The Befrfr.
This is the Nurse's soul; harrowed, long, like their creed,
It changes to the moral soul; or the ear
It unit's the Peter's voice, ruping ear
And in whose lower force is not crushed indeed.
Five hundred years this bell made Nature bleed,
Killing white woman found a living grace
In shame of their fair bodies which Jan gave,
Priests said, to lay on an unloving her
Of passion's worldly, yield it not.
And when it wakes up with the nightshade's abode
To terror round their sleep, and dream,
They keep a phantoms that it might have said:"See, Sisters, rather than take vows which bind
The body when the soul's outgrown that mind."—Muriel Daniel.

Radical Reflections.
I shall not vote in the coming election. I am fully aware that this will be of little consequence so far as concerns the general result of the impending contest; and that, perhaps, is my chief reason for not voting. But I have other reasons, chief among them is that I do not believe in government by the majority, nor by the minority either. I do not believe in government at all. I am an Anarchist.

But even if I were not an Anarchist, I would not vote. In the first place, our ballot system of government is a dismal failure—even if we concede it to be right in theory. There is no honesty in it, no sense manifested in the results; and no good has ever, so far as I know, come out of it. Most of those who seek office are actuated by purely selfish considerations. They want the offices for the emoluments attached thereto. Men who seek an office simply to advance their own interests will not sacrifice their interests for the public weal. They will not even go far out of their way to serve the interests of their constituents, simply because there is nothing in it for them.

Most of those who become candidates are, in the beginning, fairly honest, so far as regards their motives and intentions. But when a man enters politics as a candidate, he discovers that fraud, cunning, hypocrisy, and trickery are methods freely used by his opponents; and to successfully cope with them he must adopt their tactics. He finds that, by experience in so doing, besides being perhaps honestly believes he can use these weapons in an honest cause without any tarnish to his motive and his integrity. But he is mistaken. Fraud and falsehood cannot serve a righteous cause. You may vanquish the devil with his own fire, but you will be pretty sure to come off from the contest with some of the devil's own odor of brimstone about you. The man who resorts to trickery to carry his point, even against wrong, is a greater trickster, and is no better, so far as the morality of his conduct is concerned, than he who uses trickery with less honorable motives.

But, unfortunately, for the candidate who seeks office with honest intentions, and who refuses to suit himself with the practice of deception and fraud, the political forces are all against him. By refusing to be all things to all men, and failing to pander to the ignorance and errors of the social herd, he fails to secure popular favor; and the votes go to the unscrupulous demagogue, who wins approval by pandering to popular prejudice. Hence, the honest politician ever plays the role of an unsuccessful candidate.

Political corruption and dishonesty is so notoriously apparent that even believers in government, advocates of political action, are fully conscious of it. They go on and off office, with the same feeling that, in some mysterious way, conditions will be changed, and that, after a while, enough pure men will be elected to office to ensure an honest administration of public affairs. Their hopes are never realized, however. New men are put in and new parties given control. The trouble is with the system and not with those who administer it. The very nature and principle of government, of human authority, is demoralizing and corrupting. No man can possess the power to rule over others without using that power to his own advancement; and the spirit of selfishness would certainly become non-existent in the man who did not do so. Therefore, as long as human nature is what it is, we cannot expect men in power to disregard their individual interests, nor will they fail to make use of their power to exploit their fellows for their own personal gain.

The man who votes gives a certain degree of approval to the result of the election, even tho be on the defeated side. And that is precisely why I, as an Anarchist, have no business at the polls. I do not wish to be governed; I do not wish to govern others, consequently, I shall act consistently with my professed principles by declining to vote.

Of course, those who take this view will contend that, in declining to vote, I become in a measure responsible for the election of bad men, who by my vote and influence might be defeated instead. But I do not think so. In the first place, a thoroughly honest man has no business to be a candidate for office, for who can say what could happen to him than to be elected. When a man becomes a candidate, he is confronted by one problem: How to secure the largest number of votes. This overshadows all else. To secure the votes of the majority he must of necessity pander to the whims and prejudices of the majority. If he happens to entertain an opinion, of which he knows the majority disapproves, he must be silent—and there he surrenders his independence, and becomes false to himself. He is no longer honest. That is the first step.

Suppose we admit it to be possible for an honest man to be elected. We know, in the first place, that in the administration of any public office, there is continually arising the conflict of interests; and new cases constantly appear, wherein the official must go against the wishes of one person or class of persons, in order to satisfy another person or class. In such a case, the official knows very well that, take whatever side he may, he is pretty sure to array the defeated side against him. Here he is again exposed to temptation—he must choose often between the interest of one person or class of persons, and the interest of political retirement by offending some powerful political element. Can a man so situated remain honestly true to himself and his convictions? Hardly.

But, supposing the possibility of a conscientious official, another question arises. Can a public official be really a servant of the people who elect him? Does the elevation to official power carry with it an endowment of superior wisdom? Are we sure in electing our "servant," that he will know just what is and is not good for us, even if he be willing to act in the interest of his "masters"? If we place our social welfare in the hands of a government, we are compelled to rely upon the wisdom as well as the honesty of those who constitute the government, to do the right thing with the power granted them. But the welfare of society is chiefly a matter of individual opinion. Society is merely an aggregation of separate individualities, in which, aside from those common interests upon which all agree, the vast majority of issues and problems that are constantly arising, are largely matters of individual concern, upon which there is at all times diverging opinion, as conflicting various in the interests of individuals themselves. In this state of affairs, how is it possible for a man, invested with administrative power, to do public business as to give either "justice" or satisfaction to all concerned?

It simply cannot be, and that is precisely why I am an Anarchist. I do not believe that any scheme of government can be devised which the operation of which the interest of all would be suberved. This is because each individual must live his own life, and pursue his happiness in his own way. To the extent that men and women are left free to pursue their ideals and to follow their natural bent are they satisfied and
friction is avoided. The strife and discussion in society, in every instance, is the outcropping of the spirit of authority. I want for every man, woman, and child the right to govern themselves, to do what they like, so long as they live their own lives. Therefore I have no use for the government official, and will not nod in his election.

I am an Anarchist, therefore I will not vote.

— ROSS WINTON

Present Factors in the Struggle for Ideal Social Conditions.

It will be disputed by few who are in touch with modern thought that the present is emphatically a transitional period in social conditions. We stand at the parting of the ways, and across the ever widening chasm of conservatism and radicalism are measuring forces and gathering strength for the impending conflict. Rumors of change are flying thru the air and a decided ferment of the spirit is visible in the minds of men. "Cranks" of every sort are more in evidence than in any preceding epoch, and each herald of a new dispensation garners each to his "cave of Adullam" an army of more or less radical "inspired" readers, each with a considerable following, might readily be cited. These will pass away and their creeds will die with them, but as manifestations of the thought movement of the day, their advent is of a striking significance.

Scarce less numerous are the schools of social and economic thought. Nothing is any longer taken for granted, and the anathema against the removal of ancient landmarks falls on deaf ears. Institutions are being sternly re-examined. The plea of prescription is no longer considered as valid in the domain of ideas. The chaos of standards is everywhere boldly proclaimed. It is the era of man, and he demands that customs cease to assert an a priori prerogative, and become merged to his will. Standards of justice which can abide the sharpest criticism and prove its adaptability to the varying and increasing wants of human beings. We are passing from an old world to a new one, and the old order of things can only escape from the threat of change.

Amid the apparent chaos of conflicting views it may be worth while to note certain streams of tendency, as constituting factors of no small importance in the movement toward social change. Without pronouncing on the merits of the ceaseless conflict between conservatism and radicalism, we can hardly deny that the latter presents the most varied and interesting study. There are many ways of moving, but there is only one way of keeping still. Conservatism should be used as a rudder, not as an anchor, while radicalism is the current by which it performs a great deal of superficial pulling, but, after all, is needed to keep the boat in motion.

The desire for ideal social conditions has been long the prevalent dream of humanity. In its religious aspect it is the kingdom of God on earth. In speculative philosophy it has given birth to Plato's Republic, and later to Utopia and the New Atlantis. It has created the social theories of Jacobins, Fourierism, and St. Simonism. Descending to our own day it has become the main spring of a host of reform and more or less revolutionary movements. Despite its frequent vacillations, it is a healthy symptom of the human mind. "Health" being that divine discontent which makes the present ever a stepping stone to a larger future. It demands sympathetic study, not hasty and wholesale condemnation. It has its pain and its pleasure, its有时 fake, and its genuine. The Populist movement, earnest and conscientious, despite its incoherence, has been greatly misunderstood. Such a tremendous and wide-spread wave of thought does not take place without an adequate cause. No chance word of a popular leader could awaken so tremendous a response, if the conditions were not ripe for the new doctrine. Populism was unspectacular and emotional, hence only transitory in its influence; yet, as well as the New Democracy of Bryan, be spoke a far-reaching desire for a radical change in social conditions. It was a cry for relief. The present concentration of wealth was left to be a menace which must be resisted. Immediate help was sought, with only small regard for remote consequences. It was the effort of the farmer and the small business man in a broad movement to break the water against the rising tide of large commercial combinations. Its remedies were of a specific nature; but its cohesive force was small. To engrat its proposed legislation on the body of popular enthusiasm would be to burden the minds of many, both radicals and conservatives, be an attempt to harmonize the incongruous which could only produce "confusion worse confounded." Nevertheless, in its main principles and essential tenor, it forms the basis of the Bryan Democracy.

Thru the free coinage of silver, it is hoped to increase the volume of the currency and to relieve the congestion of the money market. Government ownership of the means of transportation and other public utilities is expected to break the power of the trusts. Direct legislation and simplified forms of election are relied upon. The government is made more fully in the hands of the great body of the people. These and other measures are ardently championed by the "reform" element as the means of preserving the "cheerful, free, and mental character" and "inhibition of the effete democracy," as adapted to the more complex conditions of today.

Meanwhile, the labor organizations are busy on other lines. They have interests distinctly their own which they seek to protect. It seems to them, that, as civilization is founded on labor, those who do the work of the world should receive greater consideration than is ordinarily accorded to them. They seek a higher relative position, with better opportunities for culture and intellectual development. They insist that no civilization can thrive where labor is not duly honored. They demand protection for higher wages, shorter hours and recognition of their unions, are not mere wishful attempts to stir up trouble, but deliberate steps toward the attainment of an end by which they believe the conditions of society will be raised. While occupying a distinct sphere, the work of the trades unions is frequently found to coincide with that of the various schools of reform, and the issues of the day are not so名列前茅, but instead by any who have not made close and sympathetic study of the present status of the labor movement.

The Single Taxers form a connecting link between the reformers and the revolutionaries. They range all the way from moderates like Tom L. Johnson, to intense radicals such as Bolton Hall and Ernest Crosby. One class of Single Taxers puts forth the doctrine of group ownership of land as the panacea for the social evils; while the other supports it vigorously as the necessary first step in a peaceful but effective social revolution. Henry George's "Progress and Poverty" is still the Bible of the propaganda, altho a considerable body of subsidiary Single Tax literature has been put forth. A tax on land values, as a substitute for all other taxes and made equal to the rental value of the land would, they claim, destroy rent, speculation in land values and all the evils of landownership. It would break the vital monopoly from which all the other monopolies draw their sustenance. The creation of opportunities thus afforded would prevent excessive combination of capital, rob competition of its most destructive feature and afford a healthy stimulus to individual effort. These, in turn, would be maintained by an energetic press, and a corps of able writers and lecturers. Whether their doctrines will be ultimately accepted or not, they certainly contribute to the clearer understanding of the relation of man to the land from which all his wealth is drawn.

The more radical idealists of the day are mainly Socialists or Revolutionaries. The dogma of these schools of thought deserve far better consideration than is given in the conventional caricatures of their teachings. In both are to be found as fine types of intellect and character as are to be found in any other school of thought. The Radical schools are more numerous, and have a larger percentage of the greatest artists, scientists and men of letters of the present day. In certain respects, the two philosophies are closely allied; in others, they differ widely.

The Socialism of today boasts of having advanced from utopianism to a strictly scientific standpoint. Bellamy's "Looking Backward" and similar "social projects of the future" are not seriously considered by modern Socialists. A thorough study of the writings of Karl Marx is necessary in order to obtain a clear conception of the Socialist position. Its cardinal tenet is what is known as the materialistic conception of history. Briefly stated, this asserts that man is led to act solely by the primary necessity of satisfying his material wants. From this mainspring of action have evolved his various characteristics, and all social and political institutions. Change the economic environments, and you change the man and all that pertains to him. This is claimed to be the foundation of the doctrine of evolution, when applied to history and sociology. From this conception follows that of the class struggle, which is looked upon as the inevitable sequel to this principle, and the existence of the biological formula. History appears to them as a struggle between classes, each great epoch being marked by the dominance of a particular class. This struggle is only one, and the same with the triumph of the proletariat—the class on which all the others rest. Hence it is of paramount im
FREE SOCIETY.

portance to infuse a spirit of class consciousness into the wage workers of the world, until, standing together as one body, they possess themselves of political power through the ballot, and transform the social organization into a cooperative commonwealth. This result is inevitable, from the certain working of economic law; and it is imperative for the worker to accede to it, that the intermediate steps may be taken in a more orderly and intelligent manner, and with the minimum of effah or suffering during the transitional period. The constantly increasing momentum of the tendency to large industrial combinations is cited as a proof that a nation must own the trust, and that an industrial commonwealth will inevitably succeed the present political State. Their arguments merit careful attention, even tho' they may not carry complete conviction. The Socialist propaganda is growing with great rapidity, and must be reckoned with as destined to be at least one of the prominent factors in shaping the social conditions of the future.

The Anarchist movement is still less understood than the average legislator. It is essentially a gospel of peace and fraternity, and some of it's prominent advocates go so far as to preach absolute non-resistance; it is still looked upon in many quarters as an instrument to plunder and carve. The Anarchist is simply a disbeliever in the validity and efficacy of government. He holds that the history of mankind shows the worthless character of State control, and that social liberty is based on the individual. Its growth must be from within, according to the laws of organic life. In the words of Walt Whitman: "Produce great persons, the rest follows." Man is naturally a social being. Our artificial social conditions choke out his spontaneity, and place him in an attitude of hostility and aggression toward his fellows. Given equality of opportunity and freedom of action, his normal faculties would speedily gain the ascendency. Our mutual independence is such that self-interest must bind us together in fraternal cooperation, and teach each man to appreciate the rights of others, in order to secure the respect to his own rights. Liberty and responsibility are the great school masters. Cooperative industry, or more probably complete Communism, is expected to be the natural outgrowth of perfect freedom. There would be peace and harmony, not because men would become perfect, but because they would have no possible motive for feud. The Anarchist abstains entirely from political action, believing the true remedy to lie in awakened intelligence. His propaganda is mainly educational, and passive resistance is his most practical means. The so-called Anarchist assassins are individuals who act on their own responsibility. Some Anarchists admire them, while others entirely disapprove of their methods. In any case, they have no connection with the propaganda, and the Anarchist philosophy is in no way at the bottom of their acts.

The foregoing synopsis of some of the facts in the long process of social changes now going on is indeed woefully incomplete. Each of the schools of propaganda deserves long and careful study. The future of hu-

man society is a problem which concerns us all, and it is well worth our while to determine our own position among the conflicting forces. Wherever we take our stand, we cannot afford to be ignorant of the real nature of the different forces involved; for it is out of these that our course of social evolution will be molded.—James F. Morton, Jr., in the Pacific Monthly, July, 1901.

Some Ideas and Inferences.

I am an Anarchist. I believe in absolute individual liberty. Everybody believes in liberty for themselves, but only the Anarchist believes in liberty for all.

The Anarchist believes in liberty as the principle of right action. Restrictions react to the detriment of all. "All men are born free and equal, with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," as our Declaration of Independence affirms, it seems to me the only logical position is that of the Anarchist. In the light of Herbert Spencer's exposition of his own ideas, we know that a government was never organized to secure these rights to men, but was born of aggression and by aggression. The Anarchist's proposition that government is essentially an unjustified assertion to subdue and control.

"It is a matter of self-protection that moves government to stamp out Anarchy." It was a bad oversight in the author of the Declaration of Independence to advocate such revolutionary doctrines. I can understand why the politician has such a horror of Anarchy. He doesn't want to lose his job; and the press and pulpit conservatives of fashion and custom dread a change. But for the citizen or subject of government, there is no danger. The Anarchist is averse to government in all its forms. He would have no more government to stamp out Anarchy.

"It is a matter of self-protection that moves government to stamp out Anarchy." It was a bad oversight in the author of the Declaration of Independence to advocate such revolutionary doctrines. I can understand why the politician has such a horror of Anarchy. He doesn't want to lose his job; and the press and pulpit conservatives of fashion and custom dread a change. But for the citizen or subject of government, there is no danger. The Anarchist is averse to government in all its forms. He would have no more government to stamp out Anarchy.

The Anarchist is only the consistent advocate of liberty, equality, and fraternity. Their liberty is not a mere paper right, but a real experience that is based upon battle flags. It is a principle applicable to human nature. Their equality is the logical conclusion that all men were born free and equal, hence all authority over one's fellows must be a usurpation—a crime. Their fraternity proceeds from their liberty and equality. There can be no perfect love except between equals. It matters not if it be based upon the fatherhood of God, or upon the thesis of Evolution.

I am an Individualist.

Of course, being an Anarchist, and rejecting all authority, I regard an individual as supreme; and therefore, the right to do whatsoever he wills at his own cost. There would be very little invasion under freedom. It is government that teaches men to invade. I deny the proposition of the State Socialist that the individual is indebted to the community, as Mr. Joseph Wood puts it: "We talk about our right to our own. What is our own? We are bankrupts every one except by the grace of the community and our one right is the right to serve." What wonder Herbert Spencer should write of Sociology as the "coming slavery." Community, society, government, God—words to conjure with, but as meaningless as the "social organism." It is the individual who can serve, injure or benefit. Individuals create wealth and individuals should enjoy it. Communism as an institution would enslave the individual, yet I would have wealth in common.

I am a Communist.

I believe that liberty and equality will usher in a fraternity that will ammunicate communism and the greater kindness. With the land and opportunity free, the laborer will no longer work for others, but supply his own needs with his labor. With the wonderful factories for manufacture, the immense aids of inventive genius has placed at his disposal, but usurped by government agents, every man could be independent, and the fear of poverty would be unknown, the incentive to accumulate wealth for any other purpose than use would be gone. Rent, interest, and profit would pass away. It is a mistake to suppose that money consideration of itself is an incentive to labor or invention. When competition is alive. When men labor for the love of their works, art and beauty will be in evidence.

I am an Agnostic.

I believe that the motive of every action is the satisfaction of self, self-protection, self-defence, and the glory of man is self-created and self-maintenance. This principle of selfishness has brought man up from brute to manhood, from being purely self to intelligent self, from gluttony to temperance, and the occupation a greater than he that taketh a city. Let man govern himself.

I am an Evolutionist.

I believe in those laws so ably presented by Darwin and others, "the struggle for existence" and "survival of the fittest." In the realms of Nature these laws were as ruthless before as ever; Man's intelligence gave evolution a new direction. Competition has ruthlessly destroyed the unit. With reason mercy tempered the law, and the individual, though gradually made fit, not thus altruistic motive, but association engendered sympathy, and it became a pleasure to advance the unfortunate. Commercialism has grown into a mighty factor in civilization.

The Anarchist is scientific. It is a well-known fact that our leading scientists are largely Anarchists. Science and literature are our greatest allies. Science has destroyed the power of religious authorities; and it will surely undermine the State. In the future, science will never endorse actions that destroy the social organism. It will endeavor to prove man's sovereignty of self. All forceful authority is fraud, a usurpation and a crime. When man assumes to be his brothers keep him irrevocably develops a tyrant, he is a tyrant, or think alike. Hence when one governs, the other is forced against his will, which renders one a tyrant and the other a slave. Again there is a principle in human nature and it may be seen in the animal kingdom—that rebels against the authority. "A still small voice," assures us we are free, we want no government, and liberty like love "worketh no ill." (Continued on seventh page).
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History of the
French Revolution.
BY C. L. JAMES.
Probably no historical period has commanded so much attention as the French
Revolution. This history needs no commendation to those readers who have been
following the serial in FREEDOM.
It begins with a rapid sketch of history from the earliest times; the decline of
the ancien régime, and the rise of the French monarchy; and traces the causes which made
the Revolution inevitable. The action of the
Revolution is narrated in detail; the most
important events have been given in full.

The French Revolution was the result of a
philosophic conception of the nature of society
and of human freedom. This conception was
made possible by the development of the
philosophy of the French Revolution, which
was based on the idea of the autonomy of
man, and the equality of all men before the
law. The Revolution was therefore a
reaction against the feudal system, and a
liberation from the chains of slavery.

The political philosophies of the
Revolution were based on the idea of
liberty, equality, and fraternity. The
revolutionaries believed in the
possibility of establishing a perfect society
on earth, and they worked towards this end
with a zeal that knows no bounds.
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gress. But I admit the monster was a whooper—likewise the imagination that conceived it, but I really thought Todd was faking—alas! I may live to see another Republican administration if I didn't. Is it possible that Theodore the Terrible is rattled?

I notice that my friend Eugene V. Debs is stumping around over the country in the interest of some one of the numerous Socialist Parties (capitols always used); also in behalf of a prospective boonielet of his own, doubtless. Away back in the long ago, Eugene dreamed one night that the ballot was the only remedy for the wrongs of the American working people. A dream is an inspiration with Gene; he would no more think of ignoring one than of offering a table feline, or beginning a journey on Friday. Accordingly he cast his lot with that small but gallant crowd of scientific class-conscious Socialists who, individually and collectively, are men of religious fervor that they have a lead-pipe clasp upon the world's entire stock of wit and wisdom. Since then, Brother Debs has agitated the turbulent atmosphere which the great war of the politician, but he is not in a congenial element—at heart he is a thorough revolutionist, and above all, a philosophical Anarchist Communist. We love him still, and long to call him to our Anarchistic breast; and for him the ifch, string hangs on the outside. He will come, and we will be happy again. Ross Wren.

Here and There.

P. Calegugno, an Italian Anarchist, recently left the United States for Italy, and on his arrival there was arrested and banished to an island prison. The Spanish government has presented to the Cortes a bill to regulate strikes, that is to suppress them. The same measures have been employed in Portugal, where judicial and executive action is a red flag of Anarchy and the Social Revolution.

Maxim Gorky, the popular novelist of the Russian masses, has been banished by the government to Nogoygorod. He took a ticket for Moscow, and the government accomplished its purpose without giving him the benefit of publicity, by quietly unceremoniously and without warning he was in and attaching it to a special train, which would bid him off to the far west. The re-elected officers of the United Brewery Workmen boldly declare that there is but one party which is willing or able to do something for the workingman, and that is the Socialist party; therefore advise: All workers, men and women, embrace this noble calling. There are men deplorable.

What slaves the above attitude produces, the editor of the Brewer's Gazette gives a striking illustration. In the "LetterBox" he says: "The affair has been before the executive board of the economists, and no steps in reply which would express my personal opinion on the matter. No, no, we keep our hands off." Such is the result of organization and discipline. How fortunate to be an Anarchist editor who always allows his personal opinion, even when it concerns the President of the United States. "The French Women's Suffrage Society has issued an edict," says the Truth Seeker, "that women shall retain their same after marriage, and further that children take the name of the mother." This is another step of the advanced women. Let us hope that she will not pause until she reaches true freedom.

Chicago Meetings.

Lawyer Heckman addressed the Chicago Common Tuesday evening on "Law, and why we need it." Mr. Todd also spoke on "Thrift." Heckman outlined the growth of the American system of government. Todd advised the world to improve its condition by saving up for a rainy day.

Comrade Myers said that such advice, if acted upon, would send us all to hades, as it violated the command of Jesus: "Take no thought for tomorrow."

In the free discussion, the Anarchists and Socialists severally critized the idea advanced by both of the first speakers.

Dr. Woods, in his address before the Anthropological Society, January 12, took for his subject: "Life, and its Purposes." He made the following points: Truth is eternal. Any law binding people prevents growth. Progress is endless: the higher man walks the greater is his impulse to reach still higher places. The purpose or impulse of all life is the desire for self-gratification or pleasureable sensation. Man is simply what his environment makes him.

In the discussion which followed the lecture, the speakers were Mr. Brown, Dr. J. Buelver, A. Izadi, Mrs. F. Varonis, Ross Wre, Moses H. Herman, and several others. All of whom agreed with the first speaker in the main, but strongly dissented from some of his conclusions.

Mr. George A. Schilling spoke at the Philosophical Society, Sunday evening, on the "Conflicts in Economic Thought." He briefly sketched the difference between the economic schools of Socialism, Individualism, Anarchist Communism, and Single Tax. He objected to State Socialism as being destructive of individual liberty, and quoted Herbert Spencer to show that the regime of political Socialism would make of society a vast machine, wherein the State officials would exercise unlimited power over the individual units composing the machine. The speaker confessed his sympathy for the ideals of Anarchist Communism, but announced himself a Single Taxer, who considered the most practical school of economic reform. He objected to Anarchist Communism because of the provision for public enterprises, especially in cases where one person could obstruct the wishes of the entire community. He also quoted John Most as saying that under Anarchist Communism private property would be abolished, which the speaker considered despotic. He admitted that this last proposition was radiated by most Anarchists, and that Most had probably abandoned it.

In the open discussion, a red-hot debate was waged between the Socialists and Single Taxers, in which the honours were about even.

Friday, January 10, Prof. Jacobin lectured before the Daughters of Revolution on the "Schools of the Future." Mrs. Springser, president, and in her introductory remarks she made the sweeping statement that "economics are the basis of all thought." The speaker of the evening pointed out that the industry has been completely revolutionized in the last century, the schools had hardly been touched, and that they were still complying with the ancient methods of teaching, and harrowing the minds of the pupils with rubbish which modern schools ought to abandon. He thus proved that all the economic had been revolutionized, the mass of humanity was still adhering to ancient traditions and customs. His school of the future is an ideal institution, located outside of the cities and its shams, surrounded by laws and trees, where pupils and teachers can study from life and nature. The future school must be free, free from all impositions as to discipline and programs. Nothing but love and talent ought to guide the schools.

An animated discussion took place, in which it was agreed that with the abolition of the present school system, commercialism would have to follow suit. A. Schneider maintained that not only should schools free from punishment or any other punishment of the pupils, but they ought to be free to act, and to disagree with the teachers; for, if the pupil is to excel the teachers, he must have the freedom to disregard old customs and the theories his teachers hold on given subjects. A. Lank pointed out that the future school of the speaker was the ideal and hobby of those who were soon to be departed to an unknown land; and that not one or the professors of the Chicago University will ever be among the Anarchists on the island.

Comrade Hermann spoke before the German Freethought Society on the "State and a Free Society." He gave a short review of history, showing how the State has ever been an instrument of oppression and a stumbling block to progress; while in a nation a natural development would take place, and the economic misery forever be absent. After a lively discussion followed, only the statement that "in a free society everybody would be free to do as he pleases, provided he would not invade others," was severely criticized as a mere metaphysical phrase which means nothing. The critics pointed out that in a properly organised restriction of this kind, a man would infringe upon the rights of others, and that he must take the consequences, and as a man is not desirous either to receive or to inflict pain, he will follow the line of least resistance and live in relative equality with his fellows, if not hampered by government and monopoly.

REPORTER.
FREE SOCIETY.

The First Revel.

"Oh, how I love Elena!" cried Darya Vadimovna, seated at the table beside her. "She is impossible," returned Boris Alexandrovich.

"Ah, I do not think so! I could do as she did," and Darya looked across at Boris wistfully. "I forebode some day I shall see her, too, when I am married—"

"Well, you are not going to know her, or to do as she did, and that is a comfort," Dasha, toss old Tartuffe aside and give me a kiss. Then she was so pretty in your new red gown. When we are married—"

"Yes, yes, when we are married," sighed Darya, gazing thru the window, her eyes resting on the far-away horizon.

Once she was eighteen, and her father, rich Vassili Bakunin, had betrothed her on her last birthday to Boris Alexandrovich Meshkoff. Neighbors congratulated Bakunin on this match, for the young well-to-do, his own master, good looking, and popular. The girl had readily accepted him, and her trousseau was already half completed. She felt herself in luck to find a desirable husband so early. On her nineteenth birthday she would be married, and go away from the rambling old country house where she had been born, to reign in the beautiful cottage that Boris was building on his estate eighteen years away. To this day the field would be clear for Tania, the youngest sister, and how Darya would advise the child when she came back, and how she would help with the wedding clothes.

Darya was small and plump, and her eighteen summers had been passed in happiness—all except the sad time when her mother sickened and died. Darya had wished to die herself then. She felt that her footsteps were to be her dearest wish, and she asked no happier fortune than to be the same industrious housekeeper and cheerful wife. Darya looked forward to married life with pleasant fatality. Boris Alexandrovich was the open door thru which she was to attain the fulfillment of her dreams of domesticity.

Once in every seven days Boris rode over in his carriage, in order to see his bride-to-be. Together they laid plans for the future, talking of a great deal about the new cottage, or walking hand in hand around the farm, where Darya pointed out the fruits of her own labor, and boasted gleefully of her achievements.

And the lover tenderly smoothed the braids that crowned the head of his little Dolinka, and swore that he was the most fortunate man in all that district.

Why should not the girl be perfectly happy? It frightened her to hear herself asking this question one day, for it meant that she was already too near being married. "If I could just turn back and start over,"

"Listen to this, Boris Alexandrovich," cried she. "I sit down at once, and just listen! I have so wanted to read this book to you.——Now, isn't that grand?" as she finished a scene of three pages.

"Poor!—yes, she has been betrothed. He really did not know what to say. He was not used to things people wrote. "But those people—that, that Elena—are they ridiculous. I have her, Darya Bakunina, I think you are in bad company there."

"But I love Elena," cried Darya. This was the same old story, and this time the girl actually sighed. She felt an iron bond tightening on her heart.

"Dushenka, little bird," said Boris, "leave that old scribble-body. The story has no place in my heart."

"You are talking about our dear little songs."

"His words rasped painfully. Darya was staggered by content. She turned toward Boris Alexandrovich, rising slowly from the window-seat, her eyes glittering, her cheeks now ashen white.

"Your house? Your servants? Ah, and your children, I suppose?"

Never before had Darya looked tall, threatening. The abrupt change struck Boris aghast.

"What are you talking about," he stammered.

But the girl could speak no more.

It was frightful. Doubts of the future entered his soul. Anger at Darya filled his heart.

"See what a fool you are getting to be," he said, in a low, harsh tone. "I do not wish for a spoiled woman. Get your crazy notions out of your head—the Lord only knows what led you to them—or you may lose me!"

Darya turned to go, sobbing. Her soft round body quivered with pent-up emotion. She saw only the tears that hung on her cheeks, and the hopelessness that she caught at her hand, and kissed the tips of her rosy fingers. But Darya passed on, sobbing.

"What was the matter?" asked old Vassili, who sat in the opposite corner.

Boris Alexandrovich, barely answering, "Nothing," strode angrily out of the room.

Helen Tutt.
The agitation of economic questions and
especially what is termed the class struggle
in Germany, France, and Russia, has exerted
a powerful influence upon the literature
of those countries, resulting in the present
predomination of what is called school of realism. Today, in France, the
underlying assumption, which forms the
basis of the popular and general literary
productions of that country, is essentially individualistic, or rather Anarchist, while in
Germany the same understanding is strongly
Socialist. While Germany is the home of Socialism, the Anarchist philosophy is strongest in France, hence the contrast between the German and
French schools of realism.

In Russia, where the agitation of political liberty overshadows the economic question, this same spirit of Anarchism pervades the national literature, while America, I am sorry to say, in so far as it has a literature, is either of realism or romanticism, inclines towards Socialism, and the materialism of the German school.

I cannot go into a lengthy dissertation of the
question, but merely call attention to an
important fact. Those who can see in the Anarchist and Socialist movement nothing but a blind spirit of discontent upon the part of those less advanced classes will find, in the literature of today, a refutation of that false conception. These rival forces are crowned upon the world’s brain, and live in the philosophy of the age. They are not enemies; the leading principles of human thought that slowly but inevitably are pushing toward universal recognition.

— Propounds a Poser.

Editor of the Times.—Will some learned
man, versed in the science of psychology, kindly explain why the Tribune can never tell a straight consistent story? In its account of the execution of Czolgosz the unfortu-
nate man is represented as being completely
unworthy at that trying ordeal; yet, according to the Tribune and Russia, has ever
all the questions asked him intelligently, as-
serting that he had no accomplices in the
murder of President McKinley. This showed
a main principle, whether he was telling
the truth or otherwise. Under certain unusual
conditions, a lie may be more than a
man’s credit than the truth. However, a
man’s last word, as a general rule, are not
of such consequence one way or the other as
people in general superstitiously suppose.

But what I want to call attention to at
this writing, is the fact that a certain por-
tion of the well-to-do, fashionable, prosper-
ous portion of the whole body politic under-
stood absolutely nothing about Anarchy
and Anarchists, except that an Anarchist is
a man who occasionally emerges from ob-
scurity with a revolver or dynamite
in order to blast a man’s head off—whether
that be a senator or a president. When I
think of my mother and sisters staring then I cry, cry, cry.” These words from
the pen of Caserio, the murderer of President
Carnot, will show an Anarchist in the light
of a towering human being, of like passions
with his so-called betters, the superior class
who have no experimental knowledge of hunger and cold. The various govern-
ments of the world have been trying for
decades to suppress what is called Anarchist
by physical force, and today Anarchist is about
as much alive as ever it was. Anarchist
in its violent manifestations is merely a des-
perate protest of outraged human nature and
against an intolerable state of affairs, which forms the
body politic, and for one Anarchist executed
there will always be many left to carry on the work, or evil, according
as one views it from the viewpoint of a capitalist or aCommunist.—Frank Fox,
Tampa (Fla.) Times.

— Cry of the Unfortunates.

These broken ones are silent; they know
nothing, they can do nothing, they think
nothing. They simply endure. They are
hungry and cold. Their immediate Liberty appears
through their tatters. Who makes those tatters? The purple. The nakedness of virgins comes from the nudity of adulteresses. From the twisted rage of the daughters of the people fall pearls for the Fontanges and Chateauroux. It is famine that girds Vir-
as. The whole of this living and dying
shadow moves; these spectral forms are in the
pangs of death, the mother’s breast is
blood-stained, for she seeks, on the brain has
no light. The group of the little one is wan.
This whole mass expires and creeps, not
having even the power to
love; and perhaps unknown to them,
while they bow and submit, from all that
was not unconsciousness in which it dwelt, from the inarticulate murmur of those
wretched breaths, mingled together, pro-
ceeded an indescribable, confused voice, a mys-
terious language of expression, according to
the word of spirit, as a man being, Frank Fox,
Tampa (Fla.) Times.

— Some Ideas and Inferences.

(Continued from third page.)

“But Anarchy is dangerous!” Yes; dan-
gerous to vested interests; dangerous to
the peace of the country; but a how to humanity.
For Anarchy means peace.

“And Anarchists have killed governments” It is true that under the name of
Anarchists have killed ignorance, but it is
nowhere manifested in the truth and beauty of
Anarchy. Where an Anarchist has taken
one life, government has killed millions. It is
ludicrous to hear the governmentalist prate of
force on the part of the government, or of
the people to assert force, and tolerate it only
in self-defense. Anarchism means brother-
hood, a “dwelling together in unity.” Anarchism
means liberty, equality, and fra-
ternity.

A. LEVY LOWELL.
The Letter-Box.

J. W. R.—From now on, your friend, Mr. P., will receive the paper regularly. Please feel free to call on your acquaintances. We certainly encourage it. We are all of us friends. The newspapers have been known to quite sincerely, greetings.

F. W. Y.—Thank you for your interest. Each number of distribution has been mailed.

P. O. City—Hilgar is perhaps too hot for them, as you suspect; but he is more than a mere mention in his teachings, and if people do not become thoroughly acquainted, some day they may profit from it.

G. B. Laid, City—From your letter it appears that you are a consistent reader of Peter Kropotkin, and if you have not found "the bugaboo against the State" we give you up as a hopeless case.

Your Edmunds: No, Tom; the Anarchists are not in league with the capitalists, as some socialist papers charge. The Russian government is so rich in its own way, and the central government in Congress to donate a blank check to the benefit of our own government, but we are not making state treaties and just now we are opposed to the central government. You have no doubt that a Socialistic government, even more generous in providing us with the quietude of sedation, but we modestly prefer to take our chances with the hurricane head.
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April 27—The Future Militarism, by Prof. Edmund J. James.

Freimane Gemeinde, (German), Schoenhofer's Hall, Cor. Ashland and Milwaukee Aves., meets every second and fourth Saturday night. The meetings are on the 25th, Jan., 26. Kinder-Bekindung.

Debatir Club No. 1, (German), meets every 1st and 3rd Wednesday night at Fremont's Hall, Halsted, Cor. North Ave.

For New York.


For Boston.


Free Discussions in Chicago.

Pertinent questions are discussed in the following meetings, of which the comity can avail themselves to disseminate our ideas.

Chicago Philosophical Society meets every Sunday evening, 8 p.m., at 26 E. Van Buren St., Hull, 200. Lectures on all questions now regarding the public mind will be delivered. Subject for January 9: How to raise wages. Free speech and exceptions in writing.

The Chicago Anthropological Society meets every Sunday, 8 p.m., at the Masonic Temple, Hall 185.

Chicago Commons, 10 E. Morgan St., and Grand Ave., every Tuesday evening. Thursdays, Jan. 28, Rev. Jones will speak on Anarchism.


April 11—Charity or Justice, Which? by Prof. Emil C. Hirsch.

Order from Free Society.

MEMOIRS OF A REVOLUTIONIST.

By Peter Kropotkin.

This interesting work has now been published in a popular edition. It is not an economical and economical affair can do without it.


Order from Free Society.

History of the Commune 1871.

Translated from the French of P. D. Lissagaray.

By Emile Reclus.

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. Arranged in such a manner that we have made it available for the publishers enable us to sell the book.

The book contains 240 pages, and one of its authors. It is excellently printed and well bound; 52 cents.

Price $2.50.

Order to Free Society.

The Chicago Martyrs.

By Peter Kropotkin.

This book contains a half-tome picture of our eight comrades and one of the monument erected at Waldbrothers to the memory of our murdered by the government. This is the best edition of the book ever printed. It contains 160 pages.

Price 25 cents.

Order to Free Society.

MORIIBUND SOCIETY AND ANARCHY.

Translated from the French of Jean Grave.

By YOMAR DES CLAYRES.

Contents:


The book is printed in large type, and consists of 170 pages.

Price, paper cover, 60 cents; bound 80 cents.

Order to Free Society.
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