A PERIODICAL OF ANARCHIST THOUGHT, WORK, AND LITERATURE.

VOL. IX. NO. 39. CHICAGO, SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 1902. WHOLE NO. 381.

A Vision.

In dreams I saw the earth's old sorrow fade;
A cloud of error lifted from man's soul.
The golden idol crushed in dust; the whole
Of coward envy, hate, and fear obeyed
A world-wide will and vanished. Unafraid,
Man clasped his brother in the sweet control
Of love; and life had found its fitting goal
In justice, fellowship, and mutual aid.
The human hosts made feast on many a plain,
Their banners marked with, "Man hath liberty;"
Their songs of rapture rose in glorious strain,
Grand peans of time's noblest victory.
The wonder woke me. With the vision's wane
A voice spake to my ear, "This yet shall be."

—William Francis Barnard.

—— o ——

Herding or Growth?

The minds of many persons who are both bright and powerful have failed to grasp the great underlying principle of growth, or development; and confound it with herding, or worse yet, with regimentation. I will say nothing about regimentation, the plan of the State Socialists, as it belongs in the category of political action—of compulsion.

Let us look for a minute at the propositions of those who propose to herd together, calling it a colony, or association, thinking thereby to solve the questions that so vex and perplex all thinking persons at the present time. They propose to "round up" a lot of persons of varying opinions, habits, desires and occupations in a certain place, and by all these persons working together form a new society, "based on justice and equity," as they put it, and thus showing the world a better way to live. Their intentions are as good as need be, and they lack not for energy. Their plans cannot fulfil their dreams, however, and no matter how much they may strive, they cannot succeed as they expect. The reason is simple; it is this: they are attempting to work in an artificial manner. I am free to admit that most that we do is artificial; but growth is a natural process, and cannot be made, but must be allowed.

In order to make clear why the herding process, that of gathering people together promiscuously, is inadequate as a method of beginning the work of reconstruction, it is only necessary to point out the "law" of growth. The work and study of scientists for ages has shown that all growth is due to accretion. An atom exists. Another atom is attracted to it, and they become a body. Other atoms are attracted to this body, and it grows in size. Thus the work of accretion goes on as long as the vitality necessary to attract other atoms remains in the body. Little by little the growth proceeds from the simple to the complex; from one atom to many; from a single function to numerous ones. Natural process never "rounds up" a lot of atoms, nor tries to herd a lot of uncongenial atoms together. The human race is subject to the same natural processes; and each individual is, in a sense, an atom, and will unite with other individuals when attracted by them; but will fail to unite when they are uncongenial. That is why the herding plan—like the Topolobampo and other colony schemes—will not work. On the other hand where a nucleus is formed, even tho it be of but a few individuals, if it contains vitality enough—has a definite purpose in view--to attract other individuals, it will grow.

With these facts in view it is plain to be seen that in the process of reconstruction it is a waste of energy to try to herd; but directly in line with natural processes to form nucleuses, here and there, and let the natural accretion of individuals who are in sympathy with the ideal of such nucleuses be the process of growth. Then congeniality of the individuals composing the group, and their oneness of purpose, will insure harmony, and, little by little, the ideal held will become known to others; and as fast as others learn to desire the realization of this ideal, they will seek to attach themselves to an existing group, or to unite with a few others and form a new nucleus.

To make a practical application let us point out that colony schemes that propose the indiscriminate gathering of persons into colonies or associations, holding out inducements and charging admission fees, are not in line with natural growth. On the other hand it shows that small voluntary groups, drawn together by a common purpose, holding out no inducements but a realization of the ideal that prompted their union, and charging no admission fee, are directly in the line of growth, and as they grow they will develop from the simple to the complex, not only in numbers but also in occupation.

As their numbers increase the possibility of diversifying their occupations will become apparent, and one industry after another will develop in their midst. This gives rise to the hope of beginning the reconstruction of society even now, in the present vile system; for, while complete reconstruction cannot take place until the barriers raised by law and custom have been broken down, yet groups living very much nearer the ideal of Anarchists than its members now live, can grow up, here and there, and do much to prepare the public mind for the general reconstruction. Not only that; for as the groups grow up they can open up communication with each other, and the toilers in the city can supply the workers in the country with clothes, shoes, gloves and such other things as can best be produced in the city. In return the country comrades can supply the groups in the city with butter, eggs, milk, fruit, vegetables, honey and such things as the city people must get from the country folks. These exchanges can be carried on without the use of money, and thus the idea of association without money will grow up.

By working in this way a network of groups can eventually be spread all over the country, all in touch with each other, offering ready assistance to all comrades who may meet with calamities, or come in distress; showing to the mentally lazy, by example, what can be done voluntarily and without rules, laws, or compulsion of any form. It would also tend to stimulate fellowship, that sensation which inclines the will toward generosity and forbearance; toward general good-will and kindness for all others.

In localities where transportation is a serious question the comrades can establish a system of transportation between groups that will best answer their purpose under the circumstances. If there is navigable water a boat can be built. But all these things will suggest themselves as the number of groups multiply and their sizes increase by accretion.

Many of the comrades have bemoaned their life in the present dog-eat-dog life of bourgeois society, and inquired concerning colonies. I hope they will not try to herd; but will cooperate along the line of least resistance, by congenial persons, no matter how few, forming nucleuses, and these nucleuses growing by the natural and permanent process of accretion—the attraction of congenial individuals.

HENRY ADDIS.

—— o ——

Covernment.

Government is built up on a foundation of fictions, and its continued existence is maintained solely thru the medium of fictions.

The right of any one man to be the master of any other man is nowhere assumed. The most that is claimed is that he may delegate his rights to another, or that he may surrender by agreement the rights and privileges which God, or nature, originally gave

him. The veriest tyrant that the world has ever known always feels that it is necessary to make some excuse for his attempting to exercise authority over others. He will claim that he inherited his right to sovereignty, or that the subject voluntarily surrendered, or that he consented to subjection under the rule of the monarch.

But can a man make a contract binding himself to a state of slavery? And especially can he make a contract by which he can bind his posterity to a condition of bondage?

All government originates in some attempt at formality, some unimportant performance that might serve to give the affair the semblance of legitimacy. A few men, self-constituted, self-selected, get together and pass some resolution or make a government of some kind, as our political parties do in their caucuses. But how could their acts or their resolutions bind anybody but the participants themselves? How could they bind those not present at the meeting, and particularly those who were not born at the time?

A few men called delegates got together and agreed upon a national constitution for America in the year 1787. It was the work solely of these men, or of a majority of them; it merely indicated their sentiments, their views, their wishes. What they finally decided upon was no more binding upon the people of the different States than it was upon the people of France or Austria. But in due time, after a couple of years delay, the authorities of the different States surrendered and accepted the new constitution as it had been prepared by those unauthorized delegates, tho some of them submitted much against their wishes. These States did not construct or devise the constitution, nor any part of it—it was in no sense a law binding upon them. But in order to avoid trouble, or for some similar reason, they made no resistance and thus it came that they lost their rights and they have been vassals under the general government ever since. The power cannot be lodged in two places at the same time; if the general government has the power, the States of course cannot, and it is well understood they do not, have the power likewise. The States have no rights except such as the general government is willing to concede. There can be no such thing as a sovereign under a sovereign. A sovereign under a sovereign is properly a subject or vassal. The prevailing fiction is this: that when one does not resist, he consents, and further, that when one consents, all consent, even including those who have had no cognizance or control of the matter. Then there is the other fiction that God has commissioned the rulers to tyrannize over their race. How many wicked and outrageous things are done in the name of God, in the name of Christianity, in the name of the people, in the name of justice, in the name of charity! It is a practise as old as time itself for designing men to "steal the livery of heaven to serve the Devil in." If Old Satan did not carefully conceal his cloven feet and hide his hideous tail, nobody would have anything to do with him. It is an easy thing to pretend to authority which one never possessed and to presume upon conditions and contracts that have never existed.

We repeat again, and we hope it may never be forgotten or overlooked, that all government is based upon fraud and misconception, rather than upon force. The power always lies in the people, and in the people only. Men are constantly selling, as Esau did, their birthright for a mess of pottage. They trade the happiness and comfort of a life time for a few moments' enjoyment at the present time. They love to be deceived and imposed upon, and they wonder at last how the trick could have been performed so skilfully. No, people should cease to talk about the wickedness and brutality of their oppressors. They should prate no more about the irresistibleness of force. As we have intimated before, it is not force that does the business. It is deception, intrigue, strategy and strict attention to affairs that always does the work. It is the minority—often a small minority—that rules the majority. The rulers are always the few, and the subjects, the slaves, are the many. The number of slaves in Greece far surpassed the number of free men. A few scores of policemen in New York with a star on their breast and a club in their hands suffice to keep a great city in subjection. The star is far more potent than the club; the people could get along in some way with the club, but the star—representing as it does the Empire State, or perhaps the United States of America—is another thing entirely. The star strikes people with awe and it leaves them in a sort of comatose condition. That is the reason why they surrender so readily. The State gets people under its control in some such manner as serpents are supposed to get their victims into their power—*by some sort of enchantment*.—From "The New Dispensation," by J. Wilson.

—o—

A Reflection.

I had to stop. Everybody stopped. On the sidewalk for half a square and extending mid-way into the street was a crowd of men and women such as, for size, is seldom seen together on the street except during riots or at rare outdoor festivals. But this was hardly a festive crowd; it certainly was not riotous. Everyone, it is true, was doing his best to crowd out his neighbors, but otherwise the crowd was still and peaceful. It kept on increasing and increasing constantly, however, till street car traffic was fairly arrested. Already a "string of cars" waited for passage, and still the human blockade could not be raised. It grew, on the contrary, more and more formidable.

What was it that brought out this "sea of humanity" which for fully thirty minutes interrupted the traffic of one of our busiest thorofares? It was one of our theaters giving a specially attractive play. Had the cause or occasion of this blockade been an outdoor labor gathering or a poor street vender, we would have heard much talk of "the obstruction of public highways" and, possibly, of one or more arrests by the representatives of "law and order." And yet we are told that in this country the rich and the poor are equal before the law.

DAVID A. MODELL.

An Investigator.

I am much pleased with the philosophy of Anarchism as far as I understand it; but I can't see how the affairs of the people could be conducted in a state of Anarchy. How would they run the railways, postoffices, and other businesses without government? I hate the present damnable system of slavery, and cannot accept the Socialist Democratic regime, as I fear it would be a more tyrannical system than the present. Wherever a class, as a class, has ruled, it has been the most tyrannical; and the nature of the thing is bound to make it so. Look at all the Socialist colonies that have been organized, and we find that their failure was in their own ranks and and not from any outside influence; and I cannot see any heaven on earth, except in ANARCHY, and I want more light on the subject. I want my heaven here and now, and have no care or worry for the heaven of gospel pilots who preach systems and uphold conditions that make a hell of earth's pilgrimage.

Springfield, Mo. S. A. WRIGHT.

REPLY.

There are many social affairs managed even today on a strictly voluntary basis, the execution of which rests solely upon mutual agreement. So, for instance, the international postal service, some of the Red Cross Societies, Life-Saving Stations, etc. It is also an acknowledged fact that in many countries educational institutions are carried on by private initiative. In Switzerland, for instance, where the initiative and referendum is in full swing, and the people are supposed to rule, the government has done very little for education, but much is done by voluntary associations. In this country the "Social Settlements," wholly voluntary associations, came into existence when the government had proven its inability to ameliorate the sanitary condition of the slums; and, thanks to these institutions, the children of the slums receive a more thoro education than they could gain in the public schools. When the governments failed to take efficient care of the wounded soldiers during a war, the Red Cross Society came to life, which was originally a voluntary association, and is still in some countries. And those who have been able to keep aloof from governmental interference have proven to be the most efficient. In short, wherever government fails to keep pace with the growing needs, voluntary associations take its place. And such associations would be more numerous if people were not hampered by lack of means in their endeavor to improve the conditions of mankind.

We have today private and public libraries accessible to all, and the people who avail themselves of these institutions, are not asked whether they have given society an equivalent or not.

As to the tyranny of "class rule," the Social Democrats assert that the inauguration of their utopian scheme will abolish all classes; but they propose to run all things by majority rule, and any intelligent man can easily perceive that the more ignorant majority would tyrannize over the intelligent minority.

A. I.

Reply to Critics.

Comrade Lewis has found fog in my article "Methods of Science," only by putting it in. I never professed to have "discovered" that mind made the terms of mathematics. I supposed everyone knew that. I never said the elements of mathematical knowledge entered my head in any particular way. I find them there, inseparable from any state of thought or even sensation; and that's all I know about it. I am sure, however, they are not derived from "numerals or other mathematic characters"; but, as Mr. Sam Weller would say, "on the contrairy—quite the rewerse."

What I said about physical science is by no means accurately quoted. I cannot say Comrade Lewis' account of how abstractions are built, at all enlightens me, tho I seem to have heard it before. I hold to no "philosophic dualism," or monism, or triuism. I utterly reject all schemes for explaining the antithesis of subject and object, and have nothing worse (or better) to say about materialism than that it strikes me as the shallowest of the lot. But this is not to say that subject and object are really two. Very likely they are really one, only to prove it is impossible, because every step must recognize their formal opposition. In mathematics we reason from subjective will; and our ideas, such as the circle, are exact, because we make them. In physics we reason from objective impressions, and lack exact ideas because, so far as we know, we did not make the things. That is all I meant to say.

* * *

To my friends, the anti-vaccinators and anti-vivisectionists, I have, I hope for the last time, the pleasure of bidding farewell. Since I met their brag man—the only man they had who knew enough about science not to talk nonsense before me,—and made it so clear that there was nothing else for him to talk; I have always been much inclined to think I should waste breath by bestowing any on the little fishes,—which have no ears:—and now I am sure of it. I read in Small's letter a flourish of trumpets over what Dr. Friedrich did at Cleveland—and already Dr. Friedrich has returned to vaccination! I read in Brown's that I once said Comstock had a cinch on the regular physicians; as if my chief charge against the Movement in Favor of Ignorance, were not always this that it is an octopus, which can fasten one tentacle or another upon anyone who cares more for something else than abstract truth. I read in last *Vaccination* (not for the first time) an argument to prove that smallpox is a blessing! Very consistent from an anti-vaccinator, I allow; but I cannot say as much for the glorification in the same magazine of Dr. Friedrich's then alleged, and now disproved, success in banishing this blessing. In other publications of the same school, I have read within a month recommendations that doctors whose patients die should be assassinated; complaints that doctors who kill their patients thru palpable ignorance actually can be punished as mischievous impostors; and, in conclusion, avowed sympathy with Dowieism, Mormonism, and Eddyism, *because they induce some people to refuse vaccination, and to think surgical cases can be treated without knowledge due to vivisection.* If the writers of such stuff as this want another fight, they must find me another Leverson. I desire nothing better than that they will write more of it. My only purpose in talking the matter up was to show Anarchists that anti-vaccination and anti-vivisection are phases of the Movement in Favor of Ignorance, and to show other people that some Anarchists know that. The latter purpose, I have surely accomplished. The former, the antis are attaining more effectually than I possibly could; therefore I shall no longer try to teach them better.

C. L. JAMES.

—— o ——

Is Government Necessary?

From "Pure Economy," a pamphlet issued by J. Herbert Rowell, Austin, Ill., I select as follows: "From the standpoint of pure economy, a certain kind of government is very useful and even necessary." With that statement I thoroly agree. But right here comes a very pertinent question, viz: what is that kind? Government, as I understand, is usually conceived to be force brought to bear on another or others to compel them willing or unwilling to act in accordance with the will of such other or others. Such a view I cannot accept. I believe that only Anarchists really believe in genuine government. To govern is to control, to exercise force upon. The question now arises, can we control without having mastery over the being or thing controlled? And what is there among beings or things that in an approximate sense we can thus do with? Is it not one's self?

I am aware that the opponents of what is called free will, will at once exclaim self-government is impossible, because we do not have perfect power over all the forces of our being, that we are all more or less limited in our desires and achievements by our conditions: that like the currents of the ocean, man is moved by unseen powers. I mean by control simply, that he can do what seems to him best at the time of doing, without being overwhelmed by the undesired force or compulsion of any other. Self-government is the completest of all governments, "very useful" and absolutely necessary—it alone is uplifting and life-inspiring to men. I will in future enlarge upon this topic.

J. M. CLARKE.

—— o ——

One of our comrades here, a hard workingman, has three children, two girls and a boy. Owing to the nature of his work—farming—he lived a little outside of the city, and more or less secluded, and his dwelling was as many farm houses are all over the country.

His children never did a stroke of work, altho their ages range from 15 to 18 years; the father and mother devoting all their efforts to making life for the young ones easy, too easy I would say. In fact all three of them led a life of idleness when not at school, going where and whenever they pleased. However, the girls had ambitions, and life in the woods became tiresome to them, at least to one of them. The result was this one ran away from home and appealed to the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children. Soon an agent appeared at our comrade's house to investigate the matter.

The girl in question had stated that her father was an Anarchist, did not allow her to attend church and had connections with many other Anarchists in various towns, and also in Paterson.

The first question therefore asked by the agent was, "What is your religion?" "No religion!" was the reply.

"What! none? Then you are an Anarchist?"

"Yes, of course!"

A few more similar questions, and then an attempt was made to penetrate the house and inspect the women's bedrooms, in which he was stopped by our comrade's wife, however. The agent then informed the father politely that, having admitted his disbelief, etc., he could not get his child back, as the society considered him *unfit to bring up his children.*

The father will not contest the possession of the child (17 years old), as he reasons that a child having lost so far her affections for her parents, is not worthy of any, and he will be better off if he can forget her.

Boston, Mass. K. A. S.

—— o ——

Tyranny.

Tyranny is cooperation in the dark. No tyrant could wield a moment's power if it were not for the cooperation of his subjects, darkly imagining themselves to be served in the only way open to them; if they suddenly refused to obey, counting death a better servant than a tyrant, where would the tyrant be? Or consider our government powers over life and death: our priestly keys of heaven and hell: our capitalist and wage system modes of industry: these are alike perversions of cooperative love-nature. If the common life should unexpectedly refuse to think and earn its bread by coercion, what would become of government, priesthood and private ownership? The question is pertinent and urgent, for within every tyranny lies hid the universal cooperative commonwealth.—Herron.

—— o ——

Did it ever occur to you that some of the most revolting crimes in this and other lands have been committed under the cover of the flag of that country or behind its superstition, and that to question it has usually called down on the questioner the wrath of all the "conservative" do-as-their-father-dids, even to the prison and to the gallows? Sometimes they have been done in the name of Liberty. "O Liberty, Liberty. How many crimes have been committed in thy name!" Blind obedience is sometimes mistaken for patriotism, and the loud claim of patriotism often made, is only "the last refuge of a rascal." Do not forget that a thing is right or wrong only as it relates to the establishment and maintenance of our rights or wrongs, and that the flag, Ah, even old glory! may be used to cover crimes that if continued may cause her to be "hauled down" and bring about the destruction of the republic, as Lincoln feared. Old glory only symbolizes certain principles, and when they are subverted and the people refuse to see it, then their belief is not patriotism, but a kind of idolatrous foolishness that shows there are at least two kinds of fanatics—one who hopes and does his best for progress, the other that lives in the dead ashes of the past—M. Shafer, in *Iron Moulders' Journal.*

FREE SOCIETY

Formerly THE FIREBRAND.

Published Weekly by..... A. ISAAK.

ONE DOLLAR A YEAR.

Address all Communications and make all Money Orders payable to FREE SOCIETY, 331 WALNUT ST., Chicago, Ill.

Entered at the Chicago post office as second-class matter, October 29, 1901.

The publishers as such are not necessarily in agreement with any opinions expressed by the contributors.

ANARCHY—A social theory which regards the union of orde with the absence of all direct government of man by man as the political ideal, absolute individual liberty.—Century Dictionary.

CHICAGO, SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 1902.

381

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

Notes.

Thru the liberality of the Boston comrades, we have been enabled to publish the article "Origin of Anarchism," which appeared some time ago in FREE SOCIETY, in pamphlet form, and it is now ready for distribution.

The essay has been considerably elaborated by the author, C. L. James, and dispels the idea that Anarchism is a "foreign plant" or that it means "the destruction of society." The historical references and logic of the essay will not fail to impress the professor and toiler alike. It should have a wide circulation. The price is $2 per hundred. Ten copies, 25 cents. Single copy, 5 cents.

* * *

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

* * *

The International Defense Committee is conducting the defense of Comrades Grossmann and MacQueen. Contributions are solicited, and may be addressed to the treasurer, A. Salzberg, 30 Paterson St., Paterson, N. J. We have on hand some subscription blanks, which will be furnished on request.

* * *

Chicago.—The Chicago Philosophical Society meets every Sunday, 2:30 p. m., at Handel Hall, Randolph St. and Wabash Ave. September 28, either W. F. Barnard or A. Isaak will speak.

The Tolstoy Club meets every Saturday evening at the home of Dr. Mary R. Carey, 837 W. Adams St. Tolstoy readings and discussions.

Workmen's Educational Club meets every Saturday night at 8 p. m., 278 Blue Island Ave. September 28, H. Gillis will speak on "The End as We See It," in Jewish.

* * *

New York.—The Radical Reading Room will send a collector around to visit the subscribers in arrears. Those in arrears are requested to leave money or word at home, so that the comrade volunteering his services may not have his labor in vain.

Philadelphia.—The Social Science Club will hold weekly meetings at the Hall 920 Girard Ave., (entrance on Hutchinson St.) commencing September 28, 8 p. m. The exercises will consist of an opening address on some subject of religious, social, ethical or political interest, to be followed by free discussion by the audience. The subject for September 28 will be the "Coal Strike." The speakers: Ed. Moore, J. C. Frost, G. F. Stephens, and Geo. Brown. Admission free.

—o—

Splinters.

In Chicago we have had a striking illustration of the versatility of the "philosophic Anarchist." Several of them wished to amuse themselves by flunkeying around anti-Anarchist Roosevelt, so they got themselves appointed on a committee to entertain the president on his visit to Chicago. Of course tongues were soon wagging on the unusual spectacle, the police got a shivering scare, the newspapers got hold of the thing, and E. P. Rosenthal, one of the "philosophical" Anarchists—in the same sense that Emerson was one, according to Professor Triggs—was summariiy bounced, as he deserved. (In diplomatic language it is called "resigned.") He is deserving of slight sympathy in his ridiculous position; rather it is to be regretted that the lesson did not more thoroly go over Rosenthal's shoulder and hit higher, as it did to some extent.

* * *

Recent disclosures in the St. Louis bribery scandal show that it was organized in a systematic manner, and not carried on spasmodically. A number of members of the house of delegates were in a combine for the sale of legislation. It is not said whether regular prices were quoted or not; but most likely the legislation went on the auction basis. Of course the respectable people are thoroly shocked; and remedies are proposed galore; that is, everything has been proposed except to abolish the house of delegates and the whole gang, which would finally settle the boodle question in St. Louis. The New York *Evening Post* proposes curbing the power of municipal legislating bodies; and repeats the hackneyed advice about "electing honest men to office." The former suggestion is a slight advance, for it will solve the question just insofar as power is taken away from men; the latter is a chimera, pure and simple. The people have been chasing "honest men in office" as long as there were offiices; and they are remarkable thru their rarity. Men of the Jones and Johnson stamp are the exception, not the rule; which is sufficient reason to condemn the whole system. The remedy for the evils of governing is not to govern.

* * *

Special correspondence to the San Francisco *Bulletin* from Alaska, brings out the fact that the United States government, thru the enforcement of a recent game law, is bringing starvation on the natives of that territory. Hunting and fishing are their only resource for a food supply, and agents of the treasury department are destroying their primitive fish traps, for which the season is now on. In a short time the winter will set in, when assistance from outside will be unable to reach the northwest of that region on account of the water being all frozen. The law was intended to reach greedy canners who were depopulating the rivers and territory of game; but with its usual stupidity the law falls heaviest on innocence. The canners and white hunters will simply leave; but the natives, who have no other place of habitation, must stay there and starve. It is another case of the "civilized man" repaying the hospitable aborigines with shame and treachery. The peaceable Eskimos did not even resent the intrusion; and the news item states there is no case on record where they have refused to share with the whites to their last supplies. The white men, demoralized by a system of commercialism, do not understand the primitive Communism of these people. The white man's object is to get rich quick, no matter how much he ruins the country; while the natives fish and hunt for food. And the whites make the natives pay dearly for their own stupid folly.

* * *

The Observer of the New York *Truth Seeker* is on the lookout for arguments just now, so he steers into me for stating that government originated in war, and "ventures to guess" that it originated in superstition. It is a rather poor guess, for so far as known the first groups did *not* "organize into what bore a resemblance to a State . . . chiefly to support a Church for the worship of ancestors." The first groups flocked together in small tribes for the "conquest of bread," which engendered war, and the strongest or most politic warrior finally became a permanent chief; and he evolves from the robber into the more respectable "governor"—with practically identical functions. Superstition is his lever in perpetuating his job. And the "first groups" did not "worship ancestors," primarily, but rather the totem, which was, however, sometimes regarded as the first ancestor. Totemism, the protecting animal or plant, is the most prevalent custom in primative life. The worship of ancestors *per se* is no more common than worship of many other things, such as the sun, the moon, the wind, the water, and what not.

* * *

The article "Herding or Growth," by H. Addis, written several years ago, is still applcable; and I hope will receive the careful attention of all who contemplate connecting themselves with colonies. JR.

—o—

Chicago Meetings.

Last Friday night a debate took place, in Schiller Hall, between Mr. Simons (Socialist) and Mr. Hardinge (Single Taxer). Both speakers met with loud applause in their analyses of present conditions, but were exceedingly weak in their constructive theories of an equitable adjustment of prevailing wrongs. The gist of Mr. Simons' argument was that the tendency of evolution, or "economic determinism," pointed to concentration of capital and the ultimate commonwealth, while Mr. Hardinge contended that monopoly and ignorance were the sources of present inequalities, and that the Single Tax would make land free—remove monopoly. Mr. Simons retorted

that taxation levied on land would not make it free, and that the owners of the tools of production would also own the laborers. Mr. Hardinge claimed that free competition—which we had not at present—and the taxation of land only would quickly adjust things to the satisfaction of both the employer and employe; but he wanted to know how the Socialists would compensate laborers, who varied so greatly in their capacities, which in his opinion could never be justly done by the time-check or measurement of labor performed. Here he had cornered Mr. Simons, who, evidently by reason of absolute immunity from criticism by his blind followers, boldly renounced the idea of an equal compensation under Socialism, and declared such speculation as utopian, and admitted that developments would perhaps be such as to inaugurate a system of high and low wages in the beginning of the era of Socialism.

The somersaults of the philosophy of "economic determinism" are strange performances indeed.

* * *

Last Sunday afternoon, Handel Hall of the Philosophical Society was crowded, to listen to the well-known speakers, Raymond Robins and Clarence S. Darrow, on the subject "Municipal Ownership." Mr. Robins stated that the old parties were practically dead, and a cry for industrial freedom could be heard everywhere. He could hear the rumblings which were foretelling the doom of plutocracy. So far men had constantly been fooled by the politicians, and it was necessary to elect men with principles and character. Municipal ownership, he thought, would remove the temptations for exploitation. Municipal industry would perhaps not be as profitable as private enterprises, but it would make free men and women. Only a handful of devoted and honest men would be sufficient to intimidate plutocracy. He deplored the lack of men with principles. "I have had occasion to see such devotion to their principles among the Anarchists as would put millions of Christians to shame," he said among other things

Mr. Darrow disappointed the municipal ownership advocates. Having seen Tolstoy's books for sale in the hall, he opened his discourse by stating that he believed in Tolstoy—the greatest thinker produced in the last century. It was apparent that he would much rather have talked on Tolstoy than on the subject at hand. He had been too long in Chicago not to be able to "size up" his audiences, and knew very well why so little enthusiasm had been manifested. He had little confidence in the remedy proposed and thought it waste of time and energy to meddle with politics, and would not be offended if all voted against him. The Anarchists would not vote for him, who entertained the grandest ideal ever dreamed of; but how to realize the ideal was the question. Municipal ownership was coming, whether right or wrong. But he was rather pessimistic regarding a more rational remedy. One hundred thousand would cheer a brutal murderer, like Roosevelt, where only one would listen to reason. And if we compare the philosophy of Plato with Roosevelt's mouthings, one is apt to think that we are retrograding instead of progressing. Thousands of years of preaching had accomplished very little—the few still rob the many. Government was not organized to protect the weak, but to keep the poor and weak where the powerful wanted them to be. Law is a club—a machine to crush the toilers to death. He favored, for the present, courts where the toilers would get redress without feeing lawyers, and old age pension laws, altho he would rather see an age where pensions would not be needed. Municipal ownership might help in bringing about a better state of human affairs for which we are all striving. Some folks may think the best way to reach New York is to go east, while others will go west. But we can reach the same destination by either direction.

Mr. Barnard, the first critic, called attention in opening to the extremely pessemistic spirit in which Mr. Darrow had spoken of the race, its ideals, its integrity, and remarked the descrepancy between the speaker's tribute to Tolstoy, his avowed leader, and his advocacy, half-hearted tho it was, of municipal ownership. No one, he said, could know better than Mr. Darrow that political action was not only ineffective as a means of reform, but was also a positive menace to the well-being of the people who indulged in it; for an advocate of the spirit of Tolstoy's teachings to be counseling political means of cleansing our economic life was preposterous. Political action was the *bete noire* of the great Russian, and should be the same thing to Mr. Darrow.

Mr. Barnard accounted for political corruption by defining government, which he declared to be the coercion of one man by another without regard to right or wrong. No one, he said, would deny that government was coercion of one man by another, nor could anyone deny that power, monarchical, representative, or expressed in the action of a majority of citizens who coerced their fellows, was government because it was might, not because it was right. He asked, could it be expected that that which held its place by means of might would in the nature of things ever identify itself with right, or if history pointed to an opposite result of power and authority in the State. Political corruption, he declared, was only an extended and amplified corruption of that which was in its very nature corruption; namely, political action.

The speaker went on to say that the practical men were not those who like Mr. Darrow, counseled renewed attempts to use a wrong instrument to attain social justice, but were rather the poor, despised advocates of what Mr. Darrow had designated as millennial; men who saw into the soul of economics and politics, and having nothing to lose, denounced the unclean beasts whom we have taken into our bosoms for angels; the State, the laws, the multifarious forms of political action. It seemed, he said, as if Mr. Darrow, sickened and distraught by the corruption of official life, and the stupidity and ignorance of the people at large, had almost hopelessly turned back to politics, forgetting in his wish to do something somehow, that the means for which he was standing sponser there were those which Tolstoy, his revered master, had condemned with all the fervor and eloquence of a man of the age, who had seen the true nature of the State, what it was, and had pointed at it to cry in no doubtful tones, "That is the evil of evils: the State!"

After calling attention to the way in which municipal ownership had failed to help the people where it had been tried, Mr. Barnard called upon Mr. Darrow to stand for that which Tolstoy stood for, at least by word of mouth; to ask not what would bring immediate results in relieving the pressure of unscrupulous power, but to use his large influence to encourage effort toward a radical and permanent cure of social evils.

A. Isaak said it was not surprising when workingmen looked upon municipal ownership as a relief from their hardships, for the average toiler was always looking for some kind of a savior; but he could not understand how men of learning, who knew from history that both municipal and government ownership had been tried and proven a failure, could believe that such insigificant and petty reforms would alter the condition of the toilers and transform the politicians into honest men. Nothing but intelligence would free the toilers. The legislator could do nothing for the improvement of the race if public sentiment was against the measure; and once the people were intelligent enough to know the cause of their ailments, they would accomplish the necessary change in short order—without delegating their power to this or that political body. Changes in society precede laws. He admitted that very little progress had been made from Plato to Roosevelt, but this was due to the fact that people had ever dealt with the evil effects of government instead of removing the cause. "Under government society moves in a cirle, always arriving at the same spot of corruption and oppression from which it tried to escape. The Anarchists are called dreamers, but in reality the governmentalists are the dreamers. For thousands of years you have been dreaming about a little better government, but the dream never realizes. The Anarchists is accused of favoring violence, but government was born and maintained by brute force. Tolstoy, whom Mr. Darrow admires, has clearly shown that all legislation is organized violence. And if the speakers, whose honesty of purpose I do not question, would devote their influence and energy to enlightening the people as to the real remedy, instead of urging yetty reforms, their would soon be less room for pessimism."

"I have listened with pleasure to the able and scholarly criticism of Mr. Barnard, and do not disagree with him to any great extent," said Mr. Darrow in conclusion. Yet he felt constrained to suggest that logic was unreliable, as Herbert Spencer had pointed out in his latest work. The great factor in social movement was the man who could arouse the feelings of men. REPORTER.

—o—

What we want is liberty, and the power in common with our so-called superiors of enjoying the gifts of nature. It is true our wish may not be gratified, but this one thing is certain, our attempt to obtain it will end only with our lives.—Robert Ket, on the gallows (1549).

A Question of Practise.

"I said to him: 'If I should consent to marry you, it would be with the understanding that I still retained the full ownership and control of my body."

"And what did he say in reply?" I queried.

"Well, at first he gave me a queer kind of look; and then he said: 'Certainly my dear, you should continue to own your body. Only consent to become my wife—I'll promise anything—and all these little matters will adjust themselves.'"

"And you believe him? Do you think he understands what you mean?"

"Yes, to both these questions. He's very liberal in his thinking; and altho the idea was evidently new to him, and a surprise, I believe he would soon come to see the justice of it, and abandon any thoughts he may hitherto have had as to 'marital rights,' and adopt the new idea of *marital opportunity and permission.*"

"Hm! Then let you and I, my friend—believers in the justice of the demand you make,—examine, and see what this self-ownership means. Perhaps you yourself don't know what you are demanding. Evidently *he* does not; for he calls it a 'little' matter."

The speaker was fine looking, red-cheek'd, black-eyed young woman, who had been reared among "women's rights" people, with a sprinkling of "liberal Christians" thrown in. She thought in a loose way, very much as such people think, especially as to the right of woman to vote, and earn her own living and spend her quarters without being asked to give an account. Of late she had come in contact with Anarchist people and literature, and had imbibed much of their spirit. The man in question was a good kind of fellow, of five feet ten inches, wore a number seven hat, and had been to Klonkyke in search of gold. That he had found some he showed by wearing "nuggets" on his shirt front and watch chain. He didn't take much if any stock in churches; but evidently had not thought at all concerning ultimate questions, God, government; right to the land, and the unjust and muddled condition of society, nor of the possibility of a betterment by revolution. "Getting on" was his great object in life, with perhaps a vague idea of going to college at some future time—when he had made his pile—for an education. Thinking he saw his way clear to making a competence; and being in love with the girl and she with him, he had proposed marriage, previous to returning to Klondyke to grub out more gold; evidently a sensible man and likely to "succeed"!

So I proceeded in my discourse with the maiden. Said I: "It is quite likely that this dear man of yours—whom, by the way, *you cannot see*, because of the ideal man who occupies your thoughts, standing right in front of him [she lifted her eyebrows at this]—understands you to mean by 'owning and controlling your body' that, you are not to be oppressed as a wife, nor to be compelled to yield to his demands as a husband unless you are quite willing. If you desire to occupy your separate bed or room at any time, he will not intrude because of his marital relation. We may assume that thus far he understands your meaning; and further that he will not ask, nor compel you to bear unwelcome children. So far, very good. This is an improvement on the current idea of married life, and speaks strongly in favor of your suitor.

"But suppose now that, after a brief honeymoon he returns to Klondyke, and stays five or six months. Thinking on his return to give you a pleasant surprise, he enters the house without warning, and finds you sitting on the sofa with say, Mr. Johnson, billing and cooing—your arms around each other—in short, making love! Would he accept the situation as matter of course, and say: 'This is what she demanded and I conceded before we were married: he is clasping *her* body and kissing *her* lips, evidently with *her* consent; and may not a woman do what she wills with her own'?"

She shook her head and said:

"I doubt if he would take that view of the case,—but of course this would never occur with me!"

"Then why do you make the demand if you are sure you will not wish to use your freedom? Or, suppose further that, having been gone something more than a year he returns, with a full poke of gold perhaps, and finds his black-eyed wife—who meets him still with many smiles and a warm welcome—nursing a month-old baby; or perhaps with an unborn babe beneath her apron! What then?"

"I am quite sure he would think I had gone too far in demonstrating my right to do as I please with my own body."

"But surely," said I, "that is what self-ownership means."

"Yes, indeed," she replied; "but I don't think in our case he would ever have to experience such a shock as you suggest. I love him too well."

"Yes," said I, "at present! But the other fellow, and the other woman, with your notions might have the experience. Should you condemn her?"

"How little," she said, without answering my question, "do we comprehend the full meaning of the words we use: until now, I certainly did not see these implications; but now I see that marriage means giving up one's self-ownership; it is a compact of mutual ownership, mutual slavery if you please, neither less nor more."

Thinking to learn something further of her real sentiments, and how far she understood the problem confronting her, I suggested:

"Suppose now, you should say to John [John Smith is his name]—'John, I can't consent to marry you, for I will not be bound; but I love you, and am willing that you shall come to live with me during the short time you remain here; and when you must return to Klondyke, both you and I will be free to live our separate lives as heretofore, and free to mate again or not, on your return, as may happen."

"That's about like 'The Woman Who Did'," she said; "but her's was too disastrous an experience to repeat. No! that would never do, for more reasons than one. Why John would despise me—altho he might accept my offer—for suggesting such a thing: he isn't far enough advanced in freedom's ways to see that a mere ceremony—a priest's blessing, or a magistrate's permission—does not make any difference in the purity of sex association. He would think me immodest, and a wanton! Moreover, my friend, you know how I make my living: I am a bookkeeper with a fair salary, employed in one of our leading establishments. Now a mere whisper of my living with a man, not my husband, would lead to the termination of my engagement at once; and as I am not made of the stuff martyrs are made of!—you see! If I were a washer-woman, or worked out by the day as a house cleaner, it would be different; but a store girl, or a bookkeeper, a dressmaker or a schoolmarm, a seamstress or a typewriter, or a house servant: to these respectability is the very breath of their nostrils; they must be very careful not to run against Mrs. Grundy."

"Further than that," I suggested; "living with a man is apt to entail consequences, which tho not undesirable in themselves, are inconvenient for bookkeepers to carry along with them to the counting house!"

"What is to be done then?" she asked. "Shall we women who have emancipated ourselves from the Church, and who repudiate as far as we can government and the State, bow down in the end to Mrs. Grundy, and follow her precepts; or otherwise live a life of unnatural celibacy and childlessness? Shall we go back to Philistinism, marry—suckle fools and chronicle small beer—and occupy our minds with gewgaws, the illustrated magazines, diamonds and elegant literature; while the most advanced (?) of us coquet with Theosophy, bookbinding, or transcendental geometry?"

* * *

No! a thousand times no! But after all, this is the problem which confronts a large number of women desirous of realizing in free association with the men of their choice, the blessedness of motherhood: shall we marry, or shall we—retaining our liberties—mate in freedom? Motherhood in freedom—and even mating, *if known*—means the reprobation and contumely of society—our neighbors,—and very often as a consequence, it means scarcity of bread. *The problem can only be solved by each for herself.* Do that which, all things considered, seems best, or which seems less likely to entail unpleasant consequences; always, however, bearing in mind the paramount desirability of freedom.

Complete freedom in any relation of life is not to be realized under existing conditions; and the conditions favoring and permitting any near approach to freedom can only come by growth—evolution. But this growth is going on everywhere and at all times; now in this direction, and then in that; not to an even extent thruout, nor with a steady and even movement, but in pulses—with backward as well as forward swing. Consider: facility of divorce is one of the signs of growth in the direction of free association. Very few people nowadays, who have thought at all on the subject, consider marriage so sacred as to be irrevocable. The free association, and even motherhood without marriage, by people of genius or great talent, is another evidence of growth; and helps to create and maintain an atmosphere or sentiment of tolerance of unconventional lives. And this tolerance even to the extent of approbation should be the attitude of Anarchists towards those who, either deliberately from regard of principle, or thru so-called weakness (which means more passion

than prudence) violate or disregard marriage conventions. Even the rejection of the priest's or "minister's" office in the marriage ceremony, and a resort instead to the magistrate or registrar, has its good effect; for it aids in beating down the idea that there is anything sacramental about marriage; and helps to place it in the same category with the other arrangements of life. It must be borne in mind that, there are many individuals who are Anarchists in spirit and in mental attitude, but they are not heroes; and indeed they are not so thoroly convinced of the propriety of running counter to current usages, as things now stand, as to lead them to court or endure martyrdom. They are content to make only a small advance, to drop the wedding ring for instance, to forego the show of bride's maids and best man, and the ostentations of the wedding gathering and feast, and instead,—after paying tribute to Cæsar by going before the squire—to go quietly to their new home or on a journey and say nothing about it.

Some of this kind of people will, when they marry, come to an understanding between themselves that the marriage is to be used merely as a screen, to shelter them from espionage and from the reprobation of society; and that, as between themselves, they are as before free. The economic side of life however demands consideration with the majority. People cannot be free of each other in marriage unless both are economically independent. After all, the first requisite to living a free life in any respect is the *conquest of bread.* It is the recognition of this fact which determines some—Kropotkin for instance,—to leave the sex question alone. That will settle itself, they say, when the earth and its fullness *is open to all men and women* to use as they need.

* * *

The story of "The Woman Who Did" is in point. Such a story! With its lofty sentiment, its childlike faith in the "right," its generous heroism, and fatal mistakes; resulting in the most pitiful and disastrous ending it were possible to imagine. A story containing much instruction, nevertheless, to revolutionists, *because* of its tragic ending. Wherefore the disasters? Because of disregard of the unities in life. That is to say because of an attempt to live simultaneously two antagonistic lives—a life of protest, and a life of conformity. Shall we expect to eat the fruits of conformity while refusing to conform?

Protestants—the breeders and forerunners of revolution; yea even "reformers" must be prepared to live like John the Baptist, who—as the story goes—preached in the wilderness, and was clothed in rough garb, and *lived on such food as the wilderness afforded.* How could a woman as sensible as Herminia was, suppose for a moment that she could escape the ostracism of her "set," when she spat upon their most holy fetish, and contemned their most cherished usage? How for a moment believe that her father—a canon of the Church—would recognize his daughter's right to teach by her life that *his* Church, *his* profession—the subject of *his* social activities, the fountain of *his* honor and the source of *his* income,—was a delusion and a snare; and that he himself played merely a puppet's part in the life of society—like a Roman Augur? How could the man of her choice—a barrister—whose very living depended upon the law and its operations, suppose for a moment that he would be upheld by his "set" in an attempt to dispense with the law in what is considered a fundamental relation of life? Had he taken his laundress' daughter for a mistress, no great harm to him or social reprobation would have followed—many men, barristers and judges and princes, nay I have known clergymen do that; but to take, in all seriousness, *a lady*, a high dignitary's daughter to wife, without being married!

Observe the disregard of economic precautions in the case—precautions doubly necessary, considering that they twain had seriously disorganized society and made it to that extent their enemy. With Herminia's independent and generous spirit, one cannot imagine her soliciting her lover to secure to their child and herself his little property, by will. The contemplation of his death itself would be painful, and it was not likely to happen. So thinks youth and love! But a man of the world, and a lawyer, knowing the uncertainty of life and the needs of a widowed mother, should have done this at once of his own motion. A *wife*, or her friends would have insisted on this precaution against life's vicissitudes. With his property behind her Hermina and her child would have been in very different case after his death.

But the great, the fundamental error in the life of this pair was this: they intended, and expected to remain in the same "station in life to which God had called them," or in which we find them at the beginning of the story,—she *a lady*, he a professional man, a gentleman; with neither of them anything in common with the great body of their fellows. They—especially she—wished to "reform" society in respect of one thing—not to revolutionize it. They evidently did not assimilate with the people, nor intend to help them in the struggle against poverty and contempt. Worse and worse, when the time was ripe for her child to be "educated," she is consigned to a fashionable boarding school: a place where conventioual thoughts and behavior is the breath of the nostrils to both teachers and pupils, where "good form" is considered of far greater importance than good intention or effectual doing; where to be a bastard is to be shunned and her mother called by opprobrious names. How could Herminia do this, and expect her daughter to grow up into an apostle of freedom, or to become the liberator of her sex?

GEO. PYBURN.

—— o ——

Literature.

IOLÄUS: AN ANTHOLOGY OF FRIENDSHIP. Edited by Edward Carpenter. Chas E. Goodspeed, 5a Park St., Boston, Mass. Crown 8vo, $1.75.

Ioläus, beloved of Hercules, was elevated by the Greeks into a divinity, before whom were sworn the vows of friendship that play so conspicuous a part in the literature of the ancients. Therein lies the significance of the title chosen by Carpenter for his "Anthology of Friendship," a collection of extracts from various writers, ancient and modern, arranged in "a kind of rough chronological and evolutionary order, from those dealing with primitive races onwards," from pagan, Greek and Roman times, thru the early Christian and Medieval era, to the Renaissance and the present day. The volume in a way companions Carpenter's essay on "Homogenic Love," published about a decade ago, and furnishes a key to the thought involved in the earlier work.

Truly, as Carpenter remarks, "the degree to which Friendship, in the early history of the world, has been recognized as an institution, and the dignity ascribed to it, are things hardly realized today." In a consideration of that long line of famous heroic Friendships which arose with Achilles and Patroclus, and died with the Sacred Band of Theban lovers, the student recognizes a peculiar quality of comradelove differentiating the ancient institution from such as Whitman celebrates in "Leaves of Grass." The confusion of mind into which one may fall in a study of comradeships past and present throws singular difficulties in the way of discussion of the subject. It is true that to the ancients the passion implied much of what we would term grossness; tho no doubt it then existed on purely spiritual planes, as it certainly has in later times. Yet, in the present day, the very intensity of its manifestations laid "In Memoriam" open to misapprehension, and the author must indeed have shrunk with pain from "those shameful letters of abuse that he received about it."

The asceticism of the early Christian Church, which set out deliberately to exterminate the licentiousness into which Greek love had degenerated, undoubtedly had much to do with raising Friendship to a higher plane, and, with the elevation of woman to greater dignity and freedom, to establish it in some sort between the sexes.

Ioläus thruout deals with the Friendship of men, and marks the growth of that craving of the human soul for love and for loving which is differentiated from sex-love, and to the healthy development of which Whitman looks "for the counterbalance and offset of our materialistic and vulgar American Democracy, and for the spiritualization thereof."

With its wide margins and rubrics, the book fitly enshrines the delightful extracts culled from Plato, Plutarch, Ovid, St. Augustine, Montaigne, Byron, Shelley, Whitman, and the scores of other bards and seers who contribute to a unique and interesting work.

H. T.

—— o ——

LETTER-BOX.

H. C., Brooklyn, N. Y.—The paper is mailed regularly every week, and if you fail to receive it you ought to remonstrate at your postoffice. Or you may drop us a postal card and we will gladly send the missing numbers.

Mrs. L. M., Swanton, O.—Subscription received. Your apology for being four weeks in arrears almost tempted us to publish your letter. If a woman 85 years of age, who "makes her own living," can afford to pay for FREE SOCIETY and mail every copy to some of her conservative friends, it is certainly worthy of emulation for some of our younger comrades. Greetings.

—— o ——

No millions of dollars, no millions of soldiers, no institutions, nor wars, nor revolutions can achieve what can be achieved by the simple expression by a free man of what he considers right.—Leo Tolstoy.

AGENTS FOR FREE SOCIETY.

The following named persons will receive and receipt for subscriptions fo FREE SOCIETY.

ALLEGHENY Pa.—H. Bauer 73 Springgarden Ave.
ATLANTIC CITY, N. J.—M. Kisluck, 1108 Baltic Ave.
BOSTON—K. A. Snellenberg, 54 Haskins St., Roxbury.
CHICAGO—T. Appel, 1228 Milwaukee Av.
CLEVELAND—E. Schilling, 4 Elwell St.
COLUMBUS, Ohio—H. M. Lyndall, 416 E. Mound St.
LONDON, Eng.—T. Cantwell, 127 Ossulton St., N. W.
NEW YORK—S. Rubin, 180 Forsyth St.
PHILADELPHIA—Natasha Notkin, 242 N. Second St.
SAN FRANCISCO—R. Rieger, 322 Larkin St.

RECEIPTS.

Walter, Pyburn, Lopatiner (sale), S. S. Club of Philadelphia, Cohn, each $2. Ames, Baginsky, Coletti, Pool, Landeck, Schuman, Gould, Tropp, Favereau, Lass, Nichols, Deo Jay, Lelivre, Devaux, Task, Hillis, each $1. Fleiner, Rosensweet, Lavroff, Silberman, Jaffe, Jacobson, Bortman, Drill, Hurwich, each 50c. Bloch, Parmet, Epstein, each 25c.

BOOK LIST.

ALL ORDERS FOR THE FOLLOWING BOOKS RECEIVED AT THIS OFFICE.

Essays on the Social Problem	H. Addis	05
The New Hedonism	Grant Allen	05
Plain Words on the Woman Question	"	05
God and the State	Bakunin	05
The Same. (London edition.)		10
Whitman's Ideal Democracy and Other Writings	Helena Born	1.00
Prodigal Daughter or, The Price of Virtue	Rachel Campbell	25
The Worm Turns	V. de Cleyre	10
The Emancipation of Society from Government	Dallan Doyle	05
Hilda's Home. Cloth $1	Rosa Graul	50
Moribund Society and Anarchy. Cloth 60c	Jean Grave	25
A Physician in the House	Dr. J. H. Greer	2.75
Motherhood in Freedom	"	05
Government Analyzed	Kelso	50
Anarchy on Trial		05
Anarchism and Outrage		03
Roosevelt, Czolgosz, Anarchism, and Communism		03
Anarchism: Its Philosophy and Ideal	Peter Kropotkin	05
Anarchist Communism: Its Basis and Principles	"	05
An Appeal to the Young	"	05
Anarchist Morality	"	05
Field, Factory and Workshop	"	45
Law and Authority	"	05
Memoirs of a Revolutionist	"	2.00
Organized Vengeance	"	03
Paris Commune	"	05
The State: Its Historic Role	"	10
The Wage System. Revolutionary Government	"	05
Social Democracy in Germany	Gustave Landauer	02
History of the Commune. Cloth	Lissagaray	75
Wind-Harp Songs	J. Wm. Lloyd	1.00
The Economics of Anarchy	Dyer D. Lum	25
Anarchy. (Is It All a Dream?	James F. Morton, Jr.) "	10
A Talk about Anarchist Communism between two Workers		05
A Chambermaid's Diary	Octave Mirbeau	50
Responsibility and Solidarity in the Labor Struggle	M. Nettlau	05
God and Government: The Siamese Twins of Superstition	W. Nevill	05
The Pyramid of Tyranny	F. Domela Nieuwenhuis	05
Pages of Socialist History	W. Tcherkesoff	30
The Slavery of Our Times. Cloth.	Leo Tolstoy	75
Mating or Marrying, Which?	W. H. Van Ornum	05
Evolution and Revolution	Reclus	05
Direct Action vs. Direct Legislation	J. Blair Smith	05
Perfect Motherhood. Cloth	Lois Waisbrooker	1.00
The Temperance Folly	"	10
Wherefore Investigating Co	"	25
Our Worship of Primitive Social Guesses	E. C. Walker	15
Revival of Puritanism	"	10
Vice: Its Friends and Foes	"	15
What the Young Need to Know	"	15
The Ballad of Reading Gaol	Oscar Wilde	10
Life Without a Master. 336 pp. Cloth $1.50	J. Wilson	1.00
The New Dispensation. Cloth.	"	1.50
The Coming Woman	Lillie White	05
The Chicago Martyrs: The Famous Speeches of the Eight Anarchists in Judge Gary's Court; and Altgeld's Reasons for Pardoning Fielden Neebe and Schwab		25