was never an Anarchist, and is not present. He is a Socialist leader in Switzerland.

In this government is composed of? Several Anarchists, too, have led blameless lives,” says Lombrado. Perfectly true. Not only several but nearly all true Anarchists have led blameless lives. “Spies was so charitable,” again says Lombrado, “that some small weekly salary he gave part to a sick friend.” So you are mordid and criminal when you are kind and honest, so you have to be put down by the law.

“Gogouz, who was condemned to be sentenced to death in the name of Emma Goldman.” This is not true. The Chicago police had to release Gogouz and the other conspirators,” for the reason that Gogouz did not even mention any of their names.

MICHAEL COHRS

Australasian Letter.

Free Society. I have made some of the items from the text of our “Holy and consecrated Stump” in the Sydney Domain—or last three Sundays in succession. We continue to have big crowds to listen to us.

I have great hopes of practical results from our last few weeks of propaganda. We have had many workers who from time to time have been on strike at the work of sowing ideas—some of them have been in the ranks of the great majority; others have had to fold up their tents or stay at a few comparatively of the older fighters remain, but a newer one can be added.

I sometimes indulge in the grim humor of thinking what they would stand a year like 1893-94, when a reign of terror was in full blast, aided by the bolder hunters in the labor crowd here. I hope they won’t have to face such music. Andrews, Petrie, Ross, Dwyer, Dodd, Douglass, Burke, Robinson, Shee and others, altogether about eighty, went to jail for the advanced movement in Sydney; while immediately after, the sheriffs set out west broke out in open rebellion, barn river steamers, stations, woolsheds, besieged the troopers and in cases put men in cells to see how they fed their quarters.

But wiser (?) councils prevailed and a score or so more were added to those in prison, everything was settled by parliamentary election members to parliament.

A few Sundays ago about one hundred women marched through the main street in Sydney to the “Domain,” while immediately after, the sheriffs set out west broke out in open rebellion, barn river steamers, stations, woolsheds, besieged the troopers and in cases put men in cells to see how they fed their quarters.

But wiser (?) councils prevailed, and a score or so more were elected to those in prison, everything was settled by parliamentary election members to parliament.

A few Sundays ago about one hundred women marched through the main street in Sydney to the “Domain,” while immediately after, the sheriffs set out west broke out in open rebellion, barn river steamers, stations, woolsheds, besieged the troopers and in cases put men in cells to see how they fed their quarters.

But wiser (?) councils prevailed, and a score or so more were added to those in prison, everything was settled by parliamentary election members to parliament.

A few Sundays ago about one hundred women marched through the main street in Sydney to the “Domain,” while immediately after, the sheriffs set out west broke out in open rebellion, barn river steamers, stations, woolsheds, besieged the troopers and in cases put men in cells to see how they fed their quarters.
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Notes.

Comrade W. McQueen inquires us that on March 15 he will publish a new monthly Anarchist paper called Liberty. Price 50 cents a year. Address 69 Gold St., New York, N. Y.

In the issue of FREE SOCIETY of two weeks ago, there appeared a list of Anarchist journals published in America. We have received some additional information by way of correction, and will note here, that Aragonism was published and edited by Henry and Georgina Replique, W. S. Bell being connected with it only as a contributor; and that the Free Comrade, J. Wm. Lloyd, editor, is still published. We return thanks to Mews, Replique and Lloyd for the corrections, and ask for further information from our readers concerning the Anarchist press.

Radical Reflections.

The specter that is haunting the world today is Anarchism. And side by side with Anarchism is another phantom more frightful still—the Social Revolution. Authority and privilege, the Siamese twins of political and industrial society, are delirious with fear, lest their last and greed shall pass beneath the gallows of the people's wrath as the result of Anarchism's educational gospel. So dungeons walls and prison bars are invoked to stay the onrushing force of Anarchy's intellectual tide. The hayseed, propped thrones of power and privilege, whose foundation is the insecurity of the sword, is shaken with the trend of a giant—the giant of awakened thought. Thromb the world today, the "red specter" haunts the horizon, beyond which the ruling powers, with prophetic vision, behold the scarlet and sable lights of the judgment day.

The crimes of the centuries rise up to confront the gigantic criminals. The world's awakened conscience has placed a tongue of flame in the dumb mouths of the voiceless victims of the murdererscrew, whose bloodstained hands have clutched for centuries the throat of toiling, oppressed humanity.

A ghost has appeared at the banquet table, and the feasters try in vain to banish it from their startled sight. That ghost is the spirit of oppressed humanity.

Labor, supporting the burden of the world and bowed beneath the weight of the centuries, stands at the bar of the world's conscience, demanding justice.

Privilege, crowned upon the State, and belittled by law and ignored, is confronted by the demand of retribution.

The graves of the victims of oppression yawn, and out of them arise a countless host whose voiceless silence impeach the established order.

And I saw under the altar the souls of those who had been slain, and they cried aloud, saying, "How long, oh holy and true, shall we be oppressed?"

Every crime committed by the State has had the blessing of the Church. These twin vultures, hatched from the same egg of ignorance, have gone hand in hand, side by side, down the centuries, one holding the crucifix, the other grasping the sword, and both ruling by fear and force. And if we follow the path behind them we will see the blight of their desolating rule on either hand, in every age, in every land and clime. With them go the dungeon and the gibbet, behind and behind them are the sickening butcheries of the battlefields, the famished forms of want and hunger, the horrors of the slave pens, the wrecked homes, the homeless outcasts, the robbed and plundered victims of all the ages, and countless martyrs of thought and genius. But suddenly, there rises before them the Red Specter, whose uplifted hand bars the way.

That Specter speaks to them in tones that make them quail. Now it is thru the interpretation of a Marx, a Proudhon, a Bakunin, a Kropotkin, or a George. Again it speaks in tongues that are not but not less plain, as interpreted by a Vaillant, a Henry, a Breckin, or a Czolgosz. And whether it be the voice of reason or that of dynamite that commands, it serves notice to these monstrous twins, that for them the day of judgment is at hand.

And so the State and the Church seek to banish this awful specter from their path, but in vain. Pulpit thunderings are no longer potent, man-made law can no longer stay the on-rushing tide of awakened thought; and all the princes and gibelets of the world cannot subdue the spirit of liberty.

But what shall we say of the White Terror? The defenders of the existing order have much to say about the crime of violence, when some victim of their own violence yields to human impulse and strikes back. But they, the exponents of law and order, are the blasphemers of the evangel of violence, the only consistent and eternal exponents of force and murder. It is they who today, in South Africa and the Philippines, are preaching the gospel of love and peace with baskets of gunpowder. It is they who murder by wholesale and devastate by continents. It is they who are manufacturing dead men at Barcelona and Trieste, in the name of government and law and order. They, the blatant hypocrites, dare raise their bloody hands in horror when some nameless victim of their lust and greed is driven into a corner and in despair sends some pampered parasite to his deserts. Let power and privilege, State and Church shudder, the sword, and take their murderous clutch from the throat of humanity, and there will be peace.

Until this is done, the Red Terror will confront the White Terror, and there will be no peace. Those who resort to violence have invoked a genie that knows no master. And if the American congress, forgetting the lesson of '76, shall undertake to stamp out the peaceful propaganda of Anarchism, a social philosophy that denies all violence, it will create a propaganda of terrorism, as an inevitable protest. Beware, then, how you tamper with the sacred right of free speech. It is a safety valve. Suppress the voice of reason, and the discontent of the oppressed will speak to you, perchance, in a voice you have heard before—the voice of dynamite. —R. W. W.
his Anarchist lack of respect for the laws of South Carolina, for violating which he got the sentence above mentioned.

What is the matter with H. Gaylord Wilshire, of Wilshire's Whitishire, formerly of America and now of the British empire? The last issue of his paper contained only two pictures of himself. Besides, nearly a third of the reading matter was devoted to topics other than his personality. Why is this thus? What is the meaning of this coy modesty? Has Gaylord grown weary of seeing himself in print?

I am also worried about Charleyboy Moore, of the Blue Grass Blade. The last issue of his paper contained not a single editorial on himself. What dark, unattainable mystery is lack of this unaccountable silence I wot not. Whether the Blade office is short on capital I’s, or whether its editor, like Horace Greeley, is too mystic, is lost in a profound contemplation of himself, as the sublime center of his own universe, I do not know. But I am worried about it, for I know that something is wrong.

Should the proposed anti-Anarchist bill become a law, it will be a crime to circulate the Declaration of American Independence, because that document contains "teachings which are calculated and intended to breed lawlessness and contempt for and destruction of the institutions of government" (section 3 of the bill). Its a good thing for Thomas Jefferson that he is beyond the reach of the police, if this bill becomes law. We shall doubtless have to put up, in future, with exaggerated editions of American histories, for no publisher will dare to publish either the speech of Patrick Henry, or the Declaration of Independence, both of which punish sedition and rebellion against government, and tend to the destruction of political authority.

The Russian government is determined to suppress all centers of social agitation. The police have arrested the chief editor of the "Nadezhda," who has, without legal form and simply by an arbitrary decree, abolished all art schools, in the Cossack province in the Urals. This is a step forward in the destruction of the intelligentsia. The police have also arrested the editor of the "Sovremennik," who has, without legal form, abolished all art schools, in the Cossack province in the Urals. This is a step forward in the destruction of the intelligentsia.

By the Wayside.

In a controversy in the Worker's Call, Seymore Stedman sarcastically encourages the Socialists to strike, by the news that in 1878 they polled 2,000 votes, and in 1879 they polled only about a hundred. "The party has grown to such proportions that it now polls less than 50 per cent of that vote." At this rate the Cooperative Commonwealth will be quite a matter of course.

While the English government is engaged in the noble occupation of killing off the Bees, and in preparations for the extermination of s fat scamp, there are 3,000,000 children in London who are too hungry and too feble to attend school. A few unscrupulous sneakums inaugurate wholesale butcheries in Africa and the Philippines in order to fill their pockets and to live in luxury and luxury, and the millions of producers are bleeding and sweating in order to cover the bills. And yet Conrade Winn tells us there is a "class struggle."

Apropos the "class struggle." There was a time when the mass of mankind paid homage to one individual—the pope of Rome. Kings, emperors, and the humblest slave alike feared his anathemas and trembled at his wrath. With all his hatred to the class struggle, indeed, one class the pope and the other class the rest of humanity.

It were perverted ideas, or rather sheer ignorance that made mankind crawl before a pope, and it is ignorance today that makes people reverence emperors, kings, laws, and government. It is a struggle between darkness and light. I, the idea of truth and righteousness, is the old and the new ideal. And when Conrade Winn tells us that two of the "three distinct classes" are now joining hands in order to combat the tyranny of a few oligarchs, he reduces his class struggle theory to an absurdity.

Likewise he defends his "practical suggestions" regarding the general strike. He advises us to combine forces with Socialists and Single Taxers in order to inaugurate a general strike all over the world. Let us cease speculating and philosophizing on the future and organize for destruction, he says. Well, for thousands of years people have destroyed, revolted and rebelled against the rich and the rulers. Rulers have been replaced and property changed hands, yet the producer is still a slave. But "the laborer must possess three qualities," says Conrade Winn. "First, an unaiming determination. Second, a total disregard for the laws of the State and the laws of the Church. Third, the instinct of destruction." Here is the rub. The Socialist partakes of the general strike, and the Single Taxers believe in the State, to say nothing of the mass of workers who still worship Church and State; and it will require considerable organizing to convince even the Socialists and Single Taxers in the futility of their political efforts. But these questions are worthy of discussion, and those interested in the subject should read the chapters "Too Abstract" and "Revolution and Anarchy" of "Marxian Society," by Interloper.

Chicago Meetings.

At a meeting of the Jewish comrades, February 15, at 318 S. Morgan St., Dr. Charles Lewis traced the theory of democracy from its first appearance among the Greeks, thru Rome, England, France, the United States, and Switzerland. In all historical times there has been a conflict between the one, the few, and the many for leadership in human society. From monarchy came aristocracy, and from aristocracy there came a democracy. The desire of the few to be in power is born out of the tyranny of their rulers culminated at intervals in bloody outbursts such as the American and French revolutions which were bolstered by a slight amendment. Thus we can trace in nearly all communities the age-old struggle between the oppressor and the oppressed.

The most enlightened of each generation would cause their communities to oscillate between some form of oppression and a modified form of democracy. In this manner, nearly all of the brain-culture was dissipated in removing from the people an oppressive burden laid upon their shoulders by their predecessors instead of exerting their powers against the undeveloped forces of nature. Thus the State becomes a barrier to human progress, while, if man lived in a democracy, which is still coming tho but slowly, it is hoped, he will advance the sciences, social economics, develop "liberty, fraternity, and equality" to such a degree as to amount to individual sovereignty limited only by the necessities of voluntary associations.

W. F. Barnard addressed the Philosophical Society, Sunday, February 23, his subject being "The Heritage of Humanity." He defined the heritage of humanity to be self consciousness, self criticism, self determination. His lecture was able and interesting throughout, and evidently met the appreciation of the large audience.

Next Sunday Walter L. Sinton will speak on "The Economic Fascination."

At the Society of Anthropology, Professor Triggs, of the Chicago University, spoke on "Brown's Calahum," Sunday afternoon, February 23. He compared the ideas and moral conceptions of Brown's savage with the mental development of man from savagery to civilization, and concluded that only free men are capable of reaching any true or advanced plane in morals or social ethics. Next Sunday the Rev. E. L. Gleason, S. J., of St. Ignatius College, will address the Society on "An Inquiry into the Basis of Society."

0.

Authority.

King Lear.—What, art mad! A man may see in the world with no eyes. Look with thine ears. Thou hast no justic rails upon thy plain simple back. Harsh, in thine ear: change places, and hastily, which is the justice, which is the blind? Thou hast seen a farmer's dog bark at a beggar?

Gloster.—Ay, sir. King Lear.—And the creature run from the cur? There thou mightest behold the great image of authority; a dog's obeyed in office.

Thou rascal beadle, hold thy bloody hand! Why dost thou place that where? Strip thy poor luck.

Thou holdest just to see her in that kind For which thou whistled her. The usurer hounds the cooper.

Thou traitor's clothes small vices do appear; Robes and fair'd gowns hide all. Plate sin with gold, And the strong lance of justice hurles them.

Arms in rags, a pygmy's straw does pierce it.

—Shakespeare, "King Lear," Act IV.
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How will a Free Society Operate.

I am glad to know that Colin B. Whitehead is investigating Anarchism, and I judge with some confidence, inasmuch as she is willing to cast her lot with us on that "Isle of the Ocean," the politicians propose to give us over and she wrapt the only and I guess who is puzzled to know how they (the Anarchists) propose to abolish government and usher in a free society. It was good to hear the poet and the statesmen alike a protest which will show them if they would abolish slavery. Anarchists are somewhat divided on that question. But they are very unanimous in their opinion that it ought to be abolished, and it is said that "where there's a will, there's a way." Our sister evidently sees the beauty of our belief, but is doubtful about our method. She seems to think that it requires authority to establish liberty, justice, equality, and fraternity. But she is mistaken. These things do not exist because of forceful authority. Cannot she see that liberty is impossible under government? Religious liberty did not exist until the authority of the Church was abolished, and I think she will find that legislation had very little to do with its abolition. The people's refusal and the Church's division, now demonstrate that we are willing to teach without a tax, I imagine did it. Remember hearing a long "descent on priestcraft" that was written by an ancestor of some which paid his tax. It concluded as follows: "Now grown sick of blood and slaughter, fans and hatchet that was under, We'll have better times hereafter."

Many jokes spot a foe.

And it may be the increasing number of political jobs will spoil the trade of government.

Sister Whitehead seems somewhat imbued with the principle, so harped on by our Socialist friends, that the individual becomes an individual to the Community. They always capitalize community. She says, "the amount of wealth created, or possible of creation without the cooperation of many individuals, is in proportion to the wealth enjoyed by the individual; it is impossible to offset Ross Wynn's statement that "individuals create wealth and individuals should enjoy it." I fail to see the point. If individuals cooperate to create wealth, they may cooperate to enjoy it. But the enjoyment must be an individual affair. When the community enjoys it, it will be discovered that a few individuals get the cream. She quotes from a frame article of mine, which she credits to Ross Wynn, and says that it is exactly what Socialists say. I know the Socialists say many things about liberty and equality, but their methods to realize them are different. They think all State Socialists, all others are Anarchists and it seems to me those Socialists, not Anarchists, who advocate political action are the most consistent. There is no question but that the principle of free Commune in the "social organism," is centralized government, to be administered by certain individuals, in other how the men are free and governed. The fact is their cooperation is coercion. Their liberty is simply license. We have some liberty now, we can get away from government. But when State Socialism "takes possession of the government and the means of production and distribution"—God help us, if there is a God. What is there in this new regime to make officials incorruptible? I want her to contemplate this Socialist State. Will its politicians be better and purer men than the politicians now? But the "Anarchists have not seemed to me to present any plan of action." Well, the governmental principle is to make good men rich, but wherever and however tried has completely failed. The Anarchist has no "plan of action" to force men into some regime. They advocate liberty, and liberty, individualism to represent State Socialism may abolish poverty, wages and commercialism, but they establish what is worse—dependency—slavery. I was acquainted with a Socialist society in New York City—"the Bohemian Society." Their men and women, horses and oxen were fat and lazy. They used to have five meals a day and all the beer and coffee they wanted. And yet, strange as it may appear, they could not get them to work. If one would jump the hedge and marry into the homes of the poorer farmers round about. It got too civilized for the colonists, and they sold out and went into the woods where there were, I believe, was another Anarchist society. It was a great success financially; such schemes always are, until they get to fighting over the property. Yes, I repeat the Socialism is something easily understood, but all the experience we have had of its working is not according to my idea very encouraging. It is an institution, a centralized organization, that will be moved by a central head. If it is sure it would be a Whitehead, I might be tempted to join its ranks. I have great respect for Whiteheads. My wife's sister was a Whitehead. No, the ubiquitous politician will be their head, and can you trust him? I ask our comrades to analyze this organization, in the light of historical events. When and where did an organization of this kind get on the road that did not become corrupt and tend to defeat the very object for which it was called into existence? I want her to question the fact that this organization, like all government organizations, has its "plan of action" on lines of policy determined by certain individuals. Another fact: Human nature is about the same all around; its principle is selfishness, give him power and he will advance that interest without any consideration of others. And this organization would monopolize all wealth, would assume industry and direct all distribution, and it seems to me that even were the man would have either motive or opportunity for thriving at the expense of his fellows. What is it that gives a man such a "motive or opportunity?" Is it that he has been given power over his fellows? The How are these officials to live, not at the expense of their subjects? Of course I can see the position of our sis-
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The comrades. She looks out upon the vast system of capitalism. She sees the human adaptability to the wants of the people. She also sees, it's awful cruelty and oppression, a veritable juggernaut crushing blood and bones beneath its wheels. Thousands are dying daily of starvation today. The Socialists would preserve all the conveniences and comforts, and abolish all the evil. The vast transcontinental railways would be doing business at the old stand, the atmosphere of steaming coal smoke would be vastly augmented. The post office would carry letters from Denver to New York with greater facility and all the gratings. The new system would make it clear that they can look down upon the less fortunate. But State Socialism would strangle all endeavors, and could only be maintained by absolute slavery.

Not Anarchism? She asks? Is it Anarchism, or is it the struggle for an Anarchist society? She is not in a hurry, not in a hurry to rush in the door. Where is the Socialistic State? Where? And if there is such a state, has it the power of the State? No, it does not. And what is the power of the State? It is the power of the State. It is the power of the State. And if it does not have the power of the State, it is not a State. And if it is not a State, it is not the Socialistic State.

The Ladder.

A false ladder that is built of wood and has a step on it. When the person steps on it, he finds that it is broken. He falls into the gutter. He is now on the ground, and he is in danger of being trampled upon.

Effect of Child Labor.

If we are to believe Miss Jane Addams, of Hull House, capital of the United States, then the perpetual weariness of the street is deeper than most people think. She finds that many persons slip into tramp life through physical and moral exhaustion, reaping their overwork in childhood. In a recent address before the Chicago Business Women's Club, Miss Addams said: "Child labor undertaken too early or in excess is responsible for a large number of the tramps and aimless wayfarers of America. The boy or girl who works too early is surfeited with labor, bankrupt of ambition long before the time when work should begin at all."

The belief that tramps are not recruited from the ranks of youthful tailors who have been overcome by an intense and physical and moral fatigue because they have been tramps is not new, for so far it has hardly been made the subject of careful investigation. At Hull House those facts have been observed for a number of years, and data are being collected. "We work," says Miss Addams, "in the belief that the child workers who are bright and eager and ambitious when commencing work some six or seven years ago, are different now. Nearly all of them are dull and listless, lacking energy and without ambition. Many are actual tramps." — Boston Transcript.

INTERNATIONAL NOTES.

A series of riots and street fights between soldiers and striking workmen have taken place in Barcelona, Spain, during the past two weeks. The papers of February 19 announce that 80,000 pensions were given to the strikers. The city is under martial law, and the situation is considered critical.

In the province of Catalonia, Spain, a strike movement of extensive proportions has been inaugurated. The government has established a strict censorship, and no accurate news can be had. The present state of affairs in Spain is the outgrowth of the agitation of the general strike idea, and the outbreak of the Social Revolution may be the ultimate result. At least, we hope so.

In Trieste, Austria, another series of disturbances have occurred. A railroad strike, and the conditions there are similar to those prevailing in Barcelona. Martial law has been established, and three Austrian warships have been sent to the latter, from which machines have been landed in opposition to all military and governmental actions. Thus we see how the naval power is to be used against the people when occasion demands. The Austrian government defends the wholesale arrest of workmen there on the ground that the riots are the work of Anarchists. In the Reichsrath a bill authorizing the establishment of martial law was passed to its first reading, after a heated debate in which the Socialists violently denounced the troops and the government of Trieste.

The Russian students refused the government's concessions regarding student organizations, and declare that they will strike, unless their demands for free speech and complete autonomy are granted. Disorders have broken out in Rostov in consequence of this attitude.

Tolstoy is reported to be critically ill in Valga, Crimea.

As a result of the "No Rent" campaign now being carried on in Ireland by the United Irish League, forty farms in Roscommon have been sold, and many others are pending. A similar campaign in this country would be an effective means of propaganda for the idea of free land.

ATTENTION!

The pamphlet "Roosevelt, Croesus, and Anarchy" by Jack Fox, including an article on "Communism," by Henry Addams, is now ready, not containing 32 pages, as was formerly announced in Free Society, but only 16, which enables us to sell the booklet much cheaper and thus furnish its distribution. We think the articles are very appropriate for propagandistic purposes at the present time, and hope that the comrades will send in their orders immediately. The price has been reduced to 5 cents per copy. A remittance of 100 cents will pay the subscription. We also charge 10 cents per copy, in lots not less than 25. Send all orders and money to R. Leitz, 200 Madison St., New York, N. Y.