



A PERIODICAL OF ANARCHIST THOUGHT, WORK, AND LITERATURE.

VOL. X. NO. 12.

CHICAGO, SUNDAY, MARCH 22, 1903.

WHOLE NO. 406.

The Earth for All.

Thus saith the Lord: You weary me
With prayers, and waste your own short years!
Eternal Truth you cannot see
Who weep and shed your sigh in tears.

In vain you wait and watch the skies;
No better fortune thus will fall:
Up from your knees, I bid you rise,
And claim the earth for all.

They ate up Earth, and promised you
The Heaven of an empty shell.
'Twas theirs to say; 'twas yours to do,
On pains of everlasting Hell.

They rob and leave you helplessly
For help of Heaven to cry and call:
Heaven did not make your misery;
The Earth will give you all.

Behold in bonds your Mother Earth;
The rich man's prostitute and slave.
Your Mother Earth, that gave you birth,
—You only own her for a grave.

And will you die like Slaves, and see
Your Mother Earth a fettered thrall?
Nay, live like Men, and set her free
As Heritage for all.

—Gerald Massey.

Authority.

What is universal suffrage if not the right of the governed to choose their master, the right of choosing the rod to be whipped with? The voter is sovereign—so far as to be able to choose his master! But he has not the right to dispense with him; for the one that his neighbor will have chosen will be his. From the moment he deposits his ballot in the box he has signed his abdication; he has no more to do but bend to the caprices of the masters of his choice; they will make the laws, will apply them to him, and throw him into prison if he resist.

We do not wish to institute a trial of universal suffrage at this point, nor to examine all correctives, all the improvements that different people have wished to bring to bear upon it, to obviate the caprices of the elected and secure the sovereignty of the voter by giving him the means of forcing the former to keep his promises. It would lead us too far, and is, besides, of no importance to us, since we wish to prove that there ought not to be a majority-law any more than a divine right, and that the individual ought not to be subjected to any other rule than that of his own will. And, moreover, in analyzing the operation of universal suffrage we shall come to the proof that it is not even the majority that governs, but a very small minority, issuing from a second minority, which is

itself but a minority chosen from among the governed masses. That women and children, who submit equally to the laws, should be excluded from the right of sharing in the vote, is purely arbitrary. If we deduct further those who for one reason or another do not make use of this "right," we find ourselves in the presence of a first minority, recognized most arbitrarily as the only ones fit to choose masters for all. In the second place, it is theoretically the majority which on election day decides who is elected out of this original circumscription; but practically the choice of the voters is divided among six, eight, ten, and often more candidates, not counting those who, not finding their opinions represented among the crowd of candidates, vote contrary to their ideas. The successful candidate is, therefore, once more but the product of a second minority. In the third place, those elected being once assembled, it is again the majority which, theoretically always, is supposed to decide among them; but here again opinions being divided into groups and sub-groups innumerable, it follows in practice that small cliques of ambitious persons, standing between the extreme parties, decide the vote by lending their voices to those that offer them the most for it. From the little just said it is apparent that the pretended sovereignty of the voter comes down to a very small affair; but it must be observed that in order not to befog the reader we have simplified our criticism, and supposed that every voter acted logically and conscientiously. But if we include in the account all the intrigues, jobbing, ambitious calculations; if we take note that before being ratified the laws must come before another assembly, the senate, which in turn is elected by another category of voters; if we take into account that the legislative power is composed of five hundred and some odd deputies, and that each voter casts his ballot for only one, and that consequently his will goes for less than one five-hundredth of the general will, still further reduced by the veto of the senate, we shall end by perceiving that individual sovereignty enters in so infinitesimal a quantity into the national sovereignty that at last we do not find it at all.

Yet all this is still of minor importance. Universal suffrage has a still more disastrous effect, viz: that it gives birth to the reign of nonentities and mediocrities, as we shall

prove. Every new idea in advance of its epoch is, by the very fact of such advance, always in the minority at the start. Very few and far between are the minds open enough to adopt and defend it. This is an acknowledged truth, and the conclusion is that people with truly broad and intelligent ideas are always in the minority. The bulk of the masses professes average current ideas; it is they who compose the majority; it is they who will choose the representative, who, in order to be elected, will take good care not to offend the prejudices of his constituents or to shock received opinions. On the contrary, in order to succeed in collecting as many people as possible under his banner, he must round off his sharp corners and select a stock of commonplaces to get off before those whose suffrages he covets. That he may not frighten them, he must outdo them in stupidity. The more flat, mediocre, and insipid he is, the more chance he has of being elected.

If the workings of all manner of groups be thoroly examined,—committees, representative congresses, associations for mutual help, societies of artists, litterateurs, etc.,—will always see the offices in these hierarchic organizations, elected by universal suffrage, held by persons who, setting aside their ambitious desire of showing themselves off, getting themselves talked about, or creating a situation at the expense of their colleagues, and a certain capacity for intrigue, are the most mediocre of the lot. For no original mind that occupies itself solely with the realization of its ideal, can do otherwise than clash with all those—and they are legion—who follow the laws of holy routine. Everybody cries out, "Look at the jackass!" He who seeks the truth and would make it prevail, has no time to stoop to the shabby wire-pulling behind the scenes. He will surely be beaten in the electoral lists by him who, having no original ideas, accepting those received by the greater number, will have less trouble in insinuating his projecting angles (which he has not) in a manner to offend no one. The more one wishes to please people the more the average line of ideas adopted must be disembarassed of new and original conceptions, and consequently the aforesaid line will be found trite, tame, and mediocre. This is all there is of universal suffrage,—a sonorous ass' skin, giving

out nothing but noise under the blows of those who wish to make it speak!

But the authority is discussed, jeered at, lashed, it is, unfortunately, far from having disappeared from our customs. People are so used to being led by a string that they would imagine themselves lost the moment there was no longer anybody to keep them tied. They are so accustomed to seeing the gendarme's cap, the belted paunch of the mayor, the meddling and official insolence of the bureaucracy, the sorry-looking countenances of judge and policeman, appear in their lives at every turn, that they have reached the point of becoming accustomed to these filthy promiscuities, considering them as things which are certainly disagreeable, on which, when occasions offers, they never miss playing a dirty trick with satisfaction, but which they cannot imagine disappearing without humanity's being dislocated at once! Strange contradiction of the human mind! Men submit to this authority with reluctance, they scoff at it, violate it when they can, and believe themselves lost when anyone talks of doing away with it. A matter of habit, it seems!

But this prejudice is so much more illogical, if we may use the term, so much more stupid, when the ideal of each individual in regard to "good" government, is to have one which he would have the chance to cashier the moment it tried to prevent him from acting as he pleased. It was to flatter this ideal that the *bourgeoisie* invented universal suffrage.

If the republic has enjoyed so much credit among the workers; after so many deceptions, universal suffrage is still considered by the government as a means of enfranchisement, it is because they have been made to believe that by changing the men in power they could change the system of exploitation which oppresses us into a system from which welfare and felicity for all would result. Profound error, which allows the intriguing to lead the workers astray, in pursuit of illusory reforms, incapable of bringing about any change in their situation, and accustoming them to expect everything from a change of personnel in this machine for oppression called the State; an error which, in every revolution, has permitted schemers to juggle away popular victories, to install themselves in the sinecures of those who have been swept away by the revolutionary tempest, and to form a new caste of exploiters by creating around them new interests, which, once established, have succeeded in imposing their authority, reducing to silence those who had had the naivete to carry them to the pinnacle of power!

What an abyss of contradictions is the human mind! If one discusses with individuals even slightly intelligent, they will readily agree that if all men were reasonable there would be no need of government. They themselves could get along easily without it. But unfortunately all men are not reasonable; some would abuse their strength to oppress others, to live at others' expense and do nothing. To guard against these inconveniences

some authority is necessary "to keep them straight." Which in concrete terms comes to saying that, taken in a lump, people are too bad to come to an understanding among themselves, but that, taken individually or in factions, they know how to govern others, and that we must make haste to put the power in their hands, in order that they may enforce their will upon all. O happy logic! How human reasoning doth trip thee up!

So long as there are persons to give commands, will they not necessarily be in antagonism with those they command? Will not those in power, if they be sincere, have ideas of their own to further? And these ideas, tho they may be good, may also be very bad. Drowned in the mass, they will remain without power; with authority in the hands of those who profess them, they will be thrust upon those who reject them. And the more sincere the individuals in power the more pitiless would they be against those who should revolt against their way of seeing things, being convinced that they were working for the good of humanity.

In the preceding chapter we saw that our political slavery is determined by our economic situation. We have soldiers, judges, ministers, etc., because we have bankers and proprietors; the one entails the other. If we succeed in overthrowing those who exploit us in the workshop, if we succeed in ridding ourselves of those who have got us by the entrails, there will no longer be any need of the force which protects them; it will have no more reason for existence. In fact there is a necessity for government, for laws, for deputies to make these laws and a magistracy to apply them, for a police-force to maintain the decisions of the magistracy, because those who possess need some force to defend what they have seized against the claims of those they have dispossessed.

But the worker—what has he to defend? What matters to him all this governmental paraphernalia, the expense from profit therefrom, and which is there solely to teach him that he has no rights save that of starving in the midst of the abundance he has created? In the sombre days of revolt, when misery grown more intense urges the workers into street *en masse*, it is again these "social" institutions which stand before them and bar their route to the future. We must, therefore, destroy them, and take good care to reconstitute no new aristocracy, which could have but one purpose: to enjoy the most and the quickest at the expense of its *protégés*. What matters the choice of the hand that strikes you? It is not to be struck at all, that one should aim at! Let us not forget that whatever the name in which the new authority clothes itself, however benign it may seek to appear, whatever be the amendments it proposes, whatever be the mode of recruiting its personnel, we shall none the less have to encounter the following dilemma: Either its decisions will have the force of law and be obligatory upon all, in which case all our existing institutions will be needed to apply them and enforce respect for them,—

hence renunciation of liberty,—or people will remain free to discuss governmental decisions, conform to them if they please, or send authority hunting a job if it annoys them,—in which case liberty remains intact, but the government is useless tho remaining a fetter and a menace!

Conclusion: No Government.—Jean Grare, in "Moribund Society."

Strikes.

It has been a long time since we began to hear about the conflict between "capital and labor." To be exact, "capital" is lifeless and "labor" does not fight. It is the capitalist and the laborers who are sparing. The former is very much alive, and I hope the drudge will fight before many years of constant toil, hunger and privation are worried thru.

If we could quit our high-sounding talk of capital, taxation, values and profits, and squarely face the ugly fact that the men of means are *masters*, and the companion fact that the paid and the penniless men, women and children are *slaves*, possibly we might "get a move on us" with some prospect of "getting our dues."

Compare our ways of living with the mode of life of the chattel slaves. The similarities are startling. The dwellings of masters and slaves are as easily "spotted." The chattels copied the dress, the speech, the religion even, of their masters. *So do we!* And as much of their "education," and style in housekeeping as our wages will carry. Then we have castes among us, too, born of our differing occupations and wages. Isn't it funny—and distressing?

But in some respects we are quite unlike our predecessors. We glory in the wars of the masters and furnish the corpses for them, and sad, tho it is, we kill one another off when we become bothersome to our bosses with our "labor troubles."

Labor unions exist for the simple purpose of asking or demanding the masters for better treatment of the slaves in particular branches of business. Do the members see their "unions" in that light? The petition for "less work and better pay" would not look so nicely if worded thus: Master, you work us too hard for our bodies to thrive, do "let up" a little. Our clothing is scanty; our food scarce; we are "short" of wood and coal. We need an increase of wages to keep us from suffering. It will degrade us to accept, in "charity," donations from you which we have not worked for!

In labor parades if instead of "get off our backs" a banner should float, "we will throw you from our backs," it would show you that the laborers at least understood that the riders will not dismount voluntarily.

So long as we have riders, depend upon it they will not spare the whip nor spur.

Strikes are *uprisings of slaves*. Strikes must be, for the most part, *failures* so long as their aims are to obtain less galling conditions only. Absolute personal freedom should be the goal. Free men and women will not beg nor balk for better conditions. They will *make* conditions.

When we know that our present condition is, in spite of "ifs" and "ands" and paper

and oral declarations, unquestionably one of slavery, the realization will do much to unite us. It will cause us to see the absurdity of respecting the ownership claimed by a few people to the land and the productions of labor. It will make a *general strike* not only possible but *successful*.

The failures of partial strikes, and the blacklisting of the participants, cause much hardship when there had sometimes been comparative comfort. In a general strike for expropriation and possession instead of for higher wages, supplies will be taken and success *must follow*. Empty stomachs will "knock out" a strike every time.

VIROQUA DANIELS.

Hypocrisy and the Labor Movement.

It has long been a hobby of mine that one of the greatest, if not the greatest, curse of the labor movement (trade union) is the hypocrisy of the leaders; and the latest pronouncement of "Sam" Gompers strengthens my opinion in this respect. It may well be that many readers of *FREE SOCIETY* do not take this gentleman at all seriously, but the fact that he is the president of the American Federation of Labor, a body representing something over a million workers, makes it necessary to pay a certain amount of attention to his utterances—not opinions—from time to time. That Gompers' claims to represent labor is not so important as the fact that a great many people *believe* he really does represent it. As editor of the *Federationist*, the official organ of the American Federation of Labor, he is never at a loss for an audience, as any reader can testify. Then, too, with the standing that he has as president he has a golden opportunity—and he takes full advantage of it—for making himself heard at other people's expense. The expenses of the *Federationist* are supplied by the organization, and as "Sam" is not a modest man, the bulk of the reading matter of this journal, barring the reports, are the utterances of Sam Gompers pure and simple, and yet they are accepted as the opinion of labor. Under these and like circumstances it is unwise to ignore the diatribes of these so-called leaders of labor. And as it has not yet appeared in *FREE SOCIETY* the following extract from the annual report of the president (Gompers) at the convention of the American Federation of Labor at New Orleans in December last, may be of interest to those who stand outside the trade union movement. I quote from the January *Federationist*:

Our present immigration laws are unsatisfactory. We need every honest and efficient immigrant fitted to become an American citizen, every immigrant who comes here to stay, who brings here a strong body, a stout heart, a good head, and a resolute purpose to do his duty well in every way and to bring up his children as law-abiding and God-fearing members of the community. But there should be a comprehensive law enacted with the object of working a three-fold improvement over our present system. First, we should aim to exclude absolutely not only all persons who are known to be believers in Anarchistic principles or members of Anarchistic societies, but also all persons who are of a low moral tendency or of unsavory reputation. This means that we should require a more thoro system of inspection abroad and a more rigid system of examination at our immigration ports, the former being especially necessary.

Personalities are not argument, and were Gompers the only sinner in this respect, we

could afford to let it pass. Unfortunately he is but one among many, and in the interest of purity and decency in the ranks of labor it is necessary to pillory such moral frauds as the gentleman referred to above. When I assert, without fear of contradiction, that at least ten thousand men and women in America know that not only did Gompers lie when he professed to believe the statements expressed above, but that *he knew he did* when he uttered them, my remarks cannot be construed as enunendo.

That Gompers is alien born himself, an English Jew who came to this country at four years of age, entered a factory at ten, worked for some years at the cigar trade, then became a labor leader (?) and has lived and educated himself at the expense of the workers of this country for the last twenty-two years, is common knowledge to those who are at all familiar with the labor movement of the last fifteen or twenty years. That he and P. J. Maguire were hangers-on and intimately associated with Justus Schwab (poor Just! forgive me for putting you in such company) and other Anarchists in the stormy days of the eighties, is also fairly well known. That Gompers has spoken from the same platforms as Anarchists; that he sat side by side with Aug. McCraith for two years when McCraith was secretary of the A. F. of L.; that McCraith contributed Anarchistic articles to the *Federationist* under the editorship of Gompers; that he took the chair at a lecture given by John Turner in 1896 at Indianapolis, and invited him to contribute to the *Federationist*—which he did—and finally gave him a letter of introduction to the trade unionists of the country is far from being a secret. These and countless other instances of his association with Anarchists make his hypocrisy all the greater and more inexcusable. Add to this his remarks about "persons who are of a low moral tendency or of unsavory reputations" and his advice to the delegates at the convention becomes simply ludicrous.

FREE SOCIETY has better work to do than washing the dirty linen of Sam Gompers in its pages, so to those interested in Sam's moral tendency and (un)savory reputation: I simply advise them to consult any man who is at all prominent in the labor movement in any city that Sam has ever visited and he will simply stand aghast at the cheek of this mental prostitute who dares to advocate in the name of labor—"the exclusion of people who believe in Anarchistic principles—but also persons who are of a low moral tendency or of unsavory reputation."

The case of Douglas Wilson, mentioned in *FREE SOCIETY* lately, is another case of moral degeneration. Is it possible to believe that this man was a member of the Alabama legislature some years ago, and after serving two years declined to stand again because of the rottenness of the life there, a man who has posed as a revolutionary Socialist for a number of years, I say is it possible to imagine that he believed what he wrote about Mark Hanna and his friendship for labor—*laugh!*

Or take a case familiar to us all, the case

of poor Berkmann. Who of us that remember the glorious fight of July 2-4 at Homestead in 1892, but must blush with shame at the cry of denunciation that went up when that poor boy grappled with the tyrant Frick and struck him down. And the sequel—what was it? Why years afterwards these self-same unions and individuals who denounced him admitted in their meetings and in private the only thing they had against Berkmann was that he made such a poor job of the affair and didn't kill Frick. This can be proven by scores of people, for they were made in open meetings. And today Berkmann lies in prison after eleven years, deserted by the Iron and Steel Workers Union for whose cause he is suffering. How sad, how unutterably sad it all is! It is sad because many of the men who denounced Berkmann were honest men who really believed they were doing the cause of labor a service in acting so hypocritically. A labor leader who was a reporter once told me how he led a crowd of union men in an attack on some scabs, how they cleared out the place, and he returned to the office of the paper and wrote an article denouncing the act and stigmatising it as cowardly, etc., etc., and he defended his action on the ground of expediency and a desire to gain public sympathy. Such instances could be multiplied over and over again, but these are sufficient for the present. It is enough to show that Anarchists have a double task to perform in joining the labor movement. To stamp out hypocrisy which is the worm that is eating the heart out of the labor movement, it is necessary to denounce such imposters as Gompers, and point out to the honest men that to lie in order to get at the truth is the policy of Jesuits and is bound to fail.

M.

William Walstein Gordak.

Dear Comrade,—I send you for the columns of *FREE SOCIETY*, a poem on the death of our comrade, W. W. Gordak, of North Scituate, Mass. I suppose, of course, that you knew of him? He was with Tucker's "plumblers" most of the time, and used to contribute a good deal to *Liberty*, but of late years he has confessed to me a growing yearning and tendency toward Free Communism. A poet indeed, and a dear and delightful fellow.

"Died," Feb. 24th 1903.

My friend has gone—my poet friend,
A voice of music, sweet and free,
His brave pen nevenmore shall send
Its comrade-message here to me.

But poet work is deathless work,
And poet-life eternally
Enlarges in the human song
To sphere of cosmic memory.

Dear friend, I love and send you love
Vibrating thru the worlds afar;
For poet-life is brother-life,
My song shall find you where you are.

J. W. LLOYD.

It was the idea of the bourgeois to substitute the authority of the nation for that of Divine Right.—*Jean Grave*.

"There is a power a hundred times more powerful than that of bayonets: it is the power of ideas."

FREE SOCIETY

Formerly THE FIREBRAND.

Published Weekly by.....A. ISAAC.

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 order with the absence of all direct government of man by man as the political ideal, absolute individual liberty.—Century Dictionary.

CHICAGO, SUNDAY, MARCH 22, 1903.

406

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

Attention!

The entertainment and ball, given by the Progressive Club for the benefit of FREE SOCIETY, takes place March 28, 7:30 p. m., at Libuse Hall, 936 Twelfth St. Miss Fuers-tenberg will give a few Russian songs.

Tickets in advance, 15 cents; at the door, 25 cents.

— o —

Notes.

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

— o —

Outpost Echoes.

Wisdom is might.

The State is death.

Your thoughts are you.

Trust your noblest hopes.

Live, and inspire others to.

Art is the blossom of industry.

Government is the monopoly of murder.

Ridicule is the antidote of complacency.

Life is at times a greater martyrdom than death.

Authority is suiciding thru its own intoxication.

The religion of slaves is the worship of masters.

Be sure you are right, and then think it over again.

The worship of "God" is the adoration of unscrupulous might.

Liberty never inquires into the "moral character" of her supporters.

Rockefeller's stomach is all right again; so are his cruel, grasping hands.

The Hague Tribunal is another farce, showing how State promise is not performance.

The green fields and singing brooks of spring make the heart feel the sweetness of liberty.

Slaves beg for a little liberty, but men wait their hour, and then determinedly take their own.

Defeated a thousand times, humanity would rise again, and thru her eyes dim with suffering look to the future.

The injunction forbidding a strike on the Wabash has resulted in an abdication of manhood on the part of the strikers. Shame!

The desire for liberty is the desire to be; the longing for a state of existence in which to discover one's self, and let that self expand.

Only the fact that we are born and bred amongst things as they are, keeps us from immediately making them what they should be.

Respectability is only another name for obeisance paid to custom. To ask what is in good repute is not to ask what is worthy of our support.

In order to maintain itself, power occasionally finds it necessary to flatter its sycophants, who lick up the syrup of praise like greedy children.

Again it is reported that Leopold is coming to America. The sins of kings are lost sight of in the glare of their crowns. All will bow to Leopold.

There are French, English, and German stage versions of Tolstoy's "Resurrection," all popular; but how about the application of Tolstoy's ideas in life?

Archbishop Quigley is trying to exchange smiles with Socialism, but that maid has so often been deceived that the Catholic prelate will probably have slight success.

Anarchists must learn that in order to draw all men unto them it will first be necessary to ignore personal weaknesses among their fellows. No one is without faults and failings.

Rudard Kipling is again silent, waiting no doubt for some new slaughter, actual or prospective, to give him voice. The motto of this singer of death seems to be, "No murder, no poetry."

Anarchism is the assumption on the part of the individual of the right to manhood; and when the world sneers and laughs at the desire for complete liberty it is because it is satisfied to remain a timid youth.

That "Treasury Surplus" is to be tapped again in the interest of Wall street. Did anyone ever hear of a treasury surplus being tapped in the interest of the masses? Fancy the denizens of Slave street dipping into that stream of wealth!

Man is enslaved, and woman is enslaved to man. All the "unfaithfulness" which woman is capable of, and all the scandal growing out of her struggle for freedom, will only frighten those who do not understand chain breaking.

We have to fight our own reactionary spirit very often in this world. The comparison of ourselves with some smug respectable, if it occurs in an unguarded moment, may betray us into doubt of our propriety. But really, propriety is a doubtful luxury.

In a world where the many toil that the few may luxuriate, in a world where the mass of what is produced is handed over to

the non-producers, it is perfectly natural that there should be discontent, and quite as natural that revolt should come at last.

The situation in Holland promises much in the way of object lessons, both to power and to the people. The general strike would instruct both in the important science of society, and it is probable that the State would have the longest lesson to learn in the end.

Today the cry should no longer be "the world for the proletariat," but "the world for the people." The supporters of liberty are found not in one class alone, but in all classes; and over the fall of the State all men who love freedom will join hands and rejoice.

All hail! The initiative and referendum are bringing their promised blessings to the peoples. The capitalists desired a tariff in Switzerland; a referendum vote of the Swiss gave them their heart's desire. Thus we progress, by passing laws to make bread dearer.

There is a reciprocity treaty likely to become a fact between Cuba and the United States, altho there is great opposition to it on the part of trust magnates and others. But if the Cubans knew the ill concealed appetite with which this government regards their land, "reciprocity" would not interest them.

Art and industry must go together, or else man retrogrades in intellect and capacity. Machines which substitute levers and wheels for brain work and handicrafts-man-ship may be wonderful pieces of construction, but the hand of man producing at once beauty and utility is ten thousand times more interesting and valuable.

A Finnish judge was hissed and stoned because he agreed to support the power of Russia, and after that, a placard was affixed to his house calling attention to his faithlessness. If an American judge acts infamously we hardly dare criticise his conduct, and at most we try to prevent his reappointment to office.

AMERICUS.

— o —

By the Wayside.

When Socialist representatives are forced to read party papers which they hate, it may perhaps dawn upon the brains of some deluded followers of the party that the liberty of a State Socialist society is on a par with the liberty the heretics enjoyed in the Middle Ages.

"First boycott the ballot, toilers and comrades. . . . The ballot divides you and corrupts your leaders," warns *The People's Press* of Chicago. Some people will be astonished to see such an utterance in a Socialist paper; but the miracle is explained when we learn that the paper is not controlled by the party, and thus can afford to speak the truth.

The *Social Democratic Herald* has made the "startling discovery" that "Socialism is coming as a natural successor to capitalism, if the people are smart enough not to interfere with the social evolution." One would think that such logic of "dialectical reasoning" should arouse the suspicion of

the sheep and geese in the party that there was something rotten in the State of Denmark, but nothing of the kind occurs. The voters accept everything that the Socialist church offers as piously as the most devoted Catholic.

INTERLOPER.

— o —
"It is a Delight to Live."

Under the above caption Comrade Nieuwenhuis gives an interesting elucidation in the *Vrije Socialist* anent the recent general strike in Holland, from which we take the following:

"For some time the Anarchists have advocated the idea of a general strike. From different sides, even the Socialists, we were told: 'Utopia! Anarchistic madness!' But this 'Anarchistic madness' gained such an extension that it makes the bourgeoisie shiver.

"Not so long ago Liebknecht voiced the utterance that the time of strikes was a thing of the past—an antiquated means. That made us smile, for every day strikes were reported here and there and everywhere, and we thought: 'Well, he is well posted! the old man is talking silly.' But thus it is: everything that is said in Germany the party repeats parrot-like in all countries, and so also in Holland. Social Democracy looks with envious eyes upon strikes. Only recently in *Het Volk* it was said that one should continually combat the idea of striking! And what do we see today? The *Het Volk* is in sympathy with the strike, emphasizing that the lion has shown its fangs, and calls the prudent and impressive attitude of the strikers an encouraging deed.

"Whether they want to or not, they are dragged along, if they do not want to lose their influence over the workers altogether. The movement is outgrowing them, and so they hail a general strike, which only recently was but an Anarchistic folly.

"Oh, what Tom-fools! They think they are pushing things while they are pushed themselves!

"We know very well that so far it has only been preliminary skirmishes; but the workers are learning to manage this weapon and will profit by it in the future. And should it ever come about that the troops will also go on strike (just wait, we will see such things yet!), then the power of the bourgeoisie is doomed—a power which is not founded on reason, but on brutal violence.

"The workers have a right to strike, this even the employers concede; but it is urged that the government should also protect the right to work.

"Is this a fair comparison? Not at all. Why do the workers strike? Because they are encroached upon their freedom to work under conditions they are making themselves.

"Scabs are rejected in all callings of society, and when the workers desire to apply the same principle, then comes the government in the name of freedom and bids a halt for the sake of those who are 'willing to work.' If free competition is to be preserved, well and good; but then let it also be applied in other ranks of society.

"We have officials who receive \$5,000

salary. Suppose that able men (do you think there are not plenty of them?) would offer themselves to fill the office for \$2,500; do you think the offer would be considered? Not much! All such "scabs" are promptly rejected. . . . Just try to recommend free competition to these officials and see what a howl they will raise.

"But when it concerns the workers the system of free competition is looked upon as perfectly natural and beneficial, and if it occurs to the wage-slaves to resist the encroachments of the scabs, then the very officials, who have their salaries protected by law, will issue injunctions in the name of freedom.

"Is this fair? Is this just?

"Therefore we proclaim to those gentlemen: Quit your silly talk; you, who have expropriated the means of production, have the least right to speak about the freedom of work. With such sophistry we will not be diverted from our path.

"But there is danger that the workers will be made to quarrel among themselves, and against this we have to be on our guard. The labor movement is too sacred to be misused by demagogues and politicians. For surely, interpellations in legislatures will again be made in order to exhibit their sympathy for labor by oratorical effusions; but the workers should not be decoyed by beautiful words and sounding phrases. Let them ask the Social Democrats, 'What would you do if you were in the ministry?' Remember that Millerand did not protest when the strikers in France were shot down, for violence must be maintained. . . .

"Learn from this the lesson, workers, that you are a power—yes, the power in society, and that it depends upon you to bring the whole mechanism of society to a standstill. Learn also that thru your boldness you are able to enthuse even those who now reluctantly participate in your struggle, and you must watch these or else you will be left in the lurch."

* * *

"The spirits awaken! It is a delight to live."

"These are the words Ulrich von Hutten exclaimed during the Reformation, which are equally applicable today. It is a delight to live indeed!

"Very often we are told: 'What do you gain by all your efforts? You are talking to the winds.' But ask the ruling classes, whether they also think so.

"No, not in vain have we sown for twenty-five years. It would have been folly to expect the seed to ripen immediately. It is with us as with every sower. A part fell by the wayside to be scattered by the winds or to be picked up by the birds. A part fell on stony ground where it could not take root. Again a part fell among the thistles where it was choked. But a part fell on good soil, came up and bore fruit, some ten, some twenty, and some hundredfold. And if one observes the seed growing up, and were it only twofold, so it awakens our courage again to work that we may gather fruit a hundredfold,—that finally the product of labor will go to the worker, to society."

— o —

"Marriage in our days? I would almost say that it is a rape by contract."

At the Chicago Philosophical Society.

As both Clarence Darrow and Elbert Hubbard had failed to arrive in Chicago, Dr. Fishkin was invited to lecture on "Tolstoy." According to the lecturer Tolstoy was a great literary genius, but his philosophy was nothing but an expression of pessimism, destruction, death, and annihilation. For a man who denounces all that exists in a well-regulated society: marriage, government, patriotism, comfort, etc., was simply a destructionist and not a reconstructionist. The reason for such pessimism the lecturer attributed to the misery and despotism prevailing in Russia, which had driven many a great Russian poet and writer to despair and suicide.

The critics did not coincide with Dr. Fishkin. It was pointed out that he had read Tolstoy thru the spectacles of one who has made up his mind that the prevailing conditions are essential to the progress of mankind. True, Tolstoy repudiates present institutions, which are based on falsehoods, tyranny, and violence; but a man who formulates an ideal, which, if realized, would abolish starvation and tyranny, such a man is not a pessimist. A pessimist abandons all hope for improvement in society. Tolstoy tears down a Church which preaches love and brotherhood in theory and glorifies tyranny and wholesale murder (war) in practice. He repudiates government because it is founded on fraud and upheld by violence, and it is the cause of extravagant riches for the few and misery and degradation for the many. He denounces patriotism because it engenders hatred and war. He repudiates marriage as a relic of barbarism, instituted for the enslavement of women. But he gives us an ideal—a society without tyranny, without starvation and misery, and a man who cherishes such an ideal is not a pessimist, but an idealist in the true sense of the word.

Sunday, March 22, Rev. Geo. J. Barney intends to prove to us that Mormonism is the Solution of the Social Problem.

— o —

My Experience.

Don't be a coward; enter the street car like a man, take a seat, pull out your FREE SOCIETY, read it and you will have a picnic. Your neighbor will come nearer to you, stealing a few lines, and if he speaks to you tell him it is the best educational paper you know of and too good to part with, but show him the address, and on parting soften your heart and make him a present of it; and another blockhead will get a rap.

ANDERSON.

— o —

In the twentieth century, war will be dead, the scaffold will be dead, hatred will be dead, the frontier will be dead: man will live!—Victor Hugo.

This is the history of governments,—one man does something to bind another. A man who cannot be acquainted with me, taxes me; looking from afar at me, ordains that a part of my labor shall go to this or that whimsical end, not as I, but as he happens to fancy. Behold the consequence. Of all debts, men are least willing to pay the taxes. What a satire is this on government! Everywhere they think they get their money's worth, except for these.—Emerson.

A Vindication of Anarchism.

IV (concluded.)

Thirty-three years ago, Lecky, to whom I refer as my principal authority for most facts cited in this portion of the argument, summed up what he conceived to be the principal differences between the feminine character and the masculine. Men are stronger than women, women more beautiful than men. Women lack fundamental originality. They are good, quick guessers, but not deliberate systematic reasoners. They surpass men in passive courage, but are inferior in active. Their emotions are of a finer kind, and they are more capable of devotion, consequently, on the whole, they are more virtuous. In the ethics of the intellect they are decidedly inferior. They are pious, but also superstitious and fanatical. That very high and rare virtue, the love of truth as such, they hardly even know by name; but they are passionately attached to what they call "the truth," that is the opinions they have chosen to adopt: they are partizan, dogmatic and intolerant. Every day is making it more evident that these differences depend on a mutable environment. The periodicity of a woman's life rendered it impossible for her to compete with man in an age of savage violence or mere bodily drudgery. Kept for perhaps fifty thousand years from the occupations which chiefly require muscular strength and active courage, it is no wonder if women have become inferior to men in both, and not at all clear that they need continue so in an age of machinery. From a very early period wives were selected by captors, purchasers, or suitors, for their beauty. Naturally, therefore, women came to be, or at least to be considered, "the fair sex." But in this, the human race is a notable exception. Among almost all animals the male far surpasses the female in beauty. When women are as free as peahens, there is no reason to doubt that sexual selection will improve the beauty of the man as much as it has improved that of the peacock. Excluded from these pursuits which require systematic induction, women, of course, ran behind men in the capacity for sustained and profound ratiocination. Compelled at first to protect their lives and later to obtain the means of living by persuasive arts, they came, just as naturally, to excel in quickness, tact and other accomplishments of a superficial kind. With the exception of chastity and philoprogenitiveness, which obviously is peculiar, those virtues said to be feminine are simply the virtues of slaves; while those reputed masculine are the kind cultivated by freedom. So far as the most serious charge here made against women can be sustained, it is evident that their influence on society, education, and therefore human progress, must be exceedingly pernicious. So far, therefore, as it can be explained by their training, and nothing else is needed to explain it, their subjection, which is the basis of their training, must be pronounced a very great evil. The effect, as usual, reacts on the cause. Women, until lately, have with great unanimity sustained the Church, because the Church had enslaved their minds, and the Church effected this by enslaving their persons. "No society," says Maine, "which preserves any tincture of Christian institutions is likely to restore to

married women the personal liberty conferred on them by the middle Roman law." Decline of superstition thus portended women's emancipation. "The modern authorization of civil marriages," says Lecky, "as well as the general diminution of the power of the Catholic priesthood over domestic life, have been among the most severe blows ecclesiastical influence has undergone." Thus in turn the emancipation of women has undermined ecclesiastical influence. It is within the recollection of many still living that a radical woman, like Frances Wright D'Arusmont, was once pointed at as "a female atheist," that is a monstrosity. But rational skepticism is now very little less common among women than among men. And if it be true, as it evidently is, that women are casting off superstition, then is the reign of superstition in greater danger than it ever was in before! The ill effect of the subjection of women upon social progress may, on this general review, seem rather slight, because in some degree it is universal. But if the difference between more in Turkey and less in Connecticut appear little to that remaining between the latter and none at all, it is yet sufficient to show that the revolution involved in woman's entire emancipation must be the most beneficial and momentous the world has ever witnessed. On the moral effects of recent change particularly, see Jacobi, "Woman's Suffrage."*

As usually happens in these investigations, the basis of the induction is, in fact, far larger than can conveniently be shown. For miscellaneous examples of the evils of "strong government" and the blessings of liberal institutions, I might refer to Macaulay's essays on "History"; Mitford's "Greece"; Hallam, "Machiavelli," Southey's "Colloquies," Mackintosh's "History of the Revolution," "Frederick the Great," "Earl Chatham," "William Pitt" (jr.), in the Encyclopedia Britannica; also, for the tyranny of a Red Republic to his "Barere." Any tolerably impartial history of the French Revolution and the first Empire, should show a candid reader how liberty stimulated, and partially restored tyranny depressed, the civilization of France. Abbott's, originally published in *Harper's Magazine*, tho popular and inaccurate, and very favorable to Napoleon, is sufficient for the purpose. The sixth book of Green's "History of the English People" is worth reading. Merivale's "History of the Romans", Chs. XXXI-XXXIV, XXXIX, XLI, XLIV, LXVII, LXVIII, illustrates strikingly the havoc immediately wrought by Caesarism. Horace Greeley's chapter on "Our Country," in his "American Conflict," gives an unique picture of progress induced by liberty. But a reader who supposes democracy to be really much better than monarchy, desires truth, and has time for extended study, will find the most severe tho hardly an unjust criticism on republican tyranny in Mitford's "Greece," met by equally powerful strictures on the monarchical and aristocratic governments of that typical country in Grote. Such pot and kettle business is very amusing to an Anarchist.

V

A reader not previously persuaded of the truth of Anarchism, will be apt to think what I have written so far has something the nature of an *ignoratio elenchi*. Such a reader can scarcely indeed deny that we have found abundant reason for desiring much greater freedom of the individual from regulation of law and government than anywhere actually exists. But he would hardly be a typical reader, of these times, if he were not disposed to answer: "It is admitted without all this, that 'the government is best which governs least.' Still, some government is clearly necessary to protect persons and property against violence." Into this citadel of tyranny I now propose, accordingly, to carry war. Without doubt the dread of violence is what makes most people think government necessary. If, then, I can show by the unanswerable logic of observation and experiment, that government does not protect us against violence but increases the danger of violence, I shall hope to enlist this reasonable fear upon the side of Anarchism!

That violence against which government has been supposed to afford protection, is either foreign or domestic. The latter is called Crime, the other Glory. It might be convenient to begin with inquiry into the causes and preventives of Crime. But for a general view of the whole subject, such as I have always here proposed introductorily, the reader can, if he pleases, consult rather Lombroso's *magnum opus*, "The Criminal," ("L'Uomo Delinquente," long since translated into English). This is the chief authority; but the substance of it may be found in two books, both of them also called "The Criminal," one by Havelock Ellis, the other by August Drahms. If he reads them, he will find Lombroso criticised from opposite points of view. For Ellis is, like Lombroso, directly a *criminalologist*, who studies the subject from a psychological standpoint, without any prepossession which can set him against Lombroso's method, perhaps with a bias in its favor, so that he substantially agrees with Lombroso; but Drahms, like the Rev. F. H. Wines, to whom reference will also be made, is a *penologist*, a man accustomed to study the criminal not at large, not as a physiological and psychological object of disinterested curiosity; but in jail, as a subject for penal restraint and philanthropic attempts at reformation. He is a devotee of a study which just before Lombroso wrote, was beginning to make scientific pretensions, and which Lombroso's work has done more than anything else to put in the position of a pseudo-science, founded upon radically false principles. He is a governmental official, whose occupation would be destroyed if the highly Anarchistic tendencies of Lombroso's philosophy had full sway. I do not, therefore, impugn, but on the contrary pay a tribute to his honesty, when I say that he simply *must* have had a very strong prejudice against Lombroso's method and conclusions. For, the extent to which he and Ellis, both preaching from Lombroso's book as on a text, will be found in harmony, is, under all the circumstances,

* What deserve to be considered bad features, such as abortion, are lightly touched by this writer, if at all. It is evident they belong to a period of transition. The infamous common law principle which binds a married woman to endure the demands of her legal master is necessarily evaded when she ceases to be a willing slave; but the only true or even practicable remedy is that she should be free.

surprising. One strongly supports what the other tries to minimize; but the end is that, except for a few special points, they arrive at one result, which is acceptance of Lombroso's doctrines. The conclusion that these doctrines are built on very solid foundations is inevitable. Then Herbert Spencer's "Principles of Sociology," Vol. II., gives a learned, elaborate, graphic, and entertaining picture of the practices which Lombroso shows to be founded on wrong principles.

To pursue the subject now into some detail—the first idea of the barbarian legislator in dealing with what we call crime, was always to terminate deadly feuds springing from the instinct of revenge.* Hence the well known pecuniary expiation for murder, which, it has been frequently and justly argued of late, was far from so weak and inadequate a remedy as it has been represented; for, assuming that a man was usually killed by one of his own rank, if at all, the *Wehrgild*, or compensatory fine, came to about all the slayer would be worth; in any case it was quite high enough to operate as an insurance fully covering the man's pecuniary value to his family; and his family got the money, instead of the lawyers as at present. These customs are found in all primitive countries. But we have already seen that an offense against the gods admitted no such rational *utu*. It must be punished with stripes or death according to its gravity. When, therefore, a more reasonable religion taught men to regard real crimes as no less offensive to Heaven than factitious, the unreasonable consequence was drawn that the former also required corporal or capital punishment. Besides, as usually happens in the cases of ignorant people, the more men thought the more they blundered. There is nothing so misleading as good logic applied to bad premises, and no receipt for having false premises like reasoning *a priori*, without reference to a large experience, such as primitive men cannot have, and modern dogmatism will not have. The simple philosophy of the early legislator reasoned that because men do not like pain, therefore the more cruelly a crime is punished the rarer, other things equal, it will be. Of the penalties prescribed upon this principle, a most revolting list may be found in Wines' "Punishment and Reformation," Chs. III-VI. It diverts all the reader's indignation from the crimes to the laws. On the result, all penologists since Beccaria published his "Crimes and Punishments," are agreed. *The cruelty of punishment and the prevalence of crime keep even pace with one*

* The suggestion that to discontinue legal punishment would be to resume the practice of revenge, ignores, like most arguments against Anarchy, the altered conditions of society in general. Deadly feud, as a remedy for crime, is bound up with the obsolete family and clan sentiments of barbarians. In spite of feudal law, it exists still wherever they are not obsolete, as in some parts of our southern States. Another phase of revenge, as a remedy for crime, I mean, of course, lynching, appears where the law promises to suppress crime and fails with unusual signalness to do it—in other words, the soil lynch law requires is that to which all ruffianly and half-savage characters resort. As the country becomes civilized, lynching ceases, not because the law has changed—it has not—but because the people have changed. Nowhere is the most barbarous lynching so prevalent now, as in those very States of our Union where the penal code is also most severe, and the police, a reminiscence of the old patrol, most vigilant.

another. This is a fact, which stands on its own bottom, independent of any explanation. But the explanation, to a great extent, is known. First, the two things are effects of one cause. He who really wants a murderer flayed alive, (not he who says he does in a moment of passion) is just the man whom fear, principle, and good luck, among them, barely keeps from being a murderer himself. A society in which murderers are flayed alive, is a society made up of such men. This is the conclusive argument against any serious proposal to revive cruel punishments. Modern humanity will not permit them, except locally and spasmodically, as, to the shame of England, has been done there—with the usual results.* Then, without doubt, cruel punishment is in a great measure a consequence of brutal crime—the hateful flogging statutes of England sprang from a panic about garroting. But thirdly, the sight of brutalities, their appearance in pictures and print, the very fact that they exist, is an incentive to them. A hanging for those who witness and approve of it, has all the pleasing excitement without the moralizing powers of a tragedy. It brings the most vicious of mankind together for a holiday, sure to be solemnized in the most vicious manner; it invests an abject wretch with the interest higher spectacles bestow on a Macbeth; it makes him a hero,† whose notoriety and short but merry life every young blood gets to thinking worth his fate; it familiarizes with the temptations, the means, the opportunities, the graduates of crime; and if it did not increase crime, human nature would not be what it is.

And now the reader must prepare for a very startling proposition, which I should not expect him to believe but that the testimony is of so unexceptionable a character. If penologists are unanimous, as they are, in declaring with vehemence that cruel punishment of criminals decidedly increases crime, they are equally agreed, tho much more quiet, in their mournful confession that *humane discipline of criminals* (their own hobby and specialty, remember) *works but very little better*. They do their best, of course, to make it seem hopeful to themselves and others. They have plenty of schemes—indeterminate sentences, life-long imprisonment of habitual offenders, reformatories at Elmira and elsewhere, from which great things are, or rather have been, expected; but the general result, which they

* The English testimony has become clear and strong that the whipping-post is the gate to the gallows. The once boasted decrease of English crime is due improvements in the patrol and the ticket of leave system. What the flogging laws furnish is a grave upset, viz., the increasingly dangerous and ferocious nature of the crime. This is observed in Ellis' book.

† An almost incredible picture of the criminal's popularity among the class most likely to become criminals is given by Ellis, Ch. VII. Nothing, the reader who will refer to this authority may observe, makes the criminal such an idol as hanging him. And why not? If we search our hearts, we shall probably find there our own ideal of the great criminal as a sort of *dæmon*; wicked, no doubt, but combining the thews of Ajax with the wiles of Odysseus! Only the criminologist, and to a less extent the penologist, knows that the criminal's muscles (if he has them) are delusive, and his cunning also; that he never has a fine constitution, that, to be short, he is an inferior specimen of humanity, weak in both body and mind.

honorably avoid concealing, is, on the whole, disappointment. Here and there, one desperately suggests a return to cruelty, which the rest condemn as having had its trial and failure. They evidently all lean very unwillingly, to the final results that only an exceedingly small class of criminals are reformatable; that killing the other kind makes them grow like hydra's heads; that all measures less severe than killing which have hitherto been devised, do less mischief than killing only because they are less severe. Wines habitually sums up the experience of the past as follows: "Intimidation was first proposed; then reformation; then prevention. Intimidation does not intimidate, reformation does not reform, and prevention does not prevent." In the face of such an acknowledgement from perhaps the first penologist of the age, I need scarcely say that the venter of some nostrum for extinguishing crime—the temperance crank, the education faddist, the kindergarten monomaniac, the teach-them-a-trade anachronism; the "asexualization" man, etc., etc., are talking thru their respective hats. Their receipts are simply expressions of ignorance, unworthy any attention at all. Heredity, intemperance, bad education, and the rest, are, of course, factors in producing crime, but minor factors. I embrace with joy the opportunity to show that at least one Anarchist knows poverty is only a minor factor. Heredity is more thoroughly proved to be a factor of some importance than anything else; but "asexualization" could only prune the tree; for, tho criminal parents are very apt to have criminal children, most criminals' parents were not criminals.* The real causes for crime are far too deeply seated for remedies like these to reach, as proved by the notorious fact that in hard times and good; during revivals of religion and carnivals of debauchery; when education is being pushed and when it languishes; under all kinds of legislation; while war, pestilence and famine, are weeding out the unfit, and while peace and plenty most encourage their increase; whether new machinery is displacing skilled labor or not, the crime of any given country remains almost unchanged in amount; nay the same kind of crime is always nearly equally common; and, in the case of such a crime as suicide, even the means employed by this or that proportion of the offenders can be foreseen a good deal more clearly than most future events!†

C. L. JAMES.

(To be continued.)

* In any prison statistics on the subject, criminal heredity, an easy kind to trace, would be regarded as morbid. Now at Auburn only 23.03 per cent of prisoners were known to be descended from a stock in any way abnormal; but the careful inquiries of criminologists like Virgilio, Rossi, Kock, Marvo, Penta and Richard raise the proportion to 40, 46, 50, 77, 90 and even 95-6 per cent. On the other hand we are indeed told that at Elmira over 50 per cent came from homes "positively bad" and only 8 per cent from "good," but these titles are too vague. Probably few of the "bad" were criminal.

* Thus in London, suicides fluctuate about the fixed annual average of 240, at the almost exact radius of 26—viz., 266 (highest recorded) in the panic year 1846 to 213 (lowest recorded) in 1849. Similar regularity with other figures) occurs everywhere else.

— o —

It is the lies about sex, not the truth, which encourage impurity in a child.—*I'cus*.

AGENTS FOR FREE SOCIETY.

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

ALLEGHENY Pa.—H. Bauer 73 Spring-garden Ave.
ATLANTIC CITY, N. J.—M. Kisluck, 1108 Baltic Ave.
BOSTON—K. A. Snellenberg, 31 Beech Glen St., Roxbury.
BROOKLYN.—M. Metzkow, 174 Ralph St.
CHICAGO—T. Appel, 1228 Milwaukee Av.
CLEVELAND—E. Schilling, 55 Yenkel St.
COLUMBUS, Ohio—H. M. Lyndall, 416 E. Mound St.
LONDON, Eng.—T. Cantwell, 127 Ossulton St., N. W.
NEW YORK—A. Lopatiner, 180 Forsyth
PHILADELPHIA—Natasha Notkin, 242 N. Second St.

RECEIPTS.

From Philadelphia Tea Party, \$100.
Doering, \$2. Bissonette, \$1.50. Levin, Keyes, Task, Axt, Wolfing, each \$1.
Powers, Knowlton, each 50c. Mirabel, la, 25c.

FOR CHICAGO.

The Progressive Club gives an entertainment and ball for the benefit of FREE SOCIETY, March 28, 7:30 p. m., at Libuse Hall, 936 Twelfth St.

Tickets, in advance, 15 cents; at the door 25 cents.

"If we think we must act."

MEETINGS.

BOSTON.—The Social Science Club meets every Sunday, 5 p. m., at 724 Washington St., room 9. Free Forum for all sociological topics. Anarchist literature for sale.

BROOKLYN.—The Social Science Club meets every Friday evening at Central Hall, 410 Stone Ave. Free discussion.

CHICAGO.—The Chicago Philosophical Society meets every Sun'ay evening at 72 Adams St., 8 p. m. sharp. Free admission. All strangers are invited to take part in the discussions. March 22 Rev. George J. Barney will speak on "Mormonism the Solution of the Social Problem."

The Workmen's Educational Club meet's at 278 Blue Island Ave., 8 p. m.
CLEVELAND.—Liberty Association meets every Sunday at 2:30 p. m., in Forest-er's Hall, 223 Champlain St. Free discussion.

NEW YORK.—The Radical Reading Room, 180 Forsyth St. Meeting every Sunday at 3 p. m. Lectures and free discussions.
March 22, "The Soul." C. B. Gooper.
March 29, "The Union." Jay Fox.

SEATTLE, WASH.—The Progressive Club meets on Saturday evening, 8 o'clock, at the Theosophist Hall, 1118 Third Ave. Lectures on all pertinent social questions. Free discussion. March 28, Prof. J. Allen speaks on "Government." April 4, a member of the "Woman's Economic League" will speak before the club.

The Chicago Martyrs: The Famous Speeches of the Eight Anarchists in Judge Gary's Court; and Altgeld's Reasons for Pardonning Fielden, Neebe, and Schwab..... 25

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
Love's Coming-of-Age. Edward	
Carpenter.....	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
Roosevelt, Czolgosz, and Anarch-	
ism.....Jay Fox	03
Crime and Criminals....C. Darrow	10
Realism in Literature and Art...."	05
Hilda's Home. Cloth \$1.....	
.....Rosa Graul	50
Moribund Society and Anarchy.	
Cloth 60c.....Jean Grave	25
Motherhood in Freedom.....Harman	05
Origin of Anarchism....C. L. James	05
Government Analyzed.....Kelso	50
Anarchism: Its Philosophy and	
Ideal.....Peter Kropotkin	05
Anarchist Communism: Its Ba-	
sis and Principles....."	05
An Appeal to the Young....."	05
Anarchist Morality....."	05
Expropriation....."	05
Field, Factory and Workshop.."	45
Law and Authority....."	05
Memoirs of a Revolutionist....."	2.00
Mutual Aid, a Factor in Evolu-	
tion....."	2.00
Organized Vengeance....."	03
Paris Commune....."	05
The State: Its Historic Role...."	10
The Wage System. Revolution-	
ary Government....."	05
Resist Not Evil. Cloth. Clar-	
ence S. Darrow.....	75
Social Democracy in Germany.....	
.....Gustave Landauer	02
History of the Commune. Cloth...	
.....Lissagaray	75
Conduct and Profession....Darrow	10
Wind-Harp Songs...J. Wm. Lloyd	1.00
The Economics of Anarchy.....	
.....Dyer D. Lum	25
Anarchy. (Is It All a Dream?	
Jas. F. Morton, Jr.)...Malatesta	10
A Talk about Anarchist Commu-	
nism between two Workers...."	05
A Chambermaid's Diary.....	
.....Octave Mirbeau	50
God and Government: The Siamese	
Twins of Superstition...W. Nevill	05
The Deistic Pestilence...John Most	05
The Pyramid of Tyranny.....	
.....F. Domela Nieuwehuis	05
Mating or Marrying, Which?.....	
.....W. H. Van Ornum	05
Evolution and Revolution...Reclus	05
Tolstoy.....Clarence S. Darrow	10
Pure Economy.....J. H. Rowell	10
Pages of Socialist History.....	
.....W. Tcherkesoff	30
The Slavery of Our Times. Cloth.	
.....Leo Tolstoy	75
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 "	
The Ballad of Reading Gaol.....	10
.....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
Anarchism and Outrage.....	03
Anarchy on Trial.....	05

History of the French Revolution.

— BY —

C. L. JAMES.

An excellent history of the French Revolution, well written by one thoroly familiar with his subject. Special care has been exercised to give the facts as they are, the author not having made himself the champion of any faction.

Justice, Wilmington, Del., says of it:

It is concise; it is accurate; and above all, it deals with essentials; the author has entered into the spirit of the Revolution.

Azariah S. Root, librarian at Oberlin College Library, Oberlin, Ohio, says:

I was much interested in looking over the work. It seems to me to indicate careful study of the sources, and to be the work of one profoundly interested in democracy.

It is neatly printed from large type on good book paper, with a substantial binding. There are 343 pages, with an index and bibliographical epitome.

Price, bound in cloth, \$1 postpaid; paper bound copies, 50 cents, 9 cents extra for postage. Send orders to

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

A PHYSICIAN IN THE HOUSE.

IT IS THE BEST MEDICAL BOOK FOR THE HOME YET PRODUCED.

— BY —

DR. J. H. GREER.

IT HAS 16 COLORED PLATES SHOWING DIFFERENT PARTS OF THE HUMAN BODY

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

It teaches how typhoid and other fevers can be both prevented and cured. It gives the best known treatment for La Grippe, diphtheria, catarrh, consumption, appendicitis and every other disease. This book is not an advertisement and has no medicine to sell. It tells you how to live that you may prolong life. It opposes medical fads of all kinds and makes uncompromising war on vaccination and the use of anti-toxine. It has hundreds of excellent recipes for the cure of the various diseases. The chapter on painless midwifery is worth its weight in gold to women. It has a large number of valuable illustrations. The "Care of Children" is something every mother ought to read. It teaches the value of air, sunshine, and water as medicines. This book cannot fail to please you. If you are looking for health by the safest and easiest means, do not delay getting the book. It is printed in clear type on good book paper, beautifully bound in cloth and gold letters. It has 800 octavo pages.

PRICE \$2.75.

SEND ORDERS TO FREE SOCIETY.

MORIBUND SOCIETY
AND ANARCHY.Translated from the French of
JEAN GRAVEBy VOLTAIRINE DE CLEYRE
CONTENTS:

The Anarchistic Idea and Its Development.—Individualism and Solidarity.—Too Abstract.—Is Man Evil?—Property.—The Family.—Authority.—The Magistracy.—The Right to Punish and the Savants.—The Influence of Environment.—"The Country."—The Patriotism of the Governing Classes.—Militarism.—Colonization.—There are no Inferior Races.—Why We are Revolutionist.—As to What Means follow from the Principles.—Revolution and Anarchy.—The Efficacy of Reforms.—The Experimental Method.—What Then?—Anarchism and its Practicability.—The Unvarnished Truth.

The book is printed in large type, and consists of 176 pages.

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

Send orders to FREE SOCIETY.

FIELD, FACTORY AND WORKSHOP.

BY PETER KROPOTKIN.

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

The book contains the following chapters: The Decentralization of Industries.—The Possibilities of Agriculture.—Small Industrial Villages.—Brain Work and Manual Work.—Conclusion.—Appendix Price, paper cover, 40 cents, postpaid 45 cents.

Order from FREE SOCIETY.

COLLEGE of MEDICINE
& SURGERY, Chicago

Four years Graded Course.
Laboratories fully equipped.
Abundance of Clinical Material.
FEES MODERATE.
Fall term opens in September
Write today for Catalog to

FLORENCE DRESSLER, M. D., So'ey
245-247 Ashland Ave., Chicago, Ill.