



A PERIODICAL OF ANARCHIST THOUGHT, WORK, AND LITERATURE.

VOL. X. NO. 18.

CHICAGO, SUNDAY, MAY 3, 1903.

WHOLE NO. 412.

Lines to Jehovah.

I fear thee not, thou jealous God,
Thou thou canst decompose
The molecules and elements
Wherefrom my being rose;
For if these should disintegrate,—
Why, then, I will repose.

My Individuality.

That is beyond thy sway;
And therefore I will not bow down,
I will not praise or pray,
If thou dost want automata,—
Create them out of clay.

But I am unlike unto thee,
And will not bow to thee,
For there remains a refuge path
Along which I can flee:—
One step beyond the boundary,
And I am free!—Am free!

—The Whim.

Anarchism.

I am asked to contribute a paper on the much misunderstood subject of Anarchism. I gladly do so, as the current ideas of it are entirely based on ignorance and misrepresentation. Hence it is desirable that a clearer conception of this great ideal and what it stands for should be presented.

First of all, Anarchism is not a cut and dried scheme; it is simply a theory about the freedom of the individual. It is intended to enable all persons, whether Anarchists or not, to obtain a freer field, a possible environment, in which individuals or masses of them, can get an opportunity to really try any such schemes for the betterment of society as may present themselves to the human mind.

In our present governmental (or Archist), as distinguished from an Anarchist (or non-governmental) society, society presents a seeming unity. The main channels of life are uniformly controlled and run in a given groove by a unified system of administration thru laws, courts, army and police. Government is so universal that every one is born under it, and cannot escape its control. Social experiments, except within very narrow limits, can only be made under the controlling eye of government, and an immense burden of compulsory taxation, which cannot be escaped no matter how mischievous and contrary to the wishes of the individual it may be. In this governmental society changes can only be made by capturing the mechanism of government (in America by majority rule), and running the government (by the use of physical force) to compel acquiescence on the part of all. In its essence this is a perpetual

reliance on physical force, or the much-condemned "violence." Thus the art of controlling society by government resolves itself into a struggle to obtain the means of compelling consent by the appeal to force or violence. Society, in the aggregate, quite properly objects to force and violence, on principle; and in the name of order tries to escape from it by means of government. But government, in its last analysis, is itself nothing but the resort to the same dreaded force and violence—ostensibly for the protection of the whole of society, but in reality always in the interest of a part of society only. Thus it is emphatically true, in the words of Tolstoy, that "the essence of legislation is organized violence."

The Anarchist, in his turn, equally objects to force and violence, he does not believe that disorder can be suppressed by organizing disorder into government. He sees, with the historian Guizot, that all governments have been founded in violence, are maintained by force, when they fall they do so by force, and are replaced by force in some form, and they continue in essence the same. He sees that so far from government improving things it increases social evils by adding to those that may be inherent in society a new set of evils and corruptions of its own, one form of which is that it creates new opportunity for privileged abuse. Instead of desiring to better society and make it more orderly, government is directly interested in perpetuating corruption and disorder, because they are the very breath of its nostrils, the only excuse for its existence, and without which it must perish. The resulting "officialism" does and must play with crime, evil and disorder, and must perpetuate them in order to perpetuate itself.

Such criticisms of government (archism) lead to the proposal to replace it by Anarchism (without government). Historically, it is found that progress towards better social ideals is not brought about by government, but has in every case been retarded by it. The natural conclusion is that humanity in the shape of society is always better, more reliable and progressive than government; that such social progress and order as do arise come from human development in spite of government; that no matter how bad mankind may be supposed to be, it is better to trust to mankind free than to mankind plus government.

From time immemorial society without government has been called Anarchy (Greek

an, without, archy, rule), with the implication that such a society would be in a state of confusion and disorder. We deliberately choose the name of Anarchist because we deny that Anarchism implies confusion and disorder; we affirm, on the contrary, that it is thru Anarchism only that such order as is possible in human society can be reached. The continued existence of government is of itself a tacit admission that it does not secure order. As the cause of human progress lies outside of government, it must lie in freedom from control, in freedom, that is in Anarchism.

These considerations ought to make it clear that Anarchism is simply a theory about the freedom of the individual, and that it has no derivatives bearing on any other question. To illustrate further I will quote the two definitions of Anarchism that are most popular among Anarchists. The first is by Benj. R. Tucker, an Individual Anarchist, and runs thus: "Anarchism is the doctrine that all the affairs of men should be managed by individuals or voluntary associations, and that the State should be abolished." The second definition, which is a favorite among Communist Anarchists, is not even written by an Anarchist writer, but appears in the orthodox "Century Dictionary." It reads thus: "A social theory which regards the union of order with the absence of all direct government of man by man as the political ideal, absolute individual liberty."

Thus the claim for Anarchism is that mankind can better arrange their lives in a society based on freedom than under government. What arrangement is to be made it leaves to the free initiative of the individual, singly or in voluntary associations. Necessarily the outcome will depend upon the opinions of free individuals, and Anarchism can postulate nothing about what direction the mind shall move in. It claims that mankind will reach a higher stage of development if free than under compulsory direction.

While Anarchism is thus shown to be a very simple and easily understood idea, it is not to be denied that the study of literature on the subject may at first produce some confusion as to the doctrine itself. It will often be found that a writer, having accepted Anarchism as his basic thought, goes on to another subject than personal liberty, —say, for instance, he advances his theory as to what economics are best calculated to preserve freedom, and ends by seeming to make his economic theory a necessary pos-

tulate of Anarchism. The same confusion may arise on other subjects, as religion, morals, defences, methods, and so on, in all of which he may entirely differ with other Anarchists. But if the stranger to Anarchism will study it as a theory of freedom, on its own merits, he will then be better able to study the ideas of Anarchists on questions of economics, religion, morals, methods, and so on, on their merits; he will thus be better able to form his own opinion as to what bearing, if any, Anarchism has on them. He will find, again, that it is precisely because there are these differing opinions, that we have another reason for the necessity of Anarchism. It alone provides a basis by which men, agreeing to disagree, can freely and amicably attempt to carry out their theories and show by actual experience which of the competing ideals have merit.—C. B. Cooper, in *People's Culture Review*.

The General Strike in Holland.

On the 6th of April the great strike of workmen on railways and other means of transport, burst forth in Holland. The decision with reference to it took place on the preceding Sunday, two hundred delegates of workmen's unions being called together specially for such purpose.

Whatever may be the result of this movement, it will have an enormous importance in the annals of the struggle of labor for its enfranchisement.

Let us, therefore, recall the motives.

All will remember the strike which burst forth at Amsterdam in November, 1902. The National federation of workmen on transportation lines, which comprised a union of about 15,000 men organized from railways, docks and other carrying companies, had notified a syndicate of patrons of the canal boat transports that, from the first of January, no member of the National Federation would work by the side of non-organized workmen,—which were always hired by the patrons in order to lower wages.

The sixth of January following the strike was declared at Amsterdam by the dock laborers. The railroad workmen immediately made common cause with the strikers on the docks, refusing to touch the wagons loaded with merchandise for the above-mentioned syndicate of patrons. And as the railroad companies insisted that this work should be done, and refused to desist at the request of the workmen, they declared a general strike on the 10th of January.

The next day not a single train entered Amsterdam and not one left the city. One can imagine the dismay of the bourgeois.

There are nearly 16,000 men working on the railways in Holland; and they work from fourteen to sixteen hours, and receive but twenty to twenty-two francs (\$4 to \$4.20) per week.

The State possesses some railroad lines which it rents to a company for exploitation.

The conditions imposed by the strikers were these: 1, Recognize the Union; 2, No demand shall be made that the workmen shall forward the merchandise of the companies against which the dock workmen are on strike; 3, Pay the strikers for all the

time of the strike; 4, Put the strikers back in the places they occupied before the strike; and make no reprisals against any of the strikers.

The strike was spreading all over Holland when the principal company of "exploiters," and after it the State, hastened to accept the conditions of the strikers.

The strike of the railway workers was thus victorious; and a great lesson on the solidarity of workmen had been given to the entire world.

Thereupon, the bourgeoisie, having at their command the State and the representative government, decided to take their measures. An example had already been given to them by Italy, where a law—making work upon the railways a *public service of the State*—declared that all strikes upon railways would be thenceforth a crime, a revolt.

In effect, this law took the necessary arrangements so that in case of a strike, the striking workmen would be replaced immediately by soldiers. In other words, as soon as a strike burst forth on a railway, they called into active service, not such or such class of the army,—but they called John, workmen on whatever railroad,—Peter, machinist on whatever locomotive,—Paul, porter at whatever station,—and so on. In brief, since the great majority of the workmen who work upon the railroads belong to some class of the army and of the reserves, they are called into military service. Equipped as soldiers; numbered; belonging to such or such company and such battalion, they will be from thenceforth *deserters* and will be brought before a *court martial*, if they refuse to work upon the line to enrich the patron named.

One can see from this where we are going, with the Social Democrats preaching governmental capitalism; centralization by the State, and the abandonment of all that which can derange Messrs. the deputy workmen from their sweet "labor," at the chimney corner. When one has a few "Turati," and a number of cigar makers like "Singer" to represent the workingmen's interests, one may await some interesting events.

Thus, then, in Holland, a little under the pressure of Germany, which threatened to interfere in case of the stoppage of transportation, the bourgeois proposed to imitate Italy. A certain Dr. Kuyper proposed a law like this:—

1st. A parliamentary inquest will be held.

2nd. Between times, and to commence, put in the war budget a provision so that in case of strike, all the militia which knows how to work on railroads can be sent immediately to the place of the strike to set going some trains, (some trains to commence, and all trains at the end). In other words, the workmen is no longer a free man, who can debate his price and his condition of labor with a company of exploiters. He is let to them by the State, as a slave, for *obligatory work*, the same as criminals are let in Russia, to companies of gold finders.

And thirdly, to introduce Draconian laws to punish those railroad workmen who cause a strike; as also those who persuade them to cease work.

One can judge for oneself of the rest of

Kuyper's laws, by this single paragraph. It seems absolutely incredible; but we have translated it verbally.

"The officers in all public service," says this proposed law, "also all persons hiring permanently or temporarily to work upon the railroad,—if, to cause obstruction to the service, they refuse, after having received the legal order to furnish the work which they have engaged to do, according to the the nature of their contract, can be punished, at the maximum, with six months in prison or a fine of 750 francs.

"If two persons or more cause such obstruction, with a common intent, the punishment shall be four years in prison, at the maximum with no alternative of a fine.

"The persons who conduct and the instigators of such conspiracy shall have the same punishment; which can be increased to six years, if they have succeeded in their object, and created an obstruction to the service.

"Whoever, by his speaking or writing, shall have counselled to have stopped this kind of work (on railroads), will be guilty of instigation, and shall be punished at the maximum by five years imprisonment, or a fine of 750 francs."

It is to oppose this iniquitous law that the general strike of transports is called. "Let us protest against these laws, and augment our salaries before the bourgeois have cut from us our means of defense"; such is the order for the strike.

The workers are unanimous in their revolt.

The diamond cutters have just joined the railroad men.

Workingmen of all Nations; workingmen of all parties; your blood should boil in reading about these unworthy projects conjured up by the bourgeois.

It is time, quite time, that you rise against these low debauched people who enjoy an idle life and live off your sweat; on your blood and the blood of your children.

Make common cause with the strikers of Holland. They are your brothers and—they are no loiterers, they know how to march in the front.—*Peter Kropotkin*. Translated from *Les Temps Nouveaux*.

Is He a Rascal?

And here is a new explanation of that extraordinary vigor with which superstitions cling to existence. Addressing the lowest of human emotions, they are equally capable of infecting the most powerful intellects or the weakest; as witchcraft and divination are far from obsolete among the masses, so decaying moral and speculative dogmas linger in a higher grade of culture, even after their phrases have degenerated into the merest cants. This worship of words is by no means the least noxious phase of superstition.—C. L. James.

R. G., City.—Yes, a man who seduces a young, inexperienced girl by a deliberate lie, promising to marry her when he does not intend to do so, and withdraws his sympathy and aid when she is in distress,—being thrown on the street by her parents,—is certainly "a rascal," no matter what his confessions otherwise are.—FREE SOCIETY, Vol. X, No. 15.

The above letter box notice does not meet with my approval. I deny that a man "who seduces . . . is certainly a rascal." The act of the man I resent, repudiate. The way in which he achieved his purposes is not my way. Still he is not a rascal. Understand and you will not condemn. Do not attempt

to understand and you will reach conclusions similar to those arrived at by judges.

Jurisprudence and its practise agree in this instance with the editor of FREE SOCIETY. A man who seduces a girl under the above named circumstances is according to judicial wisdom a rascal. Any judge will sentence him. The editor would not. He does not believe in punishment. Still if once the same conclusions are reached it is then no more a question of principle but of expediency. It depends upon how you look at the matter. From what standpoint. In the main you classify the man. The editor makes out of the man an outlaw as far as the society of the non-rascals is concerned. This means condemning just the same. Only the usual punishment does not follow.

Why in this particular instance would the judge as well as our friend Isaak reach the same conclusion? Because for them only the act of the man and its consequences exist. Neither of them see that the act in itself was a mere consequence. To neither of the two the motives, the impelling causes which produced the act, occur! They see a certain wrong committed. Consequently the man "is *certainly* a rascal." They see a certain right violated. A right which they perceive, just as they perceived a definite wrong. Therefore the man must be a rascal. The motive of the act they do not know. Nor does anyone of my readers know the exact cause of a "crime." In sexual-cravings that look for gratification less than in any other "criminal" action. But how does a motive concern a modern judge? Why should our friend Isaak heed the psychological riddles of an act? Both gentlemen simply arrogate to themselves the right to judge. They divide mankind into "honest" folk and "rascals."

The sexual desires of man's or woman's nature can never be judged. I may have an opinion about them. What does this mean? That I shall act accordingly. That is all. Never that my opinion shall bind anybody else. Nobody has a right to pass judgment upon my sexual acts or how I acquire gratification. Neither have I a right to do so regarding others. You will answer that this holds good only so long as the liberty of others is not invaded. I answer that if this be done then those who are invaded have to settle this; but I have no right to call the man whose sexual act I do not agree with and therefore do not comprehend a "rascal." I may say he is cruel; that I should use in his place more consideration; that I would act differently. But I have no right to call him "a rascal."

It is the height of absurdity to classify man sexually. Man is neither good nor bad. Man develops. He uses his intellect as circumstances, place, need, etc., command. Man is a mixture of everything. He is good and bad. In all of us are feelings of brutality, love, gratitude, kindness, hatred. How those feelings assert themselves depends upon the degree of knowledge achieved. Depends upon our intellectual ability, and upon a thousand and more things which are beyond our understanding. They are also beyond the conception of the judge and Comrade Isaak. Still the first as well as the latter will claim that a man who acted as stated in the letter-box "is *certainly* a rascal."

About the contents of the notice I shall say little. I do not personally know sufficient about the case. If Comrade Isaak does he has presented it very insipidly. Because a girl that can only be won thru a lie, exciting the passion of a man who in such a state is apt to promise everything—the woman does too!—digs her own fate. Furthermore, it certainly matters a great deal "what the confessions of the rascal may be." The bourgeois dude will make a profession of seducing girls. Seduction seemingly is his confession. The sexually starved man will yield to any demand of the woman, however unjust and intolerant. If his confessions are of a noble nature we can imagine how great the stress was which made him succumb. If they are of very undeveloped characteristics, then the weakness of the man could only be expected. In both cases it is not for us to judge the nature of our neighbors. We are just as likely to succumb to sexual passion as the "rascal." All we can do is to arm ourselves with sufficient self-control, knowledge, etc., so as to prepare a plan of action for ourselves as far as we are responsible for our acts. But it is degrading to each and everyone who puts down his brother as "a rascal" because he acts different from the way we think we would.

The editor of FREE SOCIETY says farther that the girl theoretically in question was, "thrown on the street by her parents." Such an act is inhuman. We all agree on this just as we recognize that the act of the fellow who presumably did not support the poor lass is from our standpoint inhuman. Still do we know the circumstances? We cannot know. He may not have had any money. His conditions may have been such that he could not spare any. The girl probably could have forced him to marry her. By law and thru proving with money receipts that he had "illegal connection" with her. All these arguments are mere assumptions. And upon assumptions we can never base convictions. Furthermore, in face of the fact that parents outrage their feeling, can we really consider a man a "rascal," who never loved a girl, but simply sought sexual gratification and then left her? If parents abuse their child, why is it so impossible that the feeling of a man—"confessions do not matter"—can also be barren? The harshness of his feelings do not make him "a rascal."

The readers will understand my position in this polemic. I do not defend the act of "a rascal." On the contrary I oppose it. I help to spread knowledge so that it shall not be repeated. But I consider it anti-Anarchistic to call a man "a rascal" because of an act which he commits. If one man is a rascal than all are. I remember a splendid article written by the brilliant German writer, Rob. Reitzel: "A criminal to criminals!" Robert Reitzel knew that each of us is a "criminal" or has at least "criminal" faculties within him. Therefore it will never do to call a man "rascal" when we ourselves are such. . . .

Establish a standard of morals and you can logically excuse present society in many of its features. Sex knows no morals. Recognize morals and you are an upholder of the present social regime. Because everybody who violates *your* moral conception is

then "a rascal." Everybody who agrees with you is honest. Belongs to your clan or caste. The meaninglessness of such words as moral, honest, immoral, dishonest, right, wrong, good, bad, in their psychological, sociological and like aspects is clear when we recognize today the greatest possible variety in all those things. Right or wrong—in the main part deductions of moralistic conceptions—do not exist. There is no absoluteness in either of them. They are artificially constructed, phrases. In reality, right is might according to the individual's material and other real interests. His right is right from *his* standpoint. I struggle against government because my conception of right opposes the conception authority entertains. I believe in the social revolution as the only means of physically solving the social question because I know that right is might.

I recognize fully well that the fate of the "young, inexperienced girl" in our present society is dreadful. But it is society that is the ultimate cause of her misery. It left her parents ignorant. Society, her parents, left also the girl ignorant. It made the man grow up with the idea that it is a great thing to seduce a girl. Society has sexual conditions that are abhorrent. All these cause acts of brutality and inconsideration. Society as constituted today makes the most intelligent act most brutally, and sometimes finds the low ones and outcasts, in spite of social influences, act nobly and beautifully. Because there is no class of good or bad men, of rascals or non-rascals. Man is both. The ray of knowledge can either eliminate the so-called anti-human act or the lack of knowledge produce it there where it finds a fertile soil. I readily recognize that the really great person is the one who possesses all the elements of that which I consider great, noble, human. But the one who is not the happy possessor of those attributes I do not recognize as "a rascal"—even tho in excitement all of us are prone to fall into this mistake and error—but simply as a fellow creature whom I will attempt to develop, that he may battle more successfully against the degrading influences of social surroundings. That he may fathom his psychological longings. That he may recognize the beautiful seed of altruism which rests in noble egoism.

My brothers or sisters, however they may err to my opinion, I shall not call "rascals." I shall fight with all my power against that which I consider as wrong. But only when it is crystallized in an institution that upholds the system of today. Sexual aberrations I shall not judge. Neither in the rank of the bourgeoisie nor in the file of the proletariat. I am no judge upon methods employed to satisfy irresistible sexual desires. It is a thing I may oppose. But I cannot condemn the doer. If I do I admit that a division is existing within mankind. A division into "rascals" and honorable men. I deny that it is thus. If such a division exists, pray let me know the definition of "a rascal" more definitely. Not in its etymological sense. I can do that myself. Do not need to be told that. But tell me what "a rascal" is in sexual matters. Then I shall know. Then I will argue upon this

Continued on page 5.

FREE SOCIETY

Formerly THE FIREBRAND.

Published Weekly by.....A. ISAAK.

ONE DOLLAR A YEAR.

Address all Communications and make all Money Orders payable to FREE SOCIETY, 407 PARK AVE., Chicago, Ill.

Entered at the Chicago post office as second-class matter, October 29, 1901.

The publishers as such are not necessarily in agreement with any opinions expressed by the contributors.

CHICAGO, SUNDAY, MAY 3, 1908.

412

If these figures correspond with the number printed on the wrapper of your FREE SOCIETY, your subscription expires with this number.

ANARCHY—A social theory which regards the union of order with the absence of all direct government of man by man as the political ideal, absolute individual liberty.—Century Dictionary.

Notes.

All exchanges and correspondents should note our new address, and direct mail to 407 Park Ave., instead of 331 Walnut.

It is announced that "Modern Science and Anarchism," by Peter Kropotkin, translated from the Russian original by David A. Modell, will be published immediately by the Social Science Club of Philadelphia.

Society has not yet reached its ideal state, one in which money will no longer be used, and where everything will be free for everyone. If the comrades who read FREE SOCIETY would effectively work for that ideal condition, let them remember that one of the means to the great end is the support of the journals which devote themselves to the advocacy of liberty. Prompt payment of subscriptions is genuine and effective propaganda. Are you with us?

To anyone sending us \$2 we will send FREE SOCIETY one year and Dr. Greer's "A Physician in the House" or his new work "The Wholesome Woman." Also to anyone sending us one new subscriber and \$2 we will send the same. This applies to renewals as well as new subscriptions.

Outpost Echoes.

Ballots are bullies.
Prejudice is a prison.
Experience is expensive.
Fools would crown an ass.
Deeds speak unmistakably.
Justice is wearing spectacles.
Freedom cannot be purchased.
The Church is a religious trust.
Jealousy confesses unworthiness.
Slavery is slavery; sex slavery too.
The single tax is simply a single steal.
Hearst for president! The king of fakers!
The general strike is a blow that is not wind.
Money makes the man because man made money.

FREE SOCIETY

Custom's only trustworthy weapon is ostracism.

Some men are wrong because they dare not be right.

Harrison is in training for his next fuddling of fools.

Roosevelt would rather be a president than be a man.

To be drunk on hope is better than to be sober on despair.

Clarence Darrow is learning that rule requires a big club.

Tom Johnson is a friend of the workers: look at his millions!

An educated trickster can outargue an uneducated honest man.

President Loubet is in Africa looking over some French plunder.

State Socialists deny the State, and yet they would capture it.

The "honor of the army" is the honor of men turned murderers.

Self-respect is more to be depended upon than the respect of others.

While men can strike why do they play with papers and ballot boxes?

There will be more wheat this year than ever before, and more stealing of it.

One thing is certain: liberty never promised one of her supporters a "graft."

The Irish are beginning to see thru the boasted land bill; there is nothing in it.

Celia B. Whitehead wishes that Americus "would drop the pseudonym." Curiosity is no argument, Celia.

The Rev. Henry Van Dyke has discovered the social revolution. Wait till the social revolution discovers him.

Curious, isn't it? The law is solely for white men: they are continuing to lynch Negroes everywhere in the south.

Plutus regards organized labor as a crime. Wait till Demos knows Plutus as he is. "The first shall be last and the last shall be first."

The family grew out of oppression, and has been perpetuated by economic exploitation. The family is feudal, and the home is a fortress.

There is need of propaganda among libertarians. Let them draw closer together in friendship, and concede the liberty they preach.

The hope of Heaven can only satisfy those who have not hope upon Earth. No wonder the clerics have always opposed human happiness.

Freedom knows nothing about duties; but she knows something about aspirations, and that the basis of individual well-being is fraternity.

Thanks to the newspapers, the working masses are opposed to Anarchism. They will learn in time that Anarchism is not opposed to them.

Cook County is to have an election for new judges in June. The new judges will be very much like the old ones, impertinent pettifoggers in precedent.

Chicago women are to have a newspaper, all of their own. It is safe to say that the time-honored institutions of sex slavery will be supported by this journal.

The homestead law of the United States is being easily evaded by land grabbers and speculators daily. It took thirty-seven years to pass the homestead law.

The riot bullet is matched by the gatling gun, which is now being mounted at the mouths of many mines. Only the strong are permitted to use violence, so it seems.

Illinois has a legislature and that legislature has a problem, the traction problem. The speaker of the body has taught the members that the way to rule is to use force.

Democratic leaders are for reorganization, some of them; others are for things as they are. The one irresistible inference from party records is that disorganization is the best thing for parties.

Mary Wollstonecraft has been too little noticed by those who write of advanced women. She dared the sex superstition at its worst in the eighteenth century, and in England; and put her views into writing, as well.

All efforts which make for liberty make for human progress, and to condemn liberty because of some follies of libertarians is the bathos of reaction. Keep your eyes on the truth; the truth tellers are but human.

Ross Winn, finding fault with Americus for wishing that Clarence Darrow might escape from the legislature and return to his friends, the Anarchists, says in his paper, "The presence of a man like Darrow in any legislative body is a distinct gain for the cause of human freedom." I rub my eyes, and then reply, that the new Anarchist propaganda requires that a political ticket at once be nominated, all the candidates being Anarchists, and that from now on Anarchists settle their problems with the ballot.

AMERICUS.

— o —

At the Chicago Philosophical Society.

Last Sunday evening W. F. Barnard gave the final address of the season, his subject being "Woman."

The speaker declared that there was a great significance in the increase of divorce, illicit sexual relations, and in the general demand for more freedom in sexual relationships, as shown in popular novels of the day; and drew the inference that the average views on the subject of sex were sadly in need of revision. The general human problems, he found, (economic, social, etc.) were not only the problems of concern to the race; there were problems in the status of women of a peculiar nature, problems beyond those directly affecting the whole race; problems resulting from the facts that man was the custodian of woman's morals, that man made the laws for women, that he made religion for woman, and that her dress, deportment, and occupations were chosen for her by him. Women suffered from additional disadvantages as compared with man, in the struggle toward freedom.

Economic causes, wars, the facts of maternity, the delicacy of women's organism were referred to in accounting for man's

rule over women; and the facts of animal sex association were also declared to have exerted a strong influence in securing woman's subservience to the male human being. Attention was directed to the lower animals, which in many cases fought for the possession of the females, and it was said that modern man is in process of evolution and has not yet escaped from the savage sexual traits of his ancestry, the remote apes.

In primitive sex association the man always captured the woman, or else bought her; violence in some form characterizing his method of securing a partner; anthropology had established this, modern man, with his marriage institutions, which he had developed and made to appear in the form of law, and all without consulting women, was moving along the lines of action which were natural to the primitive man, and had not yet risen above force as the basis of sex relations; hence modern marriage; hence the convenient moral standard, which condemned in women what it permitted in man; hence the increase of divorce; hence the unfaithfulness of wives; hence the new women, hence the problem novel; hence the general rebellion all along the lines on the part of women against the rule of man. Women was becoming educated, and as a result was demanding liberty, and taking it.

Of course the sex problem would not be settled until economic problems were settled, but the truth was that women was not made for the man to possess and own, that she had begun to discover herself, and to realize that the things of most importance to her were not motherhood, not wifehood, but womanhood; which meant what manhood meant; the full and rounded development of her nature and powers, in which maternity and sex mating were but as means. Marriage in any form as now known made women the servant of man; and it would surely come to pass that woman would attain independence enough to make man realize that he was as dependent upon her as she upon him. Liberty for woman was the means of solving her problems, and the only means.

The critics contented themselves for the most part with the declaration that the sex problem could not be solved till the economic problem was solved and that what was necessary to do was to concentrate all effort on that problem and leave other things to take care of themselves. It was retorted by the lecturer, that the sex superstition and the family superstition were the most powerful supports of the economic system existing, that in the breakdown of the economic conditions which exist today all things identified with it fall and crumble into decay at the same time; and the critics were advised to prepare themselves to endure the change with good grace; for their efforts to stem the tide of sex freedom till a future day were as childish as it would be to try to stop the waves of the sea with straws. Woman, with loud voice was calling for freedom, and the day was past when men should tremble at that voice; the day was now here when the sound of rebellion in all direction should be the sweetest of music to human ears.

REPORTER.

Is Government a Success?

Is the State, in this or any other country a success! Is any organization, any grouping together of a certain number of independent individuals, with opposing interests, thoughts and feelings, a success? No candid, cool-headed thinking man would say so. Every society, every organized body of any kind, must prove a failure in its operations at last, because there is no common interest, no cohesion between the members. Each is for himself, and he is opposed to all his associates. Such bodies have no head and therefore they have no brains. Choosing a man as leader does not make him a leader. Before election, as well as after, each member is as good as another, and one has as many rights as another. Uniformly in all societies, or organizations, some one aggressive fellow takes the reins in his own hands and does the whole business. He is the boss, and the main body can simply follow the band wagon or get left.

All organizations, even the State, last but a short time. The seeds of dissolution and decay are in its constitution from the beginning. Such bodies are always extravagant in their expenditures, and waste manifests itself in every department. In the State nobody spends his own money, and it is for that reason that public funds are always disbursed with a lavish hand. Nobody appreciates money unless he earns it himself, and nobody is economical unless he handles his own funds. How could a State ever be a success under the existing conditions? The whole system is vicious and intolerable; a man acting under the government in any capacity could not be strictly honest if he tried. A strictly honest man in State or government service would nowadays be classed as a fool.

Government is never successful in any of its undertakings. There is too much red tape, and everything is done in the most expensive manner, and even then the work is rarely well done when 'tis done. Individuals thrive because they handle their own money and attend to their own affairs, while government fails for just the opposite reason. Where do we find more shameful waste and extravagance than in the army in time of war? The army illustrates what government is and how it operates. Here we find the perpetual sacrifice of the many for the advancement of the few. Indeed, a man is sent to war merely to be killed for the benefit of those who survive. So it is in public education—perpetual waste and extravagance for the benefit of a few—always a few. What a monster is State education! No tyrant in Asia ever heaped upon his subjects such a multitude of iniquities as is accumulated in this country in the name of "Free Education!" The public is sick, very sick, and the State, the governor, the boss, is always prescribing some new remedy to help the patient along! Too much doctoring sometimes kills people. J. WILSON.

May Day.

Long ago, when the workers with one common purpose decided to drop their tools and implements on the first day of May and make a demonstration before the eyes of capitalism, a great significance was expressed in the sounds of their thousands of

tramping feet, and the world of labor had reason to rejoice over its annual proof of solidarity, independence, and other great things to come. But alas! the time soon arrived when May Day was celebrated on Sunday, if at all; the Social Democrats having "persuaded" labor that ballots were the only things to demonstrate with. Another hope has become a memory! B.

— o —

First Millerand—Then Jaures.

"All who enter here leave Socialism behind." That is what should be written over the doors of all parliaments to warn the workers what they may expect from their "representatives" whom they elected at such a cost of money, time and trouble.

In *Justice* for March 21, Hyndman, in a much-needed protest, has pilloried the two renegades Millerand and Jaures, and has dealt them some well-deserved blows with all his fiery indignation. If he had been logical this attack would have been of inestimable worth, but unfortunately Hyndman himself is too much tied to the wheels of the political juggernaut, too much imbued with Marxism and State Socialism, to hew straight to the line of true Socialist principles. Were it otherwise, Hyndman would see that his impeachment of Millerand is an indictment of the whole policy of the parliamentary Socialists, who, following religiously their "scientific" theory, work for the "conquest of political power." For it is not merely that Millerand is a traitor, a murderer of the workers; he justifies himself on the very grounds assumed by Social Democrats for the taking of the first step which costs so much. Hyndman says, however, "Yet Millerand is no worse than others would be. He meant well, I have no doubt, but he could not rise superior to his surroundings. He could not be Minister of Commerce in a bourgeois government without swallowing a lot of bourgeois dirt. And he has swallowed it. It seems to have agreed with him." Very well; but why blame him? If you encourage a child to play with fire when you know it will burn itself, who is responsible if the house is burned down? Yet the same policy is being pursued in England. Comrades who have done good work in the early days of the movement get themselves elected, and immediately (as Millerand has done) they deny the Revolution. We have enough "shocking examples" at home without looking abroad. The pressing need of the moment is not a "united political Socialist party," but that all Socialists, in face of recent events, should reconsider the whole position and return to first principles.—*Freedom, London.*

— o —

Is He a Rascal?

(Continued from page 3.)

point. I shall prove to even your satisfaction by the most learned thinkers, poets, philosophers of today that rascality in the way you apply it does not exist. Life in itself is immorality because human. There is monism not only in nature. In the most thorough production of nature—in man—Monism also lives. Lives in the actions of the human being. But if you can show me that there can be "rascals," then show me also by what ethical cult they are to be declared. Probably we will retrogress to a standard of morality instead of gradually freeing ourselves from it. Quiene sabe? says the Spaniard. R. GROSSMAN.

A Vindication of Anarchism.

VII

Superstitions being founded on religious practises and these again on the insatiable nature of Man, which aspires to grasp an unalloyed and infinite satisfaction, we should expect the remedy to be found, if anywhere, in Science, which teaches its students, first to put a check on their impatience, not to aim at doing everything simultaneously, but to decide what they prefer doing before anything else; secondly, to find out the true way of doing that by the only method such inquiry admits, viz., the method of observation and experiment. By this modest and patient course she leads us up to the very threshold of those ultimate problems upon which a hundred generations of theologians and metaphysicians have spent their genius, learning, and energy, in vain.

For the two methods and their two purposes, the classic authority is Lord Bacon, in his "*Noctum Organum*," and "*De Augmentis Scientiarum*" (English translation by Basil Montagu). The futility of the theologico-metaphysical plan is, however, a common conclusion of theologians and metaphysicians themselves. Socrates, St. Thomas Aquinas, Kant, Schelling, and above all Bossuet, have expounded it very ably. But the best summary of arguments to this point is doubtless in Herbert Spencer's chapter, "The Unknownable;" where among other things it is shown that the impossibility of a satisfactory ontology is actually about the one point on which all ontologists have agreed. Here also is partly, tho I think not quite so successfully, indicated the reason why, notwithstanding this often-repeated demonstration, the human intellect returns so persistently to speculation on things beyond its reach. Macaulay's celebrated essay on Bacon, tho not without weak points, is a very good and popular guide to a student unfamiliar with the subject. The chief peculiarity of Bacon's philosophy, says Macaulay, is that he aimed at objects altogether different from those of the theologians and metaphysicians. The difference, indeed, is a little overstated in the Essay. Bacon took pains to repudiate that pig-philosophy which would make it the end of his method that sugar should be only four cents a pound. The end of his method, he says, is Truth. But he adds, most justly, that the test of truth is application. He who can do something really does know something about how it can be done. That he can construct a specious argument about it, is no proof of his knowing anything. Have not the ablest arguments, productions of the greatest intellects, been advanced for centuries on opposite sides of such issues as that between Fate and Freewill, without resulting in a verdict? Here is the real difference. The theologians and metaphysicians, speculating on emotions excited by the view of Everything in General, well knew their theories applied to Nothing in Particular, and could not be tested by experiment. For experiment is application; application is doing, and doing, unlike Emotion, must be consistent. Victory, not in a controversy even, but a debate, was all they ever attained, because controversial success was all they aimed at. But I, said Bacon, aim at truth. I limit myself therefore to inquiries in which truth can be

ascertained; and my test for such inquiries is that their results can be applied. Had the theologians and metaphysicians been like Bacon in this, they must, proceeds Macaulay, have been like him in other things. Neither the giant intellect of Aristotle nor the common sense of a mechanic ever failed to see that, given *doing something* as an end, observation and experiment (induction) must be the means.

This, however, is by no means quite enough to know. False induction is as easy to run into as false syllogisms, and scarcely as easy to detect. John Stuart Mill has shown that all reasoning is fundamentally inductive: therefore also all fallacies are at bottom inductive—the fault in an *ignoratio eleuchi* or a *non distributio medii* is really this that the middle term in one premise bears no such relation as it should to those particulars whence, according to Mill, it is virtually, tho not formally, generalized (1). To arrive by means of

- (1) To illustrate, take the following syllogism:
Fools are poets.

But Shakespeare was a poet:

Therefore Shakespeare was a fool.

We call this a non distributio medii. But clearly it is a false induction. How do you know that fools are poets? Because Phyllis Whately and Robert Montgomery were poets? This, at most, only proves that some fools are poets. It does not prove that all fools are poets, still less that all poets are fools. Compare with a legitimate syllogism:

All men die.

I am a man:

Therefore I shall die.

How do I know that all men die? Because Cæsar, Alexander and Brutus died? Yes, but more than that. Because I can extend the induction indefinitely. I know all men die, because all men who have lived more than a limited time have died. If it were equally true that all fools are poets, the presumption that a poet is a fool would be strong. To infer that he is, would be a non distributio medii of a different kind—like the following:

All men die.

But the winner of the Derby will die:

Therefore, he is a man.

Here the substantive error consists in not allowing the class "mortal" to be larger than the class "man." Before it consisted in identifying the class "fool" with the class "poet," because certain individuals are common to both. The first was a very bad induction, "all fools are poets, and all poets are fools, because some are both." The other was rather better. "All mortals are men, because all men are mortal." But in both cases the error of formal logic depends on an error of real logic. An universal proposition, which, as Mill pointed out, adds nothing to the proof of a particular inference, but on the contrary presupposes it must have been falsely generalized, because the particular inference was false. And this is an error which cannot be avoided by attention to Aristotle's rules, but only by attention to Bacon's. It makes no difference that the proposition was only implied.

No stones can fall whence there are none.

But there are no stones in the sky:

Therefore, no stones can fall from the sky.

This syllogism, attributed to Laplace, violates no rule of formal logic. But the conclusion is unwarranted for the same reason as in the other cases. Stones have since been proved to fall from the sky; which at once turns the argument backwards, and seems to prove that there are stones in the sky. Yet (tho I do not doubt it) the proof is defective, after all. The stones might form while falling, as hail probably does.

Since I have mentioned poets, I can scarcely refrain from citing an excellent example of false induction masking as logic, which is exposed in the Shakespearian work of Mr. Richard G. Moulton (now of the Chicago University). "Judicial

observation and experiment at correct results, we must observe and experiment carefully; to be sure of a general truth, we must have observed and experimented frequently; and if the results are divided, as in that case they commonly are, no valid conclusion is possible till they have been sifted. Evidently rules for the inductive process are necessary; and Bacon, accordingly, has laid some down. To ascertain the cause of a phenomenon, make as large a list as possible of cases, otherwise rather similar, in which it appeared and of those which it did not. If any condition common to the former set, and its absence to the latter, compare degrees of the phenomenon and the condition. But this may be done with like result as concerns several conditions. Then no immediate conclusion is possible. If, however, all imaginable conditions but one fail to explain the occurrence of the phenomenon, then we are warranted in regarding that one as causal. It remains to be asked, however, whether these rules are very useful after all? And unfortunately the answer must in the main be negative. All of them can be applied to the most preposterous inductions, such as that cited by Macaulay for example, whereby the practise of having three names was shown to be the cause of radicalism. The one thing really needful is a mind prepared to receive truth, however unwelcome or surprising; resolute to find the truth, however difficult this may be; and indifferent to speedy appearance of success or whatever else may divert from the pursuit of truth. It is chiefly by diffusing such a frame of mind that Bacon has come to be regarded as the father of the scientific method.

For the causes of advance and immobility in philosophy are complex; so some of them need mention here. Since the time of Socrates it had been commonplace that a sophist reasons for victory; but a philosopher only for truth. Aristotle was as well aware as Bacon that new truth can be discovered only by induction; for which also he gave rules. Improvement on the suggestion was, however, hindered partly by the interesting nature of metaphysico-theological disputations; partly by the prepossession that they are of moment to morality and salvation, which, if it were true, would evidently make them, notwithstanding some meagerness in the results, more important than physical researches, however fruitful. And finally—

criticism insists, the object of the Drama is to portray human nature, whereas Ben Jonson has painted not men, but caricatures. Induction sees that his formula cannot be a sufficient definition of the Drama, for the simple reason that it does not take in Ben Jonson.... In Latin literature... attempt has been made to limit taste by the writers of a single period, the Augustan age, and so construct a list of Latin poets which omits Lucretius! This kind of petitio principii prevades almost all "judicial"—all moral and legislative reasoning. The vice of Greece is legally punished, "because it is contrary to nature." But it isn't, or it could not have been the vice of the Greeks! Miscegenation is prohibited, "because there is a natural repulsion between the races." If there were, prohibiting miscegenation would be quite unnecessary. Unchastity is more severely punished in women than men, "because chastity is the virtue of a woman." Yes, to be sure; and cooks find smoke-jacks useful on account of their inherent meat-roasting propensities! What a shame that fallacies which would make us reject the services of a bricklayer who used them in his trade, are allowed to pass from pulpit, press and bar!

above all, we infer from the final issue—the inductive method was neglected because little was expected from it. Bacon, however, wrote in an age of important discoveries and inventions. The contemporaries of Columbus, Gama, Jansen, Galileo, could hardly think with Lucretius that there was not much left to be discovered. At the same time theology and metaphysics had plunged into a chaos. A foreboding of the great results of science, a disposition to try its methods, was in the air. By enlarging with unrivalled eloquence on the benefits which induction was likely to confer upon mankind, Bacon gave competent men a motive for systematic induction, which, as Macaulay says again, was much more to the point than giving them rules for it. Because, *the individual talent counts for very much in scientific pursuits, a general propensity towards them counts for more.* The most eminent natural philosophers of antiquity—Pliny, Celsus, Ptolemy, Galen, even Aristotle himself, are remembered quite as much for their mistakes, which their authority, we have before seen, made very mischievous, as for their discoveries. But when many are seeking truth in the right way, authority is disdained; so the mistakes of an individual are quickly exposed and corrected. Every child knows that Newton was the first to demonstrate the law of gravitation. Nobody cares to remember that he maintained the corpuscular theory of light. Priestley's isolation of oxygen was an era in chemistry. The theory of phlogiston could be no deader than it is, if Priestley had not taken oxygen for "dephlogisticated air." Thus, that rapid progress in science which Bacon initiated is but little due to his rules, tho they are excellent as far as they go. (2) It is very largely due to his confidence in

(2) Probably the best are those referring to what he calls idols (Greek eidola, delusive appearances of reality); on which there is an interesting paper in the Popular Science Monthly, for October, 1899. There are, says Bacon, four species of these idola. "Idols of the Race" (idola tribus) are those common to all mankind. Such is the presumption that things must needs be as they seem to us, whose most glaring example is what they call Anthropomorphism in theology. But another, just as bad, goes among shallow skeptics by the name of Common Sense. It is the foundation of Materialism and Hedonism. It was also the chief obstacle of Copernicus' and Galileo's discoveries. The notion that divine things are and human things should be "orderly" and "settled" is a mischievous Idol of the Race. Many terrible wars might have been averted by simply leaving unsettled what had to be left so at last. And what does order mean in "natural theology?" Order is a subjective term. We say things are in order, where they are so arranged that we can find them easily. Order is classification. To put our own possessions in order, is, therefore, an useful habit for us; but that objective phenomena must be in any particular order is neither necessary nor true. The height of logical confusion is reached in the celebrated argument that Chance could not have produced Order; i. e., that an objective condition (equal probability of this or that result) could never have produced a subjective arrangement and classification of things—which, notwithstanding it is perverse enough to do continually. Prejudice, hasty inference, desire to make a case for what we wish true, are all idols of the race. Idols of the Study (specus, the Den) are those peculiar to men of peculiar pursuits and habits. The different ways in which a lawyer, a doctor, and a clergyman, from the backs of their respective hobbies, regard such a very serious phenomenon as Crime, are an example. All sorts of "cockneyisms," the bias of every party, sect and nation,

the possibilities of the inductive philosophy; which he declared to be the secret of practical success, not only in inorganic, and organic, but in moral and social inquiries. (3) In truth, however, Bacon's own conception

are idols of the study. Too common an one among radicals is thinking that the usual opinion can by no accident be right. Again and again such men argue quite seriously that one who thinks theology a pseudo science should have the same opinion of surgery, or that if he does not believe in monarchy, he should not believe in Theism. There are cases of a still more general bad habit—yielding to the bias of temperament. One man can see nothing but what he wishes, another nothing but what he fears. One, always looking at resemblances, generalizes fancifully; another, always looking at differences, degenerates into a criticaster and a quibbler. Idols of the Market Place are hallowed by the colloquial, loose, and ambiguous use of words, which sometimes, as Bacon remarks, give us most important theories founded on absolutely meaningless expressions; sometimes on such as have, indeed, meaning, but a vague and misleading one. Morality has been the greatest sufferer by the first sort of these "idols." One who seriously considers the effects produced by such terms as justice, rights, patriotism, chastity, may perhaps conclude that they are answerable for more misconduct than could have been produced by a sect which formally set up the worship of the Evil Principle, and adopted for its formula "do unto others as you would not they should do unto you;" for the crimes of such a sect would not, like those of the meddling, the pedantic and the censorious, be able to pass as virtues. The other idols of the market are worshiped chiefly by scientists inclined to be metaphysical. "Ultimate questions, matter, essence, evolution, social organism," are examples of their phraseology. The evil reaches its height, however, when such scientists try to define the undennable, which is particularly apt to occur in "sociology." Frequently a word of this dubious sort is, as the Autocrat says, "polarized." It acquires new and foreign powers, like a piece of magnetized iron. "Law and order," "progress," "duty," are, as many people use them, familiar examples of polarized words. Idols of the Theater are those of the Study to those of the Race. They are related to those of the Market, somewhat spring, not from communities, but divisions among men. The favorite methods of conflicting schools—the a priori, equally that of the Hegel and that of Schopenhauer; the empirical, illustrated by such monomanias as phrenology, Grahamism, water-cure, the quasi-theological, mythical or superstitious (Christian Science, Theosophy, "Harmonial Philosophy"); these, to take modern examples, are the chief. The two last groups of "idols" differ from the other two, especially in this, that they represent fountains of error, walled, as it were, and filtered, by the baneful mechanism of Authority. Macaulay justly says it is very well to warn men against delusions like these, but the counsel is too general to be of much practical use. It is easy to give exact rules for that part of the inductive process which all perform alike. There are no exact rules for that part which a Lavoisier performs in one way, and an anti-vaccinator in another. The antidote for the anti-vaccination style of induction is a worthier purpose than the anti-vaccinator's—to learn, not to cavil; to accomplish something, not to make a sensation. The revolution which Bacon effected in philosophy was a result of rendering such purposes general. His caution against prejudice reverses Protageras, about whom it was said: "Putet id cuique verum esse quod cuique videretur."

(3) This least and last applied result of the Baconian philosophy is unquestionably the most important, and I do not doubt a conviction that it would come influenced minds like those of Falkland, Wilkins, Spratt, Chillingworth, and others, who, tho very religiously inclined, avoided the perils of applying induction to Moral topics, and turned by preference to Physical. Bacon's prompt intuition strikes the keynote. Former moralists have aimed to invent reasons, utilitarian or intuition, for the customs of their country. They

of the scientific method was very imperfect. Certain branches of this method were much better understood by some of his fellow laborers, particularly Descartes. Bacon, it seems, was not much of a mathematician. He depreciated pure mathematics, partly because he knew little about them, partly because to his mind, so impatient of verbal subtlety, they seemed too abstract and speculative to be very useful. In quite the same spirit, he spoke contemptuously of hypotheses—like Copernicus. Nothing, however, is more certain than that the principal instrument of inductive research, ever since his time, has been mathematical reasoning, founded on hypothesis, and only tested by experiments. (4) In another trait of scientific intellect, however, Bacon far surpasses Descartes; and, indeed, all other men. His love of hard facts, his delight in tests which can be seen, made him the special apostle of Experiment. This method, without which mere observation is so hampered, agreed with the utilitarian temper of his nation; and rendered him, at least in England and America, more influential for good than Descartes could ever have become.

C. L. JAMES.

(To be continued.)

have exhorted men to the attainment of unattainable frames of mind, such as indifference which could be happy in the bull of Phalaris, or benevolence, which should operate with energy directly proportioned to the square of the distance. They have argued, with signal ability such questions as "what is the highest good, whether pain be an evil, whether all things be fated...whether a wise man can be unhappy, whether all departures from right be equally reprehensible." They have speculated much on the grounds of moral obligation, the life of nature, the fitness of things. They have darkened counsel with voluminous analysis of exceptions to ordinary moral laws. Sometimes they have amused themselves with very interesting paradoxes, such as that right and wrong are made to differ solely by divine commands, that private vices are public benefits, that ethical teaching and sentiment has been productive of harm, rather than good, that the moral standard is necessarily a mere convention, that true morality begins by casting away the sense of responsibility for sin. All these lines of argument alike run into vicious circles. The moralist of the future will seek to learn, thru observation and experiment, how character is actually affected by heredity, by habits, by reaching, by training, by study, by example, by particular kinds of each, by society, solitude, emulation, friendship, love, parentage, quarrels, sin, repentance, remorse, age, nationality, occupation, creed. Then we may begin to know something about how to produce a desired moral type. Similarly, the future philosopher of Law and Politics will not content himself with being the compiler and eulogist, the assailant, or the empirical reformer, of his own country's institutions, but will seek to learn from history the causes which determine social arrangements, and their reactions on the society which produces them. This is evidently the method pursued in the author's celebrated Essays.

(4) Bacon at one times proposes, consistently with his general maxims, to ascertain the nature of Heat by making as large a list as possible of those bodies we find to be hot (such, I suppose, as live coals, brandy, Spanish flies, and cayenne pepper), then a long list of bodies which are not hot (ice, blanc-mange, "cold iron," and ammoniacal vapors?), and then inquiring what is common to all in the first list, but not found in any of the second. Widely different is the way in which heat was actually found to be a mode of motion. Observing that friction causes heat, various philosophers, among whom, very remarkably, was Bacon himself, propounded the true theory as an hypothesis, and even tried some experiments with a view to test it. Thru many years of sedulous labor, in which they were guided by this hypothesis, Meyer and Joule, independently of each other, demonstrated the equivalence of a "foot-pound" molar motion, with the quantity of heat necessary to raise in a fixed amount the temperature of a fixed quantity of water. The Encyclopedia Britannica articles on Bacon and Descartes are worthy of study on this point.

AGENTS FOR FREE SOCIETY.

The following named persons will receive and receipt for subscriptions to FREE SOCIETY.

ALLEGHENY Pa.—H. Bauer 73 Spring-garden Ave.
ATLANTIC CITY, N. J.—M. Kialuck, 1108 Baltic Ave.
BOSTON.—K. A. Snellenberg, 31 Beech Glen St., Roxbury.
BROOKLYN.—M. Metzkow, 174 Ralph St.
CHICAGO.—T. Appel, 1228 Milwaukee Av.
CLEVELAND.—E. Schilling, 55 Yeakel St.
COLUMBUS, Ohio.—H. M. Lyndall, 416 E. Mound St.
LONDON, Eng.—T. Cantwell, 127 Ossulton St., N. W.
NEW YORK.—A. Lopatiner, 180 Forsyth
PHILADELPHIA.—N. Natasha Notkin, 242 N. Second St.

RECEIPTS.

Partosa, Lehu, Hansen, Flint, Golland, each \$1. Lichterstein, Tanner, Calvin, each 50c. Blair, 25c.

FOR CHICAGO.

Saturday, May 2, 8 p. m., a grand tea-party will be given by the Workmen's Educational Club, at 330 Polk Street. All comrades and friends are cordially invited.

On this occasion W. F. Barnard will speak to the gathering on "Man's Struggle With Nature."

FOR NEW YORK.

A picnic, vaudeville, and ball will take place on Saturday, May 23, in Glendale Schuetzen Park, Myrtle Ave., Brooklyn, as arranged by the Radical Reading Room. All friends of freedom are cordially invited.

MEETINGS.

BROOKLYN.—The Social Science Club meets every Friday evening at Central Hall, 410 Stone Ave. Free discussion.

Workmen's Educational Club meets at 330 Polk St. every Saturday evening. April 18, Feldsher speaks in Jewish. May 2, W. F. Barnard will speak on a subject in English.

CLEVELAND.—Liberty Association meets every Sunday at 2:30 p. m., in Forester's Hall, 223 Champlain St. Free discussion.

NEW YORK.—The Radical Reading Room, 180 Forsyth St. Meeting every Sunday at 3 p. m. Lectures and free discussions.

SEATTLE, WASH.—The Progressive Club meets on Saturday evening, 8 o'clock, at the Theosophist Hall, 1118 Third Ave. Lectures on all pertinent social questions. Free discussion. March 28, Prof. J. Allen speaks on "Government." April 4, a member of the "Woman's Economic League" will speak before the club.

The Chicago Martyrs: The Famous Speeches of the Eight Anarchists in Judge Gary's Court; and Altgeld's Reasons for Pardoning Fielden, Nebe, and Schwab..... 25

BOOK LIST.

ALL ORDERS FOR THE FOLLOWING BOOKS

RECEIVED AT THIS OFFICE.

Essays on the Social Problem.....	05
.....H. Addis	05
The New Hedonism.....Grant Allen	05
Plain Words on the Woman	
Question.....	05
God and the State.....Bakunin	05
The Same. London edition.....	10
Whitman's Ideal Democracy and	
Other Writings.....Helena Born	1.00
Love's Coming-of-Age. Edward	
Carpenter.....	1.00
Prodigal Daughter: or, The Price	
of Virtue.....Rachel Campbell	25
The Worm Turns.....V. de Cleyre	10
The Emancipation of Society from	
Government.....Dallan Doyle	05
Roosevelt, Czolgosz, and Anarch-	
ism.....Jay Fox	03
Crime and Criminals.....C. Darrow	10
Realism in Literature and Art.....	05
Hilda's Home. Cloth \$1.....	
.....Rosa Gaul	50
Moribund Society and Anarchy.	
Cloth 60c.....Jean Grave	25
Motherhood in Freedom.....Harman	05
Origin of Anarchism.....C. L. James	05
Government Analyzed.....Kelso	50
Anarchism: Its Philosophy and	
Ideal.....Peter Kropotkin	05
Anarchist Communism: Its Ba-	
sis and Principles.....	05
An Appeal to the Young.....	05
Anarchist Morality.....	05
Expropriation.....	05
Field, Factory and Workshop.....	45
Law and Authority.....	05
Memoirs of a Revolutionist.....	2.00
Mutual Aid, a Factor in Evolu-	
tion.....	2.00
Organized Vengeance.....	03
Paris Commune.....	05
The State: Its Historic Role.....	10
The Wage System. Revolution-	
ary Government.....	05
Resist Not Evil. Cloth. Clar-	
ence S. Darrow.....	75
Social Democracy in Germany.....	
.....Gustave Landauer	02
History of the Commune. Cloth.....	
.....Lissagaray	75
Conduct and Profession.....Darrow	10
Wind-Harp Songs.....J. Wm. Lloyd	1.00
The Economics of Anarchy.....	
.....Dyer D. Lum	25
Anarchy. (Is It All a Dream?)	
Jas. F. Morton, Jr.).....Malatesta	10
A Talk about Anarchist Commu-	
nism between two Workers.....	05
A Chambermaid's Diary.....	
.....Octave Mirbeau	50
God and Government: The Siamese	
Twins of Superstition.....W. Nevill	05
The Deistic Pestilence.....John Most	05
The Pyramid of Tyranny.....	
.....F. Domela Nieuwehuis	05
Mating or Marrying, Which?.....	
.....W. H. Van Ornum	05
Evolution and Revolution.....Reclus	05
Tolstoy.....Clarence S. Darrow	10
Pure Economy.....J. H. Rowell	10
Pages of Socialist History.....	
.....W. Tcherkesoff	30
The Slavery of Our Times. Cloth.....	
.....Leo Tolstoy	75
Our Worship of Primitive Social	
Guesses.....E. C. Walker	15
Revival of Puritanism.....	
Vice: Its Friends and Foes.....	10
What the Young Need to Know	
The Ballad of Reading Gaol.....	10
.....Oscar Wilde	10
Life Without a Master. 336 pp.	
Cloth \$1.50.....J. Wilson	1.00
The New Dispensation. Cloth.....	1.50
The Coming Woman.....Lillie White	05
Anarchism and Outrage.....	03
Anarchy on Trial.....	05

History of the French Revolution.

— BY —

C. L. JAMES.

An excellent history of the French Revolution, well written by one thoroly familiar with his subject. Special care has been exercised to give the facts as they are, the author not having made himself the champion of any faction.

Justice, Wilmington, Del., says of it:

It is concise; it is accurate; and above all, it deals with essentials; the author has entered into the spirit of the Revolution.

Azariah S. Root, librarian at Oberlin College Library, Oberlin, Ohio, says:

I was much interested in looking over the work. It seems to me to indicate careful study of the sources, and to be the work of one profoundly interested in democracy.

It is neatly printed from large type on good book paper, with a substantial binding. There are 343 pages, with an index and bibliographical epitome.

Price, bound in cloth, \$1 postpaid; paper bound copies, 50 cents, 9 cents extra for postage. Send orders to

ABE ISAAK Jr., 407 Park Ave., Chicago, Ill.

A PHYSICIAN IN THE HOUSE.

IT IS THE BEST MEDICAL BOOK FOR THE HOME YET PRODUCED.

— BY —

DR. J. H. GREER.

IT HAS 16 COLORED PLATES SHOWING DIFFERENT PARTS OF THE HUMAN BODY

This book is up to date in every particular. It will save you doctor bills. It tells you how to cure yourself by simple and harmless home remedies. The book recommends no poisonous or dangerous drugs. It teaches simple common sense methods in accordance with Nature's laws. It does not endorse dangerous experiments with the surgeon's knife. It teaches how to save health and life by safe methods. It is entirely free from technical rubbish. It teaches prevention—that it is better to know how to live and avoid disease than to take any medicine as a cure.

It teaches how typhoid and other fevers can be both prevented and cured. It gives the best known treatment for La Grippe, diphtheria, catarrh, consumption, appendicitis and every other disease. This book is not an advertisement and has no medicine to sell. It tells you how to live that you may prolong life. It opposes medical fads of all kinds and makes uncompromising war on vaccination and the use of anti-toxine. It has hundreds of excellent recipes for the cure of the various diseases. The chapter on painless midwifery is worth its weight in gold to women. It has a large number of valuable illustrations. The "Care of Children" is something every mother ought to read. It teaches the value of air, sunshine, and water as medicines. This book cannot fail to please you. If you are looking for health by the safest and easiest means, do not delay getting the book. It is printed in clear type on good book paper, beautifully bound in cloth and gold letters. It has 800 octavo pages.

FORMERLY SOLD FOR \$2.75.

SEND ORDERS TO FREE SOCIETY.

MORIBUND SOCIETY AND ANARCHY.

Translated from the French of
JEAN GRAVE

By VOLTAIRINE DE CLEYRE
CONTENTS:

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

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

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

Send orders to FREE SOCIETY.

FIELD, FACTORY AND WORKSHOP.

BY PETER KROPOTKIN.

This interesting work has now been published in a popular edition. No student of social and economical affairs can do without it.

The book contains the following chapters: The Decentralization of Industries.—The Possibilities of Agriculture.—Small Industrial Villages.—Brain Work and Manual Work.—Conclusion.—Appendix. Price, paper cover, 40 cents, postpaid 45 cents.

Order from FREE SOCIETY.

COLLEGE of MEDICINE & SURGERY, Chicago

Four years Graded Course.
Laboratories fully equipped.
Abundance of Clinical Material.
FEES MODERATE.
Fall term opens in September
Write today for Catalog to

FLORENCE DRESSLER, M. D., Sec'y
245-247 Ashland Ave., Chicago, Ill.