



Our Unknown Friend.

I read with much interest the communication of the unknown friend with comments by Comrade James, and I feel a sympathy for the brother, hardly expressed by our comrade's comments.

"A fellow feeling makes us wonderous kind."

I well remember occupying a very similar position, when I, too, found myself in "the Tucker and Proudhon camp," and I hope our friend, when he has read *FREE SOCIETY* understandingly, will find, as I did, that Anarchist Communism is something very different from his present conception. I am especially pleased to add my testimony in this connection. Inasmuch as I may answer a Cleveland friend, the author of "Organization and its Relation to Anarchism," who told my daughter I had torn his pamphlet all to pieces in an article to *FREE SOCIETY*, and how the paper had generously offered him space to reply, but he had never "got around" to answer it. He also said Tucker told him, I was the only man who had changed from Individualist to Communist, and he wanted to know the reason. If I had experienced any change, I cannot see why that article did not explain it. I want to say to my Cleveland friend, however, that he is not the only one who has failed to "get around" to answer my arrangement of the organization theory, which I claim to be antagonistic to Anarchism.

I am as much an Individualist as I ever was, but a better acquaintance with the "common folk" — the proletariat — has tempered stern justice with a sympathy I failed to discern in the words of our unknown friend. As I consider my Individualism has improved, and therefore my Anarchism is better, as I understand the term, I have experienced no change in my convictions, but simply found them better represented by a different association.

When Comrade Byington wrote in *Liberty*, "What Anarchism Is," and put forth the claim that under it all the machinery of government could be used, that courts, police, and jails might be factors of Anarchism, I protested, and my protest was quietly dropped into the wastebasket. Imagine a free society suppressing the honest convictions of one of its members! I prefer an association where objection to methods and opinions are published and considered. If my Cleveland friend will follow my thought, he may read the nature of my change.

Our unknown friend writes:

"It seems to me that Communism would result in the most autocratic despotism."

It is a trick of "the Tucker and Proudhon camp" to confound authoritative Communism with anarchistic Communism, for there is as much difference between them, as there is be-

tween Anarchy and authority, State Socialism and free Socialism, which includes Anarchism. Now I want to ask our friend, if it is not true that "autocratic despotism" is only possible with actual organization? And is it not true, that "the Tucker and Proudhon camp" advocates actual organization, while the Anarchists Communists everywhere regret it? Which, then, would be most liable to develop autocratic despotism?

Again, our friend thinks that property is the most important right to the freedom of the individual. Yet Proudhon said that "Property is robbery." Of course, he meant the legal right, but what difference is it to me whether my property is assured by the state or some other organization? The idea is, a power higher than the individual assures him, and "power" is what generates "autocratic despotism." The Anarchist Communist will not trust organized power, while "the Tucker and Proudhon camp" makes it the basis of their program. Which, I ask, is more liable to despotism? Oh, but their organization is very different! Granted. Government is the supreme organization, all others are sub-organizations. But suppose "the Tucker and Proudhon camp" is successful? Then the "sub" would be supreme. "Oh, but these organizations would be multiplied." Very likely, even as governments are multiplied, but their clash would result in reorganizing the organizations, forming a trust. Sovereign authority is the goal of power and "autocratic despotism" ever its final condition. Is it not true that power always develops tyranny? Is it not true that such power always depends upon organization?

I want to assure our friend that he utterly misconceives the position of Anarchist Communism. He has in mind what has been called "communityism". We believe in the absolute liberty of the individual, and we denounce property as incompatible with his freedom, that is to say, property as commercially considered, a right, vouchsafed by some power higher than the individual. It was this right which demanded government, and is only possible under government. And we denounce commercialism for the same reason. It deprives man of his natural right. *Anarchism means the liberty of man from man's rule; Communism means the liberty of all things from man's rule.* It is essentially anti-monopoly, the old communistic theory based upon the god-idea would have all things in common, but conceived a higher power necessary, which could only be obtained by organization—by vesting an authority higher than the individual in certain members of the community, which has always produced rebellion since "Lucifer leads the hosts of heaven against the most High." It is this authority, this power — developed by organization —

which constitutes the difference between the old and the new, or, anarchistic Communism.

My meaning of "Anarchy" is "without rule," consequently without organization. My trust is in "Anarchists without adjectives"; but so long as professed Anarchists believe in organization — some kind of a rule — to resist invasion, perhaps an adjective is necessary. Communism is the word which means "to share," "to communicate," "to make common or familiar," fellowship, fraternity, equality, and — liberty. The fact that this idea was supposed to be possible as the basis of a state, a government, an organization, does not alter its meaning any more than Anarchy is altered by the endeavor of "the Tucker and Proudhon camp" to introduce a principle diametrically opposed to its original meaning. I want to assure our friend, that anarchistic Communism is based upon the natural right of the individual. It is not to abolish property, but to abolish that rule that can hold property out of use; that arbitrary rule which would establish "thine" and "mine". There is no denial of personal property except when "personal" is established by rule; when organization deforms it.

Communism is a condition where the world's wealth is common wealth. It would do away with commercialism that leads to monopoly and demands authority. It would do away with competition, which is simply the grab-game of commercialism. They believe in liberty, not as a right to be established by some power of organization, but as a principle in nature, which an institution must of necessity deform.

The selfishness of a man is a glorious thing when confined to the individual, but, dressed in a little brief authority:

"Plays such fantastic tricks before high heaven,
As makes the angels weep." (1)

A. LEROY LOUBAL.

To me, at least, it would be enough to condemn modern society as hardly an advance on slavery or serfdom, if the permanent condition of industry were to be that which we behold, that 90 per cent of the actual producers of wealth have no home that they can call their own beyond the end of the week; have no bit of soil, or so much as a room that belongs to them; have nothing of value of any kind except as much old furniture as will go in a cart; have the precarious chance of weekly wages which barely suffice to keep them in health; are housed for the most part in places that no man thinks fit for his horse; are separated by so narrow a margin from destitution that a month of bad trade, sickness or unexpected loss brings them face to face with hunger and pauperism. . . . This is the normal state of the average workman in town or country. — Frederic Harrison (England).

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 East 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 contributors.



SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1904.

482

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

..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*.

All delinquent subscribers are earnestly requested to renew their subscriptions if they wish to receive the paper. A blue pencil mark on the wrapper indicates that the subscription expired.

A Yom Ha-Kippurim Picnic,

of the Jewish comrades takes place Monday, September 19, at Liberty Park, Cooper Ave., Glendale, L. I., and it is to be hoped that all those who rather dance and be merry than fast and atone for their past sins will rally in Liberty Park.. Half of the proceeds will be poured into the empty treasury of FREE SOCIETY.

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 to Cypress Ave. cars and get off at Cooper Ave.

By the Wayside.

Lewanika, an African potentate, says, "They ruined me when they made a king of me. I have become a corrupt and bloodthirsty man." Certain office-holders toward Lewanika's antipodes might say very much the same, if they had his insight and frankness.

In Denver a "Peabody Law and Order League" has been organized, and the Chicago *Public* is anxious to know what kind of law and order" that is, which goes to show that superstition is immortal even with the most intelligent editors, otherwise they would have learned by this time that there is and can be only one kind of "law and order," namely that which is enjoined either by virtue of peoples ignorance and reverence for the idol or at the point of a bayonet. Essentially there is no difference between the laws of a Peabody and those of any form of government.

The Socialist press thinks "that the great strike against the meat trust is to add one more proof that the workers stand no chance of winning on the industrial field, and must do battle on the political field if they ever hope to win." It will be an easy matter, however, for the

trades union papers to prove that organized labor — in spite of its ups and downs — has done much in the way of improving the conditions and in creating a spirit of fraternity and self-reliance among its members — a spirit which is growing year by year. But where is the success the Socialists have achieved during the many years of political action? Let us hear of a single instance where the workers have been benefited by political action and we shall henceforth keep mum as regards the ballot box

* * *

In the Cripple Creek District, according to the *Miners Magazine*, the reign of terror still continues, and any man who is known to have failed to sever his connection with the Western Federation of Miners, who dares to give utterance to a word that can be interpreted as conveying sympathy for the organization, or in fact, any man who fails to give his sanction and approval to the lawlessness and outrages perpetrated by a band of whitecappers, backed and supported by the mine owners' association and the citizens' alliance, becomes a target against whom vengeance is to be administered.—But it occurs from the attitude of a Methodist minister, Leland, the miners themselves are greatly to blame for the treatment they receive. When the minister of the gospel was informed to leave, he declared that he would defend his home with rifles and revolvers, and "the mob was not anxious to test the nerve of the man who declared that he would 'stay' at Victor." Well, if a minister of the gospel, who the editor says is "a brave man," can keep the mob at bay, it seems to me the miners who cringe and crawl and appeal to the sheriff for help deserve to be deported from the vicinity where only one brave man can be found.

* * *

"The battle has been lost," says the *Chicago Arbeiter-Zeitung* anent the great strike of the Meat Workers' Union. "At the orders of their commander-in-chief, Donnelly, the striking workers have laid down their arms. After a battle of fifty-nine days the toilers have not only nothing achieved, but have even lost what little they possessed. Hardly ever has a great strike terminated more ingloriously and pitifully. The blame for this revolting defeat rests with the leaders. If they did not think the masses standing behind them strong enough to fight the battle, the strike ought not to have been proclaimed. But once the battle was in progress, it was their duty to push the strike on with all possible vigor, to combine all the forces available and to damage the enemy wherever possible. Instead they struggled with might and main against sympathy strikes and passed resolutions — strangely enough — which purported to guard the enemy from damages. Do not trust your leaders! — that is the lesson the unions can draw from the outcome of the strike. And it furnished still another lesson, namely, that the time of isolated strikes is passed — that only the combined efforts of all the organized workers have a chance for success in their struggle with the allied forces of capitalism."

"You are many and they are few," the editor addresses the workers. "You could conquer these few easily and teach them that it is for their well-being to work with you for the welfare of all. But instead you crawl and humiliate yourselves before them; you rub your backs

and knees sore and become old and wornout prematurely, only to make it possible for the few to live a life of idleness and revelry. They openly show their contempt for you, and look upon you as breathing machines. And your pusillanimous and lamentable behavior gives them the right to scorn you, to trample upon you, to give you the lash, and to spit in your faces. Those who behave like slaves deserve to be treated accordingly. And what else are you — considering your numbers — but low and wretched servile souls? If you at least were conscious of your wretchedness — you would begin to meditate about your disgraceful condition and look for means to liberate yourselves. But as it is you vegetate along bluntly and stupidly and are getting accustomed to the slave-drivers whip, as you are accustomed to the crumbs of bread for which you suffer insults day by day."

INTERLOPER.

Were the Chicago Martyrs Anarchists?

As a matter of fact it should be remembered that the men who were hung, the so-called Anarchists in Chicago, were really Socialists, Socialists at that time not being distinguished from Anarchists. — Rev. Thos. C. Hall in *North American Review*.

Quoting the above, Bolton Hall in No. 32 of FREE SOCIETY asks:

Is this correct? Will one of your well-informed readers answer? I do not know enough to judge for myself, except that I do know that the latter claim is true.

The question whether or not the Chicago martyrs were Anarchists has been asked so often that a few words from one who was very close to them from 1883 to the time of their judicial murder may not be out of place.

In the first place I wish to state that at the time of the famous lake front agitation in Chicago, in which I took an active part, the program of Anarchist-Communism, as it is understood and taught by the best informed disciples of that school today, had not been clearly elucidated. We were in a condition of doubt and inquiry; with the most ardent longings for liberty the most of our old State Socialists beliefs still clinging to us. Many a time have Parsons, Fielden, Spies, and Fischer, together with Mrs. Holmes and I, threshed over the old ground. Parsons and I were probably closer than we two were with the others. Our families were very intimate. He and I had both been members of the Socialist Labor party and both left the party about the same time, I took up with Tucker and Liberty, he with Ira Stewart. Fielden had also, I believe, been a member of the Social Labor party, but up to the time of his joining the International had been more active in the old Liberal League. Spies, Fischer and I think Engel and Schwab had also been members of the party, as had also Neebe. Lingg I do not know so much about, as I never met him until he was incarcerated in the county jail. All of us left the Socialist Labor party because our growing libertarian views would not permit us to subscribe to the doctrines and tactics. We joined the International, a purely anarchistic society; not the International of Marx be it understood, that organization had no members in Chicago at that time, but the I. W. P. A. founded by Bakunin. We called ourselves Anarchists, and everything except a thoro and well-grounded knowledge of Anarchism we were to all intents and purposes Anarchists.

Parsons and I kept abreast of one another. We read Proudhon, Warren, Spooner, Tucker, and other anarchistic writers; we also read Kropotkin's, Malatesta's, and other works, and gradually the truth dawned on us. Unknown to me at that time, Fischer had pursued a similar line of reading and thought, with decided lea-

nings toward Individualism. Spies was thoroly well read, but he and Schwab had imbued the ideas of Marx so thoroly that it was more difficult for them to break away. Fielden also had become a thoro libertarian, and was not one whit behind the rest of us. Such was the position of these comrades at the time of the Haymarket affair.

During the year and a half that they were incarcerated in Cook Co. jail, the Chicago Anarchists read and thought a great deal, with the result that several months before the judicial hanging, they had completely thrown off the last remnants of State Socialist belief and were Anarchists, pure and simple. Fischer leaned more and more toward Individualism, while the others, and particularly Parsons and Fielden, were communistic in their tendencies; recognizing the great fact that under liberty production would become so cheap, and manufactured goods of nearly every description so common and plentiful, that Communism would inevitably follow. This I know, for during all the time they were in prison I visited them daily, and was in close touch with them to the last days.

The reason they called themselves Socialists as well as Anarchists is plain. Tucker refers to his paper, *Liberty*, as an exponent of Free Socialism. The term Socialism is a generic one, and no school of socialistic philosophy has a right to claim it to the exclusion of others. State Socialists are fond of arrogating to themselves the name Socialists, but the Chicago Anarchists took the same ground that I do, and called themselves Socialists with the same freedom that they took upon themselves the name Anarchists. The apparent antagonism between the two exists only in the minds of (1) ill-informed radicals who do not take the trouble to look the matter up, and (2) State Socialists who know better but fear that the least identification with Anarchists will besmirch their cause and make it less popular with the masses. Many Tucker Anarchists also sneer at the Anarchism of the Chicago comrades, but that arises from their inability to comprehend the logical outcome of free conditions, and because they delight to label themselves with the high sounding term "philosophical."

WM. HOLMES.

No Longer an Anarchist.

As a boy I was born and raised a Republican. I became a Democrat upon reading some criticism of Republicans. I became a Populist upon reading the criticism of Republicans and Democrats. I became a Single Taxer upon reading the criticism of Republicans, Democrats and Populists. I became a Socialist upon reading the criticism of Republicans, Democrats, Populists and Single Taxers. I became an Anarchist by reading the criticism of Republicans, Democrats, Populists, Single Taxers and Socialists. I became a Nihilist by reading about Republicans, Democrats, Populists, Single Taxers, Socialists and Anarchists. I have become at last a Libertarian by reading of, and mingling with, them all.

What is a Libertarian? I don't know. I never met another one.

While I admit learning much from reading *FREE SOCIETY*, I have had a supreme contempt and disgust for the abject servility and mental slavery and cowardice — the ignorance and superstition — of most of its contributors, whom I consider to be but little removed beyond the stage of those they call conservative.

I have just been reading an article entitled "From Colorado" by "An Observer" in No. 471 of *FREE SOCIETY*, in which he sets up a most plaintive wail for pity and sympathy in behalf of the "poor workers" in Colorado. This seems to cap the climax of my disgust for the writers of such Anarchist literature. (1) In his defense of the miners he says:

"I am told by reliable persons that not a shot was fired by the miners, and that Carley, whom they (the soldiers) murdered, was not only unarmed, but had his hands up when he was shot down. People who knew him there say he was a very peaceable citizen."

"Observer" just makes Carley out to have been not one whit better than his slayers. I have no more interest in the controversy between these Colorado miners and their masters than I have in the approaching campaign between Republicans and Democrats — and a few Socialists. But when I see a cringing coward ignominiously begging for mercy I always hope he won't get it.

I have repeatedly addressed to me in a sigh supposed to be piteous: "What a terrible tyranny has developed in Colorado!" Well, I invariably reply that the 40,000 striking miners do not seem to consider it very terrible. There's only been one dinky little bit of a country station fallen and but a score of funerals, and the strikers themselves all disclaim any credit for the one feeble little blow that was struck. Hardly a single finger pressed in protest. If they don't mind it, I don't.

This may not seem to have much to do with libertarianism, but, as I don't know what it is myself, I'll tell you what I am like, so you may know what kind of a fellow has decided to call himself a Libertarian since he has deserted the ranks of the Anarchists, who preach against government — and fall all over themselves to conform to its mandates. (2)

I am absolutely selfish and know no duty whatever. I do whatsoever I most want to (like everybody else, as I think) merely because I want to; merely because I think it will give me more pleasure than to do otherwise and I never try to justify myself or decide whether it is right or wrong. I don't care whether it is right or wrong. If I want to cohabit with the opposite sex without a license, I do because I want to. If I desire to rape a female rather than cohabit with such as would cohabit with me voluntarily, I do so and care not the least whether it is right or wrong. (3).

I do not (as do the Anarchists) refrain from doing so because it is "wrong" to use force or violence. I will refrain thru fear (and I am not overburdened with fear) more readily than from considerations of "right" or morality. I have no regard for morality. I admire the fiend more than the virtuous (whom I consider ignorant and cowardly) and I despise chastity. I will enslave such ignorant imbeciles and cringing cowards as will let me whenever I feel like it, tho I may or may not ever feel like it. That will not depend upon "right," "wrong," or "morality," but upon whether I think it will add to or detract from my pleasure. I would murder a president or king if I wanted to, or would become president or governor if I wanted to and had the power. (4)

I could go on indefinitely along these lines but it would give me no pleasure to write so much as would take up more space than you are willing to give to what you will no doubt consider as the idle vaporings of an apostate Anarchist. (5)

STURBER.

COMMENT.

1. — It is no wonder that Sturber is disgusted when he takes the report of a strike for "Anarchist literature." Besides, "Observer" neither justified nor condemned the attitude of the strikers, but simply stated facts.

2. — How can a man desert the Anarchists when he never was in their ranks and had not even grasped the ABC of their philosophy, as he proved by his "Anarchist Constitution"? And I happen to know that the courageous and valiant "Libertarian" Sturber meekly succumbed before the mandates of a Chicago policeman, who arrested him for speaking on the street.

3. — In his "Anarchist Constitution" Sturber provides even for a kind of age of consent rule, which evidently was to be applied for the "other fellow." At any rate, after such confession no Anarchist will regret Sturber's desertion. Not that we would punish or even condemn him for assaulting the opposite sex, for we

know only too well that such people are the victims of the perversity of sexual morality prevailing in "civilized" society; but we prefer to have people in our ranks who are sound mentally and physically, requiring neither our pity nor the care of an asylum. As to "right" or "wrong," the Anarchists have not yet written a "Constitution" in which these terms are defined as a rule of conduct; but certain actions, such as raping a woman for instance, are repulsive to us, and we avoid the company of people who are afflicted with such and similar diseases, as we avoid the fragrance of a badly smelling flower.

4. — No doubt you would, since you have "deserted" the Anarchists. But the latter find no pleasure in ruling over others or being ruled over, and it is for this reason that they had the audacity to reject even the "Anarchist Constitution."

5. — "The idle vaporings of a muddled head" would be more appropriate.

A. I.

The Anarchist Convention in St. Louis.

"International Workingmen's Congress," says John Most in No. 34 of the *"Freiheit"*, "are certainly of most demonstrative importance when they are of a revolutionary character and as a whole personify the class struggle, expressing in ardent manifestations the courage for battle and the hatred towards the enemy, so that the masses are electrified and the criminals of mankind terrified."

This is just what the St. Louis comrades had in view, and never was there a better chance for such a demonstration as it was offered to all of us during the Worlds Fair, where comrades from all over the United States could have come to such a convention for less than one half of the usual railroad fare. And yet, strange to say, Comrade Most was the first who wrote against the convention in the most abusive and ridiculous terms, inducing comrades and the Anarchist papers of this country to oppose the efforts of the St. Louis comrades.

Thus, with four Anarchist papers writing against the project, we could not expect much, and frankly admit that the convention was a failure. We nevertheless held our first meeting according to the program on the evening of Labor Day, September 5. Present were one comrades from Chicago and twelve from here. Interesting letters and articles on different subjects were received and partly read, which will be published afterwards. The subject for the evening was "The General Strike." The following is the quintessence of the discussion:

Considering the fact that nearly all the large strikes during the past few years and especially in this year have been lost, the workmen ere long will realize that new ways must be adopted to save their organizations and themselves from the united attacks of organized capital and government.

The leaders in the trades union movement are either cowards, politicians aiming for political jobs, or, if they are honest and sincere men, are not intelligent enough to understand the present conditions, the social question in all its phases and the new tactics necessary to successfully cope with the enemy. While the average workman is still far behind his European brother in the study of social questions and even antagonistic to the ideas of Anarchism, it is nevertheless a fact that during a large strike he is more

attentive to radical ideas than during times of peace. All agreed that it was of utmost importance to agitate for the general strike and do henceforth more in this line than was done hitherto.

It was suggested that a fund of several hundred dollars should be raised and some 20,000 pamphlets printed, explaining in plain words the general strike and Anarchy in the English language. These pamphlets should be distributed free in all organizations and especially among the workers during strikes.

Comrades of other towns who agree with us are requested to contribute to this fund. It was also suggested that FREE SOCIETY should call upon the comrades of this country for assistance, receive the money, act as treasurer, and take the publishing of these pamphlets into its hands.

St. Louis herewith encloses \$15 for this fund and \$5 for the support of FREE SOCIETY. This is all the convention has done. If other comrades and papers, instead of talking, kicking, and criticizing would act a little more, a good deal more could have been done.

CARL NOLD.

The Rod in Russia.

Under the above caption and the sub-heading, "A teacher who found love a substitute for spanking," the following communication appeared in the New York Times:

"The discussion regarding corporal punishment of children now going on in your paper is especially interesting to a Russian, a 'semi-barbarian,' and as such I hope I will be permitted to add my mite to this pertinent subject.

"The question agitated pedagogical minds in Russia some thirty years ago. Fortunately, the 'new school' won the victory: the rod was abolished, and today there is hardly a teacher in favor of corporal punishment, unless he be Russia who would have the hardihood to speak a tool of Russian despotism, to which integrity, the spirit of independence, and self-respect are dangerous qualities — qualities which the rod mortifies.

"The principal of a school which I attended in my boyhood had abolished corporal punishment on his own hook, and, altho he remained in this school for forty-eight years, he never found occasion to regret his liberality. And it will perhaps be of some benefit to the American teachers who are clamoring for the rod to learn that the greater number of his pupils were 'untractable' children, 'miscreants' who had been expelled from other schools.

"To show how he had reformed these mischievous boys and girls, I will relate only one instance. A rich man's son, about nine years old, was brought into our class, and the father frankly told the principal that his boy had been expelled from five other schools. After the father had left the room the principal stepped toward the boy and shook his hand, presenting him with a fancy slate-pencil. Johnny looked defiantly at the principal, threw the pencil on the floor, and said sneeringly: 'I can buy them by the thousands.'

"The principal smiled lovingly, seated himself near the little millionaire, and began to tell the boy that he was laboring under false notions if he thought that the teachers of the school would accept his declaration of war. 'You are among brothers and sisters here, my little friend, who know that you have been abused by people who

were stronger than you. We do not believe that might makes right. You have as much right to whip me as I have to whip you. It is simply a matter of brute force, and we have learned to realize that force is not conducive to friendship.'

"In this strain the principal talked till 11 o'clock, when the boy started to weep, grasping the outstretched hands of the principal. 'When the teacher turned to us and said: 'We have had no exercises, my dear children, but the time has not been spent in vain — we have saved a maltreated little soul, and gained a friend and brother. I hope all of you will learn to love him.'

"We did learn to love him, for he was always the first in the class, and the most lovable companion. But the father now surely wishes that he had remained the 'mischievous boy,' for the 'reformed son' now languishes in the Siberian prisons for his high aspirations and his love for suffering humanity in Russia.

"Let me relate another instance to 'An Old-fashioned Pastor and Educator,' whose 'clothes have been ruined by decayed vegetables, etc., by the miscreants.' A year or so ago a Sunday school class in Chicago, boys and girls from twelve to sixteen years of age, drenched their teacher with water and chased him out of the schoolroom. He was a man at the age of fifty. I had been lecturing before a German society on the raising of children, repudiating all sorts of punishment, and even reprimands. After the 'miscreants' had thus got rid of their dignified teacher the board called upon me, asking me to teach the class, and thus prove my theories in practice, I accepted the challenge.

"There were forty-two 'miscreants' in the class. The first Sunday I told those good little souls all about my views regarding the relationships between parents and teachers and the children. They listened attentively, and I had no chance to witness any wickedness in them during the year, and the parents, as well as my colleagues of the other classes, insisted that I had performed 'a miracle' without a rod and without any strictness."

What shall it Be?

History has not been an uninterrupted evolution. At different intervals evolution has been broken in a certain region, to begin again elsewhere. Egypt, Asia, the banks of the Mediterranean, Central Europe have in turn been the scene of historical development. But in every case, the first phase of the evolution has been the primitive tribe, passing on into a village commune, then into that of the free city, and finally dying out when it reached the phase of the State. In Egypt, civilization began by the primitive tribe. It reached the village community phasis, and later on the period of free cities; still later that of the State, which, after a flourishing period, resulted in the death of the country.

The evolution began again in Assyria, in Persia, in Palestine. Again it traversed the same phasis: the tribe, the village community, the free city, the all-powerful State, and finally the result was — death!

A new civilization then sprang up in Greece. Always beginning by the tribe, it slowly reached the village commune, then the period of republican cities. In these cities, civilization reached its highest summits. But the East brought to them its poisoned breath, its traditions of despotism. Wars and conquests created Alexander's empire of Macedonia. The State enthroned

itself, the blood-sucker grew, killed all civilization, and then came — death!

Rome in its turn restored civilization. Again we find the primitive tribe at its origin; then, the village commune; then, the free city. At that stage, it reached the apex of its civilization. But then came the State, the Empire, and then — death!

On the ruins of the Roman Empire, Celtic, Germanic, Slavonian and Scandinavian tribes began civilization anew. Slowly the primitive tribe elaborated its institution and reached the village commune. It remained at that stage till the twelfth century. Then rose the Republican cities which produced the glorious expansion of the human mind, attested by the monuments of architecture, the grand development of arts, the discoveries that laid the basis of natural sciences. But then came the State. . .

Will it again produce death? — Of course it will, unless we reconstitute society on a libertarian and anti-State basis. Either the State will be destroyed and a new life will begin in thousands of centres, on the principle of an energetic initiative of the individual, of groups, and of free agreement; or else the State must crush the individual and local life, it must become the master of all the domains of human activity, must bring with it its wars and internal struggles for the possession of power, its surface-revolutions which only change one tyrant for another, and inevitably, at the end of this evolution, — death!

Choose yourselves which of the two issues you prefer. — Peter Kropotkin, in his "The State: Its Historic Rule."

Letter-Box.

M. T., Oshkosh, Wis. — Of course you have "a right" to choose your master at the ballot-box, and this right has never been denied you by the Anarchists. But we deny you the "right" to impose such rulers upon us. You are also mistaken that "propaganda by deed" means nothing else than the killing of kings and capitalists. To the Anarchists it means "nothing more than thought transferred into action", as Jean Grave says.

R. W., Baltimore. — Yes, the manner by which Anarchy will be brought about is to "jest let it grow", as you put it. I am not aware that society has ever been changed in any other manner. But we do not think there is such a thing as "evolution" independent of man. He must find the causes of the ills from which he suffers and look for a remedy, the application of which brings about what is called "evolution." Sometimes ignorance and tyranny attempt to check its course, and hence the "bloody revolutions."

T. L., Brooklyn, N. Y. — I accepted the rebuke of B. H. in good grace and frankly admit that "finding fault is not an argument." But when you refer me to Victor Hugo's writings as a sample of language that the Anarchists should use in their press, I am tempted to quote from him for your benefit. He says: "What kind of society is it which is based upon inequality and injustice to such an extent, as this? Would it not be well to take the whole thing by the four corners and fling pell-mell up to the ceilings the cloth, the feast and the orgy, the gluttony and the drunkenness and the guests; those who have their two elbows on the table, and those who are on all-fours under it, to spew the whole lot in God's face and to fling the whole world at heaven . . . The Hell of the poor makes the paradise of the Rich." It seems to me this is about as strong as any language ever used by the writers of FREE SOCIETY.

The right of property was the origin of evil on the earth, the first link in the long chain of crimes and misfortunes which the human race has endured since its birth. — PROUDHON.