



A PERIODICAL OF ANARCHIST THOUGHT, WORK, AND LITERATURE.

VOL. X. NO. 21.

CHICAGO, SUNDAY, MAY 24, 1903.

WHOLE NO. 415.

Justification.

She has uttered her heart to them all. The warm maiden moon,
The stars gleaming white in the zenith when night is at noon,
The clear dawning flame, and the sunset-sky rivers which show
Rare gold and red beauty and purple that follow and flow,
Cool depths of dim woods, and crystal-voiced hesitant streams,
Blown clouds in the sky that wander like dreamers of dreams,
Wide emerald fields made glorious with blossoms of flowers,
The hills in the dim purple distance, the zephyrs and showers,
Have heard her love story; by day and deep in the night
She has breathed to the world all her hope, her desire, her delight.

The love of a heart is the boon that she joys to possess;
The love of a heart, and the kisses and every caress.
The union of all within all, and the service and meeds,
The whole of love's uttermost gifts and rich rapturous deeds

Are hers, in life's springtime; untainted, unbroken; the whole
That a soul full of love and of truth can confer on a soul.

It is rapture; a joy unconfined, and that needs must be sung;
A glory of hope and of faith from a heart that is young;
A love that but claims what it gives that the life lamp may burn—
An equal abandon of life unto love in return.

She has uttered her heart to the earth, and all pure things that live;
She has spoken her soul, and besought these responses to give.

The sunlight has blessed her; the moonlight has kissed her white brow;
The trees sigh delight to her message; the wild blossoms bow;
In the vales, on the hills, all voices are gladness in throng,
And her purpose is sealed by the sound of sweet birds in their song.

Naught has she invoked but has heard her, and answered her so
With a voice of an aspect most fair, and she surely doth know
That what seems to her sweetest of sweet things a glad soul may tell,
Is at one with all beauty that lives; and she says, "It is well."

She yields for a gift all she is to him finding her fair;
A splendor of longing and courage, her spirit stands bare,
And confesses itself; clear discerning, the while it is fed,
All shapes of all sorrow as nothing thrust from it and fled;
While the fervors of passion grow strong and consume as with flame
Dim darkening doubts and the shadowy substance of shame.
All sound she deems music; all bitterness changes to sweet;
All souls seem as one, and all pathways grow smooth to her feet.

Good fills the whole world, around her, beneath, and above;
Joy melts into life and the substance of life into love.

—William Francis Barnard, in *Lucifer*.

— o —

Government.

The right of men to govern other men, the right of one man to give rules and conditions to another man and thus make a slave of him, cannot be maintained for one moment. Not one word can be said in defense of such a claim. We have government not because there is a pretense that it is right, but because people have allowed themselves to be deluded with the idea that government is necessary. They had come to feel so feeble and so helpless that they actually imagined that they needed somebody wiser and abler than themselves to take them in charge and bolster them up. For a long time they depended upon God, but now that he has been found wanting, they naturally turn to the State for assistance.

So far as human agency avails, government is the result of encroachments and usurpations extending thru a long series of years. As we have shown in the earlier pages of this work, the main cause of men's losing their rights and becoming the subjects of others who are neither wiser nor better than themselves, lies in their own indolence and apathy. But in the beginning men contracted the habit of employing agents and delegating their powers to others who were authorized to do what they ought to have done themselves. All our law-makers and policemen are mere delegates of ours, and we are just beginning to see what a dangerous experiment it is to place ourselves, under any circumstances, in the hands of other men. The fact that these men are our servants, our representatives, does not help the case in the slightest degree. It is found that even our servants and representatives finally become our masters, and so far from carrying out our wishes, they usually do as they please.

Government appeared originally in the family, and finally it extended to the priests, it being assumed that they represented God, the father of us all. So long as the authority was confined to the family, no serious harm resulted, because there was a community of interests between the several members; but when the priests came to govern, they soon drifted into the habit of looking after their own individual interests to the exclusion of those of the people. From priests who served as the defenders and masters of men to those who were not priests, the transition was

easy and natural. Religion was the platform on which our governors reared their structure in the first place; but, as we see in architecture, after the building is completed and the platform has served its purpose, it is speedily taken down and cast aside as worthless. So it has been with the Deity. But what have we now? What is government? A castle in the air, with absolutely no foundation to stand on. Strange and anomalous condition of things! How long can such a structure endure? Not for any great length of time, most assuredly. . . .

Every governor, every man who sets himself up as our master or protector, is a usurper and impostor, and he should be treated accordingly. If we once get this fact firmly settled in our minds as we should, we shall dispose of our governors and government in short order.

No one pretends that governors do their work well, or do it better than any ordinary man in his right mind could do the same work. No one pretends that government saves labor. It adds to labor. No one pretends that government is cheap. It is just the reverse—it is the most expensive and wasteful contrivance known to man. Then why do we not dispense with our governors and take hold of the wheel ourselves? It is impossible to say why not; we really do not know why not—except that we are more or less indolent and are abnormally timid. We have been slaves so long that we have finally come to the conclusion that we are fit for nothing but a condition of slavery, as really is the case with a great many people of the present day. What is needed is a certain lapse of time and such an education as will enable us to appreciate the actual condition of affairs.

Do we need punishments? Do we need the rack and torture? Do we need prisons and jails and workhouses and asylums? Do we need armies and the police? Do we need sheriffs and jailors? Do we need courts and judges whose privilege it is, if not their duty, to send people to the gallows or the madhouse? Do we need any of these agents? No, we need none of them. They are a part of the machinery of the government, in fact they are the government itself. They came with the government—let them go with the government. Let the Bastille fall, and with it let the Hall of Justice fall. Justice! Justice!—most frightful, most hideous of all those imaginary forms which men are accustomed to worship! What

awful crimes are committed daily, nay hourly, in thy name!

Why so much machinery, why so many laws? They are not for the people, but for party favorites. They are mere instrumentalities thru which the spoils may be secured and appropriated. Originally in this country, and not longer than fifty years ago, we had but few laws and but few officers to execute them. Even those employed by the government were poorly paid, and scarcely any man thought then of living at the expenses of the people. The case is different now. Then everybody worked, but now as few work as possible. Now we have paternalism with a thousand laws, where we had only a few before. Having raised a false alarm over the necessity of protection, government now takes charge of everybody and of everything. A considerable portion of our people look to the State for employment and support. They are not exactly paupers, but simply pensioners upon the bounty of the public. These are the parasites and drones of civilization.

Do we need government, do we need laws and officers, do we need parties and partisans? Does the present government afford us a healthy condition of things? Is the present way unquestionably the best way? Is the present system just to all the people, or even to a considerable portion of the people? No, this can hardly be affirmed. The people are like so many sheep which are shorn annually, and sometimes semi-annually. As a rule, under government, it is always the many who labor for the few. When people come finally to open their eyes and understand the facts in all their enormity, we are certain to have a change. No people was ever content to remain in a condition of bondage for any length of time.

Government uniformly breeds politics, and politics parasites. If we made no laws, we should need no officers to execute them, and we might dispense with our official paraphernalia, and with all that expensive political machinery which we are now obliged to maintain. Again, if our laws were just and satisfactory to the people, we would need no force to keep them in subjection. Force is needed solely because it is known that the laws are framed in opposition to the wishes of the masses.—From J. Wilson's "The New Dispensation."

— o — The General Strike.

No other method of combating and overthrowing the present social, economic, and political institutions has been so universally accepted by the Anarchists as the general strike. The reasons therefore are, in my opinion, very fundamental. The methods, in their ultimate and manifest conclusions, are thoro and logical. And still, while expressing the above views, it is my aim to point out the shortcomings and misconceptions of the general strike.

Apart from the two extreme and diametrically opposed ideas—government and no government, dividing the Anarchists and Socialists, the methods employed in gaining or bringing about the social revolution, also divide us. While the Socialists lay great stress on the political struggle, we have exposed the futility and absurdity of the same, and have always aided and hoped

most from the daily economic struggle. In our polemics with them we have shown that it is thru the economic organization of society, order by the State, that we are exploited, and that only by and thru an economic change of things can humanity free itself—to start the march towards the broader and grander vistas beyond the present horizons.

If the short generalization of methods given above be true, then the general strike, in its broad sense, is most logical and fundamental; and, if false, then all our criticism of a political struggle must be branded as false and weak. I have shown that for us we limit ourselves, and a logical limit it is, to an economic struggle only. And hence we must join in many of them while yet admitting that in their present aspects and tendencies they do not meet our extreme hopes and desires. Let us abandon this and we have neither a lever nor a resting place for a practical attempt at solution. Have we not always aided and sided with economic struggles of today rather for what they can and should be than for what they are? The same viewpoint I take in regard to the general strike.

We are all settled upon this point: revolutions are not upstarts, but are a result of ideas developing and permeating society; each struggle gaining and leading to newer fields of thoughts and action. And I have pointed out the direction of activity we must take or else retreat and remain the "foredoomed" minority of which we,—alas! hear so often.

The shortcomings of the general strike are due to the negative nature permeating it and its promulgators. The spirit of—

"All the wheels will cease to go
If thy strong arm wants it so,"

is at present too manifest. Should it remain so the position I take is weak; but I see that the positive side must needs follow the negative, "as the day the night." And it is from the positive side I hope most from. It is from the expropriation of all that is at our command for the general sustenance of life, and expropriation must follow, for the workers will starve themselves instead of the bourgeois, if it does not, which will give the great impetus to the social upheaval. And when such steps are taken we must certainly expect to meet the bourgeois at its best and in all its array.

I know that I lay too great stress on the masses, who, their instinctive rebellious characteristics notwithstanding, are conservative and bereft of ideas. But I have to analyze and pick: I see the great middle class divided into intellectual conservatives and intellectual progressives, yet as a whole permeated too much with the instinctive desire for self-preservation, and hence will not begin the work of reconstruction. I must necessarily base my hopes upon the down-trodden masses, who have both the destructive and constructive abilities at their command. A blending of these factors is necessary for a successful attempt. Let us educate the people not by isolating ourselves, but by mingling in their ranks: working, fighting, and dying for humanity.

San Francisco, Cal.

S. MINTZ.

— o —
Gods have slaves; but friends, never. B.

"Misconceptions of Anarchism."

Under this heading J. A. M. (see FREE SOCIETY of May 10) takes issue with some statements I had made in a daily, replying to a so-called Individualist who had misrepresented Anarchist Communism.

He asserts that egoism and altruism are two distinct and "positive forces in the evolution of psychological life," and he does not see what purpose I had in denying these factors. My object was to show that those who sneer at altruism and make egoism a sanctified creed in their philosophy of life, are making themselves ridiculous; for both egoism and altruism are relative, metaphysical terms, which "mean everything in general and nothing in particular," as Comrade C. L. James would say. If "to seek pleasure, to avoid pain, is the general line of action of the organic world," as Kropotkin says, then it is difficult for me to draw the line between altruism and egoism. We may call the action of one man egoistic and the action of the other altruistic; but if it is admitted that both seek self-gratification, all demarcations must be arbitrary.

My opponent also objects to my contention that contracts imply slavery. Says he:

Forced contracts as we find them today between the starved workmen and his employer are certainly expressions of slavery; but given a condition of equal opportunity, where there is entire freedom of choice for each of the contracting parties, contracts are then voluntary agreements, the very foundation of a free society. Free contracts, then, never imply slavery; nay, the very essence of Anarchism is voluntarism, i. e. society reorganized on the basis of free contract.

Most assuredly, in a free society "where there is entire freedom of choice," contracts are not expressions of slavery; but I contend the free men will not enter any contracts which they cannot dissolve at any moment. In fact, contracts without arbitrary power to enforce them are meaningless, if by the term is understood anything else but a verbal agreement for the time being. The Tuckerites understand this very well, and therefore propose an "Anarchist jury" to arbitrate between the contractors. But when J. A. M. qualifies opportunity by the prefix "equal," his free society is as vague as "equal liberty." In the absence of all authority (including the voluntary police and jury), there will be opportunity for all to enjoy the bounties of nature and labor, but there can be no such thing as qualified liberty or opportunity, that is, in the sense that it is capable of being measured by human intellect.

But the writer is one of those metaphysical philosophers, like those of the pioneers of the Declaration of Independence, who imagine that freedom must result from the issuance of principles, without reconstructing the whole basis of society. He contends that property is possible under Anarchism if only "equal opportunity is the condition of society." Now what is "equal opportunity"? Each school of reformers, nay, even Mark Hanna, claims to strive for equal opportunity, and there is certainly something utterly wrong when all political parties promise the same heaven under "equal opportunity"!

Anarchism never made the contention that the laborer's share of a total product cannot be determined, asserts my opponent. Again I say: If J. A. M. concedes that An-

archism repudiates all authority, I have no objection to his claiming New York State (or the whole globe for that matter) as his product or property; for the rest of humanity will go on tilling the soil as tho he never made this claim. Such claim is only dangerous to freedom when it is backed by infantry or even voluntary police clubs.

He also asserts that, if I deny the possibility of measuring out the share of each laborer in the product, that is denying the right of each in enjoying his life otherwise than Communistically; which is absurd. I simply claim that under freedom the idea "that the amount produced by the individual should determine the amount consumed" will "linger" to its death, because there will be no way to determine the one nor the other, as one of our best writers says. And it should be evident that if each is free to consume all he produces property becomes obsolete—as a matter of course.

In conclusion I will frankly admit that I believe Anarchy to be impossible unless we have that "sweet and idyllic" condition in which man, women, and child are free to produce and consume without let or hindrance. Whether such condition is labeled Communism or Anarchism is of little significance to me. *Free men* will no more sacrifice their liberty for a mode of production and distribution, than they will maintain individual property form after it has become useless and harmful. All I contend for is freedom—freedom without any qualifications or provision,

S. R.

A Joke On Trials.

In this wilderness of laws, which no human being could possibly remember, you will find laws against murder, arson, theft, adultery, perjury, and other crimes, which, altho no layman could be expected to find them, much less to know what they mean, keep you from putting a knife into your brother's heart just from pure love of deviltry, as you certainly would do if there were no government; but, if public opinion is strong enough, he will sometimes be caught—just as he would be without the aid of government. Instead of trying to find out whether he is guilty or not, we will take him into court and appoint one lawyer to prove that he is guilty, whether he is or not; and another to prove that he is not guilty, whether he is or not. If the prosecuting attorney knows facts which would render guilt questionable, or if the defendant's attorney knows facts which would prove guilt with absolute certainty, each will be expected carefully to conceal such facts in order that justice may be properly administered. In order still further to insure justice, we select a jury of twelve men who must be so intelligent that they do not read or form opinions; and after this jury has been properly enlightened by the efforts of two opposing lawyers to conceal the two respective halves of the truth, it will be instructed by the judge in everything except what it needs to know; namely, what the verdict should be. The consequence is that the verdict is sure to be just.—A. C. M., in "Reflections of a Lonely Man."

Government is the greatest "gold brick."

The Rising Sap.

Margaret married her first love and went to housekeeping in a modest cottage where she lived happily with her worthy husband. Energetic and amiable, she made an attractive home, and observers commented upon the ideality of the couple's domestic life.

After a year, on a morning in the sap-rising days of spring, the time referred to by Tennyson when he wrote about the "young man's fancy," etc., Margaret stood on her side porch happily contemplating the budding willow-tree whose branches hung over her neighbor's porch across the lawn, a few yards away. The neighbor's lodger, Jean Warren, stepped out from under the tree and approached.

"That's a fine tree, isn't it?"

"Yes," said Margaret, radiant in the morning glow. "I've been watching it every day to see the buds grow. They are twice as large as they were yesterday."

"I've seen you watching it. I am glad we have something over here of interest to you."

Margaret blushed, and conscious of her reddening face, blushed more, and turned to a hanging basket on the banister, which she took up to divert herself and hide confusion.

"I must hang this basket soon."

"Let me hang it for you."

"Well, you might," stammered Margaret.

"I will bring out your step-ladder."

Jean Warren stepped up on the porch and Margaret pulled the step-ladder out of the storeroom just inside. She turned around with face more composed, and gave instructions in a matter-of-fact way where to hang the basket.

"Now just hand it to me," said the man on the step-ladder. As she did so their hands touched. "Who did it?" was her first thought. "I didn't. He did. But it was an unobtrusive touch," she concluded, and might have been an accident; however, the woman's intuition told her that it had not been necessary.

He did not look at her at the moment and she was glad. He only chatted with his habitual mischievous twinkle of the eye about the beauty of pendant vines in flower baskets.

The man came down, said he had an article to finish, that he hoped to see the hanging basket a thing of beauty, and stepped out on the lawn after they had exchanged polite "good-byes."

Margaret went about her housework and tried to forget the trifling incident on the porch, but the warm touch of a hand, and its handsome owner could not be forgotten. "It is not proper for me to think and feel this way," she moralized. "I love my husband; dear Charles is the best man in the world." But realizing that no pleasing, lively sensations were aroused by the thought of dear Charles, she proceeded doggedly and stoically to prepare an unusually good supper for her husband that evening.

The next morning Margaret stepped out on the porch to look at the willow tree. Jean was there looking out at the hanging basket.

"Fine morning," said he with his characteristic twinkle.

"Yes, fine," replied Margaret, and made haste to go in to hide coming blushes. She

thought she would not appear again on that side; but the third morning her resolutions faded, for the willow tree had become a vital thing, and she went out again to take at least one glimpse at it.

Of course, Jean was out again to look at the hanging basket. "What fine days we are having," he exclaimed.—"By the way, did I leave my pocket-knife over there? I've lost it somewhere."

"I haven't seen it," said Margaret, looking here and there apparently in search but seeing nothing before her eyes, for she was conscious of the man's approach across the lawn. Her heart fluttered and she backed into the door as he came up.

"Just let me have that step-ladder, I may have left the knife in the flower basket. I used it to cut the string." Margaret moved to get the ladder. "Let me do it," said Jean as she had her hand on the storage door, and gently removed her fingers from the knob; then a pressure was put upon her hand that started her blood tingling, and all resolutions against improper emotions subsiding, she responded to it. Confused, then she turned to moving chairs, and setting things on the table in different positions, none of which had previously been at all out of place. Jean climbed up with no doubts about finding the knife, which he said had a history and was dear to him. He returned the ladder to its place next the dining room, when he said a happy, respectful good-bye to the woman who energetically and frantically continued to find the right places for her household articles.

What had happened? "Nothing," said she to herself and yet she knew that interest was lost in everything that had hitherto been interesting. A new tenderness arose in her heart as she thought of Jean Warren's charming personality, and she mused about him in spite of the conviction that it was not proper. Everything else took on a tame, dead aspect. Margaret was sorry, but for a day she was happy in her sorrow. Then followed philosophy which in combat with the heart racked her. For days after she was in a bad temper which the beautiful spring time could not soften, and even the willow tree, which was now seen thru a window, was a source of aggravation.

As the season advanced the hanging basket let down vines that vibrated in the soft breezes, but the one who hung it was not there to see it, for he was no longer the neighbors' lodger. The willow tree drooped with heavier foliage. But we draw a veil over Margaret, whose heart too had promised to burst into new leaf and flower, and then failed.

OLGA ARNOLD.

The class struggle which it [Socialism] emphasizes, is a contradiction—that which nominally stands for society as a whole actually standing for a class. Of course, I am familiar with the apology for this contradiction—namely, the claim that after socialization has been accomplished classes will cease. The idea is centuries old, and is one of the weak points that Socialist condemn in the Church. Every tyrant, every trust, every Church of every land and age, has made the same promise of uniting the earth by swallowing it. It has always been the world's excuse for conquest, this promise that the conqueror will be generous and bless.—*The Social Thought*.

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 24, 1903.

415

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.

Ida C. Craddock's photograph can be obtained from E. C. Walker, 244 W. 143rd St., New York, N. Y. Price, 30 cents.

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. For details see page 8.

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.

"Just government," is shackles politely put on.

Parry is still talking, but the evolution of events proceeds.

The kaiser says that Theodore is a dangerous man. Is the kaiser envious?

You can never vote the craftiness out of politicians nor the conquest out of the ballot.

While kings hate each other there is hope for the people. Woe unto us when kings agree!

The only thing that libertarians can hope from elections is that the worst of the candidates may be elected.

Russia has eaten Manchuria. The disapprobation of other governments is that of the dog who lost the bone.

Those three preachers who got thirty cents an hour for their services in arbitrating a labor dispute, know now what it is to be poorly-paid workmen.

FREE SOCIETY

The Chinese are teaching us again; in San Francisco they have actually formed a union to shorten the hours and increase the pay of their employees.

Those Socialists who teach, and those who oppose "economic determinism" are having a merry war. Dogmatism and doubt go together.

The owners of Chicago assignation houses have been exposed; an expose of Chicago dwelling houses would reveal rotten conditions in legalized sex servitude.

When candidates fall out we learn the truth. It was an Irishman who, after listening to rival candidates in their accusations against each other's characters, said, "I belave thim both!"

Thirty-one "suspects" were locked up for a time while Theodore Roosevelt was in Los Angeles. If it would comfort Theodore to know it, all who abhor him are content to wait till his own pride suffocates him.

Pennsylvania has a new law gagging the press; thus taking a long step toward suppression of free speech. Let other legislatures follow this example, for only thru oppression, it would seem, can "featherless bipeds" learn to be men.

The latest "Anarchist" scare has set everyone to looking under his bed for infernal machines and all kinds of terrible bombs. No one thinks of looking in newspaper offices for infernal machines, but all know where to look for infernal liars.

John D. Rockefeller, Jr., recently told his Sunday-school class that God always answered his prayers, and that he consulted him in regard to business. Is it not time to deny God (if we have no other reasons) when he will make a friend and associate of a notorious exploiter and hypocrite?

Radicals who let their children grow up with the kind of instruction (that received in public and Sunday schools) which they have so painfully grown away from themselves, have convictions but no courage. And their paternal love is a mockery.

The disfranchisement of the Negro may lead him to become an Anarchist. Then he would not want to wield the billy of the ballot. Experience would teach him that liberty for himself is worth far more than the privilege of gambling for the opportunity to rule others.

Mark Hanna, who speaks as one having his hand on the pulse of things, is telling the capitalists that panic is coming soon, and is saying that, what with strikes and lockouts increasing everywhere a revolutionary clash is inevitable. Mark is a great poseur; he can steal, and point to the other fellow all the while.

H. M. Hyndman, in an attack upon the

trimmers, opportunists, and almost everyone else in the Socialist parties, describes Anarchists as "impossibilists." It is true, the Anarchists look too far ahead for political Socialists' eyes to see, but on the other hand political Socialists look so far back for justification that they may fairly be called "behindhanders"; often helped in their reactionary ideas, alas! by the prophet himself, H. M. Be-Hyndman.

M. Faguet, of the French Academy, gives to Goethe the honor of the discovery of those views which the popular mind has credited exclusively to Nietzsche, and he himself is advocating "the religion of selfishness." Of this it may be said that the threat to develop into a religion with a creed and cult is enough to render any intellectual conception worse than worthless. Let us have fewer religions, that everything may be called to the bar of judgment and constantly tested. The days of worship are over.

Carnegie is still endowing libraries, forming associations, posing as a friend of the people, ventilating his ignorance in books, and on occasion indulging in high-sounding heroics on the future of this country and its certain prosperity. Carnegie is a canny Scott and a capitalist, an interesting combination; and we may assure ourselves that with his native capacity for self-deceit and relish of hypocrisy, he will play the fool as long as there are listeners, and pile up money at the same time. Carnegie is one of our great national mountebanks.

Everywhere political Socialists are at war among themselves respecting their sacred formulas, as opportunism, the character of Millerand and men like him, and the true method of working for their political utopia. A shrewd mind can discern the augur of decay in a movement which is political and yet uncompromising, which stands for change and still will have only one political method of change. The truth is that the other political parties have begun to steal Socialism; and that people will go with them finally is quite a foregone conclusion.

The sex superstition is so thoroly a part of our beings, that we refuse to discuss it or endeavor to remove it, the evidences of its miserable results are as common and conspicuous as can be, everywhere. Even many libertarians shrink from putting their ideas to the test in this respect, and hang back with ill-concealed dismay; advising that the problem of sex relationships be left to settle itself when the economic question is settled. If these individuals will tell us how the economic problem can be settled while woman holds her present status in society, and is dominated by the ideas which she labors under as under a heavy cross, it will be more to the purpose than red faces and angry and incoherent protests can be.

It is a national fault, born of insularity, (which is the true name of patriotism), to enlarge upon the shortcomings of other nations while we minimize those of our own. We abhor the wars in which England en-

gages, we blame France bitterly for her persecution of a Jewish captain, and abominate Russia for her Siberian atrocities and the slaughter of the Jews, while we are equally guilty ourselves. Our Philippine record is a record of murder and torture; and our whitecapping, and periodical horrible burning and killing of Negroes in the south are equal to the worst acts of other peoples. Our own crimes are not the less horrible because we have become accustomed to them thru mere repetition.

The slaughter of Jews in Russia has called forth the indignation of a great part of the world, the hypocrites of politics, morality, religion, and our murderous economics joining the people with their crocodile tears. But forgetting these patriots and their pretense of being "better than thou" we must bow the head and weep at the inhumanity of man in Russia. The Jews have been a hunted race for so long that it almost has come to seem a natural thing that they suffer; but they are human beings like all the rest, and their interests are the interests of all those who love freedom; and Anarchists everywhere extend to them sympathy and the assurance of fellowship. The Russians look upon the Jews as being largely the cause of their national misery, the government all the while working to instill and fix this belief, in the hope to divert attention from the real cause; itself. The recent slaughter is but a result of economic conditions and the rapacity of rulers, for which these must surely answer sooner or later at the bar of humanity. The Jews suffer now; next it will be men who suffer, without regard to race or creed. AMERICUS.

Not "Shaky Shakespeare," But Truly Wilde.

The reference made in FREE SOCIETY No. 413 to George MacDonald's "Shakespeare" by C. L. James, reveals the fact that the sage of Eau Claire has either not read or has forgotten Oscar Wilde's great poem the "Ballad of Reading Gaol," from which the line "All men kill the thing they love" is quoted. The last stanza of that poem is:

And all men kill the thing they love,
By all let this be heard,
Some do it with a bitter look,
Some with a flattering word,
The coward does it with a kiss,
The brave man with a sword!

This poem is a masterpiece which is well worth perusal by every lover of liberty and justice. Here are two very forceful stanzas:

I know not whether laws be right,
Or whether laws be wrong;
All that we know who lie in gaol
Is that the wall is strong
And that each day is like a year,
A year whose days are long.

But this I know, that every law
That men have made for man,
Since first man took his brother's life,
And the sad world began,
But straws the wheat and saves the chaff
With a most evil fan.

The "Ballad of Reading Gaol" can be procured of FREE SOCIETY for ten cents. It is well worth the price. J. M. CRANE.

LETTER-BOX.

N. H. Brooklyn.—You have made some good arguments regarding the "rascal," but I fear the discussion will never end if we publish your article.

"Is He a Rascal?"

Lest the repentance of Comrade Isaak should last too long, I desire to call his attention to the fact that he has not forgotten everything he was taught in Sunday school; namely, how to confound every problem and make it appear different from what it really is. Indeed, only the latter reason induces me to reply to his rejoinder; otherwise my first article answered effectively all the arguments Comrade Isaak presents, that our readers by simple comparison of his and my statements can readily see who the "metaphysician" is.

But in his "P. S." he accuses me of inconsistency; pointing out with very ill-chosen and puerile hilarity that I called a man who in a public meeting slandered me "an infamous, low backslider, and an all-around rascal." Therefore he implies—in arguments he is poor, in implications rich—that I indulge in "incongruities of thought." Now I shall be very mild; not say that our editor is malicious, but only that he does not know what he is talking about. If he understood what my standpoint regarding right and wrong implies, he would quickly see, that I am not supposed to spare my weapons when an enemy of mine is concerned. But I take the side of those who say, that we cannot condemn sexual acts. The title of my article, its whole trend, proves that I simply want to point out the fallacy of calling a man a rascal for a sexual act and thereby dividing mankind sexually. (Compare col. 1, line 62, and others of my article).

Certainly Comrade Isaak, who confounds psychology with metaphysics, possesses a marvelous historical knowledge, as his quoting Judge Gary, Frick, Louis XV, etc., etc., proves. While I was entirely ignorant of the existence or deeds of these men until my dear comrade condescended to tell me, I now have the courage to assert that we as Anarchists are not fighting these men for their sexual acts, but because they represent authority. (Compare col. 3, line 57-65). As authoritarians, Comrade Isaak may assail them with whatever names he pleases, but sexually they are not worse than the laborer who forces his wife or the bourgeoisie who visits prostitutes, etc. In fact, we find the same sexual acts in the highest and lowest stratum of society—according to its capacity for actions, which is only limited by lack of means. Regarding Messalina, I advise Comrade Isaak to study the scientific problem of sadism. It may also do him good to read Swinburne's poems on: "Satia te Sanguine," "Dolores," "Noyades," "Sapphics," etc.

But who in this controversy is really inconsistent? Let us see. About five months ago the following discussion took place between several comrades, amongst them Comrade Isaak and myself. A man having seduced a girl at the age of 13 or 14 years by the promise to bring her on the stage (is he a rascal?). A lady comrade present uttered herself about him in the same way as our editor does now about the assumed "He." Strange it is now to comprehend that Comrade Isaak defended the man in the same manner as I now do in respect to the "Rascal." I at that time took the same position regarding sexual matters as now; and the editor even privately remarked to me, that it was self-evident that

a man would succumb to temptation. You see that at that time "succumbing" did not yet belong to the theories of Adam. Well, who is the "metaphysician" now, and who must rescue his philosophy from the "entanglement of contradictions"?

Comrade Isaak accuses me of having said the "man is inhuman." In my entire article this passage cannot be found. What I said is: the "act of the fellow is inhuman." In order to prove to the reader that this is not the same I refer him for comparison to Col. 1, line 62, of my article, where he will find that I do not recognize any sexual classification.

The editor speaks of "a would-be Nietzschean, or metaphysical philosophy." Poor Nietzsche, even you will turn in your grave and exclaim: "I and metaphysics? Have I not broken down metaphysics and its barrier all my life?" I challenge Comrade Isaak to mention me one work of Nietzsche where he is metaphysical.

Regarding the "deliberate lie the man employed to acquire gratification," allow me to say, that when the sexual passion overcomes man, he or she does not know what promise is made. What is said then is the outflow of passion—neither a conscious lie nor a truth.

In my article I said: "... 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. But tell me what 'a rascal' is in sexual matters." Does Comrade Isaak reply by telling me the desired definition? Not at all. He says: "As to the definition of the term 'rascal' I refer Comrade Grossman to the Standard Dictionary. ..." Exactly what I was not anxious to learn, because it does not need Comrade Isaak in order to know where to find the etymological sense of a word. He here consciously avoids giving an answer. By the way: if "metaphysicians teach nothing if they are not at least logical," I ask: Can metaphysicians ever be logical?

His rejoinder has not convinced me in the least. I doubt whether it did convince the public. The rejoinder of his consists of word-jumble, evasions, taking unfair advantages—as for instance in his P. S., where he makes it appear as tho I am against the word rascal as such, while the whole discussion hinges on: Is he who seduces a girl, as stated in the letter box, a rascal sexually—and making unproven statements.

Verily, his case must stand very bad, if he had to take refuge in such an armory.

RUDOLPH GROSSMAN.

[I do not consider the style and manner of the foregoing article such as to make it advisable to continue the discussion. The whole thing now hinges on the distinction made by Grossman: A man who does a rascally act in the sexual matters is not a rascal. Altho I did not criticise any sexual acts, I cannot accept the distinction on his mere assertion. Neither will I impose upon the readers my views of his arrogance and ridiculous condescension. Furthermore, as he grossly distorts my statements made privately to him, and willfully slanders a comrade, I refuse to further argue the matter. A. I.]

A Vindication of Anarchism.

VII (continued.)

It is among our self-deceiving hypocrisies to call sensual vices beastly and brutal, as if we were better than other animals as regards superiority to lust; but the obvious truth is that no animal exhibits sexual passion in anything like the same degree as man, and none approaches in lasciviousness a man who chooses to give himself to unchecked indulgence of his desires. We think it a proof of our superiority that only we associate the source of life and its happiness with most irrational, ill-explained, and inconsistent feelings of shame; forgetting that alone of all God's creatures, we have systematically used it in a way which gives us good reason to be ashamed. (12) Asceticism, a thing as foreign to the instincts of undebauched nature as sense-worship, is but the other side of sensuality. Because the savage is a polygamist and ravisher, he is also a self-torturing devotee. Because the Oriental nations from India westward to Egypt, are the most voluptuous among those which have attained any civilization, they also produced the cults of the fakir, the dervish, the eunuch, the hermit, and the monk. In the same soil with worship of Ashtor, Mylitta, and Pasht, flourished also those of Moloch, Cybele, and Typhon. Sometimes the connection is so well preserved as to be quite visible. Siva, the Destroyer, is the hermaphrodite idol of India, whose right side (male), is associated with the masculine worship of beauty, the left (female) with that of grossness and immodesty, both with the combination of malevolent and libidinous orgies. Because Mahomet promised his followers a Paradise of fleshly delights portrayed with vividness known to no other religion, the Mussulman Tartarus is no less graphically conceived as a place of bodily torture; and fanatics seek to escape it by a novitiate beginning with such operations as biting red-hot iron or drawing their teeth. Because Roman civilization in the third century was the most vicious and corrupt the world had ever seen, it produced the great outburst of eremitism and cenobitism, whose extravagances rival those of Brahmanism and whose devouring magnitude was certainly greater. (13) No observation in the lives of self-afflicting saints is more familiar than that they had been grossly sensual and immoral. In late revivals of the same spirit,

(12) The weakest thing, Lecky ever wrote is his explanation why a sense of shame is associated with the sexual function. It amounts to this, that such a sense is associated with carnal desires. Granting this to be true, it does not appear why the sexual instinct, which is not by any means wholly sensual, should be any more associated with shame than the appetite for food, which is. A host of much more plausible theories—Bishop Blongram's being one of them, might easily be found.

(13) See Lecky's "History of Morals" for most vivid pictures of how the hermits grew into "a mighty nation;" what depths of dehumanization they reached; how their one real virtue, chastity, being represented as the surest way to heaven, drew the bulk of European wealth and land titles alike into the devouring maw of the monasteries; how, after this had come to pass, the general run of the monks were neither saints nor fanatics, but merely peasants, who found the life easy and attractive; how sure they were to break their one irksome vow, of continence, if they could safely; and how easy this became, viz., owing to their unrestricted intercourse with women in the sacred roles of almoners and confessors.

as among the Flagellants, debauchery went hand in hand with self-torture. Similar affinities appear in the orgies of Henri III and his miignons. These observations of coincidence are so familiar, so extensive, and so uniform, that their significance has often been suspected. But all doubt about it is set at rest by the researches of modern criminologists into degeneracy. These establish beyond question that self-torture, particularly self-whipping, operates upon jaded sensuality like indulgence of lust at an earlier stage; that the common proposal (actually carried out sometimes, even now) to punish sexual crimes by flogging, must increase the evil; that the torments inflicted by religious fanatics upon themselves are not consequence of their superstition which represents sex as the fountain of damnation, but that the superstition springs from the same source as the rite, viz., from nothing else than the reaction of abused appetite, which long before produced just the same effects among savages to whom such superstitions were unknown. Thus experience of the mental and physical misery caused by excesses of masculine desire does no good—it only substitutes one absurd and vicious excess of the diseased imagination for another. Emancipation of women, by whatever causes brought about, is the one social change which has operated to promote continence. We need only name prostitution to be reminded how far from perfect the emancipation is, and what horrors wait to be removed on its completion. For the information of one who would know more, the history has been written by Dr. Sanger. Unhappily, the subjection of women in marriage, which indeed requires the other kind, (14) produces social evils no less cruel even if we consider only the happiness of individuals. Connecticut is among those States which have been reproached with the facility of divorce. Yet Connecticut produced the notorious and atrocious case of Shaw vs. Shaw; the citations from which, in Bishop's "Marriage and Divorce," show that there is no remedy provided for that abuse with which the Honyhumhu taunted Gulliver. And for a crowning touch, the laws which consecrate these hellish sorceries have managed to make an exception to the general rule of free speech, for persecution of those who would have them altered. They call giving them their right names "obscene." Interesting truly is the reasoning of the governmental superstition! To commit atrocities whose very titles are too bad to be spoken, is within the rights conferred on a husband by the sacrament of holy matrimony. But to speak the names for the purpose of correcting the abuse, is by no means a case in which the end justifies the methods! Men, we hear it daily said, are too bad to be without laws. Therefore, men are good enough to make laws. (15) To these pearls of logic

(14) As proved by St. Louis and Maria Theresa, who found that putting down prostitution was "breaking up the family."

(15) Any such objection as that there is a middle—good men may make laws for bad—will be worthy consideration when it is settled whether good men are known by the accident of birth (aristocracy) or the result of election by bad men (democracy). A similar cavil against another great argument of like import may be similarly met. A law either is sustained by public opinion or it is not. If it is, public opinion is enough without it. If not, it cannot, at least when new, be

continent than men; therefore, hear oh heavens and give ear oh earth! for the mouth of the Fool speaketh it every day—therefore, to emancipate women from the government of men, would give rise to all manner of incontinence and vice!

The crowning sin involved in the subjection of women remains, as elsewhere intimated, for we may now add another. Women are more exposition. Any tribe of inferior animals, to avoid extinction, must multiply up to the limit of capacity. This end nature, thru her peculiar process of selection, has secured, by making the males so amorous that the females are sure to become mothers as often as they are willing. That they should do so oftener, could only weaken and degenerate the species, securing too rapid multiplication for a time at expense of subsequent decay. Accordingly, they never do become mothers otherwise than by their own desire. But under the artificial arrangements which men have instituted, women are compelled to become mothers. The reasons why they should not be, are far stronger than even those against a similar condition among other animals. For extreme poverty is not the normal state of man, as it is of other animals. The more strictly a wolf lives from paw to mouth, the more-wolves there are, and the more wolves there are the longer their extirpation will be delayed. But the more men live from hand to mouth, the more they will be subject to famines like those of India, plagues like the Black Death, wars like those of Genghis Khan, which threaten their premature extinction. The continuation of our species does not depend, like that of the wolves, upon mere numbers, but much more upon wealth which banishes famine, knowledge which conquers disease, strong social interests which enable civilized nations to defy the assaults of barbarians. It is, then, against the interest of the species, even if continuation alone, and not happiness, be considered, that the population should increase faster than increase of wealth, knowledge, and social organization can keep up. When the contrary happens, as in Ireland before the potato famine, the result is a calamity which sweeps the people away still faster than that degeneration necessarily attendant on enforced maternity. (16) Now women, having other things to care for than mere pain in bearing children—being concerned also about comfort, elegance, leisure, calling, social standing—are, relatively to men, even less inclined for sexual pleasures and its probable consequences than other females relatively to males. It follows that the subjection of women to masculine lust is the cause of increase in population beyond the increase in wealth, knowledge, and social evolution.

It may be asked: Is the dilemma absolute? May not people be willing to enforce a liquor law which they often break? I reply: Show me an example. What experience seems to prove is that they will readily vote such a law, but not effectuate it. See below in text.

(16) Behold the answer to Henry George's absurd question, If population is liable to increase unduly, why does the wild beast lick her cubs in what were once the busy haunts of men? These were the haunts of Babylonians, Egyptians, and other races, enervated by that very lust which makes the undue increase, or else of Irishmen, who had not, indeed, as yet degenerated physically, but had learned to be content with potatoes; on which they were marrying and giving in marriage, till "the flood came and took them all away."

lution. One effect of this increase has been mentioned. But there are plenty more, as bad. Increase of population in Ireland was a top-heavy tower, which at last came crashing down altogether; but under favorable circumstances it may result in permanent decrepitude or pernicious extension instead of in collapse. The northern nations of Europe and Asia, kept hardy by sharp selection, barbarous and extremely poor, used, until a recent period, to overflow their habitat periodically, and pour down upon the wide plains of India, Persia, or Egypt, peopled by races whom lust had enervated. That any permanent good came of these terrific Scythian invasions is by no means clear. In important countries, as Bactria and Asia Minor, they have certainly substituted a ruder, less improveable race for one more refined. And in themselves, the names of Attela and Timor must remind us, they were among the greatest calamities mankind has ever sustained. In India, the facility with which mere existence could, previously to the famine era, be supported is no doubt answerable for the number, the poverty, and the servile character of the people. The caste system truly lowers wages, entails expenses and keeps the Sudras poor. But how do they come by the caste system? Buddhists, Muslims, and Christians have offered to free them from it. They have the caste system because they like it; and they like it because it is bound up with race traditions, at whose root are their sexual customs. In all these cases, emancipation of women would have averted overpopulation and its evils. It is true no such thing as emancipation of women is conceivable among such people. But the observation is not useless, for similar evils exist where emancipation of women is not impracticable. The Jews of Europe and America are not such a backward people but what it would be quite conceivable among them. How would it operate on the poverty of "Jew-town?" Much more important, however, than all the rest is the bearing of knowledge like this upon impending social changes. A system of State Socialism which, by applying suitable methods of agriculture to nationalized land facilitated a great increase of rural population, would indeed be a "coming slavery," with a proletariat reduced to contented frugality, until famine came at last to rouse them; and a bureaucracy of directors who would surely find ways to line their own pockets. I must accordingly think that an Anarchist who does anything to direct hope towards that quarter makes a very grave mistake. So long as man enslaves woman, he will be a slave himself,—and serve him right! I confess very little sympathy with hostility to the Malthusian theory on the ground of its "avowedly making vice and suffering the necessary results of a natural instinct with which are linked the purest and sweetest affections."

As we learn from anthropology that the disposition to go by authority is the measure of affinity with our grandsire Ape," and from comparative sociology that it perpetuates in every country the institutions of the barbarous past; so the biological theory of Malthus, upon which, it is well known rest Darwinism and in short all knowledge of the laws governing racial or social progress as such knowledge has been developed since Malthus' time, brings us up against the conclusion that man's tyranny over women is the

fundamental one which has enslaved himself. Resulting immediately in increase of population beyond former means of subsistence, it drives the barbarian to seek new sources of nourishment in war. The first and lowest stage is simply killing off. It may be seen among the Negritto race from Melanesia to the dwarfs' settlements in central Africa, and among the Indians of some islands where fruits like the banana delay necessity to the point of actual crowding; but these people are not cannibals. Cannibalism, thus, in its day, a progressive innovation, of course, implies war. It was general once among the Negroes, Polynesians, American Indians. Traditions, customs, and superstitions, indicate that it also prevailed, tho at a forgotten period, among the Semites and the Aryans. (17) Making slaves of prisoners next proved more profitable than eating them—an improvement which has been introduced in important parts of Africa during our own time. Beyond this it would be unnecessary to retrace the successive stages of exploitation down to wage-labor. The important points already established, in Section I, are that comparative sociology shows exploitation to be the purpose of war and war the foundation of government; that the religious systems of the world, however, refined since, arise in superstitions, to which the name of religion cannot without degrading it be applied; and that of these superstitions at least that transcendently important class associated with government, such as totemism, its rules of baptism, confirmation, marriage, burial, the practises of utu and taboo, and the resulting criminal law, are all bound up with the military system of barbarians.

That the restraints imposed by these traditions and the institutions which they hallow are shown by various branches of the modern sciences to be mischievous, we have found in connection with trade, penal discipline, foreign relations, and sexual relations. See section IV, and the earlier ones referred to here.

In the same section, we also learned why it is that most people do not yet see this. The opinion that government does good is a superstition. Government, because it is the gift of our Totem, the perfection of human wisdom, and all that, gets credit for doing away with great friction, what those instincts of advancing society which prompt its action would do if it were obsolete with less. What is said in the same section and those there more

(17) Thus the Vedas state, that a man being sacrificed to the gods, his spirit, which was what they wanted, like the Hawaiian deities, went into a horse, and thence, after being again offered, into other animals. The last was a sheep, which, therefore, is the most suitable sacrifice. The meaning of this is that all these creatures, beginning with the man, had successively come to be regarded as unfit for food, except the sheep, which, accordingly, was the only one the priests would accept. Again, the most amazing of ceremonies which would be considered wholly incredible, if we had not an everyday example, is that sacrifice, in which the god is himself the victim, eaten to his honor! Yet it is very common. It appears to be associated with the cannibal's belief that he imbibes the moral qualities of those he eats, for which reason bad chiefs are refused this post mortem compliment. Unquestionably it is connected with the paschal sacrifice, the worship of Moloch, Kronos and a cannibal god, and redemption of the first born. Thus it points to early Semitic cannibalism. God-eating, in one form or another, prevails among almost all nations, and myths in which one god eats another are innumerable.

or less directly referred to about the "rights of property" also shows it to be the teaching of science that the purpose of all these restraints is essentially predaceous and unjust.

The evil, we have also concluded, is not to be met by making restraint in some uncertain proportion less. (See Individualism in the same section.)

C. L. JAMES.

(To be continued.)

Jottings.

The course of religious and political progress in this country has run along the same lines. We have thrown over the pope, a man, and set up the Bible, a book, in his place. We have also thrown over a king, a man, and set up the Constitution, a written instrument, in his place. We have transferred the pope's infallibility to the Bible and the king's majesty to the Constitution. Does anyone suppose that either protestantism or democracy are going to end in the worship of printer's ink?

Soldiers do not seem to realize it, but in reality they are no better off than slaves. They are compelled to obey orders, no matter how disagreeable they may be, and disobedience is severely punished. As far as I can see, soldiers are about as free as slaves and yet they will insist on alluding to their profession as a manly calling. And by the way, if it is a glorious thing to wear uniforms and march in step, why should not convicts, who also do these things, be proud of their occupation?

One of the most original and suggestive addresses that I have read for a long time is that on "Crime and Criminals" delivered by Clarence Darrow some time ago to the prisoners in the Chicago jail. He told them in so many words that they were quite as good as the people outside. I confess I do not quite follow him in his belief in the irresponsibility of the individual and that we are all completely made by circumstances. I feel that I have a certain degree of responsibility for what I do, and I am inclined to impute the same degree to my neighbors. But Darrow is right in saying that most crime is the result of conditions and that our way of attempting to put a stop to it is itself criminal. "Hanging men in our county jail does not prevent murder," he says. "It makes murderers." He tells us how to do away with crime. "It can be done by giving the people a chance to live,—by destroying special privileges. So long as the big criminals can get the coal fields, so long as the big criminal has control of the city council and gets the public streets for street cars and gas rights, this is bound to send thousands of poor people to jail. So long as men are allowed to monopolize all the earth and compel others to live on such terms as these men see fit to make, you are bound to get into jail."

Darrow, you see, seems to hold the big thieves responsible, but not the little ones. As I say, I cannot quite follow him to the end, but there is a lot of truth in what he says, and you must read the whole address if you wish to judge his argument.—*The Whim*.

The teacher is one who makes two ideas grow where there was only one before.

AGENTS FOR FREE SOCIETY.

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

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

RECEIPTS

Radical Reading Room (from tea-party,) New York. \$13.25. Lopatiner (sale) \$4. Seattle Group, \$3.50. Keel, Wohl, each \$2. Berger, \$1.50. Field, Hirschberg, Wilbrat, DeShon, Aronberg, Weiss, Alber, Small, Faessler, Krieger, Landa, Sacharoff, Tilles-Schneider, Stief, Wood, Braun, Goetz, each \$1. Eldridge, Nack Pelsner, each 50c. Tannenbaum, 25c.

MODERN SCIENCE AND ANARCHISM.

By Peter Kropotkin.

(Translated from the Russian by David A. Modell—and revised by the author.)

Considered by some Kropotkin's best work.

Well and tastefully printed on good paper in clear and large type. 96 pages (or more.)

CONTENTS:

- I. Two Fundamental Tendencies in Society. The Kinship of Anarchism and the Popular Creative Tendency.
- II. The Intellectual Movement of the Eighteenth Century: Its fundamental traits; the investigation of all phenomena by the scientific method. The Stagnation of Thought at the Beginning of the Nineteenth Century. The Awakening of Socialism: Its Influence upon the Development of Science. The Fifties.
- III. Auguste Comte's Attempt to build up a Synthetic Philosophy. The causes of his failure. The religious explanation of the moral sense in man.
- IV. The Flowering of the exact Sciences in 1856-62. The Development of the Mechanical World—Conception, embracing the Development of Human Ideas and Institutions. A Theory of Evolution.
- V. The Possibility of a New Synthetic Philosophy. Herbert Spencer's Attempt; Why it failed. The Method not sustained. A false conception of "The Struggle for Existence."
- VI. The Causes of this Mistake. The Teaching of the Church: "The World is steeped in Sin." The Government's inculcation of the same view of "Man's Radical Perversity." The Views of Modern Anthropology upon this subject. The Development of forms of Life by the "Masses" and the Law. Its Twofold Character.
- VII. The place of Anarchism in Science. Its endeavor to formulate a Synthetic Conception of the World.—Its Object.
- VIII. Its origin. How its Ideal is developed by the Natural-Scientific Method.
- IX. A Brief Summary of the Conclusions Reached by Anarchism: Law. Morality. Economic Ideas. The Government.
- X. Continuation: Methods of Action. The Understanding of Revolutions and their Birth. The Creative Ingenuity of the People. Conclusion.

Price, 25 cents

Send orders to Natasha Notkin, 242 N. Second St., Philadelphia, Pa.

BOOK LIST.

ALL ORDERS FOR THE FOLLOWING BOOKS

RECEIVED AT THIS OFFICE.

Essays on the Social Problem.....	
.....H. Addis	05
The New Hedonism.....Grant Allen	05
Plain Words on the Woman	
Question....."	05
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	05
Realism in Literature and Art.....	10
Hilda's Home. Cloth \$1.....	
.....Rosa Graul	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....."	10
The State: Its Historic Role....."	05
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....."	10
Vice: Its Friends and Foes....."	15
What the Young Need to Know "	10
The Ballad of Reading Gaol.....	
.....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 thoroughly 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 Revolutionists.—As to What Means follow from the Principles.—Revolution and Anarchy.—The Efficacy of Reforms.—The Experimental Method.—What Then?—Anarchism and its Practicability.—The Unvarnished Truth.

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

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

Send orders to FREE SOCIETY.

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.