



To Percy Shelley

ON THE DEGRADING NOTIONS OF DEITY.

What wonder, Percy, that with jealous rage
Men should defame the kindly and the wise,
When in the midst of the all-beauteous skies,
And all this lovely world that should engage
Their mutual search for the old golden age.
They seat a phantom, swelled into grim size
Out of their own passions and bigotries;
And then, for fear, proclaim it meek and sage!
And this they call a light and a revealing!
Wise as the clown, who, plodding home at night,
In autumn, turns at call of fancied elf,
And sees upon the fog, with ghastly feeling,
A giant shadow in its imminent might,
Which his own lantern throws up from himself.

—James Hunt.

Words or Deeds, Which?

Freeland, a long-projected journal of some sort of Anarchism, Vol. I., No. 1, lies before me at last! "Parting is sweet sorrow," so there is both pleasure and pain in the discovery that I must give up an ideal; for *Freeland* turns out to be not even nominally a journal of any sort of Anarchism. It drops the name, and announces that it is a journal of "Anticratism." The pleasure in this discovery is that it will save repeated explanations, which are always monotonous and seldom instructive. The pain begins at seeing those whom I thought were some sort of Anarchists, acknowledging finally that they are not. It deepens at having to learn a new goose-Greek word. But then it lets up again, for we are given a definition which certainly has the merit of simplicity. "Anticratism means literally opposition to invasion." I am real glad to know that. "And so," proceeds the lesson, "it may be practised anywhere at any time." It may, it may. If I liked word-catching half as well as an Anticrat, I might ask what invasion was? But I think I see plain enough what is meant. If A should put his heel on B's toes, and B, in return, should apply the toes to A's ultimatum; if C should advise A to keep his heel off B's toes; and if A and C form an anti-treading-on-toes association—why the first of these operations would be invasion, and the other three would be Anticratism. So far, so good. There is, no doubt, all that can be practised, *semper, ubique, ab omnibus*, because it has been, ever since Cain first punched Abel. I have no doubt Cain considered himself "invaded" when Abel put his nose out of joint. So he "opposed invasion," and was the first Anticrat. Then, I am confident, Adam and Eve organized an anti-punching association, and, consistently, spanked Cain. Only—*cui bono?* How much nearer have we got to doing without "inva-

sion" since then? Well, by the looks of things in the Congo Free State and in Colorado, I should judge not much.

Now, *Freeland* professes to be "A Journal With a Purpose." If the purpose be only to "oppose" invasion, it is quite unnecessary, we see. But if the purpose be to get rid of "invasion," then I suggest that the editor of *Freeland* put on his thinking-cap, and ask himself why "invasion" flourishes after being opposed all these centuries? And to help him out in a purpose with which I sympathize sincerely, I will suggest that it flourishes for two reasons. First—nobody knows what "invasion" is, except it is what suits the other fellow better than it does him. There is no method of deciding whether the dislocation of Cain's nose by Abel were "invasion," except giving them a common judge—like Adam—which is decidedly Cratic, and so should not be in the program of Anti-cratism. The other reason "invasion" still flourishes is—hear, oh heavens, and give ear, oh earth! for a solid chunk of wisdom is coming now—*because it has been opposed too much*. When Cain punched Abel for dis-jointing his nose, he did not reflect that Eve would spank him and tell Adam. When Eve spanked Cain, and Adam followed suit, it did not occur to them that they were educating Cain to kill Abel. Thus three "invasions," each worse than the former, grew out of one. But in the course of ages, the uniformity of such phenomena did suggest to a few observing persons the reflection that opposing "invasion" makes it worse. And thus sprang up certain schools of Anarchism, whose multifariousness in method causes *Freeland* a good deal of grief. To mention some of the chief—there is the Tolstoy method, "Do not oppose invasion at all." There is a method recommended by the martyr Heywood, "Oppose invasion only passively—boycott 'invasive' people." There is also the Bakunin method, "Oppose invasion only in that developing form of a common judge." All these are within the scope of Anarchism; for they all admit being freely tried. But the method which, in opposing invasion, violates its program by requiring a judge to tell us what invasion is, has done well to take another name.

It may be observed that the dividing line between Anarchism and Anti-cratism is also the line between induction and *a priori* dogmatism. That two-word formula, "Try it," makes the difference. Anticratism, *apud Freeland*, dogmatically asserts that "Anarchism expresses the idea of the absence of all invasion, a condition that will in all probability never be realized." Oh, no. Anarchism, in every anarchistic family and group, just tries acting

as if there were no "invasion," and finds that where there is no opposition, there, so far, is none. On a larger scale, a Tolstoy and a Bresci may have plans which, like in kind, are different in degree, as shown above. But, being both Anarchists—they try them. Does *Freeland* really propose to try its "purpose" by starting a community in the Congo Free State or in Colorado? *Felix esto!* Somebody will learn something-by that, sure.

But that would be induction. And *Freeland*, in its first issue, declares war against induction. Which renews a doubt whether its purpose be to get rid of invasion, or only to "oppose" it. If the purpose be deeds, it certainly will not be effected without induction. If words alone, perhaps it may. But only on condition that the words are "wild and whirling." No induction is necessary to talk like Roosevelt. But even to talk so that anyone will heed, is a practical purpose. And that does require induction. You must try it—probably more than once—before you can get a mule to listen.

Supposing, therefore, that *Freeland's* "purpose" extends beyond the pleasure of hearing its own voice, it should learn—by induction—something about induction before attacking induction. And then it might stagger at the size of the job. "There is a great deal of shallow talk," it announces, "about the superiority of inductive methods." Whey, thunder and lightning, try some other kind—if you can, without making them inductive! Results can be counted on to shut up shallow talk—when they have been tried. Only that is the "supposed superiority" of those which stand inductive tests. "The results of induction are at no time final." That's the beauty of them. By induction we are daily learning more about pre-natal destiny vs. free will. All Calvin could learn about this problem by deduction, Zeno knew just as well. The results of the Greek were "final" for the Frenchman—because he didn't think to try them. "Economics, physics and other semi-mathematical sciences can be best developed, outside of the mere gathering of data, by deduction." The exception destroys the proposition; but, blast word-catching, try. It was proved in physics, deductively, that a steamer could not carry coal enough to cross the Atlantic—until someone tried. It has been proved in economy that the laborer's wages were necessarily limited to the minimum on which he could live and reproduce—and Ricardo is out of date, because he only proved it deductively. "Induction is practically limited to the descriptive sciences, like botany, geography, history, etc." No, it isn't. Engineering is not a descriptive

science. George Stevenson proved by induction that a locomotive would run up hill; after some forgotten philosopher had proved deductively that a smooth wheel on a smooth rail would have no friction, to cause any locomotion at all. "The field of induction is limited to the establishing of workable premises." Now, my friend, you have succeeded triumphantly in proving that you do not know what induction is. Ask the nearest English speaker who was its chief apostle? and he will almost certainly tell you, Bacon. And why Bacon, rather than Descartes, who was a much better mathematician, and in most respects a greater man? Because Bacon was the apostle of *experiment*, which does not establish premises, but tests deductions from them. He discovered the powers of induction, because he appreciated its most valuable function, which you entirely leave out. "The most splendid achievements in physics, chemistry, astronomy and economics are the results of daring deductions." Verified by experiment. Can you tell me one result in all these sciences not so verified, and what came of it? I can give examples in plenty. Ptolemy's astronomy, the phlogistic chemistry, the physics of proper motions, MacCullodi's economy—all the deductions which have fulfilled their functions and perished in leading to practical tests such as showed that their premises were unsound. "The validity of absolute liberty can no more be deduced from experience than the validity of equal liberty." Can't it? If the experience of all history teaches that the nearer men were at any time to absolute liberty, the more they prospered; and the more they haggled about equal liberty, the more time they wasted in words or blows; I call that a good enough generalization to warrant further experiment along the former line.

"The chief sinners in this windmill fight are the revolutionary Communists, by the rabid talk in which they indulge when a plea is put in for absolute or unlimited liberty." The rabid talk, I submit, is summed up in the inductive formula, "Try it," to which may be added the saving clause, "if you like." If you don't, there is no more to be said—except that you are not in a way to set the present river on fire. If you have not nerve enough to cut off a finger for the purpose of saving a life, you are not fit for a surgeon. And that's all—barring that you should not abuse one who has. If the experience of others has convinced you, as it long ago did me, that a community in Colorado or the Congo Free State is not likely to succeed, then, by all means, *don't* try it. But in that case, don't recommend it, either. And to prove my faith, as I advise, by my works, I will try a new experiment. I always signed my name before; but, perceiving that it acts upon Anticrats like a red rag on a bovine; and wishing to win them to judgment, not insanity, I will borrow a hint from their pages, and use the prolix *nom de plume*.

A Newly-Fledged and Half-Baked Aspirant.

P. S.—The editor of *Freeland* gives half a column to telling why he is not an Anarchist. We can tell him in twelve words. It is because he does not understand the methods of positive science.

He only earns his freedom and existence who daily conquers them anew.—*Goethe*.

Whitman's View of Life. *)

I regret exceedingly to speak on this subject without some kind of adequate preparation. Unfortunately, my time is so occupied day and night in taking care of the graft by which I make my daily bread, in answering appointments like the present one, and in carrying on my Sunday work, that I never have undisturbed time to prepare my mind to make a talk like this. There are two or three thoughts, however, to which I wish to call your attention in treating of Whitman's view of life. I do not want any one to expect for a moment, however, that I am going to give a comprehensive view of Whitman's attitude towards life.

At the outset, I want to say I do not share the views of many in regard to Whitman as a poet. With the exception of some parts of "Leaves of Grass," his works could all be reduced to prose. Most poets deal with fancies, imaginings and ideals, while Whitman kept himself down very closely to just facts, and it is almost impossible to make poetry out of facts.

The basic idea of Whitman's view of life may perhaps be stated in this way, that he always regarded the universe at large as being sane. He has much to say about "God," but he admits himself that he did not know anything about that subject. He used the word, probably, because it was a habit, and he makes it clear that he did not believe in any particular kind of god. He did not believe in a god with bodily parts, feet and hands, but he did believe that the god of the universe was all right. He also claims that the universe is all right, and that everything is as it should be, because everything is as it must be—which is the best reason in the world.

I am going to select a few passages here and there from this book by way of illustration to explain what I am talking about, and I shall take them just as I have selected them without any logical order at all. Here is one: "Let others ignore what they may, I make the poem of evil, also." He is the one man who has openly declared that he makes poems of evil as well as of what is good. Others aim to avoid that which is evil, and confine themselves to that which is called good. "I am myself just as much evil as good, and my nation is." He is probably the only man in the world to admit that his nation is not the best nation in the world. "I am not the poet of goodness only, I do not decline to be the poet of wickedness also."

Now, that is Whitman's view of life from start to finish. He says there is no evil. Or if you want to haggle about the meaning of words, let us admit there is evil, but if there is evil, it is just as important to you and to me and to the nation as anything else, and that is a way of saying that what you call evil is just as good as that which you call good. "There will never be any more perfection than there is now, nor any more heaven or hell than there is now." I do not mean to interpret these things, and you had better not, because you would make a mistake. It is claimed there was a time when there was a creation. Whitman says there never was a creation any more than now, and there never was miracle working any more than now. He says the world never was any more perfect than it is now, and never will be any more perfect. And he says there never was any more heaven or hell than now. The meaning is that the world is always just as perfect as it can be at that time and in that place. At this time the universe is just the place it ought to be, because it cannot be anywhere else but just there.

"I believe materialism is true and spiritualism is true—I reject no part." That does not mean that he is a Spiritualist or that he

is a Materialist. He says he does not reject either of them. They are here and are in their place, and are doing their work.

I see that old accounts, bibles, genealogies, are true, without exception; I assert that all past days were what they should have been; And that they could no-how have better than they were, And that to-day is what it should be, and that America is, And that to-day and America could no-how be better than they are.

After you come to understand the Whitman philosophy you never have any more remorse, and you never have any more conscience. "I see the wife misused by the husband," you can see that any day. I do not know why he did not put the reverse of that in there. "I see the treacherous seducer of young women," and I do not know why he did not turn that around the other way. The poem, "I Sit and Look Out," is the result of the view that I have been trying to explain to you. Had Whitman been as narrow-minded as some of us are he would have ended that poem something like this. Instead of saying, "I see, hear, and am silent;" he would have said, "I see, hear, and am a Socialist;" or, "I see, hear, and am an Anarchist;" or, "I see, hear, and am a Democrat because all of these things happen on account of the infamies of the Republican party;" or, "I see, hear, and have become a reformer;" or, "I cannot sleep at night." But he says nothing of the kind. "I see, hear, and am silent;" but he was not silent, for he wrote this book and another one as large. The point is, that these conditions did not upset him and make him lose his balance. They did not give him a disposition to go out and kill a king, or wreck a railroad, or do anything silly like that.

At a dinner I attended lately, one speaker said he did not believe Whitman would keep his poise were he living now an observing what is being done with the miners out in Colorado, driving them out of the State. Whitman was capable of taking a long view and a wide view. The slaughter of a few hundred or a few thousand people, or the locking up of a few hundred persons in prison, did not disturb him. He knew that the world and society have been going on for a long time, and what happens now has to happen! Evil? Yes, if you want to call it evil, but the evil is just as good as the good.

Now, that is a view of life that very few people comprehend and enter into. If the world is all right, and as it has to be, why did Whitman take the trouble to write? Why should we take the trouble to do anything? They cannot seem to understand another thing that Whitman said, "Evil propels me, and the reform of evil propels me." Why does Whitman or anybody else take the trouble to write, kill a king, organize a labor union, or a Socialist Labor party, or endure imprisonment? Simply because it is a part of a process, that is all. We do those things for the reason everything else is done, because we cannot help it. What we do is a part and parcel of our lives and we do it for the reason that tyrants tyrannize, because we have to do it. We simply say, "Here is a situation and I am uncomfortable, but it is right that I am uncomfortable." Whitman wrote in order to satisfy his desire for happiness. He had to say these things. "Walt," he said to himself, "if there is something in you, you must get it out." That is why we do anything, because we have to get out what is in us. The world is all right today just as it is, but it would not be right for it to remain to-morrow just what it is today. We work for what is right to-morrow, next year, next century. The result of this view of life is that it enables you to work without friction, without tearing your hair. It enables you to take what comes with equanimity. If you once get this large, Whitman view of life, then you work with peace and comfort rather than in strenuousness.

*) A discourse delivered before the Radical Club by Hugh O. Pentecost, showing that the poet reversed certain common ideas about morals, government, and the sex question.

I am going to speak specifically of just two other things. There are two directions in which Whitman turned the world upside down. I mean to say he takes exactly the reverse from the common view. One of those things is what we hear called law and order. The whole world takes as the idea of life what is called law and order. That expression has become so orthodox that people cannot understand it at all if a person says he believes just the reverse of law and order is preferable. I would not say Whitman was an Anarchist. He may have been familiar with the word, but he was not a man who would take a sociological view in opposition to some other view of life. He would say Socialism is true and Anarchism is true. He would say, "I am not an Anarchist, because then I would have to separate myself from the Socialists or Democrats or Republicans." Then some thinker replies, "You have got to take your position in one party or the other." In that sense Whitman was not an Anarchist, and he was a man who did not believe in law and order. He was teaching Democracy, but he did not mean by that that he was opposed to the Republican party. He did not believe in majority rule as an ideal, but as it is here he accepted it as all right. He did not regard majorities as having authority over him. Read what he says about "the great city." Most people think the great city is where the greatest libraries and schools are, and where most people and wealth are. Whitman says, "Where the brawniest breed of orators are and where the men and women think lightly of the laws, there the great city stands." Everybody tells you the great city is where everybody is brought up to believe in law and order and where everybody obeys the law, and they say, "As long as it is the law, you must obey it. The legislature has made the law, and if you do not like it, get the majority on your side, and until that is done you must obey the law until it is changed. Organize into labor unions, but do not break the law," they say. Whitman says the great city is where the people break the law, and would a little rather break it than not.

There are few people who have ever yet been able to see that children should be laws unto themselves and depend upon themselves. I have expressed these sentiments before about children and they are very generally objected to. The *Truth Seeker*, this week has an editorial about the new "Society for the Recognition of Human Rights," and says you cannot do that with children. But if you let a child depend upon you until he is six, seven or eight years of age he will never depend upon himself after that. Whitman says, "Where children are taught to be laws to themselves, and to depend on themselves," from the very start. The reason why so many men and women are so ignorant or so stupid that an idea cannot be driven or coaxed into their heads is because their parents started them the other way. Their parents have held them up and kept them from falling until now they cannot stand by their own support. "Where the city of the cleanliness of the sexes stands." The average citizen would say, "Yes, that is our city; that is what we have Comstock for—to keep the sexes clean." "Where the best bodied mothers are, there the great city stands." You see how he takes the common idea and reverses it exactly!

I will take one other thought. The idea of Whitman in relation to the community and the government is to root out of your mind the notion that any person is your superior. The moment you admit your own inferiority, you weaken yourself and become unfit for life. Nobody is your superior, and that means that nobody ever lived who is of more importance in the world than you are yourself. If you get the idea that "God" himself is any better than you are, you become unfit to cope with the requirements of life. The villain that comes up to the bar with the handcuffs on, Whitman says, is his brother. The sponge, the loafer,

and deadbeat are myself; I am no better than they are and they are no better than I am. That is the idea you must get into your minds if you want to follow what might be called a Whitman life.

I will call attention to only one other point. Just as he upset the ideas of government, political superiority, or rulership, so he upset all ideas of morality. That is what disturbed Emerson. "Great book," Emerson said, "but, Whitman, you should leave out some things." "Are they not true?" "Yes, but say them in another way." Whitman said, "No, that book has got to go just as it is written." Think of such a thing as this: "I am a free companion. I bivouac by invading watch fires." Anarchism, I understand, is against nothing but invaders, but Whitman was an invader, and see what kind of an invader! It makes me laugh quietly to see how Freethinkers cover their tracks and make them a soft bed to sleep upon by claiming that Freethought is more moral than Christianity. Liberals pride themselves on having a philosophy that gives them a keener conscience and stricter conventional morality than other people have. They talk about living a noble life and doing unto others as they would be done by. See what Whitman says: "I turn the bridegroom out of bed," and so on. What are you going to say to that? That smashes the sacredness of the Christian household all right. That is not doing by others as you would like to be done by. No, golden rule there. Now, what are you going to do with a man like that? Do you not suppose he knew people would call him a bad man for saying that. I know that John Burroughs says his life was very correct, and it is pretended he did not mean what he says. He did mean what he said. He meant that our whole fabric of morality is wrong. From our own times, go back to Marcus Aurelius and Epictetus and back to the Greeks, and you will see that the same morality is everywhere. And here is the first man yet known of, who has gotten the ear of the world, to say something contrary to the established idea of morality.

You say, "Do you think it is right for a man to do anything like that?" The answer is, Yes, perfectly right, but look out for the bridegroom, for he may be a bigger man than you are. What Whitman wanted to say was, if you can do that and want to, do it, and do not think it wrong, because there is no evil; and you have just as much right in that bed as the bridegroom has.

Now, if you cannot understand that, I cannot help you. If that means to you something impure and wicked it is not Whitman's fault, it is your fault. It is because you cannot think of anything like that without some idea of uncleanness or of immorality. It is not that Whitman was immoral, but that you yourself are immoral. He dares to tell you that in this way: "Without shame the man I like knows and avows the deliciousness of sex." Be honest with yourselves for a little while and see if you can suggest a better word than that. Why has sex been a subject of disgust for thousands of years? Because it is delicious. We have adopted this idea of disgust from the Christian monks, who took it from the old Buddhist teachers, and the Christian monks were the filthiest bodied men the world has ever known. Whitman says:

O to be yielded to you, whoever you are, and you to be yielded to me, in defiance of the world!
O to return to Paradise! O bashful and feminine!
O to draw you to me—to plant on you for the first time the lips of a determined man!

Everybody knows that last line is what a woman likes. Every little, modest, retiring woman in the world knows what that means, and every little, sheep-faced man knows what it means. You can despise it if you want to, but it is there, and if you talk about Walt Whitman that is what you have got to talk about. Was his view right and better than the

common view? How can you doubt that he was right when you compare his ideas with the lecherous notions prevailing?

This is a subject that fathers and mothers keep quiet on to their children. Mothers are ashamed to talk to their girls about it. There are plenty of mothers who would blush if they were to talk to their girls on the subject, and the result is the only knowledge girls get about this is from books secretly circulated around among the school children. Now, which way is better, Whitman's or the common way? I do not hesitate to tell you that Whitman's is the better way.

I think Whitman struck deeper into conventionalities than is generally realized. He has made me think about many things very difficult for me to speak about. The subject of marriage is one that most of us sit down over for a long time and count the cost before we express ourselves, but Whitman unquestionably struck at what some people call "the sanctity of the home," which is just a cant-phrase, and as long as any such phrase is common it is open to suspicion as having been invented for the purpose of clouding people's minds.

I am speaking now with reference to the future. I am not sure but that the Christian home is doing more to retard the development of woman than anything else in the world, and I think woman is more enslaved and kept down by the home than any other one thing. Whitman struck at the entire marriage system. As long as there is a property system those who have property will come under the legal rules of marriage, because in our present social state there is no way to determine who will succeed the holder of property except by determining who the children are. That is why it is called a sacred and divine institution, because it is intended to make the common people believe that God is on the side of the property holder.

A man says to a woman, "I love you," and she says to the man "I love you." "Very well," he says, "that settles it." "No," she says, "that does not settle it. I want you to go with me to a minister, and I want it recorded with the Board of Health that you love me." Now, by that recording the woman says to the man, "I cannot trust you and I cannot trust love." My personal opinion is, however, that nobody is going to be any happier by not getting married under the present circumstances. My sympathies are with the women, because they have a hard time to make a living, and when one of them gets hold of a man she hangs on because her bread and butter are involved.

Remember this: Every one of you is free. You are free and I am free. You are living your own lives every day. You are not slaves. You are perfectly free to do all the time just as you please.—*The Truth Seeker*.

Thru the courtesy of Mr. C. J. Ferguson we are put in possession of the following extract from a sermon delivered in the Pilgrim Congregational Church of Chicago by the Rev. Frederick E. Hopkins, who said: "War is Christlike, because Jesus said: 'I came not to bring peace, but the sword,' and also because he permits it. In the Art Institute there is an inspiring figure of one of the men who laid the foundations of our country, and he went to church with a Bible under his arm and a gun over his shoulder. That was Christlike. Love ought to be the compelling motive in every relation in life, but it certainly is not." Historically that is an accurate statement of the Christian view of war. Believing that "war is Christlike," Christians have adorned with a cross the hilt of their weapons and fought like wild beasts. However, both war and peace sentiments may be found in the conglomerate philosophy attributed to Jesus by his biographers. If you don't see what you want in the gospels, hunt for it, or read it in.—*Truth Seeker*.

FREE SOCIETY

Formerly THE FIREBRAND.
Issued Weekly by FREE SOCIETY PUBL. ASSOCIATION
A. ISAAC.....Editor.

ONE DOLLAR A YEAR.

Address all Communications and make all Money
Orders payable to FREE SOCIETY, 230 E. Fourth
Street, New York, N. Y.

Entered as second-class matter March 3, 1904, at
the postoffice at New York, N. Y., under the Act of
Congress of March 3, 1879.

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

SUNDAY, MAY 22, 1904.

466.

If these figures correspond with the number printed
on the wrapper of your FREE SOCIETY, your sub-
scription expires with this number

ANARCHY.—A social theory which regards the
union of order with the absence of all direct govern-
ment of man by man as the political ideal; absolute
individual liberty.—Century Dictionary.

NOTICE.

**The Third Annual Afternoon and Evening
Picnic and Games of the Radical Reading
Room take place Saturday, June 4, at
Liberty Park, Cooper Ave., Glendale, L. I.
Music by an Union orchestra. Come and
enjoy yourself. Admission, 15 cents.**

From Brooklyn Bridge take Myrtle or Gates Ave
cars; Broadway Ferry, Bushwick Ave. Cars;
Houston St. Ferry, South 4th St. cars; 10th St.
Ferry, Union Ave. cars. Transfer at Ridgewood
for Cypress Ave. and get off at Cooper Ave.

FOR ST. LOUIS.

For the benefit of the Anarchist press, the
International Debating Club holds a picnic
on Sunday, May 19, at the Red House,
Cahokia, Ill. Speeches will be made by Ameri-
can, French, German and Italian comrades,
which will be sandwiched in between music
and dances.

Take the boat at the foot of Sydney street,
which leaves every hour. In case of disagree-
able weather, the picnic will be postponed
till the following Sunday.

From the Watch Tower.

Hope never looks back.

Poverty is a social error.

Progress is ever unsatisfied.

Wisdom is the undoing of tyrannies.

In true Socialism there is no coercion.

There are no "ifs" and "buts" in liberty.

Free speech is the last barricade of freedom.

A political party is a trust desiring a mon-
opoly.

When love enslaves, the whole life of man
lies shackled.

Kings boast of their conquests; men boast
of their resistance.

FREE SOCIETY

Individuality builds up solidarity as the safe-
guard of its own future.

The czar is praying that his god will choose
between two murderers.

Anarchism is a thunder-spoken "No!" to
authority's plots and pleas.

Liberty and law are natural foes; for one
triumphs only as the other weakens.

Grover Cleveland has attacked the memory
of Altgeld. Any cur can bark at a dead lion.

Russia has persecuted the Jews, it is true;
what would Japan do if the Jews were living
there.

To an aspiring heart the thought of freedom
is like the thought of health to one who has
long been sick.

The authority of what is called "morality"
is just as open to question and denial as the
authority called "economics."

Patriotism is the slavery of the mind of
man to the State. Religion is the slavery of
the mind of man to the State of God.

Canon Henson, of Westminster, is in favor
of revising the false stories out of the Bible.
A dangerous business; where would he stop?

Stanley, the African explorer, is dead. His
chief claim to fame consists in the fact that his
cruelties to natives were only limited by his
brutal ambitions.

A country where all are contented is a
country where tyranny is only lying in wait-
ing to find the easiest means to cultivate
patriotism while it takes away liberty.

It is universally admitted that the Colorado
Legislature refused to pass an eight-hour law
when legally it was bound to do so; the people
having voted to that effect. Law and order,
indeed!

Eastern cigarette manufacturers have given
money to the Anti-Cigarette League, stating
that the attempt to legally discriminate against
them increases their profits. Coercion defeats
itself.

The Church in America is again rising
against divorce. The tendency toward An-
archism in the field of love is too strong,
however, for religious sentiment to stop it.
What superstition will die next?

The attempt to make Judge Parker the
Democratic nominee for president has brought
out Hill again, who is the soul of corruption,
and Cleveland, Hill's enemy, who is the body.
The people must endure the stench.

When a man does not want to interfere
with his neighbors by trying to get the legal
power to direct them, he is told that he "has
no public spirit." The man, then, who be-
lieves in controlling men in all respects has
the most of this spirit.

When men vote in primaries, or in munici-
pal, State or national elections, they base
their action upon the principle that "Might
makes right," and such is the case, too, when
they go to war. Patriotism, wherever found,
is a pretty cheap thing.

It is reported from Washington that Roose-
velt will determine what the laws for the Pan-
ama Canal strip of territory shall be. When
authority dares to be honest enough to do
this, and admit that it is a tyrant, there is
hope that wisdom may yet open its eyes.

Bebel recently made a speech in the Reich-
stag in which he expressed the fervent hope
that Russia might be defeated in her war with
Japan. Bebel is not a patriot, or he would
not hope anything for a nation resulting from
her defeat in war.

The coal combine between Baer, his pure-
minded associates, and God, is ordered to
go into court and make its doings known.
Now, either God or Baer, whichever one has
the most money, will have to employ some
wicked lawyers to prove that the law does
not mean what it says.

Single taxers would not tax private prop-
erty, because, in their view, it represents wealth
actually earned by the individual possessing
it. Query: did the people earn those land
values which are the result of population? If
not, what right have the people to tax them
away?

Imperialism, which begins by subjugating
weaker peoples, will end by subjugating all
the people; the subjugator being the State.
That which dares stand in the way of such
a result will be given the name of "reactionary
sentiment" at first; but in the end it will be
known as "Anarchy and treason."

District Attorney Jerome, in his efforts to
prosecute gambling in New York, is making
an amusing spectacle of himself. It is all
very well to take an heroic attitude, and say
that you will enforce the law no matter what
the consequences may be; but gambling is
bigger than Jerome at his biggest, and will
triumph over law in the end as it has tri-
umphed before.

Now that the Socialists have nominated a
national ticket, and have settled the vexed
problem involved in the "immediate demands,"
they may proceed to call out the class-con-
scious vote and try to win in the election.
That they believe in tyranny, providing only
that they are in the seats of authority, is clear.
With these good men "Might makes right"
as much as it does with any Republican of
them all.

Professor Albion W. Small, of the Univer-
sity of Chicago, declares that the professional
class is afflicted with intellectual aloofness or
coldness, as a result of being separated in
its life from the actual world. The philo-
sophical trend of mind betrays its victim into
mechanical explanations of human phenomena
and a consequent indifference to its joys and
sorrows.

Amidst the many conflicting stories told
about the Japanese, the partisans of the island
people in the war must find but little comfort.
And, as a matter of fact, tho either side be
the right side (which I do not believe), no
one can consistently justify the war who re-
members that guns and cannon ignore the
truth, and that the issues will be settled by
strength, and strength alone.

AMERICUS.

The freest government cannot long endure
when the tendency of the law is to create a
rapid accumulation of property in the hands
of a few, and to render the masses poor and
dependent.—Daniel Webster.

By the Wayside.

Only a few weeks ago the Austrian government refused its railway workers a mereittance of increase in wages, offering them bullets instead of bread if they intended to insist upon their demands; and now the same government demands \$100,000,000 for the purpose of purchasing modern instruments of wholesale murder. Government is a blessing indeed!

* * *

In consequence of the outrages committed by the authorities in Colorado, an organization called the "Liberty League" has sprung up during the last few months, which has now become strong in every part of the State. "Its purpose is to unite all wage earners into one political party, so that the reign of trusts and military generals in Colorado will be ended," says the report. Thus the deluded toilers are eternally led around a circle, evidently with the best of intentions. But when will people learn that knowledge, integrity and manhood are the only means by which freedom will be wrested from despots and exploiters, and that politics is the very safeguard of tyranny?

* * *

Comrade J. W. Fleming writes me from Melbourne, Australia, that he has been expelled from the Trades Hall Council for being an Anarchist. He resisted the politicians in the trades unions, the so-called leaders, because they were dining with Lord Northcote and the Governor-General, while the unemployed workers and their families were starving. But, like all despots who muzzle honest criticism, they brought Anarchism to the front. To please the labor leaders, the daily press lampooned Comrade Fleming and his cause, with the result that on the following Sunday he addressed a crowd of several thousand people in an open-air meeting, exposed the well-fed labor leaders and explained the principles and aims of Anarchism.

* * *

"Law and order," combined with religious bigotry, seem to produce the same phenomena all over the world: poverty and race hatred. In Chicago a delegation of Jewish canvassers and peddlers have called upon the mayor for protection against the assaults and brutalities perpetrated upon them by the rowdies and loafers composed of "Young America." Many of the beaten and mutilated victims were taken before the mayor, who seemed to be very much surprised that he should be the mayor of a second Kishineff in a "free country." Of course, Mayor Harrison is a hypocrite, for it is only two years ago when the Jewish canvassers appealed to the daily press, in which they stated that the police were encouraging the ruffians in their outrageous assaults instead of protecting the victims.

* * *

It has lately been stated in the press that the present war is costing the Russian and Japanese people more than \$1,500,000 a day, and as the "cost" of men is mentioned only incidentally, the *Telegraaf* (Holland) suggests that the commanders-in-chief report to their respective "majesties" the financial damage inflicted upon each other, adding here and there the following: "I forgot to mention that also some of your majesty's subjects were killed and mutilated, but these don't cost anything." After the wholesale butchery inaugurated for the benefit of a few real estate syndicates, the people will have the pleasure to continue the war at home—against the tax-gatherers. Such sarcasm on governments coming from a daily is encouraging, for it will occur to some of the readers that government has no other purpose but that of protecting property and exploitation.

* * *

A prominent priest of this city attributes

the increase of crime to the "laxity of the police" and the growth of atheism. Perhaps a perusal of the works of some of the early Church fathers may enlighten this modern "father" a little. "We also affirm," said Thomas Campanella, the Italian monk and philosopher, who lived four hundred years ago, "that poverty is the principal cause which makes men vile, deceitful, fraudulent, thieves, intriguers, vagabonds, vicious, false witnesses, etc., and that riches are the cause of pride, of ignorance, of treachery, of presumption, of deceit, of vain-glory, of egoism, etc., and that it is contrary to the good of the community that there should be rich and poor. Men will be rich when they have what they really want, and this state of things can easily be attained. Labor must be distributed in such a way that work will not injure men, but will contribute to make them better and healthy."

* * *

Rejoice, ye women who suffer from economic slavery! Vote the Socialist ticket, as soon as the "lords of creation" permit you to do so. A woman asks Mr. Wilshire "how a mother can be independent under Socialism," and the good-hearted editor promptly replies: "In strength she will perform that labor she is best able to perform, in weakness she may confidently lean upon the State. . . . When she brings children into the world, the State will be her debtor, and its indebtedness will be paid by throwing around her every comfort that unlimited plenty can supply." The editor frankly admits that "the vast majority of husbands are neither generous nor considerate," and "when they are not wife-beaters they are generally petty tyrants who consider a wife as something they own, something—they are privileged to treat as a slave," but the unspeakable State, this modern deity, will possess all the virtues the husbands are lacking. Of course, committees may annoy you here and there, to see whether you are worthy of the good-will of the State, or gossip may have it that you are merely breeding children in order that you may revel in comfort and luxury, but what does it matter, after all, as long as you can lean on one "generous and considerate" husband—the State.

INTERLOPER.

To the Comrades.

After some deliberations and correspondence, we have come to the conclusion that it would be expedient and helpful to our movement, that all Anarchists and liberty-loving people who intend to visit the World's Fair in St. Louis, gather at a fixed time, in order that we may discuss ways and means for the promulgation of our ideal, thus invigorate the propaganda all over the country, and, last, but not least, demonstrate to the world that the Anarchists continue to work for a better society in spite of persecutions and anti-Anarchist enactments.

Of course, we will meet with difficulties, but if we have our cause at heart we will overcome them by tenacious and obstinate efforts.

It is not our intention, however, to draw up a program for the propaganda in general, nor do we expect that the visitors of the convention be supplied with mandates from groups. It shall merely be a fraternal meeting of liberty-loving people, each representing himself only, for the purpose of exchanging ideas, establishment of a closer co-operation among ourselves, and to find the most effective means for the dissemination of our literature.

Therefore, we call upon all those who intend to visit the fair to communicate with us regarding the most convenient date, etc. Others are invited to make suggestions as to the subjects for discussion. All propositions will be recorded and discussed, and afterwards reported in our papers.

All communications concerning the foregoing should be addressed to the Debating Club, 1008 N. 17th St., St. Louis, Mo.

Appeal to Advance People.

It has been decided among literary people to set on foot a movement the object of which will be to produce on Sunday afternoons plays of modern tendencies, as well as classical dramas, before an audience consisting mainly of the intelligent and progressive proletariat, similar to the movements existing in Europe, and flourishing in Germany. In this latter country the movement has resulted in cultivating among the masses a high appreciation of the dramatists and their works, thereby raising the art to a higher sphere.

By carrying to the masses the beauties that lie latent in the treasures of dramatic art, an enlightenment and education will be conferred upon the working people overshadowing immensely any other effort from above to "educate the poor."

A distinguishing feature of this movement will be that it is to be entirely free from commercialism, that is to grow directly out of the people themselves, and we do not appeal to the philanthropically inclined to endow a national theatre with the money wrung from the producers of wealth.

It is universally lamented that the masses dwell in ignorance and that in this country especially, there is a complete lack of appreciation of art. This condition is inevitable, as the country could not have produced any different results owing to its commercial activity. Commercialism being in its waning stage, bound to give way to a higher state of society, the conditions are now favorable to the inauguration of the movement indicated above, and an appeal is directed to literary men and women to participate in the launching of this mighty vessel.

All details have clearly been decided upon, and it remains now to gather around us a sufficient number of men and women who will lend their moral support to the movement.

All those who are interested in this organization will kindly send their name and address to the undersigned, and as soon as an adequate number of addresses have been obtained, further notice will be given of a public conference which will be held for the purpose of giving additional information and submitting a plan which has successfully been followed in Europe.

Send all communications and inquiries to

JULIUS HQPP.

203 East 114th street, New York City.

Letter-Box.

N. S., Berkeley, Calif.—Sub. received. Glad to hear that you are still among the "true and faithful." Kropotkin's "Conquest of Bread" and "Words of a Rebel" will soon appear in the English language. He also works on a new work, entitled "Ethics." The two former books have been published in different languages, and are excellent works for propaganda purposes. Greetings.

J. S., Altona, Ill.—Of course, names of liberal-minded people are always desired, for this is one of the means thru which we gain new subscribers. Never mind those who sleep and dream about a revolution, thinking that a change of society will come as the manna was divinely supplied to the Israelites. You will find them everywhere. They find fault with everything and criticize everybody, but never even attempt to do anything themselves. Rather pity them, for they lack both backbone and sincerity. Pamphlets have been mailed.

S. H., City.—It seems to me it is not so much the "outside influence which contaminates" the children, as the ignorance of the Anarchist-parents. When you tell your little girl that the "Catholic sisters" are bad, and are trying to deceive the people," after she has observed that they are taking care of the sick and the orphans, you are telling her a lie, and I do not see why she should believe her father or obey his command not to visit the "sisters." Tell her that they are doing the best they can under the influence of their belief; that most of them, perhaps, are not actuated by love and kindness, but are performing their work from a sense of duty, and in obedience to the command of their superiors, etc., and then let her go and see for herself. Or are you afraid that the ideas and conduct of the "sisters" are superior to your own?

Some Criticism.

No. 460 of *FREE SOCIETY* is exceedingly interesting, and the triumvirate of social ideals—Anarchism, Socialism and good government—seem to be fairly on trial before a tribunal composed of a doctor, a judge and the editor. I plead, therefore, for an artist to be admitted as well into the controversy, if only for the sake of variety.

Judge Ladd's arraignment of present corruptive government, its cause and effects, could not be better, but he fails to convince that his proposed remedies and substitutes would not result in much the same state of things eventually as we have them today. Individuals less in number, with more pay and power, are no guarantee against abuse, waste, tyranny or corruption, if such men are ill chosen, and which latter is only too often a mere accident of the present class ballot, if not worse. If we could invariably rely on our putting only the best men into office, there is no doubt that the judge's plan of simplification and betterment of government would be very commendable. This for "good government."

A. I.'s comment on Ladd's article shows a deeper knowledge of governments at large, as far as the world has had them, and also what in that line we may expect of the future*. He has a deeper knowledge of history, science and humanity than his opponent, but he forgets to reckon with the insurmountable obstacles human nature puts into the path of his ideal. He and others overlook the fact that man is by nature invasive in his desires, and the more inclined to be so, the more his intelligence grows. Hence we have always had laws growing gradually from the simplest family 'codes of conduct' among the earliest tribes to the complex multitude of class laws in our own "intelligent" times. That legislating has been overdone every one knows, but our intelligence, instigated by a highly developed invasive egotism, inborn in every individual, has willed it so. Man's will is simply man himself. It is his one object to life, and his will being first, last and all the time, the interpretation of his egotism. Now, how are you going to make him submit voluntarily to your ideals and make a disinterested being of a naturally egotistical being? How will you check his manifold and ever present tendencies to invade the rights of weaker or meeker individuals than himself? It can only be done by laws backed up by force; and as there never has been any human society without institution, what right has any idealist to the contrary notion, any more than that he should strive to make the sun rise in the west instead of in the east? To me it seems pure waste of time and energy.

The assertion that law never did and never will prevent crime is true in only so far as that law will never entirely wipe out crime; neither will even ideal Anarchy. But it is equally true that law and force have been the only means to check crime and keep it to its lowest possible minimum, and which alone make it an imperatively necessary institution. Law has even prevented wars and does prevent excesses in wars, reprisals, etc., all the time, and all history shows it to have been a necessary institution. True, it has its abuses. So has the higher and unalterable natural law, as electric storms, floods, droughts, tornadoes, earthquakes and volcano outbreaks show in abundance.

We now come to the third proposed remedy—Socialism. Whether a permanent state of Socialism is possible or not, I do not undertake to say. But that it has been the natural and permanent institution in the family, rich or poor, and from time immemorial and in all lands, is irrevocably demonstrated. The only question to be settled, therefore, is, Can the State be transformed into and maintained as one large family? Some point to a big, disciplined, well managed and drilled army, and

claim that it represents successful Socialism. Yes, but only partly so. In the army the rank and file comes and goes, while the officials are permanent. Under ideal Socialism it is the opposite; the rank and file is permanent, while the officials are transient. The latter circumstance is the great safeguard of corruption and tyranny, the buggaboo of all governments. But all those who cry out "the worst slavery of all" at the mention of Socialism are on examination found to be the shirkers or their echoers, but never the workers of today. All those that fancy themselves "born to command" are naturally opposed to Socialism, as also those who hope to be able to command one day. Then come those who live by "skinning" others, and lastly, the parasites.

What Anarchists in general purposely or unwittingly forget in the case of Socialism is the all-important fact that the governments they so justly condemn are those of today (and that have been tried for ages and found to be wanting) are made up of permanent officials belonging to the privileged classes, while under Socialism we would have for the first time in history a truly representative government of, for and by the people, and not by any class only. Imprint that on your mind! You have a right to condemn the former, but not the latter, since they have never been tried. Be fair!

Moreover, under Socialism, each official is subject to strict account, supervision and the imperative mandate from those under him. Was there ever such a proposition under present or past governments? So, why not discriminate in accordance with facts? Are you so hopelessly enslaved to your pet prejudices as to refuse Socialists a fair trial? How can you consistently advocate Anarchism when you have no faith in humanity at large, for that matter?

Don't condemn 12,000,000 Socialists in your narrowness just because some obscure individualist "Socialist" here and there has found it impossible to make his immediate surroundings faultlessly socialistic under overwhelming odds against him, or otherwise blundered.

Such is no criterion to a large minded man. Under Socialism no official will ever be long enough installed to become a tyrant. Until it has been tried on a large scale nobody has a right to condemn Socialism.

Anarchists in general admit now, considering the trend of events, that before the philosophy of Anarchism can be seriously entertained, society will have to undergo the "ordeal" of Socialism. Logically, therefore, Anarchism comes in only when Socialism has been "tried and found to be wanting."

F. CAMBENSY.

COMMENT.

Again I must ask our well-meaning Socialist friend to be less presumptuous in his assertions, and give such vast subjects as criminology, sociology and "human nature" at least a passing thought before he ventures to dispose of them in a few paragraphs, and he will not fall into the Christian platitude that man is inherently bad. The study of primitive folk does not warrant the assertion that "man is by nature invasive," or that his "tendency is to invade the rights of the weaker or meeker individuals than himself." On the contrary, mutual aid is the moving force among men, nay, even among animals, as Cambensy can learn from Kropotkin's "Mutual Aid," and other works of learned men. Even today, after "human nature" has been stunted and stifled and perverted by Church and State, commercialism and monopoly, the tendency to aid the weak is still conspicuous in society. In fact, government is only tolerated and endured because it promises to protect the weak against the strong. Even our friend clamors for law and government merely because he labors under the de-

lusion that these mundane deities prevent crime and protect the weak. He forgets, however, that the same virtues were, and are yet, attributed to the heavenly deities. It was argued that without the belief in God men would immediately destroy each other. He has since learned that the greatest atrocities and bloodshed have been perpetrated in the name of God, and when people will have learned that today government is the real criminal, which causes war and strife, and exploits its deluded subjects for the benefit of a few, they will then be on their way to solving the social problem. The trouble with Cambensy is, he confuses "human nature" with "vested rights" and power—government—the tendency of which is to become more and more tyrannical, no matter under what name and promises it is instituted.

The idea that man can be made virtuous by "laws backed up by force" is no longer entertained even by the most antiquated penologists. They have learned that "crime" is always on the increase where punishment is the most severe. Blackstone, in his account of the laws of his time, gives a statute which provides for a fine for anyone who will cut off the ear of the king's subjects. This was at a time when the government indulged in the practice of cutting people's ears off for minor offences, showing that this "crime" became frequent among the people, and the "inherent" habit ceased as soon as government abolished this form of punishment. Even the death penalty for murder does not deter people from murdering each other; on the contrary, murder is most frequent where the death penalty prevails. But improved conditions do decrease crimes. The assertion that "law has prevented war" and its excesses is simply absurd; for even a Socialist should have learned enough of history to know that wars have been most frequent and brutal when gods and laws were at the zenith of their glory and power. True, today there is a tendency to mitigate the horrors of war by respecting human life and the "unarmed enemy," but is this due to the increase of laws and force? By no means. The institution of law and the belief in the divinity of government are on their decline, and the "international rules of war" have been wrested from governments by public opinion—the growth of intelligence—and are only imitations of the customs which prevailed among primitive peoples prior to the institution of law.

That Socialism "has been the natural and permanent institution in the family" I readily admit, and it is for this very reason that I abhor State Socialism. The family, in which the father reigned supreme from "time immemorial," was the first form of tyranny which was capable of completely suppressing and crippling the individuality of its subordinates, and it is only with the growth of intelligence that family life has become more or less tenable, i. e., to the extent that the "rights" and prerogatives of the head of the family have been curtailed, in consequence of which the institution of the family is in a state of dissolution. And when Cambensy compares State Socialism with the régime of militarism, he does his party a poor service, for every intelligent individual will shrink from such prospects of a future society; and the consolation that the officials

*And in this lies the great service the Anarchists are rendering in the libertarian movement. Let them persist at it, for it will bear good fruit, tho their offered remedies may not be sympathetic or logical.

under Socialism will be "transient instead of permanent" is not apt to enthrone the average American, who by this time knows a little about the honesty, integrity and purity of "transient" officials. Besides, State Socialism has been tried, and is being tried today, in many departments of society, as for instance the post office, the public schools, etc., and the results are not at all in its favor. The "transient" officials have not proven to be the "safeguards of corruption" in the postal service, neither has the "transient" school board promoted a progressive program for the public schools, nor has it eliminated political corruption.

The trite assertion that "under Socialism each official is subject to strict account" is equivalent to the ridiculous belief that the officials are our servants. All representative governments have, in theory, been liable to impeachment, but in practice it is always the subject who is impeached, just as the official is always the master in practice, altho the official may not be so much of a tyrant as the rules and regulations he is empowered to enforce—laws imposed upon the individual by an headless majority of legislators. "As an executive, I had to do as I did, but as a man, I am a union man," said Gov. Peabody to Mrs. Emma Langdon, of Victor, Colo., who in person presented him her book, in which she condemns the governor and the military authorities.

In conclusion, I will say that every Anarchist is not only willing, but anxious, to give the Socialists "a fair trial," for it is not Socialism that we combat. We are attacking the palliatives and reform measures which now so ostentatiously sail under the name of Socialism, and Cambensy is badly mistaken when he asserts that the Anarchists now "admit that society will have to undergo the ordeal of Socialism" before Anarchy can prevail. We only admit that the so-called Socialist party may come into power here and there before mankind awakens; but such régime will have no more resemblance with Socialism than Anarchy has with monarchy.

Who told Cambensy that Anarchists had "no faith in humanity at large"? Who has more faith in humanity, those who think that man must eternally be kept in check "by laws backed up by force," or those who trust that man will get along much better without the whip constantly hanging over him? A. I.

"Order" as a Superstition.

To the ordinary man, whose main concern is the making of a living for himself and family, any disturbance of the conditions upon which his calculations are based is apt to seem the worst thing that could possibly happen. Fires, floods, riots, crimes of violence or other things which stop, even temporarily, the machinery of production, may bring to naught the earnest and self-sacrificing labors of a lifetime. It is hardly to be wondered at, therefore, if, in these days of industrialism and commercialism, men are willing to sacrifice almost anything to the maintenance of "order." And yet it is often a superstition from which there are few more dangerous.

The United States may yet suffer seriously from a more selfish and cowardly desire to avoid disturbance. In very many cases the rights of citizens are being set at naught on the plea that order must be maintained. We commented, some time ago, on the case of John Turner, the English Tolstoyan and Anarchist,

who was ordered to be deported from the United States because he did not believe in organized government. The fatuous and reactionary law under which this treatment can be meted out to a stranger can be used, if its constitutionality is upheld by the Supreme Court, to deport people who have lived in the country for years and to harass any citizen whom the president or his officers think it desirable and safe to throw under the harrow of the law.

Turner before leaving New York said: "It seems to me that the United States government itself has been spreading the most dangerous kind of anarchistic tendencies by its action in my case. Holding me a prisoner for so long a time on Ellis Island not only drew attention to me and the ideas I represented—which are not dangerous, I assure you—but must have stirred up hard feelings in the hearts of many of the public."

"It seems strange that this free government should attempt to exclude and to deport a man of honest ideas, whose principles and beliefs have nothing of violence."

In the labor war now in progress in the mining sections of Colorado the tyranny of the soldiers has clearly been carried beyond bounds. Individual freedom is impossible in the shadow of loaded rifles. In Philadelphia recently a public meeting was forcibly prevented by the police on the plea that the main address was to be delivered by Emma Goldman, who is classed by the police as an Anarchist. Miss Goldman was to speak on the subject of woman's rights. Two citizens who questioned the right of the police to prevent the holding of the meeting were arrested and imprisoned. It has long been the custom of the police in large American cities to subject prisoners to inquiry which sometimes amounts almost to torture in order to compel them to reveal their plans and accomplices. This, it is said, is necessary in order to give those who enforce the law a fair chance against the criminal classes.

The business of the law and those who enforce it is to assert and maintain the right of the individual and to prevent aggression upon the weak and simple by the strong and cunning. But the danger is that those who are entrusted with the power of the people in enforcing the law may themselves become aggressors upon individual rights. Merely to call this high-handed conduct "maintaining order" does not make it any less disorderly. The czar is only "maintaining order" in Finland at this moment, but his process means the stamping out of civilization by mere barbaric force.

We of British blood have had to fight this cause out many a time against magistrates, lords, and kings. Not only have we asserted the right of the individual as against the mere might of the ruler, but we have set up plain constitutional marks, in order that we might know at once when the sacred territory of individual right was being invaded. The right to think freely, to speak freely in private or in public, so long as common decency is maintained; the right to a speedy and open trial; the right to be held innocent until proven guilty; these and other boundary marks are unquestioned with us, as yet.

The United States inherited the standards of British liberty, as we did. Their object in making themselves a nation was to "set the bounds of freedom broader yet." In the spirit shown by the examples just given and by others that might be given, they indicate themselves apostates to the faith. It is not for us to judge them or to plume ourselves upon superior virtue. It may be that we sin in other respects and have earned condemnation in our own special way. Or it may be that temptation has not come to us as strong or as insidious as that which assailed them. But we have a right to note our neighbors' errors if we do it with a sincere desire to avoid similar errors in our own conduct.

For, be it noted, this plea of "maintaining order," however honest those may be who use it, may be a sheer illusion. Arbitrary power may be granted for the public good, but it is always in the long run used against the people and in the interest of those upon whom it is conferred. Those familiar with great cities make much of the difference between London and Chicago in the matter of police protection. In London the police are under iron discipline and must observe scrupulously the rights of every individual, from the Lord Mayor to Bill Sykes himself. And in London life and property are safer, and order is better maintained, than in any other great city on earth. On the other hand, Chicago gives its police great latitude. The club and the "sweat box" are theirs, to use at their discretion. And in Chicago crime and the police are partners. The law-abiding citizen who would keep his property and go about the streets unmolested must know and observe the terms of that partnership and go abroad only when and where it is safe to do so. Liberty is sacrificed to a too cowardly love of order, and order is sacrificed to the tyranny of those whom the people have been weak enough to clothe with arbitrary power.—*The Journal*, Ottawa, Canada.

Echoes.

Endless talk. The German Reichstag and the Prussian diet in beautiful rivalry. It is a time of political fad. And it is a blessing, indeed, that the newspaper reports are almost illegible; for that which does not suit the partisan press is distorted so brazenly that it sounds as the twaddle of a fool. The pious citizen is told in his paper that the Social Democrats have been whipped in parliament, and the red press tells the impious toiler that the government collapsed disgracefully under the blows of Bebel. And everything remains as before. Next year the same story is made over again in the household of parliament. And things go on as they were of old. The speeches held in the dear Reichstag for the party members are as fruitless and unrefreshing as the rainy wind which in the fall rustles thru the withered leaves. In the long run the entire representative system is nothing but a tedious and leathern toy. Small children break the toy which becomes tiresome to them, and throw the pieces in the corner. The big child people continues to amuse itself cheerfully with the emptiness and stupidity of a ballot box, and feels highly dignified when it reads the absolutely useless speeches of its representatives.—*The Future* (Germany).

* * *

Patricians and plebeians, aristocrats and democrats, have alike stained their hands with blood in the working out of the problem of politics. But impartial history declares also that the crimes of the popular party have in all ages been the lighter in degree, while in themselves they have more to excuse them; and if the violent acts of revolutionists have been held up more conspicuously for condemnation, it has been only because the fate of noblemen and gentlemen has been more impressive to the imagination than the fate of the peasant or the artisan. But the endurance of the inequalities of life by the poor is the marvel of human society. When the people complain, said Mirabeau, the people are always right. The popular cause has been the cause of the laborer struggling for a right to live and breathe and think as a man. Aristocracies fight for wealth and power, wealth which they waste upon luxury, and power which they abuse for their own interests. Yet the cruelties of Marius were as far exceeded by the cruelties of Sylla as the insurrection of the beggars of Holland was exceeded by the bloody tribunal of the Duke of Alva, or as "the horrors of the French Revolution" were exceeded by the massacre of the Huguenots two hundred years before, for which the Revolution was the expiatory atonement.—*Quoted by the N. Y. Journal*.

SUBSCRIPTIONS for FREE SOCIETY can be paid at the following addresses:

ALLEGHENY, Pa.—H. Bauer, 73 Spring-garden Ave.

ATLANTIC CITY, N. J.—M. Kisluck, 1108 Baltic Ave.

BOSTON.—K. A. Snellenberg, 127 Center St., Roxbury.

CHICAGO.—T. Appel, 790 Girard Ave. H. Gordon, 427 Park Ave.

BROOKLYN.—M. Metzkw, 173 Ralph St.

CLEVELAND.—E. Schilling, 34 Elwell St.,

LONDON, Eng.—T. Cantwell, 127 Ossulton St., N. W.

NEW YORK.—M. Maisel, 194 E. B'way. Alfred Schneider, 230 E. Fourth St.

PHILADELPHIA.—Natasha Notkin, 1332 S. Sixth St.

FOR NEW YORK.

The Manhattan Liberal Club meets every Friday, 8 p. m., in the German Masonic Temple, 220 E. 15th St.

The Freeland League meets every Thursday, 8 p. m., sharp, at Etris Hall, 168 W. 23rd St. Lectures and free discussions as follows:

On Thursday, May 19th—Dr. H. Solotaroff, "Communism."

On Thursday, May 26th—Jno W. Ould, "Freeland."

The Slavic Group meets on the first and third Tuesday of the month, 8 p. m., at 543 East Sixth St. Free discussions. All are invited.

LIBERAL ART SOCIETY meets every Wednesday at 8 15 p. m. sharp, at Terrace Lyceum, 206 E Broadway. Free discussions.

Wednesday, May 25 — Lecture by Platon Brounoff on "Russian Music as an Appeal of an Oppressed Nation to the Civilized World," and Dr. Rovinsky will speak on "Can Russia Claim the Sympathy in the Present War?"

FREE SOCIETY Group meets every Tuesday evening at the Radical Reading Room, 37 Attorney St. All comrades interested in the English propaganda are cordially invited.

TO RENT

One or two light rooms. Address: Helene Müller, 71-73 E. 100th St. Call in the forenoon or evenings.

FOR ST. LOUIS.

The Debating Clubrooms, at 1008 N. 17th St., are open every evening. Lectures and discussions every Saturday evening. Everybody is welcome.

FOR PHILADELPHIA.

The following meetings will be held at Odd Fellow's Temple:

Sunday, May 15, 8 p. m., Bolton Hall on "Does Reform Pay the Reformer?"

Sunday, May 22, 8 p. m., Emma Goldman on "Anarchism and the Modern Drama."

FOR CLEVELAND.

Free Society Group meets every Sunday, 3:30 p. m., at 223 Columbus St. Lectures and free discussion.

FOR CHICAGO.

Liberty Group meets every Thursday, 8 p. m., at 427 Park Avenue, for propaganda purposes and discussion. The club rooms at 427 Park Ave. are open as usual.

Book-List.

- "Essays on the Social Problem"..... 05
.....H. Addis
"The New Hedonism".....Grant Allen 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
"Love's Coming of Age"..... 1.00
.....Edward Carpenter
"Evolution of the Family"..... 05
.....Jonathan Mayo Crane
"Conduct and Profession"..... 10
.....Clarence S. Darrow
"Crime and Criminals"..... " 10
"Realism in Literature and Art" " 75
"Resist Not Evil" Cloth..... " 10
"Tolstoy"..... " 10
"Crime and Punishment"..... 10
.....Voltaire de Cleyre
"The Worm Turns"..... " 10
"The Emancipation of Society from Government".....Dallan Doyle 05
"Roosevelt, Czolgosz, and Anarchism".....Jay Fox 03
"Moribund Society and Anarchy." Cloth, 60c.....Jean Grave 25
"Origin of Anarchism".....C. L. James 05
"Anarchism: Its Philosophy and Ideal".....Peter Kropotkin 05
"Anarchist Communism: Its Basis 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 of Evolution"..... " 2.00
"Organized Vengeance"..... " 03
"Paris Commune"..... " 05
"The State: Its Historic Role"..... " 10
"The Wage System. Revolutionary Government"..... " 05
"Socialism and Politics"..... " 05
"Government-Analyzed".....Kelso 50
"The Economics of Anarchy"..... 25
.....Dyer D. Lum
"Anarchy." (Is It All a Dream? Jas. F. Morton, Jr.).....Malatesta 10
"A Talk About Anarchist Communism Between Two Workers"..... 05
"A Chambermaid's Diary"..... 50
.....Octave Mirbeau
"Do You Want Free Speech?"..... 10
.....James F. Morton, Jr.
"The Deistic Pestilence".....John Most 05
"God and Government: The Siamese Twins of Superstition".....W. Nevill 05
"The Pyramid of Tyranny"..... 05
.....F. Domela Nieuwehuis
"A Cityless and Countryless World: An Outline of Practical Co-operative Individualism." Cloth \$1..... 50
.....Henry Olerich
"Mating or Marrying, Which?"..... 05
.....W. H. Van Ornum
"Sine Qua Non; or, The Core of Religion".....Dr. Geo. Pyburn 10
"Evolution and Revolution".....Reclus 05
"Pure Economy".....J. H. Rowell 10
"Pages of Socialist History"..... 30
.....W. Teherkesoff
"The Slavery of Our Times." Cloth.....Leo Tolstoy 75
"Our Worship of Primitive Social Guesses".....E. C. Walker 15
"Vice: Its Friends and Foes"..... 15
"What the Young Need to Know"..... " 10
"Life Without a Master." 336 pp. Cloth \$1.50.....J. Wilson 1.00
"The New Dispensation." Cloth. " 1.50

"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
Order from FREE SOCIETY.

M. N. Maisel's Book Store

194 EAST BROADWAY
New York

"History of Civilization in England."
By Henry Thomas Buckle.
Three vols., cloth, 1' mo., 1720 pages, large type and good paper. This best edition of Buckle's great work was originally published at \$9.00 a set. My price is \$3.25 or \$3.60 postpaid. I have only a few sets on hand.

Walt Whitman's "Leaves of Grass."
Elegant artistic cloth binding, 12 mo., 446 pages. This is the copyright edition of 1897 by Bucke, Horned, & Traubel, literary executors of Walt Whitman. My price is \$5 cents, or \$1.00 postpaid.

The best ten plays of
HENDRIK IBSEN.
A Doll's House, 25c.
Rosmerholm, 25c.
The Lady of the Sea, 25c.
The Wild Duck, 25c.
Young Men's League, 25c.
Hedda, Gabler, 50c.
The Master Builder, 50c.
The Pillars of Society, 25c.
Ghosts, 25c.
The Enemy of Society, 25c.
The last three plays named are also published in a cheap edition in one volume, cloth, and sold at 50c. or 40c. postpaid.
The above ten plays, paper, sent to one address, postpaid, for \$2.50.
The same ten plays, seven in paper, together with the last three in one cloth volume, sent postpaid for \$2.25.

MAXIM GORKY'S.
"Orloff and his Wife" and seven other stories, 485 pages, cloth, published at \$1; my price for the copies on hand, 45 cents, with postage, 60 cents.

LEO TOLSTOY'S.
"The Slavery of Our Times," cloth, published at \$1.25; my price 40 cents; with postage, 50 cents.
I have only a few copies of this book on hand.

Modern Science and Anarchism

BY PETER KROPOTKIN.

By some critics this book is considered one of Kropotkin's best work, dealing with all phenomena of life scientifically. The author reviews and analyzes the intellectual movements of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, as well as the teachings of the Church. He shows what place Anarchism takes in science; the object of the ideal, its origin, and how it developed. In conclusion he treats law, mortality, economic ideas, government, and revolutions and their birth.
Price, 25 cents.

Address orders to N. Notkin, 1332 So. Sixth St., Philadelphia, Pa.

History of the French Revolution.

By C. L. JAMES.

A new history of the French Revolution, and a history written from a new point of view—this is in little a characterization of a work which is exciting intelligent interest and appreciative criticism among historical scholars and readers of history in general.

The author of the work, C. L. James, is in a literary as well as the physical sense the son of his father, G. P. R. James, who was well known both as a scholar and imaginative writer to an older generation of book lovers. With a trained literary faculty, an unbiased judgment, and a capacity for painstaking investigation and emendation, he has produced a piece of writing which cannot fail to become better and better known as time goes on, and which will take a place among authoritative pronouncement upon those events which it chronicles.

C. L. James approaches the problem of the French Revolution in a thoroughly scientific spirit, and conciliates opposition at once by giving due consideration to all the facts having any importance in that memorable strife. But ere the reader has gone very far into the book he discovers that it is a vindication of the human race in its long, long struggle to free itself from restrictions upon its liberty and life; in short, he discovers that the author views the evil of the French Revolution as a thing arising mainly out of oppression prior thereto and authoritative interference during its progress, and the good as those liberties which it gave to the world and which its ideal and example predispose men to augment according to their strength and individuality.

Monarchic, democratic, religious histories we have had; the French Revolution is now presented to us from a libertarian point of view.

Printed from large, new type on good book paper, and handsomely bound in cloth; 343 pp. Price \$1, postpaid.

Order from Liberty Group, 427 Park Ave., Chicago, Ill.

"THAT WAR SPIRIT" SURE CURE FOR

Resist Not Evil 75 CENTS postpaid

By Clarence S. Darrow.

Write for list of other Darrow books.

THE HAMMERSMARK Publishing Co.

151-153 Wabash Ave., CHICAGO, Ill

Comrades SEND ME NO MONEY Cured of Cancer but a statement from the publisher of FREE SOCIETY, that you

have deposited with him the sum of \$25 to be forwarded to me when the Cancer is removed, or returned to you if it is not, and I will send you, postpaid, my Remedy, which is painless and has NEVER failed. Edw. E. Gore, Lawrence, Kan.