

FREE SOCIETY

FORMERLY THE FIREBRAND.

Exponent of anarchism-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. 34.

CHICAGO, SUNDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1901.

WHOLE NO. 332.

Speak the Truth.

Speak the truth if thou believ'st it,
Let it jostle whom it may;
E'en although the foolish scorn it,
Or the obstinate gainsay;
Every seed that grows tomorrow,
Lies beneath the sod today.
All conviction should be valiant;
Speak the truth if truth it be,
Do not seek to stem its current,
Thoughts, like rivers, find the sea;
It will fit the widening circle
Of eternal verity.

—Mackay.

Anarchism.

(This lecture was delivered in Philadelphia last April, after the police had announced that no lecture on Anarchism would be permitted in the city.)

There are two spirits abroad in the world,—the spirit of Caution, the spirit of Dare, the spirit of Quiescence, the spirit of Unrest; the spirit of Immobility, the spirit of Change; the spirit of Hold-fast-to-that-which-you-have, the spirit of Let-go-and-fly-to-that-which-you-have-not; the spirit of the slow and steady builder, careful of its labors, loath to part with any of its achievements, wishful to keep, and unable to discriminate between what is worth keeping and what is better cast aside, and the spirit of the inspirational destroyer, fertile in creative fancies, volatile, careless in its luxuriance of effort, inclined to cast away the good together with the bad.

Society is a quivering balance, eternally buck afresh, between these two. Those who look upon Man, as most Anarchists do, as a link in the chain of evolution, see in these two social tendencies the sum of the tendencies of individual men, which in common with the tendencies of all organic life are the result of the action and counter-action of inheritance and adaptation. Inheritance, continually tending to repeat what has been, long, long after it is outgrown, adaption continually tending to break down forms. The same tendencies under other names are observed in the inorganic world as well, and anyone who is possessed by the modern scientific mania for Monism can easily follow out the line to the vanishing point of human knowledge.

There has been, in fact, a strong inclination to do this among a portion of the more educated Anarchists, who having been working men first and Anarchists by reason of their instinctive hatred to the boss, later became students and swept away by their undigested science immediately conceived that it was necessary to fit their Anarchism to the revelations of the microscope, else the theory might as well be given up. I remember with considerable amusement a heated discussion some five or six years since, wherein doctors and embryo doctors sought for a justification of Anarchism in the development of the amoeba, while a fledgling engineer searched for it in mathematical quantities.

Myself at one time asserted very stoutly that no one could be an Anarchist and believe in God at the same time. Others assert as stoutly that one cannot accept the spiritualist philosophy and be an Anarchist.

At present I hold with C. L. James, the most learned of American Anarchists, that one's metaphysical system has very little to do with the matter. The chain of reasoning which once appeared so conclusive to me, namely, that Anarchism being a denial of authority over the individual could not co-exist with a belief in a Supreme Ruler of the universe, is contradicted in the case of Leo Tolstoy, who comes to the conclusion that none has a right to rule another just because of his belief in God, just because he believes that all are equal children of one father, and therefore none has a right to rule the other. I speak of him because he is a familiar and notable personage, but there have frequently been instances where the same idea has been worked out by a whole sect of believers, especially in the earlier (and persecuted) stages of their development.

It no longer seems necessary to me, therefore, that one should base his Anarchism upon any particular world-conception; it is a theory of the relations of man to man, and comes as an offered solution to the society problems arising from the existence of these two tendencies of which I have spoken. No matter where those tendencies come from, all alike recognize them as existent; and however interesting the speculation, however fascinating to lose oneself back, back in the molecular storm-whirl wherein the figure of man is seen merely as a denser, fiercer group, a livelier storm centre, moving among others, impinging upon others, but nowhere separate, nowhere exempt from the same necessity that acts upon all other centers of force,—it is by no means necessary in order to reason oneself into Anarchism.

Sufficient are a good observant eye and a reasonably reflecting brain, for anyone, lettered or unlettered, to recognize the desirability of Anarchistic aims. This is not to say that increased knowledge will not confirm and expand one's application of this fundamental concepts; (the beauty of truth is that at every new discovery of fact we find how much wider and deeper it is than we at first thought it). But it means that first of all Anarchism is concerned with present conditions, and with the very plain and common people; and is by no means a complex or difficult proposition.

Anarchism, alone, apart from any proposed economic reform, is just the latest reply out of many the past has given, to that daring, breakaway, volatile, changeful spirit which is never content. The society, of which we are part, puts certain oppressions upon us,—oppressions which have arisen out of the very changes accomplished by this same spirit combined with the hard and fast lines

of old habits acquired and fixed before the changes were thought of. Machinery, which as our Socialistic comrades continually emphasize, has wrought a revolution in Industry, is the creation of the Dare Spirit; it has fought its way against ancient customs, privilege, and cowardice at every step, as the history of any invention would show if traced backward through all its transformations. And what is the result of it? That a system of working, altogether appropriate to hand production and capable of generating no great oppressions while industry remained in that state, has been stretched, strained to fit production in mass, till we are reaching the bursting point; once more the spirit of Dare must assert itself—claim new freedoms, since the old ones are rendered null and void by the present methods of production.

To speak in detail: in the old days of Master and Man—not so old but what many of the older workmen can recall the conditions, the workshop was a fairly easy going place where employer and employed worked together, knew no class feelings, chummed it out of hours, as a rule were not obliged to rush, and when they were, relied upon the principle of common interest and friendship (not upon a slave-owner's power) for overtime assistance. The proportional profit on each man's labor may even have been in general higher, but the total amount possible to be undertaken by one employer was relatively so small that no tremendous aggregations of wealth could arise. To be an employer gave no man power over another's incomings and outgoings, neither upon his speech while at work, nor to force him beyond endurance when busy, nor to subject him to fines and tributes for undesired things, such as ice-water, dirty spittoons, cups of undrinkable tea and the like; nor to the unmentionable indecencies of the large factory. The individuality of the workman was a plainly recognized quantity: his life was his own; he could not be locked in and driven to death, like a street-car horse, for the good of the general public and the paramount importance of Society.

With the applications of steam-power and the development of Machinery, came these large groupings of workers, this subdivision of work, which has made of the employer a man apart having interests hostile to those of his employes, living in another circle altogether, knowing nothing of them but as so many units of power, to be reckoned with as he does his machines, for the most part despising them, at his very best regarding them as dependents whom he is bound in some respects to care for, as a humane man cares for an old horse he cannot use. Such is his relation to his employes; while to the general public he becomes simply an immense cuttle fish with tentacles reaching every—

where,—each tiny profit-sucking mouth producing no great effect, but in aggregate drawing up such a body of wealth as makes any declaration of equality or freedom between him and the worker a thing to laugh at.

The time is come therefore when the spirit of Dare calls loud through every factory and work-shop for a change in the relations of master and man. There must be some arrangement possible which will preserve the benefits of the new production and at the same time restore the individual dignity of the worker,—give back the bold independence of the old master of his trade together with such added freedoms as may properly accrue to him as his special advantage from society's material developments.

This is the particular message of Anarchism to the worker. It is not an economic system; it does not come to you with detailed plans of how you the workers are to conduct industry; nor systemized methods of exchange; nor careful paper organizations of "the administration of things." It simply calls upon the spirit of individuality to rise up from its abasement, and hold itself paramount in no matter what economic reorganization shall come about. Be men first of all, not held in slavery by the things you make; let your gospel be, "Things for men, not men for things."

Socialism, economically considered, is a positive proposition for such reorganization. It is an attempt, in the main, to grasp at those great new material gains which have been the special creation of the last forty or fifty years. It has not so much in view the reclamation and further assertion of the personality of the worker as it has a just distribution of products.

Now it is perfectly apparent that Anarchy, having to do almost entirely with the relations of men in their thoughts and feelings, and not with the positive organization of production and distribution, an Anarchist needs to supplement his Anarchism by some economic propositions, which may enable him to put in practical shape to himself and others this possibility of independent manhood. That will be his test in choosing any such proposition,—the measure in which individuality is secured. It is not enough for him that a comfortable ease, a pleasant and well-ordered routine, shall be secured; free play for the spirit of change—that is his first demand.

Every Anarchist has this in common with every other Anarchist, that the economic system must be subservient to this end; no system recommends itself to him by the mere beauty and smoothness of its working; jealous of the encroachments of the machine, he looks with fierce suspicion upon an arithmetic with men for units, a society running in slots and grooves, with the precision so beautiful to one in whom the love of order is first, but which only makes him sniff—"Pfaugh! it smells of machine oil."

There are, accordingly, several economic schools among Anarchists; there are Anarchist Individualists, Anarchist Mutualists, Anarchist Communists and Anarchist Socialists. In times past these several schools have bitterly denounced each other and mutually refused to recognize each other as Anarchists at all. The more narrow-minded

on both sides still do so; true, they do not consider it is narrow-mindedness, but simply a firm and solid grasp of the truth, which does not permit of tolerance towards error. This has been the attitude of the bigot in all ages, and Anarchism no more than any other new doctrine has escaped its bigots. Each of these fanatical adherents of either collectivism or individualism believes that no Anarchism is possible without that particular economic system as its guarantee, and is of course thoroughly justified from his own standpoint. With the extension of what Comrade Brown calls the New Spirit, however, this old narrowness is yielding to the broader, kindlier and far more reasonable idea, that all these economic conceptions may be experimented with, and there is nothing un-Anarchistic about any of them until the element of compulsion enters and obliges unwilling persons to remain in a community whose economic arrangements they do not agree to. (When I say "do not agree to" I do not mean that they have a mere distaste for, or that they think might well be altered for some other preferable arrangement, but with which, nevertheless, they quite easily put up, as two persons each living in the same house and having different tastes in decoration, will submit to some color of window shade or bit of bric-a-brac which he does not like so well, but which nevertheless, he cheerfully puts up with for the satisfaction of being with his friend.) I mean serious differences which in their opinion threaten their essential liberties,—I make this explanation about trifles, because the objections which are raised to the doctrine that men may live in society freely, almost always degenerate into trivialities,—such as, "what would you do if two ladies wanted the same hat?" etc. We do not advocate the abolition of common sense, and every person of sense is willing to surrender his preferences at times, provided he is not compelled to at all costs.

Therefore I say that each group of persons acting socially in freedom may choose any of the proposed systems, and be just as thorough-going Anarchists as those who select another. If this standpoint be accepted, we are rid of those outrageous excommunications which belong properly to the Church of Rome, and which serve no purpose but to bring us into deserved contempt with outsiders.

Furthermore, having accepted it from a purely theoretical process of reasoning, I believe one is then in an attitude of mind to perceive certain material factors in the problem which account for these differences in proposed systems, and which even demand such differences, so long as production is in its present state approximately.

I shall now dwell briefly upon these various propositions, and explain as I go along, what the material factors are to which I have just alluded. Taking the last first, namely, Anarchist Socialism,—its economic program is the same as that of political Socialism, in its entirety;—I mean before the working of practical politics has frittered the Socialism away into a mere list of governmental ameliorations. Such Anarchist Socialists hold that the State, the Centralized Government, has been and ever will be the business agent of the property owning class;

that it is an expression of a certain material condition purely, and with the passing of that condition the State must also pass; that Socialism, meaning the complete taking over of all forms of property from the hands of men as the indivisible possession of Man, brings with it as a logical, inevitable result the dissolution of the State. They believe that every individual having an equal claim upon the social production, the incentive to grabbing and holding being gone, crimes (which are in nearly all cases the instinctive answer to some antecedent denial of that claim to one's share) will vanish, and with them the last excuse for the existence of the State. They do not, as a rule, look forward to any such transformations in the material aspect of society, as some of the rest of us do. A Londoner once said to me that he believed London would keep on growing, the flux and reflux of nations keep on pouring through its serpentine streets, its hundred thousand buses keep on jaunting just the same, and all that tremendous traffic which fascinates and horrifies continue rolling like a great flood up and down, up and down, like the sea-sweep,—after the realization of Anarchism, as it does now. That Londoner's name was John Turner; he said, on the same occasion, that he believed thoroughly in the economics of Socialism.

Now this branch of the Anarchist party came out of the old Socialist party, and originally represented the revolutionary wing of that party as opposed to those who took up the notion of using politics. And I believe the material reason which accounts for their acceptance of that particular economic scheme is this (of course it applies to all European Socialists) that the social development of Europe is a thing of long-continued history; that almost from time immemorial there has been a recognized class struggle; that no workman living, nor yet his father, nor his grandfather, nor his great-grandfather has seen the land of Europe pass in vast blocks from an unclaimed public inheritance into the hands of an ordinary individual like himself, without a title or any distinguishing mark above himself, as we in America have seen. The land and the landholder have been to him always unapproachable quantities,—a recognized source of oppression, class, and class-possession.

Again, the industrial development in town and city—coming as a means of escape from feudal oppression, but again bringing with it its own oppressions, also with a long history of warfare behind it, has served to bind the sense of class fealty upon the common people of the manufacturing towns: so that blind, stupid, and Church-ridden as they no doubt are, there is a vague, dull, but very certainly existing feeling that they must look for help in association together, and regard with suspicion or indifference any proposition which proposes to help them by helping their employers. Moreover, Socialism has been an ever recurring dream through the long story of revolt in Europe; Anarchists like others, are born into it. It is not until they pass over seas, and come in contact with other conditions, breathe the atmosphere of other thoughts that they are able to see other possibilities as well.

If I may venture, at this point, a criticism of this position of the Anarchist Socialist, I

would say that the great flaw in its conception of the State is in supposing it to be of *simple* origin; the State is not merely the tool of the governing classes; it has its root far down in the religious development of human nature; and will not fall apart merely through the abolition of classes and property. There is other work to be done. As to the economic program I shall criticise that, together with all the other propositions, when I sum up.

Anarchist Communism is a modification, rather an evolution, of Anarchist Socialism. Most Anarchist Communists, I believe, do look forward to great changes in the distribution of people upon the earth's surface through the realization of Anarchism. Most of them agree that the opening up of the land together with the free use of tools would lead to a breaking up of these vast communities called cities, and the formation of smaller groups or communes which shall be held together by a free recognition of common interests only.

While Socialism looks forward to a further extension of the modern triumph of Commerce—which is that it has brought the products of the entire earth to your door-step—free Communism looks upon such a fever of exportation and importation as an unhealthy development, and expects rather a more self-reliant development of home resources, doing away with the mass of supervision required for the systematic conduct of such world exchange. It appeals to the plain sense of the workers, by proposing that they who now consider themselves helpless dependents upon the boss' ability to give them a job, shall constitute themselves independent producing groups, take the materials, do the work (they do that now), deposit the products in the warehouses, taking what they want for themselves, and letting others take the balance. To do this no government, no employer, no money system is necessary. There is only necessary a decent regard for one's own and one's fellow-worker's selfhood. It is not likely, indeed it is devoutly to be hoped, that no such large aggregations of men as now assemble daily in mills and factories, will ever come together by mutual desire. (A factory is a hot-bed for all that is vicious in human nature, and largely because of its crowding only.)

The notion that men cannot work together unless they have a driving-master to take a percentage of their product is contrary both to good sense and observed fact. As a rule bosses simply make confusion worse confounded when they attempt to mix in a workman's snarls, as every mechanic has had practical demonstration of; and as to social effort, why men worked in common while they were monkeys yet; if you don't believe it go and watch the monkeys. They don't surrender their individual freedom either.

In short the real workmen will make their own regulations, decide when and where and how things shall be done. It is not necessary that the projector of an Anarchist Communist society shall say in what manner separate industries shall be conducted, nor do they presume to. He simply conjures the spirit of Dare and Do in the plainest workman—say to him, it is you who know how to mine, how to dig, how to cut; you

will know how to organize your work without a dictator; we cannot tell you, but we have full faith that you will find the way yourselves. You will never be free men until you acquire that same self-faith.

As to the problem of the exact exchange of equivalents which so frets the reformers of other schools, to him it does not exist. So there is enough who cares. The sources of wealth remain indivisible forever; who cares if one has a little more or less so all have enough? Who cares if something goes to waste? Let it waste. The rotted apple fertilizes the ground as well as if it had comforted the animal economy first. And, indeed, you who worry so much about system and order and adjustment of production to consumption, you waste more human energy in making your account than the precious calculation is worth. Hence money with all its retinue of complications and trickeries is abolished.

Small, independent, self-resourceful, freely cooperating communes—this is the economic ideal which is accepted by most of the Anarchists of the Old World today.

As to the material factor which developed this ideal among Europeans, it is the recollection and even some still remaining vestiges of the medieval village commune—those oases in the great Sahara of human degradation presented in the history of the Middle Ages, when the Catholic Church stood triumphant upon Man in the dust. Such is the ideal glamored with the dead gold of a sun which has set, which gleams through the pages of Morris and Kropotkin. We in America never knew the village commune. White Civilization struck our shores in a broad tide-sheet and swept over the country inclusively; among us was never seen the little commune growing up from a state of barbarism independently, out of primary industries, and maintaining itself within itself. There was no gradual change from the mode of life of the native people to our own;—there was a wiping out and a complete transplantation of the latest form of European civilization. The idea of the little commune, therefore, comes instinctively to the Anarchists of Europe,—particularly the continental ones; with them it is merely the conscious development of a submerged instinct. With Americans it is an importation.

I believe that most Anarchist Communists avoid the blunder of the Socialists in regarding the State as the offspring of material conditions purely, though they lay great stress upon its being the tool of Property, and contend that in one form or another the State will exist so long as there is property at all.

I pass to the extreme Individualists,—those who hold to the tradition of political economy, and are firm in the idea that the system of employer and employed, buying and selling, banking, and all the other essential institutions of Commercialism, centering upon private property, are in themselves good, and are rendered vicious merely by the interference of the State. Their chief economic propositions are: land to be held by individuals or companies for such time and in such allotments as they use only; redistribution to take place as often as the members of the community shall agree;

what constitutes use to be decided by each community, presumably in town meeting assembled; disputed cases to be settled by a so-called free jury to be chosen by lot out of the entire group; members not coinciding in the decisions of the group to betake themselves to outlying lands not occupied, without let or hindrance from anyone.

Money to represent all staple commodities, to be issued by whomsoever pleases; naturally, it would come to individuals depositing their securities with banks and accepting bank notes in return; such bank notes representing the labor expended in production and being issued in sufficient quantity, (there being no limit upon any one's starting in the business, whenever interest began to rise more banks would be organized, and thus the rate per cent would be constantly checked by competition), exchange would take place freely, commodities would circulate, business of all kinds would be stimulated, and the government privilege being taken away from inventions,—industries would spring up at every turn—bosses would be hunting men rather than men bosses, wages would rise to the full measure of the individual production, and forever remain there. Property, real property, would at last exist, which it does not at the present day, because no man gets what he makes.

The charm in this program is that it proposes no sweeping changes in our daily routine; it does not bewilder us as more revolutionary propositions do. Its remedies are self-acting ones; they do not depend upon conscious efforts of individuals to establish justice and build harmony; competition in freedom is the great automatic valve which opens or closes as demands increase or diminish, and all that is necessary is to let well enough alone and not attempt to assist it.

It is sure that nine Americans in ten who have never heard of any of these programs before, will listen with far more interest and approval to this than to the others.* The material reason which explains this attitude of mind is very evident. In this country outside of the Negro question we have never had the historic division of classes; we are just making that history now; we have never felt the need of the associative spirit of workman with workman, because in our society it has been the individual that did things; the workman of today was the employer tomorrow; vast opportunities lying open to him in the undeveloped territory, he shouldered his tools and struck out single-handed for himself. Even now, fiercer and fiercer though the struggle is growing, tighter and tighter though the workman is getting cornered, the line of division between class and class is constantly being broken, and the first motto of the American is "the Lord helps

(Continued on page 6.)

* Here, I think, Comrade de Cleyre errs. I have met many Americans who had read Tucker's *Liberty*, and after explaining to them the theory of Anarchist Communism, their typical answer was: "That's something different; I can understand its working; but I could never comprehend how the Individualist Anarchist could get along without government to protect their property in land and machinery. Their voluntary police system seemed to me either a farce or government under another name."

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.

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.

Account yourself happy if it be your lot to espouse some noble and unpopular cause in the beginning; to stand by its cradle, to throw yourself on its broad altar; to see it grow, to help it grow; to see it first arouse curiosity, then attention, then contempt, then hatred, then fear, then respect; always growing and growing, until at last, over prejudice and hate and party and old customs and vested interests, the irresistible current makes its way.—Author Unknown.

Notes.

Owing to the long delay in publishing FREE SOCIETY since our arrest, it has been deemed advisable to cut off some of the routine discussions going on in the paper. No further papers will therefore appear from Fox and Wight, and Walter Leighton and his various opponents, in the controversies in which they were engaged.

If some who have sent their subscription or orders for books, and fail to see the money credited next week or their orders attended to, they are asked to notify us. Some communications, as well as other things, were "seized" by the police, and got lost.

By the Wayside.

All newspaper writers lay great stress upon the fact that McKinley "loved his wife." Is this really such rare phenomenon among the wealthy that it is necessary to emphasize the fact as a meritorious trait of character? It seems to me that ought to be understood as a matter of course.

Very characteristic mourning was manifested by some of the "patriotic American business men." They offered funeral pictures several days before McKinley's death. "Money does not stink," says a German proverb.

A conscious-stricken heart is an uncomfortable thing. In all European countries—even in Russia—the assassins were given an opportunity in court to assail governments and prevailing institutions. But not so in the "freest country on the globe." Czolgosz was told he could speak on three propositions, but would not be allowed to talk of the "social order of things." Did the judge apprehend that a mirror might be put before him, reflecting some horrible-looking pictures of injustice, misery, and suffering, mitigating the crime somewhat in the eyes

of the general public? Russia will, of course, not hesitate to adopt such methods of arbitrary court proceedings, as exemplified by the authorities of a "free republic."

"Well, how does the stamping-out craze effect your subscription list?" I asked the publishers of FREE SOCIETY. "We received more new subscribers and requests for sample copies during the last three or four weeks, than during the whole year previous to the newspaper attacks," replied Comrade Isaak. "Here is a letter just received, which is typical of all the others we have received." The letter reads:

Dear Sir,—Enclosed find \$1 as a subscription for FREE SOCIETY. Kindly send sample copies to addresses below mentioned.

I did not know that there was an Anarchistic organ in this city, but read a few sentences quoted from FREE SOCIETY in a daily paper; and as I have found more sense in those few words than in a complete Sunday edition of any of our "independent" dailies, I would like to know more about Anarchism.

That's the trouble: there is "sense" in the teachings of Anarchism! And I may suggest to the "intelligent" members of the Marquette Club, that "stringent laws," mob violence, rifle bullets, or other "noble" means of persecution, are rather poor arguments against a philosophy based on inductive science.

INTERLOPER.

Leon F. Czolgosz.

In the issue of September 1 of FREE SOCIETY, there appears a note of warning against a person as a spy. It is now practically certain that the person alluded to was Leon F. Czolgosz. Although at the time the warning seemed justified, it was an error. No matter what opinion one may have of Czolgosz, it will be admitted that he was not a spy. For that note, I offer to Leon F. Czolgosz, hatred and despised as he is by all the world, an apology.

ABE ISAAK JR.

Who are the Guilty?

Four years ago, September 16, 1901, there died at Lattimer, Pa., twenty coal miners. The immediate cause of their death was a bullet in the back of each, fired by Sheriff Martin and one hundred licensed murderers, commonly known as deputies. The miners were charged with trespassing on the property of the coal operators. They refused to disperse at the first command of the sheriff. Hot words followed. A few stones were thrown, and then that awful volley of death, fired, as was proven by the nature of the wounds, after the miners had turned to retreat. None of the deputies nor Sheriff Martin were injured. The dead as well as the living miners had no weapons, some not even a pocket-knife.

The families of the dead men amounted to something near seventy souls. They were left in such destitute circumstances that one labor organization raised a small sum of money for their immediate needs. In twenty houses of that poverty-stricken mining community, lay the corpses of twenty working men. Their labor scarred hands crossed over breasts that would never more feel the pangs of injustice, or thrill with the passion of revolt. Over their rigid, unresponsive

faces hung the weeping ones who loved them. From house to house went the parish priest, counseling forbearance, submission to the will of God! The dead were buried amid the weeping and wailing of wives and children and the curses of comrades.

What was the sequel to this awful tragedy? The great dailies did not lay much stress upon the matter. There was some criticism of the sheriff, and he was finally tried and acquitted. It was found he had murdered the men—of course the court did not word it so—but he had done the killing legally, strictly within the law. The newspapers did not gush over the widows and orphans that were on the verge of starvation. Neither did they write fool editorials on the "stamping out" of corporate greed, or of how they would submit to God's will, in thus removing twenty of the useful members of society, if only it would lead to the destruction of that power called monopoly, which robbed and murdered the poor. No, the press was dumb, likewise the pulpit. As for the members of the legislative and judiciary bodies of our land, they are part of the machine, and dare not criticise the workings of any part, lest the whole thing go to pieces.

Having briefly recalled the terrible murder of those poor laboring men four years ago, I will now touch more briefly still upon a late murder, counting it of far less importance, as it involves but the death of one man, or of two rather, for the second is the same as dead, namely Wm. McKinley and Leon Czolgosz.

As I have already stated, that class who is popularly supposed to hold the public ear and conscience, were coldly indifferent to the Lattimer murder. But when the shot was fired at Buffalo, which meant the death of Wm. McKinley and his assassin, then the flood-gates of wrath were opened. The pulpit, the capitalistic and so-called reform press, members of our legislative bodies, governors, lawyers, judges, with a few exceptions, all went into hysterics. For three weeks they have talked blood, dreamed blood, and shed blood. Dare a man express a criticism of the dead president, he ran the risk of being knocked down. Drunken men who expressed gratification on his death, came near being lynched. Worse by far than all this is the cry of "Stamp out Anarchy!" Men of brains and culture, used to the so-called refinements of life, ministers of the gospel, and public educators boldly demand the extermination of those who advocate Anarchism, and the persecution of all who cherish these views. The governor of Georgia calls for an amendment to the constitution of the United States making the advocacy of Anarchism treason, the penalty death, and an amendment to the constitutions of the various States making it conspiracy for two or more to listen to a teacher of Anarchism. A number of governors express similar views, among them Savage of Nebraska who made the call for prayers for rain last summer. Let us hope his petition to the throne of the State will be as bare of results as his petition to the throne of grace. Stone of Missouri, our ex-governor, declares the propagation of Anarchism should be punished as treason. Stone is the man who once threatened to throw

the United States troops into the Missouri River, if President Cleveland sent them into the State while he was governor. A minister in the St. Louis *Christian Advocate* demands death for the Anarchists. I mention him as a fair sample of the rest of his cloth. I consider ministers of the gospel, and the judges in our so-called courts of justice as the most cruel and unsympathetic creatures on earth. Their position robs them of the very quality which most embellishes the human character, viz. reason and sympathy.

A professor in the public schools of Webster City, Iowa, declares that our form of government is responsible for Anarchism, that the constitution does not define the proper limits of free speech. He charges that Patrick Henry, who prior to the Revolution made his famous speech "An Appeal to Arms," over-stepped the bounds of free speech, and was dangerously near Anarchistic grounds. It is unfortunate for Henry that he is long since dead, or the form of government which he helped to establish, and that is worshipped by his posterity as the ultimate of all perfection, might serve as a means of exterminating him. This brilliant educator further declared for the death penalty for Anarchists, or else marooning them on some desolate island, when they might work out their own salvation. This last seems to be a favorite method among the "suppressors," but they little know the Anarchist. We want the earth, and will have it. It is only a matter of time. History teaches us that each generation discovers and appropriates new rights, and that every discovery of this nature is a step towards more liberty instead of less.

The St. Louis *Globe-Democrat* comes forward with the remark "that Anarchists are glad to give the life of one of their number for President McKinley, and assassination will continue and increase if no greater penalty is exacted."

It is supposed that death is the final penalty that can be exacted from so-called criminals. Perhaps the Christian gentlemen who presides over the *Globe's* editorial department would add torture to the death sentence? When the lives of the ruling class were ever protected by extra penalties, history fails to discover. If the representatives of government would abdicate, if they would conclude that any calling in life was more respectable than that of professional politicians, they would be in no danger from a revolutionist. As it is, like Humbert of Italy, they must take the risks with the trade. And as their risks in their nefarious business are far less than the risks of honest laboring men in machine shops, factories and mines, where it is an every-day occurrence for some of them to lose life or limb, part of such accident at least the result of improper precautions by the employers, who fear any extra cost that will detract from profit. If these ignorant, loud-mouthed saviours of society are sincere in their expressions of horror at the shedding of human blood, let them prove it by their works, instead of passing laws restricting free speech and press. Let them examine the mines of this country, and the sanitary conditions of the tenement districts. Let them put a stop to legal executions, a disgrace to this age,

and cease to give men a legal permit to shoot down workmen in the name of law and order. When they do this, they will prove their sincerity, not before.

When one reflects that the wild ravings of the past week have emanated from our law-givers, it causes serious thought as to what may arise, before the mass of the people grow enlightened enough to question the all-powerful State, the foundation of which is based upon ignorance. But our law-givers will probably come to their senses, as some of them have already said that laws are useless to protect our rulers against a man who has no fear of death, and they will find that no law is powerful enough to close the mouths of those who recognize the real character of government, and that those who aid and abet it in any way become a party to its crimes.

KATE AUSTIN.

— o —

The Price of Empire.

What has been occurring with almost periodical regularity in Europe, happened at Buffalo on September 6. The ruler of this nation was assassinated. It is not the first time that an assassination has occurred in the United States; but for the first time it is the government itself which has been assailed. That makes all the difference in the world. For it was not for partisan gain that the assassin struck, as was the case in Kentucky; nor was it done by a disappointed office-seeker, as in the case of Garfield.

The apostles of innovation and progress have ever chosen the peaceful path; but they have been ruthlessly crushed with violence and death by the apostles of conservatism. Government is the personification of conservatism, and always lends its forces to reaction. Then why is it so surprising if at rare intervals some individual strikes back with a forceful hand?

At the present time our whole social life is based upon continual warfare. In order to succeed in the world, one must do so on the heads of his fellow beings. Every year thousands of men go down in the industrial struggle, men who are in every way equal to and surpass the character of McKinley. They are unhonored and unwept; and no hand of sympathy is stretched out to their widows and children. Mothers are swept off, and the orphans are turned into the streets, to be picked up or left to their fate. In the factories young girls and small children waste away their lives, and go to their graves in the bloom of youth. No tears mark their death, and flowers are not strewn on their graves. If fortunate they leave a few friends or relatives to mourn their loss; but the nation does not weep. Then again thousands of men fall victims to murders and mob violence; they are passed off with a shrug, and are forgotten. Why then all this weeping and mourning at the death of McKinley? It is said that the nation itself has been struck in the person of its president.

What of the nation?

During McKinley's reign the United States have passed from a nominal republic to an empire. It was during this time that we have seen the nation wage a war for the ostensible purpose of freeing Cuba; and

then break its moral promises to the "liberated" people. It is during McKinley's reign that we have the spectacle of American soldiers going to the Philippines to crush a people struggling for liberty; and we have starving and outraged Porto Rico, begging again for their Spanish masters. Taxes have increased enormously to pay for a war of extermination. It was during this time that peaceful miners were shot down in Lattimer; and the bull pen of Idaho is yet fresh in our memories. McKinley did not hesitate to send the soldiers to Wardner, as King Humbert sent them to Milan.

These things have been forgotten now; but it is here we must look for the cause of assassinations. It is repression, and not liberty, which causes man to pull at his chains. So long as men are victims of misery and oppression, those in high places are bound to suffer, as well as those in low places. So long as our whole life is a continuous war, victims will fall on both sides. The difference is only that those on the one side are numerous and unknown, and those on the other side few and conspicuous.

Much has been said upon the folly of killing the president. There is always another man to become president. It is these same people who talk blood and gore, and cry for vengeance upon the Anarchists. They do not appreciate their own statement that a principle cannot be "stamped out" with violence. Not only one, but hundreds stepped into the places of the martyrs of Chicago; still the hysterical reaction is calling for another "lesson." But such comments do not apply in the case. If there was anything to show that any assassin ever expected to kill the office with the man, the argument might be admissible.

So long as we have rulers in the world, who crush out the life and aspirations of mankind, there will be men who will feel the pain of the iron heel, until the pressure becomes so great in their hearts that they must rebel. They will strike at what represents their oppression. It is a protest of the man, and the cry of pain which humanity feels.

Where pressure is greatest, the resistance is equal to the pressure. For this reason many have confessed their inability to understand Czolgosz's act, although it would be perfectly intelligible to them if committed in Europe. But the very fact that such a deed was committed in America has opened the eyes of thousands of men to the fact that the political and economic difference between Europe and America is to a great extent ceasing to exist.

As Brooks Adams has recently pointed out in a magazine article, if America has made up its mind for a career of empire, it must be willing to pay the price; large armies and navies are necessary; and high taxes, resulting in an economic tension of the masses, are inevitable. The murder and rapine incident to an imperial program are accepted as a matter of course. But what Brooks Adams did not see, is that the price of empire includes an occasional assassinated president. So long as there are men to feel the wrongs and pains of their fellow men, so long will imperial life incite them to strike, often blindly and unwisely, but with their heart and soul.

The whole world has hastened to repudiate Czolgosz and his deed, including some supposed Anarchists. It behooves us therefore to understand and explain his act, whether he has declared himself an Anarchist or understand the principle of Anarchism or not. Anarchism has nothing to do with violence in itself; but an Anarchist, as well as any one may commit a violent deed, the same as a governmentalist and a Christian may do. If I can applaud an Angiolillo or a Bresci, it is not Anarchism that does so, but my individual temperament, the same as another temperament will applaud even a Luccheni and a Czolgosz, while I explain them.

Blind rage at the assassin, with an attempt to hush up and hide the evils of present condition, will surely not stop assassination. The sooner an attempt is made to study in a rational way the psychology and temperament of the assassin, combined with the most open criticism of societary conditions, the sooner will these causes be known. Without removing the causes, effects cannot cease. Oppression and repression will but augment the evils.

ABE ISAAK JR.

— o — Hungry Strikers.

Not long since, I saw in a labor union paper the remark that the steel workers on strike were firm, and would doubtless win their case; but that it was likely some of the men would "get hungry" first.

Hungry? That is an ugly word to be spoken so glibly! And it occurs to me that hunger, or the fear of it, must curtail the efforts of those who are afflicted or threatened with it. Strikes cannot be successfully carried through in company with starved stomachs; that is certain.

All of us who desire freedom wish to see the strikers come out ahead in the struggle. But, looking at the matter from an Anarchistic standpoint, should this strike be won, the winning will cause but a temporary lull in the battle between employer and employee. Nothing short of a complete revolt against the system of bossism and obedience can end the difficulties. To permanently settle the conflict between capital and labor, the positions of master and hiring must be discarded, and free associations of men and women in all occupations essential to the welfare of mankind take the place of the wage system.

Whenever a strike of any magnitude occurs hopes spring up in the minds of many agitators for human emancipation, that desires akin to their own may infiltrate the ranks of the workers, both those who quit work and those who, though still slaving, sympathize with this passive protest against grinding conditions.

In my opinion, strikes would be more beneficial if OPERATIVE, not mere deadlocks. Before this change from blockading to acting can be initiated, the laborers' idea relating to *ownership* must be altered. They must see that the product belongs to the producer, and renounce and denounce the claim that "to the victor belongs the spoils." When the origin of "proprietary rights" is known, when it is understood that they commenced in the conquest of land by soldiers and conquest of BRAIN by priest and

politician, it does not then require a great wrench of "conscience" and "honor" to decide that the land naturally belongs to those who occupy and use it; the "improvements," transportation facilities, food, clothing, decorations and means of amusement to those who built, raised, or manufactured them instead of to those who "own" them. When the strikers come to this conclusion, the object of a strike will not be to merely ameliorate their relations with their masters, but to rid themselves of the parasites altogether. With this for their aim, the first move should be to insure every one against HUNGER. Provisions stored by those who wax fat in handling it, belongs to the producer and should in justice be distributed amongst the needy. What food may still be in possession of the cultivators can be secured by exchanging for it manufactured articles desired by this class of workers. Every other product should be procured in like manner. A strike should not increase privation but decrease it, and that instantly. "Hope deferred" is sorry comfort. Exposure to the elements, hunger and rags should not be tolerated.

When governments "seize" lands or goods, dispensing with the usual formula and routine of law, the performance is glossed over by calling it "confiscation." Confiscation is an orderly and meritorious act—in the eyes of the multitude! This is so because the multitude has been taught to look upon the governmental proceedings of whatever character as quite proper. The suggestion for wage earners to confiscate the essentials for life and happiness from which they are now penned off by superstitions, reverence for titles and other paper obstructions, is contemplated with horror not only by "owners" but by the toilers themselves.

Perhaps you may say the force displayed by police, sheriffs and the army is more substantial than paper. So it is. But these marauding forces are made up of individuals taken from the working class, and only require *light* to dispel the darkness of their superstitions, which are patched up out of the same pieces of rotten cloth as are those of the class they are pitted against. Thorough investigation into the whys and wherefores of the impoverished condition of the industrials in every "civilized" country will transfer the feeling of abhorrence from the proposal of appropriation for the common people of what is really their own to the present cruel system of robbery and murder.

Welcome the day when the strike for dispossessing the thieves and assassins begins. The tragedies of the times are too frightful to be viewed with indifference by those who observe them. Happy, happy will we be when no one need be killed by inches through exposure, by overwork, or worried to death by lack of it. Then shall no one be doomed to breathe foul air, to go about ragged, filthy, and hungry.

A malignant industrial and social system breeds and broods our pains and sorrows,—away with it.

VIRGIL DANIELS.

Los Angeles, Cal.

— o — Anarchism.

Continued from page 3.

him who helps himself." Consequently this

economic program whose key-note is "let alone" appeals strongly to the traditional sympathies and life habits of a people who have themselves seen an almost unbounded patrimony swept up as a gambler sweeps his stakes by men who played with them at school or worked with them in one shop a year or ten years before.

This particular branch of the Anarchist party do not accept the Communist position that Government arises from Property; on the contrary they hold Government responsible for the denial of real property—(viz: to the producer the exclusive possession of what he has produced). They lay more stress upon its metaphysical origin in the authority-creating Fear in human nature. Their attack is directed centrally upon the idea of Authority; thus the material wrongs seem to flow from the spiritual error (if I may venture the word without fear of misconception) which is precisely the reverse of the Socialistic view.

Truth lies not "between the two," but in a synthesis of the two opinions.

Anarchist Mutualism is a modification of the program of Individualism, laying more emphasis upon organization, cooperation and free federation of the workers. To these the trade union is the nucleus of the free cooperative group, which will obviate the necessity of an employer, issue time-checks to its members, take charge of the finished product, exchange with different trade groups for their mutual advantage through the central federation, enable its members to utilize their credit, and likewise insure them against loss. The mutualist position on the land question is identical with that of the Individualists, as well as their understanding of the State.

The material factor which accounts for such differences as there are between Individualists and Mutualists, is, I think, the fact that they first originated in the brains of those who, whether workmen or business men, lived by so-called independent exertion. Josiah Warren, though a poor man, lived in an Individualist way, and made his free life social experiment in small country settlements, far removed from the great organized industries. Tucker, also, though a city man has never had personal association with such industries. They had never known directly the oppressions of the large factory, nor mingled with workers' associations. The Mutualists had; consequently their leaning towards a greater Communism. Dyer D. Lum spent the greater part of his life in building up workmen's unions, himself being a hand worker, a book binder by trade.

I have now presented the rough skeleton of four different economic schemes entertained by Anarchists. Remember that the point of agreement in all is: *no compulsion*. Those who favor one method have no intention of forcing it upon those who favor another, so long as equal tolerance is exercised toward themselves.

Remember also, that none of these schemes is proposed for its own sake, but because through it, its projectors believe, liberty may be best secured. Every Anarchist, as an Anarchist, would be perfectly willing to surrender his own scheme directly if he saw that another worked better.

For myself, I believe that all these and many more could be advantageously tried in different localities; I would see the instincts and habits of the people express themselves in a free choice in every community; and I am sure that distinct environments would call out distinct adaptations.

Personally, while I recognize that liberty would be greatly extended under any of these economies, I frankly confess that none of them satisfies me.

Socialism and Communism both demand a degree of joint effort and administration which would beget more regulation than is wholly consistent with ideal Anarchism; Individualism and Mutualism, resting upon property, involve a development of the private policeman not at all compatible with my notions of freedom.

My ideal would be a condition in which all natural resources would be forever free to all, and the worker individually able to produce for himself sufficient for all his vital needs, if he so chose, so that he need not govern his working or not working by the times and seasons of his fellows.* I think that time may come; but it will only be through the development of the modes of production and the taste of the people. Meanwhile we all cry with one voice for the freedom to try.

Are these all the aims of Anarchism? They are just the beginning. They are an outline of what is demanded for the material producer. If as a worker, you think no further than how to free yourself from the horrible bondage of capitalism, then that is the measure of Anarchism for you. But you yourself put the limit there, if there it is put. Immeasurably deeper, immeasurably higher, dips and soars the soul which has come out of its casement of custom and cowardice, and dared to claim its Self.

Ah, once to stand unflinchingly on the brink of that dark gulf of passions and desires, once at last to send a bold, straight-driven gaze down into the volcanic Me, once, and in that once, and in that once forever, to throw off the command to cover and flee from the knowledge of that abyss,—nay, to dare it to hiss and seethe if it will, and make us writhe and shiver with its force! Once and forever to realize that one is not a bundle of well-regulated little reasons bound up in the front room of the brain to be sermonized and held in order with copy book maxims or moved and stopped by a syllogism, but a bottomless, bottomless depth of all strange sensations, a rocking sea of feeling wherever sweep strong storms of unaccountable hate and rage, invisible contortions of disappointment, low ebbs of meanness, quakings and shudders of love that drives to madness and will not be controlled, hungerings and moanings and

sobbing that smite upon the inner ear, now first bent to listen, as if all the sadness of the sea and the wailing of the great pine forests of the North had met to weep together there in that silence audible to you alone. To look down into that, to know the blackness, the midnight, the dead ages in oneself, to feel the jungle and the beast within,—and the swamp and the slime, and the desolate desert of the heart's despair—to see, to know, to feel to the uttermost,—and then to look at one's fellow, sitting across from one in the street-car, so decorous, so well-got up, so nicely combed and brushed and oiled and to wonder what lies beneath that commonplace exterior,—to picture the cavern in him which somewhere far below has a narrow gallery running into your own—to imagine the pain that racks him to the finger-tips perhaps while he wears that placid ironed-shirt-front countenance—to conceive how he too shudders at himself and writhes and flees from the lava of his heart and aches in his prison-house not daring to himself, to draw back respectfully from the Self-gate of the plainest, most unpromising creature, even from the most debased criminal, because one knows the nonentity and the criminal in oneself—to spare all condemnation (how much more trial and sentence) because one knows the stuff of which man is made and recoils at nothing since all is in himself,—this is what Anarchism may mean to you. It means that to me.

And then, to turn cloudward, starward, skyward, and let the dreams rush over one—no longer awed by outside powers of any order—recognizing nothing superior to oneself—painting, painting endless pictures, creating unheard symphonies that sing dream sounds to you alone, extending sympathies to the dumb brutes as equal brothers, kissing the flowers as one did when a child, letting oneself go free, go free beyond the bounds of what *fear* and *custom* call the "possible,"—this too Anarchism may mean to you, if you dare to apply it so. And if you do some day,—if sitting at your work-bench you see a vision of surpassing glory, some picture of that golden time when there shall be no prisons on the earth, nor hunger, nor houselessness, nor accusation, nor judgment, and hearts open as printed leaves, and candid as fearlessness, if then you look across at your low-browed neighbor, who sweats and smells and curses at his toil,—remember that as you do not know his depth neither do you know his height. He too might dream if the yoke of custom and law and dogma were broken from him. Even now you know not what blind bound motionless chrysalis, is working there to prepare its winged thing.

Anarchism means freedom to the soul as to the body,—in every aspiration, every growth.

A few words as to the methods. In times past Anarchists have excluded each other on these grounds also; revolutionists contemptuously said "Quaker" of peace men; "savage Communists" anathematized the Quakers in return.

This too is passing. I say this: all methods are to the individual capacity and decision.

There is Tolstoy,—Christian, non-resistant, artist. His method is to paint pictures of society as it is, to show the brutality of force and the uselessness of it; to preach the end of government through the repudiation of all military force. Good! I accept it in its entirety. It fits his character, it fits his ability. Let us be glad that he works so.

There is John Most—old, work-worn, with the weight of prison years upon him,—yet fiercer, fiercer, bitterer in his denunciations of the ruling class than would require the energy of a dozen younger men, to utter—going down the last hills of life, rousing the consciousness of wrong among his fellows as he goes. Good! That consciousness must be awakened. Long may that fiery tongue yet speak.

There is Benj. Tucker—cool, self-contained, critical,—sending his fine hard shafts among foes and friends with icy impartiality, hitting swift and cutting keen,—and ever ready to nail a traitor. Holding to passive resistance as most effective, ready to change it whenever he deems it wise. That suits him; in his field he is alone, invaluable.

And there is Peter Kropotkin appealing to the young, and looking with sweet warm eager eyes into every colonizing effort, and hailing with a child's enthusiasm the uprisings of the workers, and believing in revolution with his whole soul. Him too we thank.

And there is George Brown preaching peaceable expropriation through the federated unions of the workers; and this is good. It is his best place; he is at home there; he can accomplish most in his own chosen field.

And over there in his coffin cell in Italy, lies the man whose method was to kill a king, and shock the nations into a sudden consciousness of the hollowness of their law and order. Him too, him and his act, without reserve I accept, and bend in silent acknowledgement of the strength of the man.

For there are some whose nature it is to think and plead, and yield and yet return to the address, and so make headway in the minds of their fellowmen, and there are others who are stern and still, resolute, implacable as Judah's dream of God;—and those men strike—strike once and have ended. But the blow resounds across the world. And as on a night when the sky is heavy with storm, some sudden great white flare sheets across it, and every object starts sharply, *ou*, so in the flash of Bressi's pistol shot the whole world for a moment saw the tragic figure of the Italian people, starved, stunted, crippled, huddled, degraded, murdered; and at the same moment that their teeth chattered with fear, they came and asked the Anarchists to explain themselves. And hundreds of thousands of people read more in those few days than they had ever read of the idea before.

Ask a method? Do you ask Spring her method? Which is more necessary the sunshine or the rain? They are contradictory—yes; they destroy each other—yes, but from this destruction the flowers result.

Each choose that method which expresses your selfhood best, and condemn no other man because he expresses his Self otherwise.

VOLTAIRINE DE CLEYRE.

* This is exactly what is understood by Anarchist Communism. Yet not only to let natural resources to be free to all, but also the products of society. Man may produce individually, if he so chose, and also live all by himself, yet price and property in the products being absent, he would live in a state of Communism, being free to render his surplus products to the community and to consume in return according to desire. In such a state of society freedom is guaranteed to every one man, woman and child.

332

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—Brighams' 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.

The Latest Press Outrage.

The defeat of the Comstock gang in the Moore case has not shaken their determination to unite in a determined effort to destroy free speech on social questions, and particularly on the sex question. For the second time they have invaded Home, this time to place in jeopardy the liberties of three members of our community. On Tuesday, September 24, a deputy marshal entered the office of *Discontent*, bearing a warrant for the arrest of Charles L. Govan, James W. Adams, J. E. Larkin and G. Morong. The offense charged was that of "depositing lewd, lascivious and obscene matter in the mails," to wit, certain issues of *Discontent*. Comrade Morong is not a member of the colony; but the other three were taken into custody. Our comrades were taken to Spokane, Wash., as provided for in the warrant. Bail was fixed at \$1,000 each. This being furnished, our comrades were released and are with us again. The trial will be held before Judge Hanford, of the federal court, in Tacoma, at its regular session, next February.

The articles complained of are understood to be that of James W. Adams, in No. 128, and especially certain quotations from "The Prodigal Daughter" contained therein; and that of G. Morong, in No. 149. Both of them are quietly argumentative in tone; and neither one contained a line calculated to inflame sensual passions. There is not a word in either which could offend the most susceptible ear. It is purely and solely a question of the right to express honest opinions on the sex question. The issue could not be more clearly drawn. Every American citizen

should be interested in this test case. It is an open secret that a conviction in this case will mean other arrests and a concerted attempt to destroy all discussion of vital social questions. The goodness or badness of the "free love" idea is not involved in the contest. It is simply a question of free speech. Those who believe in ignorance, and in the wanton invasion of individual liberty, will be found ranged on the side of the prosecution. Those who believe that knowledge is essential to progress, and that open discussion is the best roadway to knowledge, will support the defense.

This is no season for indifference. Popular prejudice is relied on to force a conviction. This must be met by a full presentation of the true facts, and of the real animus of the prosecution. The liberties of many others are bound up with the liberties of our persecuted comrades. The case must not be suffered to go by default. It calls for the united support of liberals everywhere, regardless of past divisions. Never mind your personal opinion of *Discontent* or of its contributors. It is your fight, if you believe in free speech at all. The indicted comrades represent the principle of the liberty of the press.—Jas. F. Morton, Jr., in *Discontent*.

The Letter-Box.

J. A. B. Pittsburg, Pa.—"Anarchism and revolutionary Socialism" are the same, both in methods and ends. As soon as "Socialism" enters the political arena, and thus recognizes the State, I do not see how it can be "revolutionary." As to the methods which Anarchists advocate, first and foremost is an educational propaganda. Without intelligence nothing can be expected from any method. "Ancient history" is a very good teacher of methods, and if we would go by actual facts, history shows us that the ballot is futile.

Postal City.—Do not mistake the thieves in the City Hall and Congress for Anarchists. They are exploiters. An Anarchist is not an exploiter. Exploitation is one of the offsprings of government—not of Anarchism.

A dispatch from Rome states that the current issue of our contemporary *L'Agitazione* has been suppressed, owing to an article by Enrico Malatesta on the assassination of President McKinley.

One number of *Neues Leben*, Berlin, the German Anarchist paper, has been confiscated by the police.

Comrade Ciancabilla, editor of *L'Aurora*, has been placed under \$5,000 bonds pending trial. *L'Aurora* continues to make its appearance in spite of the arrest of our comrade.

Opulence is always the product of theft committed, if not by the actual possessor, then by his ancestors.—St. Jerome.

MEMOIRS OF A REVOLUTIONIST.

BY

PETER KROPOTKIN.

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

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

Price \$2.

Send orders to FREE SOCIETY.

HISTORY OF THE COMMUNE 1871.

Translated from the French of

P. O. LISSAGARAY

By ELEANOR MARX AVELING.

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

75 CENTS.

Send orders to FREE SOCIETY.

THE CHICAGO MARTYRS.

THE FAMOUS SPEECHES OF THE EIGHT ANARCHISTS IN COURT

AND

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

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

Price 25 cents.

Send orders to FREE SOCIETY.

MORIBUND SOCIETY AND ANARCHY.

Translated from the French of

JEAN GRAVE

By VOLTAIRINE DE CLEYRE.

CONTENTS:

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

The book is printed in large type, and consists of 176 pages.

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

Send orders to FREE SOCIETY.

BOOK LIST.

ALL ORDERS FOR THE FOLLOWING BOOKS RECEIVED AT THIS OFFICE.

Essays on the Social Problem.....	
.....H. Addis	05
The New Hedonism.....	Grant Allen 05
Plain Words on the Woman	
Question.....	" 05
Prejudice.....	M. Bachman 50
God and the State.....	Bakunin 05
The Same. (London edition.).....	10
The Proletarian Revolt, a History	
of the Paris Commune of 1871.....	
.....G. B. Benham	25
Prodigal Daughter; or, The Price	
of Virtue.....	Rachel Campbell 25
The Worm Turns.....	V. de Cleyre 10
The Evolution of the Family.....	
.....J. M. Crane	05
Evolution of Modesty.....	" 05
The Emancipation of Society from	
Government.....	Dallan Doyle 05
Hilda's Home. Cloth \$1.....	
.....Rosa Graul	50
Moribund Society and Anarchy.	
Cloth 60c.....	Jean Grave 25
A Physician in the House.....	
.....Dr. J. H. Greer	2.75
The Education of the Feminine	
Will.....	Harlor 05
Marriage and Morality.....	
.....Lillian Harman	05
Regeneration of Society.....	" 05
Love in Freedom.....	Moses Harman 05
Motherhood in Freedom.....	" 05
Government Analyzed.....	Kelso 1.00
How to Dispose of Surplus Pro-	
ducts and Employ Surplus Labor.	
.....Kinghorn-Jones	05
Anarchism: Its Philosophy and	
Ideal.....	Peter Kropotkin 05
Anarchist Morality.....	" 05
Law and Authority.....	" 05
Memoirs of a Revolutionist.....	2.00
Paris Commune.....	" 05
The State: Its Historic Role.....	10
The Wage System. Revolution-	
ary Government.....	" 05
History of the Commune. Cloth...	
.....Lissagaray	75
The Economics of Anarchy.....	
.....Dyer D. Lum	25
Anarchy.....	Enrico Malatesta 05
Anarchy. (Is It All a Dream?)	
James F. Morton, Jr.).....	" 10
A Chambermaid's Diary.....	
.....Gustav Mirbeau	50
Commune of Paris.....	Wm. Morris 05
Monopoly.....	" 05
Responsibility and Solidarity in the	
Labor Struggle.....	M. Netlau 05
God and Government: The Siamese	
Twins of Superstition.....	W. Nevill 05
A Cityless and Countryless World.	
Cloth.....	Herman Olerich 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 Com.....	" 25
Our Worship of Primitive Social	
Guesses.....	E. C. Walker 15
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.....	J. Wilson 1.00
The New Dispensation. Cloth. "	1.50
The Coming Woman.....	Lillie White 05
The Chicago Martyrs: The Fam-	
ous Speeches of the Eight Anarch-	
ists in Judge Gary's Court; and	
Altgeld's Reason's for Pardoning	
Fielden, Neebe and Schwab.....	25