

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. 29.

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, SUNDAY, AUGUST 18, 1901.

WHOLE NO. 327.

A Long-Hour Tragedy.

The wearied sawyer scarce could stand;
Outworn, we saw him reel.
The fingers of his good right hand
Fell on the whirling steel.

"Good-bye," the sawyer said, with tears,
"To wife and children three!
The hand that was their prop for years
No longer such can be."

Beside the whirling steel, with awe,
We saw dead fingers lie;
And sallow panels near we saw
All dashed with crimson dye.

"Take them away," the foreman said;
"The fault's not thine nor mine.
Sand will erase the bloody red;
Paint make the panels shine."

Not thus, O, Foreman, no, not thus
Is lulled the wrath Divine.
If wrongs be undenounced by us,
The fault is mine and thine!

And you who ride, in robes of pride,
Without a dream of care—
There's blood upon your surly's side!
The sawyer's life is there!

—Wm. R. Fox.

An Era of Transition.

VI

PROFIT, RENT, AND INTEREST.

"The produce of labor constitutes the natural recompense or wages of labor." Thus wrote Adam Smith a century and a quarter ago, and no better definition of wages has since been formulated. Though Francis A. Walker's theory of wages is currently accepted by the professors as a masterly exposition of the subject, it is nothing more than a re-statement of the data, and it fails to explain the present unequal and arbitrary division of the product. Walker, who discarded many orthodox economic fallacies, and who was in some respects notably ahead of his time, affirmed that wages absorb the whole product of industry, less rent, interest, and taxes. But to tell the laborer, who sinks beneath the burden of landlord, capitalist, and tax-gatherer, to rest content because he really obtains in the form of wages all the wealth he creates, with the trifling exception of a few slices carved off to satisfy the claims of rent, interest, and taxes, is not so much a consolation to him as it is an apology for the plunderers.

In the present inquiry our aim is to arrive at a definite understanding of the reasons why the wage worker is unable to secure an equivalent for his labor. To simplify the discussion we shall accept the customary classification of the aggregate product into profit, rent, interest, and wages. Let us, however, amend the definitions of the economists by a more exact differentiation.

Profit is a term used to denote gains from a variety of sources. Reduced to its lowest terms it comprises wages, interest, insurance against risk, besides the enforced tribute of monopoly. The employer, for example, or

organizer, as I have already defined his function, is an essential factor in an efficient industrial system. According to his usefulness in aiding production he is entitled to compensation for his services. His share, then, is his wages. If he is at the same time a capitalist he will also draw interest in proportion to his investment. Monopoly gains arising in various ways also fall under the head of profit. To cite an instance, the Carnegie mills, with exclusive control of armor plate manufacture, supplies the government at a price yielding an enormous profit. But where it has to meet competitors in other countries it sells at a much lower figure, in some cases actually at cost. The control of important patents, mines and raw material, together with vast capital, enables the masters of the steel industry to command their own price in the home market. Tariff also plays its part in maintaining such a monopoly, but effective competition would eliminate profit accruing from these artificial conditions.

After thus resolving profit into its prime factors we can safely eliminate the term from our economic analysis.

Taxes, as Adam Smith shrewdly noted, form the support of the unproductive class. On whomsoever levied, taxes are borne by the consumer, and become in fact a charge upon industry. Under existing conditions, however, all taxes are not unjustifiable imposts. In the process of evolution the State has assumed numerous functions which otherwise would be carried on by suitable voluntary agencies. Setting aside for the moment the habitually wasteful and inefficient methods of authority, it is obvious that such activities as the maintenance of highways, harbors, lighthouses, life saving stations, irrigation, and the like, are useful public services, and would doubtless be supported in some form if the State should disappear. Even territorial defense might have to be provided for in an Anarchist community. The cost of government is the least of its baneful effects. Much greater injury is inflicted on society as a consequence of irresponsible legislative activity than the evil produced by burdensome taxation. As fiscal imposts embrace the cost of public services in themselves beneficial, as well as the expense of invasive activities, we can therefore eliminate taxes as an economic factor from this discussion.

In economic science that only is rent which is paid on account of the differences in the productive capacity of different soils. Economic rent is therefore a minor part of the tribute usually exacted under the guise of rent. In short, a close analysis discloses the fact that the larger portion of rent, so-called, is in reality interest on capital. Ground rents in cities comprise what I have called a monopoly tribute and interest, or a return on financial investments. Strictly speaking

it appears that rent is not of primary importance as a claimant against labor for a share in the product of industry.

What remains then as chief economic factor contending against wages? In the final analysis we find that interest is the claimant that appropriates the lion's share of the wealth which ought to be the natural recompense or wages of labor.

The economic problem as it affects the producer is primarily the problem of interest. We have seen that the rate of interest tends downward, pointing apparently to an automatic solution of the question. But the difficulty is not thereby overcome. There are other considerations to be noted.

As explained in my paper on "The Growth of Wealth," the world is making haste to become rich, and capital increases so rapidly that, even with interest on the decline, the aggregate share of the product falling to capital is ever increasing. In the process of industrial transformation capital plays a more and more prominent part. The amount needed is greater in proportion to the quantity of wage labor employed. This is a growing tendency and at the present stage marks the danger to wage labor. Briefly, while the rate of wages increases and interest decreases, yet capital by its greater magnitude must absorb more and more of the wealth created by labor. And indeed it is doing so before our eyes at a prodigious pace. By grasping the significance of this truth we can clearly understand the conspicuous rise of the millionaire in the last generation, of the multi-millionaire in the present, and witness without wonder the advent of the billionaire in the next.

WAT TYLER.

Concerning Contracts.

The increase in the number of autonomistic and other queer kind of marriages is no doubt a hopeful sign of discontent, as Lillie D. White remarks. But though discontent is "the mother of progress," that's all she is. She isn't the mother, and the daughter, and all the country cousins. The aim in these autonomistic and so forth marriages, apparently is to substitute "contract for status," which is well enough as far as it goes. But it is not possible to draw the line. An unreasonable contract; as "not to allow" ones' children "to go to church or to kneel in prayer"; or "to separate" if the parties "cannot get along without quarreling"; has the singularly unlucky peculiarity of differing from a status only in this that it is valid to the exact extent it agrees with a status and no further. Walker and Lillian Harman found that out; and their example (good as a mere protest) is, for any other purpose, simply a warning.

The law is most too sharp to be dodged. We do better to bluntly disobey it. The law

considers that a man and woman adopt a status known to it when they agree to cohabit until separated by death or legal divorce, the man supporting the woman in consideration of her submission, and both being bound (by law, not the agreement) to "fidelity." If the man and woman try to make some other sort of a marriage, the law simply inquires whether these conditions are fulfilled. Regardless of all protests, it will hold the parties to the conditions if their contract involved the same; for the rest it will treat the contract as a nullity; or, if the conditions fail, as a crime. The decisions are so conflicting that it is difficult to tell whether the contract of Frederic Federle and Martha Seamen is good in law or not. According to the decision in *Indiana vs. Buel*, it might be held a marriage,—and the agreement to separate in case of quarrels ignored as a mere protest. According to *Kansas vs. Walker*, it would have the ingeniously unfortunate effect of marrying them for civil, but leaving them in "lewd and lascivious cohabitation" for criminal purposes. According to *Minnesota vs. Miller*, it would be punishable and civilly null. At least, so I, who am not a lawyer, should interpret these decisions.

But amidst all confusion in application, the principle is clear. Cohabitation, support, and fidelity, are the elements of a valid marriage, not by contract but status; and a marriage cannot be made without them. Why then beat around the bush? If you want to live in thoroughly respectable prostitution, be married by a priest. If you value liberty, purity, and consistency, don't be married at all. These contracts are all made to involve, or at least to look as if they involved, the unreasonable obligation of duality and the immoral one of exchanging submission for support. They are on a par with agnostic forms of baptism and other contrivances to appear respectably vicious when one might be virtuously disreputable. Lillie D. White is right about the evil of separation. Those of involuntary union are worse; but separation is a bad thing. The true remedy for that coldness which too much intimate association induces is not separation but variety. "Autonomistic and so forth marriage" can only spoil it by infusing the poison of hypocrisy.

Let something, however, be conceded to the weakness of Philistine flesh. If you must have a contract "just to look well," I offer the following suggestions. A contract to cohabit between a man and a woman who do not assume all the obligations of marriage, is void and cannot be made anything else. But I am of opinion that a competent lawyer, of whom there are now many among Anarchists, could frame a valid contract between paramours who call themselves nothing but that, for the support and endowment of their prospective children. This would enable them to spend a propitiatory dollar on the red tape fetish (since they like it); it would answer a principal objection to free love; and, above all, it would get them out of the now fashionable but ridiculous attitude of joining hands across a ditch into which they are sure to tumble before getting any nearer. I should, indeed, feel that I had not lived in vain if I saw this plan adopted by enough

to compel action, tolerant or even hostile, on our Solons' part.

C. L. JAMES.

A Letter from the Rockies.

Sometimes I forget that slaves still exist. Close to the eternal peace of nature, under the shadow of the mountains, where civilization has not yet brought her luxuries, her dazzling advantages, her codes and institutions, her "systems," and her sin and misery, in the quiet which is often dullness, I do not realize what life is where the struggle is fierce. I see poverty—but it is a nearer approach to simplicity than to squalor. Men work and get little in return, but there are few bosses. If there is little beyond the elementary necessities to enjoy, we are none of us tantalized by glimpses of beauty, art, sweetness which we cannot obtain. For the grandeur that one enjoys here is open to everyone—the grandeur of scenery, pure air, sunshine, and broad expanses.

But the trail of the "civilizer" is seen everywhere. There are four churches and three saloons to less than four hundred inhabitants. The churches have the effect of narrowing the lives and minds of the people and of curtailing their enjoyments to the very few occupations that are not sinful, if they do no more. The saloons, "the poor man's club," pander to the grosser elements in men's nature, and encourage nothing better. The law-maker is only manifest in the tax-gatherer, who squeezes the uncomplaining rancher or miner of every cent he can spare, each year. They consider taxes a calamity, but they don't know why they exist. Some of the better informed, know that a most rascally gang of politicians sits at the head of county affairs and holds up the citizens as daringly as ever did bandit robbers in old feudal times; but they "can't help it," and they shrug their shoulders and stand it. I asked one lady what she received as an equivalent for the enormous taxes she paid out on the bit of property which constitutes her home. She did not know. I told her she was supposed to receive "protection," but asked her "would she willingly pay all she did every year for such protection as she received?" "No indeed," she replied, "who am I to be protected from? I am not afraid of my neighbors and there is none else to hurt me." I asked her if she did not think government a pretty expensive luxury as well as a mischievous one since it afforded a chance for so much robbery and wrong and she replied, "indeed it was." She agreed with all I said about it, but if I had told her I was talking Anarchy she would have been horrified. Some apparent necessity for common regulation exists here in the need that water rights should be justly distributed, and that timber, game, etc., should be preserved. But the present laws do not accomplish their purpose. Whereas, a common agreement among the people concerned, without going two hundred miles away to an extravagant and expensive body of men who care nothing about the interests of this locality, would bring about the required justice and harmony.

The curse of "civilized" economics, presented itself when the wonderful work which are the boast of the new country, the mount-

ain railroads, were built. People come here and watch the sturdy little engines dragging their trains up and around the mountains, hanging over precipices, creeping through rock-bound gorges, clinging to the sides of steep and mighty hills, and marvel with awe over the magnificent creations of man. But they seldom give a thought to the miserable drudges, the \$2 a day men who actually performed the labor and who in most cases gave their lives to it. The conditions in which these labored were so hard as to be unendurable. If a man determined to stay no matter what happened, sooner or later he succumbed, got sick, died and was carted away like a worn out mule. Most of them remained not more than a week or two and penniless, friendless in a strange country, they wandered away to meet death, the jail, or vagabondage of the worst sort, as the case might be. Most of the men paid an employment agency for their job; this fee is divided between the agent and the contractor for laborers and is a profitable source of revenue. For men are constantly coming and going and many a day's work is done for which no pay is given. The men who built the wonderful new road over La Veta Pass, three years ago, slept in the snow without shelter or bedding, if they did not own some themselves. They paid an enormous price for miserable board, they worked in snow, slush, rain, mud, they risked being hurled down dizzy heights every day, being blown to atoms by charges of dynamite, they were yelled at and sworn at like brutes instead of human beings, they knew no moment that was not filled with drudgery or pain and discomfort of some kind.

So I know that wherever our "Christian civilization" goes today, under the burning skies and sweltering air, that the victims of unjust systems are suffering as ever. While the rich who do not know how to dispose of their ill-gotten gains, are luxuriating in seaside palaces or sailing on yachts or fishing in the cool woods of the mountains, the people who are making this ease possible are steaming, panting, sickening and dying in their pens at the toil which is killing them. I feel it all, the deep, deep need for our work, for rebellion, as strongly as ever I did even in midst of it—but perhaps with the added bitterness of my helplessness, my inability. Still, there is through it a high hope, a certainty that these things must be done away with, as inevitable as the principle of life and progress which pervades the universe, that bids me never despair.

LIZZIE M. HOLMES.

In Reply to Comments.

My article, entitled "The Curse of Government?" has now been indicted twice for diffuseness. But if my censors will kindly remember that I have neither their years over my head nor their experience inside of it, in argumentative composition, I believe they will be more or less charitable toward my polemical shortcomings.

The first point which friend Mr. Morton makes against me that I wish to discuss is the following:—

Government is today a device for doing poorly what could be better done without it, and robbing us into

the bargain. If it ever had any usefulness, that usefulness has long since departed.

I believe that as regards our public schools, public libraries, museums, road-ways, park ways, hospitals, water-works, sewerage systems, street-lighting systems, light-house and life-saving institutions, coast defense, and system of jurisprudence, our majority-rule Republican-Democracy here in the United States does more good for the whole country than could by any means be achieved by private cooperative effort. By this, however, I do not mean to deny that in much of its legislation our government assumes duties and responsibilities to an extent almost entirely uncalled for, and, in the long run, often grievously detrimental to the general public welfare.

Again friend Morton writes:—

To say that we must have a strong military government, to protect ourselves against other nations that have, is to propose a perpetual deadlock.

In committing himself to this statement Mr. Morton, I believe, overlooks a fact at present almost universally admitted by biologists and scientists, in general, to the effect that all things survive by strife and that among governments, as in the midst of Nature, conflict is the law of life. To be sure few of us care to maintain that this is as things ought to be. But I doubt not most of us are ready to acknowledge that this is pretty much as things are. In this August number of the *Atlantic Monthly*, Brooks Adams writes:—

Americans are apt to reckon on their geographical position as in itself an assurance against war risks, on the principle that, like the tortoise, they are invulnerable if they withdraw within their shell. Such was the case formerly, but it is not the case now. On the contrary, in European eyes, America offers the fairest prize to plunder that has been known since the sack of Rome, and, according to European standards, she is almost as unprotected as was Holland before Louis XIV.

One is led to infer from what Mr. Morton writes that by pursuing a policy of disarmament we here in the United States may inaugurate an Era of Universal Peace. But apparently such an authority as Brooks Adams believes that by neglecting to provide for our national defense we may invite European invasion and pillage.

And finally Mr. Morton writes in response to one of my statements:—

To say that "government would long ago have been abolished" were it the evil it is described to be, is a strange argument, which takes little note of the facts of psychology. Superstitions have a marvellous vitality, especially where a powerful class is deeply interested in their retention.

I cannot help thinking that in ascribing faith in government a mere superstition, as so many of us do, we allow our fancy to run a little at riot. Unquestionably without continual agitation in our midst stagnation would sooner or later ensue. Also there can be little doubt that the Chinese, the Hindoos, and other peoples in various parts of the world are today far in the rear of the march of civilization of the western Aryan races largely because they are shackled and impeded to such an extent by blind reverence for and servile acquiescence to the customs and institutions of the past. Such a train of thought I do not controvert. Furthermore, I fear that if the present tide of unbounded faith among us in the efficiency of

government as an agency of administration for all things at all times swells much more it will eventually sweep us all on toward a state which Spencer has graphically described "The Coming Slavery." Many of our shortsighted and irresponsible fellow-citizens, indeed, are now in respect to government like the proverbial beggar a horseback. They have found government a good thing, and so are foolishly riding it to death. Only in so far as people have too much faith in government, however, do I concur with my friend Mr. Morton in ascribing such faith a "superstition." Faith in the general efficacy of our modern Republican-Democratic form of government for our good is, I believe, (if restrained within normal and wholesome limits) no more a superstition than faith in the general efficacy of foot-gear is a superstition. Both governments and foot-gear have, from time immemorial in the case of western Aryan races, been, I firmly believe, of real benefit as a means of securing life, liberty, and happiness to their members and wearers. Both governments and foot-gear also, it seems to me (as I remarked in my article "The Curse of Government?") have a tendency in the course of time to wear out and serve illy. But my conclusion from the premises that government is an agency and that government tends to serve illy is not similar to the conclusion which I believe many of my fellow Anarchists are inclined to draw, who are disposed less than I to be dreamily philosophical. Unless I err, friend Morton and others conclude from these premises that government should be abolished; while I only conclude that government is a more or less useful and necessary agency for our protection and comfort which should be preserved for many years yet among us, though continually kept in repair and changed for the better.

As I await utterance from Comrade Tyler's pungent and versatile spirit to which I trust to make respectable reply I believe it best for me to drop further argument with my good friend Mr. Morton here and now.

WALTER LEIGHTON

— o —

An Individualist's Query.

It beats all how little free lovers know about free love.

But I am glad to notice occasionally a radical writer who perceives that no solution of the economic side of sexual problems has been offered.

The support question will not down. Sex liberals are troubled in spirit over this matter, as we see in the very thoughtful article of Lillie D. White in *FREE SOCIETY*.

EDGAR D. BRINKERHOFF.

— o —

Is Society an Organism?

In his comment upon my article showing that society is an organism, Jay Fox does not make any serious attempt to disprove the fact that an organism exists by virtue of its organization instead of the degree of its dependence upon its parts. In order to do so, he would be obliged to maintain that a plant or some low form of animal life that can part with one or more organs without serious injury is not an organism—and Mr. Fox is intelligent enough to avoid so patent an absurdity.

Mr. Fox says that you may call a herd of sheep or a bale of hay an organism if you choose, but that will not make them so. I agree perfectly with Mr. Fox. It is incorrect to call anything an organism that is not

organized, and until a herd of sheep and a bale of hay become organized it is absurd to call them organisms. Just stick to the definition, and you will not get into trouble.

There is a perfect analogy between the human body and society, and it is that analogy which exists among all organisms simply because they are organisms. To deny the analogy of organisms would be the height of folly. When Mr. Fox referred to the hat-making organ of society, he denied the analogy upon the ground that if it should die, it could be quickly replaced by another one. By precisely similar argument I could show that a fresh water hydra is not an organism because it can reproduce any mutilated part, or that a lobster's claws are not organs because when cut off they will grow again. I have conclusively shown that power of reproduction has nothing to do with the matter, but that service or use is what determines the existence of an organ.

The comparison between the human body and society was instituted by Mr. Fox himself for the purpose of showing no analogy, and now that his argument has been disposed of it remains for him to bring forward a new one or else admit that he was mistaken.

To be perfectly honest, Mr. Fox, did you not oppose the idea that society is an organism simply because a Socialist happened to take that statement as the corner-stone of the social structure he was advocating? For a society in which the cooperation was voluntary—which in one place you state to be the Anarchistic ideal—would not only be an organism, but would be a more fully developed organism than one in which the cooperation was compulsory, for the reason that liberty comes only with very complete development, while force and incomplete development go hand in hand. Furthermore, a society composed of various groups working out different theories—which is not necessarily voluntary cooperation at all, but which you state is also an Anarchistic ideal—would be simply a group of social organisms, each organism being organized in its own way.

Yes, Mr. Fox, I freely confess to the "stomach troubles"—if not for myself, for millions of fellow-beings. It appears that evolution has not confined stomachs to pigs, and I suspect that the pens of even Kropotkin and Tucker would be soon silenced should the supply of fodder for their stomachs give out. No fodder, no essays on Anarchy. Humiliating, isn't it, Mr. Fox? But most unfortunately true.

Wellesley Hills, Mass.

ALEX. E. WIGHT.

COMMENT.

It takes but a moment's reflection to see that organization and dependence are co-partners. Look at the human organism. In it the degree of organization is the highest, the dependence of the individual organs the greatest, and the absolutism of the directing or central intelligence the most complete. This proves that the human organism is the most perfect of organisms. This agrees with my contention that dependence is the mark of an organism, and with Wight's that an organism "exists by virtue of its organization." But when he says, further on, that a voluntary or Anarchistic society would be the highest form of an organism, he contradicts himself, for in such a society there would be less organization than there is today, and consequently, according to his own argument, less occasion for calling it an organization. And when I said that it was the measure of dependence that marked, most distinctly, the organism; that individuals could live without each other, and that society was an aggregation of individuals loosely thrown together; when I said this, the implication was plain that I regarded organization as the root of organisms. I insist, however, that society is not an organism, because of the lack of dependence or organization, and want of concentration of the directing power in society that prevails in the animal or human being. If society was so organized that the movements of its

(Continued on fifth page.)

FREE SOCIETY.

Published Weekly by Free Society Publishing Asso.

A. ISAAK.....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.

I die professing the profoundest contempt for all political parties, including the Socialist, as I have always considered them as nothing else than groups of simpletons ruled by shameless and unscrupulous ambition.—Gutave Lefranc, in his will.

— o —

Note and Comment.

In regard to Comrade Voltairine de Cleyre's proposition to discuss the advisability of holding frequent conventions in various sections of the country, we will state that our columns are always open to all matters pertaining to the propaganda. Communications should be short and to the point, so as to economize space.

* * *

The delegates of the Hungarian Imperial Council were unpleasantly disturbed in a recent session. A workman from the gallery interrupted the "honorable body" thus:

Honorable Delegates! Listen to my words. The fate of the poor is far more important than what you discuss. I am terribly wronged and nobody is willing to listen to me. I and thousands of others starve—we are without bread and work. I am a boiler-maker . . .

Here he was arrested and subsequently imprisoned, for daring to tell his "servants" that he had been starving for several weeks.

* * *

The Standard Oil Company has distributed \$40,000,000 dividends during three quarters of a year. These legalized highway robbers have been quite busy "saving" and "storing-up labor," as our friend Wat Tyler calls it.

* * *

The Socialist delegates from the Indianapolis Convention gave their report last Sunday behind closed doors, and to members only. There must be something rotten in Denmark when reports of a political body cannot stand publicity. I should think people who hold the fate of future generations in their hands would only be too anxious to let the world at large know all about the fraternization of the Socialist parties. A. I.

— o —

A Report of the Movement in Philadelphia.

Allow me to present to our comrades everywhere the following brief report of the local propaganda since the Paris Conference.

In consequence of the facts elicited in making up the report to that body, and the propositions suggested by various comrades as to future methods of agitation, a small group of active workers came together and decided to try to practicalize the following plans:

1. To hold open air meetings on street

corners and at the City Hall Plaza.

2. To collect a group of comrades who should give a certain amount weekly, limit being fixed by themselves, toward the publication of leaflet literature to be distributed at the open air gatherings, and at shops, unions, and meetings of any sort where the people were not already converted.

3. To open indoor meetings when the weather became unseasonable for outdoor efforts.

It was thought advisable at the outset that we should avoid the use of the word Anarchism, unless directly pressed, in the speeches and articles proposed. We called ourselves the Social Science Club, first, not to prejudice outsiders and second, not to exclude such Socialists or other sympathizers as might be willing to make common cause with us.

At the very first meeting at the City Hall, however, when Comrade Geo. Brown proposed that the knot of listeners gathered about us should ask questions of the speakers, he was asked for a label for the ideal of society he had been picturing. From that evening on, we have openly pronounced ourselves wherever occasion demanded.

Inadvertently enough we had lit upon an excellent time for opening; it being just before the election, and all kinds of latitude with the municipal regulations being taken by all parties alike, it would have been inopportune for the authorities to have singled out any particular group for suppression; though in fact there are laws enough to stop any and all of them. Thus it is forbidden to hold a political meeting on Sunday; and on one occasion, indeed, Comrade Brown was made to discontinue while speaking on a street corner in Kensington. The subject of the talk was "Crime and Punishment," and our comrade had said that if he had his way he would open all the prison doors tomorrow morning; discharge all the prisoners, all the judges, wardens, and policemen. At this point the guardian of law and order, present for the first time at our Kensington meetings, told us he couldn't allow us to continue without a permit from the lieutenant. It was of no avail we told him Superintendent Quirk had told us we needed no permit as long as we were not disorderly, in vain we told him we were at the City Hall every Sunday night. He privately informed me, in a tone as if it had been a grievance, that that was "just the way they did; they [the powers] allowed all those fakirs along Market St., and they won't let us have 'em up here." I then went to the police station to hunt the lieutenant, but found only the sergeant and two or three fat, good-humored human puppies, able to turn brute at order, who inquired as to the nature of the meeting, and on my explaining, said: "Well, what did you say? Maybe you said something the policeman didn't like." I quoted Brown; whereat they all fell into hearty laughter, exclaiming: "That's it; he saw himself out of a job." The lieutenant not being expected till 6 o'clock, it was of no use trying to hold a crowd around an empty box for two hours, and we dismissed them, announcing ourselves at the City Hall in the evening, where indeed we held our meeting as usual, said over precisely the same things, distributed our leaflets, against which an

ordinance also exists, and gave the full account of the afternoon's affair.

The lieutenant upon interview next day not only refused a permit, but said he had severely reprimanded the officer for not arresting Comrade Brown. We then took counsel with ourselves, and resolved that if attacked in the outlying corners we would simply go from district to district; but if denied our rights at the Plaza (which is the center of the city and under the police superintendent's windows) we would fight for free speech. This however was the only case of interference in our outdoor work.

The crowds collecting at these meetings range from two hundred to six hundred, and of course are mostly composed of chance passers who evince all shades of—I was about to say *intelligence* but I had better say *ignorance*. Mostly, however, they listen respectfully, and always a small number, say thirty to fifty, will remain as long as the speakers; even on cold nights they have stayed till a quarter past eleven, curious and interested. We have never confined our talks to any particular phase of the movement of Anarchism; but have rather treated it as a principle to be applied to all social and individual development,—as religion, ethics, economy, the sex relation, education, art, literature, etc. And we find that, while, as I said before, it is a measure of ignorance we meet rather than intelligence, so far as our ideas are concerned, the ordinary street-passer can be much more interested by this variety of subjects than by the regular program served up by our Socialist and Single Tax friends, who nevertheless deserve much praise for the fidelity and earnestness with which they pursue their propaganda.

It will not be out of place here, I think, to observe that one of the most gratifying results of this year's progress has been the very marked melioration in the antagonisms heretofore existing between Anarchists and Socialists. How far this is unconscious and how far conscious may be difficult to decide; but speaking for our own little group I may say we cultivated the "New Spirit," as Comrade Brown has baptized it, quite assiduously. From the first we made it part of our method of action to say nothing unkind of them, to emphasize those points whereon we agree, to state as simply as possible our differences *when need arose only*, and that without any bitterness. With the opening of our indoor lecture season we made it our special effort to get expressions from the organized labor movement, at whose union meetings we regularly distributed our leaflets and cards during the winter. December and January were chiefly occupied by presentations of the Trade Union idea, by representatives of the shoemakers, moulders, cigarmakers, paperhangers, and others of the United Labor League. The good effects of thus getting on friendly terms with these various workers' organizations were seen when near the close of the season the Director of Public Safety came forward with his *coup*, closing our meeting place and threatening to stop not only Emma Goldman, but any Anarchist or any person who wished to speak about Anarchy, from addressing a public audience in Philadelphia. The United Labor League arose as one man and said they would have a lecture on Anarchy delivered in their hall,

and if not allowed they would find out why. The lecture was delivered, as has been reported in *FREE SOCIETY*, and very fair, even friendly, reports were given by the daily press.

Aside from this, the three most significant meetings of the season were the November 11 commemoration, attended by about six hundred people, and the first attempt at internationalizing held in this city; the Twentieth Century Watch Night meeting, which brought together reformers of all descriptions in fraternal welcome to the new century, whose crowning moment was the reading of the New Declaration of Economic Independence, an Anarchist Communist statement; and the international commemoration of the Paris Commune, which included speeches in Jewish, German, Italian, French, and English from Single Taxers, Socialists, Trade Unionists, and Anarchists. One of the most pleasing results of the mixing of nationalities is that we have been able to get some good music from our Bohemian and Italian comrades—a thing we have never succeeded in evolving from ourselves—us, the Americans. This enabled us to close our indoor work with a free concert, whose chief pride was that all its sixteen performers were working men and women—better to say boys and girls, for we are getting the young with us.

We opened our outside campaign under the superintendent's windows as before, and intend to keep it up all summer. With the discontinuance of our indoor work, we discontinued our leaflets also, some of our contributors and distributors having grown tired, and it being thought better to issue an occasional pamphlet, upon popular local subjects, such as the recent discussion of the tramp case reprinted by *FREE SOCIETY*, for the present.

As soon as our paper was established in Chicago, we made it a part of our work to contribute a certain amount weekly to its support. This we believe could be done in every city, and would afford a helpful regular income to the paper, perhaps even more desirable than larger occasional donations. However, each group of workers must decide according to its special circumstances.

We also formed a reading-class which is following up C. L. James' Course of Reading for Anarchists with much interest.

While it does not come exactly under the head of direct propaganda, I cannot close without mention of the largest effort undertaken in this city by any of our workers, and what at present bids fair to be an effective educational attempt among the Jewish workers in the principle of self-reliance and solidarity. This is the Jewish Workers' Co-operative Association, initiated and very largely organized by the efforts of H. Weinberg, known throughout the country for his faithful and persistent propaganda both of cooperation and Anarchism. The association counts at present something like nine hundred members, including many persons who have never taken part in any radical movement before, and has opened a shoe store, half the profits of which are to be devoted to the increase of the business, 20 per cent to benefits of members in sickness, etc., and 30 per cent to educational purposes, such as lectures, pamphlets, papers, etc.

They have held crowded meetings, weekly, all winter, and certainly cannot fail to attain some considerable good, even should misfortune overtake the business venture, which will of course be obliged to meet some sharp competition.

In concluding, I would say that I think this has been the most fruitful year we have ever had in this city; that while there have been some disappointments, as is always the case in any undertaking, the whole is satisfactory. I have written that it may serve as a suggestive outline to comrades in other cities who may be looking for a way to utilize their forces. To me personally, the gratifying thing has been the getting of our doctrines into the ears of the man on the street corner. Not that anyone who attempts such propaganda need expect to convert crowds; but the very accustoming of the passer-by to the word "Anarchism," so that it is no longer a bugbear to him, so that he can hear it with the same equanimity that he hears "Single Tax," or "Socialist," or "Democrat," is sufficient for the propagandist who knows that he is but one, and our whole labor very great.

At a recent meeting of the Club it was suggested that the plan of holding an annual convention be proposed for discussion in the columns of *FREE SOCIETY*. Comrade Moore, who suggests it, calls attention to such annual affairs held in England; and thinks that comrades able to speak could have their expenses made up en route by stopping at all possible points, and thus kill two birds with one stone—make propaganda and attend the convention too.

There is no doubt that such conventions could be made very interesting and indirectly advantageous to the movement; but I think the territory of the United States is so large that it would require several divisions with as many conventions;—if in little Britain there are three, the South, the North, and the Midland Counties (very enjoyable picnic affairs into the bargain) we ought to have six at least,—say one in New England, one in the Middle Atlantic States, one in the South, one in the North Central, one in the South Central, and one in the West. These thoughts occur to me and I write them down as they come, suggesting that we get a discussion of them and others bearing thereon in *FREE SOCIETY*.

VOLTAIRINE DE CLEYRE.

Is Society an Organism?

(Continued from third page.)

integral parts were controlled and dictated by one intelligence, then we might have justification for calling it an organism. But since it is not, but simply "an aggregation of human beings," to use Comrade Wight's own language, I will adhere to my original proposition.

To establish an analogy between even such a low form of organism as the low water hydra and society, he would have to show that the various organs of the hydra, while intact, are not under the control and direction of a central power, and to attempt any such feat "would be the height of folly."

If Wight had produced any evidence other than a repetition of his assertion that "there is a perfect analogy between the human body and society," I would have been glad

to consider it, even though it were "the corner-stone of the social structure he was advocating." We are searching for truth rather than the maintenance of dogma; and if we can discover it in Wight it is just as acceptable as though it came from Kropotkin or Tucker.

The hog finds his whole delight in a full dinner pail. And when Socialists spend all their time and energy in an effort to convince us of the large amount of "fodder" that can be produced under their system in a given time, and put this forward as the one and principal reason why we should adopt their theories, and ignoring the discussion or consideration of all other subjects or refusing to give them merited attention—then I say their philosophy is worthy of the hog. They will tell us that the economic system is the foundation of all the institutions of society. Agreed! But when go to build a house the foundation is not the only thing we pay attention to.

JAY FOX.

— o — Here and There.

Some time ago two comrades of Paterson, Nicola Quintavalle and Antonio Laner, went to Italy, and have disappeared. It was learned that the Italian government had arrested them, and is holding them as accomplices of Bresci, but their whereabouts the government refuses to divulge. A few days ago a report appeared in the daily press, stating that a spy had discovered, while in Paterson, that Bresci had accomplices, and that Bresci himself did not fire the fatal shot. The conclusion is easy to draw. It is evident that the Italian government is manufacturing evidence against the prisoners. The comrades in Paterson are collecting a fund for the purpose of hiring two competent lawyers, of whom Merlino is one, to find out the place of confinement of the imprisoned comrades, and to defend them at their trial. All comrades are called to assist in raising this fund. Address communications to the group Pensiero ed Azione, 142 Warren St., Paterson, N. J.

The labor war in San Francisco is still extending. The Employers' Association, which has taken the initiative in crushing the labor unions, has taken a firm stand against all labor unions. The police are taking an active part in the strike, wielding their clubs very freely, as a result of which 38 persons, some of them women and children, are in hospitals; and eagerly watching all the shipping trade, in some instances going so far as to assist in loading trucks.

News comes from Serbia that during recent elections the government gave a fine object lesson of the power of the army as opposed to the "power of the ballot." Soldiers were freely used to keep opposition voters from the polls, and in one place, Gradna, the authorities drove the peasants into the booths and compelled them to vote for the government. The government secured a majority by these means.

The representatives of the French miners have resolved that workmen should abstain from all political action, as experience has proven that they have nothing to expect from that quarter. The *Vorwärts* (Berlin) remarks that such resolutions could not be passed in Germany, which is no doubt true so long as the independence of the workers is stifled by party discipline.

The recent report of the Associated Press that Chas. Mueller of Denver was arrested for preaching Anarchism on the street was incorrect. Mueller is a Socialist.

History of the French Revolution. XIX

Danton much regretted the horrors of September, and devised a way of preventing their repetition which requires notice. There was previously a tribunal ("of the Seventeenth") organized in pursuance of his promise, as minister of justice, to investigate crimes like that at the Tuileries. "The guillotine did not go, badly," for a beginning. Within the week of organization (August 17-25) the Tribunal cut off three royalist heads. Ten days after the September massacres, it condemned Cazotte, whom the Septembrists had spared. The minister of justice conceived that the massacres would not have occurred had Paris been sure traitors would be dealt with generally after this prompt fashion; and that the way to prevent other such occurrences was to make sure. So on this idea he wrought, till the Tribunal of the Seventeenth became, next spring, the Extraordinary or Revolutionary Tribunal. He lived to repent bitterly, and died by his own machine. Can an Anarchist historian let such an occasion for reflection pass? Had not the Tribunal already proved itself more bloody-minded than the Septembrists? How could a man like Danton think that, given opportunity, its hands would be less bloody? For the same reason, reader, that you think law less sanguinary than Anarchy. "Everybody says so"—i. e. such is the assumption long in vogue. Where do such assumptions come from? From the past. And what is the mental state of the past as compared with the present? Superstition! If an attempt be made to vindicate this assumption by such an observation as that a mob killed more people in September than the law; the answer is ready. Laws act every day; mobs only now and then. All criminal law began as lynch law. The remedy for the horrors of lynch law accepted by all but Anarchists, is to embody in a code which it shall be the sworn duty of "proper persons" to execute, those popular instincts which express themselves in lynch law (because no other conception of criminal justice can be immediately executed). But, in the form of lynch law, these only break forth sporadically. Hardened into a system, they continue to operate after going far enough to become unpopular. The September massacre involved perhaps 1,200 persons, of whom there is much reason to believe that almost every one had clearly committed either felony or treason. The Revolutionary Tribunals slew thousands, of whom a very large proportion were probably innocent and certainly would not have been lynched.

The best excuse for the Septembrists is that, as Napoleon said, they saved the revolution.* The royalists continued to be hated, suspected, and oppressed; and, according to their wont, they did all that was in their own power to justify their own "enemies, persecutors, and slanderers." But after so many had been slaughtered by a handful of tatterdemalions, against whom no dog wagged his tongue, it was impossible they could be feared. Beaurepaire received a Pantheon funeral—his widow, a pension: Panic ceased. The twenty-three theatres of Paris reopened; and the city

resumed its usual aspect, when blood began to flow! Of Carmagnoles, as the new revolutionary soldiers were called, 100,000 went trooping gaily to the front. Between the 11th and 14th there was heavy fighting at the Argonne. Dumouriez being busy with Brunswick, the Austrians penetrated some passes, and threatened his other flank. His road to Chalons lay temptingly open; and most of his officers wanted to fall back thither. But his plan, was in harmony with Danton's and Vergniaud's. By a skillful night march he crossed the Aisne, which thus protected his left against the Austrians, and took up a strong position amidst swamps and creeks between Ste. Menehould and Valmy, whence he could strike the flank of the Prussians; who had been compelled to go around the southern end of the Argonne. As Thionville effectually blocked Hohenlohe's advance on Metz, Dumouriez called Kellermann to join him with 20,000 men from the latter city. These perilous manoeuvres were not effected without sacrifice; but they succeeded. The Prussians made a detour to the heights of La Lune, opposite (west) of Kellermann at Valmy. They were in Champagne, on the site of Louis' misadventures. This country, whose name is known to every vinous soul, is not, as might be dreamed, a terrestrial paradise, but a sandy prairie, among the most barren and uninviting parts of France. There was such rain as there usually is in northwestern Europe at that season. The invaders found nothing to burn but green wood, nothing to eat but unripe grapes. The hills were shrouded in mist; the streams were torrents, the quagmires lakes. Fever and dysentery were saving the sword much labor. Provisions could not be brought through the abysses of mire; and, though Kellermann had only eighteen guns, he was stronger in this arm than the enemy. A third of the Prussians were sick. Thus their available force was not much greater than the French; but they had flanked it. On the 19th, there was cannonading, renewed with double fury next day. Among the German officers was Johann Wolfgang Goethe. He leisurely cantered through mud where French balls struck without rebound, while the shells threw it up into geysers—testing the sensation of "cannon fever," which he pronounced wholly due to noise. About 1,000 men—mostly Prussians—were slain on the 20th. Towards noon there seemed to have been made some slight impression—a powder wagon blew up—Kellermann's corps, almost surrounded, "a cape in a sea of bayonets," countercharged; and Kellermann's horse was blown from under him by a cannon ball;—result, repulse of the Prussians. Towards night, they advanced again; but the French stood firm; and the officers decided against a general attack, which if it failed must be fatal. Meanwhile every hour increased Dumouriez' army, which soon amounted to 70,000 men. The Prussians and emigrants were so unwilling to retire, without even a good drubbing, after all their vaunts, that they fortified La Lune, and part of them remained there till October 23, suffering greatly from sickness and want of all things. But nothing befel to give them courage. Slight as the action at Valmy was, it has been classed

among the Fifteen Decisive Battles. Hohenlohe raised the siege of Thionville. On the 29th, the Austrians began that of Lille—at the other end of their line—they could not follow Brunswick without leaving their base. On October 6, they gave them up—after eight days' heavy bombardment, which the people, inspired by good news, turned into play. Volunteer brigades worked constantly, putting out fires. The Commune, disturbed in deliberation by entrance of a cannon ball, "declared the session permanent." The boys wrenched matches out of shells just fallen. A man put his hat on a spent ball, which set it afire,—when the ball cooled, they gave it a red cap. A barber picked up a fragment of shell, used it for a shaving-pot, and started a fashion. Now, at last, Brunswick could call his retreat going into winter quarters. But it was disastrous enough for a flight. Goethe, at Verdun on the 11th, compared it to the overthrow of Pharaoh's army—in a red sea of mud.

Though Danton always said the majority of the French were not republicans, the majority of Conventionists were. The massacre may have intimidated royalist voters, but there was a deeper cause. Danton spoke for the people of all parties when he said "the ship must be lightened" and war made no longer "in Lafayette's sham fashion." Those who "dared" to act thus were mostly republicans: therefore the people, with little regard to abstract views, supported republicans. In October, Gouverneur Morris recorded his persuasion that public opinion, as regards the best form of government, had changed.

The last act of the Legislative Assembly was a terribly stringent war measure. Every citizen, male and female, was required to obtain from the municipality a card certifying name, residence, and occupation; to carry it always, and produce it on demand. Failure to do so meant arrest as a suspicious person. This was soon to mean trial by the Revolutionary Tribunal, and probable death. Directly the Convention met, a change of fronts became apparent. The Republic was proclaimed without serious opposition. But if the doctrinaires who did this, made a most characteristic mistake in supposing the people cared a button for it, the people, on their side, had made a mistake equally like themselves in inferring that because those who "dared" were not afraid to say "republic," therefore every one who did say it dared do anything particular. The truth is the Jacobins, in close touch with the people, were, like them, practical men, indifferent to political terminology. Danton, as yet their principal mouthpiece, had, we saw, no expectation the republic would last. But the Girondins, who predominated in the ministry, were mere idealists, besides being much divided among themselves. Royalism having gone into hiding, the issue lay between these two kinds of radicals—on one side the men of dogmas, which always prove to be inconsistent things, the friends of universal suffrage, local autonomy, "sacred property," the initiative and referendum, universal education, parental authority; and the other men of facts, who knew that suffrage was a bait; that times required centralization; that money-grabbing and public spirit did

* "Napoleon at St. Helena," 394.

not hitch; that the art of life was not learned from books; that the outgoing generation must win the rising, or else fall before it. Typical Jacobin measures were a maximum scale of prices, first applied to grain only; a progressive income tax; forced loans; requisitions for support of the war; suppression of speculation; provisions for the orphans and the aged; compulsory technical education; security for the property rights of married women; abolition of the colonial slavery; uniformity of laws, weights, and measures; the establishment of a strong centralized government. Against pretty much all alike, the Girondins raised the usual conservative cries of spoliation, Communism, and Anarchy. It is far from my intention to glorify either party unreservedly. The "despotism of freedom,"* I shall take especial pains to show, was a terrible mistake. The political economy of Jacobinism, from a scientific point of view, appears to me very bad. I endorse every word the bourgeois says to effect that laws against usury and speculation hurt the poor but do not disarm the rich; that a tax on incomes is a tax on industry; that forced loans and requisitions are robbery and produce the normal effects; that a premium on children is a premium on beggary; that palliatives for misery delay the true remedy; that technical education is in vain in an age of machinery. It is not judicious Anarchism to dissemble so great a truth as that the economists' doctrine of *laissez faire* leads logically, and will lead practically to the Anarchist's contention which make law and government a fraud. But—it can scarcely be too often repeated—the Jacobins do not solicit esteem as political philosophers, but as men of action at a fearful crisis. Many of their measures they would doubtless have admitted to be mere temporary makeshifts. Many are now held useful by all except Anarchists, who claim to have found a more rational way since then.

The Jacobins knew what they wanted. They were consistent about ends, if not always words and arguments, which are but means. If I may borrow a very homely piece of slang from Yankee politics, the Jacobins were "sound on the goose." At whatever risk, no matter how fearful; by whatever means, no matter how extravagant and clumsy, so they were the most available proposed, France must be saved and coalition beaten! Because almost all Frenchmen agreed to this, the Jacobins succeeded. In other words, from the standpoint of the whole nation, the Jacobins deserved to succeed, and the *soi-disant* philosophers to fail. Yet an Anarchist historian should not forget that among the persons reckoned Girondins there were at least two real Anarchists, Paine and Condorcet, who opposed the Jacobins on account of their faults, not of their merits. The part of these two over-advanced men was not very conspicuous. The Girondin leaders, if a party so feeble and unsettled can be said to have had any, were Roland, Vergniaud, Isnard, Pétion, Brissot, Gensonné, Guadet, and Barbaroux. Among prominent Jacobin Conventionists were Robespierre, Danton, Marat, Billaud Varennes, a prominent lawyer, Robespierre's friend

* Robespierre's expression; but Marat seems to have originated it.

St. Just, Collot d'Herbois, a noted actor, Carnot, Desmoulins. Lesser lights were Orleans, now called *Egalité*.^{*} Legendre, Sergeant, David the famous artist, Fréron, and Lepelletier. Of course there was a considerable "Plain." Trimmers and barometers known as the Toads, supplied its brains. Sieyes, Barrère, Merlin, (Law of Suspect fame), Cambon, Cambacères, afterwards chancellor under Napoleon, the historian Thibaudeau, and Barras, were among them. Such gentry usually brought their heads safely through the stormy time—their reputations very seldom. Those inwardly royalists and Constitutionals also tried their hands at balancing, but with less selfish prudence and success. It should be observed that among all the Conventionists and mob orators there was not one Socialist or Communist according to any acceptance of those terms which has prevailed since Fourier and Saint-Simon published their famous works. Robespierre described the doctrine of community in goods as "a phantom raised by scoundrels to frighten idiots": and this terse designation appears entirely correct for any pretended resurrection of such Communism as John o' Leyden preached or anticipation of such as *Enfantin* desired. A faint adumbration of the latter may doubtless be found in Rousseau, Condorcet's "Human Mind" (not then written), and the English Godwin's "Political Justice." But no idea of reducing it to immediate practice entered into the dreams of any French Revolutionary party.

At first the lines were not sharply drawn. Manuel (Jacobin and Septembrist) proposed that a president should be lodged with royal pomp in the Tuileries. Collot d'Herbois opposed the plan; and it was defeated. The Girondins wanted their leader Roland exempted from the constitutional disability to sit in both the Convention and the Ministry. Robespierre and Danton opposed; and Roland resigned his legislative functions. Kersaint (Girondin) moved and got appointed a committee to fix responsibility for the September massacres. It did nothing; but the weaklings of that party made the fatal mistake of thinking it an excellent club to hold over the Jacobins, who possessed a deadly pistol! When we deplore the judicial slaughter of the Girondins next year, we should not forget that it was they who made, or rather in their feeble way tried to make, the guillotine a political argument. Next, Buzot revived the old fallacy about the legislature's being coerced by the Parisian mob; as if the mob could coerce a legislature which the nation trusted. He proposed that each department furnish a quota of troops to protect the Convention. This attempt to set the departments against the capital was a ruinous blunder. The decree was repeatedly voted and as often rescinded. It excited no enthusiasm in the provinces, and was odious to the Parisians. It reminded everyone that Barbaroux had talked of secession and a

* Sergeant says that Manuel gave him this ridiculous name, which is more probable than that he chose it, for he never ceased aspiring to be king. "Orleans," at any rate, would not do for a candidate in September, 1792; and "Capet," besides being equally unpopular, had not come into fashion—as Louis XVI told the Convention, it is not a family surname, but a sobriquet of the famous Hugh.

southern republic with its metropolis at Marseilles or Toulouse, that Barrère, a native of Gascony, the least French province out of Vendée, wanted a constitution like that of the United States; that all the Girondins disliked "a strong government." They might probably have avoided some mischievous errors of the Constituent Assembly. The stock charge against them henceforth was that they were "federalists," which meant what we call "States' Right men"; reversing the American usage, because our Revolution was effected by colonies imperfectly federated, but the French by a national organization with nothing federal about it. Robespierre, in the very spirit of Webster, maintained successfully that the republic must be "forever one and indivisible." While the Girondins, in the Convention, where they were strong, abused Paris for electing "Septembrists," the Septembrists retaliated with double power through their organs, the revolutionary papers and the Commune. They accused Roland of being a monarchist in disguise. It is said the Commune actually issued a warrant for his arrest, but Danton, having no love for internal dissensions, got it quelled. Blind to their own weakness, however, the Girondins would not have peace at home. Barbaroux brought a new battalion of Marseillais to the metropolis, notwithstanding the failure of Buzot's motion. The Commune showed proper attention to patriot soldiers, the guests of Paris, and this was made ground for a story that Marat attempted to corrupt them! On October 3, Danton and Robespierre were fiercely denounced in the Convention as would-be dictators; Marat as an apostle of Communism and massacre. All had been under fire since the Convention was four days old. Danton and Robespierre denied the charges, which dropped for that time; but Marat would explain nothing. His counter-charges against Roland were at least examined and discussed, December 7; though the gallery appeared to sympathize with him. These dates may be considered to begin and end the personal phase of quarrel. In October Dumouriez came to Paris. For various reasons the reception of such a hero was cooler than might have been expected. He was blamed for not attacking the Prussians while they were entangled a second time in Argonne. Marat took him to task for harsh treatment of Parisian Carmagnoles imbued with the temper of September. The Girondins shared a wholesome dread of military power sufficiently to snub their own general.* Robespierre, Danton, and Santerre, were left to show him proper honor—with what effect on his party zeal may be imagined. He went away on the 17th, wisely resolved again to seek his laurels in the field, not the forum. Next night Marat bragged at the Club of having humbled Dumouriez! Very interesting are Dr. Moore's descriptions of these memorable scenes—not copied from the *Mouiteur*, as Carlyle insinuates.

C. L. JAMES.

(Continued next week.)

* I infer this from the corporate behavior of the Convention, where they had control. Marat says they were assembled in all their pride to flatter him at Talma's ball; where the Friend of the People sought him out. If I gave full credit to the loose assertions, at the Club, of such a rhetorical speaker as Marat, I should call their conduct double-faced. That the Club had received Dumouriez with the highest honor, Robespierre and Danton waving the most fragrant censures, is quite certain. According to Marat, who can here I think be trusted, Santerre was master of the ceremonies at the ball in Talma's house.

327

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 Haslins 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—Natasha Notkin, 242 N. Second St.

SAN FRANCISCO—R. Rieger, 322 Larkin St.

ST. LOUIS—C. Norman, 1351 S. 13th St.

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.

COOPERATIVE AGENCY.

It may be interesting to cooperators to learn that a cooperative agency has been opened at 233 Milwaukee Ave., where goods will be sold or exchanged, real estate business transacted, and a labor agency established.

This is not a money-making scheme, but an effort to unite and help those who are crushed by the present commercial order. Workers of the various trades will be brought together and assisted in establishing cooperative industries; the workers regulating their own trades; the agency being simply a depository for the finished products and a means for their sale or exchange. Individual producers may deposit their products on the same terms.

The liberal professions will be connected and exchange their services the same as artisans.

Those who wish further information and application blanks can address C. Levy, 233 Milwaukee Ave., Chicago, Ill.

The Letter-Box.

Circolo, W. Hoboken, N. J.—The number on the wrapper, compared with the number of the current issue, will tell you when the subscription expires.

M. C. City.—Correct; "men are not angels, and will steal and oppress as long as the incentive is not removed." It is for this very reason Anarchists strive for a condition in which there shall be no incentive to rob, kill and to enslave any human being. But when Socialists elect officials under the present system, they set bad examples to the world. The Socialist's councilmen in Marseilles, France, eight or nine years ago, robbed the city treasury to such an extent that even the Socialists demanded their resignation. In Switzerland a Socialist chief of police was the most tyrannical the working-men could remember; and Millerand did not even hesitate to approve of the expelling of an Italian reporter who reported some disagreeable things to an Italian Socialist paper, regarding the Marseilles strike.

H. F. E., Cazadero, Cal.—We may recognize that every individual is the effect of a cause; but that does not make him our friend. We know that it is in the nature of a snake to be venomous, but still we kill it, as Kropotkin says. In the same way individuals may be our enemies.

K. J., San Francisco, Cal.—I have not denied the importance of the money question, but simply the statement that it is paramount. Both articles will appear.

A. L. B., Wellesley Hills, Mass.—Were glad to hear from you again. Would be pleased if you would again write more often.

Dwamish, Wash.—Will the sender of a money order from this place please inform us from whom it came and for what purpose?

W. G., Newell, Wash.—Stamps are accepted at this office, but 1-cent stamps are preferred.

N. Notkin, Philadelphia.—The \$3.25 for books and pamphlets received. Thanks.

Literature.

Methodism. By M. Grier Kidder, 241 Webster St., San Francisco, Cal. Price 5 cents.

Twenty-two pages of dry husks which the author must have thought witty. To give one example is sufficient to warn the reader against the boredom of attempting to read this diatribe: "She (Methodism) will last as long as Immaculate Conception of a Virgin by a Holy Goose of a God, sanctions immeasurable deception of a foolish goose of a woman, by a holy humbug of a preacher." A. I. JR.

RECEIPTS.

Mantler, \$2. Starke, \$1.50. Boberts, Brown, Finkler, Gartman, Kleinman, Siart, each \$1. Belz, Goldhaber, Hurwitz, Menkin, Gerhart, each 50c. Gibbons, Nichols, each 25c.

DONATIONS.—Social Science Club, Philadelphia, Pa., \$2.

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.

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
ALTTGELD'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.....	05
.....H. Addis	
The New Hedonism.....	05
Grant Allen	
Plain Words on the Woman	
Question.....	05
.....M. Bachman	
Prejudice?.....	50
God and the State.....	05
Bakunin	
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.....	25
Rachel Campbell	
The Worm Turns.....	10
V. de Cleyre	
The Evolution of the Family.....	
.....J. M. Crane	05
Evolution of Modesty.....	05
The Emancipation of Society from	
Government.....	05
Dallan Doyle	
Hilda's Home. Cloth \$1.....	
.....Rosa Graul	50
Moribund Society and Anarchy.	
Cloth 60c.....	25
Jean Grave	
A Physician in the House.....	
.....Dr. J. H. Greer	2.75
The Education of the Feminine	
Will.....	05
Harlor	
Marriage and Morality.....	
.....Lillian Harman	05
Regeneration of Society.....	05
Love in Freedom.....	05
Moses Harman	
Motherhood in Freedom.....	05
Government Analyzed.....	1.00
Kelso	
How to Dispose of Surplus Prod-	
ucts and Employ Surplus Labor.	
.....Kinghorn-Jones	05
Anarchism: Its Philosophy and	
Ideal.....	05
Peter Kropotkin	
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.....	05
Enrico Malatesta	
Anarchy. (Is It All a Dream?)	
James F. Morton, Jr.).....	10
A Chambermaid's Diary.....	50
Gustav Mirbeau	
Commune of Paris.....	05
Wm. Morris	
Monopoly.....	05
Responsibility and Solidarity in the	
Labor Struggle.....	05
M. Nettlau	
God and Government: The Siamese	
Twins of Superstition.....	05
W. Nevill	
A Cityless and Countryless World.	
Cloth.....	1.00
Herman Olerich	
The Slavery of Our Times. Cloth.	
.....Leo Tolstoy	75
Mating or Marrying, Which?.....	
.....W. H. Van Ornum	05
Judgment.....	05
Wm. Platt	
Evolution and Revolution.....	05
Reclus	
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.....	15
E. C. Walker	
Revival of Puritanism.....	10
What the Young Need to Know	
The Ballad of Reading Gaol.....	15
.....Oscar Wilde	10
Life Without a Master. 336 pp.	
Cloth \$1.50.....	1.00
J. Wilson	
The New Dispensation. Cloth.....	1.50
The Coming Woman.....	05
Lillie White	
The Chicago Martyrs: The Fam-	
ous Speeches of the Eight Anarch-	
ists in Judge Gary's Court; and	
Alttgeld's Reason's for Pardoning	
Fielden, Neebe and Schwab.....	25