



A PERIODICAL OF ANARCHIST THOUGHT, WORK AND LITERATURE.

VOL. X. NO. 32.

CHICAGO, SUNDAY, AUGUST 9, 1903.

WHOLE NO. 426.

On The Rubaiyat.

Old Omar spake untrue. The Rose of long
Ago in Naishapur he loved when young
Is fresh today, and shall forever bloom,
Fed on the scented Dew of his dear Song.

Old Omar speaks untrue. "I've sold," he says,
"My Reputation for a Song." But Praise
He buys with that same song, and Love and Wine,
And life and Youth thru everlasting Days.

Old Omar spake untrue. The gracious Wine
Still fills his Glass, and beaded Rubies shine
About his Lips. And Love and Time for aye
Shall wreath his brimming Cup with Rose and Vine.

GEORGE BROWN.

— O —

The Truth About Authority.

Belief in the necessity of authority, the power of one man to superintend the actions of another, is so wide-spread, so universal, that of course it would remain undisturbed for a long time tho elaborate and complete evidence against its validity were presented. All wide-spread beliefs rest on superstition finally; the necessity of substantiating them having been lost sight of thru the mere absence of criticism; and even now the fanaticism of their adherents will give ear but slightly to objections, however strong.

One may show that the history of authority is a history of slavery; that its rules often have been written in the blood of those who defied it or only questioned it; one may point out the truth that authority has always sought to preserve the errors of the past; that its voice is the voice of the dead; that it represents not intelligence, but custom; and finally, one may show that all learning, all art, all science, all individual and social progress, has developed thru the struggle against authority, thru liberty; and yet, fanatical, unconvinced, the believers in conquest, in tyranny, utter their platitudes anew, and are eager even to fight for them, if need be.

So now, it is necessary, again and again to reiterate the arguments of freedom, that unwilling prejudice may be overcome by mere persistence of repetition, and finally give way to reason in spite of itself. By what means does authority come into being, then, and how does it act by virtue of its nature and opportunities?

One of the vital misconceptions of those who worship authority, and which must be dealt with at the beginning, is that of thinking that the thing came into being of necessity because men in tribes must defend their societies and possessions against encroachment on the part of men from other

tribes. Kropotkin and Herbert Spencer, among other savants and thinkers, have easily shown the falsity of this by inductions from the facts of primitive life. But, it may fairly be asked in this connection, is not the very act of aggression itself an act of authority; and is it not evident that authority began in aggressive acts on the part of one individual toward another, within or without the tribe, and developed thence?

Is it likely either, speaking of a second misconception, that man, wishing to be ruled, sought for some one to rule him? Is it probable that primitive man was of such a nature that he would rather be governed than himself to govern? All that we know of anthropology unites with all that reason could reply to this question, with an emphatic no! Authority undoubtedly arose thru coercion, thru aggression.

What was the occasion of authority's origin?

As wild and domestic animals fight at times among themselves for possession and even for mere pleasure of supremacy, so primitive man, unequally strong, in lack of intelligence, because of love of possession, of power, of ease, fought and conquered and ruled, or was himself conquered to be ruled by those stronger than himself. He fought and conquered or was himself subdued, not necessarily with arms or thru slaughter, but thru a show of force, thru popularity, thru having wealth, that buys other things, or thru ways and means aggressive in general. Given the appetite for power and ease, authority would develop as end and a means among primitive human beings. And once tasted, authority was not forgotten, but went on to greater and greater victories.

In the course of time elaborate systems of government arose out of primitive aggression, and the affairs of the individual came more and more within the pervue and jurisdiction of the State. The original strong man sought always after his first victories to make himself more and more secure, and unseating rival after rival within the tribe, and at last attacking the rulers of other tribes in the ambition to enlarge his power, he became a chief who sought by every means to strengthen his hold upon the people. His great means was to fix rules affecting conduct in general, and then rigorously to enforce them with appropriate penalties and punishments. The elaborate machinery of all kinds of government is this primitive ruler's monument.

Thus we have the general origin of au-

thority; ("government began in aggression," says Spencer). Now, let us consider the nature of the institution.

Its nature is one and indivisible, but its opportunities determine a scale of variation as extensive as all varieties of government can make it. Among men where authority had but begun to be felt, only a part of the individual's conduct was subject to force, but the tendency before accounted for (that of extension and comprehensiveness) made itself felt as fast as submission was secured, and more and more the individual's life passed under the sway of authority.

It is a long way from primitive rule to democracy, the milestones upon which are varied; among them being absolutism, feudalism, limited monarchy, and republican institutions; but in all these forms the substance is the same; aggression, coercion, with the ever widening pressure of extension. Laws, taxes, public institutions carried on by the State, privilege, standing armies, State-made money, State-regulated land-tenure, State-made marriage, morality and religion are some of the fruits and evidences.

The State has with all its might resisted the efforts of the citizen who believed that he could reform it; and has left no means untried to extend itself and its functions. Feudalism fell; monarchy succumbed; democracy took up its weapons. Every power subdued the people in every way which it could command.

Education was brought under the control of authority in the shape of the State in exchange for the franchise to vote, and so the votes are influenced if not controlled. Change institutions as struggling man would, the State, authority, ever remained one and unchanged, the strong embodiment of coercion, of aggression; fooling ignorance with its little good, and rewarding craft with place and privilege. It lives upon the exploitation, the submission of man alone.

"Political corruption," which, wide-spread as it is, only moves the unfortunate dupes of authority to efforts toward reform, is not corruption at all, but is merely the evidence of corruption, the evidence of the existence of a State. That which comes to its place thru mere might, thru either a ballot or bullet struggle, naturally is indiscriminate in its choice of means to keep itself there and profit by its place. Trickery, vote buying, official stealing, ship subsidies, tariffs, salary grabs, are found wherever they will be profitable to existing power

or that which hopes to be power. Coercion, aggression, authority, know no limits of action save that of public indignation generally and forcibly expressed. They arise out of evil (ignorant self-seeking) and parasitically they maintain themselves upon us.

Today the State Socialists are almost the only reformers left who think the State a good in itself, tho most men think it a necessity; a study of the origin and nature of the State would doubtless do them little good; but the average man of reform may some day see the light after it has flashed its morning on his eyes for the thousandth time.

Meanwhile, the most effective answer to those who hear and yet do not comprehend, those who would reform a thing which is itself an evil, those who persist in asking the question, "How can we live without authority or government?" the most effective answer is another more pertinent question, namely: How can we live with it.

W. F. BARNARD.

The Bugbear of Socialism.

VI

If we turn to the United States, we find a condition of things even worse than our own, altho some attempt has been made to secure united action by a number of the Socialist organizations. The two most important bodies in the States at present are the Socialist Democratic party and the Socialist Labor party. The latter is at once the best organized, the most militant, and the most virulently intolerant of all the Socialist parties. It stands aloof from the others, scornfully rejecting all offers of conciliation, hurling slander and vilification in every direction. Its autocratic leader, the anti-Semitic Spanish Jew, Daniel De Leon (whom Samuel Gompers has accused of being a stranded emissary of Bismarck) has, by his "rule or ruin" policy, and his fierce intolerance, done much to wreck his party and maintain discord between it and the others, leaving it in the position of Thersites, a nuisance to friends and foes alike.

While the two chief organizations in Britain, and those in other European countries are calling each other names, the Socialist Labor party laughingly stigmatizes them all as "fakirs"; tells them there are no Socialists anywhere save within the ranks of the "fighting S. L. P." This country, especially, is singled out for their contempt. The leaders have declared over and over again that there are no Socialists in England; that the leaders of the Social Democratic Federation and Independent Labor party do not understand Socialism. When Keir Hardie visited New York about two years ago, De Leon's paper, the *Daily People*, covered him with abuse. About the same time a series of articles appeared in its columns, purporting to be written from Glasgow and London, attacking indiscriminately the two chief Socialist bodies of Britain, but having special hits at the Social Democratic Federation. The organ of the latter party (*Justice*, of London) was so far misled by these spurious compositions as to enter into a wordy war with the Socialist Thersites. I have alluded to the articles in question as spurious for the reason that tho

dated from London and Glasgow, as the ostensible work of correspondents in these cities, they were actually written in the *Daily People* office, by members of the staff.

One reason for this trickery of De Leon's was that the working men who compose the rank and file of the Socialist Labor party, and whose subscriptions sustain the paper, might be gulled into believing they had the services of a staff of "foreign correspondents," just like an ordinary newspaper. Some of the articles were written in full consciousness of the manner in which they were to be published, others were obtained by a "fluke," and dated by the chief or his second in command.

These and other questionable tactics have resulted in almost destroying what was once a very powerful party. The Socialist Labor party met its Waterloo at the polls during the presidential election of 1900. Soon after, a debate was arranged between De Leon and Job Harriman, the leader of the Social Democrats in New York. The debate took place in New Haven, and in their tiltings the two Socialists knights errant (errant knights, indeed!) accused each other of receiving bribes from the big political parties. This is one of their favorite modes of slandering each other. Another is the practise of stigmatizing an opponent or rival as a tool of the capitalists; tho why the capitalists should go to the trouble and expense of subsidizing such sorry knaves is past any sane man's comprehension.

There has lately appeared in Edinburgh a small group of a character so similar to the New York Socialist Labor party, that it is probably a colony sent out from the latter organization by the Socialist Old Man of the Mountains, De Leon. This action was long contemplated by the American body, who, in their narrow egotism believed it the only possible means of establishing a Socialist movement in this country. The colony has started a small paper, and carries on the De Leonite policy of slander and misrepresentation. There is the same ape-like spite, the same pug-dog impudence, the same reckless mendacity. This body, if it gathers power will probably wreck the Social Democratic Federation. The other parties are in no danger from it, as it does not hold out the hand of friendship to any but the Social Democratic Federation.

The Edinburgh group, feeling the necessity of having an idol, in imitation of the larger bodies, has raised to the godhead George S. Yates, who is at present a candidate for "parliamentary honors" in Leith. This gentleman, whose valor is characterized by a total absence of that quality which Falstaff declared to be its better part, recently denounced his own party (the Social Democratic Federation) in an article published in the *Socialist*. According to him, certain of the members are thieves, liars, and "escaped parsons." The article in question is a superb imitation of the New York *People* style of composition.

The foregoing instances are cited as examples merely. A hundred more could be given, of trickery, dishonesty, and factional intolerance; but I question if it be worth while. In leaving this part of my subject, I might ask: Are the men employing such tactics fit to be trusted with the task of

emancipating the worker? Or likely to achieve the lofty purpose they profess to aim at? Are not the tactics and the aim utterly at variance? Are slander and lies the proper means of spreading the truth? Do honest men use dishonest means for getting their ends? A noble object cannot be attained by ignoble methods. The employment of unrighteous weapons argues an unrighteous cause, doomed to failure.

In the interests of truth it is necessary to expose these charlatans, who, while preaching to the working class of capitalist exploitation, are themselves exploiting the higher qualities of their dupes—their moral and intellectual qualities; their aspirations towards a nobler and completer life, without which they would stagnate—"sink back into the beast and be no more."

It is a saddening spectacle we are treated to, this picture of a myriad of aspiring toilers, in a quasi-organized condition, deluded by false prophets, counselled by confidence men, and led over a desert towards a mirage by paper mache messiahs!

VII

I have still to point out a gross inconsistency in the attitude of the revolutionary or scientific Socialist parties, such as the Social Democratic Federation of Britain and the Socialist Labor party of America. Repudiating the reform policy pursued by other political parties, they nevertheless advocate "palliatives," which are only reforms called by a new name. Again, while scoffing at the "step-by-step" policy of the milder schools, they expect to keep sending an ever increasing number of representatives to the various houses of legislature. One is inclined to ask, what will these representatives be doing during all the long generations which must elapse before they succeed in getting their "majority"?—granting for a moment the possibility of such a thing.

Should they, true to their repudiation of partial reforms, remain idle, they will simply constitute a body of drones—to use no harsher term. If, on the other hand, they agitate for the modification called palliatives (which can easily be shown to be nothing of the sort), then a Socialist party loses its revolutionary character and becomes, in spite of all assertions to the contrary, merely a new "reform" party. In Germany today we are furnished with an illustrative example of this fact; for the Social Democrats there have relinquished their revolutionary pretensions and become a mere opportunist body.

Thus, then, we arrive at a true comprehension of the mission of the Socialist in politics. It is to create a new party, which will run its course, as all parties do. In Europe, at least, this is the probable outcome of the movement. In the United States it has already happened more than once; the nineteenth century having witnessed in that part of the world the growth and decay of numerous organizations, large and small, of a Socialistic or quasi-Socialistic nature. We may expect, then, to have in this country, at some future epoch, a new political party, formed by the various Socialist organizations now existing. It will have its day and disappear, as the old Whig party did, as the Chartist party did, as the

Liberal party is doing. What good (if any) it will accomplish remains to be seen.

It is not contended here that all the leaders in the Socialist movement are insincere or dishonest, any more than it is admitted that all are paragons of disinterested virtue, as their disciples and followers would have us believe. There are no doubt many upright men and women working conscientiously for social amelioration in what they conceive to be the true path. But where there is so much smoke there must be a little fire. The accusations which certain of the leaders (not always the most morally or intellectually exalted among them) hurl at each other cannot be all baseless fabrications; but even if they are, the very circumstance of their use is an evidence of depravity, inconsistent with their lofty professions. And it is certainly true and capable of proof that the movement abounds in cheats and charlatans.

When the Socialist finds his theories criticized to their disparagement, when the littleness of his methods is pointed out, and the infallibility of his assumptions questioned, he retorts: "How, then, do you propose to revolutionize society?" To this the answer is: "Ask the fly which you find freezing to death on your window pane on a chilly morning, how it is going to bring on the winter, whose first cold breath is killing it."

Standing on the rocks at the sea shore, watching the on-rolling waves as they are hurled against the crags, one is deeply impressed with the force and fury of the ocean. Each breaker, as it surges towards us appears endowed with power sufficient to overthrow the natural ramparts on which we stand; yet, each shatters itself against these ramparts, is dissipated in foam and spray, and falls back upon those behind it, retarding their progress, and sometimes neutralizing their effects. We know, however, that every wave that strikes the craggy wall does a little towards modifying and altering its shape, and that the ultimate result will be to transform it completely.

Imagine for a moment, one of these waves endowed with individual intelligence, conscious of its impetuous progress towards the shore, and fancying that progress to be the result of its own volition; imagine it surging onward, revelling in its strength, and saying to itself: "I am going forward to batter down these old, decaying rocks, and flow over the land they guard." Inspired with this delusion, it goes sweeping on, feeling itself invincible, and in a brief space the shock of the collision has flung it back in fragments, while the old cliffs loom up, practically unharmed, altogether indifferent.

The picture finds its similitude in the social and political world, where wave after wave of innovation and revolution hurl themselves against the ramparts of established institutions, each believing itself destined to wreck and overflow these institutions, each destined to effect its modicum of change, and in doing so destroy itself.

This is the fate of Socialism in the world of politics.—*Alvan Marlaw.*

— o —

Counting noses decides no problems.

Vivisection and "Justice."

I see that the inventor of the "Movement in Favor of Ignorance" has chosen your columns, July 19, to pay his respects to my article in *Lucifer*. The only statement of importance made by him in his whole letter is where he attempts to define "justice." He says that "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." Nonsense! That is not JUSTICE—that is simply a definition invented by the people of the James, Rickaby, Mantegazza stamp to defend their peculiar dogmas. His definition reduced to lowest terms, simply means this,—that animals have no rights because man "claims" to be the only thing worth considering,—which is the very subject up for discussion! Mr. James in his jugglery of words has simply begged the whole question; first he defines "justice" to suit himself, and then proceeds to draw his conclusions! Justice in the broad (not legal and restricted) sense means what is due, suitable, fair, proper, right. Now, the question is, what is fair, proper and right in this question of man and animals? Over against Mr. James' bald begging of the question I place this statement, which I claim represents in the mind of any intelligent and unbiased person a self-evident fact,—that the small and weak, of whatever kind or species, are as much entitled to happiness as are the great and powerful; and that any conflict with this proposition springs from no right except the "right of might"—which is no right at all.

James' conception of "justice" depends for its existence upon his very ignorance! For if, perchance, a race of beings "superior" to man, and with like views regarding themselves, should be discovered, or should visit this earth, lo and behold, Mr. James' conception of justice either vanishes or becomes a driving absurdity. I fear that then we would see him pleading for a broader definition!

The fact is that people of Mr. James's habits of thoughts (and in writing this article I have not the slightest hope of convincing him, but only offer food for meditation to the readers of this journal) are actually incapable of entertaining certain broad ethical conceptions. They worship their little hand-made idol which they think embodies the spirit of the universe. They cannot see that the march of moral evolution has passed their point; while they imagine they are looking at the procession itself, they are simply gazing with admiration at the gaudy advertising wagons in the rear. Not so very long ago ecclesiastical conclaves met to discuss the question whether woman was really a human being; quite recently certain learned and conservative people haughtily denied that the Negro belonged to the human family; today the same class of people preach, as a creed, that sentient, sensitive, intelligent, loving beings,—but of different shape, color and covering from ours "have no rights which may conflict with the interests of man,"—which, of course means no rights at all.

Mr. James charges us with "putting the rights of men and brutes upon exactly the same basis." This is childish. We

have already brought many of the animals into a condition of dependence upon us. This is a fact, whether or not a deplorable one. We should therefore treat them much as a good parent treats his children, with love and kindly guidance, expecting a fair return of assistance and obedience. No one but a savage would assume that this dependence confers upon us a right to inflict torture upon them. Mercy, as defined by Mr. James, does not belong here, and in fact has no definite place in ethics. As he defines it, and as it means, outside of synonyms of "kindness" or "compassion," it signifies the yielding of the right to inflict suffering. Now, if it be right to inflict torture, to yield that right is no virtue; and therefore in James's eyes the most hardened vivisector is as high in the moral scale as the most humane.

I will make no comments on certain unimportant portions of Mr. James's letter, for instance, where he accuses me of "attacking science and religion" because on the one hand, I take no stock in his pet medical notions, and, on the other, because I refuse to believe that the controlling power of the universe has the characteristics of a fiend. His closing remark, however, as he charges the defenders of animals with "putting the rights of men and brutes upon exactly the same basis," calls for more than passing mention. Instead of giving us the credit of trying to elevate the animal to the plane of protection of "babies," Mr. James, with his usual logic, hints that we are bringing the babies down to the plane of the "brutes"! But this was an unfortunate slip for Mr. James. It was another of his famous boom-crangs. For what he charges the opponents of cruelty to animals with conniving at, is exactly what his friends, the vivisectors, have been engaged in for a long while,—bringing down the helpless bodies of the hospital poor to the level of the "brute," and experimenting upon—vivisection—men, women and children with scalpel, virus and inoculated disease! It is not only done—it is boasted of in the medical press, as any active opponent of vivisection has ample proof. But these assassins have logical grounds for their deeds—they are possessed of Mr. James's quality of "mercy," that "cares nothing about an individual," and, realizing that vivisection of animals is a barren method, they naturally turn to more fruitful fields. Such has always been the outcome of the cruel and degenerate practise of vivisection the lower animals, and such is its legitimate result.

J. M. GREENE,
Corres. Sec. N. E. Anti-
Vivisection Society.

Boston.

LETTER-BOX.

N. R., Philadelphia.—John Henry Mackay is alive. He was born February 6, 1864, in Greenock, Scotland, but grew up and was educated in Germany, where he lived from his second year. At present he lives in Switzerland. Any radical bookseller can supply you with his works. Inquire of them.

G. H. Shoaf, Editor of "The Union Leader," Chicago.—When a man announces that he is going to "modify his tone" for the sake of policy, he may be excusable on Falstaffian grounds; but, when such "policy" surrenders manhood to the extent of deliberately sacrificing truth, it is time he was called down. However, that a backslider should end by making himself a scavenger of capitalistic newspaper slander about Anarchists is not at all surprising. You are welcome to all the pleasure you can get from your avocation.

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, AUGUST 9, 1903.

426

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

Notes.

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.

A. Isaak is now in the east visiting various cities and meeting the comrades. All who wish to communicate with or meet him may write to him care of Jay Fox, 57 East 99th St., New York City. He will be glad to see all friends personally. The delinquent subscribers are urged to pay him their arrears.

— o —

Important for Chicago Only.

As the picnic of the Chicago *Arbeiter Zeitung* on May 31, was greatly hindered by rain and cold weather, many friends have urged the management to arrange another picnic this year. They have accordingly engaged Ogden's Grove, which has been newly refitted, for August 16. Prizes for children will be given, and all are invited to bring them along. Singing societies are especially invited.

Members of trade unions, turner and singing societies admitted free. Subscribers will receive complimentary tickets.

Admission at the gate 25 cents.

The grove is at Clybourn Ave. and Wilcox St. Take North Ave. or Clybourn Ave. cars. Transfer from all north and west side cars.

A good time is assured all around—let everybody wishing to enjoy life be present.

— o —

Outpost Echoes.

Liberty forges no fetters.

Wisdom springs from experiment.

Fear of privation makes all property.

Anarchism changes patriots into fellow men.

He who can hope can enjoy working for freedom.

FREE SOCIETY

Work is a privilege; only misery makes it a burden.

Even the house of God trembles at the voice of independence.

Taxes are paid that officials may remove the evils which they create.

The lowest slaves are those who are satisfied when their chains are gilded.

Theodore is sorry that so many of his friends were found to be thieves; whitewash costs money.

A man who is "a credit to the State" is a discredit to the people. The State represents submission and servitude.

"Dreams" are preferable to reality when the reality is of such a nature that it wets every eye with tears and chains every hand.

Cleveland is in training for a nomination; the dirty, disgraceful fight for privilege will follow later, to the tune of "My Country, 'Tis of Thee!"

Those who are tired of waiting for liberty to come to the people might spend their time to better advantage in putting a shoulder to the wheel of change.

Anarchy is order. Government, and law, are types of disorder to which we have become so accustomed that their real nature is totally obscured. Then they have their pretensions too.

When God's beetles, the black-coated clergy, begin to refuse to eat Rockefeller's money; when they begin to say it has blood upon it, Rockefeller had better dissolve his partnership with God.

Liberty asks no definitions, for no measures, for no distinctions. But, confident that all these things would prove superfluous in practise, she boldly announces her chain-breaking campaign, and laughs at the fools that fear her.

The convicts who escaped from the California penitentiary were no worse than thousands who escape that institution while equally guilty; yet they were persecuted as dangerous and "desperate criminals." Who knows why?

A Missouri man who several times secured a verdict against a railway corporation for damages to his person, has been deprived of his award by the Supreme Court of his State, which also had previously refused to set aside the first verdict. And this is "the majesty of the law!"

The president of the United States has violated the Constitution twice recently by receiving presents from crowned heads in his official capacity. Article one, section nine, paragraph eight, provides that no official, without consent of Congress, may ac-

cept any gift from a foreign power. The president is superior to the Constitution, of course.

Free love may be an evil, as many of our truly good teachers would have us believe; but if it is an evil, then slave love, then purchased love, then prostituted love must be the opposite of evil; namely, good. But does love become an evil when it is wholly voluntary? Let the moralists tell us.

Within the last few days, two Chicago judges in passing upon one case of picketing by trades unions, arrived at exactly opposite conclusions respecting the equity and legality of picketing. When the law is held up to ridicule by its own stern representatives in this manner, Anarchists may make the most of it.

A man who is great solely by reason of the fact that he is a great ruler is not great in the true sense of greatness. The great man among men is the one who is wise, strong, and free, himself, and who by example, in his daily life, inspires others to be wise, strong, and free. The greatness of rulers is only the inferiority of their subjects turned upside down.

On the testimony of a mere child, a man was convicted of murder in Chicago last week, and even after the child, who was the son of the accused, had stated in court that his father was innocent, and that all of his previous testimony had been false. The thirst for justice (revenge) is one of the things upon the satisfaction of which the State waxes sleek and fat; and when there is any doubt as to the innocence of accused persons, they, if poor, are hardly allowed to escape.

The *Outlook*, a religious weekly, in defending the late wars in the Transvaal and the Philippines, compares those who make wars with those who pull down old buildings to erect new ones on their sites. Wars do pull down the old and make place for the new, but those who know that the new things of conquerors are in the nature of speculation, standing armies, taxes, markets for their shoddy goods, and the general conditions of subjection, regard the *Outlook's* comparison as an unfortunate one.

As long as sexual love continues to hold the place which it holds today, and is regarded as the most important thing in life, the crown and supreme consecration of existence; as long as it is not put in its place along with other simple and varied needs of life, neither above nor below the rest, nor men nor women will be noble. Sexual freedom, in removing the illusion of love's supremacy over life, will provide means and opportunity for the other powers and capacities, for the rest of our faculties and functions to take their rightful places. Then we may become men and women.

Benj. R. Tucker fully admits that he has been "rejoicing over the election of a libertarian to an Illinois judgeship," for which offense I recently took him to task, noting

that such rejoicing is inconsistent with the proper attitude of an Anarchist toward voting, and inconsistent with the attitude taken by Tucker in a controversy with Victor Yarrows some years ago. Now, however, the editor of *Liberty* retorts with an observation in the nature of a comparison; alleging that the rival candidates for the judgeship were like men hunting each other with guns; and he asks if it would be inconsistent for him to rejoice were the one to fall in the duel less a friend of liberty than the one who escaped unscathed. Is the comparison logical? I trow not! The rival candidates for the judgeship were not men trying to destroy each other; they were like rival robbers on opposite sides of a safe, each trying to penetrate its walls and appropriate the contents. They struggled over a *special privilege* and one of them got the booty. It is inconsistent in an Anarchist to rejoice over the success of one whose object is *special privilege*, even tho that one does profess belief in liberty. Benj. R. Tucker should look to his "plumb line"; the plummet seems to have fallen off.

— o —
AMERICUS.

— o —
Judge Not.

Why should we condemn a man because he is more wicked than we are, or because we imagine he is so? He is wicked in one direction while we are wicked in another. The lowest criminal has not a single quality or characteristic that we do not also possess. If he steals, is it not a fact that we have similar propensities, tho perhaps under better control? We curb our passions while criminals do not, or perhaps cannot. It is absence of temptation, in many cases, that make some better than others. No man knows what he might do if he were driven by want. Circumstances change, as well as develop, character, and they bring to the surface conditions that otherwise would never appear. No man can say truthfully that he is better than other men. No man knows what he might do until he has been sorely tempted.

There are no real sins, no real crimes. There are only things that some people regard as crimes. If these things were not declared to be wicked or criminal, no one would think of calling such acts by such names. Nothing is positively good or positively bad. What is bad at one time is good at another. It is usually considered bad to kill a man, but if he has done us great injury or given us great offense, or if he has violated our laws, that makes a difference in our view of the matter; and if we happen to kill the delinquent in such a case, it will be regarded as "justifiable homicide." What we mean by doing right, is doing what is considered right by the community in which we live. There is no other standard. Our main effort should be to keep out of other people's way—and especially out of the way of those who are inimical to us. The lower animals have learned as much as that.

Let there be no punishments, no pains, no tortures, no sorrows of which we are the occasion. We should at least hold ourselves

guiltless, no matter what others may decide to do.

It is wrong for us to assume or declare that this or that is necessary. It is only a matter of opinion at best. How shall we ever know whether anything is or is not necessary? Who shall decide that question? Sometimes we use the word necessary as a synonym for expedient. We say it is necessary to have government, or religion, or law, or education. Again, it may be said, this is merely a matter of opinion on which men differ. We never know that anything is necessary, for it belongs to the future, and of that we know nothing. We say government is necessary for the protection of the people. But does the law protect the people in all cases? Does it do so in any case? We say punishments are necessary, in order that society may be protected. But that is only an excuse, a mere pretense. We do not know that such things are necessary. Many get along very well without punishments. Nothing is necessary, nothing is unavoidable. How shall we ever know whether things are necessary or not? We say this or that is necessary for self-defense, but that is merely an excuse, a pure fiction, a pious fraud. Taxes are said to be necessary, but only because we imagine so. There is not the slightest evidence that they are either necessary or unavoidable.

One of the most serious mistakes that people make, is to suppose that all the bad men are in prison or in jail; or that the men who are in prison or in jail are appreciably worse than those who are on the outside.

J. WILSON.

— o —
Here and There.

Comrade Ross Winn, publisher of *Winn's Firebrand*, Silver Springs, Tenn., writes: "As I rubbed up 'agin' one of Brother Madden's made-to-order rulings, *The Firebrand* is going now at one cent a copy, instead of the pound rate. I really don't care, as the postoffice rulings are such a suspended sword that I would rather pay the increased rate and be free."

The postoffice authorities are still persecuting Helen Wilmans, editor of *Freedom*. In spite of the fact that the charges made against her collapsed in court, the postal department issued another sweeping fraud order, which debars everybody connected with the paper from receiving mail. C. C. Post, being at Essex, N. C., and not at Seabreeze, can receive mail, but cannot have a letter delivered to his wife at Seabreeze.

Heretofore all exchanges were regarded by the postal department as legitimate subscribers; now Madden objects that the *Demonstrator* has too many exchanges on its list, without specifying, however, what he considers a reasonable number. It will also be remembered that in the case of the *Commoner* he objected to free copies, except within a "reasonable" number. When pressed to give a percentage or number, he refused to do so. As an evader Madden is a champion. No one knows what this official acrobat will do next.

On May 31 and June 1 the third confer-

ence of the German Federation of Revolutionary Workers took place in Mannheim. It was decided in future to call the organization the Anarchistic Federation of Germany. A declaration of principles and constitution is to be worked out by a committee this year, to be published for discussion not later than January 1, 1904.

Madrid, August 3.—The threatened general strike began today in several centers, including Barcelona, Murcia, Cadiz, Bonda, and Alcoy. The immediate motive for the strike is to re-enforce the demand for the release of numerous workmen who have been thrown into prison for offenses in connection with recent strikes.

Leaders of the movement are exhorting the members of the trades unions not to return to work until the imprisoned men have been released. The government has taken stringent measures to cope with disturbances. The military forces and the civil guards have been re-enforced wherever necessary and the troops have been confined to the barracks. The instigators of the strike are threatened with severe penalties.

At Alcala, province of Cadiz, the residence of the mayor and a number of private houses have been attacked by strikers, who exchanged shots with the gendarmes.

— o —
Literature.

The first brochure of John Most's "Memoiren" (German) is an interesting one, and gives promise that the whole series of ten little pamphlets will be of great value. He tells briefly and entertainingly of his childhood and youth, and his first skirmishes with the police. The beginning of his connection with the Austrian labor movement is narrated. It also contains some of Most's poems. Let all who read German give themselves this treat by sending 25 cents to the author, 3465 Third Ave., New York, N. Y.

We are in receipt of several copies of *The Agitator*. It is in small pamphlet form, and is intended for primary Socialist agitation. Each issue contains a leading article to enlighten beginners on Socialism. The illustrations are well adapted to catch attention. It is gotten up by The Comrade Publishing Company, 11 Cooper Sq., New York, N. Y.

The Pocket Library of Socialism is a series of small pamphlets for Socialist propaganda. No. 38, "Easy Lessons in Socialism," by William H. Leffingwell, is intended for "starters," the man in the street, and contains elementaries of Socialism. Published by Chas. H. Kerr & Co., Chicago, Ill.

A new German Anarchist periodical, *Der Weckruf*, has made its appearance in Switzerland. It is a fortnightly paper, published at three francs a year by M. Rouge, rue de Coutance, 28, Geneva. No. 2, which has reached us, is an excellent one, and shows an auspicious beginning.

— o —
For San Francisco.

The Anarchist propaganda is now carried on every Sunday at 7:30 p. m. at Knights of Red Branch Hall, 1133 Mission St. Discussion and free platform.

SOCIAL SCIENCE CLUB.

A Vindication of Anarchism.

X (continued.)

These last observations are unquestionably weighty—they are the truth contained in casuistry which enables the errors of this pseudo science to pass. But from this strong point of casuistry we proceed immediately to the weak one. By what test are we to decide whether a particular case calls for specific obedience to a rule or constitutes an exception throwing us back on the reasoning whence the rule was deduced? We must, of course, begin by knowing what the reason for the rule is. The casuist claims to know. The reason is the greatest good of the greatest number: and the test for an exception is that keeping the rule would not be for the greatest good. The facility with which this reasoning lends itself to any desired conclusion, quite in harmony with what has been said here about the general versatility of practical reasoning from metaphysical first principles, is illustrated in the Jesuitical writings on this subject, among which Father Lemoine's "Devotion Made Easy" is probably the most instructive. It is also exposed with matchless irony in Pascal's "Provincial Letters," which supply from the Jesuitical writings answers to problems of conscience as convenient as the most ingenious combination of irregular desires with timid scrupulosity could wish. And a brief summary of the whole matter may be found in the Encyclopedia Britannica, article "Casuistry." Of course, the authority of the Church is decisive. But her unanimous authority is seldom attainable. The judgment of a majority among moralists; of one's own confessor, or even of anyone revered for orthodoxy, may, according to sundry casuists, be acted upon as probably right. Certain comprehensive propositions are also demonstrated for the self-guidance of individuals. Thus taking the possessions of another is justifiable for an end more important than that of property, such as to escape death ("extreme necessity") or disgrace ("quasi-extreme necessity"). Restitution ought ordinarily to be made, if possible; but the act being justifiable in itself, restitution is unnecessary if it were not meditated as likely at the time. The sanctity of honor enters largely into excuses for acts otherwise censurable: thus the casuist Sadler lays it down that a person may be killed whose life would dishonor the slayer. A familiar example is where a man who has been struck avenges it; another, illustrated in actual cases, is that of killing one who threatens a revelation fatal to honor. The morality of deceiving makes a great figure in these discussions. Clearly it is not for the greatest good of the greatest number to give information which would assist the execution of a wicked design. Yet the casuists shrink from saying it is justifiable to lie, or, what they admit amounts to the same thing, tell a merely verbal truth whose real meaning could not be suspected. But they console the troubled conscience by this reflection that it is almost always practicable to deceive the person whose better information would be against the general good by a discoverable equivocation or mental reservation; i. e. one whose meaning he might penetrate if he were shrewd enough, but probably will not. The grounds

on which chastity may be disregarded are ingenious and amusing; but I respect the prudishness of my own generation, and will mention only one. The seducer is bound to make his victim the reparation of marriage unless her station be too much below his own; in which case the interests of society are paramount. It will probably be conceded that this does not look much like Anarchism, and it does look a good deal as if one might deduce from the maxims of Utility whatever he found convenient; especially if it chances to hitch with prevailing custom. But tho Hedonism does not especially tend to Anarchism or to any other practical doctrine, it does, as I intimated was the general case of metaphysical theories, to run into a circle thru others back to itself. A common landing place is Pessimism. See Windelbrand on the "Cyreniads" and "Hegesias" in "History of Philosophy." The Cyrenian school at Alexandria was closed by the Ptolemies on the ground that it encouraged suicide; tho I am much inclined to think with Hallam that a defense of suicide will make no man kill himself except perhaps from fear it should be continued! The Pessimism of Buddha sets out with the assumption that pleasure is the end of action; and is instantly refuted by denying this. See the article "Pessimism" in the Encyclopedia Britannica.

That altruism tends any more to Anarchism than does hedonism or egoism appears to me quite a mistake. But it is less easy to prove a mistake, because, while hedonism is an easily stated and comprehended doctrine, altruism is a very vague term. Anyone who denies that pleasure is the chief good may, I suppose pass for an altruist, and an induction which should take in all moralists who have done that would be far too large for the probable value of the result. Comte, however, was a typical altruist. He recommended the greatest good of the greatest number as the object of life, without, like the utilitarians giving any such reason for following this end as that it is the way to be happy. His pragmatic maxim "Live for others," thus cuts a knot which Bentham and Dumont never succeeded in untying to anyone's satisfaction except their own. But he no more made it clear than they why a person who lives for others should, (outside following the plainest dictates of common sense, which all systems allow equally,) do any one thing rather than its opposite. This is the weak point of his system. See the article "Comte" in Encyclopedia Britannica. Certainly he was no Anarchist. And if we consider the actual lives of persons who have professed to live for others with some appearance of sincerity, we shall find among them every possible variety of idea as to how the good of others should be promoted. The philanthropist Howard; the model gentleman Chesterfield; the philosopher Confucius; the blundering reformer Joseph II; the conqueror, tyrant, and legislator, Bonaparte; all gave some evidence of having the good of mankind, as they understood it, very much at heart; they were as unlike each other in personal character and public views of utility as possible; but not one among them was an Anarchist or showed any disposition towards Anarchism.

Materialism is asserted by some friends and some enemies of Anarchism to be very closely bound up with it. I cannot in this case refute the argument dialectically, for I have to acknowledge that I do not understand it. If an altruist thinks Anarchy for the good of mankind, he must be an Anarchist. So must a hedonist, if he thinks it for his own good. But what believing in a future state has to do with Anarchism, one way or the other, I must confess myself utterly unable to see. My own main reason for not believing Materialism tends towards Anarchism is that, on a large view of the subject, I see quite as little tendency towards Anarchism among Materialists as among those who were not Materialists. Among decided precursors or promoters of Anarchism, Burke was a sound churchman; Godwin a deist; Proudhon a Catholic; Emerson, Thoreau, and Whitman, transcendentalists; Garrison, as he always took pains to state, a Christian; Tolstoy a Christian indeed—in whom there is no guile; Heywood a Spiritualist. Shelley, Byron, Paine, Jefferson, Condorcet, Marx, Bakunin, Voltaire, and Rousseau, were indeed known as decided opponents of religious dogma. But excepting perhaps Condorcet and Marx, there were no materialists among them.* On the other hand Hobbes, Bolingbroke, La Mettrie, Hume, Gibbon, Billaud Varennes, were Materialists, or Positivists not easily distinguishable from Materialists. Hobbes advocated despotism. (See his "Leviathan.") Varennes was the most tyrannical member of the Great Committee. Hume's once universally prized "History of England" is an elaborate apology for the king's party. La Mettrie was a courtier, Bolingbroke a Jacobite, Gibbon a Tory. See also, Lecky's "History of Rationalism" on the very general political conservatism of sceptics between the Reformation and the French Revolution. If more modern examples be wanted, there is certainly not much Anarchism in the *Blue Grass Blade* or the *Freethought Magazine*.

It is far however from my intention to make out that belief in a spiritual sphere tends any more towards Anarchism than unbelief. There is a great deal of Anarchism in the Hegelian Left, which has sublimated Hegel's idealism into Nihilism. But Hegel himself was as far from an Anarchist as possible. See the article under his name in the Encyclopedia Britannica, and the summary of his social theories in Schweigger's "History of Philosophy." There is a strong Anarchistic tendency in modern Spiritualism, which can be traced as far back as Andrew Jackson Davis' "Penetralia." But it illustrates this general truth that a metaphysical system, being a gigantic effort of the human imagination, worthy of all respect as poetry if it only would not set up for science, comes after instead of preceding a body of physical knowledge which it seeks to systematize.† E. B. Tyler's "Primitive Culture" will show

* Voltaire, it is well known, professed to believe in God, and pronounced La Mettrie's materialism nonsense. Rousseau's most sceptical work is the deistical confession of the Savoyard Vicar. His equally famous eulogy on the Bible and Jesus is quite enough to show that settled disbelief in Christianity was not the habit of his mind.

† This is also the order of precedence as between the different sciences and those metaphysics sometimes

the reader that all-institutions having a religious or quasi-religious character, that is all institutions, rest on Spiritualistic first principles. Tolstoy deduces Anarchism from the teachings of Jesus. But seeing he is probably the first Christian who found it there, I must suspect that the part I have allowed Christianity in introducing modern civilization, and therefore Anarchism, was considerably slighter and less direct than he supposes.

In fact if it be true that the propositions of Anarchism follow from application of the inductive method to their subject matter, then they can have no special affinity with any metaphysical system. For the inductive method condemns all such systems alike upon certain common grounds.

It condemns them indiscriminately, first, upon the ground that they are not inductive. The modesty of science, which always seeks to learn, waits for more light, accepts correction, doubts whatever cannot be immediately verified, has, like all genuine modesty, another face of wholesome pride, rejecting with no small scorn every speculation which assumes that the author has dived into his inner consciousness and found there the secret of all this complex universe. The spirit of induction instantly recognizes in such pretensions the ear-mark of the quack. The man accustomed to follow this slow and certain method makes short work with current views of God, morality, society. The mark of the Beast, the stigma of dogmatic assumption, is upon them all. But he has not thrown these venerable images out of the window and into the dust hole, that their niches may be occupied by another lot of "stone dolls," which Bentham, and La Mettrie, and Fichte, and Comte, and Nietzsche, constructed, evidently upon the same principles. "Truth alone doth judge itself" and induction is truth. To the humblest estimate of actual knowledge, it unites in the minds of those who accept its restraints, the most absolute assurance that it is the only way knowledge can be attained.

But again, the inductive method condemns transcendental generalizations indiscriminately, on the ground that they are mutually destructive. A legend asserts that when the patriarch Abram was left alone with the idols his father Terah made, he seized the opportunity to take a stick and break them. Being brought before Nimrod, the king, for this sacrilege, Abram gravely said: "They did it themselves. They got to fighting with each other about which should be God; and as they were all demolished in the battle I suppose none of them is." The philosophy of Abram has descended to every true iconoclast, his spiritual son. "Suppose," he reflects, "I were to fill up the places of Calvin, and Moses, and the dear called their bases. In geometry, for example, it was first empirically ascertained that the square of the hypotenuse is equal to the squares on the other sides. When Pythagoras translated the practical demonstration into words, it became necessary, or at least it was thought convenient, to give the words metaphysical definitions—a line is length without breadth, a point is that which has position but no magnitude, etc. The proofs of Sextus Empiricus and other Sceptics that these definitions are contradictory has nothing to do with the physical demonstration that actual figures approach the properties proved for them by geometers as they approximate the ideals implied in the definitions.

old Roman lady who reminds me of that unquotable title which Ford gave his best drama, with the effigies of Hume and Kant, Berkeley and La Mettrie, Comte and Bentham, etc., etc., I fear they would not keep the peace any better than their predecessors. Theories of the universe cancel one another, the moment we put them side by side, because, as Dr. Watts said about dogs' fighting, " 'tis their nature to." And when they have all killed each other, I see the same objection as Abram saw to receiving any of them for the living God. The best I can do with them is to play Cadmus, and set them killing each other again, like sons of the dragon's teeth, as they are; whenever I feel as if looking at a battle would amuse me

Suave etiam belli certamina magna tueri
Per campos instructa, tua sine parti periculi.

This ground for common rejection of all such systems, found in the old book "De Tribus Impostoribus," is very well stated and applied to religious ones by Lord Amberly, "Analysis of Religious Belief," and to metaphysical by Mr. Lewes, "Biographical History of Philosophy." In Macaulay's review of James Mill's "Essay on Government," he also points out that the Utilitarian philosophy is among those which revert to the pre-Baconian method of syllogistic deduction from assumed first principles. This brings the rest of what we have been considering under the same double condemnation. If Utilitarianism be not inductive, no more is Altruism. If these hostile creeds encounter with the old weapons they must attain the old result.

But thirdly, the inductive method, we have seen, condemns all such speculations as these on the ground that granting one of them to be true (which it might be, tho it has renounced the only hope of proving itself so) still it is useless—it leads to nothing. From any theory of the universe any practical conclusion whatever, may, on account of all such theories' antinomical character, be deduced with equal ease; and, since the theory equally proves everything, it proves nothing—to have the pleasure of quoting myself, Everything in General is Nothing in Particular. Like most other things we have stated, this is an induction sufficiently old in respect to all its aspects except an application which only the obstructiveness of superstition can have kept from being made long since. It goes back to an early period of Greek philosophy. The Sophists were, indeed, as Grote has pointed out, no such sect of doubters as some historians, mostly German, have represented them. They were collectively nothing else than teachers of the higher branches. But the art most in favor at Athens, the principal scene of their activity, was disputation; and, as teachers of that, they did maintain with great success until Socrates showed the practical arts to imply a true tho neglected theory of practical methods, that "man is the measure of things," in other words that anything could be proved with equal ease from any premises. See the article "Sophists," in Schwegler's "History of Philosophy," III, 7. At a later period, when the inductive side of Socrates' philosophy was forgotten in the war of disciples who conceived of him from one limited standpoint or another, the Sceptics revived

the methods of Zeno (the Eleatic) and Protagoras, disposing of all theories alike by showing that contradictory conclusions followed from all of them.* For the application, see Macaulay's review of Mill. Mill deduced democracy from the principles of hedonism, and from them proved all other forms of government to be very bad. Macaulay showed that, starting with the same premises, and using logic just as plausible, it would be equally easy to prove despotism perfectly good. The fault then was not in the logic but the premises. They would prove any Q. E. D.; which is just as good as proving none.

In Herbert Spencer's "The Unknowable," (first part of his volume "First Principles,"), and in the various metaphysical or anti-metaphysical parts of his "Principles of Psychology," these annihilating objections to metaphysical methods are demonstrated; and as far as Materialism or Idealism set up for bases of any system, the objections are applied. But Herbert Spencer was himself inclined to metaphysical reasoning, and accordingly relapsed into it when there was nothing like his ontological Agnosticism to keep him safe, and a sad large part of his "Principles of Morality" is given to vindicating Hedonism, with as much gravity as if any use could be made of it after it were vindicated. Nor does he ever inquire why it is that men so persistently revert to syllogistic reasoning from assumed first principles, after such abundant demonstration of their futility. Bacon, tho as concise as Spencer is prolix, does better. Reference to his "Novum Organum," book I, or to the *Popular Science Monthly*, October, 1899, or to my own note 2, Sec. VII, will show that he reckoned this propensity among the Idols. It springs from the Volition to Persuade, but in a certain indirect manner, implying a previous Volition to Know. The *a priori* philosopher first seeks to escape from the slow drudgery of accumulating facts and testing theories. He climbs on the wings of Icarus, towards a satisfactory theory of the universe. So far he is worshipping an Idol of the Race,—that idol whose false oracle teaches that things needs must be as they seem to us. But when the sun begins to melt the wax, Icarus, as it were, spreads himself a parachute—his *a priori* assumption, tho it will not bring him nearer to heaven, will retard his descent to earth; and instead of tumbling head over heels, he soars majestically above the heads of an unthinking rabble, and is a good enough high priest for an Idol of the Theatre.

C. L. JAMES.

(To be continued.)

* They impugned not only metaphysical but physical conceptions, such as motion. But to this sort of sophistry Diogenes' reply was good. The idea of motion shall be as contradictory as you please; but I walk, therefore the Thing of which I have this contradictory idea exists. The fault of metaphysics, as we usually understand the term, is that unlike the metaphysical base (so-called), of a true science, their definitions correspond to no sensible objects, and thus are not the end but the beginning of this pseudo-science.

— o —

As long as our civilization is essentially one of property, of fences, of exclusion, it will be marked by delusions. Only that good profits, which serves all men.—Emerson.

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 Yeakel St.
LONDON, Eng.—T. Cantwell, 127 Ossulton St., N. W.
NEW YORK—A. Lopatiner, 135 Monroe
PHILADELPHIA—Nataasha Notkin, 242 N. Second St.

RECEIPTS.

Dolincy (deceased), thru the *Freie Arbeiter Stimme*, \$25. Social Science Club, \$7.20. Snellenberg, Brotman, Landaw, Wallace, Gartman, Moore, Slominsky, De Young, each \$1. Weislander, Dubin, Eidelson, Goldfin, Miller, Morgulis, Zimmerman, Prenowitz, Dalitsch, each 50c.

MODERN SCIENCE AND ANARCHISM.

By Peter Kropotkin.

(Translated from the Russian by David A. Modell.)

Considered by some Kropotkin's best work.

Well and tastefully printed on good paper in clear and large type. 94 pages.

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 |
| God and the State..... | Bakunin | 05 |
| The Same. London edition..... | | 10 |
| Whitman's Ideal Democracy and Other Writings..... | Helena Born | 1.00 |
| Prodigal Daughter; or, The Price of Virtue..... | Rachel Campbell | 25 |
| Love's Coming of Age..... | Edward Carpenter | 1.00 |
| Evolution of the Family..... | Jonathan Mayo Crane | 05 |
| Conduct and Profession..... | Clarence S. Darrow | 10 |
| Crime and Criminals..... | | 10 |
| Realism in Literature and Art..... | | 05 |
| Resist Not Evil. Cloth..... | | 75 |
| Tolstoy..... | | 10 |
| Crime and Punishment..... | | 10 |
| | Voltaire de Cleyre | 10 |
| The Worm Turns..... | | 10 |
| The Emancipation of Society from Government..... | Dallan Doyle | 05 |
| Roosevelt, Czolgosz, and Anarchism..... | Jay Fox | 03 |
| Hilda's Home. Cloth \$1..... | | 50 |
| | 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 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 |
| Social Democracy in Germany..... | Gustave Landauer | 02 |
| History of the Commune. Cloth..... | Lissagaray | 75 |
| | J. Wm. Lloyd | 1.00 |
| Wind-Harp Songs..... | | |
| The Economics of Anarchy..... | Dyer D. Lum | 25 |
| Anarchy. (Is It All a Dream?) | Jas. F. Morton, Jr. | 10 |
| A Talk about Anarchist Communism between two Workers..... | | 05 |
| A Chambermaid's Diary..... | Octave Mirbeau | 50 |
| | John Most | 05 |
| The Deistic Pestilence..... | John Most | 05 |
| God and Government: The Siamese Twins of Superstition..... | W. Nevill | 05 |
| The Pyramid of Tyranny..... | F. Domela Nieuwehuis | 05 |
| Mating or Marrying, Which?..... | W. H. Van Ornum | 05 |
| | Dr. Geo. Pyburn | 10 |
| Sine Qua Non, or The Core of Religion..... | J. H. Rowell | 10 |
| Evolution and Revolution..... | | 10 |
| Pure Economy..... | W. Tcherkesoff | 30 |
| Pages of Socialist History..... | Leo Tolstoy | 75 |
| The Slavery of Our Times. Cloth..... | | |
| | E. C. Walker | 15 |
| Our Worship of Primitive Social Guesses..... | | 10 |
| 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 |

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.

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.

MIGHT IS RIGHT; or, The Survival of the Fittest.

By RAGNER REDBEARD

Every student of social problems must read this book. It is a remarkable volume, perhaps the most remarkable ever printed since the days of Julian the Apostate. The author is a scientific Anti-Christ, who declares upon evolutionary and historic deductions that the entire social philosophy of Christendom for 2,000 years is a vast hoax—an Oriental imposition—and that the only supreme law of the world is now, exactly as it was in the days of the Caesars, viz., "They can take who have the power, and they may keep who can."

This book bears the name of having influenced Cecil Rhodes, Joseph Chamberlain and Theodore Roosevelt; and without doubt it is now stirring up the brain of many a coming hero of genius, power and revolt.

Price, 50 cents, mailed. Fifth edition. 168 pages. Address Adolph Mueller, 108 Clark St., Chicago, Ill.

| | |
|---|------|
| The New Dispensation. Cloth. | 1.50 |
| The Coming Woman...Lillie White | 05 |
| Anarchy on Trial..... | 05 |
| The Chicago Martyrs: The Famous Speeches of the Eight Anarchists in Judge Gary's Court; and Altgeld's Reasons for Pardoning Fielden, Neebe, and Schwab..... | 25 |

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 Magocracy.—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.