

# FREE SOCIETY

FORMERLY THE FIREBRAND.

Exponent of Anarchist-Communism: Holding that Equality of Opportunity alone Constitutes Liberty, that in the Absence of Monopoly Price and Competition Cannot Exist, and that Communism is an Inevitable Consequence.

VOL. VII. NO. 25.

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, SUNDAY, JULY 21, 1901.

WHOLE NO. 323.

## Freedom.

That which Slavery is too well,  
For its very name has grown  
To an echo of your own.  
'Tis to work and have such pay  
As just keeps life from day to day  
In your limbs as in a cell,  
For the tyrants use to dwell;  
So that ye from them are made,  
Loom and plow, and sword and spade,  
With or without your own will bent  
To their defense and nourishment.  
'Tis to see your children weak  
With their mothers, pine and peak,  
When the winter winds are bleak.  
They are dying whilst I speak.

—Percy Bysshe Shelley.

— o —

## An Era of Transition.

### II

#### THE APOGEE OF CAPITALISM.

We have seen that there is going on throughout the world an unprecedented accumulation of wealth and consequent anxiety to place this surplus where it will yield more increase to the possessing class. When we remember that the chief function of government is to protect property, and that the present owners form the only class whose interests are, under all circumstances, served by the State, it is easy to comprehend the drift of world politics and to perceive the motive of the raids made by stronger nations upon races unable to withstand the aggressors.

The heyday of the capitalist has already passed. So long as surplus wealth could be profitably invested in the construction of railroads, the working of mines, the building up of great industries which produced an income under comparatively safe conditions, the capitalist, while developing home resources, was in clover. Because of the imperative need for capital in the rapid up-building of this country the rate of interest till recently remained higher than in Europe. But here too it has now sunk almost to the Dutch level. The federal government borrows at about two per cent, and investors are satisfied with but little higher rates in safe commercial enterprises. Arising out of highly developed industrial organization and abundant capital this tendency explains two important facts. First, the scramble for foreign markets, not only for domestic products but for capital unable to obtain returns at home. Second, the inflation of values, as seen in the startling activity of the stock exchange, and the expanding capitalization of staple industries. Let us consider these two movements separately, taking the first in the present paper and the second in another article.

Imperialism is today the world-embracing tendency of capitalism. It is no new feature of civilization, but it is undoubtedly reaching its zenith in this age. For at least three centuries past the primary cause of

nearly all wars has been commercial advantage. The profit making instinct has prompted most of the colonizing and civilizing schemes which have so often brought the nations to blows. The fabulously large national debts of Europe have grown up out of this militant commercialism. No less than a thousand million dollars are yearly wrung from the workers to pay interest alone on these costly legacies of commercial antagonism. The millions of men (officially given as 4,000,000) taken from the ranks of industry to maintain the armed camps of Europe cost the patient producers a sum as large as the burden of interest, to say nothing of the loss entailed by so much labor power withdrawn from production.

Why this warlike array in times of peace? Not the fear that one nation will occupy its neighbor's territory, but the dread lest the neighbor will gain some exclusive trade or financial advantage elsewhere. Herein lies the secret of the rivalry that needs such an imposing array of troops to preserve an amiable neutrality.

England and Germany are at present commercially at daggers drawn. The intense industrial warfare between these mighty rivals is approaching a critical point. And both are united in still fiercer hatred of their bigger and better equipped rival, the United States. On the other hand Russia presses steadily forward, determined to be behind none of them, where an acquisition is to be gained, or a sphere of influence to be achieved. In this connection it is interesting to observe the beautifully harmonious manner in which the paternal efforts of the Russian government work out for the good of its beloved people. It is engaged in the Socialistic task of establishing a line of steamers to encourage Russian trade by carrying farm products from the Baltic to London, for the benefit of the agricultural interests. To cap this laudable undertaking there are accounts of famine in Siberia, along the path of the Trans-Siberian railroad, another State enterprise, which by suddenly destroying the old methods of transportation that had employed large numbers, has taken away the means of livelihood of people who are now allowed by this beneficent government to die of starvation.

What kept the allied armies so long in China was not so much to suppress the rebels and punish the Boxers as to keep a vigilant eye on one another, in order that none might surreptitiously secure a trading privilege, or a grant of territory without the others gaining an equivalent. It seems certain, however, that Russia has got ahead of the game despite the watchfulness of her fellow-marauders.

It is needless to say that had it not been for the supposed commercial importance of the Philippines, as a sort of focus of the trade of the Orient, even the slippery McKin-

ley himself would have hesitated to consummate the conquest of those remote islands. But he is merely the instrument of the profit-hunting classes.

Everybody now knows, except the loyal Briton and Rudyard Kipling, that it was at the instigation of a nefarious clique of capitalists that England goaded the Boers into war. Was it not British bondholders, afraid of losing their money, who nigh twenty years ago forced their subservient government,—Gladstone's at that,—into a war in Egypt to suppress a rising of the people against native oppressors? It is now the purpose of the capitalists, of whom Cecil Rhodes is the mouthpiece, to complete the civilizing of Africa by running a railroad through the heart of the continent from the Cape to Cairo. The conquest of the Transvaal was the first great step in this scheme that will enable them to exploit, through industrial processes, now that chattel slavery is gone, the untamed Ethiopian of the tropical wilds.

New difficulties begin to confront the philanthropic civilizers. The tribes that could once have been bought with beads and massacred at will with the weapons of science are now arming themselves with the most modern patterns of rifles, and the utmost vigilance of the Europeans who have set up "spheres of influence" is powerless to stop this process. Not only do the Christian merchants find this trade with aborigines too lucrative to submit to its suppression for reasons of State, but they are said to send commercial agents among the tribes for the purpose of inciting them to fight one another, and thereby insure a better demand for guns and ammunition, the only feature of civilization which the natives can always appreciate.

Behind this phase of capitalistic expansion is the economic system under which we live. When all outlets for overflowing commercial energy have been occupied, when expansion has reached its limit by reason of there being no more worlds for the capitalist to conquer, then will come the recoil. Production for profit will at last fail to meet the needs of man and the present industrialism must be transformed. As to the method of change and the time when it will ripen there is abundant room for the speculative imagination. Indeed I have observed that confident prediction and enthusiastic certitude are greater in proportion as exact knowledge and unprejudiced study are deficient amongst those who assert their views on the matter.

WAT TYLER.

— o —

ERRATUM.—Last week, in Wat Tyler's article, first paragraph, "scientific" should read "economic determinism"; third paragraph, "to break" should read "to bank heavily"; sixth paragraph, "useless" should read "useful outlets."

### Liberty or Death.

Many of us, if compared with our ancestors of even a century ago, are immoderate in our passion for liberty. What seems to us very mild types of religious and political liberty sated their desires.

Religious liberty meant to them the worship of "God" according to the caprices of the individual conscience, coupled with choice of ceremonies invented and proffered them by numerous self-delegated, hairsplitting, creed-making "middlemen," or representatives of the "Almighty." It still means just that to their loyal (!) descendants. To a large portion of their progeny, however, the ideal is altered. The alteration ranges in degree from the non-belief in hell and in the divinity of Christ to interpretation of the "Holy writ" that might well cause Calvinists and their ilk to shudder at the sacrilege, and to the most wicked and complete disbelief in everything "holy," "sacred," "revered," or "worshipful." These ultra dissenters would fain be allowed to dispense with the entire worshipping arrangement, including payments to middlemen and missions, the dependencies of modesty, morals and marriage, the mystical methods for manufacturing nonentity, and the dastardly repression of investigation of the open secrets of the universe. Against this thorough disavowal the "god-fearing" exclaim "Heaven forbid!"—(I suppose "Heaven" signifies "Jehovah" and his servants, the "angels" of the several castes!) If "Heaven" fails to comply, there are always enough "religious liberty" fellows ready to do the work overlooked by the celestial clique, either by force or by falsifications and appeals to that faithful defender of established "order," PREJUDICE.

The political liberty of our forefathers was cut after a pattern like unto that of their religious liberty. The hereditary monarch was succeeded in a few countries by elected presidents—with kingly prerogatives! Where the customary rulers continued to be tolerated, suffrage was bestowed (!) upon classes heretofore inexperienced in the handling of that "privilege." It was assumed by agitators of the time that economic conditions were controlled by political power, and that poverty would disappear upon the wielding of the ballot by the "oppressed"; for they, of course (!), would not permit the levying of exorbitant taxes, nor submit to exactions in a financial way. The new political methods were expected, too, to guarantee freedom from despotic whims and petty spites of governors. If that theory of political liberty was correct, the "wrong men" have ever filled the offices, for riches and rags with their superfluities and miseries, indiscretions and crimes still prevail.

Ideals of political liberty now vary as radically as do those of religion. They are graded from conformity to the old modes through the ranks of woman suffragists, property and educational qualification adherents, initiative and referendum propagandists, Single Taxers, State Socialists, free lovers, to the extreme section of Anarchists. The latter wish to discard every political fallacy, foible, and function.

That there could be liberty other than that designated by their conceptions of the religious and political, evidently did not

dawn upon the minds of our predecessors.

When persons harbor ideals of liberty which are in advance of those in daily practice, such persons are "enemies of society." Many are the heresies sprung upon the public, and they are accepted or denied admittance to the different minds in the oddest of admixtures. Some are extreme (?) in their religious and political renunciation while they cling to sex and commercial bondage, and vice versa.

Liberty in sex association is so desperately disparaged by Church, State, and society at large that but a small proportion of the people espouse the cause. The two former institutions are the recipients of sufficient direct revenue from the devotees of marriage bonds to induce them to be untiring in their opposition to freedom. As all our habits, customs and occupations are bound to the religious and political machinery, society defends marriage from its practice of obedience to Lord and law. Portions of society orally repudiate the supernatural in the Church and the authority of the State, but the "honor," "morals," "respectability" inculcated by these powers still hedge them about, intermingle with their prejudices and perceptions, dull their reasoning faculties and check their inclinations to investigate the principles of sex forces.

Commercial slavery is approved by some "freethinkers" and renounced in part by advocates of "free trade," "free money," "free competition," "free land," and State Socialism, but wholly rejected by Communists.

It is a queer mixing up of ideals, take it all in all—and every one of these scornors of slavery exclaims: "Give me liberty or give me death!" This agitating war cry came to us from our liberty seeking grandsires. We have all been sometimes deeply stirred by its utterance. Yet, when we look the matter squarely in the face, we must admit, though reluctantly, that only in seasons of great stress and excitement do the generality of people who long for liberty, live and speak in harmony with this sentiment. If all those who see the errors and enslaving characteristics of hereditary social systems, and who wish to be freed from them really preferred, EVERY MOMENT, death to the degradation of their ideals and through their ideal THEMSELVES, so constant and loud would be the protests, so many and unceasing the acts of revolt that the work of sun-dering all ties would be accomplished with immeasurably greater speed. But—we assure ourselves we can accomplish more if alive than dead! Prudence, therefore, bids us utter so much of our protest against oppression, no more; revolt in this trifle; conform in that! We fear possible ridicule for this innovation; social ostracism for the other! We halt before and question a prospective curtailment of income; hesitate before menacing prison walls! Yes, we shrink from swelling the number of "martyrs," and we wittingly do so only when the torture, mental or physical, of the old institutional program DRIVE us to it. THEN with truth do we say: "Give me liberty or give me death!"

VIROQUA DANIELS.

Los Angeles, Cal., 2908 E. Fourth St.

— o —

Submissiveness sanctions tyranny.

### A Few Thoughts.

It is difficult to realize that so much ignorance, creedism and prejudice exist among the people of small towns and rural districts, until you come in their midst. In the large centers of commerce and industry, thought also has a center, and when you speak on any subject you are tolerably sure of being at least understood if not agreed with. But what is one to do when one is not comprehended if he speaks casually of "evolution"? Where they believe implicitly in the Bible story of creation, and argue that the first parents must have been white, beautiful and refined because they were created "in the image of God"? Where they think every phase of every wrong can be righted by "passing a law"? Who believe everything on the statute books, in the creeds, in the old codes of society are infallibly *right*, and who deem so many things "wicked" that they are at their wits' end how to amuse themselves? Here in the little spot where I am ruralizing, they are much given to "parties" and "entertainments" from the innate craving of their repressed social natures, but they are so stupid they cannot talk, they *must not* play cards, dance or indulge in "kissing games." Their greatest dissipations are listening to precocious little girls and boys "speak pieces," and filling up on ice cream, various rich cakes and cheap candy. One of their social functions is a stupendous affair—to sit through. Yet these people are not the really ignorant; they rather pride themselves on their "culture." They read and think along the lines prescribed for "nice" people; and one wonders how the ideas of freedom and independent thinking is ever to penetrate into their inmost lives. Only, we know that "thoughts grow."

\* \* \*

A man or a civilization may be known by his or its ideals. One's ideal may be one of strength, of brute force; or of gigantic intellect; or cunning, shrewdness, or of pomp, power, wealth; or of character, kindness, true thoughtfulness. But we have reason to feel encouraged when we remember that in general people entertain higher ideals of conduct than of old, that their amusements are less brutal and they love less to look upon suffering than some centuries ago. Mankind would be tolerably decent today if they were not tied and cramped by their institutions which were founded in darker ages and have hardened since. Men *want* to be better than they are, but the things that make them worse than they naturally would be, the laws, customs, creeds and authority implanted in society ages back, have crystalized and become sacred by their very centuries of existence. Worse crimes are committed in the name of "country," "Church," "party," "society," "business" than any single individual could conceive and carry out alone. No unofficial person could have been found who unaided and unapplauded, would have inflicted the tortures and agonies under which poor Bresci died; Bresci, whose only crime was too deeply feeling the wrongs of his brothers. The same class of young men would never have crossed half over the world to invade peaceful islands and carry on a brutal and inhuman attack upon its inhabitants, as have our



own "soldierly" young men on the Philippines under a government founded in old savage ideas and still perpetuating them. People would not dream of going to other countries presuming on the inhabitants' ignorance, to cram their religion, their commerce, their civilization down their throats with bayonets, were it not for the established sacredness and authority of the Church. Society would not visit with such merciless persecution the woman who dares to love without the leave of priest or magistrate, were it not for the ancient institution which assumes to possess such power. The hearts of men grow softer and their souls more tender with the advance of knowledge; but the old crystalized institutions embedded in the dark ages, repress and check all natural human development. Like the growth of grass beneath a heavy plank—human society has gone as far as it can, until the barriers are removed; as light is to vegetation so is freedom to the human organism.

This is the reason that "crime" is so misclassified. All our magazine and journalistic writers persist in speaking of "criminal classes," their treatment, their limitations and punishments, as though they were a distinct set with nothing in common with the rest of mankind. Technically speaking it is correct to call "criminal" those who break the laws. But the spirit in which these people are discussed shows that this breaking of the laws stamps the doer as the worst and most dangerous to society. We know this is far from being true. Some of the noblest people on earth have suffered and died as "criminals." The masses of "criminals" are but the helpless victims of the world's institutions—the refuse, the broken and bruised products of our industrial and social systems. Many of them are the free spirited, the pioneers, the revolters, the real saviours of men. The real criminals, those who actually cause the greatest suffering to mankind, are the rulers who send men out to war with each other; the speculators who gamble with the world's food material; the manufacturers who squeeze the life blood out of their workers to coin into gold, the monopolizers of earth's resources who prevent the children of earth from taking their natural sustenance; the whole class of those who rule, deprive, and thwart the natural activities of men—these are the real criminals.

L. M. H.

#### The Proletarian Vote a Minority.

The word proletarian, as defined by all standard dictionaries, means the propertyless class. It is contented by the average Socialist editor and orator that this propertyless class constitutes a majority of the voters of this nation.

I have quite often disputed this, and as often been called "ignorant," "middle class muddler," and one Socialist writer has broadly hinted that I must be in the pay of the capitalists' politicians, all of which shows the tolerance of some Socialists. Of course, the census reports for 1900 are not as yet available, and while I might guess as well as others, yet a clear understanding of the census reports for 1870, 1880 and 1890 will

enable us to very carefully estimate the different classes. In the first place we find that the middle class, as defined by L. Sanial, increased from 492,499 in 1870 to 1,192,931 in 1890, an increase of 142 per cent. The population increased during the same decades only 62.4 per cent.

Mr. William Hunt, a well-informed and reliable statistician of the U. S. Census Department, shows us in the *Bulletin of Labor* the occupation of the classes, dividing them into four groups. Group A relates to what may be termed the "proprietor class," comprising farmers, planters, bankers, brokers, manufacturers, merchants and dealers. Group A increased from 3,791,807 males in 1870 to 6,881,202 in 1890. The increase from 1880 to 1890 was 1,523,634. A like increase for the last ten years would make this class number 8,500,000 males over 16 years of age. Eighty per cent of these 8,500,000 males have property, for mark you, even the tenant farmer is not propertyless. He most always owns tools, some machinery, a couple of wagons, two or more horses or mules, etc. Eighty per cent would be 6,800,000 capitalist and middle-class voters. To this we must add 200,000 absolutely idle capitalists.

Group B relates to what may be termed the clerical class, comprising agents, collectors, commercial traveler, clerks, etc., numbering in 1890 1,414,929, having increased nearly 100 per cent from 1880 to 1890. This class numbers at present not less than 2,000,000, 75 per cent of whom are not propertyless, or a 1,500,000 middle class voters. Thousands of this class own small amounts of stock in railroad and manufacturing plants. There are 10,000 stockholders in the Boston & Main Railroad, but only four or five hundred can be classed as large capitalists. Then there is the idle middle class, i. e. those owning rentable property, and those who have an income sufficient for support from stocks; to illustrate, many hands, like engineers, mechanics, overseers in large manufacturing plants, superintendents, etc., who have accumulated sufficient wealth to retire. This class numbers not less than 250,000 voters at present and is constantly increasing.

Now, we have the strictly working class in groups C and D. We find that there were in 1890, 205,337 blacksmiths. There is hardly a town east of the Mississippi that does not contain one or more blacksmiths who own a shop, tools and some stock. Wheelwrights are likewise located in many of the larger towns. Then there are the job printers, numbering at present 20,000; the tailors, who own more or less stock and tools; and, lastly, the highly-paid wage laborers, like petty bosses in manufacturing and mining plants, overseers, etc., bring the middle class wage hands up to not less than 6,000 voters. Here we have a grand total of 9,350,000 capitalists, large and small, who have a voting residence. This is nearly 67 per cent of the total vote cast for president in the last election.

If we compare the vote polled in the proletarian State of Rhode Island with that polled in the agricultural State of Maine, we find that one voter out of each nine inhabitants voted in Rhode Island against one out of each six votes in Maine; and this

will hold good throughout the United States if we compare the vote in agricultural counties with those cast in the industrial centers. This is accounted for in the large number of tramp shoeworkers, weavers, etc., who seldom remain long enough in one city to gain a voting residence. Take, too, the agricultural wage hands, who numbered 2,516,004 males over 16 years of age in 1890. One-half of these were negroes and Chinese, a considerable number were Canadians, who make a practice of working on the farms each season; a large number were under 21, and a still larger number were tramp farm hands, i. e., farm hands who go from ranch to ranch, etc., and are not voters. It is doubtful if, out of the 2,516,004 male farm hands, 700,000 of them had a vote. Then, too, this proletarian army is concentrated into about a dozen States, and if in 50 years from now they should then constitute a majority of the voting kings, they would still be unable to elect a president because of their concentration into less than one-third of the States.

But what is worse than all else, is the fact that this proletarian army is degenerating into the "slum-proletariat," with the consequent fearful increase of political corruption. Politicians boast that 50 per cent of the wage-working class in the mill towns of New England can be bought. Go into the average textile factory and listen for a week to the conversation of the voting kings, and what will you hear? Prize-fighting, baseball, boasting of who can drink the most beer, and immoral discussion constitute almost the sole topics of conversation. Is this the material that is to build a cooperative commonwealth?—F. G. R. Gordon, in *The Challenge*.

— o —

#### Jesus' Representatives.

The Rev. Gilbert Reed, a missionary, in a signed letter in the *North China Herald*, concedes: "I confess I looted, and in good company." He describes his visit to the palace of Prince Li in Peking a few days after the relief of the legations, where he found the French in possession. Reed's own description should not be omitted: "We found the French soldiers and a French priest surrounded with vast wealth—iron safes containing nearly 300,000 taels of silver, trunks laden with magnificent furs, silk, and satin, and rooms adorned with the finest of Chinese art. For a moment I forgot the Tenth Commandment. I had no house, no books, no art, no silver, no clothes, except a suit made for me by missionary ladies while I had been lying in the hospital. The only trouble was the French were there and were not kind enough to leave. The French general came in and told us that on that morning the section of the city had been voted to the French. Seeing our downcast countenances, he magnanimously said: 'I am very sorry, gentlemen, but each one may take a memento.' I selected two elegant furs and moved on."

Rev. Mr. Reed says that during two weeks he was very busy discriminating between those whose places should be looted and those not. In this occupation he was invaluable, owing to his long residence in Peking. "Now and then I branched out to loot from those who were our enemies, and I only regret that I didn't have more time to loot from such despicable wretches, instead of leaving so much to others."

It is time for the Rev. Dr. Ament and others who deny that there was looting by the missionaries to stop lying.—*The Truth Seeker*.

— o —

*Freedom* brings the good news that Kropotkin's "Fields, Factories and Workshops" has been issued in a popular edition at one shilling.

# FREE SOCIETY.

Published Weekly by Free Society Publishing Asso.

A. ISAAC, PUBLISHER

ONE DOLLAR A YEAR.

Address all Communications and make all Money Orders payable to FREE SOCIETY, 515 CARROLL AVE., Chicago, Ill.

Entered at Chicago as second class matter, Apr. 5, '01.

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.

There is not, there cannot be, a State without religion. Take the freest States in the world—the United States of America or the Swiss confederation, for instance—and see what an important part is played in all official discourses by divine Providence, that superior sanction of all States. Consequently whenever a chief of State speaks of God, be he the emperor of Germany or the president of any republic whatsoever, be sure he is getting ready to shear once more his people-flock.—Bakunin.

## Notes.

The editor of the *International Socialist Review* calls our attention to the fact that only the first part of the article "Socialism in Denmark" appeared in the *Sozialistische Monatshefte*, while the latter part deals with events which have occurred since.

## Note and Comment.

The sentiment now so frequently expressed in the press of organized labor, that the disputes between capital and labor cannot be settled by legislation and courts is an encouraging feature in the labor movement.

In San Francisco the Socialists are busy trying to get the Trades Unions into politics. The *Coast Seamen's Journal* very appropriately remarks:

The workers should be warned that the idea of voting themselves into better economic conditions is a delusion and a snare. The workers never yet, in any country or time, bettered their condition, as workers, except by organizing and fighting as such.

Some reform papers continually dwell upon the advantages the governments of Germany, Switzerland and Russia derive from owning the railroads, and "the cheap fares this system affords the public." But these reformers always fail to point out whether or not the conditions of the workingmen have been thereby improved.

Christianity has a rather demoralizing effect on the natives of China. Choufu, a special commissioner on the mission question, protests against the abuses practiced by native converts; and in an appeal to the missionaries he states that the arrogant and contemptuous behavior of the Christians, consisting in looting and assaulting peaceable Chinese, may result in serious consequences. Thus it appears that the "heathens" are far superior in behavior and morals

than the Christian missionaries and their converts, who "looted in good company," as the Rev. Gilbert Reed boastingly confesses.

The issue between opportunism and revolutionary Marxian Socialism, has created an animated discussion in the Socialist press of Europe; and, if the spanking-into-line method fails, a split seems to be inevitable. The opponents of opportunism, into which all Socialist parties have gradually drifted, utter some wholesome truths, which Kautsky and others answer either by evasion or sophistry. Wolterman, for instance, very ably points out the absurdity of intending to capture political power before gaining economic power, which corresponds neither with the materialistic conception of history nor with the teachings of Karl Marx.

That spanking is as deteriorating on adults as on children, Mr. Simons, editor of the *International Socialist Review*, has learnt from experience. After he had taken F. G. R. Gordon across the knee and given him "a sound spanking" for breaking into *The Challenge* with some indisputable truths, repudiating Socialist "sciences," he immediately broke into Mr. Simons' magazine also, stubbornly repeating the same crime for which he had been so mercilessly thrashed. "And, too," F. G. R. Gordon adds, in speaking of the coming convention, "if we can get rid of a large surplus amount of class-hatred, rank partisanship, abusiveness, we will have done vastly more than any convention has yet accomplished."

The editor of *The Freethinker*, of London, England, pokes fun at the fact that in some cities of this country baseball playing is prohibited on Sunday, while golf players are not molested, and explains: "The simple fact is that golf is permitted because it is the game of prosperous people. Baseball is forbidden because those who play it on Sunday are mechanics or others not prosperous. Here is a comical spectacle in a country in which all are supposed to have the same rights. When a man who only on Sunday can amuse himself wants to play his game of ball on that day, he is locked up. If the man who can amuse himself every day in the week wants to play golf on Sunday, he is not disturbed."

## The Curse of Government Again.

As the immortal William once observed, "What's in a name? The rose under any other name would smell as sweet." But in the case of my article it seems that the title was what damned the whole in the eyes of the erudite critic. Under any other caption he would not have scented its pungent odor. Verily, if I "had given the matter a little more reflection" I might have extracted the virus from the title and thus have saved the readers of FREE SOCIETY from three mortal columns of such ponderous persiflage as "rational philosophique" and the "present epoch of cosmic evolution." It is against my desire to occupy further space with this matter, but I fear my mentor would cherish a personal grievance if I ignored entirely his labored effusion. Besides,

in the said three columns our florid critic has discovered several mare's nests, which it would be unbecoming in me to let silently drop into merited obscurity.

It appears that I have failed to illuminate the "real why and wherefore of government," so my ambitious critic unhesitatingly proceeds to make good my deficiency. "In the present epoch of cosmic evolution," he confidently tells us, we must have a government "to secure a numerous and prosperous social order, and a disciplined and efficient military force which will enable it to hold its own in the world wide, national struggle for existence, self-expression and supremacy." Yet, "in the long run," it has often "injured more than benefited the people for whom and by whom it is generally maintained and upheld." Therefore he is led to reflect that "the vigilance of all of us at all times is of course needed to see to it that such viciousness is checked." Doubtless a logical and wise conclusion.

He recognizes the beauties of governments as "organizations for concrete, hateful conflict" that "indirectly help to accelerate the course of social evolution on toward a state of universal brotherhood." Apparently the Theosophists and Ethical Culture folk are not in it with beneficent, "hateful" governments in leading mankind to that millennial state of felicity.

Our learned critic is acquainted with the records of history and the history of governments, as becomes a Harvard senior, and is therefore impelled, out of the profundity of his erudition, to deny that government is a curse, for "a strong well-organized government, with its accompanying efficient military force" is a "necessary agency in securing us from such humiliating and expensive [expensive in good sooth, not to say humiliating] experiences as our unfortunate and improvident fellow mortals" in the Transvaal and the Philippines have suffered. But the "strong" government that "secured" us has murdered thousands of our "improvident" Filipino fellow mortals. The "strong" English government in South Africa has been engaged nigh on two years exterminating one of the bravest races on earth, and has been "securing" the people of England by burning the homes and destroying the farms of thousands of helpless unoffending Boer women and children, who are now dying of want and disease in reconcentrado camps, after the civilizing methods of Weyler. Thus governments are likened unto shoes by their zealous defender, because they have "a civilizing tendency and enable us now and then [in Transvaal and Luzon, of course] to shunt off certain mad nations" which have run amuck in "self-expression and expansion," as he "quite felicitously" declares.

The reader will now see how neatly this champion of civilization on the "criminal aggression" plan, has supplied all that was lacking of the "why and wherefore of government" in my brief and feeble article.

"In the course of social evolution" (good old Evolution, what a stop-gap thou art for youthful word jugglers!) he admits that governments will grow obsolete and must be discarded. But then he thinks it not "appropriate to denounce as a curse an at least partially civilizing and protecting gov-



ernment." It is fortunate, however, that he has given us the benefit of his ideas as to what those functions are when exemplified in the use of sufficient military force by the stronger nations to overcome and dominate the weaker.

I am charged with holding "the opinion that government should be tolerated because all individuals within its jurisdiction are not yet qualified in thought and feeling to get along without it." Here is what I said: "Government is not an accident, but the outcome of human weakness and aggressiveness. It cannot therefore at a single stroke be abolished. The personnel may, as we see at times, be overturned; the form at rarer intervals be changed, but the thing itself, the State as a compelling, invasive, domineering power, remains. Only when men have learnt to accord complete equal freedom to their fellows, to resent invasion of their own rights, and to commit no invasion upon others,—then only will government fall. . . . But let us go on undermining it by disseminating the ideas and principles whose ultimate triumph means the negation of the State, the downfall of every form of political authority."

The continued life of FREE SOCIETY and its growing band of supporters is evidence that this work goes steadily on. We must continue making more Anarchists, despite the demurrs of our academic critics.

WAT TYLER.

#### Mr. Bryan Attacks Prof. Herron.

Prof. Herron has committed an unpardonable sin—he has attacked the marriage system.—*The Commoner*.

Prof. Herron's sin (?) is not unpardonable, for I have pardoned it. But perhaps Mr. Bryan thinks I have not anything to do or say about it, and that therefore my pardon does not count. If I have no authority in the matter, who has? Who is it that refuses to pardon him? Mr. Bryan? But has Mr. Bryan any more right to refuse pardon to Prof. Herron than I have to grant it? Or is it God who will not pardon? Does Mr. Bryan forget "his mercy endureth forever"? To my seeming a God who would create an unpardonable sin or an unpardonable sinner, would be an unpardonable monster.

In another paragraph Mr. Herron is spoken of as "assailing the most sacred human institution." He has a perfect right to assail any institution. Were Mr. Bryan not too young to remember it, I would remind him that fifty years ago the "sacred institution" which was assailed was chattel slavery.

"Marriage is not slavery; neither the husband or the wife own the other," says Mr. Bryan. I challenge anyone to explain the legal doctrine of "marital rights" without showing that, legally marriage is slavery of the vilest sort. I do not say that all husbands or wives enforce their legal rights, but that does not alter the case from a legal standpoint; and, as Don Piatt once said on another subject, "It is not the abuse of power, but the power to abuse of which we complain."

All holders of Negro slaves did not abuse them as much as they had a legal right to do, but that did not alter the fact of slavery.

I firmly believe that the ideal, the happy

life, must comprise the life-long union of one man and one woman,\* and that sometime the human race will be wise enough so that its members will not make the sad mistakes so many now make in choosing a companion. Father, mother, and child seem to me a holy trinity and the home wherein these dwell together, willingly and lovingly, is a beautiful temple. Therefore I look with utter loathing and abhorrence on the sacrilegious attempt to force people, either by public sentiment or by legal enactment to show the outward and visible signs of an inward and spiritual grace which they have not. Meanness, hypocrisy and misery are the inevitable results of such a course.

We are told by Mr. Bryan that the "marriage system will survive this attack as it has survived others." Just how much he includes in the "marriage system" I do not know, but if he will consider the modifications of the "system" which have taken place since the time when the husband had the power of life or death over his wife and children down through the time when he might chastise or imprison his wife, if he did not use "undue severity" in so doing, he will see that the system has undergone many changes, and that the trend has been and is toward the abolition of all compulsory features in relation to marriage. Speed the day!

CELIA B. WHITEHEAD.

#### Carnegie's Blood-Money.

In speaking of the \$750,000, which Carnegie has offered San Francisco for library purposes, *The Star* says, in part:

"Mr. Carnegie's income runs up into millions of dollars a year. This is not the result of his enterprise or industry, but of the special privileges which he enjoys. The United States Government 'protects' him in his business ventures, for instance, by paying him twice as much for armor plate as he charges the Russian Government. We do not blame him for taking advantage of a condition if thrust upon him, but we do blame him, in his greed, for endeavoring to perpetuate unjust conditions. We blame him for his inhuman attitude toward the men by whose sweat and upon the marrow of whose bones he has waxed fat. We hold him responsible for the wanton murder of the men at Homestead, whose despairing cry and piteous appeals for wages enough to sustain life he would not hear—or, hearing, answered with Pinkerton guns—claiming that the profits of the business would not warrant it, although at that moment he was drawing fabulous dividends from it and resolutions were being adopted by a dozen communities lauding his 'benevolence' for donations of money that had been earned by the very labor he was exploiting then, and has exploited ever since. "We may be flying in the face of public opinion, and taking a most unpopular stand—that we have done before—but nevertheless we protest against the acceptance of this Carnegie gift by San Francisco. No matter what other communities have done, or may do, let us decline it. As we have said before, we say again: When Carnegie can restore to the orphans and widows the

\* Heaven beware us of such narrow love, and limited and perverted taste.

A. I.

husbands and fathers who were massacred at Homestead, in the strike caused by his greed; when he makes glad the hearts he has broken, brings sunshine to the homes he has desolated, and atones for all the misery he has caused, then, but not till then, should any self-respecting community accept his gifts, which represent the stored-up earnings of labor plundered and the laborer crucified."

#### Here and There.

The Bakers' Union of San Francisco, Cal., has established a cooperative bakery as a means of self help. The bakery is located at 1527 Mission St., where the purchasers will be assured of the best quality of bread. Our readers should aid the bakers by giving them their orders.

The mayor of San Francisco has been begging, and secured an offer of \$750,000 for library purposes from Carnegie. The Labor Council decided unanimously to reject the offer from such hands. "Carnegie's money is unclean; it is the proceeds of methods that differ only in name from burglary, treason and other crimes," says the *Coast Seamen's Journal*.

The *Irish World* has "insulted" the American flag, and the sale of that issue has been prohibited in Massachusetts. How a rag can be insulted is a problem for the gods to solve.

The *Appeal to Reason* has for years diligently pointed out the postal service as a Socialistic institution, but since the postoffice department has notified the editor that the paper cannot be mailed to purchasers at pound rates, it has been transformed into a "paternalistic department."

Thirty-four soldiers deserted last month from Fort Sheridan, which may indicate that militarism has lost its fascination even in this country; but the Mohammedans are surely in the vanguard in the hatred of the man-killing trade; for in the last ten months 4,000 soldiers deserted the Turkish army. The conservative press, commenting on these desertions, declares that it is due to the spirit of revolt which has been spread among the troops by radical agitators.

According to our excellent contemporary, *Freedom*, London, among the fifty-seven French Trade Union delegates, "who came from all parts of France to proclaim solemnly and jointly with the English workers the solidarity and brotherhood of the working classes of mankind," there were "no politicians, no career-makers," but "a great portion of Anarchists." A manifesto signed by 142 Trade Unions, which the delegates brought to England, protests mainly against compulsory military service and war, and concludes thus: "The general disarmament will only be possible when we are in a position to impose our will on the government;—make them understand that we will no longer be the accomplices of their homicidal passions and when, in the name of human fraternity, we refuse to kill each other."

## History of the French Revolution.

## XV

Jourdan was brought to Paris, that he might answer for his alleged crime. The administration was ultramontane and conservative. The majority at least of leaders in the legislature were avowed sceptics and radicals. Such mutually checking authorities may be supposed to have acted with impartiality, since they certainly did without friction. Jourdan, though a man of notoriously savage temper, was declared to have this time done his duty only. He returned accordingly to Avignon. This seems to have been the immediate cause of legislation against the non-juring priests and the emigrants, whose attitude was intimately connected with the quasi-independence of French papal and imperial foes, like Avignon, Lorraine, and Alsace. The Assembly first required the king's brother Louis to return, on pain of forfeiting his eventual claim to regency. The king assented to this. But another statute requiring the emigrants to disperse before January 1, under penalty of treason, "without prejudice to the rights of their wives, children, or creditors," called forth a first royal veto (November 10). On the 29th a severe law against non-juring priests was similarly killed. These vetoes excited great dissatisfaction, and much eloquence at the Club, but no tumults. The king, elated by success, issued a proclamation commanding his brothers to come home, which he well knew they would not do. He referred to his vetoes by way of proof that he was not under duress, as certain foreign kings alleged. His secret purpose in all this is explained by a letter which Marie Antoinette wrote to Mercy during February, about the time when she fully came over to Sister Elizabeth's program. A foreign war was indeed their only hope; but rebellious France must provoke the war—Louis, meantime, standing stiffly on his dignity, while refusing to compromise himself with the nobles or the Church, and only reluctantly consenting to defend his country, so that no party could blame him. Perhaps as yet it was not foreign conquest he desired: but at least it was temporary defeat. The governments near enough to be dangerous had made civil replies to his announcement of the new Constitution, excepting Treves and Mentz, which, as States of the German confederation, were not contemptible. It was to them the emigrants largely resorted. An army raised by these gentry had stations at Strasburg, Worms, and other frontier places, but especially Coblenz. It amounted to 23,000 men. Sweden, under Gustavus III, and Russia, under Catherine II, were eager for war, but in no position to make it. Leopold, the new emperor of Germany, though vehemently reproached by Catherine and others for not going to his sister's aid, doubtless thought, with much justice, that it would be endangering her life unnecessarily. He had inserted into his blustering pronouncement of August the salvo that there must be concert of action among European powers; and it was well known that England, where Lamballe acted as Marie Antoinette's agent, would not, for the present, do anything. Thus, the king's program involved considerable difficulty. Among the French themselves, Girondins and Feuillan-

tists favored war—the former, because they reasoned that Louis would prove a traitor and be pulled down to make room for a republic; the latter because they believed him honest, and thought war would make him popular. The Jacobin leaders knew he was untrustworthy, and would not stoop to the duplicity of using him to destroy himself. Which deserves praise—the blundering party of Lafayette; the double dealers who followed Brissot; or the party of Danton, Paine, Robespierre, and Marat, which, with fearless honesty and consistency, advocated just what proved necessary? There is no question which deserved success—and got it. Louis had perceived that he must take measures to force his brother-in-law's play; and he did not lack the necessary encouragement. He dismissed his do-nothing war minister Portail, whose impeachment had been threatened. In reply to the veto of November 10, he received a very respectful remonstrance from the legislature, which employed a royalist as its mouthpiece. On December 14, his majesty came to the Assembly. He was received in gloomy silence, which changed to acclamations when he announced that the emperor must deal with the emigrants, and that the new minister, Narbonne (Madame de Stael's lover), would make vigorous preparations against war.\* At the same time, Louis was privately urging the emigrants to persevere.† The emperor returned a somewhat defiant reply (December 21). In January, the vacillating king demanded an explanation of his intentions, but did not persist. Meanwhile causes of trouble multiplied in France. Vendée, excited by the priests, appeared on the verge of counter-revolution. Louis gave great offense by employing non-jurors at his chapel. With the narrow logic of a very foolish man, he said it was hard the king alone should have no rights of conscience, as if a king's visible acts were unofficial, and it would be an intolerable grievance not to attend public worship until a new concordat could be arranged with Rome. On March 9, Narbonne was dismissed as too efficient, in spite of a protest from Lafayette. His colleague, De Lessart, was instantly impeached for a known friend to the emigrants. During the debate on this memorable day (March 10) the Girondin Vergniaud, a great forensic speaker, used expressions interpreted as threatening, for the first time, to impeach the queen. She shed tears of anger on hearing about it. Many writers have blamed Vergniaud. But I observe they neglect to compare events at the Tuileries with what was going on elsewhere. Leopold had died on the first of March, leaving his dominions to the somewhat noted Francis, a boy of twenty, who was expected to begin the war from which Leopold had shrunk. Is it uncharitable to see in this the explanation of Narbonne's dismissal; or in that the finger of Marie Antoinette? At any rate, Vergniaud effected his own purpose. The ministry were all dismissed, and their places filled with persons reckoned Girondins. On the 16th Gustavus of Sweden was assassinated by a man whom his factious nobles

hired.\* This was a severe blow to Marie Antoinette's plans, for Gustavus was a kindred spirit, an able despot, an ambitious lover of glory, who vehemently urged war, and, as many think, had been actually about to take the initiative. For a time, the court appeared in harmony with those responsible for its acts. It betrayed them; but this was not yet known.

The only important individuals among these were Roland and Dumouriez; and Roland's importance consisted in his being the husband of Madame Roland. Dumouriez, like many really simple men, believed himself a master of intrigue. Throughout a long adventurous life, he was always going for wool and coming home shorn; and, if we may judge by his conduct this time, the underlying reason is that, though he tried hard to justify his reputation of double-dealing rascal, nature had cut him out for a very honest gentleman and soldier. He was now fifty-three years old; a battle-scarred veteran, who had risen to command solely through merit and time; active and sanguine as a boy; and as ready to attempt playing all games at once as ever. He was among the first, at the Club, to assume the red cap (Robespierre would not wear it); while at the Tuileries he became quite personally agreeable to Marie Antoinette, on whom "Grandison" made so unfavorable an impression. Like herself, he was polite to the rare point of dispensing with silly forms. Of course he was for war, both as officer and Girondin. On what grounds, gentle reader! do you guess that war was opposed at this very time by Robespierre, Danton, Billaut Varennes, and Marat? On the grounds that it was cruel; that the poor chiefly suffered by it; *that it would destroy the monarchy; that it would cost the lives of the royalists in France; and that it would end in military despotism!*

On the 19th of April, Francis addressed the French an unbearable ultimatum. He demanded that the feudal rights of the German princes and the pope should be restored; refused pecuniary compensation; required the confiscation of Church property to be annulled; and the Constitution revised, according to Louis' program of June 23, 1789! Two days later, Louis himself appeared in the Assembly to declare war against "the king of Hungary and Bohemia." (The Imperial throne being elective, Francis did not yet possess it). For almost the last time, the unhappy monarch was greeted with hearty shouts of "Vive le Roi!" During the previous month, Marie Antoinette had written to Mercy revealing all the military projects which Dumouriez allowed her to understand! The first battle was fought on the 28th. The French attacked in three columns; and were everywhere repulsed by superior numbers, because their plans had been betrayed. They saw it plainly; and killed one of their traitor generals, Theobald Dillon, a life-long sharer in Marie Antoinette's follies, as in her darker deeds. Somewhat moderate historians hold this up as proof that the French army had become demoralized by the Revolution! Carlyle admits, what must be evident to whoever has studied

\* This gentleman won the heart of Napoleon by addressing him on his knees. As ambassador to Austria, he quickly penetrated her secrets, which plebeian diplomats could not do.

† Campan, Vol. II, p. 172.

† Half the historians say the 29th. This was the day on which he died, having been shot by Ankarström on the 16th.



first-hand documents, that it was thoroughly demoralized before the Revolution; and that what it needed to become conqueror of Europe was just a little more such energetic purging. The amazing thing is that Lafayette, a soldier, a courtier, a politician, did not see matters must be worse before they could be better. Dumouriez and Barnave did see it. They knew that Louis was believed to have betrayed his country, and solved the difficult problem of making war against himself. They also knew that Marie Antoinette managed him. They accordingly approached her with a view to remonstrance—Dumouriez at this time, Barnave in May. She admitted to Dumouriez, and Barnave found out, that her hatred of the Constitution was implacable. After a birth-pang which must have been terrible, their wish became mother to the thought that Marie Antoinette could by no possibility effect her nefarious designs; and that duty did not, accordingly, require them to increase her danger. Barnave said he would give his head for her, since she chose to have it so. Dumouriez warned her that to resist the Constitution was to ruin the king. This most dramatic interview is given in two highly reliable memoirs—the queen's, by Madame Campan, and Dumouriez', by himself. Though the coloring is very different, the great human features are the same. Either version would make a worthy study for a Schiller. The obstinate queen would not be saved by Dumouriez; whom she chose to call a radical. But the woman, so lonely in her height, could not refuse him her friendship, since he had proved a gentleman. She confided to him not only those schemes which cost her life; but the motives which underlay them. She could not bear those little traits of disrespect, those petty ebullitions of impertinence, to which she must be exposed unless despotism were restored. This raises to tragedy the comedy of Titania caressing Bottom! The old regime was that ass-headed love on which Marie Antoinette's eyes opened after the sleep of infancy; and in its vast "body of death" there was no common bond but the magic of wickedness. The royalist paper of the emigrants abused her as vilely as did *Pere Duchesne*. If she mortified a high-born snob, her card-table was deserted; and Louis came in for his share of refined insults. Such was the thing to which she had resolved on sacrificing crown, husband, children, honor, and life itself!

A few weeks passed amidst that brooding calm which preceded the hurricane. The Austrians did not pursue their success—perhaps because Prussia had already secretly promised another army, beyond doubt, in part because they were receiving advice from the Tuileries. This, though not yet known, was suspected. A Girondin editor openly accused Lamballe of treason. He was prosecuted for the libel, and named three members of the Assembly as his informants. The magistrate, Lareviere, issued warrants for their arrest. As they were exempt by the Constitution, he was himself arrested for a treasonable act. The Assembly, fearing dissolution by the king, declared itself permanent. It also passed three most important decrees. The Constitution gave the king 1,600 Body Guards. He had taken the lib-

erty of increasing their number to 6,000. Some of these troops, commanded by Brissac (Madame du Barry's last noted lover), had been sent to war, and, perhaps under instruction from the Tuileries, behaved badly. The first decree (May 29) dismissed their commanders and broke their corps up.\* Even the Swiss were removed from the palace. Barnave's interview with the queen was to urge anticipating this step. Another bill provided for the formation of a camp with 20,000 men, to defend Paris. Still another ordained that any of the refractory priests might be summarily banished on complaint of twenty citizens that he preached disloyalty,—a severe measure, which seemed to find justification in the state of ultramontane districts like Vendée, where the constitutional clergy were in what soon proved no idle fear of insurrection and massacre. Louis vetoed the two last decrees. If one veto might be attributed to extreme zeal for the rights of conscience, we can allow no such excuse to the other. Nothing could be more evident than that he had rushed into great danger. Lafayette came to Paris, and advised the king, through Mallouet, the queen, through Gouvernet, to join the army, under protection of the Swiss and National Guards. Both refused—the queen contemptuously. Instead, they sent Mallet Du Pan to hasten the Prussian invasion. As the Girondins were now in power, and have been greatly praised by many who decry the Jacobins, it is well worth while to keep a close eye on their methods. Pedantry and superficiality mark all French Revolutionary politicians, from Sieyes reviving consulships to Marat raving for "a military tribune."† But I am really inclined to think the Girondins the most callow sophomores of all. Their eulogists make the astonishing admission that their inspiring Nymph was Madame Roland, a charming but unmitigated specimen of a *blue*. She had read Plutarch at nine. Tacitus followed in due course; and her whole political philosophy was founded on these two unreliable Fore World writers. The Girondins, instructed by this Egeria, committed most of those blunders which have disgraced the French Revolution more than its crimes. Promoting a war which should have been delayed and prepared for, was the first. The lady now wrote a letter, which her husband delivered to Louis at a cabinet meeting, actually attended by Marie Antoinette. It urged recall of the vetoes,

\* One of their officers, D'Hervilly, had the temerity to propose dispersing the Assembly by force. It is perhaps rather to the credit of Louis' judgment that he declined.

† Macaulay justly remarks that this was because the French had no traditions of liberty later than Roman times. In 1830, Brutus, Timoleon, Cato, and the rest, were forgotten by a people who had learned to cry "Vive la Charte!" On the other hand, earlier French radicalism was as full of sham classics as the Revolutionary. There is a tract of the Reformation period, called *Le Contré Un*. "Wretched and insensate people!" cries some premature Marat, "what do you fear? He who crushes you has but two hands, two eyes, two feet. The powers he wields for your oppression are your own. Think of Harmodius and Aristogiton"—a modern reader will undoubtedly excuse more." This is exactly the style of the French Revolution. As to taking Plutarch for gospel, it is doubtful whether the French scholarship which made that possible was worse than other nations' at the same time. Mitford was the first English historian who dared to disbelieve a Greek one.

and enlarged on a subject only fit for private mention—the peril his majesty was courting. "What shall we do with these insolent people?" snapped the queen to Dumouriez. "Kick them out," was his laconic advice. They were kicked out the same day (June 12); and Dumouriez became prime, or rather sole, minister. This was an excellent specimen of his finesse. He had no sooner risen on the necks of his colleagues than he respectfully advised the king, whose real intentions, we remember, he already knew through the queen, to do just what Roland had proposed with less reserve. The effect may be imagined. Within three days Dumouriez had himself resigned—disgusted, though still favored. In a last affecting interview, he besought the king to reconsider; and set out to join the army, big with a secret which would soon make him commander in chief. Lafayette was now the only person of any consequence who believed it possible to save both the king and the Constitution. His idea of a method fully sustained his character for blunders. Beyond doubt the state of Paris was most alarming. The charge against Lamballe was universally believed—can we give a reason why it should not have been, except that only decorum still tried to make her the queen's lightning rod? The rod was too small for the thunderbolt. Mobs filled the street, crying, "Death to the Austrian committee! Death to the queen!" Insulting, and even indecent demonstrations occurred under her windows. The National Guards at the Tuileries were ready to repulse royalist visitors with the bayonet—can we blame them?—and averse to nothing which would warn their infatuated sovereigns how the people really felt. But instead of perceiving that, to save Louis' life, he must be at least practically deposed, Lafayette wrote a most foolish letter to the Assembly, in which he blamed this body collectively for unconstitutional legislation, blamed the Girondins particularly, blamed Dumouriez personally, and "demanded," in the name of the army, that the Jacobin Club be suppressed. More bad moves could scarcely have been brought into so small a total. "Let us draw a veil" over the scene which followed! Sylla, Caesar, and all the other military usurpers, not forgetting Cromwell, were, of course, invoked and marshalled, that Lafayette might lead them back to hell!—the result alone is important: hitherto none but Marat had dared to call Lafayette a traitor; now his very friends in the Assembly were reduced to the insignificance of proving he was not that. Still they were enough present to prevent the Assembly's taking any decided action. As usual, "the mob" alone had both clear ideas of what it wanted, and power to give effect. It was resolved to celebrate the 20th of June, third anniversary of the Tennis Court (and first of the king's flight, though that was not mentioned) by a monster demonstration against the vetoes. St. Huruge; Legendre, a butcher; Billaud Varennes, the coming legislator of Terror; Collot D'Herbois, dramatist and actor; Tallien, a very prominent Jacobin, were among the chief projectors. But the embodied spirit of the movement was Santerre. Rich, generous, extravagant, a prominent officer of National Guards, and a thorough man of the people, he was exactly the man to get up an exhibition after their taste.

C. L. JAMES.

(Continued next week.)

## 323

The number printed on the wrapper of your paper shows that your subscription has been paid up to that number.

## AGENTS FOR FREE SOCIETY.

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

ALLEGHENY, Pa.—H. Bauer, 73 Spring-garden Ave.  
ATLANTIC CITY, N. J.—M. Kisluck, 1108 Baltic Ave.  
B. Morwitz, 2018 Baltic Ave.  
BALTIMORE—M. Kahn, 1139 Granby St.  
BOSTON—Brigham's Restaurant, 642 Washington St.  
K. A. Snellenberg, 54 Haskins St., Roxbury.  
BUFFALO—Hattie Lang, 408 Riley St.  
CHICAGO—H. Havel, 515 Carroll Ave.  
C. Pfuetzner, 469 Wabash Ave.  
CLEVELAND—E. Schilling, 4 Elwell St.  
COLUMBUS, OHIO.—H. M. Lyndall, 416 E. Mound St.  
LONDON, Eng.—T. Cantwell, 127 Ossulton St., N. W.  
MONTREAL, Canada.—Norman Murray, 21 Beaver Hall Hill.  
NEW YORK—M. Maisel, 170 Henry St.  
PHILADELPHIA—Natasha Notkin, 242 N. Second St.  
SAN FRANCISCO—R. Rieger, 322 Larkin St.  
ST. LOUIS—C. Norman, 1351 S. 13th St.

## For Brooklyn and New York.

A great picnic at W. W. Fuehrer's Wald-Hotel and Park, Jackson Ave., Newton, L. I., combined with bowling, music, dance, etc., will take place August 4, 1901.

Take North Beach Trolley from Brooklyn and get off on Jackson Ave., where the wagons of the proprietor of the park will take you to his place free of charge.

Trainloads of discharged soldiers are returning home through New Mexico, and are reported to be committing many depredations. People along the line have been struck by stray bullets, and armed citizens are meeting the trains and preventing the soldiers from alighting. Recruits on the way to the Philippines have to be kept under guard at San Francisco to prevent conflicts with citizens and police. If our soldiers behave in this fashion at home, what must they do when turned loose on the unfortunate Filipinos? But what else can be expected from men who enlist on war conquest?—*justified*.

While our Boards of Health and a lot of ultra "scientific" ones are raising a great hullabaloo over the "contagiousness of consumption," and wanting to quarantine the whole tuberculous outfit, a German, Gebhart (*Medical Record*, March 23), of a statistical turn of mind has been looking into the matter with rather sug-

gestive results. He finds that among those whose income was below \$500 a year the death rate from consumption was 40 in 10,000, while among those with incomes over that amount was 15 in 10,000. Now let the bacteriologist find the bacilli of poverty, and a serum to knock it out, and he will be on the high road to exterminating consumption.

There's no use to blink the question. There must be revolutionary reform in society or it will fall to pieces by its own rottenness. Courts, police, penitentiaries and gallows' ropes will not continue to hold it together at the rate in which crime is progressing in legislative bodies and in the courts, not to speak of its progress among what is known as the dangerous classes.—*South-ern Mercury*.

## RECEIPTS.

Social Science Club, Philadelphia, \$3.  
Zimmerman, Koenig, Bloch, Ewbanks, Corra, Wolsky, Jaffe, Schattin, Rossetto, Rubin, Carter, each \$1. Uhlich, Wilson, Drill, Lee, Goldfeder, each 50c. Maggie, Wohlehen, each 25c.

## NOTICE.

Nicely furnished rooms, with gas, bath, and library; from one dollar per week upwards. Apply to Jay Fox, 425 Carroll Ave.

## DIRECTORY.

The following are names and addresses of comrades engaged in business.

## CHICAGO.

J. Burness, 977 W. Lake St. Boot and shoe store; repairing neatly done.  
A. Edelstadt, 366 State St. Shoe store and repairing.  
H. Havel, 515 Carroll Ave. News and book-agent.  
C. Pfuetzner, 469 Wabash Ave. Shoemaking and repairing.  
Ogilvie A. Rice, 1556 Milwaukee Ave. Dentist.

## NEW YORK.

O. B. Epstein, 163d St. & Forest Ave. Druggist.  
M. Maisel, 170 Henry St. News-agent.

## DIVERS.

Professor Bertha Grouseth, Lawrence, Kans., teacher of hypnotism and hypnotic healing; write for terms. a3-34  
R. Rieger, 322 Larkin St., San Francisco, Cal. News-agent.

## MEETINGS.

NEW YORK—The Social Science Club meets every Thursday 8 p. m., 250 W. 23th Street.

PHILADELPHIA—The Social Science Club holds open-air meetings (weather permitting) at the North Plaza, City Hall Sq., every Sunday evening, 8 p. m.

PITTSBURG—The Debating Club meets every Sunday afternoon-2 p. m. at 155 Crawford St. Take any Fifth Ave. car Pride St.

SAN FRANCISCO—Independent Debating Club meets every Sunday 2 p. m., at 909 Market St. Free discussion.

## MEMOIRS OF A REVOLUTIONIST.

BY  
PETER KROPOTKIN.

This interesting autobiography of the well known Anarchist and scientist, is one of the most important books of the Anarchist movement, as well as one of general interest. "He is more anxious to give the psychology of his contemporaries than of himself," says the noted European critic Georg Brandes. "One finds in his book the psychology of official Russia and of the masses underneath, of Russia struggling forward and of Russia stagnant. And he strives to give the history of his contemporaries rather than his own history. The record of his life contains, consequently, the history of Russia during his lifetime, as well as the history of the labor movement in Europe during the last half-century."

The book contains two portraits of the author, and one of his mother. It is excellently printed and well bound; 519 pp.

Price \$2.

Send orders to FREE SOCIETY.

## HISTORY OF THE COMMUNE 1871.

Translated from the French of

P. O. LISSAGARAY

By ELEANOR MARX AVELING.

The above book is the most reliable history of the Commune of 1871, and should be in every library of the student of revolutionary movements. Arrangements which we have made with the publishers enable us to mail the book postpaid for

75 CENTS.

Send orders to FREE SOCIETY.

## THE CHICAGO MARTYRS.

THE FAMOUS SPEECHES OF THE EIGHT  
ANARCHISTS IN COURT

AND  
ALTGELD'S REASONS FOR PARDONING  
FIELDEN, NEEBE AND SCHWAB.

This book contains a half-tone picture of our eight comrades and one of the monument erected at Waldheim cemetery to the memory of those murdered by the government. This is the best edition of the book ever printed. It contains 168 pages.

Price 25 cents.

Send orders to FREE SOCIETY.

MORIBUND SOCIETY  
AND ANARCHY.

Translated from the French of

JEAN GRAVE

By VOLTAIRINE DE CLEYRE.

## CONTENTS:

The Anarchistic Idea and its Development.—Individualism and Solidarity.—Too Abstract.—Is Man Evil?—Property.—The Family.—Authority.—The Magistracy.—The Right to Punish and the Savants.—The Influence of Environment.—"The Country."—The Patriotism of the Governing Classes.—Militarism.—Colonization.—There are no Inferior Races.—Why We are Revolutionists.—As to what Means follow from the Principles.—Revolution and Anarchy.—The Efficacy of Reforms.—The Experimental Method.—What Then?—Anarchism and its Practicability.—The Unvarnished Truth.  
The book is printed in large type, and consists of 176 pages.

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

Send orders to FREE SOCIETY.

## BOOK LIST.

ALL ORDERS FOR THE FOLLOWING BOOKS  
RECEIVED AT THIS OFFICE.

Essays on the Social Problem.....	H. Addis	05
The New Hedonism.....	Grant Allen	05
Plain Words on the Woman		
Question.....	"	05
Prejudice?.....	M. Bachman	50
God and the State.....	Bakunin	05
The Same. (London edition.).....		10
The Proletarian Revolt, a History		
of the Paris Commune of 1871.....		
	G. B. Benham	25
Prodigal Daughter; or, The Price		
of Virtue.....	Rachel Campbell	25
The Worm Turns.....	V. de Cleyre	10
The Evolution of the Family.....		
	J. M. Crane	05
Evolution of Modesty.....	"	05
The Emancipation of Society from		
Government.....	Dallan Doyle	05
Hilda's Home. Cloth \$1.....		
	Rosa Graul	50
Moribund Society and Anarchy.		
Cloth 60c.....	Jean Grave	25
A Physician in the House.....		
	Dr. J. H. Greer	2.75
The Education of the Feminine		
Will.....	Harlor	05
Marriage and Morality.....		
	Lillian Harman	05
Regeneration of Society.....	"	05
Love in Freedom.....	Moses Harman	05
Motherhood in Freedom.....	"	05
Government Analyzed.....	Kelso	1.00
How to Dispose of Surplus Pro-		
ducts and Employ Surplus Labor.		
	Kinghorn-Jones	05
Anarchism: Its Philosophy and		
Ideal.....	Peter Kropotkin	05
Anarchist Morality.....	"	05
Law and Authority.....	"	05
Memoirs of a Revolutionist.....	"	2.00
Paris Commune.....	"	05
The State: Its Historic Role.....	"	10
The Wage System. Revolution-		
ary Government.....	"	05
History of the Commune. Cloth...		
	Lissagaray	75
The Economics of Anarchy.....		
	Dyer D. Lum	25
Anarchy.....	Enrico Malatesta	05
Anarchy. (Is It All a Dream?)		
James F. Morton, Jr.).....	"	10
A Chambermaid's Diary.....		
	Gustav Mirbeau	50
Commune of Paris.....	Wm. Morris	05
Monopoly.....	"	05
Responsibility and Solidarity in the		
Labor Struggle.....	M. Nettlau	05
God and Government: The Siamese		
Twins of Superstition.....	W. Nevill	05
A Cityless and Countryless World.		
Cloth.....	Herman Oler	1.00
The Slavery of Our Times. Cloth.		
	Leo Tolstoy	75
Mating or Marrying, Which?.....		
	W. H. Van Ornum	05
Judgment.....	Wm. Platt	05
Evolution and Revolution.....	Reclus	05
Direct Action vs. Direct Legislation		
	J. Blair Smith	05
Helen Harlow's Vow.....		
	Lois Waisbrooker	25
Perfect Motherhood. Cloth.....	"	1.00
The Temperance Folly.....	"	10
Wherefore Investigating Co.....	"	25
Our Worship of Primitive Social		
Guesses.....	E. C. Walker	15
Revival of Puritanism.....	"	10
What the Young Nod to Know		
	"	15
The Ballad of Reading Gaol.....		
	Oscar Wilde	10
Life Without a Master. 336 pp.		
Cloth \$1.50.....	J. Wilson	1.00
The New Dispensation. Cloth.	"	1.50
The Coming Woman.....	Lillie White	05
The Chicago Martyrs: The Fam-		
ous Speeches of the Eight Anarch-		
ists in Judge Gary's Court; and		
Altgeld's Reasons for Pardon-		
ing Fielden, Neebe and Schwab.....		25