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Lest We Forget.
TO THE CHICAGO MARTYRS.

Forget them, our comrades, the true and the noble.
Who marched with the foremost in liberty's van,
Who piled for the cause of the work and downtrodden,
Who spoke the great word of the future, and of the dawn?

Forget them, our brothers, the sweet and the tender,
Who lived for the sake of a world that was blind,
Who marked not the slander, nor heard the belld,.
Be true to the truth, and the love of their kind?

Forget them, our heroes, the strong and the fearless,
Who faced the wild beast in its innermost lair,
Who blazed on, the laden by the rage of the tempest.

Friends taught, and tyrants what freemans can dare?

Forget them, our martyrs, the grand and the peerless.
Who mastered the scaffold, and conquered the grave.
Who mastered our living, and dying, and deathless.
Whose memory lives in the hearts of the brave.

Forget them? When hopeless and drowned in darkness.
When heavy the burden and long the delay?
They brighten the blackness, and speak from the silence.

And point's them down to the dawn of the day.

Forget them? By Liberty sovereign and disinterested.
Just as for the truth and the service of falsehoods.
By love turned to hatred—will not forget?

Forget them? When lost to the meaning of mankind.
And dead to the cause which inspired us of years.
We cannot be faithless, or turn with the traitor.
Then we may forget—for the knows us no more?

Forget them? Humanity's triumph approaches.
The harvest is ripe from the seed they have sown.
Forget them? We cannot: we must of the future.
When freedom is victor, they come to our own.

—James F. Morton, Jr.

Memorial Address.

(The following address was delivered by George Brown in Chicago on November 11, 1902, at a memorial meeting on the anniversary of the execution of the Chicago martyrs.)

The most dramatic moment in the history of this government, and perhaps in the history of all government, was that moment on the night of May 4, 1886, when a bomb was exploded on the Haymarket by the Anarchists. No matter by whom thrown, whether by friend or foe, whether as an act of private retaliation or as an act of public protest, it marked the moment of identification. It was then made plain that the character and the method of government is the same the world over. Whether it be called a despotic, a monarchial, or a republic, is of little importance, the underlying principle is the same. Many people had believed that a democratic government might be so organized and administered that it would be in no danger from the worst criticism. The founders of this republic believed it, honestly believed it; and so in the constitution they provided that there should be no interference with the rights of free speech and free assembly. This belief that an organized government is compatible with freedom of speech and action was the irreligious bubble that the people of this country had blown out of their reason and ignorance, and which was so rudely burst on that fatal night on the Haymarket. Now, we may denounce as we will the action of the authorities in connection with this affair, but we are bound to acknowledge that they did what the conditions compelled them to do. If we have at any time implied by our criticism that the government could have done other than it did, then we have failed to see the real meaning of government. For if it could act justly and humanely, then a good government is possible, and we ought to work for reform and not revolution. I believe, and admit that the government acted in its true character when it took our comrades and strangled them. If it had admitted the justice of the charges brought against it, then it would have condemned itself and so have committed suicide. A government is organized force, and must maintain itself by force. To expect it to do other than this is stupid and hopeless.

I have always stood for peace, and am unalterably opposed to violence, therefore I speak freely about these matters. Violence is the method of government; and this is one of the strongest reasons for my opposition to government. I am opposed to war and all kinds of punishment, and all those things that imply the use of violence "because I believe that it works evil in the long run. But to be honest, as soon as an act of violence is done as a protest against tyranny, I find myself seeking for an explanation, and if I found it in the social conditions, then the act itself is scientifically justified and philosophy approves. And so it comes that I, a man of peace, approve of every act of revolt that has been done in the past; and I know I shall feel so of all future acts of the same kind. To me there is no more morally heroic figure than that of the youth who stands silent and very calm amid the throng,
His right hand ever held beneath his robe,
Until the tyrant pass.

—Brown.

In a few words as possible I will tell you what led me to be present at the meeting that night on the Haymarket. To do this I shall have to tell you something of my personal beliefs. In the first place, I believe that every man, woman, and child is entitled to as much food, clothing, and shelter as each one needs; and that they are entitled to this not because they are white or black or brown or yellow, but they are short or tall or learned or simple, not because they belong to this country or this country or that religion, but just because they are human. I think that the human spirit has attained to this level, and this simple matter should be settled in the simplest way. I also believe that people cannot get these things freely, that they have been robbed of their natural opportunities. I do not mean either that they are entitled to these things an charity, but as a matter of social right and justice, and without bending neck or knee to anyone. If they have to ask permission of anyone before satisfying their simple needs, then they are slaves to those others. I do not believe it to be necessary in a sane state of society for a man to spend all his time and energy in just feeding and clothing himself. In a just society these things would come easily and with little labor, and when these are assured then will begin the possibility of living human life as it should be. There are forms of life so simple that they consist of mouth and stomach, and only for these the philosophy of the full dinner pail is sufficient; but we have hearts and brains and are capable of imagination and high endeavor, and for these we need freedom to labor and to love. Without these two, labor and love, no life is worth the living. With them the lawless life is rich and noble.

That these simple conditions are not realized anywhere today goes without saying. Look where we may, we find the opportunities owned and controlled by a privileged few; and by virtue of this ownership and control they are able to exploit the many. Everywhere the workers are propertyless, and live at the mercy of their masters. Everywhere they beg with bated breath and whispered humiliation the privilege of working, even the willingness to give up four-fifths of what they produce. The hands of every country yield abundantly to labor; the people of every country are able and willing to work; and yet in every country they are steeped in poverty and ignorance. Their hopes are blasted, their ambitions thwarted, and their lives made frustrate.

If you take Russia what do you find? On the one side a swarm of arrogant officials
and nobles who owe everything in sight and claim and assert the right to appropriate all that is produced and the fruit of the labor of the patient, industrious, common people, obedient, seldom striking back, even the robbed, beaten, spit upon, only asking to be allowed to work in peace.

And what can the few millions have exiled themselves, and others have exiled by the authorities, and nameless cruelties have been done to them. Ah! but you say this is the home of despotism, of serfdom, and from all Europe look to constitutional England or republican France. Is it not true of these also? Are not the cities of these countries disfigured by slums, and are not streets alive with degraded women? And in this country, where labor is more efficient than anywhere else in the world, is it not a fact that exploitation is also more complete? There are today greater inequalities in the distribution of wealth than at any other time or in any other place, and conditions are becoming more acute every day. We have just seen in Pennsylvania the spectacle of operators stopping the production of coal for five months, rather than come to reasonable terms with their one hundred and fifty thousand employees. No matter where we look, at home or abroad, the conditions are alike for the workers, whether it is a republic or a despotism.

I have said that these things should befall all as a matter of course, and you will probably say that I did not mean the kind of justice that can be had by those who have the money to pay for it in some civilized courts of justice. The justice I mean is that conception of it that is held by the most human and women among us, and is something quite different from the other idea or from anything contemplated by the law. The courts, if they were entirely honest, could do nothing more than administer an unjust system of laws honestly, for their duties are to apply the laws as they stand, and it is the laws that are unjust. The newer conception brings us face to face with the real nature of the sentiment of solidarity. In earlier times, before man had become individualized, justice was not conceived as a personal matter at all, but as a tribal affair; and if an injury was done to the member of one tribe by a member of another tribe, then justice demanded that an equal injury should be done to some member of the offending tribe, and this quite irrespective of the person who had done the original injury. And this equality of damage as an expression of justice gave rise to the old barbarian law of "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth." This for a long time was regarded as an exact realization of justice, and some still hold to it.

There is this parallel between the development of the idea of justice and the growth of trees. On the one hand, we have the grand statements of what some power above the individual may or should concede, and both are capable at one moment of being stated in terms of equality, and both as equally justifiable.

When I reached the higher ground I could see that a great company of policemen with drawn revolvers had marched on the meeting, which had parted to either side. The leader was close to the wagon, and had ordered Fielden to stop. Then I glanced at the parade right to interfere with a peaceable meeting, when there was some disturbance on the other side of the street from where I stood, and quite distinctly the order was given: "You'll not pass," and immediately the police fired a volley into the crowd on either side. I had thought till now that there was no danger; that only the spearsmen would be completely but now I realized that an order had been given to kill the listeners as well. I was quite convinced that the order to arrest was the agreed signal to begin the massacre. A man who had stood beside me fell to the ground with a groan, and as well as I could I helped him to get down into the area way of the corner building, which was a saloon. I then tried to get into the saloon, but from the inside the door was fast; I then tried to get past the wagon and escape north, but just as I was even with the wagon something passed over my head which looked like a lighted match. I then realized for this I could not see. At the same time I heard the sound of the bomb exploding, and looking back I saw in the middle of the street the hove that had been done to the police ranks. I was afraid to go farther in that direction, as I thought there might be more bombs, and so I turned back and made my way to Randolph street, and going east to Canal, I reached my way 121 Van Buren street, went to my room, lighted a pipe of tobacco, and then strolled along Desplaines in time to see the loaded patrol wagon carrying the wounded away.

This I know from personal observation. The next morning I learned from the papers a great deal more, and as you know many of the arrests were made, and flying our eight comrades were held and indicted for murder. You know about their trial and conviction, of the unjust judge, of the packed juries, of the laughter of the witnesses, of the audacity of the lawyers. You know how they lied and lied and lied. You know how they stretched their own laws and broke them in their mad fury against these men who had been known as leaders and organizers of labor. And seven of them were by these means condemned to the gallows; and after eighteen long months of imprisonment four of them were hanged, one had committed suicide or had been killed in jail; and three others had been sentenced, one for fifteen years, and two others to life imprisonment. These three were pardoned after a great deal of publicity, and it is to the eternal honor of Governor Altgeld that he, a capitalist and politician, had manhood enough to do this act of justice.

The story of the kind of you who were in this citizen fifteen years ago have not forgotten the solemn procession through the streets on the Sunday following the execution, the torchlights hurrying thousands of thousands of people into the streets, men, women and children, silent for the most part, some whispering: Together and many of them in tears, and then taken to Waldheim and we left them there.
And it was confidently believed by the authorities that Anarchism was dead. The leaders had been hanged, and the rats had been driven to their holes. A check had been given to the most insidious workers, and we would hear no more of the eight-hour movement. For governments learn nothing, and it is nothing to them that history is full of their mistakes. They are content once to get rid of one movement, and believe what could be more simple than to take those who preach new ideas, strangle them and so stamp out the ideas? But as they have failed in all instances in the past, so they have failed in this, for where there was a single Anarchist fifteen years ago there are a thousand now. There is hardly a city in the world where there will not be a gathering of comrades about this time to join hands in memory of our murdered heroes. And such a day of execution thousands of articles have appeared in journals and magazines expanding the theories they taught. Hundreds of books and pamphlets have been written, and hundreds of thousands have been distributed. The Anarchist spirit has permeated all science, all art, and all literature, both in America and in Europe. All the great voices of modern literature are distinctly Anarchist, and in many cases they have openly proclaimed themselves Anarchists. Take good Tolstoy, the Titan, and Kropotkin, the beloved of men of science and more beloved, these from far off Russia. There is Ibsen in Norway. And Zola, so lately lost to France, and the Reclus brothers and Carpenter and more and many more in England. And in America take Walt Whitman, the most unique product of democracy, large, uncouth, elemental, Anarchist, who has written the foreword of a new, larger expression, sounding his "barbaric yaws over the roofs of the world." With these and many more shall be named our own immediate comrades and friends, Tucker and Debs and lan and Burdick and Truesdell and Lloyd and Harman and James and Walker and Barnard and a host of others who are producing vital literature.

To me the most beautiful thing about the present day is the assurance we now have that the social spirit, the feeling of solidarity, is sufficient to inspire to all heroic conduct, even unto death itself, "for greater love than this no man that he gave his life for his friend." And did not these comrades willingly give their lives for the cause they loved? Without any belief in future life, without hope of future reward, they did what they saw as duty with love, and with words of cheering of apostrophy and of prophecy they met death. No one can read the story of their lives and live, and not be moved by the fact that the human tradition, that human history has been enriched and beautified by them; and that it is easier and better to be a man since they have lived and died. No more do we believe in the fear of God or hope of heaven to spur us to action, but simply a realization of human sympathy and human love, and with these we can redeem the world to sweet uses again.

Let the reader who shall be called upon to be actors in tragedy so great as this, for events so momentous as these do not happen often, but if we should be we can desire nothing better than to hear ourselves with the same patient courage and simple manly dignity that they did. For in the time of the hour of peace they took our hearts captive, and we feel that it is well with them in their eternal rest. In life they were great, and in death they are not less, and tonight while their bodies are finding the way back into the great reservoir of being their names and some are finding their way into the great heart of the common people. The tradition is becoming more and more beautiful, and it is a great joy to us that each year as it hurries into the night of winter brings us together to renew our spirits and our hopes, to bathe ourselves in the sweet influences that come with throbbing memories from their graves.

And on each occasion we shall tell over the great and sad story and pledge ourselves anew to the cause for which they died.

Quality Liberty

After reading J. A. M. on this subject, I sec that someone is trying hard to make us understand that I am not in the business of evolving definitions, from which experience teaches me there is little else to be evolved, except logic, but in the instance of the suggestion to facts, on which definitions must be founded, and whose harmony with definition is the test for the value of the latter, not vice versa.

I learn from the history of the world that the less people have, the better priests, judges, politicians, lawyers, peers, "hae genus onere," to tell them whether certain acts were "invasivist" or not, the less they quarrelled over that unimportant and unanswerable question; the more peace there was, and therefore the more prosperity; and, because of peace and prosperity, the more power to resist attacks, if necesssary; and thus the more of all they are pretty much agreed to regard as social goods. But above all, the less they bothered about what should be considered "invasion," and set up nodding josses to tell them, the more intellectual activity, and moral activity, both in church and country. Hence my inference—if peace, prosperity, corporate power, intellectual life, good things; then, since the less regulation the more of them we find, no regulation would be best of all.

I object to the qualification "provided the same liberty he allowed everyone else," not because it should not be, but because I want to deny anyone the same liberty. I enjoy, not, as J. A. M. supposes, because I think this proviso formally contradicts anything but because, as he takes some pains to point out, it is superficial. The consistent Anarchist will not limit himself with other's liberty; and as to those who are not consistent Anarchists, there is only one way they can interfere sufficiently to do much harm, which consists in pretending people that they need some sort of a base or twist to keep them from interfering with each other's liberty. The first step in this way is the proviso, which, like all qualifying clauses, is fatal to an ideal, and is harmless only on condition of being unnecessary, and becomes a nullification of the main proposition the moment it is allowed to mean something.

If, when Spencer, J. A. M., et al. say, "Liberty means for everyone to do as he pleases at his own risk and costs," they mean no more than they say, then simplicity, the condition of intelligibility, dictates stopping before the word "provided." J. A. M. is my witness that substantiation of any sort of a magisterial must be appointed to see that one violates the qualifying clause, they will soon find they have jumped out of the frying pan of anonomalous personal power into the fire of a new slavery. How do I know? Because experience witnesses it. The French Declaration of the Rights of Man embodied that very formula under discussion. So does the Declaration of Independence—all men are created equal, and endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights, to secure which governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. The Reign of Terror and the Philippine Islands may tell "where the germ of authority was hidden!" My dislike to formulae, like all my principles, rests on one foundation, which teaches me that they are imperfect expressions of fact, whose imperfectness does not great harm if it is acknowledged, but much if it is concealed under a dressing up clause.

There were those among the ancient philosophers who perceived that the definition of motion was imperfect (like all definitions), and, reasoning from the form of motion itself, they thought that a formula, proved very seriously that motion is impossible! Diogenes, having heard their argument, disdained to voicing the definition or refute their logic, but, in a significant manner, got up and walked away. So too, when Galileo was shown that the theory whose truth he admitted, did not hitch with his theory of the earth's motion, he is reported to have grumbled, "She does move all the same." This is the way inductive philoso-phers, by arguments splitters. Diogenes' conception of motion shall be inconsistent as you please, but the sense of which he has that inconsistent conception, exists. Galileo's theology and his physics may disagree. Then one of them, doubtless, is wrong—but the earth moves nevertheless.

"Absolute liberty" may be a phrase in which all kinds of holes can be picked; and I disdain to retaliate by showing that "equal liberty" is no better. What I look at is that the temper which makes people say, "I want absolute liberty," works well—not a newly seen fact, contrary to all orthodox assumption—while the spirit which makes them say, "We want equal liberty," soon finds them in equal slavery.

C. L. JAMES

Judge Land, who had ample experience in the work of law and courts, mostly suggests that if government was "stripped of criminal aggression" and "the Church..." there would be little left to complain of. All Anarchists will agree with this, but the liberal policy evidently does not grasp the range of its utterance. Government rests on the power of aggression—violence; and "government without God could not last for a single week," said the Premier minister recently.
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Emma Goldman will speak in Ruehle's Hall, 220 W. 12th St., on "The Students' and Peasants' Riots in Russia," in German.

The Progressive Club will hold a meeting every Friday evening at 331 Walnut St. Friendly discussions will take place.

The Tolstoy Club meets every Saturday evening at the home of Dr. Mary R. Carey, 58 W. Adams St. Tolstoy readings and discussions.

Workers' Educational Club meets every Saturday night at 10 p.m., 278 Blue Island Ave. November 22, Sam Robin's speaks on "Religion Detrimental?" in Yiddish.

Philadelphia — Social Science Club holds weekly meetings Friday evenings in Blockley's Hall, 707 N. Broad St. November 28, Dr. L. Guttman speaks on "Anarchism as a Social Ideal."

An Appeal

An appeal to the Supreme Court of New Jersey is to be taken in behalf of Comrades Wm. MacQueen, W. Grossman, and others, who were convicted and sentenced to five years imprisonment in Paterson.

The verdict against them is the result of newspaper spats, general prejudice and an itching desire to pocket fees on the part of the prosecuting officers.

Comrade Grossman has such a well-established alibi that it is believed the verdict of a prejudiced jury will be overthrown in the Supreme Court. The verdict against Comrade MacQueen is based largely on testimony of police officers, and prejudice against Anarchists, and there is a chance that it also cannot stand. The prosecutor laid special stress on the fact that these were Anarchists, and it is a case of Anarchism on trial.

These are active, able and energetic comrades, and their imprisonment means a serious impairment to the movement. No stone should be left unturned in their behalf.

Send money to H. Koffie, 60 Gold St., New York, N. Y., or Ramino Gallo, 90 Straight St., Paterson, N. J.

Splinters

Attention is called to Judge Ladd's article, "Liberty at the Gate of Imperialism," commencing last week and concluded with this issue. Judge Ladd discusses the question of imperialism rather with a judicial sense, in conservative phraseology, too strong at times; and appeals more to the language of the law than to that of his constituents would have done. So, for instance, he leaves the question of the right of the Cubans to rebel in its legal phase; but as a matter of moral right it is one they are entitled to rebel as the Filipinos, and Spain had as much "right to use force to suppress the Cuban rebellion" as the United States has to pursue that policy in the Philippines. The title in both cases is based on an estimate; and the moral status is therefore the same, "all international rules," which probably take particular cognizance of the four hundred years' subjugation of Cuba as a basis of "right," notwithstanding. Of course, legally a nation may be bound by such rules; but that is another question.

But the indictment against the imperialism of this country, traced from its weak inception to the barbaric climax in the Philippines, may be considered complete. No answer will be attempted to the case made, by the side of the imperialists, judging from their past policy. The few remarks that are made by them concerning "honor," "patriotism," "trade," having outgrown the "jus naturali" (although it is in a different sense), and, furthermore, the preposterous claim of the strenuous president as to a "human war," may be discounted, as their utter absurdity and nonsense are patent.

It is curious that a learned man, after rejecting how the honest intentions of able and sincere men have at last ended in the bankruptcy of their democracy, and the triumphant sway of imperialism on its ruins, should vehemently reject a suggested complete change, and insist that we shall begin it all over again. Are not the lessons of history sufficiently strong to teach us at last to be wise, and avoid all this horror by not planting its seeds?

It is a fact beyond dispute that every government, no matter how democratic and honest at its inception, has ended just where America finds herself today. What reason is there, then, to have another repetition of history? Where can we please but as much as we please about the dishonesty and incompetence of officials, but the fact is that experience, in contradiction to utopian theories, as to what government ought to be, shows us that the system is at the root of it all. Wherever government has been established there is the same story. At first certain powers are invested in certain persons; it is not long before they are exceeded, timidly at first, then in blunders, in arrogance, until usurpation ends in arrogant domination. Corruption at home and imperialism abroad are the logical sequence of establishing government.

Over and over again Anarchists are told they are utopian, and that their ideas are impossible of realization. But we hurl the charge back at our accusers. Again and again mankind has had its bitter experience with government, always with the same result. All its economic services are extravagant, corrupt, and incompetent; as a protection against plunder it is a failure (Judge Ladd as a witness); it saddles us with tyranny and monopolies which deprive us of liberty and natural opportunities. When we point this out, we are obstinately told that the official antidote is education, that is the case, nothing the matter with the system; only we ought to elect better and more honest men.

"Ought" is utopian. Officials are always corrupt. Men may be as honest as you please, officials never are. Their very positions and functions are corrupt. They must enforce "bad" laws, no matter how the people are individually best and it
requires extraordinary men in official capacities who will not take advantage of their position to advance, and create ease and comfort for themselves. A few instances of honest men in office can be found, but they operate as exceptions. As a general rule it is not the case. The proof of these facts will be found in all history, in the daily chronicles of our day, and Judge Ladd furnish some of the testimony in his article. The subject is too broad to be completely worked out in a brief column. Practically, then, government is a complete failure.

Other claims in favor of government are not upheld any better. We know that, when it claims to protect against invasion, a people, besides being in little danger except from rival governments, are better capable of defending themselves without one. We know that, when it claims to protect the weak against the strong, it never does so, but rather lends itself as a tool for plunder in the hands of the cunning, and makes self defense very difficult or impossible. When it claims to prevent crime, we know it is in vain; that in fact it is a prime creator of crime, by granting monopolies in natural opportunities, thus creating economic conditions where crime is inevitable.

All of this is barest outline. Space forbids elaborating and arguing in detail; but to prove the truth of these claims is the task Anarchists set before themselves. In our literature and press these truths are set forth in varied form and all its phases; let those who have an interest in social welfare study and investigate.

A Pillar of Society.

"You wander about," said the Buttress to the Bird, "but none of your agitations move me. I'm going to keep the Earth right in its place; I have it anchored to this Church. I've been looking up to that fixed star for a hundred years, and, in spite of all your propaganda, I'm in it."

"Do you know," said the Bird, "that during all that time your Church has been swinging with the Earth at the rate of 24,000 miles a day?"

The Buttress trembled. "But the Church always comes back to the place it started from!"

"It seems so to you," said the Bird, "but your steady old Earth has been wandering round the sun at the rate of nineteen miles a second, and the sun has been whirling round your fixed star at a rate that the Lord only knows, and the fixed star has been flying round the--"

The Buttress got so dizzy that it almost fell down. From advance sheets of "The Game of Life," by Bolton Hall. (The Wrench Co.)

Anarchists.

Ignorance and stupidity have been known in every age. Altho some specially stupid ideas are in time outgrown, for the progress of the age makes their absurdity obvious and patent, still a great many people are always lagging behind, and as a general thing these people take the greatest pride in their backwardness.

These reflections are called forth by the remarks of C. R. L. F. in the Traveler of October 17, on Anarchists. It is simply amazing how such ideas, which we find in comic papers by cartoonists who do not take themselves seriously, are repeated with all gravity by supposedly intelligent people. Anarchists advocate certain definite changes in society which they consider an advance; and like all who have done so before are invariably slammed by people who fear to be disturbed in their old ruts.

But such tactics, however amusing for a time (and certainly an Anarchist can enjoy a good joke on himself), are ineffective as a check to the progress of their ideas. The no-government theory has preceded the thoughts of the most learned for a hundred years and more. Such an able historian as Hulse has argued very ably for Anarchism. Emerson advocated it in America. But to enter into details on this line would lead us too far in a brief letter. As tactics I need say no word in explanation. In the Atlantic Monthly (June, 1862) of your own Boston a conservative writer has said for us all that is necessary.--Abd al Iskand, in the Boston Traveler.

Meetings.

"Moral Improvement Work in July," was the subject of John L. Whitman, Cook County jailor, at the Chicago Philosophical Society last Saturday. The speaker feared that he would not be able to do the subject justice, for the atmosphere of freedom in the hall was so different from that in the jail; and some of his hearers might entertain doubts as to his sincerity. Legislation, he said among other things, provides for the imprisonment of the criminal, but not for his reformation--hence the "Moral Improvement Club" in the jail. The prisoners should be shown their erring ways, but treated with kindness and restraint, as appealing to their sense of dignity, for the government file them with a sentiment of revenge. The spirit of the law was not revenge, for revenge was criminal in itself. Since the prisoners had been shown love and confidence, all the evils of reformation had disappeared. Their meetings were as orderly as any other respectable audience, altho there were no officers present. The speaker thought man was ordained to commit crime, and parents ought to be reformed so that they would not raise criminals.

The critics, altho admitting his sincerity of purpose, did not speak the speaker. He was shown that the punishment was nothing but revenge and had neither "cured" nor "reformed," so-called criminals. The cure consisted in abolishing the cause which makes criminals--the system which creates poverty on one hand and prevent poverty on the other.

Comrad Emma Goldman lectured on the recent riots in London's Strand last Sunday. As usual, the assembled gentlemen were there in full force, and according to the newspapers were two hundred strong in reserve at the station. The police explained to a comrade that it was all right to talk about Russia; that he believed in free speech; but when it came to denouncing this government free speech came to an end. Emma Goldman told about the riots and the revolutionary movement in Russia. Terrorism has revived there, and it is the only method possible in Russia. She said that the revolutionary situation is more hopeful there at the present time; that while formerly the nobility and educated youth stood alone in their revolt against czardom, now the people are at last awakening, and the revolutionaries are joined in the cause from the aid of the workers. She appealed to those present to aid the Russian movement; and concluded by criticizing conditions in America.

Free speech was dead long ago, and we are treading on their strider toward Russian conditions.

In Providence, R. I., the commemoration of the Chicago martyrs was disturbed by the police by preventing Comrade Emma Goldman from entering the hall. Not satisfied with this outrage, they annexed her till she was served the warrant for the train of the trainmen, instructing them to telegraph to the police in Providence in case she would leave the train before arriving in New York. But the communes in Providence are not discouraged and announce that Comrade Goldman shall soon speak their in spite of police tyranny.

Here and There.

Anthony Comstock threatens to take Dr. Ransome of St. George's Church to court on a warrant for criminal libel, because the reverend denounced his action in the Independent Case. This infamous bigot will have thousands of libel suits on hand if he intends to sue all those who have denounced him as a scoundrel and hypocrite.

The Doakshoors have addressed a petition to the sultan of Turkey. Their conscience forbids them to become the subjects of Great Britain, and, therefore, they say: "We hereby declare our allegiance and shelter in your wide dominions, and implore your pardon where we will not be compelled to obey laws made by man."

The endeavor of the Doakshoors to revive the use of the language of the Gospel in a worship by the so-called Christian press, but no argument is brought forth to show that their interpretations of Christ's teachings are religious aberrations. If Christ was on earth today he would certainly be with the Doakshoors and not with the Christian plagues and sullied sky-phists.

Russia.—Pobedonostseff, procurator general of the holy synod, and greatest tyrant in Russia, has resigned. The revolutionary atmosphere was becoming too hot for him.

Belgium.—After the queen of Belgium died of a broken heart and the brutal treatment the king accorded his daughter Stephanie, the shot fired by "a hail startled man" ("'s detective without a job," according to reports) came in proper time to stem his declining popularity. (Yr.)

Teacher.—"No, Johnnie, the names of the British generals were not Butcher and Killer, Kidderminster and Rother." The Wham.
Imperialism at the Grave of Liberty.
(The continued from last week.)

THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The question which first arises under this heading is one of title to the islands, for which we paid $96,000,000, and have sustained many millions in the murderous attempt to enslave their people.

Some four hundred years ago, the pope, who had no more claim on the islands than had the mountains of the moon, by a formal decree granted the islands to Spain. Since that time Spain has been constantly engaged in the attempt to secure possession of that country, much of the force of arms. At the time Dewey made his descent on Manila, the natives held all of the country and had an established and well regulated government thereon, except the city of Manila and the adjacent islands, and they held a larger part of the Spanish army as prisoners of war; the rest had shut up in Manila. They had virtually regained their independence. At this juncture affairs were to be settled by conciliation or otherwise, than by a joint armament possession of the two places here spoken of. The fact is notorious that Dewey agreed with Aguinaldo to act in concert in driving the Spanish forces from the islands with the clearly implied understanding, if not express agreement, that the Filipinos were to have their independence. This understanding continued, and the Filipinos kept faith with us, relying on government of the island; and McKinley, in his proclamation of April 14, 1898, in his message to Congress, said: "I speak out of forcible annexation, for that cannot be thought of: that by our code of morality which would be immoral aggression." Peace continued until Aguinaldo was forced by the breach of faith on the part of McKinley to hold his men under arms for defense, in the event McKinley should make war on him. Just which party fired the first gun is in dispute. At all events Aguinaldo did not make a hostile move until McKinley, May 11, two months before the conclusion of the treaty with Spain sent a dispatch from the Hot Springs of Virginia to General Otis, saying, "Force the fighting penetrate far into the interior, and capture or destroy every warring Filipino."

That this was a clear declaration of war there can be no doubt; nor can there be any doubt that the war which followed, (congress having taken no action,) was made and kept up by McKinley, as an individual without the slightest right so to do, unless it was a war to suppress rebellion, as the imperialists claim.

This brings the question up as to what constitutes rebellion. A rebellion can only exist where there is an established government to rebel against, and government to which the rebels owe allegiance. Now the undisputed fact is that when the war commenced, the only government on the islands was the government of the natives, of which Aguinaldo was the head, and which had not the least right to any arms against its own government, and as the United States had no government on any part of the islands, not even in Manila, what was the reason for declaring them rebels? He owed us no allegiance to an American government, for there was none there. The Americans were there without right or authority. The congress, the only war making power, had not declared war. Mr. McKinley not as president, for as such he had no power to make war up the several expeditions, fitted them out and sent soldiers to invade, conquer and subjugate these islands. In this he had no more right than any other private individual would have had to hire and equip those ships, were under the rules of international law, pirates; and when they landed on the islands they were bandits, freebooters, murderers, outlaws. As such, so they are today. When we or McKinley parted with our $20,000,000 to Spain, it was the old story. A fool and his money. It remains to be seen whether the powers at Washington will make a success in this pirating enterprise. In this discussion we are not unmindful of the fact that our United States Supreme Court, in one of the usual cases, spoke of our army on these islands as being engaged in a state of rebellion; but as that question was not, and on the facts, could not be presented before that court, because not involved in the controversy, it was obiter dicta, and not law.

But assuming that we have some legal status in this war of subjugation, it has been and is being carried on in violation of every principle on which our government is founded by compulsion and not by consent of the governed. In all this, in point of barbarity, yes, savagery, it has exceeded anything in the annals of history. Men, women and children, armed and unarmed, even prisoners of war, have been tortured and put to death by thousands. In one province alone containing 300,000 people, more than one third of them have been exterminated. Our system of ruthless spoliation, plundering, burning of towns, cities and plantations, has gone unchecked for the last four or more years. With all this brutality staring him in the face, Mr. Roosevelt now has to stand up before the American people and tell them that this war has been carried on with a degree of commendable humanity, under the circumstances. Among the things credited to this conquering humanity, the facts stand uncontradicted—yes, admitted, that General Smith gave the order to kill all males over ten years of age and reduce Samar to a howling wilderness. Nor is this an exceptional case. For it is in keeping with the general state of war, in these island's chasing prisoners of war, by what is known as the water cure; to extort evidence, has been a common practice. Numerous are the prisoners of war who have been shot and killed without trial. In one case, such a prisoner was tied to a tree, shot in the leg by the first shot in the body on the next, shot in the body on the third, and killed on the fourth. To go into a detailed statement of the numerous barbarities perpetrated by our soldiers, and their officers, on these poor defenseless Filipinos would require a large volume.

The most of these inhuman butcheries have been ordered by the officers sent to these islands, while all have approved or excused them, and some have, directly or indirectly, incited the authorities at Washington. No such barbarities can be found among savages. With all this before their eyes, the average American will deliberately go to the polls and vote to continue these usurpers, bandits and savages in office, ready to be pocketed by the uncouth than and hoodwinked by the wily priesthood.

The expediency of carrying on this hell of usurpation.

As our officials, and many others, see nothing immoral in what we are doing, and they will not let us now gather some data and measure the profits and losses. From a special to the New York World, we learn that the cost the American people $36,000,000 and from $15,054,541 on its Philippine investment, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901. From a pamphlet taken from official documents and circulated among congressmen, we are advised that in this Philippine war in one year, 246 American soldiers were killed, and 400 wounded. In the same time 3,854 Filipinos were killed and 11,953 wounded: that the cost of the war for that period was $90,000,000.

From the custom-house, (G. W. Cope, auditor) we learn that during the first six months of the year 1902, the total receipts from these islands may have been $136,000,000, and it pays the expenses of collection. Mr. Root, secretary of war, November 29, 1901, submitted a report showing that there had been over a thousand cases of war in the Philippines, between the United States and the Filipinos from May 10, 1900, to June 30, 1901, in which 3,854 patriots (insurgents as he called them) were killed; 1,902 wounded; 6,572 captured; 28,096 surrendered. That of Americans, 2,465 killed, 460 wounded, 118 captured, 20 missing.

In December, 1901, in the majority report on the Philippine tariff bill, the committee say: "This measure is another step in the well-marked line of imperialism. It is enforcing a policy of pure colonization... We are opposed to holding territories as colonies, or creating the people thereof as subjects and imposing on them a government by force, which is the method of empire. Last year we shared in the plaudits of the Filipinos to the value of $5,424,500, with a profit of $1,805,451. To get this it has cost us more than $85,000,000 to maintain our army during the same period, which is exclusive of the $30,000,000 paid to Spain, while other nations got $48,000,000 of that island trade. When the next year closes, the lowest estimate for maintaining our army in the Philippines and our operations in the Orient will not be less than $400,000,000."

Is this not imperialism with a vengeance? All this money forced from our people to gratify a false pride built upon crime, and to keep in these islands a horde of officials with are receiving salaries from $20,000 each. Of course these official rascals are for keeping the islands, and they are making little effort by laying reports to enable us to hold their places.

Senator Hatton, in speaking on this tariff measure, in the Senate said: "Under the cruel provisions in the Philippine Commissions, the knowledge of treason of her son must inform the son, the son must inform on the mother, the brother on the brother; the daughter on the father, and so on."

As the acts of this
inflamous commission contain the same provisions for extorting proof, they must have been copied from the old Spanish auto de fe priestly acts, for the punishment of heretics. It is only a wonder that the burning at the stake penalty was not made a part of the law enacted by that fœtussome body entitled a Commission. Tolstoy, following Hoare, denounced the seclusion acts of the Commission, as damnable in the extreme.

GOVERNMENTAL EXPENSES.

The governmental expenses under six of our presidents from Hayes to McKinley show the per capita of taxes as follows: Hayes: four years, average $5.21; Arthur, $4.73; Cleveland, $4.54; Harrison, $6.35; Cleveland, second term, $5.10; McKinley, $7.14. Except for the Spanish and Philippine wars, it is estimated that the per capita tax under McKinley, would not have exceeded $4.50. The appropriations based on the estimates of the secretary of the Treasury for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901 were over $600,000,000, or $8 a head. But all this is small when compared with the last, the 57th congress, which succeeded in plundering the people in the amount of over $3000,000,000 in one year.

The most careful estimates show the cost of the Spanish war to be $250,000,000 to $300,000,000. Cost of criminal aggression in the Philippines $75,000,000 to $100,000,000. In this estimate pensions are not included, nor the cost of the standing army to hold the islands. These are only some of the fruits of imperialism which commenced under the reign of McKinley, whom Mr. Sherman, after fourteen months in his cabinet, characterized as a man of so little ability that his party had to hold him up when a member of the lower house of congress. And now in order to give this imperial bureau an opportunity to further spread its wings, we are about to be infested with the Danish West Indies Islands, on which we have paid over $900,000—$91 per acre for the land, every inch of which has a private ownership. This sum we are to pay for the naked privilege of imposing a colonial government on the people we are to rule.

THE DECISION IN THE DREAD SCOTT CASE.

This brings us to the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the Dread Scott case, where the court was unanimous in holding that no power was conferred on the federal government to acquire by purchase, or otherwise, territory which could not, in the nature of things, be incorporated into the American union as one of its States, or territory anywhere to be held as colonies. While that part of the decision that referred to slavery, was the subject of much discontent, all that relates to the acquisition of foreign territory to be held as colonies, stands as the supreme law of the land. But alas! this decision has been nullified by the congress, which unblushingly tramples on all things in its path.

WHAT IT COSTS TO BE CONSERVED.

The figures from Mr. Hoare’s Year Book, 1902, we quote some valuable facts as to what it costs to govern the 76,303,287 American citizens:—i.e. to keep private persons from picking our pockets, and contrasting this right solely on government officials.

Annual expenses of our federal government for the years 1864, $257,722,019; for 1891, $387,655,338; for 1902, over $800,000,000. These figures are exclusive of payments on the public debt.

In 1901 the sum paid as pensions, growing out of unnecessary wars, was $185,323,022. At the close of our civil war the pension list was about one third of the prewar sum. As the disabled war veterans have died off from year to year, until now there is but a few left, the pensions, instead of decreasing have steadily increased.

In 1901 the expenses of maintaining our military land forces, including improvements of rivers and harbors, was $144,015,097; for the naval forces, $95,500,078. Total war expenses, $240,512,175.

The most erratic of all, the sum for war, could and should have been avoided. Nor would it have occurred under a government properly administered by honest officials, working in the interest of the people. All these wars, except in defense of liberty and country, are crimes,—crimes against humanity and against the interests of the people, and the participants are but hired murderers.

Eight hundred millions of dollars to run the federal machine a single year. For which, no man, official excepted, can put his finger on one dollar benefit received. This enormous expense does not include the paying of the mails, nor costs of litigation in the federal courts, for we pay for this service in advance out of our own pockets in stamps and court fees.

EXPENSES FOR STATE, COUNTY AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.

For the year 1890 (not later given) the expenses for carrying on the governments of State, county, municipal, township, and school districts of the several States are given thus: New York, $5,567,977; State, $2,079,330; counties, $94,269,410; other subdivisions, $282,297,785; total, $367,583,138.

Assuming that the expenses of the States and their subdivisions alone except peace with the increase of federal expenditures in the last ten years, we shall not have less than $800,000,000 to add to federal expenditures.

Total governmental expenses of $1,900,000,000 to pay annually as taxes,—one billion six hundred million dollars payable annually for the promise by governments that they will see that we are not robbed by our neighbors. This would not be so bad if it were a success; but the robbery goes on all the same. While this petty theft is going on the official robbers in a trust, appropriate our $1,000,000,000, for which they meet in council and legislate away most of our natural liberties, while giving to us neither protection to live our property.

Is it any wonder that some few people cry down with all governments—they say give us Anarchy—and we tell honest competent officials that we want. Less government; less officials; less interference with our liberties; and less expense; government that should allow each to do what he pleases, so long as he does not interfere with the same right in others. All of our best writers on government agree on this. With all its defects, the English system is today, the best the world has. Take it from its criminal aggressions,—its foreign conquests and imperial colonial possessions,—its combination of Church and State, and its hereditary rulers, and there would be little left to complain of.

That some momentous changes are, in the near future, going to occur in this country, is more likely than problematic. The monied powers have combined, and they have the government on their side. The government has several competent generals. Labor has also united, its strength lies almost in numbers. Poverty is being ground in the imperial mill which reduces its subjects to slavery. Anything is better than nothing. What will the outcome be? Imperialist despotism under an emperor, or revolution? If the latter, then, and whence the leader? History points to two men who could gather up the multitude and lead them to victory.

Alexander and Napoleon astonished the world.

Will crushed labor have the good sense to join other friends of liberty under the name of Democrats or any other name? If so, good government may be restored by peaceful means. Otherwise all is lost, and imperialism has come to stay.

All lovers of good government should lay aside their petty differences, unfling the flag of liberty; go into the next national contest, on the sole issue of the restoration of the government as it was in the days of Washington and Jefferson. If so, all discontent may join their forces. In such a contest there can be no doubt as to the result. Racials with all its ill-gotten wealth cannot stand against the latter bargains of united honesty.

Success depending on our efforts, we will throw to the breeze the star-spangled banner, without an imperial blot on its folds, to float once more over the land of the free and the home of the brave.

In such a contest imperialism with its trusts; its ill-gotten wealth; its criminal aggression, and its cohorts, will be hurled to that unhallowed, unholy grave, and the fruits of slavery.

As the next campaign we will throw to the breeze the star-spangled banner, without an imperial blot on its folds, to float once more over the land of the free and the home of the brave.

Parsam E. Lard.  
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