The White Scaffold.

I have bowed our heads in sorrow.
On the cold, unhealed stone,
Faced thus its deadly frowns.
We have buried our comrades, too;
Wept while the tears turned to blood.
In the darkness, we knew not why.
On the chill November breeze,
While the deep night shadows play:
Gone is the tall noble scaffold.
Looking o'er the pile of clay.

Thus it ever happens, always
With the unwashed sweep of time,
The dead, and deep in curse,
They you depose them with crime.

The days of October,
As dangerous as night.
Behind your great stone wall,
With its shadow, gleaming white.

Thus is it over, always
With the unwashed sweep of time,
The dead, and deep in curse,
They you depose them with crime.

Comments on the Trial.

As the anniversary of the murder of August Spies, R. Parsons, Adolph Fischer, George Engel, and Louis Lingg, nears, it may not be amiss that one whose experience so nearly approached theirs, should say a few words about this great crime. Not that it is the only crime that has been committed by the same blood-thirsty criminal government, upon those who have thought and said that it might behave itself a little better than it was doing; but there were some things in this affair differing in many respects from many of the foul deeds it has been guilty of.

In the spring of 1888, in the city of Chicago, an attempt was made by a crowd of Irishmen to murder two Irish leaders, named Kelly and Denney, as they were being conveyed from the court house to the jail. In the struggle which ensued, a sergeant of police (Brett) was killed. Four or five men were tried for the murder of Brett. The trial resulted in the conviction of four of these men. They were duly sentenced to death. Between the time of sentence and the day set for execution it was proven that one of them—I think Delaney—had not been present. He was released. About this time there was and had been an uprising of some moment by what was known as the Fenian Brotherhood in Ireland. It was not denied, in fact it was never asked, whether Delaney was a Fenian or not. The simple question with the English government was, "Did Delaney aid and abet the killing of Brett?" As far as Delaney was concerned he might have been a member of the Fenian Brotherhood, he might have made violent speeches against the government or have written denunciatory articles ad libitum, and as far as the courts were concerned that had nothing to do with the death of Brett.

Now, every year Irish Americans by the thousands meet together and commemorate the death of Larkin, Allen and Gould, the three who were executed. The Manchester martyrs and their memories are kept green, and the story of their deaths is handed down from generation to generation as proof of the brutality, cruelty and injustice of the English government.

Now, I do not for one moment doubt or call in question the brutality and injustice of these so-called executions; but I merely wish to call attention to the great mistake which our Irish friends make when they imply that in Greater Ireland (America) they are out of the reach of such brutality and injustice. I will go further and say that I defy any Irishman or American to find a single instance in any English court where the judge ever ruled that it was not necessary to have knowledge or part in the crime charged to justify conviction.

On the 11th of November, 1887, in the city of Chicago, in Greater Ireland, four men were put to death, to whom the court said in passing sentence: "Whether it is necessary to a conviction that any of you should or should not anticipate or expect the doing of the act you are charged with having done in the indictment, is not a question I need to consider here." You see that a man can be guilty of murder without ever anticipating or expecting a murder to be done. "Be-cause," says his honor, "if that is necessary to conviction, the conviction cannot be sustained, as they did not have any actual participation in the particular act charged." I believe that there is not a court in any civilized country that has ever made such a ruling. Now in the Manchester affair there was no doubt that the men who were executed were present when the act was committed, and it is not so certain that they contemplated committing murder. It is not denied that they could all of them have been convicted under Judge Gary's law, (understand, I say Judge Gary's law,) and there is no doubt that the three who were executed could have been convicted under the Illinois law, which is not the law as laid down by Judge Gary in the Anarchist case. The Illinois law is that whenever anyone commits an unlawful act, and in the commission of such an act shall cause, then all participating in the unlawful act are guilty of murder. Now the act of Allen, Larkin and Gould at Manchester in 1868, namely, the attempted liberation of Kelly and Denney, was unlawful, and death ensued. Judge Gary will tell our Irish friends that the "Manchester martyrs" would have been convicted under the Illinois law; and he would not have found it necessary to say, as he did in the Anarchist case, "There never was a case like this. There is no case like it in the books," meaning the law books. Now there are undoubtedly a lot of queer things in the law books, but we have his honor's word for it that there is nothing so queer as the Anarchist case even in those receptacles of queer cases, the law books.

I have not intended to find fault with Irishmen for bringing the matter of those brave and noble young men, the "Manchester martyrs." I was in sympathy with them then—but what born rebel could help being so?—but merely to call attention to the fact that while they are justly denominating England's injustice, they can find in the Anarchist case a far worse case of injustice, and I would mildly suggest that injustice is the same hideous thing whether in Ireland, America, or, for instance, in the Philippines. In the one instance, the convicted actually committed the act charged with; in the other they did not.

I have been led to make these observations because I have frequently noticed that many people think that the case mentioned above and the Anarchist case were parallel cases. They were not. Neither was the case of John Brown a parallel case. John Brown broke the laws of Virginia, to his honor be it said. Our martyrs broke no Illinois law, Judge Gary could find no law in the "books" which they had broken, and he said so. The enemy did not wait for them to break any law—they could not afford to wait for that. The murdered men were carrying on such a labor agitation as had never been known before or since. They had found them out,
and the thieves saw that if they were not stopped, the whole country would be made aware of their rascality. There is no question that for murders and other serious crimes by the business men of Chicago were discussing the Anarchists. The newspapers were full of them; the churches frequently referred to the subject in their sermons; proof that the act with which they were charged was the outcome of the deliberation of the clubs and business organizations, the procuring of the bomb throwing and the laying of the charge on the persons of the perpetrators, thereby stopping the mouths of the men who where above all the mouthpieces of discontent and the most feared. Certain it is that an intelligent consideration of the evidence adduced at the trial, considered in connection with the conditions prevailing previously and at the time, certainly is, I say, that this conclusion would be more reasonable than that drawn by the jury. We have it upon the words of Bonfield that the mayor consulted with prominent business men on the morning of the trial and that the suggestion was the Haymarket meeting to be held that evening. This was not divulged until after the trial. This was at least suspicious, and under the circumstances connected with the events of the police on that night. The presumption that the whole affair was a conspiracy to get rid of undesirable elements of discontent is at least strengthened on the evidence of the two men succeeding the order to disperse? They were such that no one reading the evidence can draw any other conclusion than that it would have been very undesirable to the chief director of the police, Bonfield, that the meeting should disperse without trouble. It is not doubted that the meeting was peaceful; Mayor Harrison swore to that at the trial. English, the chief newspaper witness for the prosecution, swore that it was a peaceful one up to the appearance of the police; another reporter for the prosecution swore that it was more peaceful than the English. Mayor Harrison is present. The last speaker was drawing to a close, and had said that he would be thru in a few moments, when immediately upon this there was a great bustle and hurry on the part of the police to get to the meeting before it ended. Captain Hubbard swore at the trial that he did not have time to form his men in line, but that he had to run down the street to overtake the other policemen under Bonfield who were hurrying to the meeting. These are witnesses for the State. In addition to this I might refer to the evidence of an unimpeachable witness for the defense, who swore that Bonfield told him that it was not for the women who were at the meeting he would go down there and "clean out those damn Socialists to hell." The women had barely gone when he proceeded to put his threat into force. There is no doubt in my mind and never has been but that the determination of Bonfield was to put the women out of the way; he had done it not the bomb exploded as it did before the police were fairly upon the place of meeting. Owing to the interruption, confusion ensued and Bonfield having failed, gave an excuse. But this was a judicial murder is not doubted by any lawyer acquainted with the facts.

There have undoubtedly been many judicial murders committed, perhaps some in which there has been a conviction to themselves that if this is one, it is not the only one. There have been others — so far, so good. But this case, I make it quite different. The nature of any judicial act ever perpetrated since Jef fries was sent out on his famous or infamous western circuit, in this: that, while there may have been cases of wrongful conviction and execration without the perpetrators tending to do any wrong, in this case the perpetrators went into the case with the determination to hang. The question of guilt or innocence was nothing whatever to them. Charitable persons have gone so far as to say that they might have thought the defendants were guilty in the beginning, but the could not have believed it at the end. The fact is, that the question of guilt or innocence never was thought worth considering. It was simply a question of expediency. "Damn the laws! What do we care about the law? We're going to hang them as we choose. That was the way it was put by one of them more candid than the others. Another said, "I do not doubt that he is right," referring to one of the defendants, "but we have got to hang him just the same. It's necessary." Fifteen years have passed since this diabolic crime was committed. And on the anniversary of its committal, while we who are so closely connected with them, and those who have espoused the principles for which they died, commemorate their virtues lives and heroic deaths, it behooves us to do all we can to make the blood of our martyrs the seed which shall save the race, as they died that it should.

SAMUEL PHELPS.

Buckle on Government.

The open subway, and, what is much more dangerous, the hidden corruption, thus generated in the midst of society by the ignorance of the public is indeed interfering with the other interests. It is a painful subject; but it is one which I could not omit in an analysis of the causes of civil war. It would be easy to push the inquiry still further, and to show how legislators, in every attempt they have made to protect some particular interest, and uphold some particular principles, have not only failed, but have brought about results diametrically opposite to those which they proposed. We have seen that their laws in favor of industry have injured industry; that their laws in favor of religion increased hypocrisy; and that their laws to secure truth have encouraged lies. Exactly in the same way, nearly every country has taken steps to prevent usury, and kept down the interest of money; and the invaluable effect has been to destroy currency, and raise the interest of money. For, save to prohibition, however stringent, can destroy the natural relation between demand and supply, it has followed, that when some men want to buy, and some men want to sell, both parties are sure to find means of evading a law which interferes with their mutual rights. If the two parties were left to adjust their own bargain undisturbed, and vary within without the circumstan-
which the people called into existence. These, and the foregoing statements, respecting the effects produced on European society by political legislation, are not demonstrative or theoretical inferences, but are such as every reader of history may verify for himself. Indeed, some of them are still acting in England, and, in one country or another, the people have characterized them as fair and full force. When put together, they compose an aggregate so formidable, that we may well wonder how, in the face of them, civilization has been able to advance. Yet, under such circumstances, it has advanced, is a decisive proof of the extraordinary energy of Man; and justifies a confident belief, that as the pressure of legislation is diminished, and the human mind less hampereed, the progress will continue with accelerated speed. But it is absurd, it would be a mockery of all sound reasoning, to ascribe to legislation any share in the progress; or to expect any benefit from future legislations, except that sort of benefit which consists in undoing the work of their predecessors. This is what the present generation claims at their hands; and it should be encouraged, for this is the wish of the people, and that of the next generation demands a right. And, when the right is perniciously abused, one of the things always happens; either the nation has retrograded; or the people have risen. Should the government remain firm, this is the cruel dilemma in which men are placed. If they submit, they injure their country; if they rebel, they may injure it still more. But the nation is not the only only one of the East, their usual plan was to yield; in the provinces, the people has to resist. Hence the insurrections and rebellions which occupy so large a space in modern history, and which are but repetitions of the old story, the only struggle between oppressors and oppressed. It would, however, be unjust to deny that in one country the fatal crisis has now for several generations been successfully averted. In one European country, and in one alone, the people have been so strong and the government so weak, that the history of legislation there is as happy as any other, although it has undergone a few alterations, the history of show, but constant concession; reforms which would have been refused to argument, have been yielded from fear while, from the steady increase of discipline, and stability, and preservation of property and privilege, have, even in our own time, been torn away until the old institutions, though they retain their former name, have lost their former vigor, and there no longer remains a doubt as to what their fate must ultimately be. Nor need we add, that in this same country, where, more than in any other of Europe, the growth of the institutions of the popular will, the progress has, on this account, been more undaunting than elsewhere; there has been neither Anarchy nor revolution; and the world has been made familiar with the great truth, that one main condition of the prosperity of a people, is that its rulers shall have very little power, that they shall exercise that power very sparingly, and that the people be merely permitted to raise themselves to supreme judges of the national interests, or deem themselves authorized to defeat the wishes of those for whose benefit alone they occupy the post intrusted to them.—From “History of Civilization in England,” by Henry Thomas Buckle.

Sovereignty Offended.

According to the correspondent of the Chicago Tribune, the men of finance in Wall Street are working at feverish and troublesome. They have become convinced that organized labor is about to ruin the industry of the country. In the west the people do not yet seem to understand that the danger is serious, but in Wall street, of course, where the horde of finance are now so distinctly in the singular and plural, they are conscious of the menacing danger and all its consequences. This danger consists not only in the demand for higher wages, but that which is far worse, namely the influence organized labor is gaining over production and distribution. (Here infringed sovereignty cries out plain. What a misfortune this is, we have England for an example, they say, where organized labor has become a punishment to capitalism, which once determined the world, and is now that organized labor to accept disgraceful terms—terms which tend to ruin industry and trade. And it is well known what kind of bully fellow the English trustsman is. Such is the complaint of Wall street. Of course they will not be bound hand and foot and submit to the “terrorism” of organized labor; they will fight against the “reign of terror,” and fill the streets with a mob appeal to their class all over the country to come to the front. Come hither, ye big-hearted boys of the purse, millionaires and millionnaire Swedes, organized labor is going to close in on your heavily-bloated heads of golden dividends! A terrible hoarding, altogether incompatible with divine institutions of the universe, which once for all have destined that the kings of the spurs and the masters of the universe in the parasite, and the sadder, dither and the toiler, Whose rebellions against this arrangement is a revolutionist and an Anarchist.

But this complaint in the Tribune is only an introduction to a move of chess of capitalism. Timidly the question is put forth: Could organized labor not be put under the mark illegal?” The devil, we have in the courts, the attorney general, Know, and his satellites, and it ought to be possible to do something in this respect. The situation should be about as follows: The corporations, whose purpose is to impoverish the nation at home and abroad, are a blessing to the industry of our country. They are to be taken care of and fattened with privileges and high tariff. But the curse of the only industry is organized labor, because they strive for a somewhat tolerable condition for the people. This must not be tolerated. The glorious aim of American development is a pyramid, the pole of which consists of corporative bodies of打扮ed toilers, disguised women, and scared children. On top the pillar of society and national emblazoning—few deformed Mormons as the ruins of destruction.

Organized labor should also respond to the call: “To the front!”—Chicago Arbeiter Zeitung. (Translated for Free Society by Interloper.)

Kate Austin.

I spent two beautiful months, August and September, on Sam and Kate Austin’s farm, and I have to say that I enjoyed the pleasant acquaintance of both. Sam and Kate, in fact the whole family, the young and the old, as well as the numerous relatives which live around them, are people of the kind one is always fond of. Straightforward and frank in words and action, they are esteemed by friends and foes.

Kate is a woman of about forty years of age, tall and thin in appearance; but her features indicate resolution combined with kindness. With her wide awake eyes she looks hopefully into a bright future, in which her ideals will be realized. A bit born and raised on a farm, in Iowa, and having spent her whole life on farm, it is marvelous how this woman educated herself through her own efforts. In conversing with her, one can hardly escape her influence and the force of her arguments. She needs not to waste time in looking for arguments, which are often so satisfactory as well as witty. And, thus being originally the only one in the family filled with mind and rebellious spirit, she finally succeeded in bringing all around her to her way of thinking. Undoubtedly she is a born Anarchist.

She explained to me that she always had prejudices for the wrong people. She was fighting for liberty, even at a time when she could not realize the full meaning of the word; and when a young girl, blossoming into womanhood, she declared her faith. And then, every day, manchmal in talks and actions of those who persist in following the “old faith,” as she expressed it. As she explained it in 1880 and 1887 she was a Free thinker; but when at that time Carl was killed in the war, she moved in Chicago, and the reports about the great Chicago Anarchist trial spread throughout the country, even into every farm house, she swore once her place in the ranks of those for whom liberty is no idle sound. And, how Capitalist followed in killing Anarchists in those days. Since that time Kate has been filled with the spirit of the free man, communing in Chicago, and the reports about the great Chicago Anarchist trial spread throughout the country, even into every farm house, she swore once her place in the ranks of those for whom liberty is no idle sound. It is another of the many cases which go to show how Capitalist succeeded in killing Anarchists in those days.

Unfortunately, this noble woman has not enjoyed good health during the last ten months. In the Poole of New York, when landing her case, declared her consumptive.

On September 25, Sam, Kate and myself left the farm in a covered wagon. After a ride of thirteen miles we reached Nevada, Mo., where we parted. I going to the east in search of work, she to the west in search of health. Sam and Kate intended to make a trip to Colorado in about thirty days, to visit Comstock and Chinaman Holmes, and remain there during winter. The latest news, however, is that Kate’s condition became worse, and they were compelled to stop in little town in the central part of Kansas.

Curt Nolich.

“Talk about principles that any man should hold over another the power to bind and loose. It’s a fish relationship to stand in towards one’s fellows.”—Mrs. Victoria.
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ATTENTION.

A grand concert and ball will take place November 16, in Brand's Hall, 162 K. Clark St. Before the ball, Emma Goldman will speak on "Student and Peaceans Knots in Russia," at 3 p.m. Admission 25 cents.

Kate Austin.

Kate Austin died on October 28, 9 p.m., at Kingman, Kan. For several days prior to her death she had been unconscious. Her body was taken by her sister to her home in Caplinger Mills, Mo., for burial. We can not say more at this time, but soon we shall publish an account of her life.

The Cosmos Colony.

Those who contemplate going to Cosmos are advised to halt in their preparations, for all is not as it may be sometime. A comrade who returned from there states, that the boys had a disagreement with Con- dor and as a result have left the colony. Some of them have written their friends for means to return. Con- dor, he says, does not own the land, only holds it on a lease, that it is not well situated, and would take considerable money to establish a colony in that place. We will have more to say on this subject later.

By the Wayside.

People are always reluctant to take their own medicine. Only a year ago the editor of The International Socialist Review, Mr. Simons, accused the Anarchists of being allies of capitalism. The Anarchists ignored the impositions with contempt. But now comes the Chicago American and accuses the Socialists of being in the pay of the Republican party, and forthwith the Socialists rage with indignation. "To men who know what Socialism is, lies simply produce contempt for such a paper," says the Chicago Socialite, yet this excuse not supply equal force to Mr. Simons, when he deliberately spread the lie that Mrs. Potter Palmer had "wined and dined" Peter Kropotkin "at her house."

The government declared itself bankrupt when the president and the attorneys general hastily admitted, that the government had not the power to check the greed of the trusts. But a campaign against organized labor is to be inaugurated, and the courts will find no difficulties in issuing injunctions and applying the "conspiracy" laws to check the "greed" of the toilers who suffer the parasites in human form.

No matter what the decision of the arbitration board in Pennsylvania may be, the issue between the miners and the mine owners will be fought from before being solved in the courts; and it is only a matter of time when the toilers again will be forced to lay down their tools, in order to gain a little better conditions for themselves and their families. The members of the commission will not go to the bottom of the problem, but confine their work to dealing with the effects caused by government and monopoly. The right to work, as a citizen of the country, is a paramount consideration, and thus society ever revolves in a circle, from which there is no escape. But let it once dawn upon the toilers that the mine owners' claim rests solely upon violence, as all other claims of proprietors in the means of production and distribution, and the problem between the oppressors and the oppressed will soon be solved.

A correspondent in the Boston Traveler observes that labor unions may be all right so long as they confine themselves to "sympathy and encouragement" in helping their fellow workmen; but, when by upholding strikes they deliberately bring distress upon an entire community, they should be abolished or prohibited under the severest penalties. Very well. But, what's in store for the gooselike who seeks the goose's food? Are the toilers to he- loped to supply the community with the necessities of life and suffer want themselves? Or are strikers less justified in employing means of violence to gain a more tolerable livelihood than the engineers who for centuries have brought distress upon millions of men, women, and children by the same means—brute force? And just so long as the exploiters are robbing the workers by the policy of the police—never mind the cost, just so long are the toilers driven to resort to violence, in their efforts to gain a greater share of what they produce. All laws, no matter whether those of minority or majority, rest upon force, and are bound to create violence.

"I do not believe in martyrdom," or, "I have no desire to be a martyr," are phrases now often used to express the feelings of those who are persecuted and imprisoned for words and deeds. These wiser men do not seem to realize that they practically announce to their fellow men, that they prefer to be cowards and scroolistes rather than to be true to their convictions. Poor souls! Is there a greater satisfaction in life than the consciousness of having spoken and acted in accordance with what we know to be the truth? And have all the martyrs contributed a trifle toward the elevation of mankind? Or a more degrading, miserable feeling than the consciousness of having disappointed our convictions from cowardice? Martyrs, people who deplored tyrannical laws and customs in the past, were the pioneers of the freedom we enjoy today, and the martyrs of the present are clearing the path for greater freedom in the future.
The Memorable 11th of November.

It is fifteen years since the judicial murder of the 11th of November. For the hire and for the appointment of mankind and imprisonment of three. One of these last said to me recently, "I am afraid the men are being forgotten, they are being overlooked and overlooked by their enemies remember them less and as their enemies remember the victims of 1871 in France."

But this can never be true. In every large city in the country and in every small village the people will remember the 11th of November, and the great sacrifice that was so bravely made on that day. They will tell the story anew of how brave, able, earnest men, who were devoting their lives to bettering the condition of the common people, were harassed, misrepresented, persecuted and finally conspired against and bowed to their deaths, by the class who feared to lose their power thru the work of these men. Of how bravely they died, earning more to the last for the propaganda than they did for their own lives.

They were an idealist group interested in what was going forward in the work for the cause, as they were in what was being done on their behalf, and more, Adolph Fischer said to me one day when he visited him in jail, "Why do you people hesitate about everything you do to ask if it will injure our prospects? You don't intend to stop all propaganda work because we are in prison? The only victims there will be from now on—if you cease working for the cause for fear of hurting the prospects of the prisoners you will never accomplish anything again."

And Albert Parsons said on the eve of his return, "I cannot remain away, while my comrades are on trial for their lives. I must be with them; we can speak with more power from the prisoners' dock than anywhere else. Let us take advantage of it."

Many have said that Parsons never would have given himself up if he had not believed that eventually they would be cleared. But one of this party Parson said he had faith that they would ever be set at liberty. He knew the severity of their enemy too well. He felt, on that last Sunday afternoon in beauty, when he knew that his doom was sealed, that he had determined to return, and there, on a lovely green hill above the village, he lived thru his Sepphoran. He said he never again suffered as he did in that hour when he bade goodby to life, liberty, happiness, and friends. And yet he never hesitated—once his mind made up as to what he had to do, he never wavered.

The story of that terrible tragedy cannot be told too often. Even yet a great many people think the Anarchists are a wicked, secret, dark and bloody band intent only on violence and murder, and that the State died with its noblest daughters. But it is difficult to get at the kind of people who still think this; but repeated efforts, repeated telling of the story in speeches, addresses, written articles, and the annual repetition in the papers in memory of the victims, will make the crowds present, will have great effect, especially in these later days. It should be told again and again—how these men exciting the enmity of the privileged classes, by preaching so powerfully to the masses of what their rights were, were plotted against and involved in a made-up "riot" in which the plotters were exposed, and due sacrifice made by the company of policemen, how they were arrested, persecuted, imprisoned, misrepresented, how public opinion was systematically lashed into a frenzy and kept there, how perjured witnesses employed, how a partial judge made the most absurd rulings, how the malice of the prosecution showed itself at every turn, how a verdict determined in secret and not at all pronounced to the satisfaction of the class interested in putting these men out of the way. How it was planned to keep the hatred of the people at white heat while noble friends were working for a commutation, how poor, youthful, heroic Ling was mysteriously brought to his death, no one knows how to this day, in the secrecy of his dungeon—all these things should be repeated over and over to whoever can be made to hear. I wish that Trumbull's "Trial of the Judgment," and Aylward's "Reasons for Prosecuting the Anarchists," could be read aloud and passed around at every memorial meeting in the world.

I wonder how they would feel if they could come back and visit their old scenes and their friends, and to know what is done in their 18th anniversary day? Would they be satisfied? Would they regret their sacrifices? Would they feel that we had done our part after they had done so much?

They were the first to revolution accomplished, no signs of one, and the masses of the people still trusting in some sort of a government to save and protect them. They would look upon the pitiful ending of one of the greatest strikes of history; they would know little children had starved and suffered while the powers that be were striving to coerce the workers to their degrading terms; they would see babies in cotton mills where gold is ground out for a few masters and the refuse of dwarfed bodies, bloodless faces and stunted minds are cast aside for the people. They would see men who had been stumped by the State and driven, benten, tortured, worked to death worse than chattel slaves ever were, by heartless contractors; they would see noble men and women thrown into prison for expressing what to them are useful truths; and how one sweet, intelligent and refined lady was driven to commit suicide because of the persecutions of puritanical hypocrites; they would see still, willing men begging for a chance to toil, and weak women working their lives away with their needles for less than will keep hunger from their doors; they would see that the superstition of ownership and masterrs is still prevalent; that the death of a ruler, a king or a prince is of far more importance than the death of an innocent worker, or a useful worker or a friend of humanity.

At first it might cause them to feel that all the work that has been done for the progress of the race, all the sacrifices that have been made, all the suffering that has been endured for betterment of the world. But if they could look into the minds of all the people they would discern a gleam of hope. They would know that there are twenty papers advocating the rights of the people where there was one in the old days; they would see the conservative papers saying things that they were killed for saying, and meet with no punishment; they would see pamphlets, books, people reading books, journals, pamphlets everywhere that were once circulated at the risk of imprisonment. They would find a higher standard of justice prevailing, and a higher standard of morality. They would find that in the scalds of many thinkers, a greater hope for the future, and a greater determination to grow upward themselves. We may have changed as to what we think is desirable, but so would they have changed and progressed, if they had remained with us. They would not regret the events of that dark November day, and we, cherishing their memory in our hearts sadly and tenderly, will not sorrow for them without consolation or regret them without hope."

Lizzie M. Holmes.


We have to hand the September number of the International, a monthly journal of international Socialist thought, of the Marxian scientific school. The number contains articles by all the chief representatives of Social Democracy, and the pages which this number contains, we have a true concentration of all their fallacies and misrepresentations of Socialist thought and revolutionary terminology.

In the editorial, the question of concentration of capital in the United States is treated. The author attempts to demonstrate by numerous quotations of figures that Marx's formula of concentration of capital, "the expropriation of a great number of capitalists by a small number," one capitalist kills many," and that the number of possessors is diminishing, is marvelously proved by the development of American industry.

The following article by the author of the editorial, is an argument to define strictly its objects and limits. So also in this case. From what period of time shall we compare the increase or decrease in the number of possessors and exploiters? The earliest date mentioned by the author is 1860. Well, let us ask any unprejudiced man: Since that date has the number of capitalists, exploiters and people living on the work of others, diminished in the United States? At that time Chicago, Buffalo, Detroit, Milwaukee, Denver, Brooklyn, and dozens of other places which now count their inhabitants by millions and hundreds of thousands were not in existence. Are all those inhabitants living in their own houses? Or is not the greater part of them paying rent for the houses belonging to many thousand landlords. And surely all these houses are not owned by a few capitalists?

In 1840 scarcely no railways existed in the States. At present half the railways of the world are in the United States. They gave in 1899 a yearly net earnings of $448,000,000. Are all these railways the property of a few individuals? Or do they belong to different companies, shareholders of which are quoted by the thousands?
FRBSOEY.

Not happier is Signor Ferris's attempt to prove that revolutionary method and revolutionary action mean peaceful and legal parliamentary tactics and propaganda.

The social process of emancipation and abolition of social injustice, "cannot be accomplished thru one stroke of collective or individual violence."

Proletarian revolution does not proceed spontaneously, nor does it descend from the providential heaven of government action. It rather takes shape partly thru the natural agency of economy, enterprise and competition and partly thru the pressure of the proletarian mind itself, which struggles by legal means for the realization of its revolutionary aims. "These aims are called revolutionary, and cannot be called otherwise. Not because they preach the building of barricades or personal assaults, but because they aim at the complete transformation of the economic fund of society, instead of limiting, weakening, and entangling themselves in reforms which leave the basis of private property untouched, and which the ruling classes have always granted, just in their interests, for the purpose of retarding the progress of the revolutionary idea."

So according to Ferris, peaceful men like Saint Simon, Fourier, and Robert Owen were revolutionists because they propagated ideas of social transformation! But we thought that such men were called social reformers, while those like Blanqui, Marx, Carabelli and Jollin Slow were called revolutionists because they were thé organizers of "acts of collective or individual violence."

What may be the reason that Ferris and all Social Democrats, being parliamentarian reformers and denying revolutionary action, are so eager to appear under the name of revolutionists? Because the above mentioned great revolutionists are branded by the victims of oppression as the noblest expression of the human character. And it is so attractive to appear with the halo of those great men, whose work they are denying in their glorification of liberalism and enmity in a past period when peace can exist between exploiters and exploited.

These two misconceptions on concentration of capital inevitably enmeshing the working classes, and peaceful reforms served up to the people as truly revolutionary methods, together with the substitution of reactionary metaphysics to inductive science, these are the cause of all polemics, quarrels and hatred in the Socialist camp. We ask ourselves: why Social Democrats, advocating a peaceful solution of the social problem, do not declare themselves honestly as such. Then we should show some respect for them as for peaceful social reformers; no polemics would be necessary between us Anarchists and Social Democrats; and from both sides our strength would be devoted to attack this bubbling-up exploitation and governmental oppression.

W. T. O.

A Philosophic View of Anarchy.

... it may be safely affirmed that since the assassination of President McKinley the American people have thought carefully and profoundly, revolving in their minds many theories of government and of liberty. The process of thought, perhaps, has not gone on publicly or conspicuously, but if an observer were to sit in the parlors or at the supper tables of the great mass of the people, he would hear, almost universally, discussions and speculations. It is interesting to know that these have not all been of one tone. On the one hand there has been a vague feeling that perhaps there was more reason than fanaticism in the supposed madness of Coolidges. On the other hand there is also a current of opinion running strongly toward the support of government, of the status quo, of legalism and of practicality. The latter is undoubtedly the sentiment of the great body of the American people, and the Outlook, a journal of singular poise, is in consonance with public opinion when it says: "[The Anarchist] doctrine is so irrational, so subversive of all civilization, so impossible of application, so like the dream of a disordered brain, that it never can find much currency outside an insane asylum."

It seems incredible that in an age of so much enlightenment, so much refine, so much considerative periodical can characterize adniloll a doctrine which actually exists and which finds root in the minds of many men. As regards Anarchism, one thing must be true. Either our superficial activity has surreptitiously implanted it in the minds of its devotees, or else it is the creature of circumstances. Now the first hypothesis is inexplicable, so nobody will have a moment to think for; but, with the theory of origins now prevailing, it is inconceivable that any ideal or an object should be created out of nothing; that it should be thrust extraneously into a given environment and be expected to live there and find a home. The only possible belief is that Anarchy, somehow or other, is the expression of a certain set of circumstances; and if this is so, how can Anarchy be condemned? The conditions out of which it grows may seem to those who are not Anarchists to be horrid, dark and abnormal, but are they not, nevertheless, rather produced or generated by the circumstances under whose guise we shall find that they are connected with other circumstances, in turn, with still other circumstances, until, by an infinite process, we have included the whole mass of society or reproduction: it is of human nature.

Anarchy is in some ways so profound and so comprehensive a system that we shall enter upon an explanation of it with peculiar delight.

The ideas of Anarchy upon economics are almost identical with those of Socialism. It calls itself the no-government system of Socialism, and it holds in common with Socialist doctrine that the private ownership of land, capital and machinery has had its time and is condemned to disappear ... and that the wage system must be completely done away. This is eminently just, for nothing is more clear that all property which now exists is the product not of a single individual, but of society as a whole, and not of individual property society only, but of all past generations ... The Anarchistic doctrine of Communism is not impaired by the serious defect which blights the Socialist doctrine. The Socialists, by placing industry under a bureau and...
making it conscious, robs production, exchange and distribution of their flexibility and adaptability, that Anarchist leaves manufacture and commerce just where they are now—within the nation at large. Anarchistic Communism, indeed, seems open to the criticism that it might be urged that men, when the stimulus of necessity will be destroyed, will not work. This is a serious remark. With us, work is a habit, and idleness an artificial growth. It belies the very nature, not work. Overwork for supplying the few with luxury—not work for the well-being of all. Work, labor, is a physiological necessity, a necessity of expending accumulated bodily energy, a necessity which is health and life itself.

We turn now to consider the position of Anarchy as respects government. The Anarchist has studied scientific, and he finds that it has pursued a certain trend. He employs the process of analogy and decides that government, not obviously, perhaps, not really, in the future, shall follow the same course of progress.

If man would only look deeply into it, he would find that his government, no less than the forces of nature, is everywhere and nowhere, and that the only way to get them to some council-chamber and delegate to them powers which, from their very diffusion and their omnipresence, can never reside in any particular place, is to perpetrate what is called anarchy, or to be satisfied with the earth's contempt. The Anarchists arrive at the conclusion, therefore, that the ultimate aim of society is the reduction of the functions of government to nil—that is, to a society without government, to Anarchy.

There is a practical as well as a philosophical argument against government. Here again we quote from Kropotkin. The Radicals saw in universal suffrage and public institutions the last word of political wisdom. But a further step was made by a few. The very functions of government and the State, are admitted to a sharper and deeper criticism. It became obvious that these defects [of government] are not merely accidental, but inherent in the system itself. Parliament and its executive proved to be all that the old alibi and the affairs of the community to conceal the varied and often opposite interests of the separate parts of a State. Election proved unable to find out the men who might represent a nation, and manage otherwise than in a party spirit the affairs they are compelled to legislate upon. It became evident that it is stupid to elect a few men and to entrust them with the task of making laws on every conceivable subject. It became evident that majority rule is as defective as any other kind of rule; and humanity searches and finds new channels for realizing the pending questions.

A reason for government would be even more completely lacking under the Communion which the Anarchists include in their reform measures. To each new economic phase the Anarchist adapts himself, and follows the pending question.

Absolute monarchy—that is, court rule—corresponded to the system of serfdom. Representative government corresponded to capital rule. Both, however, are class rule. But in a society where the distinction between the capitalist and laborer has disappeared there is no need of such a government. The insurrectionary system implies the no government system.

...The truth is that government is arbitrary, it is superimposed, and it can never be justified in an age which yields consent only to an inner reason.

The strong argument brought against Anarchy is that, without government, harmony and justice cannot be preserved. This is an argument which is no more than a foregone conclusion. By discovering government to play an important part, we grow accustomed to suppose that the State and the political men are everything; that there is nothing behind great statesmen.

We have proved that the absence of government would not produce violence and disorder. But even if such should be the result, would Anarchy be more culpable than government? Is there not at the present time an appalling accumulation of violence as a direct result of government? Consider, for instance, the imperialism of nations who have plunged the Filipino and Boers.

Consider the number who are killed in the long process of executions for crimes which governments carry on. And those who warrant this mass of violence, the mass of humanity, who will make a religion of the maxim that, for the safety of the public, you must garrot, shoot, and kill. They claim that human life is not sufficiently respected.

The Anarchist morality may be briefly designated as ethical. Following the lead of Bentham, John Stuart Mill, and Treadernich, they who themselves were not the pioneurs in the movement, the Anarchists declare that all acts of man, condign or meretricious, useful or harmful, arise from a single motive: the lust for pleasure.

The gratification of the self—never another person but always one's own self—this, according to the Anarchist philosophy, is the exclusive source of all human conduct. But for the self, for whose gratification each person works unceasingly throughout the whole of his life, is no means, or entity. Each human being—so the Anarchists declare—not only may be, but must become, the whole universe. Hence the solidarity of the individual with the species, and with the whole animal kingdom, and with all inanimate objects, comes in. The universe created man, and man cannot repudiate the relationship.

The question arises, is this a high morality? We cannot answer this question, but we do know that it is a true morality. The Anarchist morality, if it may be judged from its results in practice, is healthy and elevated. An Anarchist couple, when they marry, undergo no ceremony. All ceremony is odious to Anarchists. The marriage is based only upon love; it is that which has created the marriage, and when that ceases the marriage must cease. The Anarchist parent conceives it to be wrong to punish his or her children. A great solidarity in the family secures the result. On the occasion of the marriage of Prince Kropotkin's address in Chicago, the meeting was conducted not by hired ushers or door-tenders, but by the collected Anarchist families. Buxom women hustled about, with a dashed and happy expression, procuring the sale of Anarchist pamphlets. Little tots, scarcely able to keep on their feet, were contentedly perched on their seats. The thing was a family affair.

The observer looked at these products of a much decided and persecuted system, and he felt his heart to group such the sight of a picture, domestic and human. The children were robust and ecstasy. The women seemed uncontrolled by hard labor. The men displayed sympathy, humor and hope.

The Anarchists are a population of people where the physical, evidently, is held in high esteem and the family, bound together not by perjury but by real self-sacrificing natural affection, is a powerful instrument for the expression of all the activities of the individual.—W. Lionel Heap, in The Individual, University Hall, Ann Arbor, Mich., November, 1901.

Here and There.

Comrades MacQueen and Grossman have been sentenced to five years' imprisonment at Paterson, N. J., on the charge of rioting. A stay of execution has been granted to give the lawyer time to appeal. This is another case of Anarchism being on trial. While the newAnarchists have been among the city's leading citizens and have made a speech there the day previous to the alleged riot, it is not true that he was a participant in the trouble, for he was in New York at his desk when the fracas occurred. He had a number of witnesses to swear to this fact, but a policeman swore he had seen him there, and that settled it.

Risorgimento.—The trial of the persons accused of destroying private property in the Kinnicknakee province has been finished. Lenient sentences not exceeding six months in prison were imposed. The courts refused to admit testimony that persons were whipped, their houses destroyed, and their wives and daughters outraged by the soldiers.

Belgium.—While the politicians are making speeches in the chamber of deputies, the workers are doing something to help themselves. The cooperative associations held a conference in Chicago a few days since, during which facts were reported. Aside from the numerous factories the workers have been running successfully for several years, they own also breweries, tobacco shops, coke and iron factories. At present, they are building a flour mill and a soap factory. A wool and cotton mill is also contemplated, and a consumption of two million frames of goods has already been promised by the different cooperative stores.

---

LETTER BOX.

E. H., Brooklyn, N. Y.—"Physicisms in the House" was sent us. "Color and poverty" is not our only creed for making good and noble work." The same remark consists in the satisfaction we derive from the work, and in seeing our ideal taking hold of intelligent men.

M. K., Chicago—"No, we are not infallible. "Too err is human. But if we are doing injustice to the Socialists" your columns are open to them for reply.

E. C., New York—"Stealing is an infraction of law and of a person's property. We are not denouncing the doctrine of anarchism, but of the 'work is stealing' in its ridiculous form."
MEMOIRS OF A REVOLUTIONIST
BY PETER KROPOTKIN.

This interesting autobiography of the well-known Anarchist and social reformer, one of the most important books of the Anarchist movement, as well as one of general interest. "He is more impartial to give the psychology of his contemporaries, his own role in the movement, European and Russian Armand Brandes. "One finds in his book the psychology of official Russian society, the underground work of Russia struggling forward and of Russia stagnant. And he strives to give the history of his ideas, his experiences rather than his own history. The record of his life contains, consequently, the history of Russia during his lifetime, as well as the history of the labor movement in Europe during the last half-century." The book contains two portraits of the author, and one of his mother. It is exquisitely printed and well bound. 516 pp. (Cloth.) 6.00.

Send orders to FREE SOCIETY.

THE CHICAGO MARTYRS.
THE FAMOUS SPEECHES OF THE EIGHT ANARCHISTS IN COURT.
AND ALFRED'S REASONS FOR PARDONING FIELD, RACE AND BOWMAN.

This book gives a vivid and life-like picture of our eight comrades and one of the movement at Wabash Avenue, and to the memory of those murdered by the government. This is the best edition of the book ever printed. It contains 32 pages. 50 cents.

SEND ORDERS TO FREE SOCIETY.
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History of the French Revolution. By C. L. JAMES.

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

It begins with a rapid sketch of history from the earliest times, the decline of the ancient empire, the rise of the French monarchy, and traces the causes which made it possible for the Revolution to break out. The period of the Revolution is narrated in detail: the most careful attention has been paid to chronology, giving the events in their true relation. The work of Paris in Paris is carefully set at the facts as they are, and the author relates them themselves, not aiming merely to make himself the champion of any faction. The truths of the people are portrayed in a single manner, without prejudice or exaltation.

The prevalent idea that "the terror" was the result of anarchy is most effectually exploded. The work is written in clear and concise form, 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 easily bound. For this purpose a certain number of advance subscriptions are necessary, and will receive at $1 for cloth bound copies and 50 cents for paper. Send orders to:

ABE ISAAC Jr., 331 Walnut St., Chicago, Ill.

A PHYSICIAN IN THE HOUSE.
IT IS THE BEST MEDICAL BOOK FOR THE HOME TREATMENT PRODUCED. BY DR. J. H. GREEK.

IT HAS 10 COLOURED PLATES SHOWING DIFFERENT PARTS OF THE HUMAN BODY.

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

It teaches how to avoid and other fevers can be both prevented and cured. It gives the best known treatment for Leucopenia, diphtheria, consumption, appendicitis, and every other disease. This book is not an advertisement and has no medicine to sell. It tells you how to live that you may prolong life. It opposes medical ideals of all kinds and strikes uncompromising war on quacks and the use of anti-vice. It has hundreds of excellent recipes for the cure of all diseases. The chapter on poisonous medicines is a catalog of all medicines. It has a large number of valuable illustrations. The "Care of Children" is something every mother ought to read. It teaches the value of air, exercise, and water as medicines. This book cannot fail to please you. If you are looking for health by the safest and easiest means, do not delay getting the book. It is printed in clear type on good paper, bound neatly in both cloth and paper covers, 800 pages.

PRICE $2.25.
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Price, paper cover, 25c; bound 60c. Five copies $1.
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