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PREFACE

If, after the perusal of the following pages, the reader should come to the conclusion that the society in which he lives is like an illegal poolroom under the protection of the police, let him not be discouraged, but rather bring forth the best that is within him to work for a nobler society.

The above comparison befits the situation. The windows announce the sale of bird seed, tobacco and pigeons. Upon entering, though, you find a lot of square-chinned gents engaged in betting on the fortunes of the people; the cues in their hands are the faith and the ignorance of the masses; the pigeons sold to customers are caught by watchers on the roof as soon as a buyer gives them the freedom to fly. If you return to protest, your skull is broken or, if the dealers are merciful, you are ejected with threats that cannot be mistaken.

The writer does not claim that he has said the best that may be said of the situation. But he claims that he uses the best in his abilities to arouse the reader to thinking and acting. Do likewise.

May, 1908.
THE SITUATION.

It has come to such a pass in this land of the free that any utterance in favor of freedom is regarded a crime worse than the breaking of the ten commandments. For while the ten commandments were given in an advisory manner, to wit: thou shalt or thou shalt not, the statutes on our penal codes interdict free thought and free action in a compulsory way, to wit: thou must or thou must not.

In the last quarter of a century, when all other civilized or semi-civilized countries have moved upward to higher aspects of life, our country has made itself famous as an example for ignorant legislature. The citizen either is incapable of participating in the active work of reconstruction or is made indifferent by the cunning and whimsical actions of the politicians, while an ever increasing army of officials perplexes and rules him. Thus it happens that a man who has not the backing of an influential party behind him, to save his personal liberty from the incumbency of police persecution must lie low when he utters a word of warning to the persecuted.

Seemingly, the world at large knows better the value of our inalienable rights than we know it ourselves. Dr. Eeden, the Dutch philanthropist and sociologist, in a lecture he delivered in New York City, called our commonwealth a Common Misery. But less noted men have ridiculed our police-ridden communities. We, though, taking examples from our politicians, stand pat and do not learn to distinguish between benevolent criticism and malicious slander.

Just now we are going through a very crucial point in the evolution of our destiny. But destiny is not what our rulers are pleased to make of the history of the nation, but what we are inclined to put forward by either our interest in the make-up of our social and political relations, or our indifference to the policies of our friends or foes.

Let us clearly discern between the needs of a free people and the actions of its rulers. Let us, then, judge the words and actions of our friends, and, likewise, our enemies, by their merits or demerits, without prejudice. Let us unite in proclaiming our inalienable rights for happiness and general welfare, and in condemning the pretenses of the political and social upstarts.

For we may, with the facts confronting us, declare that the affairs of the nation are not governed but the people ruled. The question foremost in the minds of the so-called administrators is not how to promote the general welfare of the people, but how to keep the majority in subjection while the minority is engaged in the division of the natural wealth of the land.

It matters little under what disguise the politics of this minority are shaping themselves, whether under republican, or democratic, or whatever cloak. By virtue of their legal entrenchments they hold the rest of the nation in subjection. While the administration of the national affairs until recently was entirely under the domination of the money market, the administrators gaining their power and prestige from the influence of funds
Collecteu by, and in the interest of, the money market, it gradually developed into semi-dictatorial power through the envious strife among that minority, through the imperialist policy of ruling a people without its consent, through the fortifying conditions of a greater army and navy until well nigh 50 per cent. of national revenue are spent for military purposes. Hand in hand with these preparations for a reactionary mode of government goes the decline of the popular intelligence, a harder struggle for existence forcing multitudes of parents to send their half-starved children to work instead of to school, impressing upon the people thus made indolent and hopeless the superstition of the paternal government, the influence of the central government to fight their battles against the aggressiveness of the combined forces of corporations and legislatures.

But when a man has come to the conclusion that he no longer can look after his own affairs, he shall soon learn that the help he employs will become his master. A nation consisting of men who deny themselves the capability of doing their own work, learns to obey the commands of one boss.

Even while these lines are being penned, a high-handed act of the Postal Department is agitating the minds of all fair-minded people. A postmaster is given plenipotentiary powers in disposing of literature not in accord with his political convictions by restricting the permit of second-class matter. This institutes a new form of censorship in this country, the equivalent of which could only be found in Russia. Monarchical Europe, with the exception of the latter, does not interfere with the press in the respective countries. A copy containing a seditious article might be confiscated, but the publication as such is not interfered with. This encroachment upon the free expression of one's opinion is entirely in line with the rest of limitations against free assemblage and free speech, and only a sequel to other objectionable amendments to the constitution enacted since the inauguration of the imperialist policy begotten by the evil spirit of the Hanna Octopus. Quick as the monstrous development of governing the people turned into ruling it, from disarming the populace to gagging it, we may with due conclusions await the formation of barefaced despotism.

THE VASSALS AND THE TRUSTS

Take away the interest of the people in the preservation of their institutions, and the downfall of the country is a foregone conclusion. Unite the wealth of a nation into the hands of a few, and the people become apathetic to the domestic or international affairs of their rulers.

Egypt crumbled into dust when 3 per cent. of the population owned 97 per cent. of all her wealth.

Babylon, once the greatest city of the world, fell, when 2 per cent. of the population owned everything in the Empire, while the people starved.

When Persia ceased to exist, the land belonged to 1 per cent. of the entire population.

Among eighteen hundred men was divided the vast Empire when Rome was taken possession of by semi-savage conquerors.

And yet we remain in the footsteps of these nations, shaping the laws in their fashion, treating the people with their methods, moulding society in their forms. Are we to evade their fate by building larger navies, keeping
stronger guards in our cities and establishing more courts, prisons, almshouses, and insane asylums?

While the land has been taken away from the people as in the days of the ancient countries of Asia and Europe, a new factor arose in our days, that took the industries from the workers. The latter find themselves in a situation analogous to the system of Feudalism in the middle ages. Their dependence is such that they must feel grateful for the permit to toil, for the chance of thus securing a livelihood for themselves and those relying on their support.

*Homage* says the Treaties of Tenure *is the most honorable service and the most humble service of revenue that a frank tenant may do to his lord*, for *when the tenant shall make homage to his lord, he shall be ungirt and his head uncovered, and his lord shall sit and the tenant shall kneel before him on both his knees and hold his hands jointly together between the hands of his lord, and shall say this: I become your man from this day on forward, of life and limb, and of earthly worship, and unto you shall be true and faithful, and bear your faith for the treatment that I claim to hold of you, saving the faith that I owe to the sovereign lord, the king; and then the lord so sitting shall kiss him.*

The conditions to-day are akin to those of the middle ages. The relations of the tenant to his lord have given place to those of the toiler to the possessor of money and material. A change in nomenclature—a trust for a vassaldom, a wageearner for a tenant, a President for a King. The cause has been the same—here and there, to wit: The power of the few, the subjection of the many; the growth of vast estates, the expansion of poverty; the subserviency of the aristocracy to the church, or vice versa, and the ignorance of the masses. Serfdom had not come over night; it was gradually developed. The tillers of the soil, at first only tributary to the lords holding privileges from the hands of the king, in the course of time were robbed of their soil and the means of sustenance, their liberties remaining at the mercy of the king's vassals. The privileged aristocracy soon became arbitrary masters. The king, to fortify himself against the usurpations of his former vassals, had to appeal for aid to the towns themselves hard pressed by the marauding conquerors. But both, the king and the vassals, were usurpers: the king had risen to power through conquest, and his followers through his indebtedness to them. It was a question of might and privilege, of privilege and might, and by rendering assistance to the king, the towns did not mitigate the lot of the tillers of the soil.

The system of government favoring the possessors of property and protecting their interests—as the basic form of a society thus organized—united in the hands of a comparatively few the land and the industries of the country. The great majority of the people are, if able to enter a contract for work, dependent on these possessors of money and material. They are the bearers of the heaviest burdens of taxation. For whatever taxes the State might impose on the possessors of the means of sustenance, are by them in a higher ratio exacted from their dependencies: so that the real burden of taxation falls mainly, although indirectly, on the shoulders of the poor.

Industrial enterprise and governmental interference have been of mutual assistance to each other. The civil war and the Spanish-American war opened new avenues of exploitation. After each crisis plutocracy gained
a stronger hold on the wealth of the nation. And in the selection of a Chief-Magistrate Wall Street became the main advisor. Thus a mutual understanding had been reached, high finance assisting the strengthening of the central power, the administration favoring exploitations at home and in the colonies by transforming national and international policies. The grip on the majority of the people tightened until they awoke one day to face a panic. The people have not learned that history repeated itself; that the crisis marked a stepping stone in the evolution of the country's history. The Trusts, the modern Vassals, had become all-powerful, and, on the other hand, the Administration, to save its face, was forced to show its authority. For the Trusts to become the absolute masters of the situation it was necessary to unite the banks, the means of circulation, under their domination without fear of any interference by the government and with the sanction of Congress. On the other hand, the lust of power and conquest had seized upon the administration and bureaucracy. Favoritism, the menace of all republics, and the thorn on the declining path of every government, marked every utterance of the highest courts and foremost administrators.

The people, finding themselves in this maze of adversities, clamoring for the prosecution of the barefaced criminals at their throats, are ready to reach the ear of the man on horseback, always present on the precipice of a nation's history. By the old methods of catering to the brutal instincts of the mob or of sounding some meaningless high-tuned phrases, the man on horseback is trying to endear himself in the hearts of the unthinking masses. And thus, as in the days of the feudal system, the dominating political influence is seeking to unite with those directly threatened by the lords of exploitation, in the hope of establishing a preeminent position of its own, that would tend to eliminate any signal opposition to its policies. And, as in the day of medieval feudalism, the sacrifices by the oppressed people for the sake of, seemingly, assured protection against the vassals of special privileges, will not bring relief of their burden, but is calculated to strengthen the iron hand of the king.

The period of depression under which we are now laboring is the forceful expression of this fight for supremacy. Who should rule, is the question, and not, how are the affairs of the country to be governed? Shall the corporations favoring the continuance of subjecting the people to utter dependence upon them, frame the laws, as heretofore, with a view to closing all channels of individual enterprise, or shall the federal government inaugurate a new mode of rule by which one person may, first and last, direct the means which strengthen his hand at the helm?

The influences favoring the latter possibility are spread all over the country. An aristocracy following in the trail of federal absolutism has grown from the class of rich idlers, that for one and more generations has been aping the fancies of Asiatic or European nobilities. Other families are brought up in traditions of militarism and exclusion, fostering snobbery and autocracy. And the great army of government employees, steadily increasing in numbers with the establishment of new offices, are, as servants always will be, tools of their masters.
PREJUDICE AND PERSECUTION.

It is self-explanatory that with the growth of power a government abrogate the rights and the liberties of the people. For nothing could better stay the progress of whim than the free expression of opinions. Whatever, therefore, parades under the banner of reform emanating from the fertile mind of a ruling power, is really repression or persecution. And in the review of those reforms wrought by the present administrator one must always read persecution for reform.

"One of the most serious things," said Chancellor Day, November, 1907, "for us to consider in regard to the administration of President Roosevelt, is the fact that he has really accomplished no reforms."

He is not quite right. He forgot that reform spelled persecution. The hysterical messages in regard to immigration gave birth, ultimately, to the most stupid laws manufacturing, from year to year, a growing mass of men without a country within the boundaries of the United States. In their wake followed curtailments of free speech, free press, free assemblage. The press, to a great extent, has raised a howl against the immigrant, like a pack of dogs at the command of a hunter. Some of the influential newspapers of the country—and it is not necessary to name them, so well are they known for their betrayal of peace at home—are openly charged with being in the pay of the Russian Government, and, at the behest of that mediaeval land of prejudice and persecution, to work in the interests of a foreign power. If conspiracy is charged to men who frankly dare oppose the whimsical ravings of a vain mind or the conscienceless pens of ill-begotten legislatures, what should be said of the men who have taken their offices on the oath of allegiance to the principles underlying this government and who with stealthy methods promote the welfare of the few, or of newspapers in secret coalition with foreign rulers? What should they be charged with who by suppression and persecution create strife and hatred in the country, appealing as it were to the lowest passions of ignorance in whipping one class of the working people against the other? In creating in the minds of the native citizens prejudice against new arrivals? In thus fostering the barbarities of prejudices, superstition, and ignorance? Until less than a decade ago nobody dared to question the immigrants' rights to our shores for his poverty or illiteracy. With what object in view have the new regulations governing citizenship been instituted? Surely not in order to keep the toilers out, the competitors in the field of labor? For if this had been the object of the administration, our officials abroad, taking notice of the luring announcements of prosperity in America, as advertised by the agents of our manufacturers, could easily prevent the influx of immigration by exposing the conspirators abroad. Rather may the object be found in the attempt of the dominating influences, to divide in their country the population against itself, to cause strife here among the working class in general, and the different nationalities, in particular. For the greater the strife among the people, the more justified seems a show of force by the government. But the tighter the grip of force, the weaker sounds the cry for liberty.

It is charged upon the immigrants that assaults on persons in exalted
positions have been instigated and committed by them. Yet, the history of
the assassinations in this country shows clearly that the committers of those
untoward acts were all born and bred in the confines of the United States.
Johnson, who tried to kill President Jackson, Booth, the assassin of Lincoln,
Guiteau, who murdered Garfield, Czolgocz, who fired the deadly shots at Mc-
Kinley, Prendergast, who took it upon himself to mow down Mayor Harri-
son, were all born in the North American Republic and educated in our
schools, as were the men who are directly or indirectly responsible for the
death of Governor Goebel, of Kentucky.

In view of these facts, is there any justification for laying violence at
the threshold of the immigrants, was there any lack of violence in the United
States? Truly, there must be another reason for inciting popular prejudice
against the newcomers, and, I fear, a reason at once revolting in its con-
ception, and diabolical in its performance.

The strategy of every foe of Truth, in dealing with adversities, centres
on the golden rule of the Roman craftsman, Divide et impera. Gain com-
mand by causing strife, is to-day no less the acme of wisdom in the actions
of intrigue than it was two thousand years ago. It is necessary to keep
the working men in distrust of each other. The distrust is the dam that
keeps the flood of dissatisfaction from storming the fortress of capitalistic
outrages. One part of the population is being inflated with its own superior-
ity, suspicion is awakened in another, both are divided against one another
by exalting the virtues of one and decrying the shortcomings of the other.

What the workmen might not know is well understood by the agents
and counselors of the powers that be. While proportionately the organized
forces of the workmen are larger in numbers this side of the Atlantic, the
European workmen have a clearer understanding of the questions of the
day; while the Americans are brought up to play with thoughts and things,
or, as Judge Gaynor recently remarked, to think superficially, the Europeans
excel in earnestness, the only key to thoroughness. In quoting the preamble
to the Constitution of the Carpenters and Joiners we desire to show the con-
servative view of labor at home, against whom our courts are so ready with
injunctions, and our newspapers with invectives:

“To rescue our trade from the level to which it has fallen, and, by
mutual effort, to raise ourselves to that position in society to which we
are justly entitled; to cultivate a feeling of friendship among the craft, and
to elevate the moral, intellectual, and social conditions of all journeymen
and carpenters. It is, furthermore, our object to assist each other to secure
employment; to furnish aid in cases of death or permanent disability, and
for mutual relief, and other benevolent purposes.” (Convention of B. C. & J.,
Chicago, Ill., August 8 1881.)

While the workmen in the United States are mainly interested in the
welfare of their individual crafts, as shown above, their European brethren
take, as a class, an active part in affairs political and social with a more or
less thorough understanding of the ideals of mankind at large. While the
leaders of our workmen are fraternizing with the oppressors of the toilers,
in Europe such actions would be looked upon with great suspicion. While
for some time past it has been the tendency in the progressive states of
Europe to extend the solitary strike of a craft into a sympathetic strike of
the industry, or a general strike of many or all industries, quite in confor-
mity with the growing mutuality of the manufacturers' associations, the organized workers at home rely, in most cases, on their meagre purses or the still poorer sympathy of the public. So long as antiquated methods in dealing with the industrial problem are followed, workmen have no chance of getting to what they are justly entitled. Capital, on the contrary, with the aid of the civil and military authorities, may dictate its terms as long as the individual craft is abandoned in its struggle by other branches directly or indirectly related to the cause of discontentment.

And this is the reason why the laws now governing the regulations of immigration and citizenship are made to work in a way to persecute the thinking and observing element among the new arrivals, and not to exclude competitors on the market. This is the reason why men of convictions adverse to the interests of plutocracy are singled out to pay the penalty for untoward acts committed by others that are strangers to them in conviction and action.

Repression or suppression do not prevent; persecution does not reform. They force the suppressed and persecuted to methods of greater secrecy, and beget hatred. Is such a policy advisable? Or is it rather desirable, in dealing with any kind of opposition, to act wisely and frankly with the arguments of nobler examples and the knowledge of the need of the opposition?

Every now and then new opinions governing labor and capital emanate from our tribunals of justice. Every now and then the courts are appealed to in an endeavor to fight objectionable legislation. But as such proceedings are a question of money and, quite often, of influence, labor is mostly defeated and capital triumphant. In their helplessness the workmen turn to petitioning Congress, or even to appealing to the President. They do not realize that such appeals weaken the cause of independence. But paternalism, however hopeless, seems more preferable to the hungry man than starvation. And thus it happens that the very forces whose well-being depends on a decentralized democracy, are working toward strengthening the forces of centralization, arming the hands of an individual with concentrated power, or, in other words, popularizing autocracy through paternalism.

MILITARISM.

The popular man on horseback has always rested his position on arms. The greater a one-man-power, the more visible the show of arms. Where democracy is on the decline, militarism is on the increase. And the difference between the citizen of the United States and the subject of Russia soon becomes one only in name.

It cannot be argued in defense of military prowess that this hemisphere must protect itself against a possible aggression from Asia or Europe. No power on the earth would dream of attacking the United States so long as the people had any liberties to defend. And no enemy attacks a country without an assured possibility in his knowledge of conditions, of defeating a nation. Armies might defeat armies, but not nations. Rome fell because it was divided against itself, and the great mass of the people had no interest in the preservation of the Empire. The Teutons, thoroughly awakened,
were victorious in their struggle against Rome, because their fight meant the liberties of their homes and person. China would be a great and noble commonwealth if the reigning dynasty had not put to sleep the intelligence of the people. Turkey, built on blood, crumbled to pieces by persecuting the people living under the dominion of the Half-Moon. Spain, intolerant in her persecution of freedom of thought and speech, in spite of her military prowess, is seething with discontent and lying in exhaustion. But when the France of the Kings was devastated by the English conquerors, the people rose to free themselves and, not relying on the royal armies, drove the English from the shores of their country. And again, after the defeat of Napoleon, when the united armies of Europe were overrunning French soil, the irregular forces of the people combated the regular, well-drilled old warriors of Russia, England and Prussia. And our own history?

A nation whose intelligence is kept awake and who has any cause for nurturing a love for the country, cannot be conquered, though the regular armies, fighting because they must, and not because they want, may not be defeated.

Militarism is, therefore, only an accompaniment to restrictions on liberty, and a precursor to despotism. It is not only no safeguard against any aggression from abroad, but a steady menace to civic justice at home. Especially when the majority of the population are not allowed to bear arms, an erratic official in an administration that grew strong upon a succession of limitations on free speech, on the free expression of the people, might, following the examples given in ancient and modern history, use the military institution for aggressions on the civic rights of his opposition.

In fact, where military preparations are made on a large scale, the government co ipso signifies its distrust of the people. But where the people can no longer be trusted to uphold their institutions, the authorities must have acted in a manner deserving of the suspicion of the people. The government, then, surrounds itself with defenders of its policies and not with defenders of the will of the people. And if it be argued that the people acquiesce in the plans of their government, then may it be said that the people have been brought up in aimless acquiescence of the paternalism of blindly chosen superiors. If the minds of the people must be supported by those elected to office, the lack of self-reliance signifies the inability to elect.

But, if a duty there be, it is the duty of society to make man self-reliant, so he may not become a tool in the hands of the cunning. Procreation itself is only in so far to be welcomed as it evolves a noble addition to the pride of man. And with the full development of the faculties of his species, man assumes the work of selection with self-reliance and ease.

For, though it has often been cited and in various ways, it must be always remembered: Man is not born for government, but government is an artificial structure erected by man. Man is more sacred a thing than government, and government is sanctified or condemned by the happiness or the misery of the people. A government that rests in doubtful peace on force, is not the government by the people, but by the few, and is not apt to instill into the minds of the masses a love which alone is the safeguard of a country's peace.
Militarism, the armed force, means violence sanctified by law. But law ought not to sanctify violence in any form since it condemns violence as a menace to civic justice. The law, therefore, that sanctifies violence as a governmental institution, is only pretending to abhor violence so long as it justifies the same thing in a certain body of men. If for the sake of defense the knowledge of the use of arms be essential, no body of men should be exempt from learning how to use them and from possessing them. But to disarm the population at large and keep a fighting force in their midst, must arouse the fears and suspicions of the observer.

CHURCH AND FREE THOUGHT.

Militarism is being fostered by the very institutions that profess to have at heart the uplifting of man's soul. The minds of the children are inculcated with the germ of militarism within the limits of ground that is supposed to be made holy by words of the fellowship of man and the godliness of love. The churches of various denominations are resounding with discords of bugle calls, with fife and drum. It has become a common usage for the authorities in the various churches to draw the children into their folds by composing drilling companies and dressing the boys in the uniforms of soldiers. Thus, instead of directing the young minds to nobler activities, the lowest temptations of savagery are given license to unfold to flaming passions. While the education of the children demands the abhorrence of violence, the formation of these drilling brigades aids in stifling the charitable tendencies in the nature of budding humanity.

With superstition and prejudice to contend with from infancy, man's development is being hampered and his intellect chained. But our minds must be freed in order to make the forces of nature, known or to be discovered, subservient to the needs of man, whereas the blind belief in the doctrines of the church makes for the subserviency of our needs and thoughts to fear of natural phenomena. Fatalism is the logical result from the teachings of doctrinal belief, and religious mania besets the reasoning power at all times when natural phenomena are explained by supernatural or unnatural interference. The philosophy of Buddhism in the hands of a priesthood became no less a flagella on the intellect of the people than the superstitions of mediaeval Europe. The search for truth alone frees the intellect, and the knowledge of human achievements and of the natural evolution of things is the only instrument able to withstand the assaults of a priesthood forever working on a science of superstition wherewith the people are kept groping in the dark.

The Rev. John J. Glennon, Archbishop of St. Louis, in attacking the schools and universities, made this bid for notoriety:

"The philosophy taught in your schools and universities today is just as brutal as it is repugnant. This philosophy of evolution, emanating from the brain of Darwin and Spencer, makes for brutality and retards progress. What is the use of struggling if there is nothing to be attained? Where is there an appearance of charity in this system? The strong succeed and the weak perish.

Evolution teaches us that environments shape the nature of man, and that man in society is responsible for the shaping of environments. Evolu-
tion, therefore, excludes the fatalism of blind belief, and operos the secrets of natural phenomena. It bids us strive for environments that may fully develop the human intellect and enthroned the noble and just aspirations of the brotherhood of mankind. It teaches us that progress is retarded by the ignoble interference by the enemies of truth, that while no species destroys its own kind, man is forever kept in artificial environments to struggle against his own kind, that through the interference of brutal environments man is not permitted to develop along the lines of least resistance.

Evolution would make man self-reliant; artificial interference by the State or clergy would keep him, bodily and intellectually, dependent.

Are the Sunday-schools not turned into gloomy chambers of superstition and prejudice? The minds of minors are filled with false illustrations of the ideals of other denominations or humane associations. In explanation of the severe task undertaken by their priests, Catholic teachers serve their pupils with horrid tales of their experiences. In treating on the subject of Free Masonry, a Sister gives the following narrative:

A priest is captured in the dead of night by a delegation of that brotherhood, who ask him to come with them to take the confession of one of their confreres. After walking a short distance they shove him into a waiting carriage, blindfold and chain him and drive with him, in zig-zag movements, through the winding streets, then get on a ferryboat, and finally land across a water at some unknown destination, where he is taken to a big hall. Upon being released from chain and kerchief he sees himself in the midst of rough and silent men and surrounded by walls covered with crossbones, etc. At last the priest is left alone with an old man who confesses that he must die because he did not obey the commands of his brothers in Free Masonry, to commit murders, although the lot had fallen to him. . . . Horrors!

Such are the means wherewith Free Thought is to be destroyed.

And Free Thought? While church property is exempt from taxes, while church authorities are given every facility to express themselves and to influence communities, while the churches are accumulating riches in investments and land, while their slanders are repeated by the press and their prejudices are made the keynote in legislative repressions, while the infamous Oxford movement is being tried in underhand manner in this country, Free Thought, all Thought not in accord with so-called religious teachings, is at the mercy of the policeman's club, and may be prohibited if a police commissioner or a postmaster deem it improper.

The Rev. Moore, during the Prohibitionists' campaign, threatened violence to the opponents of prohibition in a blood-curdling language; but the authorities did not interfere with either Rev. Moore nor the campaign. Mining workers expressed their intention to strike, and, against the protest of a town, except the mining lords, the President ordered troops to the scene of dispute, although violence by the workmen was neither shown nor feared.

Why, then, do the civil authorities aid the Church in its struggle with the ideals of advanced thinkers or, if you please, with its opponents? Why are liberal or radical associations and individuals not given the freedom to express their opinions and criticisms in halls made available for such purposes and freed from taxes? Why are radical men not permitted to use the open
squares and the highways of our towns for the presenting to the authorities—who, by the way, are only suffered by the people, and not God-given—of the protest and decision of the masses?

Supreme Court Justice John W. Goff stigmatizes the character of the police—that are nowadays made the masters of the public—in the following words, spoken April 27, to the members of the Riverside and Morningside Heights Associations:

The evil in the force is largely of our own creating. The department is the creation of the citizens and they have created what they have. The police force of New York today is virtually an oathbound secret society. Just think of it! Nearly 10,000 men leagued in a secret organization, the real object of which is not the performance of duty.

We find every grade organized from the patrolman up to and including the inspectors. Each grade has its own society, the ostensible object of which is sick benefit and the burial of needy members. If we search the records of the Legislature at Albany and the Board of Aldermen in New York, we shall find that the real objects are the promotion of the interests of individuals without regard to the performance of duty.

But Mr. Goff is wrong in saying that the citizen is responsible for the corruption in the police force. The people have no say in the matter. They do not elect the officers or patrolmen. Corruption could only be stamped out with a blow at centralization. Only when the citizens of a given territory will elect from their own midst, from their residential or mercantile neighborhood, men of their own acquaintance for vigilance duty in their respective parts of a locality, only with decentralization may a greater security of life and property be reached.

The average citizen has no confidence in the police, no matter how much it may be praised by newspapers of the moral worth of the Evening Telegram. Some tenements from the basement to top floors, of sections of New York City, have been burglarized by day and night, and only a very few robberies have been reported to the police, for the reason that it was of no avail to appeal to the protectors of property unless you caught the thief, or have the means to engage private detectives.

And these secret societies are the arbiters of justice. Said Justice Gaynor of Brooklyn before the People's Forum in New Rochelle:

Who has the right to say that the people of New York may not peacably assemble for discussion? That right is guaranteed under the Constitution. Some years ago I saw a big Socialist gathering under a red flag in a public park in Edinburgh, with not a policeman in sight. Were such a gathering attempted in Central Park the assemblers would have their heads knocked off by the police in less than half an hour.

What an uproar would result if the police were to enter without warrant the home of some Supreme Court justice in Manhattan and search out his closet skeletons and his household goods! But last night the police invaded in that unlawful manner the house of ten poor persons in the city, and the outrage has attracted no attention.

I warn you, all of you, that if you allow the humblest citizen's constitutional rights to be invaded in this way, the time may come, will come, sooner or later, when your own home rights will be invaded in like manner.
But the noblest struggle in which man may engage is the fight for freedom, for truth, the liberation of the intellect from prejudice, fear and superstition; for the mother of toleration, of peace and general well-being. Despotism reigns through fear, and the tyranny of the Church is at the beck and call of the oppressive factors in a community, and it is only natural that the police and the State's attorneys, in reciprocation of the aid rendered by Church authorities, bend their energies on persecuting free thinking men instead of looking after the criminals, in the lowest and highest strata of society, who rob the purse of the poor and the treasures of the commonwealth.

SOCIALISM AND LAW.

So long as there are no better arguments presented for the interference by Church and State with the work of liberals and radicals than the vague statements that their teachings are breeding crime against society, the restrictions on their utterances, the persecution of their agitators, is nothing but an admission of the weakness of the position of Church and State. The agitation of both, attended often with great brutality, in slandering their adversaries and bodily harming them, is an admission of the weak ground wherein their doctrines are built. The powers that be have always called the brutal forces of suppression and mob rule to their assistance, when they feared that their iniquitous systems were crumbling to pieces. The cry of enemies of society have been raised by Nero and Torquemada, against the Christians in Rome, against the Hugenots, the Chartists. They have been fed to wild beasts, burnt at the stake. And the Auto-da-fé may live in the memory of many a zealous clergyman whose heart longs for a strenuous attack on all independent thinkers.

This is an easy way of getting rid of one's adversaries. But it smacks so much of the despotism of former ages that we are no longer deceived by that cry of enemies of society. In our days this cry has been raised particularly against the Anarchist, and, in a lesser degree, against the Socialist.

Socialism expresses a general tendency to institute organizations of society constructed on a co-operative basis to take the place of our present organizations of a competitive system. The Fabians, the Single Taxers, the Anarchists, the Social Democrats, the Christian Socialists, are all striving toward the goal of fraternity, a social equality.

Owing to the numerical strength of the Social Democrats and the scope of their political activities, the public is more familiar with their branch of Socialism and commonly apply to them the general term, Socialists.

Quoting from their platform adopted in New York, July 9, 1896, we fail to find anything criminal in their intentions:

The United States to obtain possession of the mines, railroads, canals, telegraphs, telephones, and all other means of public transportation and communication, the employees to operate the same co-operatively under control of the Federal Government, and to elect their own superior officers, but no employee shall be discharged for political reasons.

The municipalities to obtain possession of the local railroads, ferries,
waterworks, gasworks, electric plants, and all industries requiring municipal franchises; the employees to operate the same co-operatively under control of the municipal administration, and to elect their officers; but no employee shall be discharged for political reasons.

It is argued that the control exercised by the federal and municipal administrations favors a paternalism injurious to the individual development. But the paternalism of social democracy, to the masses, is a benevolent despotism, at its worst, if compared to that of industrial feudalism at its best. A social democratic State or commonwealth would provide work, shelter, and education, while a progressed industrial feudalism would reduce the competing workmen to the physical and intellectual state of the coolie. If the social democratic organization may be compared to a workshop, the capitalist system builds a prison. In the first one is supplied with work and kept under a rigid supervision to effect the regulation of production and distribution for the ostensible benefit of all concerned; in the latter the workmen are arrayed against one another with a view to procuring the greatest possible profit and comfort for a few owners and their satellites, are held in subjection by an armed constabulary, and, by an ever increasing difficulty to obtain redress in the courts of justice, are unable to express their grievances. Mr. Hillquit, a lawyer and social democrat, at the protest-meeting at Grand Central Palace, following the brutal attack by the police on March 28, inst., asserted that the Socialists strictly abide by the laws of the land, and would not entertain an undertaking in defiance of law. If this be true, then the propaganda by the press and the authorities, municipal and federal, against their agitation may spring from the fear that the Socialists through their participation in politics might snatch from the claws of plutocracy those multitudes whose indolence and patience foster the ideal capitalistic Feudalism.

But, if this be the case, then obedience to law is not recognized a virtue by the authorities. It is merely a pretense. For if obedience to law were a virtue, the poor worker would be a respected citizen, above all; the Socialists were held up as the ideals of mankind; whereas, the saloonkeeper, with a side entrance open on Sunday, the policeman with a club at a peaceful meeting, St. Anthony poking his nose into other people's affairs, the postmaster abrogating the rights of free press, the legislators working in the sweat of the lobby, the bankers withholding an accumulated cash until granted ten per cent., in short, all non-productive elements in society with an income based on privileges made laws for unlawful professions would be criminals and treated as such.

But the respect for these laws is gradually disappearing. This truth we may learn even from the press that is mostly interested in the preservation of the legal oracle. In an editorial on the injustice of the treatment of the poor in our courts, the writer has this to say:

"We ask these people to have respect for law. How CAN they have respect for the kind of law that locks up the innocent because he is poor and simply as a matter of convenience, and sets the criminal free because some other criminal—oft high in politics—is willing to go on his bond?"—Evening Journal, April 15.

The truth of the matter is that the average man does not care to painlessly obey the laws but to successfully evade the laws. No ordinary man
knows the laws of his country. Neither do the courts interpret the laws in the same way. Law is forever a matter of dispute between lawyers, and a source of revenue for professional twisters of legal opinions. To a majority of the people a great many laws seem unjust in that they discriminate against the personal liberty of those whose views on moral or religious or economic questions differ from the point taken by the framers of legislation, whose range of knowledge of men and things is usually very small. The conviction that many laws are the product of cowardice and hysteria fills others with a contempt for them. The knowledge that many legal attainments swell the stocks of the few and empty the pockets of the dependent people fortifies a determined conscience to defend at least in its own acts the promise of the Constitution to procure general welfare.

If all the laws were enforced, business soon would come to a standstill: for many laws are made only as a source of revenue for offices created. If all regulations were obeyed, the brains of the people soon would stop working. If they were not obeyed, yet were made to be followed, the greatest part of the population should be under lock and chain. If all incorporated associations had honest detectives to watch over the people and were to call on the police and district-attorney to assist them in raiding, and arresting, there soon would rise a conflagration consuming the feuds between the ministers, lawyers, boards of health, of fire, of medical associations, etc., etc., and out of the ashes would emerge strife among the remnants of law-fearing citizens. and from warring upon supposed crime they would turn to warring upon themselves: so much would they lie in each other's way. But they would find out that law is a maze, the entanglement of which is enough to confuse any mind, sane or insane.

Laws, to a great extent, are made contrary to the natural and healthy inclinations of man. Law, then, is an artifice, foreign to the structure of natural organization; it is a crown of thorns pressed on the head of the vital interests of humanity.

Concluding an article on the Raines law, Judge Furlong has this to say: That our present liquor tax law should have so long been tried and so long been found wanting, without the uprising of our citizens, is but another indication of the apathy and patience of the American public under wrongs that elsewhere might produce riots and revolution.—The Civic Union, Brooklyn, May 14, 1908.

Is obedience to law a virtue? Or is it rather a crime in view of the evil resulting therefrom, both in stifling man's active participation in the well-being of his community and in sustaining wrongs committed by those in authority?

Of all laws that are least regarded and most to be desired in a community built on wage-earning are those securing the life and possessions of the working classes. The increase in murder, theft, burglary is felt in their quarters far more than elsewhere; accidents in the workshops are killing and maiming them. The police and judiciary, with very few exceptions, are unwilling or unable to cope with the situation. The manufacturers hold the lives of their prey too cheap and care not for their safety in the shops and at the machines. And when the Socialists pointing out these cruelties in modern industry, are urging the working people to join their ranks, in order to work the industries cooperatively under the control of a benevolent
administration, is it to be wondered at that they meet with a hearty response from the tortured masses?

CRIME AND THE ANARCHISTS.

Every conceivable crime has been ascribed to the Anarchists, but not one has been fastened upon Anarchism. President Roosevelt exclaimed that every question of the day paled in significance as compared to that of Anarchism. Is it so? Or is the utterance of the Chief Magistrate to be understood in the light of development toward centralization of power and limitation of freedom?

The Anarchist is the logical enemy of centralization, he is the natural foe of ruling by force. He hopes for a society in which a sublime feeling of fraternity will pervade a self-reliant people as an incentive to work in mutual aid; history and natural history sustain him in his philosophy. Men and associations will combine for mutual aid and cooperative work; they will not be under the control of an administration with ruling powers; for power over a fellow-man breeds brutality and is apt to give birth to tyrannical institutions. Men of an association will learn to adjust things themselves, they will enter treaties, as it were, with other associations for the exchange of goods or material. Those who desire to live under communism, might form leagues of that nature; those who reject communism, might work out their own salvation. But there shall be no forcible interference with the economical, moral, or political life of any man; there should be no establishment of a legislature, an army, or other institution threatening the liberty of the people. In the emergency of a dispute arising between individuals or associations those concerned shall directly, without the interference of outsiders, arrive to a settlement of their differences.

Education and environment, the Anarchist claims, shape the nature of a people. Liberty makes man generous. And if conditions can be created, that make man reliant on the resources of his intellect and sympathy, society will not be found lacking in trust and assistance.

Prince Kropotkin, writing on Anarchist Morality, says: The distinction... between egoism and altruism is absurd in our eyes. That is why we have said nothing of the compromise that man, if we are to believe the utilitarians, is always making between his egoistic and altruistic sentiments. Such compromise can have no existence for the man who knows his own mind. What really takes place in the present condition of life, if we seek to live in conformity with our principles of equality, is that at every step we feel them outraged. (Chapter X). Reviewing his argumentation, he concludes in the same chapter: We have seen the kind of morality which is even now shaping itself in the ideas of the masses and of the thinkers. This morality will issue no commands. It will refuse once and for all to model individuals according to an abstract idea, as it will refuse to mutilate them by religion, law, or government. It will leave to the individual man full and perfect liberty. It will be but a simple record of facts, a science. And this science will say to man: “If you are not conscious of strength within you, if your energies are only just sufficient to maintain a colorless, monotonous life, without strong impressions, without deep joys, but also without deep sorrows, keep to the simple principles of a just equality. In relation to
equality you will find probably the maximum of happiness possible to your feeble energies.

But if you feel within you the strength of youth, if you wish to live, if you wish to enjoy a perfect, full and overflowing life—that is, know the highest pleasures which a living being can enjoy—be strong, be great, be vigorous in all of you.

Sow life around you. Take heed that if you deceive, lie, intrigue, cheat, you thereby demean yourself, confess your own weakness beforehand, play the part of the slave of the harem, who feels himself the inferior of the masters.

Are such utterances not worthy of emulation? Are these appeals to everything that is noble in us, made by a recognized leader of communist-anarchist thought, criminal, as our Chief-Magistrate would make us believe?

Outrages recently committed in the United States have been ascribed, directly and indirectly, to Anarchists. But upon investigation it was shown that in the case of two western occurrences neither of the accused was an anarchist or had been moved to his acts by the perusal of anarchistic literature. And the connection of the New York anarchist with the bomb-throwing on Union Square is of a very flimsy nature and open to well-founded suspicion. But if we turn to Spain, the historical battlefield of the Anarchists, we find that bomb-throwing and the like outrages have been the work of the secret police. The Black Hand (Mano nera) for a long time filled Spain with terror, the Anarchists within being taken for the perpetrators of those heinous crimes until at last it came to light that no such society had existed, that the secret police had invented this devilish chimera to drive the people to fury against the Anarchists, the supposed actors in this drama. And recently, about a month ago, another crime of the secret police was unearthed there; an agent of the police having joined the ranks of some Anarchists in order to provoke them to untoward acts, upon failing to accomplish his ends, manufactured and exploded bombs in various sections of the land, thus uncovering “contemplated assassinations and assaults” and making a profitable income thereby. Such occurrences are of so frequent a nature that it has become proverbial to look at the bomb-thrower as an agent of the police. The late Governor Altgeld exonerated in a lengthy brief the Anarchists hanged in Chicago from a connection with the bomb-throwing on the hay market, 1887. Czolgocz’s deed belongs in a class for itself. Whether he was an Anarchist or not is an open question. Anarchist or no, he was moved by the same kind of patriotism that directed the hands of Brutus or Booth. A vital and sudden change in national and imperialist policies was apt to react on men with firm convictions and strong passions in a compulsory manner. Brutus and Booth thought the interests of their countries outraged, and employed forcible means in an endeavor to awaken the public conscience. The act of Czolgocz may be, with equal justice, explained in like manner.

But granted that the Anarchists did engage in violent propaganda as a means of calling the attention of the world to inhuman conditions, the amelioration of which is comparatively easy of accomplishment, but opposed to by those who profit by them. The responsibility for such acts rests with a society that does not permit the free development of ideas and ob-

---

*Trial in Barcelona of one Rull whom the Governor of Barcelona admitted as having been in his employ.
Arrests the open passage of a social movement. If you desire violence, restrict freedom. If you have freedom, peace is at hand.

Society, in permitting a government to regulate the relations of its citizens and the general welfare of all classes in a community, charges thereby the government with the duty to care for those under its protection. If the government fails in its task, society ought to replace it with another government, provided it is not to get along without one. If society fails in this, individuals must remind it that in taking from men the rights to govern themselves and laying their welfare in the hands of a criminal government, society has played the role of a traitor on the individual, that from the government being a lessee has risen a government with a slave-driver's whip in hand, who usurps the ownership of men and the settlement of affairs.

But above all, this government has no right to decry violent actions since it rose to power and holds its prestige through violence. A teacher ridicules himself by upbraiding his scholars for brutalities they have learned from the master. President Roosevelt, to argue for a greater navy, insists that the pride of a nation and the honor of etc., etc., relies on the backing of might. Very well, then, this may be also the view of the Anarchist who has no other way of settling the dispute between himself and the State. Why, then, hiss the propagandist, if he be an Anarchist, and cheer the agitator, if he chances to be a republican, since both arrive in their philosophy of might and right at the same conclusion? If a difference of a degree of merit there be, that weighs heavier to the credit of the Anarchist. For while he is moved to his acts by the desire to free the people from burdens of taxation and exploitation, the politician is using all means in his power to increase the public expenditures and to impose new rules; while the first offers his own earnings and life on the altar of an ideal, the latter disposes of the earnings and lives of others for the sake of power.

John Most, supposedly an avowed advocate of violence as a means for propaganda, defines in unmistakable terms the harm done to the cause of Anarchism by acts of violence undertaken without the object of liberation in view and without any tangible chances of success for the liberation of society from any of its forms of tyranny." Yet anarchism and crime are constantly mentioned in one breath, as though anarchism meant crime and crime anarchism; in spite of the fact that crime is growing more rampant as the power of the district-attorney and police commissioner are increasing in dimensions. A wave of unpunished crime always follows a refusal to grant them more money and men, and precedes each request for them. In fact, the only people that need to be in fear of the police and the district-attorney's office are those aware of the injustices wrought and arrayed against them, and those who are in the employ of the wealthy. The lowest strata of society, the criminal rich and the professional thieves need not fear them; the first because the respect for the rich must be maintained at all hazards, to prevent the downfall of the iniquitous system; the second, because of their show of deter-

*Attentats-Reflexionen, Freiheit, August 28, 1892.
**Governor Johnson, whose nomination for the Presidency is being urged by such influences as the World, is reported as saying that the decisions of the courts must be respected, even if unjust. An Ideal President! Could there be a greater encouragement to unjust decisions than such utterances?
mination, they must be left to war on their unfortunate fellow-men rather than be given a chance to openly attack the plutocracy.

But are we because of the connection of a man with a class, a movement, a church, to accuse them of crime committed by one of their members? Are we to call the police an association of burglars because members of the force have been found guilty of aiding and abetting in burglary? Are we to call the Roman Catholics murderers because in the month of April two most dastardly murders† by Roman Catholic priests in Italy have come to light?

Confusion reigns supreme. The attack on Anarchism is really an attack on thought, an attack on self-reliance. The minds of the people are being confused, and once their apathy permits the gagging of a class against which they have been prejudiced, the conspiracy against their free expressions of disapproval of usurpations of power will soon unmask its face.

Meanwhile government is linked with ignorance as freedom with knowledge. Its despotism can be likened to the doings of a rageful woman who is whipping her child on the street and under the gaze of a generally indifferent populace. She throws her offspring on the back, slaps it in the face, kicks it in the belly, and, in fear lest someone might be aroused to take the child from her fury, drags it into a dark hallway where she may do things nobody can witness. And this is called justice, and justice is called charitable, and charity is supposed to be an attribute to civilization, and civilization means the height of culture, and culture the possession of knowledge, the development of man's faculties, the subserviency of natural forces to the welfare of humanity, and . . . But let it be enough. Justice is nothing of that sort. She is a rageful woman, deaf to the heartaches of the weak, blind to the wounds of the sick. She knows no charity, and the civilization she adores is that of the raiment; culture to her is wealth, and the welfare of humanity is meted out by her according to the price paid in money. This justice is the justice of government. But, in spite of Roosevelt, man was before government, and, in spite of government, man will survive its justice.

AWAKE!

We must needs come to the conclusion that the restrictions on free speech, on immigration, on citizenship; the increase in military prowess, in crimes against the poor and the middle class by gangs of professionals, and by the lords of exploitation; the growth of the wealth and influence of the Churches; the dissemination of prejudice, are one long chain wherewith the enslavement of the masses is to be performed.

The more the masses will look up to Washington for amelioration of their conditions, the stronger will the institution of centralized power become. In view of the historical fact that the grossest injustice assumed the noblest insignia to cover the dark thoughts in its breast, it is rational that the suppression of liberties be covered with high-sounding phrases.

†Priest de Lembo, accused of treacherously killing one Spagnoli, of whose wife the divine was jealous. Brother Valeriano, from the Capucines in Naples, accused of grand larceny and murder by poison.
It is already a popular belief that office carries graft and graft office, and it is high time that the people realize the deception practiced on them. Instead of applying for assistance against their various oppressors to the authorities in whom they have no faith, the workmen must needs co-operate to help themselves. And since the vote is an avenue to deception and oppression, the workmen should keep away from the voting booths.

Citizenship has been made dependable on the value of the pocketbook and a man's political convictions. Citizenship has been thus made dependable on stealth and lie. Its worth has been lowered. A prize has been set on cowardice, for he who shall lie may become a citizen. It is far nobler to do the duties of an honorable man than share in the privileges of a caste.

All energies and possessions in money and labor should be spent on erecting homes of the various crafts, however small in the beginning, with the view of closer association and direct benefit. Groups should combine for co-operative work with a view to the beginning of communistic production and enjoyment of the fruit of their labor. If all money thrown away by workmen for political action, for salaries of leaders, for rent, for the profits of middle-men, for bureaus, etc., were to be used for the economic emancipation of labor, however small and hard the start may be, the workman soon would outgrow all hardships of non-employment, and at last, never resting in his agitation for self-reliance of the class and the mutual interest of the worker, would own to what he is justly entitled.

All hope for clean politics is vain. The essence of all institutions is fed by a system of espionage. If you bear no witness against your fellow man, if you do not spy on his acts and intentions, if you do not watch his movements in trade and business, the courts and competition are at a standstill. But while this system of espionage is a necessary implement to hold the modern state together, it is corrupting the faculties of man, blotting his soul with shame, killing his love for the fellow man. And thus brought up from childhood and contending with such evils during all his life, man becomes unconsciously hardened against the noblest sentiments of humanity, and accessible to all influences of corruption. The system of espionage thus breeds corruption.

Environment, as we have set forth in a previous chapter, shapes the nature of man; it is a silent educator. And Mr. Angell, the president of the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, in sketching the character of President Roosevelt, has this truth in mind when he says in Our Dumb Animals:

If, in his boyhood, President Roosevelt had been humanely educated in a hand of mercy, probably he would have written very differently about the starving cattle on Western ranches, and the shooting of animals simply for the fun of wounding and killing them. He would not be so anxious to put rifles into the hands of American school boys that they might be better prepared to shoot human beings, and he would not be engaged in his present controversy with Rev. William J. Long, whose charming stories of animal life are giving pleasure to thousands of readers.

We tried very hard to prevent Mr. Roosevelt being Assistant Secretary of the Navy because—as we wrote Gov. Long—we felt sure if he received that appointment, we should get into war with something about something.
We failed and the Cuban and Philippine wars have cost thousands of lives, hundreds of millions of dollars, an enormous increase in our pension list, and the end is not yet.

We cannot help thinking of the President as a powder mill, liable at any time to explode and do vast damage, and we most earnestly wish—as we suggested some months ago—that he might have in his Cabinet as "Secretary of Peace" some strong man to "whose wise counsels he would respectfully listen," so that he may studiously avoid everything which would plunge nation into another war.

. . . Roosevelt went afield armed to the teeth with a repeating rifle, etc. His books are steeped in the blood of wanton slaughter, and he reels in the telling of the wounding of beasts, the killing of fawns and mother animals, and of the disregard of the unwritten laws of camp life in shooting camp confines.

Let us not be deceived as to the real meaning of these hard times and the succession of restrictions on liberty. It behooves us, above all, to raise our voice in mighty denunciation of the attacks on our own rights as men and women of an enlightened age. Our voice will be heard when it shall not be dumped into ballot boxes but cried out in the open to carry it to the ears of our oppressors. They look with silent contempt or pleasure at the ballot-box, but they will tremble when our voices are heard:

Repeal your despotic measures; hearken to the pangs of hunger!

Let us open our eyes to the misery of the subjected colonies. Let us recognize the injustice they suffer from our hands, let us rectify the promises we have broken, let us investigate how much the enslavement of these foreign peoples has had to do with the enslavement of ourselves, how much to the exploitation in the colonies are due the hardships at home.

And ere we strive toward the realization of a reconstruction of society, let us not forget that we must strive toward breaking the chains that try to fasten on our intellect. Only then is the human mind creative of greatness, both, in pleasure and worry. The intellect in pleasure is like the day on which a clear sky shines; the fogs of prejudice and superstition and fear have receded. And the intellect of a free mind in worry is like a stormy night illumined by stars of hopes and thoughts and sympathy.

Awake, workers, to hope and thought and sympathy!

And then you will act directly in your behalf, and establish a truly free commonwealth.