

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. 28.

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, SUNDAY, AUGUST 11, 1901.

WHOLE NO. 326.

Les Septembriseurs.

SEPTEMBER 2, 1792.

Rouse thee, Paris, from thy slumbers,
Brunswick marches on thy gates,
Breathing slaughter, strong in numbers,
Clothed in vengeance by the Fates.
Up! as one man standing
For your homes and wives,
Liberty demanding
At the risk of lives.
Ha! the tocsin pealing
Answers Brunswick's threat,
Freedom's sons revealing
Paying long due debt.

Quick, ye brave!

Country calls!

Come and save!

Whoe'er falls!

Though all tyrant kings unite
France will answer in her might.

Rouse thee, Paris, caitiff dastards.
Revel in thy prison cells,
Highborn lords and royal bastards,
Plotting halts, grape, and shells,
Think! O fathers! brothers!
Ere ye forward step,
Daughters, sisters, mothers,
Shall they be weep?
Pause not now nor falter
'Neath appalling fears
Of revengeful halter
Seen through blinding tears.

Up, ye men!

Dare and do!

Cleanse the den!

Crush the crew!

Who in revelry conspires
'Gainst your wives and aged sires.

Rouse thee, Paris, native, stranger,
Pity cease, let justice deal
Swift relentless as thy danger,
Though they cringe to thee and kneel;
Naught to thee be title,
Strike them swiftly down,
'T would be thy requital
From the rescued crown;
On; e'er onward sweeping,
Pierce each traitor heart,
Let their fear and weeping
But new strength impart.

Strike again!

Cut red tape!

Heap the slain!

Let none 'scape!

Though the gutters ruddy run
Let the needed work be done!

Rouse thee, Paris, higher heaping;
Pile ye up the caitiffs slain,
'Tis the day of Harvest reaping,
Let no o'er ripe grain remain;
Grain, and weed, and stubble,
"My lord and lady-fair,"
Who laughed at our trouble—
Reaped by strong arms bare;
Wheat in royal meadows,
Now but stubble reaped
Threshed in Death's dark shadows,
And as harvest heaped.

Men of mark!

Pallid brow!

Livid, stark!

Plot ye now!

Rank that would the wild wind sow
Rank where reapers whirlwinds mow!

Sleep thee, Paris, softly slumber,
What though Brunswick near thy gates?
Stalwart breasts the foe outnumber,

Manly hearts defy the Fates;
Hearts in acclaim ringing
Thirst to meet the foe,
France as one man springing
In new harvests mow.
Death is not more fearful
For the high than low,
Terrors not more fearful
When ye reap than sow.
Terror, hail!
For thee room!
Lordlings wail!
'Tis thy doom!
Harvest fields e'en now are white!
Reapers, wake! The dawn is bright!
—Dyer D. Lum.

An Era of Transition.

V

THE SOURCE OF EXPLOITATION.

When we attempt to analyze economic tendencies and estimate their probable effects upon labor, it becomes an imperative duty to describe in plain terms the relation between the capitalist class and the producers. Let it be clearly understood, however, that this by no means implies any animus against individual capitalists, nor a desire to hold up one class of the community as the embodiment of selfish injustice, and portray another as virtuous worshipers of the scale-holding goddess. Conditions beyond the control of the individual, as a rule, determine his social status. A man's place in the industrial order, be he laborer or boss, tramp or plutocrat, is as much the result of circumstances as it is due to his own volition. There is no merit in being a wage slave, no sin in being an employer. The workingman has no aim in life better or worse than the multi-millionaire. Each has presumably tried to seize such opportunities as have come within his reach, and according to his capacity, utilized them to his own advantage.

There are rats amongst the workers and benefactors of mankind in the capitalist ranks. But these ethical considerations need disturb us not in dealing with the economic results of our industrial system. The capitalist as a man may be an Owen, a Ruskin, or a Morris, but as a member of a class living upon the fruits of other people's labor he is an anomaly that no society founded on justice could tolerate. And it is this ideal state, let it ever be remembered, that the Socialist or the Anarchist thinker, in treating of things as they are, has invariably in mind. When he finds that social inequality is due, not to natural differences, but to unequal opportunities; poverty the result, not of idleness, but of unjust distribution; wealth the fruits, not of useful productive labor, but of the monopoly of natural resources and the control of the tools of industry, then the reformer, in comparing these features of the present with his ideal conception of justice and freedom, very naturally, in terms often more forcible than polite, is impelled to condemn existing institutions.

It has always appeared to me that no part of Socialist economics is more unsatisfactory than the explanation of the robbery of the wage workers by the doctrine of surplus value. We hear it said that the laborer gets say one-fourth or one-tenth—as it happens to suit the occasion—of the wealth he produces. On the strength of the statement made by eminent statisticians, that one-fourth or one-third of the total national product goes to the wage-workers and the balance to the other classes, it is often asserted that the laborer works say two hours for himself and six for his employer. This six hours, whose product the toiler fails to receive in the form of wages, is consequently called surplus value, which is appropriated by the boss. Now I believe such a statement is misleading, and the argument based upon it entirely fallacious.

Nothing more is attempted here than an accurate description of existing relations, but to perform this task demands of us, as far as may be, the putting aside of personal bias, the impartial attitude of the unprejudiced investigator. To interpret the working of our industrial system does not require of us to judge the different parties concerned. The view, to which I have just taken exception, is one that implies an irreconcilable antagonism between the employer, as such, and the wage worker. Yet the facts of daily observation fail to bear out this contention. The general conditions that favor the one prove beneficial to the interests of the other. Conversely circumstances that are detrimental to one party are no less inimical to the other. To establish this identity of interest, within certain prescribed limits, it would be easy to cite well known facts. For example, that wherever wages are high and the wage worker most favorably situated, there you will find the employers most prosperous. Does anyone contend that an American employer makes less profit than a German or a Japanese?

Understand, I do not deny that there exists somewhere a fundamental antagonism of interests; I merely claim that it does not reside in the relation of wage earner and employer. Nay, more. I admit that there is often conflict between the two. Their interests clash. War is declared. But the underlying causes are deeper than the relation of the parties as employer and employed can adequately explain. Doubtless the reader has now in mind the strike in the steel industry, and is prepared to cite it in opposition to my argument. Let me point out that this strike is no simple dispute between the boss and his help, but a contest between organized capital, on a scale hitherto unparalleled, and united labor, for a well defined principle. On both sides it is a question of general policy, not of immediate pecuniary interest.

When there is sickness in the home the

workingman calls in the physician; when his daughter grows ambitious to manipulate the piano, he provides the instrument and engages a teacher. (Yes, indeed, even if his grocer goes unpaid!) In these instances, which might be multiplied, where is the antagonism between employer and employed?

In strict economic language the terms capitalist and employer are not synonymous. The employer is the organizer of industry, the one who adapts means to ends. He is the responsible agent of useful production. In this capacity the wage workers cooperate with him. The interests of both are alike as against the rest of the community. When business flourishes both reap the benefit, when it lags both suffer.

The employer may be a capitalist. That is another matter. The capitalist is the owner of wealth used in industry. His share of the product is called interest. There is an irreconcilable conflict between the producer who works for wages and the capitalist who receives interest. Capital is a requisite of production, but it is simply stored-up labor. It is seldom, if ever, the stored-up labor of him who owns it and draws the interest. Capital is nearly always the result of the labor of the wage working class. The owners of capital have, as a general rule, re-invested a portion of the income which they derive from industry. Thus is capital the result of saving. The one class saves what the other class creates. This is the true relation of capitalist and producer. Nowbeit I am not prepared to vouch that it is so taught by university professors.

In order to demonstrate the insufficiency of the doctrine of surplus value, the idea that the producer parts with the major portion of the value of his product to his employer, which is the customary Socialistic explanation of the process of industrial exploitation, it will be necessary to discuss profit, rent, and interest. This will occupy the next paper. Meanwhile it may be pointed out that in numberless subtle ways the laborer is deprived of the equivalent of his toil. As I have before noted, the worker is fleeced not only as a wage earner, but also as a consumer. Before he can obtain the commodities and services he desires, to which his money wages are merely a pass, he must pay so many preferred claims, as it were, profits of monopoly in various forms, that he is fortunate indeed if his wages will secure for him the equivalent of half the actual value his labor has created. The whole economic structure of society is honeycombed with snares and devices for appropriating value without returning an equivalent. Yet it can, I think, be made clear that, however multifarious are the methods of robbing the toiler, in the long run, the chief economic avenue through which the process takes place is the channel of interest, resting on privilege and monopoly established by law.

WAT TYLER.

— o —

A Few Words About Science.

I suppose the marked copy of the *Stuffed Club* which I received from FREE SOCIETY, meant to call my attention to the criticism on Kropotkin. Defending Kropotkin against the blows of the *Stuffed Club*, if that were all, would be as officious as taking arms for

the moon against those canine hordes which misuse her rays to make night hideous. The serenity of the Queen of Night on such occasions powerfully suggests ability to care for herself. But Kropotkin especially represents an element which is slowly and surely awakening the reading public to knowledge of this truth, that Anarchism is the spirit and method of science applied to social problems; while the *Stuffed Club* stands well enough for another, which is doing its best to disseminate the delusion that Anarchism means speculation without data and pretension without substance. The latter is so capable of recruiting from that large class whose notions of what science consists in are extremely hazy; and my relations to it have consequently come to be so antagonistic, that I gladly accept an opportunity to point the contrast between science in general and this phase of the Movement in Favor of Ignorance.

What is Science? A reply may very properly begin with Herbert Spencer's remark that there is no defineable line between "science" and "knowledge"—much between knowledge, or science, and theory. All men, whatever their speculative opinions, agree that the days are longer in summer than winter. But all astronomy consists in very similar truths. That iron will rust, that milk will sour, that meat and vegetables will rot, are chemical "laws." All chemistry is but a larger body of like discoveries, conducted with greater accuracy, and so arranged as to shed light on one another. Bacteriology, being the youngest of sciences, is a favorite point of attack for the Movement in Favor of Ignorance, which generally knows better than to tackle old ones. But every housekeeper is aware that the processes of cooking, salting, pickling, preserving in sugar or in alcohol, will to a great extent prevent the decomposition of food substances. These are the elementary facts on which bacteriology is founded. All antiseptic and antitoxin methods—"all the serum fads"—are but applications of like facts, ascertained and systematized with greater care. The prejudice against science, whether cultivated by timid theologians or their natural allies, word-butcherers quacks, becomes too absurd for further consideration when we realize that the sciences differ from the practical arts only in being emancipated from their narrowness and routine; that the physical philosopher follows exactly the same method as the mechanic, the sailor, the cook, or the farmer, but with a higher purpose—that he aims at original discovery; they only at getting a living by the application of what has already been discovered. That method which he has in common with them resolves itself into two branches—direct observation of natural phenomena, and experiment, by which phenomena are artificially varied with a view to arriving at those relations called their laws. With this method words, the capital of theologians, metaphysicians, quacks and dupes have but little to do. The cook is not made by the cookery book but the kitchen; the surgeon is made by the hospital and the "vivisection hell." The only use of text books to either is to save him the necessity of repeating old observations and experiments; and even these will be all the better for repeating, if he can without en-

croaching on the time which should be given new ones.

As to verbal controversy, it is wholly outside the scientific method. Its only use for a scientist is to call back from itself to observation and experiment, those who have become befogged with words. For the man who believes that, for example, "temperance, purity, cleanliness, fresh air, a contented and cheerful spirit" will give "bodily health" to an individual with a broken leg, the last word of science is, "If you think so—try it!" From this it also follows that formal logic, or the method of argument, so much cultivated in theology and pre-scientific times, is but little to the scientist. Its use is only to suggest new experiments, by which the soundness of his hypotheses may be tested.* Very notable indeed are the results sometimes. When Cuvier, from a single bone of an extinct animal reconstructed the entire skeleton, which afterwards proved to be as he inferred; this was justly considered a great triumph. But observe the difference between Cuvier and a mere logician like Jonathan Edwards, building up what in its way was also a masterly argument upon the unsound premises of theology. The grand merit of Cuvier's reasoning was in the soundness of his hypothesis. The proof of that merit was the verification by subsequent tests. If the tests had disproved the hypothesis, Cuvier, as a scientist, would have equally rejoiced to learn something; while Edwards, as a theologian, would very likely have been burnt rather than acknowledged his theses reduced to absurdity, and might rather therefore rejoice that it admitted no experimental trial. Lavoisier's disproof of phlogiston by testing the logical results of its existence, was a step in the progress of science as great as Cuvier's. The chemists Priestley and Cavendish, who would not be convinced, were universally held to have forfeited their previous high scientific character by obstinacy for which dogmatism, religious, metaphysical, ethical, or political, would rather have honored them as martyrs. For the temple of science, theory is mere scaffolding, to be pulled down when it has done its work.

This practical method of observation and experiment—this thinking in Things not Words, which constitutes Science, is a deadly enemy of Humbug under every form. And the enmity is mutual. Aristotle, really the first systematic cultivator of science, though the misunderstandings of his disciples have so often caused him to be contrasted with its great modern apostle Bacon, remarked that human effort follows necessarily some one of three volitions—to Make or Do, to Persuade, and to Know (in the metaphysical sense, of knowing the Absolute). They correspond obviously—not in the above order—to the

* Accordingly speculations essentially metaphysical, as materialism, idealism, egoism, altruism, Individualism, though often put forward in the name of science, have nothing to do with it. Based on a "view" of Everything in General, they lead to Nothing in Particular, and thus admit no experimental test. The Individualist, unlike the Anarchist, who affirms that all law-making is pernicious, can never tell exactly what he means by his first principle, "invasion should be resisted"; and we have no means of ascertaining how this theory would work in practise, because, for want of clearness about what is to be considered "invasive," it never reaches any practical application at all.

three divisions of human consciousness—the Subject, the Object, and what Prof. Clifford calls the Eject (the person whom the subject, reasoning about the object, always supposes himself to address). The classification may also be vindicated in this way—among our fundamental propensities, the desire of food is the root of “doing,” that of sex at the root of “persuading,” and fear at the root of our desire to explain the awful mystery which surrounds us. And from these three, all our propensities are evolved. Now, it is a tolerably open secret that while the Object, which science investigates, appears alike to all, the Subject and Eject appear alike to no two individuals. Is their contemplation therefore useless and pernicious? By no means. All the pleasures of social intercourse depend on being persuaded to see friends and lovers as others do not see them; all the pleasures of literature and art on seeing the infinite or absolute as others do not see it. Humbug begins when the methods of persuasion (social practices) are hardened into rules, when the methods of universal contemplation (esthetic conceptions) are crystalized into dogmas. To set up expressions of the subject for those of the object—that is humbug. Besides obstructing real science by the intrusion of false, it spoils those things put in the place of science for their legitimate purpose. The volition to Do or Make alone is progressive. Morals, the art of social life, whose very essence is persuading; esthetics, the art of beautifying, whose soul is the volition to Know, can improve only as they condescend to learn of it. Why then does Humbug in all ages flourish like a green baytree? Because it enables the knaves to live upon fools! That kings and priests may bamboozle nations, morals are tied to the practises, and imagination to the superstitions of those ancestors who, we know, were savages!

The volition to Do, operating by the scientific method of induction, advances steadily. Since Bacon's time its progress has been rapid. It is now gaining rather in geometrical progression than arithmetical. Ask what it has done for mankind, says Macaulay, and the answer is ready. “It has lengthened life; it has mitigated pain; it has extinguished disease; it has increased the fertility of the soil; it has given new securities to the mariner; it has furnished new arms to the warrior; it has spanned great rivers and estuaries with bridges of form unknown to our fathers; it has guided the thunderbolt innocuously from heaven to earth; it has lighted up the night with the splendor of the day; . . . it has enabled man to descend to the depths of the sea, to soar into the air, to penetrate securely into the noxious recesses of the earth, to traverse the land with cars which whirl along without horses, and the ocean in ships which run ten knots an hour against the wind. These are only a part of its fruits and of its first fruits.” In the temple of science, every story is a foundation for another no less solid than the base. Ask what humbug has done

for mankind; and the answer is equally ready. It has withstood every step in this progress, and still withstands every new step. As its essence is a false pretense of knowledge, every advance of knowledge drives it back. Its many phases, kingcraft, priestcraft, quackcraft, understand their common interest. They quarrel for the spoil of their dupes sometimes; but they are an unit in resistance to the deliverer Science. Only in one way can the result of such a contest be made doubtful—by enlisting the unintelligent brute force of ignorance and prejudice on the side of Humbug. Unhappily this has sometimes been done successfully on quite an extensive scale. In this way, the science of antiquity was crushed by the Church. In this way, the promising science of the Mahometan nations was blighted. In this way, the Chinese, naturally a very inventive practical race, have been degraded into “a people of automata.” In this way, the Catholic nations have been kept behind the Protestant; with which, at the beginning of the Reformation, they were fully equal. The Movement in Favor of Ignorance is naturally, therefore, at all times, a movement in favor of more laws—Comstock laws against sexual science, vivisection laws against medical science, etc.* For these reasons alone, the tendency of science is Anarchistic. But there are others. Forced at every step to fight ignorance and imposture backed by authority, science by this time has learned to question the origin and purpose of authority. It finds authority invariably based on the specious pretense of the powerful to protect the weak whom, in truth, they fleece. The plebeian does the fighting; the noble gets the plunder. The tenant sows; the landlord reaps. The voter chooses one set of politicians, and finds them in league with the other. Man enslaves a woman, and begets the horde of scabs and soldiers who are used to enslave himself. If you must have a law of God, here is one. “So long as you seek to be tyrants, you shall be slaves!”

Kropotkin's explanation of the term natural law, was not, as the *Stuffed Club* man imagines, an original trait of his animosity to human law; for it was given long ago by scientists not sufficiently advanced to have any such animosity. And Kropotkin is far too much of a positive thinker to engage in controversies about the “proofs” of a natural Lawgiver afforded by the nature of atoms. Did the *Stuffed Club* man ever see an atom? If not, he knows nothing about its nature. The existence of atoms is, for

‡ The quack's whine about laws to compel sanitary precautions and prohibit persons who do not know enough to get diplomas from practising on the lives of others, is like the theologian's miserable *tu quoque*. “The theories of scientists differ as much as ours!” The man who upholds a scientific hypothesis as a theologian does a dogma loses scientific caste by the very spirit the other must exhibit in order to keep theological caste. It certainly is not scientific to enforce sanitation by law; for there is no vindication of sanitary measures like letting neglect of them be fully tried. To tolerate that, however, can be expected of those whose own lives are endangered by their neighbors' recklessness, only on condition of their being very consistent Anarchists; which, of course, few are as yet. Pending their becoming such, I will be inconsistent enough, if it is inconsistent, to think a law against quackery much less obnoxious than a law against surgery—which the quacks are in league with the priests and zoophilists to have enacted.

some purposes, a very convenient hypothesis—whether true or false makes no difference to its use, which is only to suggest a train of reasoning leading up to new experiments, whose results will be permanent whatever becomes of the hypothesis. It may interest our friend with the *Stuffed Club* to know that this reasoning has already led to such conclusions as that, if there are atoms, there must be more of them in a molecule of protoplasm than there are stars in the sky; and that their distance from each other must be as great, for their size, as those of the stars for theirs'. Every scientist regards such results as somewhat grave reasons for doubting whether the great hypothesis of Democritus and Leucippus be true.

C. L. JAMES.

— o —

A Summer Outing.

Being aware of a picnic to be held at Milwaukee by the German comrades on July 28, a trio of us decided to take the trip. The steamer reached the city at dawn, so we were the first to arrive at the chosen place on the shore of Lake Michigan, where Comrade Lutz had planted a red flag.

It is difficult in this commercial age to find a spot where nature-loving folks can enjoy themselves; but the grounds selected were the most beautiful imaginable near a city. Not only did we enjoy chating and shaking hands with our new acquaintances as they arrived, but indulged also in swimming, eating, drinking, games, songs, and made time merry all around.

Shortly after the dinner hour Comrade Isaak was called upon to make a short informal talk. He briefly gave his experience in the Anarchist movement, and called attention to the evils prevailing in our own ranks. He dwelt particularly on the failure of Anarchist parents to imbue their children with our ideas by abolishing punishment and all sorts of arbitrary instructions. “Liberty begins at home.” Let us teach our children the philosophy of Anarchism not by mere words, but by actions in our own homes.

Comrade Lutz followed with a few words, regretting the indifference of the majority of the comrades, and called attention to the fact that the difference of opinions on minor questions, causes us often to forget to combat our mutual enemy—the present system.

Comrade Moser also responded to my invitation, speaking on the evolution of the Anarchist ideal, and the futility of political action to abolish obnoxious institutions.

The rest of the day was passed in lively discussions and merry-making, till we had to part from our congenial acquaintances—a merry and enthusiastic crowd, which we hope to meet again. C. PFUETZNER.

— o —

Here and There.

Comrades of Paterson celebrated the first anniversary of Bresci's daring act on July 29.

The Associated Press reports that during the commemoration of King Humbert's assassination every known Anarchist in Rome and throughout the provinces was arrested and kept under lock and key until the departure of the royal couple. Numerous arrests were also made on the frontiers, and tons of revolutionary literature seized.

* A benefit not to be despised, though Anarchy means peace. Gunpowder has terminated fear of the barbarian and subjection to the aristocrat. Dynamite, using that term comprehensively for all the rapid modern agencies of destruction, may be destined to make the rich man's “strong city” his vulnerable point.

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.

The Anarchist denies the validity of the law, and calls upon all mankind to rise up in a mass, and resist the execution of it.—Bentham (1791).

Notes.

During the summer months numerous of our subscribers have allowed their subscriptions to lapse, so that now there are a large number of names on our list who are in arrears. We hereby again send them a gentle reminder. It takes funds to run a paper in summer as well as in winter. The publishers of FREE SOCIETY have to devote all their time to the getting out of the paper, and cannot keep the paper running without means. Look at the number on the wrapper of your paper, and if it is less than 326, your subscription has expired. Please renew at once. A small sum from each of those from whom it is due, will make the work an easier task, and not compel a few individuals to carry on the whole work.

Comrade A. Hamon, editor of *L'Humanité Nouvelle*, asks us to announce that his new address is 9, rue Garnier, a Neuilly-sur-Seine, France.

Note and Comment.

From every quarter news comes of strikes and labor troubles. What makes the present tendency significant is the fact that in almost no instance is there a demand for higher wages only. The very life of the unions is in many cases involved, as employers everywhere are taking the initiative to crush labor organizations. But the workers are found to be firm, and ready to fight for their mutual protection and benefit. This pressure brought to bear upon the workers by the employers may prove more disastrous to the employers than the workers, for the latter retaliate by demanding shorter hours and better conditions.

"The whole trend of modern thought," said Professor Triggs, of the Chicago University, to his class in English literature, "is towards Anarchism. All our great thinkers display this tendency. Emerson, Walt Whitman, Shelley, in fact, all poets, are adherents of Anarchism. The individualistic tone is the predominant in all our recent literature." He further explained his views in speaking to a reporter of the *Chicago American*. "We are moving toward Anarchism and individual freedom," he declared. "Now, I don't want you to under-

stand by that that I am an Anarchist. I am merely commenting on the spirit of the times. This is an age of industrialism, and America is leading the way to a great industrial revolution, just as Europe in the past lead the way in political progress. People don't care much for politics nowadays." Professor Triggs then gave a historical outline of facts which tend to show that politics are ceasing to attract general attention in social progress, as was the case during the latter part of the eighteenth and first part of the nineteenth centuries. In this connection it is well to remember Comrade Kropotkin's recent visit to Chicago, when he attended a social arranged for him by the professors and students of the University. It appears that he has led at least one distinguished person to see the light. May the good work go on!

"Scientific Socialism" has now suffered its final collapse. The *Social Democratic Herald*, July 20, reprints with its approval an article by Bernstein, contending that the prefix "scientific" is altogether out of place with "Socialism." It is to be hoped that those Socialists who repeat glibly such words as "class-consciousness," "working class," "capitalism," "production and distribution," "scientific Socialism," etc., will now follow suit, and give a suffering public a rest.

Quite a number of the German Socialist papers have been publishing Zola's "Labor" in serial form. A late issue of the *San Francisco Tageblatt* informs us that the *Vorwärts*, Berlin, has been censoring the novel secretly. While the authorities of Germany permit Zola's works to be published without hindrance, the ever-growing conservatism of the Socialist party editors applies the mutilating blue pencil. Another straw which shows us the way of the wind, and what we can expect of the "coming slavery."

A comrade writes to us objecting to calling Anarchist king-killers "assassins," contending that they are much rather "executioners." The fact is, that "execution" has become respectable because legal; and the word "assassin" bears no opprobrium to those who understand that legality does not constitute a moral sanction to any act. The evolution of words are to a certain extent an indicator of the evolution of ideas. The word "despot" was once as respectable as "prince" is at present; and the time will come when "execution" will be as odious as "despotism." All honor to the Anarchist assassin!

ABE ISAAC JR.

Is Society an Organism?

After reading the controversy between Comrades Wight and Fox, Lam seized with a desire to comment thereon myself.

I have noticed that whenever a Socialist sets out to be very scientific he invariably clinches his argument with the "social organism." This shibboleth of the Socialist—"society is an organism"—is put forth with all the assurance of the politician when he shouts, "the consent of the governed constitutes the just powers of the government." Neighbor Wight tells us "society is merely

another name for an aggregation of human beings." Quite right; but continuing he says "in proportion as any given society is organized it is a higher or lower organism." Then "society" isn't "an organism," until we organize this "aggregation of human beings." If I rightly understand my neighbor "the highest attainable social organization" will be brought about when government assumes absolute control of society.

He assumes that all our social conveniences have been brought about by this "imperfect social organism." It will be perfect I suppose when the Socialists have captured the government. "There is little or no organization," he tells us, "when each individual tries to provide for his own needs by his individual effort. . . . When there is a division of labor, and each does that which he is best adapted by natural ability and environment, then society becomes organized." I beg to correct my neighbor comrade. Organization must precede the division of labor. The laborer as an organ is assigned his place in the organism. Now my neighbor may deny that this is his ideal, that he simply wants a mutual interest cooperation, that his "organization" is simply for the perfection of this cooperation.

Will our comrade contend for an organization based upon voluntary cooperation? Then he is an Anarchist, and should study what Herbert Spencer says: "The spontaneous cooperation of men in pursuit of personal benefits will adequately work out the general good." He finds that "for subserving material needs, the actions of individuals stimulated by necessity, and made quick by competition are demonstrably adequate." "When each individual tries to provide for his own needs," there may be no organization, but there is what is better—individual initiative. Organization is subversive of all this, and I take our comrade's definition, "an entity that is organized—that has organs or instruments of use." Many of our Anarchists contend for organization; but they fail to comprehend the meaning of the term. Organization is but another name for government; a central authority converting the individual into organs or instruments of use. The "social organism" will exist only when society is merged in government.

I am aware that there is among Anarchists an idea of a social organism. Herbert Spencer, an Anarchist as opposed to Nationalism, has written an essay on it, but there is no comfort in it for the Socialist in his analogy. He says: "It is well that the lives of all parts of an animal should be merged in the life of the whole; because the whole has a corporate consciousness capable of happiness or misery. But it is not so with a society: since its living units do not and cannot lose individual consciousness; and since the community as a whole has no corporate consciousness." Proudhon believed in a social organism. He says: "Society is perpetual motion. It does not require to be wound up; and it is unnecessary to beat time for it. It has its pendulum and its spring is always wound up. An organized society needs laws as little as lawgivers. Laws are in society as a spider's web in a beehive. They only serve to catch the bees."

This social organism of Proudhon, like

John Locke's state of nature, "teaches all mankind who will but consult it that all being equal and independent, no one ought to harm another in his life, health, liberty or possessions"; and he further states that man "hath by nature a power not only to preserve his property, that is his life, liberty, and estates against the injuries and attempts of other men, but to judge of and punish the breach of that law in others."

That is to say, society is true to itself when under the dominion of no man, or men. Association creates its laws and engraves them upon the hearts of the people. Comrade Wight would have "no word against liberty." But the organization he sighs for is the death of liberty. What has an organ to do with liberty? Is it not an instrument of the will of the organism? Can an organ be governed and be free? The cooperation of organs obeys a central will. It is never voluntary. It is the result of government. But the cooperation of individuals may be voluntary, spontaneous, and require no government organization. This is Anarchy, liberty, and it is essential to true cooperation. Cooperation under the "social organism" should read coercion.

Oscar Wilde, whom our comrade bids us read, was never a State Socialist. He spoke up grandly for liberty. There must be no compulsion. "If the Socialism is authoritarian; if there are governments armed with economic power as they are now with political power; if, in a word, we are to have industrial tyrannies, then the last state of man will be worse than the first."

Let our comrade question himself: would not his Socialism arm the "social organism" with economic power like unto the political power of government? Liberty may be "the one fitting ornament for the rich garment of fraternity," but it will never ornament society under the "social organism." Read Oscar Wilde. "It is only in voluntary associations that man is free."

Wellesly Hills, Mass. A. L. BALLOU.

A Socialist's Position.

As Mr. Fox has taken upon himself the task of pounding Socialism, it is my purpose as a subscriber to cast a ray of light upon the subject, so that the laymen in our movement may understand what we are "driving at." I propose to give an explicit and comprehensive definition of the term "Socialism" as understood by and embracing the proposition of the "political Socialist" (if you desire so to designate us).

Socialism is that system or proposition which stands for the reconstruction of the economic condition in civilized society upon a basis that will make of every man, woman, and child an equal copartner in land and the social tools of production. This has reference to so-called civilized society, and the land and tools in use by such society. Our critics should bear in mind that this is the goal of "political Socialists," and should confine their criticisms within this boundary. (1)

I maintain that the Cooperative Commonwealth instituted upon such basis would tend to the equal benefit of every individual human being within the community. That he should expect more or get less, would be doing injustice to society, of which he is an integral part. Civilized man is a very much dependent being. (2)

If we admit the law of progress, we must also admit that man has progressed, and that civilization as it is, good, bad or indifferent though it may appear to some of us, is an improvement upon the past; and is in its nature an evolution bringing in its wake a higher degree of intelligence, that seeks expression as manifested at all periods within the few, who in turn are, however, simply the creatures of their environment and acquire their knowledge as a result of that environ-

ment; being ever dependent for the utilization of their "supreme" or "superior" knowledge upon the will or "caprice" (if so you wish to style it) of the active majority sentiment in their community. (3)

To assume that the individual is greater than the "herd," is to also imply that the "individual" possesses and embodies a greater quantity of intelligence than the "herd" combined. (4) Such a proposition is fallacious, and easily refutable; for it that be a fact, then it must be demonstrated that knowledge is innate; that man does not depend upon his physical environment for his understanding of physical things; that he is the embodiment of perfection; that he is in fact a self-conscious independent entity, voluntary in his acts and in his relationship. Prove this, Mr. Fox, and you demolish the Socialist proposition in a "jiffy."

If you Mr. Fox and I (in the social sense) are not mutually dependent upon each other for our wants, our aims, our aspirations, then the "social organism" is a farce and individual sovereignty is a fact. (5)

You criticize Mr. Wight's "stomach troubles," and say "such an ideal is worthy of the fellow with the long snout." Is it not a fact, Mr. Fox, that "stomach troubles" are primary essentials of material existence? Can "humanity aim higher" before the digestive organs are replenished? Is not the object of life first existence, and second happiness?

When man's intelligence will have developed a condition that by the mere inhalation of the atmosphere environing him, he will be enabled to perpetuate his physical existence, then Mr. Fox and those who agree with him may have some grounds for such contention; but until then the "political Socialist" will hold fast with both feet on the ground, and agitate for better material conditions.

M. KAPLAN.

COMMENT.

1. In my comment upon Wight I said that if the Socialists got a hold of things we Anarchists would have to "come in" or or else "get off the earth." Now my friend Kaplan rises to state that the Socialists only intend appropriating that portion of the earth which contains "so-called civilized society" and its "social tools of production." I thank friend Kaplan for this correction; and I am more than grateful to the Socialists for being permitted to remain on the earth, even though it be that I will have to take to the woods, and dwell with the savages.

Notice how "explicit and comprehensive" his definition of Socialism is. Definitions like that we have by the score, and none of them are worth the paper they are written upon so long as they do not give us some idea of the conditions of equal copartnership.

2. And Anarchism proposes to make of him a very much independent being, by teaching him to be a man and stand erect and alone, and for the first time in his "civilized" history cease being a pillar of institutions; for institutions enslave him.

3. It is a serious mistake to say that the utilization of superior knowledge depended upon the majority sentiment. The majority sentiment is always opposed to the utilization of superior knowledge. The few must utilize it first; and later when the majority has seen the thing working it may approve or not. Who will say the majority favored the utilization of bloomers? If a vote were taken upon the question tomorrow, I bet they would be condemned.

4. I would like to know where I have ever said even by implication that one man standing alone was greater than ten men standing together. What I have said, and will say again, is that the one man standing alone has, in equity, as much right to the earth and its fruit as any one of the individuals who compose the ten. As to the

wisdom of the ten compared with the one, the lone man's ideas are unadulterated—they are his own. The ideas coming from the ten—the herd—are either the ideas of the wise man among them, or what is worse, a compromise between him and one or more of the mediocre minds of the crowd, whose ideas, because of their mediocrity, were best liked by the "herd." The wisest man may be the one who shuns the herd; and if he should happen to be within it, his ideas will not be understood, and before the herd gives them to the world as its own, it will have adulterated them. Schiller was thinking on this line when he wrote of the herd: "Each of them taken singly is passably gifted with reason; let them assemble and straight into a blockhead he becomes."

5. If I need groceries and you need blacksmithing, and we mutually and voluntarily exchange those commodities, what ever measure of interdependence it may show, it certainly does not show the existence of, nor the necessity for a social organism. Read Ballou's article in this issue, and answer to Wight in next week's issue. JAY FOX.

— o —

Here and There.

Comrade Berkmann was visited last Monday by H. Gordon of Pittsburg. He reports that the prisoner looks well and is hopeful. Recently a new commutation act went into effect in Pennsylvania, according to which Berkmann will have three years and eleven months more to serve. He now has a tolerable situation, and thinks that if allowed to retain it, he will be strong enough to endure the rest of his time.

The steel worker's strike was not settled, as was reported last week. The trust withdrew the terms submitted, and Morgan is said to have declared that they will consider no proposition except that the men return to work on the old conditions. President Shaffer of the Amalgamated Association has called upon all the workers employed by the steel trust to strike. The steel workers have the support of the American Federation of Labor.

San Francisco is now in the midst of a labor war. The teamsters are on strike, and nearly all traffic is stopped. The full membership of the City Front Federation has resolved to refuse to work at the docks of San Francisco, Oakland, Port Costa, and Mission Rock.

The rapid rate at which benevolent assimilation is progressing in the Philippines must give joy to the heart of the imperialist. Twenty teamsters employed in Manila by the quartermaster's department are in jail on bread and water, because they dared to stop working. On June 18, several of them were ordered to break stone, for which they were not hired, and they refused. For this they were jailed, and refused trial or counsel, and in addition were read a lecture by Captain Terrett of the Eighth Infantry on the "Crime of Being a Civilian."

The press reports the arrest of an Anarchist named Galliotti in Viedkon, Switzerland, for an alleged plot to assassinate Queen Dowager Maria Pia of Portugal. It is rather queer that we always have to learn of these "plots" from the capitalist press.

History of the French Revolution.

XVIII

During the 11th, a crowd assembled to demand the heads of the Swiss. Vergniaud denounced them as "cannibals." Danton pacified them by an assurance that all responsible for yesterday's tragedy would be tried. This included very particularly the king and queen. That night they were guarded by jailors, and their friends excluded from the monastery. At length they were removed to the Temple in care of the new Parisian Commune. The Temple, near the site of the Bastille, (named from Solomon's shrine at Jerusalem), was originally the fortress of those brave and pious crusader-knights whom a former French sovereign plundered and destroyed. It had recently been the residence of D'Artois. But it was a gloomy tower, each story occupied by the royal family consisting of one room thirty feet square, with narrow windows darkened by stone screens and iron bars. The doors were iron, and so low that a man could not enter without stooping. During two months, the cost of the king's kitchen still amounted to \$5,749. But as Paris was full of royalist plots, he saw no friends from outside except one cook and his faithful valet Clery. Commissioners were now sent the army to announce what had been done, and remove doubtful generals. Lafayette imprisoned the commissioners, and, with his soldiers, renewed the constitutional oath. This was made known in Paris on the 17th. He was, of course, outlawed immediately. In these times of general wakening, the man fares worst who sleeps best! Lafayette discovered that the army, though it had sworn to stand by him, would not; and on the 19th, after doing his best to provide resistance against the enemy, he fled to expiate his pedantries in the dungeons of Olmutz.* The constitution contemplated its own amendment by a Convention, still to be elected. The recent acts of the Assembly were, accordingly, not legal, but capable of being made so. As an excuse for not doing them sooner, this was a paltry quibble: it may pass as a reason for resolving now upon a new election and adjournment; which the Assembly did. The Convention was to meet on the 20th of September. Meanwhile the Assembly played at being the government; and continued to do what it was told by the new Commune of Paris, itself the organ of that mob which first rose to the necessities of the hour. The self-denying ordinance did not apply to the Convention. It was sure to consist largely of men who had been in the States General. Whether

* His treatment fully illustrated the spirit of that reaction against which Paris rose with such terrific energy. He was arrested in the neutral State of Liege; sent first to Wesel, and afterwards to Magdeburg. The Prussians objected to the odium of keeping him, and transferred him secretly to Austria. The sovereigns of both were in the field, with headquarters at Mainz. They must, therefore, be held personally responsible. At Olmutz he was denied all news of his family or the political situation; and not allowed knives or folks, lest he should attempt suicide. He had vanished as completely as any Bastille prisoner, till a physician named Bollman succeeded in tracing him out. In England there was much indignation. Colonel Tarleton, who fought against Lafayette in America, expressed it in the House of Commons. Burke, however, was implacable. It was very reluctantly that Austria, four years later, gave up her prey to Bonaparte.

it worked any better on that account, is a thing to be considered in due season. We may remark that the Committee of Watchfulness (afterwards Public Safety) which furnished a model for its principal bureau, was organized by the new Commune, before it displaced the old one.

The day after Lafayette's flight, Longwy was besieged by the Prussians. Bombardment began on the 21st; on the 24th, after fifteen hours' heavy fire, the city was evacuated. Lafayette, as incapable in war as in politics, had put his army behind strong fortresses, Lille, Sedan, etc., against which the Austrians could in no case have done anything, leaving open at his rear this way for the greater host of Prussia, which they aided. But outside positive science, methods move in circles. The Prussians, since the Seven Years' War, had adopted the dilatory strategy of Daun, the Austrians to some extent the bold tactics of Frederick. While Hohenlohe, and Clairfayt from the north, invested Thionville, Brunswick moved with the deliberation of a McClellan. It was not till the 30th that he appeared before Verdun—some even say September 2; but that is wrong. Meanwhile Dumouriez, who had taken Lafayette's place, was bringing his 27,000 men in front of Brunswick's 90,000, under protection of the swamps and mountains called Argonne, which lie north and south between Sedan and Ste. Menes. Should—drained by the Aire and Aisne to east and west. Verdun might have resisted a few days; but the people and garrison were mostly monarchists;* so the capitulation was without blood. The commandant, Beaurepaire, blew his brains out, after reproaching the other officers with their baseness. The conventionality of Brunswick's movements still gave Dumouriez time to take up ground. The same few days were decisive also in Paris. The news from Longwy excited the utmost consternation. Roland proposed abandoning the metropolis; others, calling in the armies to fight before its gates. Then it was that Danton, the Mirabeau of the mob, proved the mob to know what was needed from a military as well as a political point of view. Paris must not be abandoned; and Paris must be defended at the frontier, not the gates. Unfortunately the majority, even in Paris, was royalist rather than republican, and royalists could not be too trusted to abstain from taking arms against the nation in Paris itself as soon as the defenders sallied forth. The logic of democracy required that the majority should rule. But Danton did not intend that any logic might let France be conquered by foreign armies. In a speech which swept the Assembly before it, he proposed that all suspected persons be arrested,

* Some royalist women who went to welcome the king of Prussia, were guillotined during 1794. But certain tumbrilsful of little girls were not. (Tumbril means the old fashioned country wagon, which served during the Revolution as a "Black Maria," and carried victims to the guillotine.) Only two children are known to have taken part in the demonstration—their names were Barbe Henri and Claire Tabouillet—and their youth availed to protect them. Beaurepaire shot himself in his own house about 2 p. m., at which time the message of surrender had been sent. Its immediate certainty's being reported in Paris the same day, Sunday the memorable 2d of September, was a detail founded, doubtless, on previous approach of the advance guard.

all arms and good horses seized, all soldiers sent to the front, and all towns instructed to follow the example (August 28). The Commune, anticipating the Assembly, as usual, had already closed the gates. All people were now ordered to stay at home. All the places of business were shut. The defenders of Longwy, arriving at 7 p. m. on the 29th, were told they should have died! Three hours later, patrols, each of sixty pikemen, began going from house to house. Before the 31st dawned, at least 3,000 suspects were in prison. Danton, scorning to mince, had said it must be done if there were thirty thousand! Among notable persons arrested now or earlier, were Sombreuil, Lamballe, and the intriguing poet Cazotte. On Sunday, September 2, it was known that Verdun had fallen or must quickly fall. That Dumouriez had effectually closed the Argonne, was not. Thionville indeed resisted bravely,—a wooden horse hoisted on the walls announced, "I'll eat my oats when you get in." But at Paris the report went that Brunswick was rushing on, leaving places like this, masked, behind him—that he was only three days' march away. About 5 p. m., the black flag was raised on public buildings, as a signal of extreme danger. All the bells were set ringing. Every sixty seconds, the boom of a cannon pealed over the frantic city. At the Assembly's door, Vergniaud explained the terrible reason to excited crowds. Sixty thousand volunteers were called for—not in vain. Before the trembling Assembly, Danton's voice of thunder proclaimed: "Legislators! what you hear is not an alarm. It is the charge against your enemies! To conquer them, to hurl them back, what need we? *De l'audace, de l'audace! toujours de l'audace!* (To dare, only to dare, and always to dare!)" About this supreme moment (3 p. m.) a dismal rumor began to circulate. It was said that as soon as the soldiers marched, those twenty seven thousand missing royalists would appear, and Paris become a spoil to fire and sword! The idea was just about as absurd as that Catiline meant to burn Rome, or that "the Papists" did burn London; but there is no reason to say Danton played the part of Cicero or Shaftesbury. Even the story about his muttering a threat interpreted by later events, is ill-attested. The report, as paralyzing as if it had been true, unless, instead, it should become maddening, sprang from danger, excitement, royalist bombast, and treachery, for which those who suffered the consequences are alone to blame. A man pilloried on Friday, the day after Brunswick reached Verdun, had persisted in threatening all which people feared; until they guillotined him. Admidst that tumult raised by such alarming tidings, six carriages passed through a throng, each carrying non-juring priests from the Hotel de Ville to the Abbaye (prison). Men began to mutter, "Here are the traitors who intend to murder our wives and children while we are in the field." At the door of the Abbaye, the prisoners having drawn up the carriage blinds, an angry crowd began to pull them down. A quick-tempered priest about to get out, struck with his cane an unoffending hand—then an obstructive head—twice. Lo, the Promethean spark has passed into that Frankenstein

monster which Church and State have made! he rises to destroy his creator! In a few moments all the non-jurors were massacred, except a famous one, of whom we shall hear again. At the Carmelite convent, a hundred and fifty more were under restraint. A cry arose, "To the Carmelites, to the Carmelites!" The mob, which did not consist of above two hundred persons, ran thither and murdered all the prisoners. Back to the Abbaye it came next, furious as a tiger after the intoxicating taste of blood. A jailor jumped on a stool, and asked the populace if they would not distinguish the innocent from the guilty? They immediately organized a tribunal, of which Maillard was president. Similar ones were formed almost simultaneously for other prisons. Municipal officials were found to sanction them. The Section Committee sat in the Abbaye (Sicard). At La Force, the president, Chepy, was assisted by Hébert and D'Huillez, members of the Commune. Anti-revolutionary writers say such things as that "of course, there was no real trial." But the following details tell a different story. Maton, a prisoner at La Force, gives his experience. He had three cellmates. All were discharged at once. He alone was brought before the court—and acquitted. Abbé Sicard, inventor of the deaf and dumb alphabet,* recognized by a person named Moton at the Abbaye door, was that one priest who got in alive. He shared a cell with two men, who concealed him. Both were discharged. So was Sicard himself; on being found, and identified again. There were 3,000 persons just arrested for treason, we remember—some say 4,000. The Judge Lynch of Paris applied his style of justice also to the Swiss—180 in number,—and the common felons, of whom one class, counterfeiters, were sure to die if convicted. What was the sum of murders or executions in Paris? One thousand and eighty-nine—a fearful total: but in gross, therefore, as in tale, we find much more than three acquitted or remanded† for each one put to death! The process lasted four days. Witnesses were heard; and many seem to have attended. Danton was one. He saved several lives—among them those of Dupont, Berardier, and Charles Lameth. The political culprits (subject to interrogation by the laws of France) were asked such things, as to what party they belonged?

* The holy monk Pedro Ponce (died 1584), first taught deaf and dumb boys to talk and write. Bonet, about half a century later, wrote a treatise on this philanthropic problem. Wallis, in England, about 1661, devised a rude sign language. His contemporary Dalgarno produced a work which contained the germ of the two-handed letters. Baker, son-in-law to Defoe, taught many children by means of this. Braidwood, about the end of the century, established a school; and the good work never after ceased to be prosecuted. But these projectors generally, like some Germans, and the French Deschamps, were misled by the tempting but almost impracticable scheme of teaching mutes to articulate. De l'Epee, contemporary with Deschamps, gave that up and confined himself to signs. He died in 1789, lamented and adored by Paris and the Assembly. Sicard was his pupil, but improved on his methods. His signs, being rather ideographic than phonetic, are not the basis of the present system; but he was the first to show practically that definite ideas could be expressed by gestures easily understood.

† This was rare. The vigilants proposed to "empty the prisons," and generally released those they did not convict.

Whether they could throw any light on royalist plots? Whether they would swear allegiance to the *de facto* government? The worst who did the latter, seem to have been discharged (see below the case of Lambelle). So also were non-jurors who spoke frankly. "We do not punish opinions," Maillard said. On the other hand a lie was fatal; and influence for proved conspirators did not usually count (Journiac, "Agony of Thirty-Eight Hours"). Sometimes, however, compassion prevailed against evidence. Cazotte (soon afterwards guillotined by regular authority) was spared this time to his daughter. M. de Sombreuil, ex-governor of the Invalides, was cleared by testimony of the old soldiers. The fable that Mlle. de Sombreuil said they were republicans, and drank a glass of aristocrats' blood to prove it, may have been suggested by Cazotte's case.‡ A ghastly style of dignity and consideration for weak nerves pervaded this sanguinary jail delivery. The tribunal sat in doors. The words, "Monsieur must go to La Force—to the Abbaye," meant death outside. But this Monsieur did not know. Much oftener, as we see,—oh History, what lies have been told in thy name!—the form of acquittal was rendered, thus, "Monsieur may go—*Vive la Nation!*" Every person cleared received an ovation. When a misunderstanding threatened the life of one, Maillard ran out among the pikes and saved him at risk of his own. Yet "historians" had the impudence to call this Rhadamanthus and his cacodæmons "assassins hired by Danton"; and this absurd slander still continues to be insinuated!§ Unimpeachable royalist testimony shows they refused gifts. No women suffered at the Abbaye, though there were many there. At La Salpêtrière, where the Lamotte did her penance, thirty-five (counterfeiters, it seems) were butchered.¶ The queen's ladies, except some who had been already discharged, were in La Force. It appears that Hébert, whom they call so blood-thirsty, saved all except the Princess Lamballe (brought from the Temple, August 19.) Her fate was the crowning horror. Against the queen's advice, she had left a safe retreat in Normandy (a misunderstanding of the name Bizy has made some say Provence), and had come to share her mistress' peril. By the multitude, she was scarcely less hated—on account of her intrigues in England. But the judges tried to screen her. After she had refused the oath, her escort to the fatal door said, "Cry '*Vive la Nation!*' and you will be all right." Some say she uttered an exclamation

* Weber, the queen's foster-brother, e. g., and Molleville, who was to have aided her escape. See also Journiac's "Agony of Thirty-Eight Hours," and Maton's "Resurrection."

† Sombreuil was afterwards guillotined. He had a son; who was among those royalists kicked downstairs for bringing concealed weapons to the Tuileries, and was now fighting in Vendée.

‡ Maillard gave the executioners certificates addressed the Commune, that they had a claim for their services. All property found on the slain, they had accounted for. Yet Sergeant says that Marat indignantly refused to honor these drafts. This may be true—it was like Marat to think such work should be gratuitous. A reason for doubting the story is that Marat was not a member of the municipal government, though his patriotic reputation procured him a certain informal place in the deliberations.

§ Madame Roland has stated that they were ravished. It is somewhat natural to ask how she knew?

tion of reproach on seeing the bloody heaps; others that she stood petrified, and her silence was taken for defiance. A blow from a sabre struck her down. Her body was mutilated—like a male traitor's—her head carried to the Temple on a pike, about which the beautiful hair still curled. Before those windows, had been signalled yesterday, "Verdun is taken!" The guards protected the royal family from seeing the horrible reply of Paris! But they could not get rid of the furious crowd till delegates had been admitted to make sure the prisoners were safe; and one of these had the brutality to tell them what the sight was. Two hours later the queen still remained standing in a cataleptic state; so that Pétion's secretary, who came with a message to Louis, was surprised at what he thought her respect for "la loi"! (September 3). All defenders of the Tuileries were massacred. "The St. Bartholomew of the Revolution" will sustain no comparison with that of the monarchy either in extent or atrocity. It was confined to four cities—Paris; Versailles, where fifty perished, among them De Brissac; Meaux, and Rheims, in the track of the invading army. It was a savage but not a treacherous crime. It sprang, without premeditation, from the passions of a moment, principally from panic. There is no reason to believe a single life was sacrificed to private enmity or cupidity. Men observed that no enemy of Danton's suffered. Above all, the patriots did not boast of it. No paintings, no medal, no jubilee, commemorated a deed of which all radicals and Frenchmen had some reason to be ashamed. Two men were hanged for the murders (eight about) at Rheims. On the other hand, it is evident that no one objected much—till all was over. Santerre, commanding the Guards, put off Roland, who did not insist. The Assembly, with the machinery of government in their will, and an army at their call, made no serious effort to stay the hands of a few score men and women with only swords and pikes, during the four days' bloody work. They made it capital to keep arms and not enlist. The Commune of Paris put forth that circular in which its example was recommended to others. Soon, however, reproaches and reprimands began. The army expressed disapprobation of an act likely to aggravate the horrors of war.* The grotesque epithet *Septemberer* or *Septembrist*, became one of dire abuse. Marat was vehemently upbraided for having signed the circular of Paris. Chabot, an ex-friar, defended him with the following churchly logic: "It is well known that the plan of the aristocrats has always been and still is, to make a general carnage of the common people. Now as the number of the latter is to that of the former in the proportion of ninety-nine to one, it is evident that he who proposes to kill one to prevent the killing of ninety-nine is not bloodthirsty."†

C. L. JAMES.

(Continued next week.)

* Louis Philippe came to Paris with their complaints. Danton told him he did not understand the situation at Paris,—must mind his military duties, and not talk too much; but by and bye he would be king, for the French did not want a republic. The "Carmagnoles" were much annoyed by the cold reception they met in camp, and said, not without justice, that the army needed purging as well as the city. Dumouriez reproached the most turbulent with their recent crime, and threatened instant death unless they obeyed. They did not come to fight Frenchmen but Prussians, and soon developed into the best troops Europe had ever seen.

† There is really more than casuistry in this. At Nantes or Lyons, a few judicious executions, just then, might have saved much bloodshed later. A recent excerpt from some official document reduces the slaughter in Paris to 966.

325

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 Canby St.
BOSTON—Brigham's Restaurant, 642 Washington St.
K. A. Snellenberg, 54 Haskins St., Roxbury.
BUFFALO—Hattie Lang, 56 Wasmuth 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—Natalia Notkin, 242 N. Second St.
SAN FRANCISCO—R. Rieger, 322 Larkin St.
ST. LOUIS—C. Norman, 1351 S. 13th St.

For Chicago.

An important business meeting is to be held next Wednesday, August 14, at 515 Carroll Ave. All comrades who have the propaganda at heart are cordially invited to attend.

For Boston.

A DAY OF LIBERTY.—International picnic on Sunday, Aug. 18, on the beautiful farm and wild woods of Comrade Buitta at Newton Upper Falls. Music by the mandolin and guitar club of Lynn, and singing by our famous tenor Comrade Lippi. Dancing and all kinds of games can be arranged, free from outside interference. Refreshments and eatables can be purchased on the grounds.

Directions.—Take subway cars for Newton Boulevard. There take cars for Norumbega Park and ask conductor for transfer (free) to Newton Upper Falls. Leave Upper Falls car at Oak St., where guides will conduct parties to the farm. Fares 10 cents each way.

Justiae of the State.

Is there not something radically wrong, something absurd even and outrageous in our whole judicial system? The innocent suffer more frequently than the guilty, and men are tried daily for crime not because they are known to be guilty, but to ascertain whether they are guilty or not. Wherein does this method differ from the tortures inflicted

during the Dark Ages to make men confess that they were guilty, whether they were so or not? The court and its officers have too many privileges accorded them. They are never better than ordinary men, and sometimes they are known to be worse. Where do you see bloodthirstiness exemplified in a more striking manner than in the case of officers of the law in pursuit of what they term a fugitive from justice? What tricks, what frauds, what stratagems are brought into play in court to prove a man guilty! What pertinacity on the part of the officers in their efforts to convict the prisoner! Then consider the motives that prompt these officers to pursue the course which they adopt. Sometimes it is pride of opinion, sometimes desire for fame and sometimes thirst for gain. Sometimes it is spite, and sometimes it is ignorance or stupidity. Alas! from what a detestable source does our boasted justice spring! And then how craftily, how sneakily and unfairly does the State proceed in in weaving its net around the poor victim! How was it in the case of Robert Forburg just tried and acquitted? Did the prosecution proceed openly and fairly, in its efforts to convict the prisoner? No, most certainly not. The evidence was carefully concealed till the last moment, and the aim was to surprise and confound the defense. The aim of the prosecution was not justice, in the proper sense of the word, but victory. How long shall these wicked methods of our courts be allowed to continue? The time will come, some day in the future, when some remedy will be found for the wrongs thus perpetrated upon individuals in the name of the State.—Newark Courier.

Literature.

Edward Carpenter: Poet and Prophet. By Ernest Crosby. The Conservator, Philadelphia.

This is an appreciative sketch of Edward Carpenter, containing a short biography and a brief summary of his views. Numerous quotations are given that tend to rouse the reader's interest in his writings.

RECEIPTS.

Scheit \$2. Sahl, Crane, Curth, Epworth Leaguers, Osness, Feige, Laskey, each \$1. Machacek, Wright, each 50c.

MEETINGS.

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

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 Products 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. Revolutionary 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 Olrich	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 Need to Know.....	"	15
The Ballad of Reading Gaol.....	"	
.....	Oscar Wilde	10
Life Without a Master. 336 pp. Cloth \$1.50.....	J. Wilson	1.00
The New Dispensation. Cloth.....	"	1.50
The Coming Woman.....	Lillie White	05
The Chicago Martyrs: The Famous Speeches of the Eight Anarchists in Judge Gary's Court; and Altgeld's Reasons for Pardoning Fielden, Neebe and Schwab.....	"	25