



A PERIODICAL OF ANARCHIST THOUGHT, WORK AND LITERATURE.

VOL. X. NO. 29.

CHICAGO, SUNDAY, JULY 19, 1903.

WHOLE NO. 423.

### The Song of the Woman.

They'll never have done with the fightin' on land an' over sea;  
Government—government, what does it care—what does it care for me?  
Bugles must blow an' flags must wave, and the muffled drums must beat.  
An' what to a lass is a lover when they lay him dead at her feet?  
They'll never have done with the fightin', forward the columns sweep;  
I hear the shout o' the captain as I tend the hearthan' weep.  
Far off an' faint—but I hear it; an' a white, dead face I see  
Under the sod in the grave that God an' government make for me!  
His hair was like the raven's wing. (I joy that my lips have prest,  
As it fell in its flowing beauty, this dark lock on my breast!)  
An' his brave, bright eyes looked love to mine—the eyes I shall never see  
'Till God at the great white Judgment Day shall give him back to me.  
'Bible they've got for battles: For men have fought an' died  
Ere the Prince of Peace said strife should cease—the Prince that they crucified.  
Tho a woman's tears bedew the years, shall they stay the crimson tide?  
What can you do with government with Bible on its side?  
Man must fight the battles; lover an' lass must part;  
But what is a star of glory to a woman's broken heart?  
Government's right, they tell me, an' the wrong must righted be:  
Give the lass then to her lover—an' my dead love back to me!

—Frank L. Stanton.

### State Capitalism and Social Democracy.

The great railway strike in Victoria, which has ended in a defeat of the strikers, is full of the deepest meaning for the labor movement all over the world. It is a lesson and a warning.

For some time past Australia was described by some enthusiasts as the great field for a Socialist experiment, which was going to convert the world to State Socialism. Nearly all the railways of Victoria belong, as is well known, to the State, and there is, moreover, a system of old age pensions, which are paid by the State to its railway employes. Two important points, which we find in the electoral programs of the European Social Democrats, were thus realized in Victoria, and the result, as we see now, is most pitiful. The railway workers of Victoria are even more restricted in their liber-

ties than the workers of any European State.

As soon as Mr. Irvine, the present prime minister of Victoria, came to power a few months ago, there was a serious dispute between the railway workers and the State upon the question of wages. The workers lost, and the State, encouraged by its victory, went a step further. It boldly proclaimed the theory that, once the railway workers are functionaries of the State, they must break all their connections with other workers all over the world. They must throw in their lot with the governing classes, and if they have any local grievances against the government in whose service they are, the only way to ventilate these grievances is to follow the channels of bureaucratic hierarchy and, in the last resort, to appeal to Parliament. This theory of agreement between employer and employe applies no more in their case. They are no more workingmen: they are functionaries; and, in the expectation of the happy times when all workingmen will become the functionaries of the future Socialist State, the channels of resistance which are open to other workingmen are closed to them. All their labor sympathies must disappear; they are "gents" of the civil service, to whom the government was kind enough to assign the dirty, fatiguing, badly paid work on the railways—keeping the best paid "functions" for themselves. Soldiers, if you like, perhaps slaves, but not workingmen.

Consequently, when the railway workers of Victoria determined to associate themselves as a body with the central organization of the trades unions of Victoria, which is known as the "Trade Hall," the government interfered. It declared that no such affiliation would be permitted, because the railway workers, if they belonged to the general trade union organization, might go on strike in support of any labor struggle, both within and without the colony. Therefore, if they disobeyed and affiliated themselves nevertheless to the said Trade Hall they would be dismissed at once and would lose all their rights to pension.

This theory was openly expressed the other day by Mr. Dobson, who is acting at London as the agent-general for Victoria. In an interview with the *Daily News* represen-

tative, he said: "We look upon the ten or twelve thousand railway employes as servants. They work for the State, are paid by the State, and expect later on to draw pensions from the State. Therefore we maintain that that they should keep themselves free from all political cliques, bodies, or organizations." "Free from all labor organizations," was evidently what the said Dobson meant, because every functionary of the State belongs to one or the other political middle class organizations, while he gets his pension from the State. It is workingmen organizations which State-employed laborers must not join, because they might give support to other laborers, and the State is a machine for the support of the capitalists—not workers.

It is interesting also to note how the government were sure beforehand of their victory. As they have in Victoria old-age pensions paid by the State, they were quite sure of possessing the most powerful arm to put an end to the strike—much better than the Russian czar's or the Italian king's grape-shot.

"You see," Dobson continued, "a very great number of men are well on in years. They have families, and they are looking forward for their pensions. A lot of these men will stand by the government in any case."

Alas, the Victorian foxes had calculated quite right. Already on May 18, the railway strikers, in a vote by ballot, decided by an overwhelming majority to resume work on the government's terms.

What lesson will the middle classes of Europe draw from this failure of our Australian brothers? They will conclude, of course, that State Socialism is the most effective protection for capitalism. To sweep a city with bullets, like Milan was swept, is not always safe for the rulers. How much better it is to give a stick to the workers that they should beat with it themselves! Old Europe, we hope, will hasten to imitate Australia. Balfour will hasten (if he is not displaced by the ex-republican "three acres and a cow") to grant old-age pensions—of course with a vengeance; just as in the Irish Land Bill—so as to make it a charming instrument for keeping the older workingmen on the side of the drones. The French bourgeois will adopt, in a hurry, the pension law for the plunder of the workmen and for

increasing the moneys handed by the State which was elaborated last year by the Social Democratic minister of trade, M. Millerand, but was stupidly rejected by the over-cautious shop-keepers. And the German Social Democrats will this time, we hope, get a hearty support from all the Philistines, and get thru without delay, a truly "Victorian" scheme for the transformation of the working men into "servants of the State"—for menial work, of course.

True, the executive council of the British Social Democrats has tried to establish the other day a distinction between "genuine" Social Democracy and State Socialism, such as we have in Australia.

"The executive council further calls attention," we read in their resolution, "to the fact that the ownership of monopolies under the present capitalist State in the interest of the commercial classes is entirely opposed to genuine Social Democracy."

Similar declarations were also made from time to time by old Bebel at the German congresses. But who cares now among the Social Democrats about such out of date declarations of half a dozen of Old Mohicans? Nobody in the least! The Old Mohicans know it themselves, and the have cautiously introduced that charming expression—"genuine Social Democracy"—to describe their conception of the stuff, because they well know that real Social Democracy is now exactly the thing they condemn in Australia. The State ownership of monopolies and the State administration of the same, so as *not* to interfere with the fundamental principles of capitalism, are the first points of the Social Democratic creed all over the world.

See, indeed, their last congresses in France, Germany, and Switzerland. In the Swiss republic the program of the party states it quite distinctly: "State ownership of railways" (as in Russia), "of trade in spirits" (as in Russia), and "of the bank monopoly." Not in the future State, but right now, today, in the capitalistic State. And no Social Democrats, not even the British, have ever condemned that program. In France, an attempt was made at the last congress to expel the State Socialist Millerand from the party; but the result was that the majority of the congress was won to his program and approved of his policy. As to Germany, the State Socialism policy of Vollmar and Bernstein was twice approved by the congresses of the party, in opposition to the old ex-Fourierist, Bebel.

Social Democracy *IS* State Socialism—that is, State capitalism—and this is why it is everywhere a failure. It is the *acceptation*, by the *exploited workers*, of the *existing capitalist State*, an agreement to share power with the present capitalist rulers, for the duration of a couple of generations, and the fallacious pretext of getting in this way, in the meantime, some concessions in favor of labor,—which concessions, in reality, are usually achieved much easier otherwise, by a direct pressure on the employers.

Such is Social Democracy today; and thirty years ago every revolutionary Socialist predicted that it would necessarily end in such a compromise with capitalism. "Who goes to

parliament will compromise and trade," even Liebknecht wrote, in 1879, when he was yet a revolutionist. And the Old Mohicans, like Bebel, Guesde, and their English friends realize that, altho they do not say it publicly. The day they shelved ("for the time being," as they said then) the revolutionary aspirations which they cherished in their youth, the day they took "the conquest of power in the *present middle-class State*," as their immediate aim—Social Democracy was bound to *compromise with capitalism*. They may still talk of "genuine" Social Democracy, but they know there is only one Social Democracy,—the one that strives at State capitalism, and brings about for the worker a loss of all liberty, in exchange for some miserable protection by the State—by the present State, the capitalist State, the State which, when it owns monopolies, "owns them in the interest of commercial classes," and protects the capitalist by its armies—and cannot do otherwise without ceasing to be what it is. They know that. And so it will be, so long as the revolution, of which it is permitted no more to speak in Social Democratic papers, comes some day, notwithstanding all prohibitions, and, totally changes the whole face of affairs.—*Freedom*, London.

— o —

#### Industrial Forebodings.

History repeats itself. And "the lesson from history," says Lasalle, "is that the people do not learn from it." Unhappily how true that statement is!

The Anarchist and Socialist publications have devoted much space to recording the events that have occurred during the last year in the ranks of capital and labor. Foremost in importance have been the revelations that the capitalists have formed associations for the purpose of offsetting and combatting the attempts of the trade unions to gain any advantages which they may strive for.

That these advantages are at most and in the end of doubtful value, is no less understood by the possessing class than by the most clear and foresighted class of revolutionists. "Why, then," it may be asked, "this formation of associations to resist the laboring classes?" This question I will try to answer. But before doing this I will endeavor to show that in the recent events there is something of great significance both to us Anarchists and the diametrically opposed class of reformers, the Socialists. I am of the opinion that methods, no less than theories, must be results of an induction from history and life. Methods are right and efficacious only when events stamp them as being such. Let us, then, see and compare the methods of the Socialists and Anarchists.

In America, as in Europe, the Socialists have abandoned and deprecated alleconomic struggles. The workers have been told again and again "to use their political power to capture the economic power." Their congresses, as the last one, have explicitly stated and resolved "that Socialists refuse to join the economic struggles of the trade unions and advise the trade unions to take part in the political struggle." Their

activity has accomplished nothing in this country so far, and it accomplished nothing with the same methods for the last thirty years in Germany and elsewhere, and *nothing will be accomplished*. Their error arises in the fallacy that society is dividing itself into one large class of proletarians and a small class of ever disappearing capitalists, and that it would be a very easy task for a newly elected Socialist government to legally "expropriate the expropriators."

This is a profound error (I mean the division of society into two classes), indulged in by many Anarchists as well as all Socialists. This first error has been thoroly refuted by our Comrade W. Tcherkesoff, in his "Pages of Socialist History"; the other is an outgrowth of the same error, as it presumes that there will finally be very few capitalists to resist expropriation. Does not Engels tell us in "Socialism: From Utopia to Science"; "The first act, wherein the State appears as the real representative of the whole body social—the seizure of the means of production in the name of society is also its last independent act as the State. . . The State is not abolished—it *dies out*." It is in denying the above fallacies that Anarchism has pursued the opposite course: to fight and attack the capitalist class in its economic power and to repudiate the parliamentary (which must be legal and hence cannot do away with the institutions existing today, for they are not all legal and 'constitutional') struggles.

And that these methods, our methods, are right, is clearly verified by passing events. Is it not observed in this country as well as in Europe that, while the parliamentary struggle is allowed to be carried unmolested, every economic movement which has any tendency to attack private property, and in the remote future may attempt to expropriate, is being fought and strangled at its very inception?

Socialists, why this paradox? The capitalist class possessing the political power, which you claim is sufficient to emancipate the workers economically, controlling and being backed by the State, is, nevertheless, fighting an opponent, attacking it from its economic stronghold only.

This leads me to the capitalist associations and their threats.

"Why do they form these associations?" is asked. Because they see a persistent economic struggle, and knowing that the demands for higher wages and shorter hours will soon be found out as delusions, and that this will lead the workers to claim and demand all, they attempt to stifle this tendency in its growth. Not in vain and not without foreboding does *Dixie*, a manufacturers journal, declare:

Employers generally believe that the lines are being strengthened for battle. The labor unions are already beligerant. Numerous overt acts have been committed. The other side, rather slow to recognize the situation, inclined, until now, to treat the matter lightly, has at last sounded a bugle call, and the forces are marshalling: for counselling first, and for fighting later on, if necessary; and the general impression prevails that fighting is going to be necessary. . . . With the employer the question is that of abject submission or war.

Shadows from Hazelton, Chicago, Idaho, Buffalo and Brooklyn cast their grimness before our eyes; the voices of Parsons,



Spies and Lingg echo and reecho again and again: O ye monsters, your tentacles are stretching out again to grasp us and draw us to your greedy mouths! Your lessons have been too frequent and too severe; unwillingly have we learned them. You have reared us and you have supplied us with methods; and we will acknowledge their usefulness by employing them.

Revolutionists! Let our motto be: *Nunquam non paratus*. (Never be unprepared.)  
San Francisco, Cal. S. MINTZ.

— o —  
"Justice," Etc.

I do not like to offer short articles to FREE SOCIETY while my "Vindication of Anarchism" is occupying so much of its space. But there are reasons, obvious to every reader of *Lucifer*, why that paper no longer gets the benefit of my brains (whatever they may be worth); and J. M. Greene, while attacking in that organ, at once science, Anarchism, religion, and my unworthy self, has managed to broach a fallacy which really requires notice, because it imposes on some Anarchists. He says it is self-evident that the "rights" of any creature depend on its capacity to feel. Now I very much dislike discussion of this kind. Patriotism has been called the last resort of a scoundrel, and some talk about rights is always the beginning of a humbug. But it is true, as I have had occasion to show comrades who had imbibed too much cant of the materialistic and egotistic kind, that humbug is the shadow cast by truth; and that, therefore, if we did not have feelings of the moral and religious order, those humbugs who work upon such feelings could not do it. Sometimes, then, the humbug can be refuted, as at present, by showing that it misrepresents the feeling.

The sentiment of justice is not founded on the reflection that an individual for whom justice is claimed can feel. That reflection is the foundation of mercy. The foundation of justice is the reflection that, as man claims to be himself an end, he cannot consistently treat another man as a mere means. And therefore justice has no place but between men. Animals without the human aspiration after infinite improvement, have (because they can have) no other protector than human mercy. But the end of mercy is to diminish the total of pain. She cares nothing about an individual taken at random getting more of it than the average. That consideration belongs to justice, and is limited to the sphere of justice.

The most noted organ of the Movement in Favor of Ignorance calls itself the *Abolitionist*. But its argument is like that of the slave-owner. The slave-owner said it was for the best interest of the Negro to be subject to the white man, who, of course, would treat him as a means, not as an end, but whose own interest was against giving him unnecessary pain; and who, if foolish enough to do so, could be restrained by laws, such as all the slave States had. The *Abolitionist's* reply was: "You are not entitled to judge of the Negro's best interest. As a man, he has a right, which justice requires you respect, of caring for his interest himself."

Let not the Movement in Favor of Ignorance say it "carries further" the *Abolitionists* principles by applying them to dogs and horses. They cannot be thus applied. So far as dogs and horses are concerned, the slave-owner was evidently right. It would have been suicide for the abolitionists to admit that the horses had the same claims on white men which Negroes have. The whole case of the abolitionist was that there is no parallel. But the Movement in Favor of Ignorance says there is.

Mr. Greene's remedy for cruelty to animals again, is not the abolitionist's remedy for another kind of cruelty, but is that which the slave-owner, sincerely or otherwise proposed. It is not more liberty and knowledge but "more laws." And yet the Movement in Favor of Ignorance is Anarchistic! When the *Animal's Defender* first heard of me, it dismissed me with the remark that I was an *Anarchist*! (italics and admiration its own) and said it was blessed in its opponents.

That "the world's best and most impartial students" are opposed to "vivisection, vaccination, animal serums, ETCETERA! (all progress in medical science?)" I may believe when Mr. Greene tells me who they are. Till then, I must think him as much opposed to science as to Anarchism.

Mr. Greene's calm assumption that I believe in no God, I have denied ever since I was writing for the *Truth Seeker* (I mean I denied it then), but apparently to little purpose. If I did not believe in "a power which makes for righteousness," a power which confounded the worshippers of cats, and the sacrificers of children to calves in the days of Moses and Samuel, I don't know but I might be making money out of zoophilism, Mind Cure, and blackmail laws! To be sure, I should not be myself in that case, but I guess I was no more cut out for an atheist than a quack. Without disputing the existence of such a process as conversion, I incline to think the thoro-bred specimen of both is born not made.

When Swift ironically proposed eating the surplus babies of a redundant population, his argument, as Lecky observes, would have been much simplified if there had existed an ethical school which put the rights of men and brutes upon exactly the same basis. The attention of Mr. Roosevelt is respectfully directed to the existence of such a school in Boston. C. L. JAMES.

— o —  
Splinters.

In the United States, newspaperdom has heaped so much abuse on the "tramp," that the word is now used in an opprobrious sense. Recently a tramp inherited a fortune from a deceased brother in Brooklyn, and immediately the papers spoke of the absent "tramp" as a "wanderer." That is indeed a fine distinction. Terrible is the respect money inspires!

The New York *Worker* has several times cautioned its readers not to believe the prevalent newspaper statements that the "Socialist" success in Germany is not alarming, as the Socialists there are merely mild reformers. A close examination of several summaries of the platform on which they

made their campaign has not enabled me to find any Socialism in it, unless, indeed, "gratuitous legal proceedings," and "gratuitous medical attendance" are Socialism. I would be much obliged to the *Worker* if it would unearth the Socialism in the campaign documents that the Social Democrats used and expose it to view.

Benj. R. Tucker, editor of *Liberty*, had always seemed to me a man who could take his own medicine stoically. But now I fear I was mistaken. On page one of his last issue he heartily recommends a proposition for radicals to find more occasions for laughing, and if they can't find them, to turn their attention to each other a little. On the sixth page he reproduces some pleasantry indulged in by my friend Kelly, and copied by FREE SOCIETY, and refers to it, with rather bad grace, as a "fair sample of communist argument." I suggest that the editor of *Liberty* take another sixty-cent dinner, especially prepared, and try to see the point. (I hope the editor will not take this as a deprecation of the "sixty-centers"; if he had to do the "quick" more often, as my friend and I do, he would appreciate them even more than he does now.) ABE ISAAC JR.

— o —  
On seeing the brigandage of the men in office one is tempted to regard society as a wood full of robbers, of whom the dangerous are the archers charged with guarding the rest.—*Chamfort*.

— o —  
Governments oppress mankind in two ways, either directly, by brute force, that is physical violence, or indirectly, by depriving them of the means of subsistence and thus reducing to helplessness at discretion. Political power originated in the first method; economic privilege arose from the second. Governments can also oppress man by acting on his emotional nature, and in this way constitute religious authority. But there is no reason for the propagation of religious superstitions except that they defend and consolidate political and economic privileges.—*Malatesta*.

— o —  
LETTER-BOX.

D. L., New London, Conn.—Thanks for invitation. Particulars will come in private letter.

Various Inquirers.—Comrades MacQueen and Grossman have both failed to appear in the New Jersey courts; and a few days ago newspaper dispatches stated that the judge had declared their bonds forfeited. Their bondsman was their attorney; and while at first it was supposed that comrades had guaranteed the bonds, later information states this to be incorrect. This is the extent of our information on the Paterson case at the present time.

— o —  
Attention.

Comrade Emma Goldman has agreed to make a propaganda tour in the West and the Pacific Coast during the months of July and August, if the money necessary for the trip can be raised. Now we ask all comrades who are interested in the tour to mail all contributions and communications either to my address or to Comrade Emma Goldman, 50 First St., New York. ROSE FRITZ.  
San Francisco, Calif., 421 Castro St.

# 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

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.

CHICAGO, SUNDAY, JULY 19, 1903.

423

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

## ATTENTION!

All those who are interested in the English propaganda are cordially invited to attend a meeting to be held Thursday, July 23, 8 p. m., 407 Park Ave., the quarters of FREE SOCIETY.

## Notes.

"Socialism and Politics" is the name of a pamphlet by Peter Kropotkin, which is an excellent attack on political action and its corrupting effects. It can be obtained from our office for three cents a copy or \$2 a hundred.

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.

Convictions create courage.

Habit often chains us to evil.

Ice is the chastest of all things.

Religion offers us the nothings of spirit.

Life depends upon material or substance.

The love of liberty is the measure of manhood.

A slave is one who has forgotten his native strength.

Carrie Nation manages to keep drunk on water and warm wind.

How bold a flower is in its nakedness! Its boldness is a beauty.

Real wisdom comes only thru absolute freedom to live and learn.

Hetty Green should be a woman, instead of a million dollars wearing a dress.

## FREE SOCIETY

The beauties of nature make us hunger for a life in which we may express beauty.

Mark Hanna is retiring from business to devote himself to the task of "kidding" to the working classes.

The new Pacific cable was operated successfully July 4; and now lies can go the more easily around the world.

The revolution of State Socialists is a change of clothing by a confirmed criminal and pestilential dead-beat.

The "pure" woman today is one whose actions give the lie perpetually to all her finer instincts and aspirations. Her life is death.

How can the people wait longer when the green fields in their plenty are calling on them to create sustenance and live in peace and plenty?

A pope leads a world, perhaps; but greater is the man who asks for no leader, and who will lead no one; having faith in and regard for the sacred, the great self in each human being.

Andrew Carnegie is reported to have given away over \$100,000,000. And a large part of the world thinks him a noble man. If those who praise him could only have seen Andrew stealing that hundred million!

The San Francisco Stars says that "lynchers are practical Anarchists," and I retort that this paper's editor is either a fool or a trifier; he may take his choice. Lynching is only law in a hurry to punish. Anarchists oppose punishment.

The fraud, Hearst, married a woman in order to hide his dirty life behind her skirts; from that vantage point he is going to cry out to the mob to nominate him for president. He would make a good one on the principal that the worst is by far the best.

Steel Trust stock has fallen to \$79 and the trust's employees, who were inveigled into buying stock at \$82.50 a share, now realize that Mr. Morgan fooled them in pretending to be their friend. Another get-rich-quick scheme thus stands exposed—to some.

Roosevelt is being urged to force the protest of America respecting the Jewish massacres upon the attention of the czar. It would be worth a little, in the way of satisfying curiosity merely, to learn whether the president is restrained from this act thru fear or thru shame.

College professors are probably gladdened by the recent lecture of a Frenchman in the University of Chicago. Bluntly the lecturer told the truth that in America a university professor may not dare to express other than popular convictions. And we call ourselves an enlightened people!

Those who are ceasing to abuse Anarchism and Anarchists are, many of them, turning now to derision. The idea that the abolition of law and the State would practically bring crime to an end is an infinitely funny thing to these wiseacres. But their lack of knowledge on the nature and history of the State is a funnier thing.

The Truth Seeker, decrying lynching, says, "The use of force begets a resistance by force, and people should learn to let each other alone." Just so. Government is force and nothing but force; is the editor of The Truth Seeker prepared to follow his logic whithersoever it will lead him? Anarchism is a specific denial of force.

As an American it irks me to have to admit that my country stands high in but one direction or sphere, while literature, painting, sculpture, architecture, science, education, each finds its chosen home elsewhere. America stands highest (?) as a commercial factor in the world. Thus let it stand in ignoble isolation till shame gives it a worthier ambition.

Ministers are beginning to be ashamed of taking the money of such men as Rockefeller, Carnegie, and other great exploiters, for educational purposes, but The Chicago American, chief of cheap hypocrites, and faker in general to the public, frowns upon such a perversion of the true function of conscience, and declares, by implication, that the end justifies the means.

D'Annunzio is classed as an Anarchist by some Italian scholars, but he is as little like an Anarchist as Nietzsche is. The man who desires unlimited liberty for himself, and yet is unwilling to concede liberty to his fellows, the man who conceives of a state of society in which the many would gladly serve the "noble few," does his own intelligence and ours an indignity. Only hopeless fools would serve an "Overman" who, whatever else he might be, would not be an Anarchist.

The culmination of events in Evansville, Indiana, recently, teaches an important lesson. Vengeance would have blood; and the Negro being a thorn in the side of a White Man just now, whom should vengeance fall upon but this same Negro. Plenty of White Men were in prison, and for crimes as heinous as any charged to the incarcerated Negroes; but "justice" must have its way, and so Negroes were expected to suffer. "Justice" is of legal birth and is as big a fool as her father.

I suggest that those who punish Negroes for their crimes by torture while they let white men equally guilty rest secure in jail awaiting trial, try boiling in oil the next time they punish a "fiend"; tearing out tongues, cutting off pieces of quivering flesh, and burning at the stake are becoming commonplace; "justice" would doubtless be pleased by a slight change in the conventional program. A large kettle could be secured, and the tortured and boiling man



would make an interesting exhibit for the ladies and gentlemen who hate crime so much.

That the "free library" today is a palliative only and not a "step in the right direction," an article in the *Nineteenth Century* for June would seem to demonstrate. Its author, Mr. Churtin Collins, declares that the major portion of the books taken out of free libraries are "shilling shockers" and other cheap and worthless novels exploiting cheap and worthless ideas; and maintains that the opportunity to read given by philanthropy leads to personal deterioration. The people do not want books, but they do need changed economic conditions, for with these they would learn to appreciate good books. Charity is always blinking the facts which call it into being. AMERICUS.

#### By the Wayside.

The editor of the San Francisco *Philosophical Journal* tells his readers in all seriousness that "the Italian government sent 1,500 Anarchists to the island Tremiti, in the Mediterranean," where they fell out, "and, instead of founding a model State, eventually exterminated one another." If the ghost stories and "spirit demonstrations," which parade thru the journal, come from the same source as the above, its readers are indeed a pitiable and credulous lot.

The capitalists and their prop—the government—are preparing for war and bloodshed. Parry and his clique boldly announce that they are getting ready to crush organized labor, and the war department meanwhile has ordered military maps of the industrial centers thruout the country. This would indicate that our "law and order" people have more confidence in the "riot cartridges," which were recently recommended to the governors of the different States, than in God and the ballot box.

The organization of the Socialist youth in Belgium starts a vigorous propaganda against militarism, and at a recent congress in Brussels a resolution was read providing that the new recruits should refuse to serve in the army. But the resolution was defeated after the Socialist leaders, Vanderelde and Fisher, had pointed out that even "the German Socialists, who give so many proofs of international solidarity, are against a general desertion, as this would open Europe to the invasion of Russian barbarism." Thus the Socialist politicians are the staunchest supporters of government and its tool—militarism.

In New York a society is to be formed "for the protection of the right and liberty of the individual as guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States and of the State against the constant violation thereof by the police." The *Truth Seeker*, in speaking of "the passing of personal liberty," remarks:

The question whether the citizens of this country are entitled to personal liberty under law, or whether the "constituted authorities" are above the law, is becoming a pressing one. Just now New York is the

scene of as much police oppression as we are wont to believe Russia to be.

Judge Gaynor of the New York supreme court is also up in arms, lamenting that "free government" is a miserable failure, and in his predicament he proposes to delegate police power to men who "are keenly alive to the rights and liberties of the citizen, and the meaning of free government," as a remedy. Now since it is not very likely that Judge Gaynor and the editor of the *Truth Seeker* will ever learn that a "free government" is a misnomer, it is pertinent for Mr. Tucker to give the new society instruction on "equal liberty," so that the mathematical quantity "equal" be not violated. And as freedom is not a tapemeasure these wiseacres may finally learn that liberty is not to be achieved under government or restraint of any sort. INTERLOPER.

#### The Ideal of Anarchism.

The word Anarchy signifies the negation of authority, the constraint of the many by the few, or even, of the few by the many. But Anarchy is not a mere negation. In fact a mere negation is absurd. In denying anything we must deny it in the name of something else. What, then, can we say that Anarchism affirms? It is in the name of the individual that Anarchism denies authority. Anarchy signifies also the affirmation of the liberty of the individual. It has always been in the name of liberty that revolution and great social changes have been brought about. I think it could be shown that what we call social progress has been nothing but a gradual increase in liberty given to the individual. I ought, perhaps, to say "taken by him"; for liberty cannot be granted, it must be taken. Well, the significance of Anarchism at the present time is that it has brought forward a new idea of liberty; it has given a meaning to the word, an immensely wider and deeper meaning than has ever been conceived before; and it claims that the attainment of such liberty is possible.

What, then, do we mean by the word liberty, that has so often roused the fire of revolt in men, and sends a thrill of enthusiasm thru the heart of every poet; is it still merely a negative term, signifying only the negation of authority and constraint? I think it is more than this. For the word Liberty by itself means nothing. "I desire for you more than liberty; you ought not only to be well quit of what you do not wish, you ought to have what you do wish. You wish to be free? And from what? . . . To be free from something signifies simply to be quit of it or exempt from it." Stirner urges that Liberty is merely a metaphysical phantom; and undoubtedly in this sense it is so. We must qualify the word,—liberty to do something. What is this something? Many answers might be given; but I think what Anarchism demands is that the individual should be free to develop his own faculties and to satisfy all his reasonable needs, material and intellectual, according to his own character and temperament. "The only object for which Society can exist at all, to be binding on the moral sense, and

\* Max Stirner, "Der Einzige und sein Eigentum," pp. 184, 185.

to have any claim on the allegiance of any of its members, is that by its means the fullest scope may be given to the healthy development of the faculties of those members. Every check to that development, and every institution which does not help it, is an obstruction thrown in the way of the very ends of Society."†

I think that this conception of the integral development of the individual is really fundamental in the theory of Anarchism. It is not limited to Anarchist writers. We find the same idea in such diverse thinkers as Ibsen, Whitman, Emerson, Thoreau, Nietzsche, Guyau, Spencer. It is an idea that is "in the air," as it is said. But it remained for the Anarchists to draw from it the logical conclusions which constitute their theory, to criticise from this point the institutions of present-day social organization, and to show in what way we may hope to reach this liberty we desire.

What are the causes which obstruct or prevent the free development of the individual? There are those which come from heredity. There are fixed at birth certain limits upon the possible development of the individual. Yet I think that it is easy to exaggerate the importance of heredity. Probably much more of an individual's capacity and character depend on the influences of his early years of childhood. But this is a point to be settled by the biologists and psychologists, and to them we must leave it. In any case it must be granted that at present the obstruction put in the way of the free expansion of the individual by his social environment is much greater than that due to heredity, and is moreover of vastly more importance, since it can be removed.

When we contemplate the institutions of modern society in this light, we see that the obstruction it puts in the way of the development of the individual is immense:—the system of education, religion, the institution of private property and the resulting economic and juridical organization, and finally the State, all fall under the criticism of Anarchist theory, and all must be condemned. Not till society has been reorganized from the very base can anything like adequate freedom be hoped for; not till then will men be able to grow to this full stature; not till then shall we know all the best that humanity is capable of, all that men and women may become when the yoke is taken from their shoulders, and their thoughts, their actions, their lives may be free.—Ex.

#### Important for Chicago Only.

All friends of the labor movement should not fail to join the jolly members of the Debating Club at their Summernight Picnic, which takes place August 2, 1 p. m., in Walsh Grove. Take Lincoln Avenue cars, transfer to Bowmanville cars, at the end of which line walk three blocks west and one block south. For members of labor unions and singing societies free admission. Tickets bought in advance 10 cents, at the entrance 25 cents.

† Toulmin Smith, "Local Self-Government and Centralization," p. 33.

## A Vindication of Anarchism.

## IX (continued.)

There is a reason why rapacious "Napoleons of finance" should resist the coming of Anarchy; but their power to resist it depends on their power of gulling the masses, which is departing from them. There is no reason why an administrator of production or distribution who sees that prices fall to the cost of production, and is therefore content with (rising) wages of superintendence, should resist the coming of Anarchy. There is reason for thinking that some will always like spending and others accumulating best. But there is no reason under the system of Anarchy, why the accumulators should have any oppressive advantage over the spenders—or vice versa. For there is nothing artificial about Anarchism,—one of its great recommendations as compared with Socialism. It leaves every man free to consult his own taste about such things, without assistance from the corporate force of the nation to effectuate it; and relies, for realization of the ideal which it has in common with Socialism, upon that very concentration of effort which springs from the discovery of solidarity in human interests; which, thru the entire process of substituting contract for status, has been narrowing the sphere of government; which tends, as the "optimistic" school of bourgeois economy has pointed out, directly towards Communism; and which is hindered in attaining that end solely by the opposite exploiting tendency, whose expression ever since governments were organized has been government!

Such, then, is the Anarchistic theory of impending social transformation, as opposed to that which usurps the name of scientific. I think no one who has read and understood the summary of it can dispute that it is the more inductive theory of the two. Indeed, so far as I can see, it is strictly inductive; assuming nothing; reasoning from no mere tendency with exclusion of modifying tendencies; but taking account of all the facts, and giving each its due weight, none, consequently, any more. But in making these high claims for it I stand open to correction, of course: because it is the admirable peculiarity of the inductive method never to dogmatize, never to pronounce any question closed, but to invoke the judgment of Experiment on all its data and inferences, including the past decisions of experiment itself, which are thus always open for rehearsing. It remains for me to trace those steps by which this theory has attained its present degree of development and popularity, and to show historically, as I have tried to show analytically, that its method has always been inductive. For this purpose I might refer the reader to my papers on "Anarchy's Apostles," already mentioned, or to my more recent tract on the "Origin of Anarchism." But as he may not find them easily accessible, I will again summarize briefly the information they contain.

Anarchism makes its first appearance in history not as an economic but a general social theory. Its earliest apostles observed and generalized, inductive fashion, the most simple, obvious and widely spread class of pertinent phenomena, which are not the

economic. Application to these came later. The circumstances which turned thought in the Anarchistic direction are felicitously described by Macaulay at the end of his essay on Sir James Mackintosh's "History of the English Revolution," and at the beginning of that on Lord Chatham. In England at the date of the Revolution (1688) there were two parties, one of which asserted the inherent sanctity of these institutions inherited from the national Totem, as monarchy, aristocracy, and the ecclesiastical establishment, while the other regarded them as mere expressions of public will for public utility, capable of being modified or abolished at need. The frantic misgovernment of James II united these parties for a time, against him; he was driven from the throne and the country; and the Whig party, whose professional principles were favorable to such acts, obtained an ascendancy which, with few and short intervals, continued till the claims of his posterity had become obsolete, that is till the accession of George III, in October, 1760. Under these circumstances, the Tories soon began to repent. Tho a very strong party, they were an opposition almost excluded from patronage. Naturally, some of them engaged in perilous intrigues with the exiled dynasty; many who would not risk this, held that, with proper security for other English institutions, the direct line should be restored; all set themselves to oppose and criticise the new government. The theory of the Whigs, which they continually aired, because it constituted their title to power, was one of revolutionary freedom. But their practise was tyrannical enough to furnish abundant ground for attack. A foreign war, a standing army, military law, a funded debt, pensions, sinecures, protective tariffs, religious discrimination (against the Catholics), were all involved in their policy. Rotten boroughs were the strength of their representation, which the rural vote cut down in proportion to its strength. The Tories opposed them in the name of peace, equal laws, economy, free trade, toleration, extension of the suffrage. Thus during seventy years liberty was cried up and authority attacked by both sides. The administration party held it to be self-evident that government had no excuse for existing but the public good. The opposition party showed that the most liberal government which had ever existed was not for the public good. At last, in 1760, the relative positions of the parties altered, and, presto, change! so also did their principles. The Tories resumed their normal attitude as champions of every possible abuse. The Whigs, forgetting their record, again began to show their zeal against everything which they themselves had done as long as they could. Under these circumstances, a few sagacious men began for the first time to show signs of doubting whether government were so good or so necessary a thing as it had been represented. In the very year of demonstration, 1760, Edmund Burke published his "Vindication of Natural Society." He found it convenient to represent this tract as a satire; but it evidently represented genuine misgivings of his own restless, capacious mind. Two thoughts operated as centripetal and centrifugal forces in

all Burke's philosophy—that human nature is indefinitely improvable, and that precedent is the logic of authority. How the centrifugal eventually carried him away from the sun into the chaos and darkness need not be related here. Put together, now, as major and minor, the two propositions evidently produce the conclusion of Anarchism. "In vain you tell me," he cried, "that artificial government is good, and that I fall out only with the abuse. The thing! the thing itself is the abuse!" Twelve years later, Junius struck the key-note of his celebrated Letters thus: "It is not the disorder but the physician; it is the pernicious hand of government alone which can make a whole people desperate." From this time, neither England nor America has ever been without Anarchistic writers. In 1793, the most terrible year of the French Revolution, when Burke was at the head of the dominant and reactionary party, Godwin produced his "Political Justice." In this book the economic importance of Anarchism is recognized, but not at all after Marx's fashion. The moral-political phase is still the one emphasized. Godwin's Communism, which he also modified after his controversy with Malthus, was only a predicted consequence of that universal fraternity which he conceived mankind were learning. But to this advance in their intellectual and moral culture he clearly perceived authority to be the standing and irreconcilable obstacle. "Government in its very nature," he wrote, "counteracts the improvement of original mind." Thus his view was essentially the same as Burke's. Godwin's son-in-law, Shelley, and Shelley's most intimate friend, Byron, enshrined the new wisdom in verse.

"The man  
Of virtuous soul, commands not, nor obeys;  
Power, like a desolating pestilence  
Pollutes what'er it touches, and obedience  
Bane of all genius, virtue, freedom, truth,  
Makes slaves of men, and of the human frame,  
A mechanized automaton."

Tho Shelley certainly was a Communist, there is nothing of economic Communism about this; and in Byron's utterances on the same subject, nothing at all.\* The

\* It should be unnecessary to prove Shelley's Anarchism when we have it in such unmistakable words as these. Byron's is less easily demonstrated by citations, for we infer it mainly from the prevailing spirit of his works. It is not, however, likely to be disputed that he has always been regarded as the embodied spirit of what Philistines call Chaos, which means "the improvement of original mind." To this he owes that prodigious influence, whose decline was so often and confidently predicted, but, since the first fad of mere imitating him expired, so obstinately refuses to come. Byron, without doubt, is a poet of great and varied excellence; but if we seek the secret of his unique power, we can find it only here; for in everything else he has certainly been equaled or surpassed. It is also plain that his radicalism stopped at no half-way house like democracy or Socialism.

"I'd have mankind be free  
As much from mobs as kings, from you as me."  
Being before Proudhon, both poets use the mere word Anarchy in its now obsolescent bad sense; and, as often happens with this misapplication, the effect is apt to be laughably incongruous.

"In the great morning of the world,  
The Spirit of God with might unfurled  
The flag of freedom over Chaos;  
And all its banded Anarchs fled,  
Like vultures frightened from Immaus  
Before an earthquake's tread—  
So from Time's tempestuous dawn  
Freedom's splendor burst and shone."  
And indeed there is not a more Anarchistic poem than that called the "Masque of Anarchy."



thought is the old one of Burke and Godwin the highest good of man's nature is infinite progression, and the obstacle to it is authority. Friends of Byron, Shelley, or each other, Charles Lamb, Leigh Hunt, Walter Savage Landor, kept up this literary movement against authority till the new generation of English Anarchist poets, beginning with Swinburne and William Morris, were entering the arena. A very important connecting link, between old and new, because a purely scientific one, is Herbert Spencer's "Social Statics" (1848). Here, again, the economic side of the question is made subordinate. The equilibrium of society is absolute personal liberty, with which all institutions must, from their nature, interfere, thus sowing the wind to reap the revolutionary whirlwind. (I need scarcely caution the reader against the new edition of "Social Statics," a wretched attempt at crawfishing in the author's dotage, which will doubtless soon go out of circulation.) In America, Jefferson's early writings, as already noted, are full of Anarchism; and so are Paine's "Crisis" and "Rights of Man." Here again there is little economic theory; only general perception that authority does not produce the benefits attributed to it, but rather the contrary evils. A certain progress may, however, be traced. The early Anarchists reasoned from the standpoint of the individual. Even in Herbert Spencer's book, above cited, society is quite secondary. But Paine and Jefferson recognize man's necessities as a social being. Their case is that while government claims to protect, to create, or even to be, society, it actually depresses and impairs society. Jefferson is far from sure the world would not be better in a state of Anarchy; quite sure there is no comparison between that and European despotism. "Society," says Paine, "in every state is a blessing; but government, even in its best state, is but a necessary evil, in its worst state an intolerable one." The sequence of American Anarchists from their day, down to the present time, comprises Emerson and Thoreau, of whom more anon; William Lloyd Garrison, Charles O'Connor,\* and Colonel Greene, author of "The Blazing Star." The progressively inductive character of their thought is notable. "The Blazing Star," a book little known I believe except to American Anarchists, puts in rather fanciful form the doctrine of Burke, Godwin, Herbert Spencer in his "Social Statics" and his best sociological essays, such as that on "Over Legislation"; above all that of the transcendental school since Hegel's influence became general. "The Blazing Star" is the idea of human perfectibility. Authority is its antithesis; it is the chilling fog of "precedent"; that is of old time ignorance and barbarism, necessarily always hostile to "the improvement of original mind." But the argument is now historical, and shows considerable ability. Garrison, however, was an Anarchist because his experience as an Abolitionist taught him that government and oppression are inseparable. See, in his biography, Vol. I, pp. 124, 265, 307, 503, Vol II, p. 51 seq.; pp. 94, 108, 201, 206, and

\* He refused to be the candidate for president of the anti-Greeley Democrats in 1872; and it is an open secret that this was because he did not believe in government.

indeed many other passages which may easily be found with help of the index. The authors (his sons) inform us that his friends found some difficulty about deterring him from merging his abolitionism in a general crusade against all positive institutions.

To this native American school of Anarchism belongs also the very important distinction of being the first to adequately recognize the subjection of women as the basis of all tyranny, and their emancipation as the necessary condition of freedom. The French school of Proudhon and the German of Marx are both materially defective here; which is remarkable, because Saint Simon, from whom they got the idea of necessary evolution into Anarchy, had pointed to the economic emancipation of women as to one of those effects of the bourgeois system which portended its own transit. Bakunin was, however, the first European to recognize its importance sufficiently. But it has always been vehemently championed by American radicals. Much credit belongs, in this connection, to the Spiritualists, a sect originally and principally American. However we may deprecate their connivance at both foolish mysticism and wholly inexcusable jugglery, however plain it may be that by these very grave errors they have rather hindered than advanced recognition of whatever is interesting in the phenomena they exhibit; however chaotically eclectic we must pronounce the metaphysics of Andrew Jackson Davis and Stephen Pearl Andrews, it is undeniable the whole Spiritualistic literature, beginning before the Rochester manifestations, with Davis (see his "Penetralia"), is founded on certain truths, at once demonstrable and weighty. First among them is the old idea of human perfectibility—"man's chief end is infinite progression." "The second is like unto it"—every original mind contributes to this chief end; and authority, always hostile to originality, is, therefore, no other than the Great Spiritual Enemy. With what zeal the Spiritualists have fought the battle of woman's freedom is, I suppose, generally known; but I may refer for examples to the often reprinted speech of Julia Branch, at the very beginning of the Spiritualistic movement in America; to the martyr Heywood's *Word*; to Moses Harman *et al.*, in *Lucifer*. Yet the Spiritualists are by no means entitled to a monopoly of credit. Socialists like Robert Owen, Individualists like John Stuart Mill, free thinkers like Frances Wright d' Arusmont, Godwin, Shelley, Byron, already referred to, did their full share in the good work. Within the circle of strictly American Anarchism, something may be claimed for Ruedebusch's "Old and New Ideal," and for my own first publication "The Law of Marriage" (1870). And in the works of Walt Whitman, which may be said to crown the series of indigenous American Anarchistic writings, the same ideas are very prominent.

\* *Et al.* because the names of individuals who have shared the brunt and ought to share the glory are innumerable. I must confine my gazette to those whom I know have contributed something definite to theory. Else it would be by no means proper to omit Mrs. Woodhull, Mrs. Waisbrooker, or Mrs. Slenker. But however great their merit as agitators, I am not even sure that one of them ever professed to be an Anarchist.

The name of Whitman takes us back to that transcendental school which he represented in considerable measure. We have already had occasion to observe how the principles of Hegel, dissolving the logical and ethical foundations of those traditions upon which authority bases its claims, gave rise, notwithstanding Hegel's own pronounced social and political orthodoxy, to a most radically Anarchistic movement in philosophy, literature, morals, and politics—the Hegelian Left. The American representatives of this movement are doubtless of little importance to the development of Anarchistic theory; but, to give America all her due, they are important in popularizing it; for, except Carlyle,\* whose purely literary turn and his love of paradox, prevented his ranking among any but Anarchists as a promoter of Anarchism, they are the only authors who have written readably from the standpoint of the Hegelian Left; Thoreau's letters and biography, Emerson's "Essays," poems, and "Representative men"; and recently Whitman's "Leaves of Grass," have doubtless done more to promote a general Anarchistic tendency among the reading class than any other literature in the world.

C. L. JAMES.

(To be continued.)

\* The mention of Emerson and his Scotch friend raises an old question which it now requires some boldness to acknowledge as existing.

"There are persons, mole-blind to the soul's make and style,  
Who imagine a likeness 'twixt him and Carlyle."

Still deeper would be the damnation of whoever presumed to inquire now whether Emerson were a plagiarist. Yet there is no question that his line of thought was mainly suggested by Carlyle. The effect was rather one of reaction than adoption. Carlyle never meant all he said. Emerson meant every word he said. Carlyle always considered the effect his words would have. Emerson asked nothing of his words but that they should express his thoughts. Carlyle found a forgotten source of inspiration in heroes. Emerson found a similar source of inspiration in human individuals generally. Carlyle held up "the hero as God"; Emerson could not allow that the hero ever did more than "represent" divinity from some special point of view. Carlyle was a born disputant. Disputing was not in Emerson's nature. Carlyle idealized war. Emerson, except for a short time, when intoxicated with the national debauch of Union-saving, had no ideal lower than "sweetness and light." Carlyle's temperament was, he always took pains to inform us, gloomy; Emerson's was as serene as the empyrean. It is impossible to acquit Carlyle of sensationalizing his earthquake and eclipse. The one thing which Emerson thought worthy of working hard at was a style which should make every sentence a faultlessly lucid gem. The effect of their life-long friendship, as shown in their correspondence, is to present Emerson just what Carlyle wanted—a Puritanically exacting conscience. If the result were a certain estrangement, it is not surprising.

— o —

The State is always a conservative power that authorizes, regulates, and organizes the conquests of progress (and history testifies that it applies them to the profit of its own and the other privileged classes), but never does inaugurate them. New ideas always originate from beneath, are conceived in the foundations of society, and then, when divulged, they become opinion and grow. But they must always meet on their path, and combat the constituted powers of tradition, custom, privilege and error.—*Sismondi*.

## 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. Metzkw, 174 Ralph St.  
CHICAGO—T. Appel, 1228 Milwaukee Av.  
CLEVELAND—E. Schilling, 55 Yeakey St.  
LONDON, Eng.—T. Cantwell, 127 Ossulton St., N. W.  
NEW YORK—A. Lopatiner, 135 Monroe  
PHILADELPHIA—Natasha Notkin, 242 N. Second St.

## RECEIPTS.

Kuehn, Andrews, Orcutt, Casa, Peyer, Juchel, Caldbeck, Livshetz, Newman, each \$1.

## 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 its 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
The Evolution of the Family. By Jonathan Mayo Crane.....	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 Anarchism.....Jay Fox	03
Crime and Criminals.....C. Darrow	10
Realism in Literature and Art.....	05
Crime and Punishment. Voltairine de Cleyre.....	10
Sine Qua Non, or The Core of Religion. Dr. Geo. Pyburn.....	10
Hilda's Home. Cloth \$1.....	50
.....Rosa Graul	
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 Basis 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 Evolution.....	2.00
Organized Vengeance.....	03
Paris Commune.....	05
The State: Its Historic Role.....	10
The Wage System. Revolutionary Government.....	05
Socialism and Politics.....	05
Resist Not Evil. Cloth. Clarence S. Darrow.....	75
Social Democracy in Germany.....	02
.....Gustave Landauer	
History of the Commune. Cloth.....	75
.....Lissagaray	
Conduct and Profession.....Darrow	10
Wind-Harp Songs.....J. Wm. Lloyd	1.00
The Economics of Anarchy.....	25
.....Dyer D. Lum	
Anarchy. (Is It All a Dream? Jas. F. Morton, Jr.).....Malatesta	10
A Talk about Anarchist Communism between two Workers.....	05
A Chambermaid's Diary.....	50
.....Octave Mirbeau	
God and Government: The Siamese Twins of Superstition.....W. Nevill	05
The Deistic Pestilence.....John Most	05
The Pyramid of Tyranny.....	05
.....F. Domela Nieuwehuis	
Mating or Marrying, Which?.....	05
.....W. H. Van Ornum	
Evolution and Revolution.....Reclus	05
Tolstoy.....Clarence S. Darrow	10
Pure Economy.....J. H. Rowell	10
Pages of Socialist History.....	30
.....W. Tcherkesoff	
The Slavery of Our Times. Cloth.....	75
.....Leo Tolstoy	
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.....	10
.....Oscar Wilde	
Life Without a Master. 336 pp. Cloth \$1.50.....J. Wilson	1.00

## 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-toxins. 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.

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.

The New Dispensation. Cloth. " 1.50	
The Coming Woman.....Lillie White	05
Anarchism and Outrage.....	03
Anarchy on Trial.....	05
The Chicago Martyrs: The Famous Speeches of the Eight Anarchists in Judge Gary's Court; and Afteld's Reasons for Pardonning Fielden, Neebe, and Schwab.....	25
The Social Revolution. By Karl Kautsky. (An excellent work to disillusion deluded Social Democrats, who still imagine that Socialists contemplate a Revolution.) 180 pages.....	50

## 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 Majority.—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.