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To Any Natural Child,

Sweet babe, when the gentle warm and blame
Thee for the depth, and rye: "They hast no name;" Then art the child of passion and of shame,

Ignorant, walking on the world's highway
Full of great purpose, and thou shouldst stay
To answer with poor Cato's bidding, say:

"A name is but a sound to mark a thing
Conveniently for thought; can it make any
The silent work or give the work a wage?"

"The only name of worth is that I am,
By my own kindly deeds for my soul make;
Illustrious men have walked the path I take.

Who reads the verses of Thoreau,
And trembles for his life and love?
Or doth a bard a heartless base?

Who looks at Filipino girls' salted
With griefed heart suggests that is paint
Brought by a human man say had a birth right?

And who are those, children of sins undead,
Born of delusion? Love the world minded dead,
About whose form burned from her light has shone?

Catherine the First, De Castro, and Carthage,
James Bovee and John Burgess, Athlete.
And Archipelago the Macabre,

"Always, too many in love ones,
And for me for me, since I desire
Neither your failing favor nor love here."

-Marcus Fenwick

Radical Reflections

Life and love and death are the three great facts of human existence. From whence man comes and whither he goes is the great problem of all ages. Creeds and faiths that offer a solution, and after his own manner, to this problem, have waxed and waned; and religions founded upon these solutions have come and gone, and the world is no wiser upon this subject today than when the first men walked the earth. In the presence of this profound mystery of the beginning of life we know nothing, and of what lies beyond the mysterious portal of the grave we are as yet in darkness. Science has disclosed the material world of death; but not one ray has fallen upon this great issue. Until some departed spirit shall reveal the boundaries of death to answer this interrogation, frail humanity will grope in the dark with only the faint and flickering light of reason for its guide.

If death be a prelude or an appendix we shall not say; but this we know, that a man's life is but a vain, that the work and worth of a great and loving soul will survive the Nirvana of death, and that just and righteous deeds will vanquish the power of the grave. If man himself is a temporal, his deeds are; for the evil and the good that men do live after them.

If there be an immortal part to life it is love. Life is born of love. It is love that produces the fruits of hope and joy above the cradle; life with the arrow and song, and lives death's only remnant along the portal of the tomb. It was the inspiration of love that whispered first to man the hope of immortality, and in the clime of love the sun of this strong and radiant hope shines forever upon the equinox of the grave. We love, and parting with our loved ones here, we linger upon the lakeshore, and there we shall meet again, where life eternal is our own and parting pangs are not.

Passing from the consideration of life's origin and the mountain destiny of the race, arises, is life worth the living? The man or woman who is born to poverty, and condemned by the high court of circumstance to life of ceaseless toil, denied the pleasure of travel and freedom, living a life of barren existence, robbed, it may be even of children's joys, and denied all access to the world of social enjoyment—does his life is worth living. Poverty, the prison-house of hope, the tomb of aspiration, throws its shackles shadows across millions of lives; and builds in the midst of Nature's paradise a hell as awful as reality as the Inferno of Dante's imagination. Poverty is the supreme curse of all ages. It has robbed childhood of joy, made manhood a maimed slave, and filled old age with hopeless despair. Over the era it breathes a prophecy of woe, and upon the cages of the future it paints the phantasmagoric forms of fear and famine. It steals from life its morning and makes existence's eye a night of rayless gloom. Into the windowless dungeon of poverty no ray of the sunshine of Hope ever penetrates to warm the flowers of love, or give life to the unborn aspirations of mind and soul. A few great minds, heroes, souls with immortal courage, and endowed with the irresistible spirit of the omnipotent gods, have thrown down the walls and broken immeasurable hars of poverty's environments; but their number is pitifully small. To the great, numbed mass, for whom poverty was not, therefore comes no call, till the great and silent masses summon them to eternal sleep.

I hate poverty. Its miserable clutch has crushed and is crushing the hearts of millions of the race, and best. Its honey finger has fancied the brow, and stilled the hearts of noble men and loving women through countless ages. Its thirty hand has held the throat of humanity too long. It should have no place in this life, in this world of sunshine and joy and plenty. It has no right to be here at all. Nature has provided an abundance for all her sons and daughters, and not one need lacks a fulfilling of her bounty. Nature is not at fault. It is man himself, with his blundering attempts at civilization, building his artificial systems of social order that is crushing the life and hope and happiness of the many for the pleasure and profit of the few. That's why the voice of nature is uttered by Socialism. As long as gorged indolence and famished industry are the two extremes of the social life, the world will be a battle field, and human brotherhood an impossible dream.*

Life without opportunity is not worth the living. Every man and woman is the right hand to all that nature has bestowed upon all that humanity has achieved. Man is neither a vegetable nor a beast. Something besides air, soil, and sunshine are necessary for his happiness, to make his life worth possessing. Life is worthless without liberty—liberty to pursue one's happiness in peace and its fruits. The denial of liberty is the basic cause of all social unhappiness. The liberty to labor and the liberty to enjoy the fruits of one's labor is life's first inalienable right. The child that is born into this world without even a tax-title to one foot of its soil is a slave, and for such liberty is as unattainable as water to Dives in hell. The man who holds the right to monopolize and murder, and for his individual needs is a tyrant and a criminal. The rent-taker is a legal bandit whose moral justification is no greater than that of the masked highwayman.

I suppose this all sounds very strange to some of you, but it is exactly what I think. I do not believe that life will ever be a success so long as there is so much social unrest and its cause, individual unhappiness. And I know that the only cure for this will never be happy until the causes of poverty are eliminated. I do not advocate an equal division of the world's wealth; but I want a general distribution of the world's opportunities to create wealth.

In every life, the great main spring of individual action is the desire for happiness. If all the efforts of all the people are directed to the achievement of happiness, how does it happen that there is so much unhappiness? Why has such an unnecessary concentration of human effort resulted in such stupendous futility? It is because such efforts have been misdirected. No one ever does anything because he expects to be made une by it, but to the exact contrary. A very little while ago people were foolish enough to think that social happiness could be promoted by compelling everybody to think alike on matters of religion. In accordance with this false idea the Inquisition was established, and thousands of men and women were tortured and slain by fire and sword; and the world was made miserable by savage persecutions for conscience sake. But after a while the race became a little more enlightened; and it was discovered
Moral and physical sufferings of countless humble producers on the one side, while on the other are seen so many not only favored by fortune but in a position to abandon themselves entirely to the joys and pleasures of existence, things which all should share in, and which all may have a chance of doing in the future society where every man will feel a member of one family. For long years our proletarian fathers, imbued more or less with the ideas of the philosophers and humanitarians, never hesitated, to take up the sword to obtain what there might be of justice, equality, and liberty. We recognize and deeply deplore that in 1789, we are averse to massacre, but despite this repugnance we are obliged to declare that in order to bring about the collapse of the present social condition, a collapse inevitable owing to its disintegration, events may lead us to surpass the acts even of our predecessors.

The year 1792, by its grim violence, produced remarkable effects throughout Europe. Everywhere the weak were becoming powerful, yet failed to found a society durable yet just, or wherein all should find prosperity or well-being. Again, we know the result of the revolts in 1836, 1848, 1871. It seems therefore; the duty of each of us to examine patiently into the economic and political situation of the country as it appeared before and after each rising, to ascertain how these men manifested themselves; then comparing the past with the present, we shall learn how necessary it is for the proletarian to seek a new base of action before endeavoring to plant the seed of a great, not only social but international rebellion. For this is the end to which we expect to put the General Strike, in these days recognizing it as the only method by which to advance curiously. At the same time, we wish our adversaries to understand that we have no intention to disseminate the idea, dogmatically—that is, as an argument of a general one. But we have at least been able to show that we deem efficient, we expect our opponents to offer some comprehensive, workable scheme in its place, and not a secret one claimed by our comrades of the Parti Ouvrier Francais.

We consider also that every man claiming belief in revolutionary Socialism should accept any and every method, general strike or not, that may lead us to our end, abandoning not only from criticizing principles, but doing his best to help the promoters in the spread of such ideas; otherwise these captious revolutionists are little more than talkers, illusory reasoners, from whom we should keep as far as possible.

Other comrades may say: Instead of circumscribing such revolutionary ideas, why not pledge the people to send representatives to their executive bodies, and then say, capable of carrying them the popular demands? And what are we to expect from a regime where all is founded perhaps, upon personal ambition? Is not the existence of parliaments the actual source of political decay among the proletarians, and it is its keeping alive the hope of future prosperity through methods known to the enemies of ambition, to all enlightened men, as futile? In any case, does not the past lie before us to prove that humanity in its march to emancipation has no halting-place sustained by blood, and it is this very past which urges us to say to all: If you desire what is essential to your welfare, take it!

We now examine into the possibilities of this great movement and explain the real meaning of the phrase General Strike. We do not believe in encouraging partial strikes; we think them of little use even when it is possible to have existed because these results are never commensurate with the sacrifices entailed and are powerless to permanently improve the social position. Who, indeed, could undertake to prove that partial strikes have so far been a means of relieving the proletarian? Do we not still remember the famous strike of English engineers, of an organization numbering thousands, which in spite of international encouragement ended pitifully, little, it must be confessed, to our surprise, since it was an undeniable truth that meager earnings of a stated number of workers are hardly likely to receive a more favorable result than they have been assailed by the masters. It is, therefore, useless for the worker to enter into a struggle against finance. Looking then at the General Strike from this standpoint, and taking it into consideration that the support the entire workers receive from the administration which places at their disposal all the organized social forces, such as the magistracy, the power, and the troops, many intelligent workers have fully grasped the futility of partial strikes and believe that perhaps more can be done through the organization of unions and groups when attending decisive action in this direction.

We do not think a general strike can be decreed in advance; it is impossible to predict the moment when it should break out, but what we do believe possible is the preparation for that moment; and it is in this end that we urge the federations of groups and unions every where and the union of all such federations into a confederation so strong and so powerful as to be capable of precipitating a declaration of the movement; by means of its organization of the General Strike this confederation must be able to communicate instantly with all the federated bodies and so secure combined action. At the close of 1899, there were both preparation and declaration, but they failed. The chief cause of this failure was due to the then government, which confiscated all correspondence addressed to the unions. In view of this, we suggest as a practical method not the utilization of the mails alone as in the past, but the despatch of a body of delegates charged with the custody of a duplicate circular to the various organizations.

We shall not cease to preach organization as this subject pervades throughout the past many revolutionary movements which might have had a chance of success, but have been started, and if the people were unable to derive any benefit therefrom or good from the results it was the insufficient preparation. We also consider that the general strike, if it is to bear fruit, should not be merely provincial or national, but international in the widest sense; for the annals of history prove that the reason most of such
revoluions have hitherto failed is due to the movement having been enelosed in too narrow a circle; this it was that really killed the Commune of 1871. At the present moment we are forced to admit that the word Revolution no longer excites any enthusiasm, because they are prepared to pary every phase of an insurgent movement; whereas a general strike on the contrary, is to them an absolutely unknown quantity, since its cost cannot be measured. But it is needless to dwell on the fear of the bourgeoise with regard to this matter; barely had the workmen's congress voted upon it when parliament broached several laws destined to cancel the right to strike of certain classes of workers, nor would the famous Merlin-Thomas scheme have been voted upon but for the threats of a general strike etc. Also, was it not the commencement of a general strike proclaimed in Belgium in 1893 that advanced the cause even if only partially, of universal suffrage in that country? We think that these incidents are too significant for the efficacy of the principle the we advocate to be ignored.

And, if, comparatively speaking, the proletariat is so capable of maneuvering a partial strike, how easy it might be to start a general strike?

**Partial strike:** the chief question at stake is a rise in wages, and no possibility of carrying the struggle through without a certain amount of money in hand or collective distribution, the financial position always determining our success or failure.

**General strike:** here, on the contrary, if we think that it is immediate and according to our requirements, as little money as possible, even none would be best, each man satisfying his own special needs where he can, with the one aim in view of acquiring the fullest emancipation possible.

We conclude by inviting all who are anxious to their future, not only to accept this principle, but to assist us in the task of propagandizing.—Report to the Paris Anarchist Congress of the Revolutionary Socialist Party, Paris, France.

**Liberty, License, Freedom.**

License is the abused word of the three.

**Enemies towards Anarchy and liberty use that word with the idea of keeping oppression upon the moment for greater purity and freedom among the lower classes.**

Ours is mightier than our sword. With its strange power we will endeavor to expose the deep ignorance of our backward enemies.

Mr. Enemy you profess that Anarchy should be stamped out since it means license. If this message was delivered by agraphophone you might hear a laugh coming out at this point. Ha! Ha! What impurities the idea of license conjures up! The saloon fills your mind as the most conspicuous thing on earth that has a license. I'm not stopping at a saloon just now, so I will go on to say that everybody else nowadays must get his license to do business. Anarchists will agree with you that license is a very obnoxious thing. If you desire to stamp out licenses Anarchists are willing to aid us in that humble enterprise.

Let us suppose (pardon the doubts) you are a devout specimen and attend divine worship. It appears that all clergymen in good or bad standing must take out a license to preach their doctrines. Anarchists don't take any licenses. It must be that professional jealousy lies concealed in the rose like a rosebud. Prohibitionists have worked up a tremendous Carrie Nation-like fit of anger against saloon keepers, although they have their license to do business. The old story to license the old story is based on the antipathy towards beer stations.

What if you fall madly in love with the luminous lips and lustrous eyes of a voluptuous Venus? You must look before you leap.

The statutes say you must take out Cupid's yoke and a license before you and she twain become one flesh. Yes, license is a horrible thing, simply detestable.

Theorists say our heads are full of bumps, not wheels. It is owing to the different sizes of bombs that people choose their profession when at liberty to make a choice. Some are terroristic, and use their bombs to sway up a horridly expensive army and navy all over the world. Are you in love with the soldier because he has taken out his license to commit contract murder? Is it just as vile, cowardly and contemptible for our American boys (as the under orders) to assassinate Filipino ladies and gentis as for a man without a license to drive a bullet into the heart of an ideal gentleman, a man who had the misfortune to be filling out the obscene custom of controlling the minds and destinies of millions of people. Then followed the judicial murder for which they had a license—then a walk to the Anarchist, but Mr. Enemy how about license? Do you like it as much as ever? Anarchists are not libertines like the saintly Mornong, altho' they do occasionally attempt to gratify normal appetites and desires without a license. This licensing business is nearest the baldheaded, a tax on honesty and a premium for dishonesty. Fugaces and fugitives take out a license. It is one of these invisible methods of taxing labor which labor would have discovered and discovered long ago if Mr. Enemy had a license against Anarchy, calling it license. You are said because it doesn't take out a license to preach its doctrines. Those who encourage man governments are as hard to convince as those who don't believe in high or low license. 

- MARY HUSTON

**Freedom.**

The intellectual activity that is born of freedom made Greece glorious; made Rome great; made some medieval European cities famous; has given England her power in the world and has placed America at the front line of modern civilization. It is in this intellectual activity drawing its inspiration from freedom that has spanned the continents with that political leavening has brought the different parts of the earth together, that has built cities and given its progress to the world.

We discover that the commercial momentum has carried us to a point where commercialism in itself has become an object and man is made incidental; material development has become an object instead of a means to an end, and the human hands that are to make it are looked upon merely as so many machines, so many means to an end, workers and no more, and there is no individuality in the work and it has no sentiment, it cannot understand high ideals, it does not know of any high standards, it can see nothing but a dollar mark. It does not look towards the instrument that made it, possible for these men to make men narrow. It drives up the more tender and more noble qualities of the soul and makes them fierce money getters.

We all admire the captains of industry, great railroad men, great manufacturers and great merchants. They stand in place of the generals of the past. But they have no right to strange free institutions. They did not make this country. They did not make the free soil. They must not dominate the nation nor the state. These captains sat down by the wayside of commerce and waxed rich and many of them used the government to exploit the people. It was the labor of the man and the women that were building homes, cultivating fields, slaying in factories, operating railroads, teaching schools and doing the country's work that made it possible for these captains of industry to assume their gigantic form. I believe that the man and the women who in tears and in sorrow have worked and have wept, have plowed and have watered, have sown and have watched, and were not permitted to repel, will sit nearer the head of the table at the great banquet of destiny than will the men who simply gathered the harvest.

The world is not going backward. Viewed from headland to headland the march of the human race is upward. True, every forward movement seems to be followed by a short reactionary step. The waves of the tides of civilization roll on majestically, and they roll back again, but the next wave that comes will roll further up than the last, and I believe that the world is on the threshold of a new development, of a new industrial, economic and social existence based upon justice.

As religions freedom gave the world a new birth, as political freedom gave it a new development, so industrial freedom and social justice will lead mankind to the highest plane of human felicity. But if we would be harbingers of the new time we must not pull down our altars. We must protect the rights of the citizen, we must maintain American standards, we must uphold the right of assembly, and we must preserve free speech and a free press. We are not ready to admit that the fathers were wrong—we are not ready to apologize for their immortal words and to substitute mediocrity for their graves. All of our greatness was born of liberty, even our commercialism was born in the cradle of democracy, and we cannot change the most without destroying her children—John P. Albright in his speech at the University of Michigan, Dec. 14, 1901.
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CHICAGO, SUNDAY, JANUARY 24, 1902.

Current Comment.

It is perfectly unnecessary to advise the Socialists to "get together." Whenever they do so, it generally requires more plCapital and labor to separate them.

Chicago is pretty well supplied with gods, however near they may be on other points. We have with us both Kosutic and Donohue, each of whom claims to be the only god there is. But a stranger who might happen to stumble into this quiet country village would scarcely mistake the place for heaven, even tho' it be the abode of the gods. More likely he'd imagine that he had hit the other place. What we need, by way of variety, is a good, active devil, and we have no lack of material for that article either.

Egotism is not a characteristic of the editor of "Why?" A Single Tax monthly that drifted in the other day. He says: "The February issue of "Why?" will contain an article by Robert Cummins on 'Who shall own the land?, which is shown how equitable taxation will eliminate that element from society.' If congress can only be induced to grab hold of the "Why?" for the Federals, it will be saved a vast deal of effort and worry in eliminating 'Anarchism from society.' When Mr. Cummins introduces his equitable taxation (as he's pleasanter to general notice), I will undertake to go along better with a red-hot scythe in a glass case.

Prince Henry, of Prussia, is about to honor us with a visit. By "us" I do not refer to the members of FREE SOCIETY, nor to the American people. The latter may, perchance, be permitted to forget their gaze upon a real live prince, but we do not expect Henry will really have the time to drop around at this office to renew his acquaintance with FREE SOCIETY. His visit will be largely a state affair, and his entertainments will be for the most part members of the nobility of America—the crownless aristocrats. The public of Chicago has been imbued with a profound admiration for the note of European royalty, and they who dare not express a series of ecstatic thrills at this opportunity to tick the boots of this worthless Prussian parasite.

Professor Charles W. Pearson, of the Methodist Northwestern University, has gotten himself into hot water by declaring that he does not believe the Bible to be inspired, and that most of its miracles are myths. The Methodist Church seems to be in a bad way. With inanity in its pews, higher criticism penetrating all its pulpits, and now rank skepticism holding forth from its university chairs, it is about time for the faithful to take their hands and find out what they are up to. The faculty of the Northwestern University had best get a Chicago hustle on them, and go after an injunction to stop this progressive professor's think, do it (p. d. i.), or first thing they know he will blow out as a full-fledged disciple of Robert Ingersoll—a good god, or devil.

A lot of reporterial pin-heads employed as news-gatherers for Chicago's daily press, have been trying pretty hard to work up an 'Anarchist scare,' in connection with the proposed visit of Prince Henry to this city. These sensational reports deserve considerable more attention than is being given them. These pencil-shavers are past-masters in the art of lying. The habit has so grown upon them that they are almost incapable of telling the truth. They can't even write a three-line description of a catastrophe without misstating the facts. If one of the Chicago newspaper fraternity were ever employed to revise the Old Testament, he would report Adam as coming out of the dust of the ground instead of as dust, as the Jewish scholars taught. He'd put Cain in Noah's ark, and add a full column personal interview with the devil to the Apocalypse. A certain literary magazine once offered a prize for the most unanswerable lie. The editor received one that began: "Once there was a truthful reporter who worked for a Chicago daily. . . ." He read no farther, but closed the contest and awarded him the prize to those whose lie was a lie that could not be hushed. All this to-morrow about the Kaiser's brother is nauseating. Anarchists have not the slightest interest in his movements. Let him come, and let the empty-pocket sobriety of Chicago mangle their slober with linheimer and saucroth, and bathe it in the scented waters of their adduction to their heart's content; let them throw their full over this royal bumb, who, were he shorn of his egotistic title, would perchance find it difficult to get a job as a hotel man; let them focus a crowd on him at some fashionable late front-lash messiness, where, under other circumstances, his talents might be displayed in the capacity of chambermaid, or underling of the vessel of dishonor. Chicago Anarchists are occupied with weightier matters. Ross Wax.

La Protesa Ominosa is the title of a new monthly Anarchist review which is shortly to appear in Chicago. It will be in the language of the people, and its publishers are C. C. Cassuballa, formerly of the same and E. Trulturco. Subscription, $1.00 a year. Published at 515 Carroll Ave., Chicago.

Danger.

I am not an alarmist. And while I see no occasion for Anarchists to be nervous over the threatened anti-Anarchist legislation by congress, I do see some grounds for apprehension. But the part of all believers in free speech and press and freedom of action is being done and said by the national legislature at this time, but rather on account of what is not said. The present silence of the government is more ominous than the threats of its pamphlets. It is possible that the subject is to be ignored, until the public has forgotten it; and then, at the last day's session, an eleven-hour measure will be rushed thru without debate, without consideration and without publicity. A law, thus smuggled thru, might contain such a blow at free speech as would not only stifle the educational propaganda of Anarchism, but include other forces of protest and criticism directed against the ruling power; and this dreguote of repression would undoubtedly secure the signature of President Roosevelt.

This is what we have to fear, and this is what we desire. We desire publicity. If congress is to enact laws effecting the propagation of certain ideas, the general public should demand a full and open discussion of those ideas, and if these laws are to be proposed. Free speech and free press is involved. Democrats, Socialists, Single Taxers, and Trade Unionists, are all concerned in this matter. Let them speak. Anarchists are positively desirous of full investigation by congress of their aims, principles and methods. If Anarchism cannot stand the light of public scrutiny, we do not desire indulgence, and will not ask for it. But since we deny that we are criminals, and insist that the propaganda of our ideas and ideals is not calculated to inspire deeds of crime, we believe that we have a right to demand of the law makers a full investigation of the subject before they act.

If our opponents are honest they will not hesitate to deal with us in a public manner. We are not concerned with those who are really interested in the propagation of ideas. They are not honest. They have no intention of dealing with this matter fairly. They are asleep. We are concerned that any direct legislation aimed at the suppression of ideas and opinions, however unpopular, would be blown to fragments by the storm of public protest. Unsubmitted to general inspection and criticism.

For this reason I suspect that the foes of speech and press in congress are playing a waiting game, with the intention of rushing this legislation thru at the last moment, when the public is too busy and, half of the congressmen are celebrating adjournment with the usual debuca. Anarchism has everthing to gain by public discussion. Now is the time for us to hold a hearing. Let us train our batteries upon congress and demand publicity and investigation. But whatever legislation congress may enact, it will not stay the growth of Anarchism throughout the country. The brain cannot be chained by law. The history of mankind proves the inability of clubs and laws to stay the rising tide of intellectual advance. Truth ever triumphs. Nothing can stay the irresistible march of the day." Ross Wax.
Here and There.

Ever since Friday morning a heavy snow has been falling in Milwaukee, while its father has been threats to the streets in a way would enable him to give its protection to the sweepers at the southern end of the town. The snowfall isheavy, and another inch of snow has been deposited since yesterday morning, making it difficult for the sweepers to do their work.

This is civilization’s proclamation of universal prosperity.

During an agrarian riot in the village of Wittenberg, Wisconsin, on Thursday night, the rioters attempted to burn the home of a local farmer who refused to pay them a portion of his corn. The rioters were ultimately dispersed by the local sheriff, and no injuries were reported.

A fierce insurrection has broken out in southern Russia, with the prospect of engulfing the entire island. The insurgents are trying to overthrow Japan’s authority.

The police of this city have attempted to organize a union of their own, but they got a dose of what they have been, for years, helping to give law. The chief ordered them to disband, and they disbanded. The leader of the insurrection is Frank B. Colson, who is leading his “brothers,” and invited the police to join with organized labor. The policemen very sensibly declined, as follows:

It was proposed to the police organization that they go into the service. This question has been discussed and we have come to a conclusion that an organization of policemen cannot join with others, but must stand by itself. In the case of unionism we might be compelled to fight against the men who could be defeated by force.

The strike situation at Barcelona, Spain, is said to be so alarming that large reinforcements of troops have been concentrated about the city. The strikes now numbered 20,000.

In Germany the industrial depression is assumed alarming proportions. The suffering among the poor is intense. Street riots have occurred in Frankfurt-on-the-Main. Meanwhile the Reichstag discusses the high tariff.

The Polish minister, Henry Sienkiewicz, has been arrested in Poznan for “treason.” He protested against the barbarous methods adopted by the German government in forcing the Poles to leave their homes. The German government is very sensitive.

A new Russian monthly publication, The Free World, has appeared. The publisher is A. Tchertkov, Christchurch, New Zealand. Price 2 a year.

The Congo Free State government—perhaps we should say its agents—is showing what Christians are capable of in their dealings with the black “heathen” of Africa. Captain Guay Burrows, who has lately completed six years’ service on the Upper Congo, has been interviewed by a British representative. He says he has “sworn” to the cruelty of the most horrible kind, and “photographic evidence of atrocities” cannot be denied. “I have in my dispatch book,” he says, “sworn evidence of a Belgian landing over natives to the cannibal tribes for the express purpose of being eaten, and of paying their workpeople with corpses of murdered natives.” It would be hard to limit these horrors.

Chicago Meetings.

The Reporters owe Mrs. Springer, president of the Daughters of Revolution, a large debt of gratitude for the hospitality and kindness she showed them. She said that she didn’t say “Americanism is the basis of all thought?” as reported, but that “activity is the basis of all thought.”

Sunday, January 19, H. H. Harlingue addressed the Philosophical Society on “How to Raise Wages.” He traced the cause of low wages to land monopoly. He defended competition and denied that free competition had any effect at the present time. The man of work was the spectre that never left the spectre that never left the man working for low wages. To abolish the unemployed, land must be made safe and cheap. “The Single Tax,” he said, “is the most practical method of accomplishing this result.

A. I. Sabin said that monopoly was the tragedy of government, and that under Anarchism there could be no special privilege, consequently all functions would cease. He said that wage slavery did not result from the amount of wages received by the worker, but from the fact that he did not receive the full product of his labor, which would abolish the wage system altogether.

A. B. Sweeney said that the Single Tax was only a reform, that what Socialists wanted was a complete revolution that would abolish the wage system altogether. Several other speakers were made by people whose names the reporter failed to get.

At the Chicago Commons, January 21, President Perkins, of the Gigamakers’ International Union, and Secretary Thompson of the Federation of Labor, were the chief speakers. Their remarks were largely confined to the trades union aspect of the economic question. Mr. Perkins said that the trades unions, in holding up wages, benefited society generally, and contended that the higher wages were paid by the employer and not by the consumers of labor products.

A. Schneider disputed this, and asserted that the price of labor and labor products always fluctuate together. He thought that, since Combes and Mark Hinson had traced labor to its sources, there would have been no further occasion for strikes, as these great and good men would have learned to settle all difficulties and differences between labor and capital.

The usual discussion followed the addresses of the evening, in which all sides were given a chance to present their ideas.

Geo. W. Beacelle addressed the Anthropological Society Sunday, January 19, on “Law as a Social Institution.” He defined law as “a rule for external action, enforced by a supreme political authority.” He said that this was the only social institution that could work. The Anglo-French, of whom we are descendants, instituted thraldom, wherein the subordinate wore an iron ring around their necks, and were sold with the soil. Power would prevail over the weak and helpless. The power of the state, he said, was the power of the people. This power should be held by a political unit. No person sold

Chicago Meetings.

The Reporters owe Mrs. Springer, president of the Daughters of Revolution, a large debt of gratitude for the hospitality and kindness she showed them. She said that she didn’t say “Americanism is the basis of all thought?” as reported, but that “activity is the basis of all thought.”

Sunday, January 19, H. H. Harlingue addressed the Philosophical Society on “How to Raise Wages.” He traced the cause of low wages to land monopoly. He defended competition and denied that free competition had any effect at the present time. The man of work was the spectre that never left the spectre that never left the man working for low wages. To abolish the unemployed, land must be made safe and cheap. “The Single Tax,” he said, “is the most practical method of accomplishing this result.

A. I. Sabin said that monopoly was the tragedy of government, and that under Anarchism there could be no special privilege, consequently all functions would cease. He said that wage slavery did not result from the amount of wages received by the worker, but from the fact that he did not receive the full product of his labor, which would abolish the wage system altogether.

A. B. Sweeney said that the Single Tax was only a reform, that what Socialists wanted was a complete revolution that would abolish the wage system altogether. Several other speakers were made by people whose names the reporter failed to get.

At the Chicago Commons, January 21, President Perkins, of the Gigamakers’ International Union, and Secretary Thompson of the Federation of Labor, were the chief speakers. Their remarks were largely confined to the trades union aspect of the economic question. Mr. Perkins said that the trades unions, in holding up wages, benefited society generally, and contended that the higher wages were paid by the employer and not by the consumers of labor products.

A. Schneider disputed this, and asserted that the price of labor and labor products always fluctuate together. He thought that, since Combes and Mark Hinson had traced labor to its sources, there would have been no further occasion for strikes, as these great and good men would have learned to settle all difficulties and differences between labor and capital.

The usual discussion followed the addresses of the evening, in which all sides were given a chance to present their ideas.

Geo. W. Beacelle addressed the Anthropological Society Sunday, January 19, on “Law as a Social Institution.” He defined law as “a rule for external action, enforced by a supreme political authority.” He said that this was the only social institution that could work. The Anglo-French, of whom we are descendants, instituted thraldom, wherein the subordinate wore an iron ring around their necks, and were sold with the soil. Power would prevail over the weak and helpless. The power of the state, he said, was the power of the people. This power should be held by a political unit. No person sold

down by legislation.

In the discussion which followed the lecture, Dr. Chas. J. Lewis said that the State takes its authority and power, and all its duties are imposed upon its citizens to safeguard its officials. This duty is accepted by the people to please the politicians. The theory was that the end—justice and imputed duty and the means. Political leaders formulate the law, the enforcement of which brings the social order into a fluidity, which greatly retards social progress. That law tends to social increases is exemplified by the fact that all legal institutions are governed but only some of which belong to a barbaric age. In every nation, the majority allow themselves to be dragged along more or less like an inert mass. Emerson probably said this in view when he said that genius should be marked: “Good for this trip only.”

Several other speakers expressed various dissenting opinions, and the debate adjourned.

An Enquiry.

A stranger, a student at Earlham College, Richmond, Indiana, wrote to me, without giving his name I send you my reply.

San Francisco, January 18, 1902.

Dear Sir,—Yours of January 2 to hand, in which you ask if congress has the power to legislate against Anarchist. It is pleasing to know that some one is thinking. Yes, congress can do anything the majority wish; and the majority of the exceedingly small minority of the government—a majority of one of the supreme court—can quash it. Could anything more childish, or rather idiotic, ever be conceived? I think not. Majority rule means that one fool and a half fool can compel one wise, noble man to do their bidding, or suffer any penalty the fool and half fool please to inflict. All mis-representatives of the people do exactly as they please, after they obtain office—do not ask, how, unless they think of a clever and popularly acceptable scheme. It was written. It had failed from practice in the United States long before the fading of the ink.

The ballot is simply a childish humble, invented to deceive fools. Those who vote admit they want to be governed. Lincoln thought no man good enough to govern another man, without his consent.

Huxley said: "Anarchy as a term of political philosophy must be taken only in its proper sense, which has nothing to do with disorder or crime, but denotes a state of society in which the rule of each individual by himself is the only government and the legitimacy of which is recognized in this man, Anarchist may be the highest conceivable grade of perfection of social existence."

I send copies of FREE SOCIETY and DISSENT of the last few weeks which I think well worth reading. You will consider it a favor to have a few lines from you after you have looked them over.

I would have written earlier, but have to work very hard for two landsmen, the federal and civic vampires, and the tax all
The Social Organism Myth.

If I were to prescribe a hypnotic and calming powder to a person afflicted by an acute mental attack of "social organization," I should advise the afflicted individual to consult Dr. Schiller's "Bau des Lebens des Menschen Körpers" or "Building and Life of the Social Body." This postural and pretentious work in four classed volumes undertakes to analyze and dissect the hypothetical "social organism" as if it were in reality a veritable, palpating, conscious, living structure of bone and tissue, blood and sinew, rather than a mere abstraction of the individual mind. The subtitle of this Teutonic performance translates as: "An encephaloponeplan of real anatomy, physiology, and psychology of human society with special regard to political economy as social metabolism." Its method is one of interminable classification, division, sub-division, and resub-division down to the minutest and most inconsequent detail of the unfortunate organism of society to the utter bewilderment of the patient reader.

The attribute "socialists" have accepted the self-appointed social surgeon general of a sociological authority, I venture to say that no intelligent and impartial student could examine this weary treatise without coming to the positive conclusion that in the first instance it might have existed for drawing this dubious analogy, it had now by Schiller's fact of unmitigated dullness been deprived of even the shadow of valid scientific usefulness, and at last reduced to irredeemable absurdity.

The original idea of the analogy seems to have come from Comte, to whom it was Spencer who contributed the active part. "As an encyclopedia plan of real anatomy, physiology, and psychology of human society with special regard to political economy as social metabolism."

The "Principles of Sociology," however, without due reservation and limited qualifications, which latter exponents of the fantastic simile have invariably ignored. We may be sure that Spencer never dreamed that in his convenient similitude, intended to illustrate certain general resemblances between society as a product of evolution and the living individual organism, would have been erected into a kind of fetish, having all the attributes of immortal law, by every paternalist and authoritarian who knows beyond peradventure what is best for his neighbors infinitely better than they know themselves.

In a recent article on "The American Woman" (International Monthly, June, 1901) Prof. Hugo Muensterberg of Harvard and Germany unvitiatedly displays the moral absurdities into which accepting this "social organism" hypothesis too seriously. Evidently this spurious, socio-physiological analogy strikes a responsive chord in the Teutonic personality. So Marx says, "To the American mind the community is a multitude of individuals, to the German mind it is above all a unity. The American sees in the State an accumulation of elements of which he ought to be a perfect as possible; the German sees in it an organism in which each element ideally fulfills its role, only in so far as it adjusts itself to the welfare and perfection of the whole. It is the essential idea of community as against the organic one; the naturalistic attitude as against historical; the State as a sand-hill when every grain is independent of every other against the State as a living being that has internal and external connection with every other." I have italicized the clause that shows unmistakably the tendency of this social organism dogma to subordinate individuals, in short to suppress liberty. Our Harvard professor brings this out distinctly in a later paragraph. The natural corollary of this "organic" view he puts thus: "We have the right to demand from the government that the woman be taught to consider as the really best for her what is in the highest interests of the whole of society, even if it be second best for the individual."

As the "social organism" is nothing more than a mechanical combination, without scientific validity, and therefore carrying no obligation for its acceptance, we observe therefore that belief in it is a matter of bias and temperament, rather than of logical necessity. Six years ago I had occasion to treat this question with special reference to the assumptions of the English Fabian Socialists. The argument I imagine as an apt parallel of this approach is a respectable folley today even when first penned, and I therefore offer the following extracts:

"Society is an organism, they say; therefore the perfect development of one individual is not necessarily the utmost and highest cultivation of his own personality, but the filling of his humble function in the great social machine. Hence the coordination of functions that the woman be taught to consider as the really best for her what is in the highest interests of the whole of society, even if it be second best for the individual."

"One of the first principles of biological science is that organic evolution consists of a differentiation of functions. The lowest forms of life are almost homogeneous, there is no separate differentiation of life-sustaining acts. Complexity denotes advancement. In evolving heart, lungs, brains, and so forth, it is attaining a higher form of life. And the highest of all manifestations of sentient existence yet evolved, a civilized man, shows the greatest specialization, the most complete separations of the functions which combine their work in the life of the perfect organism. Now the development of a living organism is characterized by the separation of each part by its specialization for the performance of certain functions, each organ having a special and in many cases a limiting function to which it is fitted to perform. The greater the degree to which this physiological division of labor has attained the more perfect is the animal. True, this implies a combination, an organization, which, however, arises naturally, without outside or even conscious arrangement. Yet life was of a lower form before it reached this greater differentiation and specialization; it is the separation and consequent heterogeneity, in distinction to the combined homogeneity that denotes progress."

"What is biologically true of individual life in this respect is observed to hold good in the life of society. Not only is the degree of sociological differentiation a measure of human development, but it is equally so in other great and recent transformations. Yet we are taught to believe that a process the reverse of this, the return from differentiated functions exercised by highly specialized parts of society, individuals and groups spontaneously combined into the homogeneous principle in which all social, economic, and regulatory functions converge towards one point,
collective authority, is the tendency of social existence; and we must accept this passing phase of a transitory stage as the highest aim of civilized society. "We have seen how the commonwealth is set up to be the paramount end of individual action, and how it is required of each to subordinate his interests and conduct to society. But this argument ignores the vital distinction between the social and individual organism. As a whole, society exists for the benefit of its members, not for members of the benefit of society. It is ever to be remembered that, great as may be the efforts made for the prosperity of the body politic, yet the claims of the body politic are nothing in themselves, and become something only in so far as they embody the claims of its component individuals." (Sociology, vol. 1. third ed., p. 460.)

"Another distinction, as equally important, is lost sight of, by advocates of social organization: I refer to the difference between the needs of the military (form of social organization) and the industrial type. Such a distinction exists between the Russian and American. The military type demands a highly centralized, regulating system, and great subordination of the individual members, and the effect of this is to increase, in the measure of its success, the wants of the social organism. It becomes more evident because adapted to the conditions at the existing time. But the industrial type which represents a higher ideal of society evolved more recent, requires quite a different construction. The industrial regulating system exists as a separate and independent function from central or political authority. The form of society is to be judged by the degree of voluntary interdependence and the freedom from all authority and enforced regulation which its members individually and collectively attain. Again, to use Spencer's words, "relatively to their ultimate conditions society becomes high in proportion to the evolution of their industrial systems, and not in proportion to the evolution of their centralized regulating systems fitting them for higher conditions."

"Looking at social organization, therefore, from the scientific and evolutionary point of view, we are compelled to reject the organic theory which Eubanks and other Socialists (not to mention Harvard professors) so industriously endeavor to weave into social evolution. Wat Tyler."

It Was Ever Thus.

B. C. about 500,000 laborers employed on the pyramids of Cheops are said to have complained of the food furnished them, and refused to work. Seven thousand were cut to pieces by the Egyptian troops. The rest were driven back to work.

B. C. 610. Over 30,000 laborers employed by the emperor of China on the embankment of the Yellow river demanded higher pay and ceased to work. They were beheaded and the rest resumed work.

B. C. 280. Workmen employed by Herod to rebuild the temple and palaces of Jerusalem were paid on account of poor food and insufficient pay. They were surrounded and butchered by the Parthian cavalry in Herod's pay.

A. D. 61. The masons employed by Nero to rebuild Rome after the fire, objected to the wages offered them and struck. They were surrounded by the Praetorian guards and several hundred killed. The rest surrendered, seventeen were crucified, and the rest went to work.

72: The Jews ordered to build the temple each of Titus refused to work and were slain by hundreds by the city garrison of Rome.

342: Masons employed by contractors to build a church in Constantinople struck for higher pay. The contractor appealed to Constantine who ordered a half dozen of the ring leaders to be hanged before the church.

804: Some workmen employed by Charlemagne on a palace at La Chapelle refused to continue unless their wages were increased. Twenty were hanged and eighty were sent to Spain to be placed in the galleys.

1038: Strikers among the laborers employed by William the Conqueror to build Hastings Castle. A number were beheaded and a number sent to France as slaves.

1213: The rights of laborers and mechanics recognized by Magna Charta. The form laborer not to be punished for his fellows' spades, the tools of the latter to be exempt from seizure for debt.

1271: Riots caused by striking laborers at Norwich, England. The cathedral and many houses burned. The king went to Norwich and witnessed the hanging of many of the rioters.

1831: Tremendous insurrection of laborers and mechanics under Wat Tyler. Suppressed with great cruelty.

1495: Strike among the tailors and turban makers of Constantinople. The Sultan was appealed to and twenty-six of the strikers were hanged, the rest drafted into the army.

1530: Workmen employed to pull down one of the suppressed monasteries in England provoked for better pay. Several were put to death, but others were imprisoned.

1560: Masons employed on the Escorial Palace, Spain, refused to work unless better paid. Seven were sent to the galleys and the rest were exiled to America.

1825: Strikers among the ten pickets of the Central Chinese province for the higher pay. They were hanged by dozens at the command of the noblemen entrusted with the trust.

1784: The shipbuilders and sailmakers employed by Peter the Great at St. Petersburg struck for the shorter hours. Seven were hanged, 127 sent to Siberia, and 902 were drafted into the army.

1777-1800: Many trade unions were formed in England, France and Germany.

1792: Laws passed in England prohibiting labor unions.

1881: Many strikes and much rioting in Wales among the iron workers. Troops were sent and 187 were killed.

1860: London weavers strike against Irish workmen. Terrible riots and many lives lost.

1892: Great riot at Stalybridge, England, caused by the imperfect distribution of relief to the striking cotton operatives. Put down by the military after much loss of life.

1760: Serious riots in Wales caused by the refusal of unskilled mechanics to obey local superintendents, suppressed by dragoons.

1872: General strike of journeymen bakers in London. Great suffering for want of bread.

1872: Lookout of agricultural laborers belonging to the British Labor Union. Much suffering among men.

1873: The panic year, attended by a very serious falling off in the membership of most of the unions.

1876: Strike among the bakers of Berlin. Soldiers were permitted to work for the master bakers and the strike was a failure.


1873: In Chicago fifteen were killed and over hundred wounded. General Sheridan with troops sent to Pittsburg.

1892: Great strike at Homestead caused by the Carnegie companies raising the scale proposed by the Amalgamated Iron Workers. Battle between Pinkertons and the strikers. The militia ordered out and order restored. The strike was declared illegal.—Appeal to Reason.

Voices.

While some of our labor unions are raising funds for a Black Star monument, and others collecting for the people's silver jubilee, why not more others raise money to buy Hiram a jeweled posy, out of gratitude for his work in the "peace conference?"—People's Press.

Judging from the number of bills already introduced in congress, the anarchists do mighty little voting, and never contribute to the campaign fund.—Detroit Free Press.

Anthony Comstock is a happy man. He knows all about the lobbyist, and is not in his endeavors to find some more. He in no way bothers them, but he attends all shows to find out whether or not there is any chance for him to get in his work. Anthony has had so much experience that he must be a past master in question matters.—Weekly People.

Old Diogenes came up the street rubbing his hands and shaking his head.

"Hello, Mr. Dooley," we called out, "how are you?"

"I'll tell you, Mr. Dooley," said the old man, "my name is Hiram."

"Don't tell me about Chicago," groaned the ancient philosopher. "While I was searching for an honest man some one came up and stole my lantern."—Chicago Daily News.

I knew th' time was coming. Hiram. Th' th' only way. Ye may talk about it as much as ye want, but government, me boy, is a case in me makin' ye do what I want, an' if I can't do it with a song, I'll do it with a shovel. Th' th' in hand th' velvet glove, th' horsehoe in th' boxin' mitt, th' quick right, an' th' heavy boot, that was th' way we run pilkies when I was captain in me precinct."—Mr. Dooley.
MEMOIRS OF A REVOLUTIONIST.

By PETER KROPOTKIN.

This interesting autobiography of the social anarchist and socialist, Peter Kropotkin, is one of the most important books of the anarchist movement, as well as one of the most controversial. "It is necessary to give the psychology of his contemporaries as well as of himself," wrote the critic for "The Nation". "Kropotkin's works in his book the psychology of the Russian revolution as well as the history of the Russian revolution as it is written in his book, 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; 610 pp.

Price $2.

Send orders to FREE SOCIETY.

HISTORY OF THE COMMUNE 1871.

Translated from the French of P. D. LEBASSAGAY.

By ELIAS ROUX AURIOL.

The above book is the most reliable history of the Commune of 1871, and should be in every library of the study of revolutionary movements. Arranged so that we have made with the publishers enable us to sell the book postpaid for

75 CENTS.

Send orders to FREE SOCIETY.

THE CHICAGO MARTYRS.

THE DARKEST SPOTLIGHTS OF THE ANARCHISTS IN COURT.

ALTRUIST'S REASONS FOR PARARNING FIELER, WIEBE AND SCHWAB.

This book contains a balanced picture of our eight comrades and one of the most important acts of the lack of knowledge of the justice of the government. This is the best edition of the book ever printed. It contains 388 pages with illustrations.

Price 25 cents.

Send orders to FREE SOCIETY.

MORIBUND SOCIETY AND ANARCHY.

Translated from the French of J. ROY.

By VOLTAIRE DE LASALLE.


Price paper cover, 25¢; bound 60¢.

Send orders to FREE SOCIETY.

All orders for the following books must be received at 50 cents.

ESSAYS ON THE SOCIAL PROBLEM.

By J. A. Addams.

10 cents.

The New Individualism.

Grand Army of the Republic.

10 cents.

The Social Question.

By H. C. Baxandall.

10 cents.

The Socialistic Movement in Russia.

By J. E. S. H. Berkman.

10 cents.

The Socialistic Movement in Russia.

By J. E. S. H. Berkman.

10 cents.

The Socialistic Movement in Russia.

By J. E. S. H. Berkman.

10 cents.

The Socialistic Movement in Russia.

By J. E. S. H. Berkman.