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were given them. In some cases the women retaliated, and a few of the rowdies were badly hurt, and will have to undergo considerable repairs. The courts imposed heavy fines on all who were arrested, hoping thereby to crush the spirit of revolt that had suddenly displayed itself so vigorously and in such unexpected quarters. All fines were promptly paid from a public fund collected for that purpose, proving that there was no Jubal A. Morgan clubbing one person—a pregnant woman—is dead.

The New York Times is not at all satisfied with the weakness of the police in handling the rebels. "They should have been on the keen lookout for disturbances," it remarks, "and they should have been amply ready to put it down without hesitation and without in any way furthering revolution.

The class of people, especially the women, who are engaged in this matter have many elements of a dangerous class. They are very ignorant. They mostly speak a foreign language. They do not understand the duties or the rights of Americans. They have no idea or respect for law and order in the best sense of the life of the society into which they have come.

"They are very ignorant. They mostly speak a foreign language." These are two of the elements which constitute a dangerous class.” By a “dangerous class” the Times means, of course, a class opposed to the present harmonious order of things, whereby the Times and the beef trust and the coal trust and the meat trust and all the other trusts down—the coffer trust was fat at the expense of the poor Jewish men and women, and all the other poor men and women, who “are very ignorant,” and who speak every language. It is no doubt true, as the Times states, that these people are very ignorant; but that does by no means make them “a dangerous class.” On the contrary, it is intelligence that makes such a dangerous. If they had remained in ignorance of the fact that the meat trust was robbing them, they would have not have revolted and endangered the “peace and order” of the community. And, if so much intelligence has been fitted to such a pitch, and has been the cause of so much pain and worry to the Times, what would happen if by some miracle the whole panorama of robbery and iniquity were even more their mental vision? Methinks the Times would alter its tone, and publish no more such savage editorials, on pain of being boycotted or drenched with coal oil. The Times and its co-journals are the ministers of the food trust, the land trust, the law and order trust, the God, and all the other trusts, and know full well the food upon which they thrive and fatten so joyfully and quick. The name of that food is ignorance; and when the Times stated that one of the elements of danger was ignorance it felt—deliberately and maliciously lied. How stupid is the assertion that to speak as to which constitutes a “dangerous danger! The only intelligent interpretation of it can be this: that the Irish police force, which has a green lamp outside of every police station, cannot understand a foreign language and are therefore handicapped in “preserving” the peace of the community.

“They do not understand the duties or the rights of Americans.” Does the Times mean that there areignorant or whores on the east side, or did it mean that one of the rights and duties of Americans is to be skinned alive by the vampire trusts? We ready to go. No may take our choice, ours is as worthy as the other. And I fancy the Times would find itself in a serious predicament were it forced to explain. An explanation to be correct would have to be somewhat like this: A few Americans, for foreigners postulates a certain kind of intelligence—a perverted intelligence, have, owing to the ignorance of a large number of Americans and foreigners, succeeded in coining the country and its vast wealth, with the result that this large number of ignoramuses must cringe and crawl before the few intellectuals to be permitted to eke out a miserable existence upon any terms. These terms are harsh. The few ask much from the many as the price of their ignorance. The many are everlastingly doomed to dig and delve, to mon and sweat, and to share but a mite of the sweet fruits of their labor, unless they too quickly their intellects, scrape the scales of ignorance and superstition from their visions, and, not like wild beasts, but as sober, intelligent men and women, seize society into a master and an equal. The Jewish women, with but a spark of the light of intelligence which flames in the mind of the man of thought, rebelled against the injustice which they represented in their person. A spark soon burns out, and so the strike of the Jewish women. But it has its lesser for those who can see it. It gives us more proof of the Anarchist philosophy; that intelligence is the mother of revolution. The rebellion that springs from intelligence is constructive, as well as destructive; it prepares its plans for the new structure before it destroys the old.

The revolt of the Jewish women was not an intelligent revolt. In the very nature of things it could not be. It was a reflex of their minds. The sudden raise in the price of meat sharpened their intellects and forced them to think. They saw the injustice which they represented no justifiable reason for the high prices, and therefore became unwilling to pay them. That was the intellectual process. Now they were ready for the revolutionary propaganda. The intellectual awakening had made the revolution inevitable. But where was the Moses to lead them from their bondage? Lol from their midst she sprang, unknown to all; her voice was heard, for she uttered the words that were in their hearts. Mounting a rostrum she shouted, "Sisters, we are oppressed, we must revolt!" And the strike was won.

When they will think of the great stalwart family of trusts, of which the meat trust is but an individual member; when they shall have felt sorely of the ill, and discussed coolly and intelligently the possible cure; when their intellects and have realized that everything, even the very heaven they looked up to as a final palace of peace for their tired and hungry souls, is controlled by a trust; and when they will have never been heard of in the whole existing scheme of things and pictured in their minds a social structure for the future, then let the tyrants clear the way, for the revolution will be upon them—this intelligence, conceived in the womb of reason, nurtured with the milk of human kindness, and guided in its glorious work by the cool determination that springs from a clear knowledge of the way to be accomplished."

JAY FOX.

An Open Letter to James F. Morton, Jr.

"When the resolution of Disruptor was referred of the committee, I sort of thought of entering into a thorough discussion of the scope of philosophy Anarchist. These writers for Emma Goldman, with whom I have had some discussion, seem to rest upon a broader foundation than they imagine. — J. F. Morton, Jr., in Chicago."

"Philosophic Anarchism!" Is it possible that there are different kinds of Anarchist, and that some of us have failed to "catch" the superior article? I hope Comrade Morton will clearly define the difference so that we may be enabled to recognize a "philosophic" at the first glance. Without doubt it is a great damage to the cause that the dif-

rutable ideal known the world over as Anarchist should be so promiscuously hauled into the field. Anarchism is the true motive that actuated Comrade Livey, of Sykesville, Md., he, several months ago, scattered a circular far and wide trying to explain the difference.

"The trouble with gold," declared this "philosopher," "that they fail to distinguish between the different types of Anarchists. There are the red Anarchists, to whom gold is everything. Goldman belong, and there are the philosophical! Anarchists, who never asso-

ciate with the reds." And when Comraced Livey vigorously protested against any laws repressing the philosophies, he rather left the other type outside of the protest.

Comrade Barnes, of Henderson, Ill., rebuked Livey for taking such a position, and Livey answered, "We have to do this to work things around."

Here is a comrade, who claims to be a philosopher, who boldly defends Judaism and expediency, and practises them. I think he considers this the best method; but these means mean no appeal to the passions and no appeal to the reason. It is the only method of true progress. It is only thus appealing to man’s reason, sympathy, and courage that the movement against government ad-

vances.

Anarchism, as I understand it, is the philo-

sophy of freedom,—the negation of authority. When we explain Anarchism we explain natural law and principles: the observance of which would build a human brotherhood in which government of man by man is aboli-

shed. In the immortal word Anarchist, con-

sidered as it is by the blood of the innocent, the noble and true, so devoid of meaning that we must add the prefix "philosophic." If, perhaps, in due time a suffix will be added also. In my estimation the latter would be no more out of place than the former. Why should we add the general term "philosophic" that hardly exists between those who have a common ideal, especially as no ground seems to exist for such distinction? So far I have never exchanged ideas with him who could intelligently explain why he thought government should be abolished. While it is true that men vary in ability to reason, no man deserves to be set apart from his fellows as a philosopher. The idea that nearly all his knowledge is derived from his fellows, and even
the humblest savage or peasant is capable of teaching something in regard to the things they best understand.

If Comrade Morton can broaden the comradely by explaining the difference between a "philosophical" Anarchist and an Anarchist, I for one am ready for the stretching process. It is not the "scope" we are asking for, but the difference.

There is one more little matter that needs explaining, since Comrade Morton declares he has been "misinterpreted." In *Discontent*, of March 26, was an "Open Letter from the Home comrades to the postmaster general of the United States, in which among several questionable statements was the following: "They [the Anarchists of Home] have no connection whatever with the revolutionary element." Will Comrade Morton reconcile this statement with the open and well known fact that the Home Anarchists propagate Anarchism thru the sale of the literature of the revolutionary element, holily advertising the same in Discontent down to its last issue? If the Anarchists of Home have no connection with the revolutionary element which numbers in its ranks such luminaries as Bakunin, Malatesta, Jean Grave, Louise Michel, and the dead Bakunin, whose words still live and move the human mind to high endeavor; if they have no connection with the revolutionary women who have lived and died for the ideal of Anarchism, the cause of humanity—lived or died as circumstances required, —then all I have to say is that they are a "harmless crowd." You reason well as a general thing, James Morton. Please explain the why of your not being connected with the "revolutionary element." But I would rather hear you say, "I made a mistake, comrades, in denying that element; concerning expediency I lost the logic of my position." But if you are positive that you made no mistake, tell your critics why you have not cured it in a statement that apparently is necessary.

Caplings Mills, Mo. — Kate Austin.

"Human Law." I wrote you asking what you meant by liberty, seeing that you repudiated equal rights and advocated an "expression of the individual." James, of which the first twelve lines only now concern me. Now, if James stands for the editor, and be for James, I will not demur.

"What liberty means ought to be tolerably obvious," I am told, "from the standpoint of social science"—as opposed to metaphysics. "Liberty is absolute or unrestricted when limited by no human law." From the statement of society—"in which I am at, and I would like to make further inquiries. If liberty "absolute or unrestricted in this sense is what Anarchists believe in," would you be willing to take active measures by explaining the difference between individual liberty, i.e., the liberty of the individual to do as he wishes? In a word, are you prepared to agitate, educate, and organize (into a voluntary association) for the defense of this individual liberty?

Please explain the precise meaning you attach to the phrase "human law," as used in sentence quoted above. A.H. Harrison.

Mr. Simpson's last question seems to call for an answer first. I should recommend him to read the article "Law" in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. It gives the drift of scientific and revolutionary thought on this subject. I will not, of course, say perfectly, but sufficiently to answer his question, which, however, I will do, merely referring to the authority.

The difference between social science, all law is human law. The laws of physics are only called laws by a metaphor, which must be eschewed when we aim at precise language; and moral laws of God may be considered when someone has decided what they are. This was the observation with which Austin began the modern treatment of this subject. Blackstone, the great representative of a school now out of date, had inextricably jumbled the laws of God (scriptural), the laws which he was pleased to call natural (meaning the notions and prejudices likely to be accepted by his readers), and the laws of England, and he was nhiệt as well as the sentences for the latter. Austin replies, "the laws of England are just simply the laws of England, whose one real sanction is the fiat of the English government." All laws, in the sociological sense, are human, deriving their sanction solely from the will of a king, majority, or whatever has authority among men. "Law is a rule of action; imposed by a superior (human) power, and necessary for the preservation of society," This point of view is the most important in Mr. Simpson's question. But it did not escape Austin's neatness that law, in the legal and sociological sense, must be uniform. A single command for a single case is not a law. It is an ordinance, or sometimes by other names which denote its ephemeral character, is not a law. To cite Austin's Illustration, if a master should tell his dog to go and bring him at six o'clock next day, that would be only a command. But if he told Pompey to call him at six o'clock every morning, this would be a law to Pompey, differing in nothing essential from any law of the kind which jurisprudence can consider. This distinction is implied in the familiar words "law is a rule of action." But it is worth emphasizing, because mere arbitrary government, with no laws, has no advocates. What concerns me more is the certainly rather grand and impressive conception of rules which may be known to all; are alike for all; reflect the "wisdom of our ancestors," modified when actually necessary by our own "collective wisdom," assembled in a legislature; and which, by their uniformity, bind in a measure the power itself which makes them.

It is not very logical, in appearance, that one Anarchist should undertake to answer for others. But, if I stand for the editor, and he for me, I have no objection to say that in my judgment Anarchists differ from other social philosophers precisely because they do not think laws (uniform rules of action imposed by a superior human power) good things, but rather think them, if possible, more evil. Moreover, it is only the social interference with individual liberty by greater power which no one thinks good in the main, or says better for a particular case than that some circumstance of great necessity or necessity, and so on. I do not know what else the Anarchists are, such, are doing all the time than take active measures, by agitation, education, voluntary association, etc., for the emancipation of the individual from government by laws, in this sense.

The Anarchists take such views or adopt such measures, is, of course, quite a different question, and one on which Mr. Simpson has not, so far, asked for information.

C. L. James.

The Rifle Diet. An associated press dispatch from Hinton, P0., under date of May 27, stated that a consignment of rifles had been shipped to that place and placed in the cellars. These rifles are for the use of the mine owners against the strikers. It occurs to me that it would be a pretty good idea for the strikers to order a "consignment of rifles" for their own use. If strikers are to be settled with rifles, I don't see why the arguments should all be on one side. If the rifle is agreed upon for the "boss," why not for the worker? I have an idea that some "philosophic" persons with a penchant for peace at any price will uphold their hands in holy terror at the suggestion; but my advice to strikers who expect to be targets of capitalism's armed thugs, is to either disband their organizations and come under the yoke, in meek submission, or else put themselves on an equal footing with the bosses in the matter of "resources of civilization." — R. W.

Literature."


A little tract of eight pages wherein the author claims that abortion is the cause of all crime, and demands a law to make it punishable by death. It is decidedly weak and shallow. The claim remains entirely a prejudice of the few cases cited being insufficient to prove a hypothesis. The remedy is unworthy of a "liberal," but belongs rather to the Catholic Church. Socially it is devoid of insight. Every advance in intelligent knowledge that still penalizes to prevent nothing; and no woman ever finds abortion a pleasant experience. We have too many laws already. And to demand the death penalty for anything, is the province of a savage—not a refined man.

The essay "Organized Vengeance," by P. Kropotkin, which appeared in *Free Society* some time ago, has been issued as a pamphlet by *Freeman*. There is a supplementary article on "The Superstition of Government," by Henry Glassie. It is excellent for distribution. Price 3 cents, in larger quantities 2½ cents each. Order from this office.

Abolish the Hunger. I clip the following from an editorial of the Chicago Citizen. When there will be friend, hunger, hating, and discontent, folklore preserves disappear from legislation? Or will they forever disappear?

"Just so: legislation without these would be like the play of Hamlet with Hamlet left out." In this case the "Ora" works, and it is an utterance. — J. M. Clarke.
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Notes.

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 we will send the name. This applies to renewals as well as new subscriptions.

Comrade J. Fox, 836 Fifth St., New York, N. Y., will furnish information to comrades interested in Cosmic Colony, such as to the best means of transportation, fare, etc., to Brazil, and other useful intelligence.

Some Chicago comrades wish to start a Tolstoian literary club immediately. Its purpose will be to read, discuss, and properly understand the great Russian writer and philosopher. The necessity for such an association is very apparent at this time when punch writers and reform speakers are manifesting so much ignorance of the man and his writings. Those wishing to join will please address A. Goodheart, 902 N. Woodlawn Ave., Chicago.

Comrade Alphonse Washburn, 1412 S. 12th St., Denver, Colo., has taken the initiative in a move to organize a veteran’s union. The object is to find out where possible whether the rent collectors have the (legal) right to do so, and if not to refuse to pay it. It is inserted that much property is taken possession of by hired sharpers which has really lapsed by default, the owners having disappeared. Those farther interested can communicate with her.

Zap

Splinters

The People’s Press says it is to the credit of Senator Tillman that he has never proposed killing Negro boys over ten. Is it to the credit of our press that he makes a savage of himself, that he does not go quite so far as the rest of the savages (at Washington)?

Another quack doctor has given out a “cure for Anarchy.” This time it is the One Hoos, of the Appeal to Reason. The mixture is education liberally drenched with Socialism. As is evident from what he says, the invention of the new patent remedy is not so much in need of the formulator himself, as it is in need of the formulator himself and all who use it, and that while he is about it, he is not likely to do any harm, and that while he is about it, he is not likely to do any harm. The only question is whether the patent office will grant the invention to the better end of the human family.

During the recent strike of teamsters for the packers in this city, the police, as usual, distinguished themselves for their sangrave brutality. Meat wagons were driven about in caravans, with a formidable police escort all along the line. As the strikers had the sympathy of the whole populace, driving for the packers was done under difculties. Wherever the caravans went, the passing vehicles always managed, asby, miracles, to be in the way. Dozens of wagons blocked the streets, and the meat wagons spent hours in moving short distances. Large unruly crowds congregated, and showed their practical sympathy by making it extremely unpleasant for the scal-drivers, who were almost as much a pain to our admiration.

A day or two after the worst brutality of the police was displayed, the police monument of Haymarket square, and Chicago’s disgraceful eyesore, was found bespattered with dirt and the figure had a rope around its neck. The newspaper raised a cry aboutanarchists. The rope that was cut with dirt is of no import, as it could hardly be in a more unsanitary condition than the police have allowed it to stand permanently, a fitting emblem of their shame. But what should be more natural than that some rabid workman should express his indignation in that manner?

The sanguinary violence indulged in by the police finds only extenuation in the capitalist press while the strikers are censured for their unlawfulness. If the packers are justified in protecting their property with armed violence, why are the strikers not justified in protecting their labor power with resistance? The only reason offered in the strikers acted against the law. This raises a question. A policeman cracks a man’s head with his club, and the man wrecks the club away and cracks the policeman’s head. The striker’s head was cracked with due process of law, the policeman’s unlawfully. Where is the actual difference? Jw.

By the Wayside.

The boldness and determination of the striking teamsters of this city created a general feeling of anxiety among those who ride upon labor’s back. A few more lessons, a little more information on the labor problem, and greater vigilance among their “leaders,” who are ever more and more confused, and their government in order, not to jeopardize their jobs, will improve matters considerably.

A. W. Yeater of this city, an enthusiastic advocate of “good government,” laments in True Topics that those “who try to make the world better should perhaps wait until they die for their reward.” Exactly; especially when they waste their energy in the futile task of making rotten eggs smell like roses. I sincerely hope a little more experience of “good government” will teach Mr. Yeater that nothing but the increase of intelligence and the abolition of authority can make the world better.

“The parliamentary comedy is the supreme political drama of our age,” says Poliemonostoff in his book “Reflections of a Russian Statesman.” We may differ with this statesman in many respects, and suspect his motives; but his convictions of democracy are well worth reading, and all Anarchists will agree with him on this subject.

Marriage becomes a “problem” as soon as man and woman live together and begin to mind each other’s affairs, especially as regards their feelings and subsequent actions. There is no problem so long as people are mere lovers, at least as far as marriage is written for the purpose of solving the love question. A final solution will only be reached when all the necessities of life are as free as air and sunshine, which solves the question of supporting the children. The women will have then every incentive to live with a man for the sake of their children or for the struggle to sustain her own life. Yet it seems an impossible work to wish for, especially if they find the means to support themselves and each other. Without the present day marriages would be impossible even today if they get rid of the idea that they own each other. True, once people live together and have children, they have assumed an obligation to raise those children, but that is where the obligations to each other should end. Man and woman can often enjoy greater comforts and conveniences by cooperation in housekeeping; but such cooperation ought no more to interfere with each other’s private affairs than those of two business partners. If their mutual love is so great that there is no craving for a variety in companionship, well and good; but if one is more brandished and has a longing for more love, a feeling which enables both sexes, even each must be to act accordingly, and else deceit will be the result.

There was a time when the Social Democrats in Europe were not censured by non-partisan journals for their retrogressive and compromising attitude. But since “science” was substituted for “revolution,” the “philosophic” Anarchists take note—they have to put up with ridicule from their opponents. In the Zinnkin, Berlin, a liberal bourgeois journal, Maximilian Harden reviews Millerand’s mission as follows:

“Now it is murder, not anti-Socialist laws, no battle with ‘spiritual weapons’ could have had such an effect. The defeated and disarmed Social Democratic monster has furnished his party. The Millerauds, Jauréses, Bonniers, and Volx, who were so weak and unable, have shown more effect than has been done by the heads of the republic, freedom, and the rights of men were needed. Whenever a bourgeois feels that its rights of possession are in danger, it changes that the most savage.
red word of humanity is in jeopardy. And every time— we have just seen it in Belgium, where the liberal politicians, who were more interested in the battle price and inflicted a wound upon Social Democracy from which it will not soon recover—every time we see the workers so manipulated, so blinded that the uncustomed humanitarian currency easily came and drove them into a war in behalf of the privileged, from which they cannot again withdraw.

Mr. Walter Henshaw did not invent this expedient, but so shortly applied the same that success was assured. France, which feared a revolution, has today only 'get rid of Socialists and powerless sects. Millénard's entering the ministry did not signify the capture of political power for the proletariat, but signally strengthened the position of the bourgeoisie. Not Socialism, but class government found in the "Socialist minister," a strong support. Revolutionists should heed the advice of Storrus: "But beware, oh, man, of making a career."

To demonstrate the essence of children's labor in this country, agents of labor unions have taken a dozen of boys—from eight to twelve years of age—from the glass factories of New Jersey, and they intend to travel with these unfortunate victims all over the country. It is too bad, remarks the Chicago Arbeiter-Zeitung, that it is not possible for the public to take a couple of our finest compon-ex-cutters with these crippled victims of our country's industry. This would bring the enthusiasm for "our industry which conquers the world" to a boiling point.

Since President Mitchell threatens to resign if the coal miners truncate a general strike, it is evident that he is either a traitor or a coward, and the sooner he resigns the better. As long as he is the miner's friend, Mark Hanna and Roosevelt looking after their interests they can rest assured that they will be helped with or without Mitchell. Speaking seriously, the suspicions of Mitchell and the preparations of the mine owners for violence will teach the miners a lesson which "agitators" could not have accomplished in years to come.

INTERLOVER.

Certain Comments.

When complaint is made of a gross act of injustice, there are some who assume that the victims overstate the case, and are likely to be as much at fault as those whom they charge with oppressive acts. A protest against wrong is often cynically met with the overworked quotation: "The third me'er feels the harder blow, With good opinion of the law."

When impartial bystanders, however, protest against the treatment accorded to those with whom they have no personal connection, the average man is a great deal more ready to listen. The following letters, both written by intense opponents of Anarchism, reflect the opinions of a number of outsiders, who have had some opportunity of looking into the affairs at Home. I learn that Mr. Gaskin's letter was received, and referred to the postal department. Since the matter is one of Washington, to whom Mr. Geer's letter is addressed, has promised to do what is in his power for the recovery of the post office. Our prospects are very fair; but the red tape of officialdom will probably last for a considerable time. Letters addressed to any of us at Home, Wash., are promptly received, being delivered at the neighboring post office of Lake Bay.

JAMES F. MORTON, JR.

To Theodore Roosevelt, president.

Mr. Roosevelt,—The papers I enclose call your attention to a very important matter indeed, and you want to read them carefully.

It seems your postmaster general has just abolished the use of postmaster post offices on the recommendation of a federal grand jury. The papers will explain the case in particular. Now this is an extraordinary proceeding. The recommendation of the grand jury was based on a charge brought before them by one of Comstock's agents, that the people using the postoffice were Anarchists and free lovers. In a word, an ignorant jury was bullied by this agent and the district attorney. When the charge against these people of publishing immoral writing in their journal and sending it thru the mails was brought before Judge Hanley, he next week, that is, after he had carefully read the matter so charged as immoral and decided that on the contrary it severely rebuked immorality, and directed the jury to set aside the verdict of acquittal. How he had ever brought himself, the week before, to send to the postmaster general the preposterous recommendation of the grand jury that the postoffice at Home be abolished. This is an irresponsible, unless that in the crazy matter of Anarchy he lost his head, as have so many others.

It goes without saying that it is not within the province of a grand jury to instruct the postal department as to the discontinuance or discontinuation of post offices and that it was simply a piece of arbitrary stupidity in the postmaster general to carry out such a recommendation. This is America, still, Mr. Roosevelt, not Russia, but your postal officials have distinguished themselves in the last few months by assumption of authority so silly, while yet so unwarranted, that they would have disgraced the innocent hareem. You want to bring this matter to the attention of Mr. Payne. It is a disgrace to his office and his personal intelligence that he should have permitted it.

As to Anarchists and the people settled about Home, you will find some account in the little paper Discontent which will repay perusal. You will observe an article by myself—"The Need of Social Control," and a chapter summarized from Professor Ross' remarkable work under that title. In this way I am bringing to the consideration of the leading American Anarchists—their self—confessedly philosophical Anarchists—the inadequacy of a national social order on which the Anarchistic faith is really founded. The chapter from Ross will point out with irresistible conviction that society must exercise an artificial control over the individuals and conduct. And this is the true and only way to overthrow the foolish but extremely dangerous philosophical Anarchy.

As you know very well, that hypocratic idea of Anarchism is purely a metaphor to the vocabulary of a great many notable writers and very estimable persons as meaning something very good and not evil, before the tremors, an intellectual and last September. They ought to have known better! Yet but people do not know better—and indeed only minds of the fullest information can clearly grasp the true relations of the individual to society and to its control. Nobody knows what we can have, but we want better than more intelligent government. Government, rooted in old traditions and superstitions, is becoming more and more irrigative every day, to intelligent persons, and as if G. Wells puts it in his "Anticipations": "If there is to be any sort of government, let it be a sort of government itself that is irritable and keep themselves in the face of a large number of self-respecting persons outside the law."

Now this was the mental or psychological state of the people at Home. They hung up in their schoolhouse the motto "the best government is self-government," and they wished to be, and believed that they, and if not all, many others, could be a law to themselves. They are not revolutionary Anarchists. They are much the type of character that were at Brook Farm fifty years ago, those not so much literary cultivation. Abstainers from liquor and to-day, "bitter beer"—which is always doing their own work—hard to make a self-made man. Stopping there some months I found myself, a querulous and more intelligent society is a great step, and indeed the people I have ever known. The United States marshal who went there to make the arrests, reported on his return that he found them leading an "ideal life." Can you suppose that it is in the line of the suppression of Anarchism to take the use of a postoffice from such people? As the intelligent editor of Discontent writes me, such an act gives force to the Anarchist position that government is the very cause of all crime. The discontinuance of the Home postoffice is an outrageous abuse of official opportunity, Mr. Roosevelt, and calls for your prompt intervention. Yours sincerely,

J. W. GASKIN.

Tucson, 10/24/8 S. 11th St., May 9, 1901.

[The other letter, addressed by Pearl W. Geer to Senator Turner of Washington, recites facts already given, and protests against the action of the postmaster general. Lack of space prevents us from giving it in full.]

LETTIN BOX.

A. H. S., Boston, Mass.—Why detest or have any objections to those who wear your queues? Being confident that Congressman James cannot control the subject more briefly and conclusively, I requested him to write the reply, and, although we do not differ for, I agree with everything Congressman James says on the subject now.

N. S., Buffalo, N.Y.—As to reports of the labor movement are always submitted by Union representatives from our foreign contemporaries.

M. P., Brooklyn, N. Y.—So we would not advise people to go to Home without food. Poe's method of regarding Congress's propositions. Why the election will be a success depends upon the people themselves and the arrangements made. We need many people and those who want to "make," ought to stay away from the election.

E. C., New York City.—We have neither "attached" Congressmen, have not "embraced" him as a result for social evils. Both the national and state officials were individual expectations found only in some.

Home Defense Fund.

Amount previously reported, $1241.25, Ohio.


E. S. 188, Ohio, $12, I. E. 189, W. F. III., Total, $1241.25.

Home, Wash., June 8, 1902.

J. T. SEITER.
Suicides and Martyrs.
A shadow crept into my life the past few weeks.
It came, and has gone; and yet the memory that will remain is more vivid than the shadow.
The name of the shadow was Selma Paine Harrison.
His home— but he had no home—I will call it, therefore, his "starting place," was Tocotalo, Florida.
He was the world calls a common laborer, and he was a wanderer.
He was past fifty years of age, sick in body and sicker still in soul.
He was a slave— a wage slave—who had discovered his slavery— rare event among slaves—and the discovery had become an awful burden.
And yet he had worked at his labor nearly up to the last, and had never begged a cent.
Poor fellow! he scarcely weighed a hundred pounds, and the master class, you know, have little use for weak slaves.
So it was hard for him to find work any longer, even at a starvation wage.
He came to my house—pardon me, I have no home, I am only able by hard knocks, to rent a shelter, so I will call it "where I and my dear ones stay."—I dare say, where to-day, because he had heard I was a radical, and he, in his broken down old age, had become a radical himself.
To know him was to pity him. It brings tears to my eyes to think of him. He was a typical type of abuses, and he was very meek withal.
Without strength to work any longer at hard labor, he was attempting to eke out an existence canvassing for a book—a medical work.
He also wore an Appeal to reason button and took subscriptions for Socialist papers.
He was eager to read radical literature, and I supplied him to the best of my ability. His face fairly illuminated as he read Proudhon.
I envy him no poor self, or I would gladly provide for his few wants, but even with my poverty I told him not to go hungry.
That was all we had of us in this locality with enough not to let him starve.
He told me he had been told to go home.
I will never forget the look on his wane face when he tried to smile and assured me that he had "a place to go to" when his money was gone.
On Saturday afternoon, May 20last, he came to my home— I meant to the shelter I pay rent for—and told me he was going away, and left me a memento to remember him by.
That night, at a lodging house in this town of Winchester, Kentucky, he took two ounces of laudanum, and went to the place to which he had gone when his money was gone.
There was no other place for him.
I had more than half guessed the "place" before he went there.
On the Sunday following his death I, in company with a friend or two, looked for the last time upon his lifeless form.
And thus I spoke to those with me.
"Appia, a laborer, a former strain of blood had flowed thru the veins of poor Harrison—a more rebellious strain than marks the neck and resided face that lies before us, would you wonder then at a deed like that of a Bresle or a Choctaw? What care the capitalist for a slave? He tolerates a suicide like this, that makes no violent protest, but meekly succumbs to the master's tyranny? Such things as this have happened every day in every clime for ages—and Creusa onlyLaughing. But once in Unigloss, with fiery blood in his veins, dies and dies with an awful protest against the master class, and all plutocracy trembles! I do not uphold assassination, I only ask you if you are so blind that you will not see that we could have taken but a little of sterner stuff to have changed the suicide Harrison into the Regicide Unigloss?"

As for myself, I uphold neither assassination of the master nor the self. To me, nonresistance is the greatest force conceivable. But I cannot be blind to cause and effect, nor refuse to admit that a desperation of which I, fortunately, have not been forced to taste, can create a Harrison—or a Choctaw.

I believe in nonresistance. I believe in the kingdom of heaven—the uplifted society—wherein "ye shall take no worry of the morrow, of what ye shall eat or what ye shall drink, or where ye shall be clothed," but because all men do not believe in it, because on one side the men believe in it, I look for hell to pop, and that not very far away. Armageddon will be fought, and fought to a finish.
And the slaves will win. Otherwise evolution is a lie.

Man, when he destroys his master and acknowledges his own brotherhood, is absolutely divine. And the evolution from the monkey to the Republican party is just as wonderful an evolution to the free society that shall defy the race.

Gods! Man is a god, and just as figures are the expression of mathematics, so Man is the expression of the Soul of the universe! Man, kingless and priestless and free, with Love dominating every action of his life, is the sum total of evolution, the companion of the stars.

And the kings must go. The masters of every class, kind, and description must go.
With Malachi, the old Hebrew seer, I exclaim, "The day cometh, that shall burn as an oven, and all the proud shall be stubbed, and the day shall burn them up." Then the people will live.
And the nautyes—Jesus, and Harrison, and poor Choctaw will be glorified, and the monument at Waldheim will be a sacred place.

HARRY M. TICHENOR.

Can there be a Just Government?
"Yes, it is true that government has been bad and unjust; it has always been on the side of the rich; it has served them as a weapon to protect their robberies; and it has always been hostile to the poor. But yet there can be a just government, good for every man, as well as there is a bad one. The only thing to do is to abolish private property.

This is what our State Socialistic friends say and really believe. Very well, then. Let us see whether they say is true or not.
To say that there can be a just government, is to say that we can reap corn by sowing wheat. Government first of all means the ruling of man by man by force, that is by coercion. And that in itself is not just. What right has one man to rule over another? Are not all men born free and equal? Are they not of the same race? Are they not the same beings that the ruled are? How can one man compel, or prevent, another from doing anything, whereas every man thinks differently, and whereas a thing that seems to be right or wrong, good or bad to one man, seems different to another? And if we even say that man cannot control himself, then how is he able to rule others? And the fact is that if we give a man power over another, he is even not able to control himself. Therefore government is unjust.

Government, also, can never be just; and it is foolish to expect it to be so. Since it has been a thing for the rich to protect their robberies from the poor against the poor. The moment man claimed a right to anything for himself, he already used force in order to get it, and when he got possession of the thing, he proceeded with arms to protect it from being shared by others. Later on, when he had stolen much already, he hired men, whom he paid in rice, and continued to protect him against those who were being robed. The rice was rolled on, and certain men, by the aid of their protectors, who suppressed those who refused to be robbed, got possession of the earth and everything. And thus it is that we have now the two institutions: private property and government.

We see that government is based upon coercion and injustice; and therefore it cannot be just. Government and justice cannot exist together; one means the ruin of the other. Government has been, is, and will be unjust as long as it will exist; and the only time when it will be just is when it will exist at all.

As to the assertion, which our friends make, that they want to abolish private property without the destruction of government, I can say that they are contradicting themselves. In the first place they say that they do not wish to destroy the government, but only to make it just (by the help of the "Almighty Lord in Heaven," I suppose); and that means that they do not wish to abolish property. Because, when a man runs for office, he wants already to lead a better life than those common people— the workingmen—who produce everything for him, vote and elect him. He wants to have something more than his usual desires. He wants to have what is called private property, which they cannot prevent him from having for he gets more pay than all the other people. And when he has been elected and has the power to rule in his hands, he abuses it; he acts then as he pleases, and as is beneficial for himself.

And so our friends admit that they must have a government, they are in the meantime unconsciously admit that they must have rulers, policemen, schools, soldiers, and policemen to enforce all the laws. And
**FREE SOCIETY.**

I desire to thank those friends who have so generously responded to my request for subscriptions to the Freebird. I have received many letters on the subject that a personal reply to each is impossible. I take this means of communication to assure all those interested in the new publication that the subscription list is fully assured. It will be of sixteen large pages, printed on good paper, and of artistic appearance. Each number will contain fifteen pages of reading matter, all original, and devoted to a wide discussion of political, theological, social, and industrial problems. Its aim is to give to the radical movement not a mere organ of special policies, but a high-class literary journal, and while its tone will at all times be Anarchistic, radical and revolutionary, it will occupy an entirely new field. It will appeal to the cultured, thoughtful, and the progressive of all classes. It will be just the kind of radical Literature for missionary work among the masses.

While personally connected with Free Society last March, I first conceived of the Firebird as a monthly edition of Free Society; but circumstances compelled my return to the South, and prevented any serious consideration of this idea. In establishing the magazine here, as an independent publication, the flag of revolution is to be planted on Southern soil, and a residence in a lifetime in this section convinces me that it will be a fruitful field for libertarian ideas, if the right methods are used to present those ideas.

I have now a bona fide paid subscription list sufficient to secure the second-class postal rates. But I yet need two hundred subscribers to enable us to get into the main the five hundred sample copies I desire to circulate. To see these, I renew the subscription to the Firebird three months on trial for ten cents to all who send in that sum before the first issue. In order to secure the required number of subscribers (important on account of the matter of sample copies) I will delay the first issue (already in type) until July 15, instead of June 15, as previously announced.

**Wm.'s Firebrand.**

Edmond Burke

Men in sects were to him a profligacy. His name and Negroes and Celts were one. His was mankind’s splendid humanity. Large in its record the world he has done.

**For Boston.**

The first picnic of this season will be held June 17, on Comrade Buitta’s farm, Newton Upper Falls. Friends and comrades going there should take the electric cars for Newton Centre. No extra charge for car and change for Newton Upper Falls and get off at Oak St., walk down to Pumping Station and inquire for Buitta’s farm.
History of the French Revolution

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 these columns. It begins with a rapid sketch of history from the earliest times; the decline of the ancient empire, and the rise of the French monarchy; and traces the causes which made the revolution inevitable, as well as the effects of Revolution is narrated in detail; the most careful attention has been paid to chronology, giving the events in their proper chronological order. The mass of the evidence is carefully appraised, not to get at the facts as they are and the author relates them impartially, not having made himself the champion of any faction. The trial of the French people are portrayed in a simple manner, without prejudice or extenuation.

The prevalent idea that the "terror" was the result of Anarchy is most effectively exploded. The philosophical conclusions are comprehensive, and the position taken, laying a foundation for the philosophy of Anarchism, is bound to attract the attention of thinkers, and make the book important to students of history and the social question.

It is 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 realized at $1 for cloth bound copies and 50 cents for paper. Send orders to

ABE ISAAC JR., 331 WALNUT ST., CHICAGO, III.

A PHYSICIAN IN THE HOUSE.

IT IS THE BEST MEDICAL BOOK FOR THE BOKE TIN PRODUCED.

By DR. J. H. GRISER.

It has 10 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 your ailment and the hardships of a physician. The book recommends no poisonous or dangerous drugs. It teaches simple common sense methods in accordance with nature's laws. It does not endure dangerous experiments; it teaches how to save health and life by safe methods. It is entirely free from medical rubbish. It teaches prevention—that it is better to know how to live and avoid disease than to know how to die.

It teaches how tuberculosis and other fevers can be both prevented and cured. It gives the best known treatment for cancer. It is a useful book for every home and advertisement and has no medicine to sell. It tells you how to live. You may prolong life. It opposes medical fads of all kinds and makes worm-compounding work on the patient, and the use of anti-tubercle. It has hundreds of excellent recipes for the cure of the various diseases. The chapter on painless surgery 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 exercise, massage, and water treatments. If you are not sure you are looking for health for the safest and easiest means, do not delay getting the book. It is printed on excellent type in good book paper, beautifully bound in cloth and gilt lettering. It is 12 by 18 inches.

PRICE $2.50.

ORDER TO FREE SOCIETY.

FIELD, FACTORY AND WORKSHOP.

By PETER KNORPEN.

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


FIELD, FACTORY AND WORKSHOP.}

Send orders to FREE SOCIETY.

HOME HISTORY OF THE COMMUNE 1871.

Translated from the French of P. O. LSSAYAR.

By EDWARD J. MC AULD.

The above is the most reliable history of the Commune of 1871, and should be in every library of the student of Socialism and Anarchism. It has taken a long time to get the book printed in large type, and contains 176 pages.

Price, paper cover, 25c, bound 60c. Five copies $1.

Send orders to FREE SOCIETY.