



A PERIODICAL OF ANARCHIST THOUGHT, WORK, AND LITERATURE.

VOL. X. NO. 5.

CHICAGO, SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1903.

WHOLE NO. 399.

"Fools Rush In."

One fool sailed westward till he found a world;
One found new worlds within the mind of man;
The cynics called Columbus charlatan
And burned Giordano Bruno! . . . Who unfurled
The heavens like a scroll, that man might know,
But foolish Galileo? . . . Who began
Our new free art and thought and social plan,
But that poor outcast crazy fool, Rousseau?
There is one toast the future ages drink
Standing!—To those who dare, rush in, and die!—
Those who defy all rights and break all rules,
Who fight impossible battles, and who think
True thoughts—of whom with one accord we cry,
"The fools, the fools, the fools!"—God bless the fools!
—Curtis Hidden Page, in *Harper's Magazine*.

Politics and Party Rule.

In a democracy like ours, where all questions of State management and State policy are settled ultimately by the ballot, government degenerates into a matter of mere party rule. Under such a condition of things, men are counted not in accordance with their moral or intellectual worth, but rather in proportion to their influence and the number of votes they happen to control. No one pretends that any questions which are even remotely connected with politics are settled exclusively upon their merits, or that men are either elected to office or favored in any way on the simple ground that they are deserving of honor or worthy of confidence. In elections, the issue is decided by a mere mechanical process of counting, and it becomes not a question of right or wrong, but merely a matter of enumeration. If the number happens to be 20, the result is one way; but if it happens to be 21, then the result is just the opposite. It is well known that the ballots, when they are counted, are not a measure of the judgment, experience, intelligence, or even of the integrity of those who have voted. It is very well understood that, at our most important elections, many people vote who are wanting in the best elements of manhood. They are often men who are not noted in the community in which they live either for sound judgment, large experience, or even for common honesty. As a rule electors vote in droves. They often vote under orders, often under a misconception of facts, often without any knowledge of the subjects under consideration, and still oftener without any serious convictions of their own or any concern about the result. They frequently vote for the pay they receive or the benefits they expect, and their choice between candidates or

measures is governed solely by what they conceive to be their own personal interest. Perhaps such things must be expected under a democratic form of government, but what could be more unworthy or unjust? No question could ever be settled upon a basis of fairness and right in that way. It is, as we have said before, wholly a matter of figures. Legal forms and rules are observed, it is true; but of what avail is this, when legal forms and rules can always be altered to suit the interests or fancy of those who are in power?

We are not able to conceive of anything so dishonest or so destitute of principle as political management or party rule as it prevails at the present day. Neither party makes any pretensions to being fair and honorable in its action. It is an established rule upon which all parties act, that everything is fair in politics, as in war, and that to be successful is always better than to be right. Their constant aim is to deceive the people, and always to seem better than they really are. During a canvas all parties keep themselves disguised as if they were acting a part at a masquerade. The moment a party succeeds and is placed in power, the mask suddenly falls, and then from the first the country begins to understand what it has done, and it is enabled to perceive the character of the men into whose hands it has fallen. During the canvass, the rallying cry heard on all sides is, "the good of the country," but after election is over, it is soon ascertained that what was meant by "good of the country," was really "the good of the party," and generally of only a very small portion of the party at that.

No form or phase of human nature can give such an exhibition of unalloyed selfishness as a political party. A party, any party, will do meaner things and get down to lower depths of corruption and infamy than any individual alone would ever dare to do. We see this fact exemplified in New York city, at our State capital, and in all places where spoils can be reached, and where men find they can get rich more rapidly by foul than by fair means. We saw the selfishness of party exemplified in the war of 1812, when the Federalists favored the British, with whom our country was at war at that time; also in 1846, when the Whigs sympathized with Mexico, and practically opposed their own government in its war with that country;

and again in 1861, when the Democrats as a party were opposed to war with the South, and did much, in earlier stages of the contest at least, to render victory on the side of the Union a matter of very grave doubt. Even in the war of the Revolution there was a party opposed to Washington, and it did all that was possible to embarrass the commanding general in his efforts to secure the final independence of the American colonies. It has often happened in the past, and it will doubtless often happen in the future, that a party not in power would rejoice at a defeat in war that would bring ruin upon its country, for no other reason than that a victory would result in some material advantage to an opposing party. Alas! where shall we find villainy manifesting itself in darker hues than in the management and maneuvers of a political party? What did the Republicans of the nation do in 1876, and the Democrats of New York in 1891?

How can we talk about liberty, equality, justice and proper representation under any form of government, where everything is controlled by party, and where the sole aim of the leaders of the party is the spoils? What shall we expect where the welfare of the public, and even the much talked of "greatest good to the greatest number" is lost sight of, where decency and fair dealing are ignored, where all that is manly and magnanimous is trampled in the dust and where people lose their heads, as well as their character, in the mad scramble for office?

Politics, especially under a form of government where everything is decided by the ballot, leads to the development of the very worst characteristics to which human nature is susceptible. Its chief stock in trade is vilification and misrepresentation. Everything that is done by one party is assumed to be right, while that which is done by the opposing party is presumed to be wrong. The party managers and their agents spare no efforts that might serve to blacken the name of their antagonists, or that might tend to bring them into disrepute with the people. Politics is largely a game of trickery, treachery and deceit, and the most persevering schemer, if not the most unprincipled rascal, is the one most apt to succeed, at least for the time being. It is no wonder that good men by the hundreds refuse to come out on election day, preferring to be disfranchised rather

than to soil their garments by coming in contact with some men that they are certain to meet at the polls. If they went, they would be sure to find the front seats all taken: they would find themselves crowded to the rear, while boodlers and professional politicians, would be left sitting in high places. These, the boodlers and the politicians, are the men who own, control and run the machinery by which our laws are made, by which the destiny of men is settled, and in harmony with which all the departments of the States are managed.

No, there is not a tinge of honesty, fairness or principle in politics as conducted in this country. Even the laws, as everybody concedes, are usually the result of a compromise—but it is well known that where the spirit of compromise prevails, there principle is thrown to the winds. Compromise is always unfair to one party or the other. Compromise is an argument of rogues.—*From "Life Without a Master."*

Why Cooperatives have Failed.

I see a writer in *The International Socialist Review* has been wrestling with the above question. He says:

More than fifty years ago men lent themselves to the hope that the launching of cooperative enterprises would inaugurate a system of industry that would drive from the world both the industrial despot and the industrial slave.

Then he proceeds to show how "signally has this hope miscarried" and gives as

The reason that the cooperative industrial group succumbs to the capitalistic group is because the capitalistic industrial group is primarily a fighting organization, while the cooperative industrial group is primarily a productive organization.

He quotes Walker as saying—

The armies of industry can no more be raised, equipped, held together, moved and engaged without their commanders than the armies of war.

The capitalistic industrial group he describes as having—

All power . . . vested in the head. One mind must move the mass. The more powerful that mind and the more obedient the mass, the more efficient will be the organization. . . . In the army we have the court-martial, in the factory the discharge; one is just as potent in its power to secure discipline, just as destructive to life and liberty in the long run, as the other. Another important qualification of the capitalistic group as a fighting organization is its power to accumulate capital. Capital is the great conquering agency only by which the market of each group can be extended, and the great expropriating agency by which it alone can absorb the properties of its rivals. as an agent of production it cannot rank high. . . . It robs the members of individuality, individual initiative, freedom of action and the keen joy of the master workman and the creator. It robs the workman of the advantage of intelligence and culture and reduces his efficiency far below the normal level.

How remarkably like the indictment advanced against State Socialism! But the "cooperative industrial group" is the opposite of all this—

It is an association of equals. . . . The organization is immobile and moves slowly because it is composed of a mass of distinct individualities possessing equal power. . . . But its weakness does not lie so much in these conditions as in its incapacity to accumulate capital. . . . The cooperative does not exist for the production of capital; it exists primarily for the production of consumable wealth.

Regarding the abolition of competition he

thinks we may "as well attempt to abolish war among the Dervishes of Soudan" by planting in their midst a colony of non-resisting Quakers as to try to abolish competition by establishing cooperatives."

After dwelling upon the qualifications of the "cooperative group" he concludes as follows:

Before we can hope to reap the bountiful harvest promised by modern production, before we can realize the coming age of Art and Spiritual Gladness we must hush forever the strident voice of commercial war. As well try to democratize the army in the midst of war as attempt to democratize the industrial group in the midst of competition. Absolutism is inseparable from the struggle for existence. The only way open for the advancing hosts of Democracy is the path that leads to the conquest of the Monopolistic public powers, against whose bulwark the punitive forces of competition are powerless. The position of the International Socialist Party is the only position that is tenable for those who would bring about industrial democracy.

Which means, if I understand him, that we must fight the devil with his own fire. We must have commanders and absolutism, a political party must meet a political party, and the tug of war must result in a victory for our side. Then we will reorganize society and greet "the coming of Art and Spiritual Gladness." But has he answered the question he starts out with? Has he not, while drawing with great exactness the condition of the "capitalist group," drawn the "cooperative group" almost wholly from his imagination, when he says "we will have to conceive of the cooperative group operating in a cooperative society"? As we never had a "cooperative society"—by which I suppose he means a Socialist government—his "cooperative group" remains an object of his own conception. Had he taken up the "cooperative groups" as they actually had existed and analyzed their methods and organizations he would have found many reasons "why cooperatives have failed." But it is quite evident that is not the real question with him. Why cooperatives have failed to abolish competition is what he is considering. I have yet to learn wherein they ever organized for that purpose. They organize to escape competition by creating a little world of their own which hopes to successfully compete with the world outside. They take advantage of "the conditions competition inspires" or rather the condition monopoly imposes and sell their surplus products at a large profit, and it is generally an increasing treasury which forms one reason "why cooperatives fail." It is internal dissension, envy, pride, and avarice, *commanders and absolutism*.

When the cooperative group which he has so ably described shall prevail it will never be the result of the "conquest of the monopolist or public powers" thru political action.

Horace Greely once said in reference to specie payment: "The way to resume is to resume," and the way to cooperate is to cooperate. What has government got to do with it? The only thing government can do is to rob the cooperators. But a successful cooperation could evade or stand the drain until strength would enable them to ignore the power and refuse the tribute.

Get together, members of all trades and exchange your products; you could do so and supply your every need without money and without price.

What has legislation to do with it? Spider webs in a bee-hive.

Instead of organizing a political party organize a productive one, and the gates of hell (government) shall not prevail against it.

A. LEROY LOUBAL.

A Recollection.

It was on the afternoon of August 8, 1893. In the hall-room of the Tonhalle in Zurich, Switzerland, a battle was raging over admitting the Anarchists and independent Socialists to the international "Workmen's Congress." The discussion had already lasted two days. With all possible and impossible means the adherents of parliamentarism, being in the majority, tried to shake off the embarrassing Anarchists.

In spite of the tolerant suggestions of the Frenchmen, regarding the admission of the Anarchists, which were seconded by the English, Hollandish, and Belgian speakers, the German delegates insisted on the brutal power of the majority. By means of demagogic jugglery the German delegates were victorious.

After the congress had thus been made a vestry-board, the heretics could be—al tho not burned—excluded.

While the credentials of the different delegates were being contested by the strictly orthodox, a tall man leaned against one of the pillars in the hall. A classic profile, dark, glowing, flashing eyes. For hours he stood there motionless at the pillar—Amilcare Cipriani.

The old Revolutionist, the Commune, who over twenty years had been in exile and in prison, who had many years been forged in chains, who had sacrificed everything for freedom and again was ready to sacrifice,—this man had to witness how the congress proceeded with the Anarchists.

The next day he wrote the following letter to the congress:

"Zurich, Aug. 9, 1893.

"To the Delegates of the Marxian Congress in Zurich.

"My Sirs,—I came to your congress in the hope that justice and the sentiment of fraternity would be at the bottom of all its considerations, but I have been painfully disappointed.

"From the first day you have displayed a deplorable intolerance, unworthy of Socialism; an intolerance which went so far as to deny me the floor, for which I asked, to defend the delegates who were brutally driven from the hall without any reasons, and to protest against these exclusions, which degrades the ideas you profess to hold.

"These men were driven out because they are revolutionists. When a congress, which calls itself Socialistic, goes so far in its intolerance as to persecute ideas, then it ceases to be Socialistic and becomes just as reactionary as the governments, which imprison and hang us.

"I tell you, sirs, the red banner, around which you have gathered, comes from the 35,000 proletarians who were slaughtered by the autocrats at Versailles, and who died for the freedom of all, and not for a small sect.

"The Socialism of our dead excluded nobody; its name is unity—not separation, love—not hatred, freedom—not oppression.

"You, my sirs, have during these three

days trampled all this under your feet; you killed the International, and for this crime you will answer before the judgment of humanity—universal history.

"True to the principle of the International, which is not yours, I withdraw from the congress, in which there is nothing Socialistic, and I go with the banished, with the victims of your intolerance and brutality, to take again my place in the battle, and this time to prevent your fratricidal ideas from spreading, as it would destroy the work of our martyrs.

"AMILCARE CIPRIANI."

This letter of protest was repressed by the bureau of the congress! We, the banished delegates, then published the letter as a leaflet in the English, French and German languages, and distributed the same among the delegates taking part in the congress.

Later on the letter was merely incidentally mentioned at the congress. It is a falsification in the minutes of the congress which calls forth the allusion of the reader as to the letter had been read before the congress Aug. 9. The words in the protocol, "The congress passes it with silence," are characteristic of the proceedings.

Over nine years have elapsed since that memorable afternoon. The congress in London established intolerance against the Anarchists as a principle, and intolerance against those who think otherwise has since become an integral part of Social Democracy.

Anarchism has not been injured by their attitude. Apart from Germany the anti-parliamentarian movement has gained everywhere, and for this reason we recall Amilcare Cipriani's letter and its motives.—P. P. in *Freiheit*.

— o —

Russian Sectarists and Resistance.

According to *Free Russia* "the doctrine of non-resistance is far from being universal among Russian Sectarists." V. Tchertkoff and I. Treguboff, editor and staff of *Svobodnoye Slovo* (Free Speech), have addressed the following letter to the sectarians:

"Dear Brothers in Christ,—Many educated men who, no doubt, wish well to the Russian people, but advise the use of the un-Christian means for the attainment of good—violence and murder, have lately begun to say and write that our Russian Sectarists are also prepared to wage a violent revolutionary struggle against the Russian government and the Orthodox Church, that is to rebel, to rob landlords, to despoil churches, and, if necessary, even to murder the rulers and other oppressors of the people. The representatives of the established Orthodox Church say the same things, wishing by these means to increase the coercion of the Sectarists.

"We believe that this is not true, and is, on the one hand, a misunderstanding, and on the other a horrible calumny on our brethren, the Sectarists, who profess, though with differences, each according to his own conceptions, but still one and the same teaching of Christ, who commanded us not to avenge ourselves and kill men, but to love and forgive those men, whoever they be, whether friends or enemies.

"But to convince ourselves still more and

to learn the truth in its fulness, we have decided to ask the sectarians themselves whether what is said and written about them by those educated people is true.

"Having this in view, we ask you to give us replies to the following questions:—1, Is it right or wrong to rebel against oppressors, to rob and murder rulers, and why? 2, Is it right or wrong to despoil orthodox churches and destroy icons, and why? 3, Have the Sectarists of the village Pavlovki acted rightly or wrongly in despoiling an orthodox church? 4, What must and what must not a Christian of our times do for the betterment of his personal existence and of life generally? 5, What is your faith now, and what was it before? 6, What is your occupation? 7, What books do you like to read best, and which do you believe to be useful for spreading among the people?"

In reply to this open letter, a group of Sectarists sent to the *Free Speech* the following epistle:

"*Brothers in Christ Treguboff and Tchertkoff*,—Replying to the questions put to you in your address to Russian Sectarists, we propose that you should also answer our questions, which follow: 1, What proofs have you that people who carry on 'a violent revolutionary struggle against the Russian government and the Orthodox Church,' and who, according to your own words, wish well to the Russian people, effect rebellion, robbery and spoliation? Rebellion, robbery and spoliation are crimes always committed by villains only for their own cruel and covetous interests. If, however, men have recourse to deeds of violence not for such aims, but, according to your own statement, 'for the well-being of the Russian people,' how can you term their deeds rebellion, robbery and spoliation? 2, What grounds have you for charging these same people with vindictiveness and a tendency to murder, while stating yourselves that they undoubtedly wish well to the Russian people? 3, What have you achieved yourselves which gives you the moral right to put such questions to others, and, which is the main thing, so publicly; questions, to put which it seems to us it must be the more difficult to a man the more modest he is?

"And now listen to our replies to your questions. (1) In your first question you have evidently used wrongly the word to rebel (against oppressors), instead of the words to become indignant and resist. Therefore, we must reply to your first question thus: 'To stir up rebellion is always wrong, but to become indignant against and to resist oppressors is always right, and the more so, the more self-denying and the more loving towards the oppressed manner of this indignation and resistance will be.' (2) Your second question, whether it is right or wrong to despoil orthodox churches and destroy icons, seems to be either too simple or premeditated. If it is simple our reply will also be simple; it is wrong to despoil what is no concern of ours. If, however your question is a premeditated one, our reply will also not be direct, and we shall say it depends on what the circumstances may be. (3) Concerning your third question, we should be insincere did we abstain from saying that we consider it thoughtless and not right. It seems to us thoughtless

because everyone who knows, as you do, in what circumstances the doings of Pavlovki Sectarists occurred, must also know that it is as impossible to ask whether these deeds are right or wrong, as it is impossible to ask the earthquake which caused the tower of Siloam to fall on the heads of those who were in it was right or wrong. This question of yours is also not right because by means of it you condemn people who were subjected to the utmost sufferings, and are now doomed to still greater ones. (4) Your fourth question is too general. Our reply to it will, therefore be short. For the betterment of his own existence of life in general the Christian of our times must do the same as Jesus did in his time, because the truth of Christian teaching, the meaning, aim and path of life remain the same for all time. (5) To your fifth question we can give you only a reply which would make clear to you the thing which you want to know in the first place. Our faith consists in this, that love is measured by self-denial, because there is no greater love than that a man should lay down his life for his friends. Therefore, we believe that a revolutionist using violence, but, laying down his life for others is near Christ, far nearer even than the man who prates about Christian non-resistance. (6) To your sixth question we do not wish to reply. (7) To your last question we reply that our favorite and most useful reading is that of the letters of our suffering brothers."

Mr. Zhook then shows that, aside from fanaticism, mysticism, and distorted political ideas, the program of the Sectarists is rather far-going for a religious sect. They propose to take away the land from the landlords, and that the payment of all taxes shall cease; that "it is a sin to work for landlords"; that "supreme power be abolished," and "universal equality established." S. R.

— o —

Marriage and Population.

All husbands and wives agree—but the agreement is usually to the effect that they made a mistake in marrying. Therefore, according to statistics, marriages are decreasing and suicides are increasing. They are evidently choosing the quicker and less painful method of leaving the earth.

But how about the command to "increase and multiply"? Well, according to the same statistics, divorces are on the increase, and the multiplication is brought about by the divorce courts, which make two of one.

R. GOODHEART.

— o —

LETTER-BOX.

C. L., *El Reno, Okla.*—It seems as tho some so-called Individualists cannot see any other motive of man's actions except those that can be explained from cut and dried "principles." Has sympathy no place in your vocabulary? It was obvious from Comrade Voltairine de Cleyre's appeal that she did not assume anybody was under "obligations" to aid her assailant in rescuing him from the grip of government.

R. D., *City*—If, as you say, "the Socialists can do nothing against economic development and should not be blamed if Socialism is not inaugurated after we have the power" why all this fuss about "capturing the government"? Why not leave it to the management of that deity called "economic determinism"?

— o —

Publications Received.

"Socialism the Basis of Universal Peace." By Dr. H. Gibbs. Comrade Publishing Co., New York. 5 cents.
"Socialism and the Negro Problem." By Chas. H. Vail. Comrade Publishing Co., New York. 5 cents.

FREE SOCIETY

Formerly THE FIREBRAND.

Published Weekly by..... I. ISAAK.

ONE DOLLAR A YEAR.

Address all Communications and make all Money Orders payable to FREE SOCIETY, 331 WALNUT ST., 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, FEBRUARY 1, 1903.

399

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.

BOSTON.—The Social Science Club meets every Sunday at 5 p. m. at 724 Washington St., room 9. Free forum for all sociological topics. Anarchist literature for sale. Subject for Feb. 1, "Law and Authority."

BROOKLYN.—The Social Science Club meets every Friday evening at Central Hall, 410 Stone Ave. Discussion free to all.

CHICAGO.—The Progressive Club will hold a meeting every Friday evening at 331 Walnut St.

The Chicago Philosophical Society meets every Sunday evening at 72 Adams St., 8 p. m. sharp. Free discussion. Sunday, Feb. 1, Dr. Juliet Severence will speak on "Thomas Paine."

The Russian Revolutionary Club meets on Sunday evenings at 278 Blue Island Ave.

The Workmen's Educational Club meets Saturday, 8 p. m., at 278 Blue Island Ave. Jan. 31, H. Dalitsch will speak in Jewish on "Will the Ballot Emancipate the Working-men?"

Friday, Feb. 6, 8 p. m. R. Grossman will speak on "The Social Question."

CLEVELAND.—Liberty Association meets every Sunday, excepting the first Sunday of the month, 2:30 p. m. in Foster's Hall, 236 Champlain St. Free discussion.

NEW YORK.—The Radical Reading Room, 180 Forsyth St. Meeting every Sunday at 3 p. m. Lectures and free discussion. Every Thursday evening L. Rosenzweig gives lessons in "Physics."

Feb. 27, Friday evening, the Bauern Ball of the Radical Reading Room will take place at Lenox's Assembly Rooms, 252 Second St. Admission, including hat checks, 25 cents.

PHILADELPHIA.—Social Science Club holds weekly meetings Friday evenings in Bricklayers' Hall, 707 N. Broad St.

FREE SOCIETY

Outpost Echoes.

They can't hang truth.

Force is not an argument.

Love will not come for hate.

The social spirit completes man.

Reputation is only a coat of paint.

Liberty lives solely by breaking laws.

Revolution is just a phase of evolution.

The brightest of lights cannot cure blindness.

A patriot is a man who is proud of his ignorance.

J. P. Morgan has succeeded in bribing his conscience.

If women are fools, remember, all of them have had fathers.

The London poor are crowding the churches. Now where is "God"?

Sweden has a famine. Hanna could prove that this famine was prosperity.

The coal barons have just admitted their crimes and ordered wine and cigars.

"What law have I broken?" asks the exploiter, and his dying victim answers, "No law."

There is nothing so bad but that a good reason for doing it may be found. Ask Rockefeller.

Attorney General Knox is an adept in the fine art of drawing a salary for services not rendered.

Venezuela knows now just how much the word of government is worth. Thieves must lie, to "get there."

We all want liberty for ourselves, but when it comes to the matter of liberty for others—"Dangerous!"

Those who want "God in the Constitution" should rest satisfied; the Constitution contains lies enough for a hundred such documents.

"It is opportunity that makes the thief," it is authority that makes the opportunity; and there is the matter in a nutshell.

Goldwin Smith is still arguing the case for the Boers. What other defense do they need than that Chamberlain was against them from the start?

The Filipinos are reduced to ruin, but the "greatness" of the American government has been proved beyond doubt. Might makes right.

Colonel Lynch has been convicted of high treason. He helped the Boers. The British government stands convicted of high treason to all humanity.

Judges and legislators accept free railroad transportation and deny that it is bribery. They escape self-condemnation on a technicality.

The movement toward freedom will not wait to keep the good people from being shocked; even what they call goodness will have to submit to experiment.

Those who deem sex and its manifestations unclean and low should never do the wrongs involved in sex association and procreation. It is shameful to live,

What man undergoes in the self-effacement necessary to the avoidance of martyrdom may be in the nature of a greater privation than that martyrdom, tho it involved torture.

Government, frankly unveiling itself, is imperialism. Under the form of a republic it disguises its essentials for a while, but sooner or later it goes forth to conquer in fact.

There are three thousand miners out of work in the anthracite regions, and those who are at work are given too few cars to fill. Prices must be kept up even if the strenuousness of Theodore is sacrificed.

All man's yearnings and aspirations, however they may be clouded by false ideals and evil methods of attainment, are directed toward no other end than fulness of life or adequate manifestation of self.

Those who are ever calling attention away from the untoward conditions of life and bidding man perfect himself here and now, are like those who would have man put on flesh yet never eat any food.

Philosophy, an explanation of existence which makes all things fall into a harmony and work together for perfection, is an elder brother of religion, with more astuteness and offering a more subtle poison.

Those Social Purity women who are pitting their forces against the nude in art, have, taken all together, less purity in their natures than exists in one picture such as Watts' "Love and Life." They see dirtily.

A true libertarian should be absolutely unafraid of any consequence of liberty, either superficial or wide-reaching and profound. Liberty's worst is better than slavery's best, for under liberty her worst may disappear.

AMERICUS.

A Student.

What is it to be a student? Usually it is understood that anyone who attends school, or especially one who attends some high seminary of learning, is a student. But, we apprehend, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, the term is misapplied. A man, or a boy, may attend a seminary or a college, and not study. A pupil who belongs to classes and recites lessons that have been assigned to him, is not for that reason a student in the proper sense of the term. A student is one who thinks, inquires and considers on his own account, without any reference to any authority or doctrine. One who searches after truth in any manner that leads him into the ways of truth, is a student. A student is always an independent thinker; he is one who thinks and inquires on his own responsibility, without the slightest regard to authority. How many such are there in any city or town in this country? No one who is a pupil in any of our schools or colleges is properly called a student. He has masters, teachers and books. To be a good pupil, he must follow authority at all times. He must not think, or inquire, or investigate on his own account. That would be rebellion, and next thing to treason. No student who thinks can receive a diploma at any institution. All his acquirements, when he gets thru, consist in his having learned what others teach.

That is all that can be acquired at any college in the land. Such pupils make good subjects, excellent slaves, and that is what schools and colleges are intended for. If a pupil only knew how to think, or was allowed to think on his own responsibility, he would never need to go to college.

This country will never have real students so long as we follow the school and college system that prevails today. A man to be a real student, must first of all dispense with authority—the authority not only of books but of teachers also. Knowledge cannot be fed to pupils as you would feed gruel with a spoon.

J. WILSON.

The Toilers.

It is growing dark and the western sky is of a deep rose color. In the distance, dim, shadowy buildings are outlined against the sky, like huge gray spectres. The buzzing of ever-going sewing machines fills the air from the open windows of the sweat shops behind and below me.

This is Sunday, the day of rest, and all day long the wheels have been turning and I have watched the bent figures of men and women and their busy, toiling hands. Hour after hour thru this whole beautiful day they have been confined in those low, dark, dusty rooms. I could see the baskets piled high with the men's garments they had finished.

How can they be so patient and passive? Does it never occur to them that this beautiful world is theirs, that days like this are here that we may go out into the world and see the sunshine? In the country the orchards and lanes are full of ripe, red apples that will rot away, and here in the city, men, women, and children toil hour after hour for a piece of bread to eat.

How long will people continue in this stupor and blindness? How long will they be satisfied to be beasts and machines? In every breast there is a soul that is only waiting for a chance to free itself. When will the multitude begin to understand that the God it is looking to for help and a future reward for its sorrows and burdens is in the breast of each individual; that each one of us has the power to be free and independent, that no one need submit to despotism! My breast feels like bursting when I think of these things, and I feel like standing on the house-tops and crying down unto the multitude: "Wake up! Realize that each one of you has infinite powers and capabilities, and that you can all do what you wish to do! The fact that you wish to do a thing shows that the power to do it is hidden within you."—C. L., in *The Whim*.

At the Chicago Philosophical Society.

"Socialism and the State" was the subject last Sunday, and the speaker, A. M. Simons, did not see why mankind should dispense with the State—an institution which would be a blessing if the Socialists were the governors. Kropotkin had shown us in his "Mutual Aid" that people had helped each other independently of the State in various ways, but being afflicted with "Stateophobia" Kropotkin had failed to see that the State was also an institution of mutual aid. Still Mr. Simons was confi-

dent that the benevolent institution would pass away with capitalism; and the way to abolish the State was to get hold of it, which could easily be done thru political action. Neither non-resistance nor terrorism had ever accomplished anything. Ideals had ever remained a dream, for it was economic conditions which mapped out society's destiny. "Economic determinism may be all rot," he exclaimed, "but the Socialists will cling to it!"

The critics showed that they had closely followed Mr. Simons' lecture, for they disputed every point he had made. According to Mr. Simons' logic, said one critic, the way to abolish Catholicism is to take hold of the Catholic Church and elect a Socialist pope. All endeavors to rid society of its evils had always been a failure because all forms of government, whether autocratic or democratic, prevented a spontaneous growth and natural adjustment. No matter how sincere or honest the intentions of reformers were, the result had always been the same—tyranny. And the result of political action in the Socialist parties was already apparent. Altho Socialist stump-speakers still assert that Socialism will be established after the government has been captured, their most prominent writers frankly admit that only petty reforms will be introduced "the day after the revolution," such as raising the wages and shortening the hours of the laborers; of which everybody could convince himself by a perusal of Karl Kautsky's latest book, "The Social Revolution."

In his concluding remarks Mr. Simons did not attempt to refute the arguments of the critics; but confined himself to a few generalizations and a defense of Kautsky's book. He claimed that that which Kautsky had outlined for "The Day After the Revolution" was not Socialism (nobody had said that it was), and that the failure of establishing Socialism after the revolution was no fault of the Socialists, but depended on economic development. He did not seem to realize that his position of fatalist makes man a nonentity, who always remains a play-ball of economic conditions, before which shrine he can only exclaim: "Thy will be done!"

REPORTER.

Literature.

THE NEW LIFE. By Leroy Berrier. Cloth, pp. 126. Published by the author, 2301 Farnam St. Davenport, Iowa. Cloth, \$1.

An offshoot from Buddhist stock, developed from a variation into Theosophy, corrupted into Christian Science, and presented to us at last in still another new form, the "New Thought," a thing about which we hear everywhere, is merely synonymous with a recrudescence of idealism at the expense of materialism, presenting the old problems and their old solutions. Mr. Leroy Berrier gives us in the volume named above a conception of existence in which hypnotism with its various forms of suggestion; and psychometry, telepathy, concentration, and all the rest play their parts, and out of which theory constructs the "perfect life."

The book is well written, that is to say, simply; and if the matter were as good as the manner there would be little fault to find. Mr. Berrier endeavors to make his thought

clear to his readers, which is more than many writers on such subjects care to do, if their work may serve for proof. But inasmuch as the case which our author makes out rests on assumptions which themselves stand in need of demonstration, inasmuch as the work is deductive rather than inductive, its value lies chiefly in some suggestive conceptions, and it cannot be taken seriously, as a whole, at all.

The truth is that the book does not concede that environment plays the part in human life which most sociologists believe it does, but on the other hand boldly takes the ground that "mind" is the supreme power in things and can dominate them to any result which it desires. Individual reformation therefore rears its head as the prime means of changing society and turning it from the error of its ways. The reader is told the familiar tale that he is perfect essentially—that is in his real being—and that when he learns that he is the "all," or what is supreme in things, he will be able to dismiss error, disease, and evil from his being, as these things are but mistaken thoughts. We are not told how it is that the perfect became imperfect, not yet how imperfection can play a good part in a world where there cannot be too much wisdom. In fact a thousand questions which induction would ask are ignored and unanticipated, it would seem, by our ingenious author.

As an evidence of the way in which Mr. Berrier goes about it to prove a proposition the following may perhaps serve:

"I believe that I am warranted in making the following statement: The most advanced thought of today expresses the belief that mind is life's mode of expression. It is therefore the creative power. This fact being established, it becomes obvious that an understanding of the laws that govern the expression of that power in human life and all that pertains to its welfare is vitality."

Because "the most advanced thought," not necessarily the truest thought, "expresses the belief"—mark you, it expresses the belief (would it not be better if it would furnish the proof?) "that mind is life's mode of expression"—"It is therefore the creative power." Italics my own. What have we here? A belief becomes the proof of the statement that mind "is the creative power." This is "the new thought" with a vengeance.

The idea that man is "the all, the perfect," and that his task is to realize this, and that then evil will disappear from life and the golden age be with us, stands in such terrific contrast to experience and established truth that it appears almost grotesque; and when there is added to the stubborn facts the truth that if there is an "all," a "perfect," a final, then evil, disease, error, and crime are parts of it too because they simply are, because they exist in experience; when it is realized that good, truth, reason, mind itself has no more objective existence than any of these others, the "new thought" will make but slight headway it is to be hoped.

Psychology is the most difficult of sciences because the data upon which its inductions must be based are so elusive and impermanent; the powers of mind are by no means yet fully apprehended, but when we are told that mind is the ultimate power, when we are misled by the wonderful revelations of telepathy and the rest into such sweeping generalization as the new thinkers allow themselves, we are very near the borders of a mental fog. As far as social problems are concerned the social revolutionist knows that he is fighting not only wrong thoughts but wrong facts as well. Mr. Berrier has not solved the great problem of human existence. Perhaps there will never be a complete and finished science of psychology, but if such a work should be forthcoming it would not deny or ignore one half of life.

W. F. B.

A Vindication of Anarchism.

III

Having seen that authority in all forms is softened by culture, which, again, appears to derive uniform encouragement from getting rid of the authority, we must be prepared for the startling conclusion that Civil Government, the only institution which lays claim to authority independent of and supreme over others, is the mainstay of all surviving tyrannies and the principal impediment to our advance in civilization. Those who desire only a strong statement of the case against this institution may find it in Bakunin's "God and the State," Proudhon's "What is Property?" and Karl Marx's "Capital." But as I have all along announced my method to be inductive, not polemical, I prefer, instead of digesting anything like an invective against government from such sources, to show that it is actually the stay of those practises now felt to be oppressive, and necessarily, the obstacle to their removal.

The tenures of land by the actual cultivators involving the tribute they are compelled to pay non-producers for the privilege of increasing the world's wealth by their labor are among those grievances most generally recognized in sundry countries. Let us not lay the flattering unction to our souls that our's is not among them. It enjoys, on the contrary, at this moment, the honor of being the only country in the world where landlordism prevails on so gigantic a scale that the new republic of Illinois contains more tenant farmers than the ancient feudal kingdom of Scotland, with about the same area and population; the only country in which absentee landlordism is an increasing evil; and about the only one in which the tenant's rights against the landlord have absolutely no protection. In this latter respect, we are much behind even Ireland, which is usually cited as a very extreme case.

The immense popularity of the late Henry George's "Progress and Poverty" has familiarized everyone with Ricardo's law of rent, asserted by orthodox economists to contain the philosophy of an admitted evil. If a particular piece of land yield more net income to its possessor, for the same outlay of capital and labor than that average which determines the current rate of interest and wages, this surplus is properly Rent, being the amount which a tenant could pay for use of the land without becoming worse off than if he squatted on the least remunerative land in use. Because the least remunerative land in use is sure to be just within that on which the current rate of interest and wages may be realized; any surplus on better land being swallowed up by Rent. And land derives value only from the rent,* so that the poorest in use which yields none, is, tho' legally protected, practically free (because worthless) to anyone who will try making it valuable. Moreover this surplus gain from any land equals all that anyone will pay for the use of it, inasmuch as to give more would put him in a worse position than if he squatted upon free land. Apparent exceptions to the rule are not real exceptions. Thus if land, in an agricultural

sense quite unproductive, is rented for the purpose of a pleasure ground, the popularity of the site makes it productive to its possessor, which is the condition we have been reasoning from, and the rent paid is still what the tenant can recover out of the land by sub-letting, minus what he could get from the least remunerative in use—unless, indeed, he has a peculiar fancy to the spot; and that is one of those accidental circumstances which cancel each other on a wide survey, since personal aversion to a location also operates to lower the rent. From this law, Mr. George has drawn such startling consequences as that no progress in the arts, no reform of institutions (except of course his own single tax scheme), no increase of wealth, can add anything to the gains of capital or labor; but, on the contrary, these must decrease as the margin of cultivation extends downward to poorer land—all the increased yield being engulfed by devouring Rent! And in reply to criticisms on the law itself, he quotes John Stuart Mill to the effect that those who dissent from it do not understand it. Yet Mill, who said this, adopted (without credit), a most serious criticism on the law from Richard Jones,* viz., that the "law" (more properly to be called the generalization) is not true. The division of crops between landlord and tenant is not ordinarily determined by considerations like those which Ricardo's deductive logic assumes; but in very different manners. Thruout extensive regions, the land, belonging to the government, pays a tribute (ryot rent). In considerable European districts custom, dating from the time of the Roman Empire, ordains that the landlord shall provide the tenant with working capital, receiving for the use of both land and tools a stated share of the crop, whether it prove little or much (metayer's rent.) There are countries, Ireland being one of them, where the farmers, unable to get away, and jealously watched lest they should presume to squat on "free" land, pay whatever the landlord can get out of them upon the simple principle that a cat has no more than its skin (cottier's rent). The customary labor of serfs had equally little to do with the Ricardian calculation; and long leases, such as in England are frequently granted for a series of lives, can be adapted to it only in the most random and haphazard manner. Rent on Ricardian principles (economic rent) can be demanded and paid only where there exists a considerable quantity of land open to untaxed settlement, forbidding a combination of landlords, and where the use of occupied land is an object of rapidly fluctuating speculations. And even there, as the plans of single-taxers for realizing George's program have brought out in the United States, it would be very difficult to determine what, on Ricardian principles, the rent of any given land ought to be; so that there are the gravest reasons for doubting whether the actual rent is the "economic." One thing is certain—that the value of the land by no means represents the money which at current interest would produce the actual rent†; tho' according to Ricardo's law it should be. This enables us to say at once

that ryot rent, metayer's rent, and cottier's rent, are not economic rent in disguise; but that the generalization errs substantially by attributing to landlords and tenants a knowledge and judgment about the natural remunerativeness of land which actually they are far from possessing. The best we can say for the theory is that, like much else in Ricardo's commonwealth, it is an ideal to which the facts approximate only under conditions of unwonted enterprise and freedom. This observation does not predispose us to regard it as a formula of particularly "dismal science." If it be true that the wages of labor and the profits of capital are being constantly driven downwards by the overgrowth of Rent, it must be true also that land-owners are by far the richest class of men; that in an age of such rapidly increasing wealth as ours' they must be growing richer very fast; that merchants must constantly find it harder to keep their heads above water; that the proletaires must be constantly growing more miserable in comparison with their predecessors—i. e. that whereas the English laborer of Elizabeth's time frequently had to live on bread made of beans, peas, and oats, with some acorns added to eke out,* he must now find much difficulty in getting that! Well, then! I assert not only that these evident conclusions from the Ricardo-George theory are palpably false, but even that they are palpably absurd.

It is somewhat remarkable that the Ricardian school of Socialists, as George and Marx, should always have thought it incumbent on them to demolish Malthus. For acquaintance with the history of political economy teaches that the Ricardian laws of rent and wages are corollaries from the Malthusian law of population; and, moreover, that Malthus himself rejected them as incorrectly drawn. Because Malthus had said that population must increase faster than the means of supporting it, unless it were restrained either by the "positive checks" of vice and misery, or the preventive check of voluntary continence, Ricardo, omitting the saving clause, reasoned that population must increase, keeping down laborers to the minimum necessary for life and propagation ("Ricardo's iron law of wages"), which must involve extension of cultivation to progressively poorer land, and rise of rent. But Malthus replied that in his judgment the positive check was not at all necessary: the preventive was quite practicable on a scale sufficient to prevent increase of population from affecting wages; while, even if wages did fall from this cause, rent would not rise. Granted (which Malthus did not believe) that the masses, where improvidence is not factitiously encouraged, are ignorant enough to think a man should marry without seeing his way to bring up children as well as he was brought up, it is certain men of business do know better than to take land on which they cannot obtain as good remuneration for their outlay as on any now in use, unless they do it by way of a charitable enterprise; and that will not raise rent. Only when the returns of new land to labor and capital seem like to be as good as those of the poorest in use have

* Land, in an economic treatise, is always understood to exclude houses and other improvements.

* Encyclopedia Britannica, article "Political Economy."

† Roscher, "Political Economy."

* Hollinshed. See Macanlay, review of Southey's "Colloquies."

been till lately, will such land be taken as an investment: and until that happens rent will not rise. The brilliant dialectics of Ricardo triumphed over Malthus, whose reasoning was in the main inductive and his style uninteresting.* But it was at this very point that John Stuart Mill, originally a docile pupil of Ricardo, began to dissent from his master's teachings. The whole difference between the economics of Ricardian Socialism as expounded by the Marx-Engel school, and Anarchistic, are in Mill's dictum that the rate of wages is not the lowest at which the laborers can live, work, propagate, but the lowest at which they will consent to do so. And this is also (reversely) the difference between the Malthusianism of Malthus and the Malthusianism of Ricardo-MacCulloch improvements upon Malthus. Returning with these lights to the facts about rent, we see that in all countries the landlord is somehow enabled to reap where he has not sown. This I have ventured to call an universally recognized evil. But the philosophy of this evil, we now see, is not that some lands yield a better return to labor and capital than others. It is to the interest of the community to encourage prompt improvement of land which will do that; for this means encouraging discovery of natural resources; and the confiscation of "unearned increment" proposed by George would be against the public interest, as tending to discourage such discovery. The true cause of the evil is property in land, as distinguished from possession of land;† and this evil, as Proudhon asserted, is equally great whether the property be public or private.‡ I, however, am prepared to go a little further than Proudhon. All property, we have remarked, was at one time in the tribe, not in individuals; and property in land has continued to be tribal more persistently than property in chattels; because chattels are produced by individuals whose personal claim on them the tribe cannot afford to disregard, which is unlike the case of land. Now the tyranny of the landlord, I affirm, is

* Malthus had in him the making of quite a brilliant rhetorician, several passages in the first edition of his "Essay," having high poetic merit—among them the famous one about Nature's feast, which has been so atrociously garbled by many of those who quote it. These, however, generally disappeared in the edition of 1803 and later ones. His aim was to place his theory on a basis of positive induction. The method, tho the most philosophical, is not the most amusing; his talent for arrangement and exposition was limited; and he refined till his friends thought he would have been clearer for taking less pains to be clear. On the whole subject, which is of great importance to social science, see Bonar, cit. George attributes rent not to increase but concentration of population.

† Every ghyster knows that there is a difference between proprietorship and possession. It was defined two thousand years ago by a lawyer in his own time very eminent. Possession, says Cicero, is the right to use; property is the right to use or misuse. The right to misuse was never claimed by any except governments and those creatures to whom it has been formally transferred. In the absence of government, we cannot even imagine such a right's existing or being recognized at all.

‡ It is I suppose generally known that in recommending a single direct tax on land values, George was preceded by the French "economists" (physiocrats), particularly Quesnay, whom see in series "Principaux Economistes." Their ground, however, was rather different from his. A closer predecessor was Patrick Dove, himself a Scotch landlord, whose works, "Theory of Progression," and "Political Science," have been brought into notice by George's eloquent agitation.

worse in proportion as the landlord represents the tribe's old property claim on land. Under the system of ryot rent, where the landlord is the government, the condition of the proletariat is economically at its worst—very much lower than that of slaves, in America forty years ago. Metayerage, a system under which the cultivators are very poor, is well known to be a relic of serfdom; and serfdom in Europe sprang from a reassertion of eminent domain, to which the Roman Emperors were driven for the purpose of getting something out of this exhausted country (see the previous references to the codes of Constantine and later emperors, in Justinian; and to modern historians who quote). Cottier rent prevails in countries which have been conquered, like Ireland, or divided on feudal principles, like Scotland. It is a direct transference of the State's property claim (termed by Proudhon the *aubaine*) to individuals. That approximation to "economic rent" which we see in the United States is less oppressive to the cultivator than any other system in actual use. But the original sin of eminent domain not being obsolete in the United States, we see, even here, immense tracts of land sold at nominal prices to railroad companies and foreign capitalists, whose rent is not derived from the Ricardian law, but solely from the factitious power which our government has chosen to give them of keeping the land out of use. At every step, therefore, progressively, in proportion to the actual regulation of land by government, we find government, not any natural law, at the bottom of that evil universally allowed to pervade the system of rent.

Very different from the situation of the idle landlord is that of the employing capitalist. As projector, organizer, or at least manager, of a productive enterprise (exchange is a secondary branch of production), he is an unquestionable laborer, a great part of whose income is universally admitted to be wages not above what would be necessary to hire a competent person for his task. Another considerable proportion is loosely called interest of assurance. That assurance is very necessary for the purpose of inducing men to stake their possessions on their success in a business, must be obvious, when we remember that of those who do so only five per cent escape bankruptcy at one time or other; and only three per cent, entire loss of their first investment. And it is clearly for the interest of the laborer that new branches of industry should be opened with the aid of wealth. A poor colony, like that planted by the Pilgrims in New England, becomes rich very slowly if left to its own resources; and a country in which those who have anything consume it apace upon shows, feasts, or other amusements of rich people who are not men of business, will not, for any thanks it owes them, advance in wealth at all. It seems strange, therefore, that ever since wage-labor began, the capitalist should have been fully as unpopular a character as the landlord. What is that item in his gains which, according to a widespread feeling, he obtains unfairly, at some one else's expense? It is of a rather miscellaneous character. In one of Henry George's ablest chapters, he touches, too lightly, for it was foreign to his deductive argument, upon the multifoldness of ways by which "money makes more money," and the palpable illegitimacy of some. A railroad company approaches a small town as a highwayman does a traveler. The threat "if you do not accede to

our demands we will leave your town two or three miles to one side" is as efficacious as the "stand, and deliver" when backed by a cocked pistol. For it is not merely a threat to deprive the town of the benefits of the road. It is a threat to put the town in a much worse situation than if the road had never been built. This is very far from an exception or a trifle. The enormous fortunes of the last century are here identified in every one's mind with a regular system by which their present possessors have half-deluded, half-intimidated almost every civil corporation, from the federal government to the town ward, into giving them enormous bounties and incurring heavy bonded debts. And, by these means, chiefly or largely, the combinations of capitalists which did it have become so great that, as is commonly believed, they nominate governors and senators as they would clerks; dictate legislation, and rule our rulers, no less than our own individual selves, with all the tyranny of a secret oligarchy, or *Vehm-Gericht*. That they are able habitually to defy the laws; and to keep secret transactions which the representatives of the people have enacted shall be published; is not suspected but well known. It is not to be denied that the power of capital to do such things is partly in its nature. We have seen reason to think that private property originated in the making by individuals of tools and weapons, which were the first capital. And it is evident the possession of a bow gave one a savage such an advantage over another who had no bow, that the first might easily make the other his slave. Not very different has been the effect of every step in the progress of invention. I have just condemned as an error of fact, fruitful in fallacies of argument, the popular notion that the poor grow poorer while the rich grow richer. But like all widely disseminated ideas, it must contain a grain of truth, which recommends it to the public. The truth it contains is that the progress of invention destroys that technical skill which used to make a cobbler or blacksmith his own master, and renders the proletariat more helplessly dependent on the owner of machinery. The Marx-Engel school of Socialism has a keen appreciation of this truth. It regards capital as that factor in general human progress which has simultaneously emancipated the masses from chattel slavery and serfdom, but enslaved them again to corporations; from which, it teaches they can be liberated only by transferring control of capital to the State, a corporation consisting in themselves. What such reasoning overlooks, is that the power given by inventions is inherent in the inventive faculty, and can therefore neither enslave man, the inventing animal, without factitious aid, nor be prevented from doing so thru any system which by teaching him to rely on others, depresses his originality. The pistol with which the railroad highwayman approaches the citizen of the small town is his charter. Without that, he is only a man to a man—ahead, indeed, since he has his money; but not so far ahead that the other cannot, if stimulated to exert itself, catch up. We see this in the history of new and poor countries, like the American colonies, which, if only let alone, soon become able to defy commercial dictation by the older and richer. "It is the pernicious hand of government"—it is the charter which enables an existing corporation to prevent others from being formed in express resistance to any tyranny it may attempt exercising. Because "progress by conflict" is rather slow, we have forgotten that it is sure. In our haste to be rich we have ceased to be innocent. We ourselves have endowed corporations with power to "develop our resources" by oppression of the minority; and our reward is that they now oppress the majority.

C. L. JAMES.

(To be continued.)

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 Bee h Glen St., Roxbury.
CHICAGO—T. Appel, 1228 Milwaukee Av.
CLEVELAND—E. Schilling, 4 Elwell St.
COLUMBUS, Ohio—H. M. Lyndall, 416 E. Mound St.
LONDON, Eng.—T. Cantwell, 127 Ossulton St., N. W.
NEW YORK—A. Lopatiner, 135 Monroe St.
PHILADELPHIA—Natasha Notkin, 242 N. Second St.
SAN FRANCISCO—R. Rieger, 322 Larkin St.

JUST OUT!

Memoirs of a Revolutionist

By PETER KROPOTKIN,

in the Danish Language.

Elegantly bound.....\$1.75

Paper cover.....1.00

M. R. Ackerman,
364 Milwaukee Ave.,
Chicago, Ill.

RECEIPTS.

Dr. M. Cohn, \$2. Heitman, Heinze, Gustafson, Gatet, Hitch, Klambt, Walsh, Kunert, Phinney, Pluetznes, Barthelot, Brieson, each \$1. Gronseth, Johnson, Huebner, each 50c. Carlin, 25c.

LEO TOLSTOY'S COMPLETE WORKS.

Twelve volumes, translated by Maud, Hapgood, and Dole. Printed on good paper and from new plates.

CLOTH BINDING, PER SET \$15
SAME, GILT TOP, BACK, AND CENTER \$18
SAME, HALF GILT \$35

Another uniform edition, 22 volumes, cloth, containing a photogravure frontispiece on Japan paper:

PER SET \$44
\$2 down, \$2 a month.

R. Goodheart,

919 Talman Av. - - Chicago

MEMOIRS OF A REVOLUTIONIST.
BY

PETER KROPOTKIN.

This interesting autobiography of the well known Anarchist and scientist, is one of the most important books of the Anarchist movement, as well as one of general interest. "He is more anxious to give the psychology of his contemporaries than of himself," says the noted European critic Georg Brandes. "One finds in his book the psychology of official Russia and of the masses underneath, of Russia struggling forward and of Russia stagnant. And he strives to give the history of his contemporaries rather than his own history. The record of his life contains, consequently, the history of Russia during his lifetime, as well as the history of the labor movement in Europe during the last half-century."

The book contains two portraits of the author, and one of his mother. It is excellently printed and well bound; 519 pp. Price \$2.

Send orders to FREE SOCIETY.

BOOK LIST.

ALL ORDERS FOR THE FOLLOWING BOOKS

RECEIVED AT THIS OFFICE.

| | |
|--------------------------------------|------|
| Essays on the Social Problem..... | |
|H. Addis | 05 |
| The New Hedonism.....Grant Allen | 05 |
| Plain Words on the Woman | |
| Question..... | 05 |
| God and the State.....Bakunin | 05 |
| The Same. London edition..... | 10 |
| Whitman's Ideal Democracy and | |
| Other Writings.....Helena Born | 1.00 |
| Love's Coming-of-Age. Edward | |
| Carpenter..... | 1 00 |
| Prodigal Daughter: or, The Price | |
| of Virtue.....Rachel Campbell | 25 |
| The Worm Turns.....V. de Cleyre | 10 |
| The Emancipation of Society from | |
| Government.....Dallan Doyle | 05 |
| Roosevelt, Czolgosz, and Anarch- | |
| ism.....Jay Fox | 03 |
| Hilda's Home. Cloth \$1..... | |
|Rosa Gaul | 50 |
| Moribund Society and Anarchy. | |
| Cloth 60c.....Jean Grave | 25 |
| Motherhood in Freedom. Harman | |
| Origin of Anarchism.....C. L. James | 05 |
| Government Analyzed.....Kelso | 50 |
| Anarchism: Its Philosophy and | |
| Ideal.....Peter Kropotkin | 05 |
| Anarchist Communism: Its Ba- | |
| sis and Principles..... | 05 |
| An Appeal to the Young..... | 05 |
| Anarchist Morality..... | 05 |
| Expropriation..... | 05 |
| Field, Factory and Workshop..... | 45 |
| Law and Authority..... | 05 |
| Memoirs of a Revolutionist..... | 2.00 |
| Mutual Aid, a Factor in Evolu- | |
| tion..... | 2.00 |
| Organized Vengeance..... | 03 |
| Paris Commune..... | 05 |
| The State: Its Historic Role..... | 10 |
| The Wage System. Revolution- | |
| ary Government..... | 05 |
| Resist Not Evil. By Clarence S. | |
| Darrow.....Cloth..... | 75 |
| Social Democracy in Germany..... | |
|Gustave Landauer | 02 |
| History of the Commune. Cloth..... | |
|Lissagaray | 75 |
| Wind-Harp Songs.....J. Wm. Lloyd | 1.00 |
| The Economics of Anarchy..... | |
|Dyer D. Lum | 25 |
| Anarchy. (Is It All a Dream?) | |
| Jas. F. Morton, Jr.).....Malatesta | 10 |
| A Talk about Anarchist Commu- | |
| nism between two Workers..... | 05 |
| A Chambermaid's Diary..... | |
|Octave Mirbeau | 50 |
| God and Government: The Siamese | |
| Twins of Superstition.....W. Nevill | 05 |
| The Pyramid of Tyranny..... | |
|F. Domela Nieuwehuis | 05 |
| Mating or Marrying, Which?..... | |
|W. H. Van Ornum | 05 |
| Evolution and Revolution.....Reclus | 05 |
| Pure Economy.....J. H. Rowell | 10 |
| Pages of Socialist History..... | |
|W. Tcherkesoff | 30 |
| The Slavery of Our Times. Cloth..... | |
|Leo Tolstoy | 75 |
| Our Worship of Primitive Social | |
| Guesses.....E. C. Walker | 15 |
| Revival of Puritanism..... | 10 |
| Vice: Its Friends and Foes..... | 15 |
| What the Young Need to Know..... | 10 |
| The Ballad of Reading Gaol..... | |
|Oscar Wilde | 10 |
| Life Without a Master. 336 pp. | |
| Cloth \$1.50.....J. Wilson | 1.00 |
| The New Dispensation. Cloth..... | 1.50 |
| The Coming Woman.....Lillie White | 05 |
| Anarchism and Outrage..... | 03 |
| Anarchy on Trial..... | 05 |
| The Chicago Martyrs: The Fam- | |
| ous Speeches of the Eight Anarch- | |
| ists in Judge Gary's Court; and | |
| Altgeld's Reasons for Pardoning | |
| Fielden, Neebe, and Schwab..... | 25 |

History of the French Revolution.

— BY —

C. L. JAMES.

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

Justice, Wilmington, Del., says of it:

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

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

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

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

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

ABE ISAAK Jr., 331 Walnut St., 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.

PRICE \$2.75.

SEND ORDERS TO FREE SOCIETY.

MORIBUND SOCIETY
AND ANARCHY.

Translated from the French of

JEAN GRAVE

By VOLTAIRINE DE CLEYRE

CONTENTS:

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

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

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

Send orders to FREE SOCIETY

FIELD, FACTORY AND WORKSHOP.

BY PETER KROPOTKIN.

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

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

Order from FREE SOCIETY.

COLLEGE of MEDICINE
& SURGERY, Chicago

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

FLORENCE DRESSLER, M. D., Sec'y
243-247 Ashland Ave., Chicago, Ill