



A PERIODICAL OF ANARCHIST THOUGHT, WORK, AND LITERATURE.

VOL. X. NO. 6.

CHICAGO, SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1903.

WHOLE NO. 400.

Belgravia by Night.

(From "Songs of the Army of the Night.")

"MOVE ON!"

"The foxes have holes,
And the birds of the air have nests,
But where shall the heads of the sons of men
Be laid, be laid?"

"Where the cold corpse rests,
Where the sightless moles
Burrow and yet cannot make it afraid,
Rout but cannot wake it again,
There shall the heads of the sons of men
Be laid, be laid!"

—Francis Adams.

— o —

Place of Anarchism in Socialistic Evolution.

PART I

You must often have asked yourselves what is the cause of Anarchism, and why, since there are already so many Socialist schools, it is necessary to found an additional one—that of Anarchism. In order to answer this question I will go back to the close of the eighteenth century.

You all know the characteristics which marked that epoch: there was an expansion of intelligence, a prodigious development of the natural sciences, a pitiless examination of accepted prejudices, the formation of a theory of nature based on a truly scientific foundation, observation and reasoning. In addition to these there was criticism of the political institutions bequeathed to humanity by preceding ages, and a movement towards that ideal of liberty, equality, and fraternity which has in all times been the ideal of the popular masses. Fettered in its free development by despotism and by the narrow selfishness of the privileged classes, this movement, being at the same time favored by an explosion of popular indignation, engendered the great Revolution which had to force its way thru the midst of a thousand obstacles both without and within.

The Revolution was vanquished, but its ideas remained. Tho at first persecuted and derided, they became the watchword of a whole century of slow evolution. The history of the nineteenth century is summed up in an effort to put in practise the principles elaborated at the end of the eighteenth: this is the lot of revolutions: tho vanquished they establish the course of the evolution which follows them. In the domain of politics these ideas are abolition of aristocratic privileges, abolition of personal government, and equal-

ity before the law. In the economic order the Revolution proclaimed freedom of business transactions; it is said—"Sell and buy freely. Sell, all of you, your products, if you can produce, and if you do not possess the implements necessary for that purpose, but have only your arms to sell, sell them, sell your labor to the highest bidder, the State will not interfere! Compete among yourselves, contractors! No favor shall be shown, the law of natural selection will take upon itself the function of killing off those who do not keep pace with the progress of industry, and will reward those who take the lead."

The above is at least the *theory* of the Revolution of 1789, and if the State intervenes in the struggle to favor some to the detriment of others, as we have lately seen when the monopolies of mining and railway companies have been under discussion, such action is regarded by the liberal school as a lamentable deviation from the grand principles of the Revolution.

What has been the result? You know only too well, both women and men, idle opulence for a few and uncertainty for the morrow and misery for the greater number; crises and wars for the conquest of markets, and a lavish expenditure of public money to find openings for industrial speculators. All this is because in proclaiming liberty of contract an essential point was neglected by our fathers. Not but what some of them caught sight of it, the best of them earnestly desired but did not dare to realize it. While liberty of transactions, that is to say a conflict between the members of society, was proclaimed, the contending parties were not equally matched, and the powerful, armed for the contest by the means inherited from their fathers, have gained the upper hand over the weak. Under such conditions the millions of poor ranged against a few rich could not do otherwise than give in.

Comrades! you have often asked yourselves: "Whence comes the wealth of the rich? Is it from their labor?" It would be a mockery to say that it was so. Let us suppose that M. Rothschild has worked all his life: well, you also, every one of you working-men have also labored: then why should the fortune of M. Rothschild be measured by hundreds of millions while your possessions

are so small? The reason is simple: you have exerted yourselves to produce by your own labor, while M. Rothschild has devoted himself to accumulating the product of the labor of others—the whole matter lies in that.

But someone may say to me: "How comes it that millions of men thus allow the Rothschilds and the Mackays to appropriate the fruit of their labor?" Alas, they cannot help themselves under the existing social system! But let us picture to our minds a city all of whose inhabitants find their lodging, clothing, food and occupation secured to them, on condition of producing things useful to the community, and let us suppose a Rothschild to enter this city bringing with him a cask full of gold. If he spends his gold it will diminish rapidly; if he locks it up it will not increase, because gold does not grow like seed, and after the lapse of a twelvemonth he will not find £110 in his drawer if he only put £100 into it. If he sets up a factory and proposes to the inhabitants of the town that they should work in it for four shillings a day while producing to the value of eight shillings a day they reply: "Among us you'll find no one willing to work on those terms. Go elsewhere and settle in some town where the unfortunate people have neither clothing, bread, nor work assured to them, and where they will consent to give up to you the lion's share of the result of their labor in return for the barest necessities of life. Go where men starve! There you will make your fortune!"

The origin of the wealth of the rich is your misery. Let there be no poor, then we shall have no millionaires.

The facts I have just stated were such as the Revolution of the eighteenth century did not comprehend or else could not act upon. That Revolution placed face to face two opposing ranks, the one consisting of a hungry, ill-clad army of former serfs, the other of men well provided with means. It then said to these two arrays: "Fight out your battle." The unfortunate were vanquished. They possessed no fortunes, but they had something more precious than all the gold in the world—their arms; and these arms, the source of all wealth, were monopolized by the wealthy. Thus we have seen those immense fortunes, which are the characteristic feature

of our age spring up on all sides. A king of the eighteenth century, "the great Louis the Fourteenth" of mercenary historians, would never have dreamed of possessing a fortune such as are held by those kings of the nineteenth century, the Vanderbilts and the Mackays.

On the other hand we have seen the poor reduced still more and more to toil for others, and while those who produced on their own account have rapidly disappeared, we find ourselves compelled under an ever increasing pressure to labor more and more to enrich the rich. Attempts have been made to remove these evils. Some have said: "Let us give equal instruction to all," and forthwith education has been spread abroad. Better human machines have been turned out, but these educated machines still labor to enrich others. This illustrious scientist, that renowned novelist, despite their education are still beasts of burden to the capitalist. Instruction improves the cattle to be exploited but the exploitation remains. Next, there was great talk about association, but the workers soon learned that they could not get the better of capital by associating their miseries, and those who cherished this illusion most earnestly were compelled to turn to Socialism.

Timid, at the outset, Socialism spoke at first in the name of Christian sentiment and morality; men profoundly imbued with the moral principles of Christianity—principles which it possesses in common with all other religions—came forward and said: "A Christian has no right to exploit his brethren!" But the ruling classes laughed in their faces with the reply: "Teach the people Christian resignation, tell them in the name of Christ that they should offer their left cheek to whosoever smites them on the right, then you will be welcome; as for the dreams of equality which you find in Christianity, go and meditate on your discoveries in prison."

Later on Socialism spoke in the name of governmentalism; it said: "Since it is the special mission of the State to protect the weak against the strong, it is its duty to aid workingmen's associations; the State alone can enable workingmen to fight against capital and to oppose to capitalistic exploitation the free workshop of workers pocketing the entire value of the produce of their labor." To this the bourgeoisie replied with grape-shot in 1848.

It was not until between twenty to thirty years later, at a time when the popular masses were invited to express their mind in the International Workingmen's Association, that Socialism spoke in the name of the people, and formulating itself little by little in the congresses of the great Association, and later on among its successors, arrived at some such conclusion as the following:

All accumulated wealth is the product of the labor of all—of the present and of all preceding generations. This hall in which we are now assembled derives its value from the fact that it is situated in Paris—this magnificent city built by the labors of twenty

successive generations. If this same hall were conveyed amid the snows of Siberia its value would be next to nothing. The machinery which you have invented and patented bears within itself the intelligence of five or six generations and is only possessed of value because it forms part of that immense whole that we call the progress of the nineteenth century. If you send your lace-making machine among the natives of New Guinea it will become valueless. We defy any man of genius of our times to tell us what share his intellect has had in the magnificent deductions of the book, the work of talent which he has produced! Generations have toiled to accumulate facts for him, his ideas have perhaps been suggested to him by a locomotive crossing the plains, as for elegance of design he has grasped it while admiring the Venus of Milo or the work of Murillo, and finally, if his book exercises any influence over us, it does so, thanks to all the circumstances of our civilization.

Everything belongs to all! We defy anyone soever to tell us what share of the general wealth is due to each individual. See the enormous mass of appliances which the nineteenth century has created; behold those millions of iron slaves which we call machines, and which plane and saw, weave and spin for us, separate and combine the raw materials, and work the miracles of our times. No one has the right to monopolize any one of these machines and to say to others: "This is mine, if you wish to make use of it you must pay me a tax on each article you produce," any more than the feudal lord of the middle ages had the right to say to the cultivator: "This hill and this meadow are mine and you must pay me tribute for every sheaf of barley you bind, and on each haystack you heap up."

All belongs to everyone! And as each man and woman contributes his or her share of labor for the production of necessary objects, they have a right to share in all that is produced by everybody.—P. Kropotkin.

Thoughts.

"Dare to do right, dare to be true."

This line from an old Sunday school song comes to me now and then when I hear people excusing themselves for acting one way while believing another. And I think there would be a grand awakening if even one half the people could and would express their *real* sentiments.

This train of thought was started by hearing a prominent Freethought lecturer say on the public platform, "We all believe more than we dare say"; and a little later a supposedly conventional young lady expressed herself as decidedly opposed to the marriage system, and said that until she met other than the conventional man, she should be careful to form no attachments.

Later still, an intelligent man writes from a western State, saying: "I am a recent convert to Anarchism and want to know more about it and the people who believe in it."

There are thousands of men and women

in a state of revolt, owing to the sufferings imposed by the recent "hold up" by the coal barons, and now is the time to place our literature in their hands.

At a recent meeting of the Socialists in this city the speakers gave out some most excellent Anarchist idea and barring the fact that they expect to obtain liberty by the ballot, their arguments are sane and sound.

It does seem queer to hear them declare for the liberty of the *whole* people and then in the next breath say: "As soon as a majority of the people declare for Socialism we will force the rest to accept it." That's it—force is behind every form of government, and what is force but tyranny?

Talk of giving freedom to others! It cannot be done. We must first free ourselves from the superstitions of religion, and government, to learn that each and all are subject to the natural laws of the universe, and suffer from mistakes.

Every person should hold himself in the attitude of a learner, being ever honest with himself and true to the light that shines for him. We Anarchists have no cut and dried creed that we ask people to accept with or without evidence. We say that every man or woman who declares for justice, and liberty, and love, belongs of right to our brotherhood, no matter by what name they are called. And let us remember—

"Dare to do right, dare to be true!
You have a work that no other can do."

MYRA PEPPER.

Kansas City, Mo., 4015 Locust St.

— o —

Restraint vs. Government.

The question as to what would or should follow the abolition of the present regime commonly called the State, or the capitalistic State, is one that is now engaging the attention of political reformers of all grades and shades of opinion. Some of these who call themselves "Socialists," "Social Democrats" or "State Socialists," would, by voting, capture the present machinery of government, including what are called the "trusts"—the railways, the telegraph lines, the telephones, mines of coal and other useful minerals; the factories, packing-houses, warehouses, banking institutions, farms, orchards, grazing lands, etc., etc., and have these all operated by "the government" for the benefit of the whole people instead of the comparative few—as now.

Another class of reformers equally honest and earnest, sometimes termed Anarchists, call the scheme thus briefly outlined, "paternal government," and will have none of it, but advocate instead simply the removal of all government—all man-made laws that limit or control individual action, leaving it to the natural sense of justice and to the influence of human sympathy—care for others—to keep people from robbing and murdering each other.

To my thinking this latter plan is all right—in theory, and as between the two schemes just named I much prefer the second, but is there not a more practicable way than either, and one that would appeal to the common sense of those who fear any and all radical changes in governmental affairs? We all admit that children and insane people should be cared for and restrained from

injuring themselves and others until they have learned enough to govern their own acts, and to respect the rights of others.

If we were all born as sane and as nearly perfect as to type as are the beasts and birds in a state of nature, there would be little need of compulsory restraint upon the actions of anyone, but unfortunately, as we all know, under the meddling interference of invasive government, government of priests and political bosses called judges, legislators, etc., most of us have been deprived of our natural right to be well born—our right to be born *sane*, born with a sound mind in a sound body. Some of us, for instance, are born kleptomaniacs; some born with homicidal proclivities so strong that they would rather fight and kill their fellow human beings, any day, than sit down to the enjoyment of a good dinner. Few of us are born sufficiently normal, sufficiently sane, that at some period of our lives we do not need compulsory restraint to keep us from seriously hurting ourselves or our friends and neighbors.

For these reasons, and to bridge over the *interregnum* that must necessarily follow the abolishment of outside government—government of man by man on the one hand, and real self-government on the other—the period that will be needed by *free motherhood*, free and consciously responsible motherhood, in order to supply the world with a race of truly sane, really self-reliant and self-governing human beings, during this *interregnum* we shall need, as I very honestly think, cooperative associations of individuals, strictly voluntary associations, that could rightfully be called “the Restraint,” to take the place of our present plutocratic governments, our invasive and tyrannical monarchic, aristocratic, democratic-republican governments.

In *FREE SOCIETY* dated Dec. 28, 1902, appeared certain comments by C. L. James, upon an article of mine previously printed in *Lucifer*, of this city, which article was written in reply to Emma Goldman's strictures upon my advocacy of “Restraint” as a substitute for the thing now technically called the government. In that article I showed that both from etymology and from rational usage the two words were radically different, and should not be confounded one with the other. The comments of Mr. James were so unfair, his quotations so partial and unjust, that I hereby ask the readers of *FREE SOCIETY* to allow me to give them, in my own language, a fair statement of what I have been teaching for many years upon this very important question. Free of charge I will send to all applicants one or two copies of *Lucifer* containing replies to James and others on the question of what should follow the abolition of the State—big S—as we now have it, or as it has us!

M. HARMAN.

Literature.

THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION. By Karl Kautsky. Chas. H. Kerr & Co., Chicago. 189 pp. Cloth, 50 cents.

Karl Kautsky's “The Social Revolution,” lately translated by A. M. and May Wood Simons, is a volume which every lover of liberty should read; firstly because it is one more statement of what political Socialism

aims at, and secondly because it shows plainly what opportunism and change of base are doing to make rickety that structure which Karl Marx and Engels thought to be a final edifice of economic truth.

In the first part of the book the author shows us clearly enough that constitutional means and the measures which are commonly known as reform measures can effect nothing materially for the better, as they do not promise to interfere with the triumphant progress of capitalistic production. The cessation of exploitation is rightly fixed upon as fundamental to social well being; and Kautsky of course, being a “scientific” Socialist, declares that nothing less than the capture of the State by the proletariat will suffice to bring economic exploitation to an end and furnish the grounds for a settlement of social problems in general. The evils of the existing State he concedes with interest; but the fact that the State, any State, is in itself exploitation and robbery, does not appeal, it appears, to either his mind or imagination. The capture of the State, the conquest of political power—these are the first supreme objects of effort with Kautsky.

Early in the book its author repeats the contradiction that capitalistic production is exploitive in its nature and tends to degrade the individual exploited, and that *therefore* the Socialist State will come into being as a good evolution from it. Can that, we ask, which is evil essentially become that which is good essentially? Can we justly say that a thing is bad and in the same breath declare that still it is in its nature progressive? Nothing but Hegelian dialectics can save the argument in this juncture it would seem. Yet Kautsky is an orthodox Marxist, and as such he must of course repeat all the old formulas; and if the facts do not fit the theory of economic fatalism so much the worse for the facts. Kautsky does, however, concede that Marx was in error in pointing to England as the scene of the future proof of evolution in the sphere of capitalism; England having disappointed expectation by calmly refusing to occupy the stage as the transformer of greed into State control of production. Plentiful evidence having been adduced by Tcherkesoff showing that the Marxist formula, the expropriation of the smaller capitalists by the larger, is based upon a profound error, Kautsky does not enlarge upon it, but suggests that strikes, wars, cooperatives, and the conquest of political power will all be means of overthrowing capitalism which the proletariat may use. This reminds one that Tolstoy in a recent work solemnly adjures his fellow Russians to not leave their farms in obedience to Hegel-Marxist formulas, to not fall into the miserable error of thinking that they must all be first expropriated by capitalism before the day of justice and freedom can come. Kautsky is altogether at a disadvantage in trying to save the edifice of “scientific” Socialism from falling to pieces, but he does the best that he can.

The latter part of the book deals with “The Day After the Revolution,” and begins by admitting that things cannot all be changed at once thru the capture of the State by the proletariat. There will still be money, mortgages, wages, oh yes! capital-

istic production, State bonds, compensation of the expropriated, and all the rest. In fact, opportunism, which will be turned out of doors by the uncompromising battle of the proletariat ending in the capture of State, will calmly come in again by the window after the victory and occupy her old place with all the familiar honors. Kautsky is modest in laying down his program, but it would save him trouble if he could judge the future of State Socialism by the past of all political action; and could see how opportunism has always risen as a rock to sink the ship of reform, and draw an inference from the facts applicable to the prospect. But induction is for “Utopians,” for we who know nothing. Kautsky, following Marx, who followed Hegel, cannot see it in this way. According to our author, tho, the small farmers will not be disturbed in the process of forcible expropriation; so the followers of Marx at his worst may cease the unpleasant task of advising them to aid the exploitation of themselves in every possible way.

To show finally how far Kautsky has receded from the position taken in a former book, “The Basis of Social Democracy,” to show how equivocal this “scientific” Socialism can become under the stress of libertarian criticism, let us read two passages from two books, the first book being this new “Social Revolution.”

“The most manifold forms of property in the means of production—national, municipal, cooperatives of consumption and production, and private can exist beside each other in a Socialist society—the most diverse forms of industrial organization, bureaucratic, trades union, cooperative and individual; the most diverse forms of remuneration of labor, fixed wages, time wages, piece wages, participation in the economics in raw material, machinery, etc., participation in the results of intensive labor; the most diverse forms of circulation of products, like contracts by purchase from the warehouses of the State, from municipalities, from cooperatives of production, from producers themselves, etc., etc. The same manifold character of economic mechanism that exists today is possible in a Socialistic society.”

Now compare this, from “The Basis of Social Democracy”:

“Socialist production is not compatible with liberty of work; that is to say, with the worker's freedom to work when or how he likes. . . . It is true, under the rule of capitalism a worker still enjoys liberty up to a certain degree. If he does not quite like a factory, he can find work elsewhere. In a Socialist society all the means of production will be concentrated by the State, and the latter will be the only employer; there will be no choice. The workman today enjoys more liberty than he will possess in a Socialist society.”

With these two contradictory passages staring each other helplessly in the face, and waiting for Marxist dialectics to harmonize them, let us leave Kautsky for the present.

W. F. BARNARD.

— o —
The State began in aggression, developed in aggression, and is aggression today. “Can the leopard change his spots?”—*Ironicus*.

FREE SOCIETY

Formerly THE FIREBRAND.

Published Weekly by..... I. ISAAC.

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 8, 1903.

400

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.

For announcements of meetings, see eighth page, first column.

Outpost Echoes.

Weaklings need a god.
Experience makes us men.
Only the free can truly enjoy.
Law was made for its makers.
We must restrain the restrainers.
Liberty never goes in leading strings.
Love will have a chance when hate is dead.
Benevolent authority is the worst of authorities.

The pursuit of ideals is a practical aim for real men.

He who will not trust others cannot himself be trusted.

Why should we punish our children for being like ourselves?

No man ever made an honest living at using his fellow beings.

Corruption is rampant in Cuba. So soon, and with a democracy?

Crime will cease when that greatest of crimes, the State, ceases.

It is not enough to believe in liberty; we must concede it to others.

Every politician has his price; some have two, according to your purse.

Those who live by a code will die intellectually and emotionally intestate.

He who repudiates authority may then fall back upon his manhood. Crime is government.

Economic determinism seems to have become quite an indeterminate factor in social evolution.

FREE SOCIETY

The hope of the world is the spirit of its rebels; even every truth must fight a battle with the reigning lies.

Those dilettante, the charitable, are finding it rather expensive to keep a benevolent heart; but the thing is fashionable.

It is hard to make the slave love liberty, but the task that we have set ourselves to accomplish is nothing other than this.

General Booth and Mark Hanna are friends. One makes the poor, the other saves them, and both get a profit out of it.

Those who live in the past are dead to the present, and to the future as well. The dead should not be buried minus their codes.

Major Glenn has been acquitted by the courts, but if Major Glenn can repent he will never be able to acquit himself of inhumanity.

Karl Kautsky's book, "The Social Revolution," pictures a revolution without revolt. While condemning opportunism it embraces it.

The wheat corner has fallen; but J. Ogden Armour still holds his place in commercial circles. Thieves never dare repudiate each other.

All law is mob law; that is it was framed by those who had the power, not the right; and its sole means of enforcement is brute force.

The world is large enough and fruitful enough to make us all happy; the trouble is that we have made exploiters of a few fellow beings.

In freedom man can discover himself, and that is all that he will need; in slavery man can neither discover himself nor rightly know his masters.

Theodore has exchanged privileges with Edward; Edward engages to call Germany off in Venezuela, and Theodore will give Edward a piece of Alaska in return.

Woman was not made for man any more than man was made for woman. Let this be realized, and all attempt to coerce humanity thru sex regulation will seem an impertinence.

Alone with nature; in her primeval forests, or climbing her towering mountains, man feels the blood of a freeman flowing thru his veins; why should social life then enslave him?

There is no difference between cannibalism and the killing and enslaving of weaker peoples in order to acquire their possessions, except that in the latter case we eat them alive.

General McArthur says that war always contributes to the happiness of mankind. To the happiness of part of mankind, you should have said, general. Some murderers it is true, do enjoy their deeds.

Arbitration is unthinkable between a slave and his master. A slave is a slave however much his slavery may be ameliorated. Arbitration is possible between equal powers only. The miners are not arbitrating.

Those who find fault with the faultfinders are either the comfortable, those who expect to be comfortable, or else those whom slavery has made love their chains. The faultfinders are social life-preservers.

The man who loves liberty makes no war upon society; he wishes society to become a possibility, and opposes anti-social acts. The enemy of society is one who preserves it with his lips while he destroys it thru his rapacity.

AMERICUS.

By the Wayside.

Brother Harman's article, "Restraint vs. Government," shows that he has not read to advantage the discussion between Mr. Simpson and C. L. James: which puts the latter in the position of having to repeat all that has been said by him on the subject recently.

"Organized Vengeance"—Philistines call it "justice"—has been "vindicated." Herman Helsher must serve six years and nine months in the penitentiary, altho the injured one—Comrade Voltairine de Cleyre—refused to prosecute him and pleaded for his freedom. What a lesson for the would-be Christians who accuse the Anarchists of "bloodthirstiness"!

William Morris once said, on hearing it stated that it required fifteen years to pass a law in favor of labor, that fifty would be more correct. But it does not take very long to knock a labor law out. The Supreme Courts of Maryland and Indiana "finished" two of them recently. They were "unconstitutional" of course.

The chief of Police of Paris, France, intends to invite the chief cities of Europe and America to send delegates to Paris for the purpose of finding ways and means to deal with the Anarchists; and a Minneapolis newspaper hopes that measures will be taken which will "exterminate every Anarchist who dares to show his head." Here is another job for the fool-killer.

But in spite of the brainless editors and arrogant blue-coats an "awakening" is taking place which soon may relieve the governments of the ungrateful task of exterminating those who stand for freedom and humanity. Only recently a Detroit millionaire, Clarence A. Black, arraigned (before a church audience) society in general and the commercial spirit rampart in the Church in particular, vindicating at the same time the revolutionists. Church and State, he said, have always been against reformers and revolutionists. "They regarded Christ as a 'dangerous character,' a political agitator, a preacher of Anarchy. His followers were regarded as firebrands and as utterly feared as ever was the follower of the red flag of modern times."

The Mirror (St. Louis), a journal for "thinking people," states that we may expect abject poverty, ignorance, and misery to be always with us, "it is our duty to relieve their intensity"; which does not indicate that the editor possesses a very deep thinking cap. Up-to-date thinkers have come to the conclusion that it is "our duty" to relieve the intensity of the rich and the strenuousness of the rulers in order to establish a healthy equilibrium. So soon as

the producers understand that the gulf between rich and poor exists merely by virtue of their own superstitious belief in government, which by violence upholds monopoly in the means of life; "abject poverty and misery" will pass into oblivion.

If the editor of the *Union Leader*, who is now under the ban of the Socialists because he favors the candidacy of Clarence S. Darrow for mayor, will but invest a few cents in Karl Kautsky's new book, "The Social Revolution," it will be quite a consolation to him to find that he is a back number among the Socialists, as far as "training and compromising with capitalism" is concerned. For according to Kautsky, "God Almighty" in his impenetrable wisdom, which is now embraced by the "scientific" Socialists under the name of "Economic Determinism," has decided that, after the Social Democrats have captured the government, *the taxes of the rich must be raised, the wages of the workers increased*, and "perhaps"—altho this is not certain—the "Socialist regime" will also *lower the mortgage burdens of the farmers!* And this is no joke, workers. The Socialists actually promise to bestow these blessings upon you if you will vote them into power.

"Perhaps you folks don't know how amusing it is to observe the proceedings of a political party," said an ex-Socialist the other day. "There are, say, thirty-five members of the 'Central Committee' present, to determine the destiny of mankind. But Simons and Morgan, the leading spirits, are at odds as to the shortest road to State Socialism, and while they are hair-splitting, Comrades Burness, Miller, and Schulze are taking a nap. Finally a rising vote is taken, and the secretary finds that the foes are equally divided—16 against 16. But the secretary is in favor of Comrade Simon's proposition, and so he suggests a recount. Mr. Simon's friends again rise, but their number has not increased. In his agony, Comrade Klencke notices that his neighbor is snoring and quickly pulls him by the arm. Comrade Schulze jumps to his feet—'17! Carried!' exclaims the secretary. Comrade Schulze does not know what is going on and is much confused, and when he is told that his vote has defeated Comrade Morgan he sneaks away in a hurry, for he had promised to stand by the latter. So you see, in many instances the sleeping man rules the party."

INTERLOPER.

At the Chicago Philosophical Society.

Last Sunday Dr. Juliet Séverences spoke on "Thomas Paine," who, according to the lecturer, had done a great deal more for the liberation of the American colonies from England than George Washington and others. His "Common Sense" leaflets had silenced the Tories and inspired the Revolutionists with enthusiasm. He had also clearly foreseen that a republic was no safeguard against oppression, hence the provision in the "Declaration of Independence," and his warnings not to trust too much in governments in any form. But the Americans had not been vigilant, and today there was more tyranny

in this country than in England. People were being hung for speaking the truth, as the monument at Waldheim could testify.

There was little criticism made this time. It was pointed out however, that, altho Thomas Paine had been a great man in his time, sociology had largely advanced since then, and that experience with democratic representative governments had conclusively shown that all governments were essentially alike and had to be abolished before the social problem could near a solution.

Sunday, Feb. 8, W. F. Barnard will give us his views on "Man and his Work," a subject which ought to attract a large audience.

REPORTER.

Report.

Comrades,—I wish to acknowledge receipt of the following sums sent to me for the defense of Herman Helther:

WM. D. DENTON, Philadelphia.....	\$1.00
L. CLARENCE ARMSTRONG, Boston.....	50
FLORENCE WESTRUP, Chicago.....	1.00
W. E. HENDRIC, Toronto.....	1.00
D. S. CRYSTAL, Toronto.....	50
B. GINVERT, Denver.....	1.00
SACRAMENTO GROUP, California.....	4.00
A. JOHNSON, San Francisco.....	1.00
WORKINGMEN'S EDUCATIONAL CLUB, Chicago.....	4.80

Total, \$14.80

The money has been turned over to Mr. Feinberg, brother-in-law of the sufferer, and has been used in his defense. Of that defense, and the judge's savage sentence I cannot at present bring myself to write.

Most of those who have sent money sent kind inquiries for my health. I feel quite well, considering all things.

VOLTAIRINE DE CLEYRE.

People should not be deceived. It was never intended that all men should be good. Only a portion of the people, the fools, are to obey the laws, pay other people's debts, reverence their masters, worship God, and wait for their inheritance on the other side. The fools, we repeat, do these things. The wise men take the good things of earth as they go along. They fare sumptuously and live like princes every day. They do not bother their heads about the kingdom of heaven or the world to come.—J. Wilson.

I don't believe in charity. It is merely another drink to a shaky man. What the world needs is justice and not benevolence. I shall continue to decline to give checks to the eleemosynary institutions and I shall leave no money to build churches and found libraries. My family will be well provided for, but the rest of my fortune, after my death, as well as before, will be spent in trying to teach people how to stop me, and men like me, from robbing them. So long as it is permitted to any man to take what doesn't belong to him thru monopolizing nature's resources, and the private ownership of public utilities, plenty of men of my kind will always be ready to step in and do the stealing. My mission is to show the people how it is done, to take what they are stupid enough to let me take, and show them how they can put an end to the system which enriches me and impoverishes them.—Tom L. Johnson.

A Vindication of Anarchism.

III (concluded.)

The orthodox economists define capital as wealth employed to produce more wealth. But those mighty aggregations of capital, by which it is well known among men of business that our Vanderbilts and Rockefellers are only hired, absolutely do not consist in wealth at all. One of George's great merits was to point out this. The capital consists in bonds, that is interest-bearing obligations for wealth long since destroyed in such wasteful operations as war. And thus the Marx-Engels school reach, as George himself, reasoning from the same first principles, does also, this delightful *reductio ad absurdum* that a Rothschild is not a capitalist! But Marx himself would never have fallen into such a blunder. He knew and taught with emphasis that capital is not wealth employed to produce more wealth; but wealth, or something which serves its own possessor as well, employed to exploit labor. (See his famous chapter on "Capital and Wage Labor.") A Rothschild is the typical capitalist. He is a capitalist—and nothing else; while the manager of a productive business is a capitalist and something more. We may see then that the income of the latter is derived from various sources, which fall into two classes, one legitimate the other illegitimate; one having the character of benefits done the consumer,* who accordingly pays for them; the other of injuries done the consumer, who has no motive to pay for them, and when he does so must have been either robbed or swindled. Under the first head come material increase of wealth by the use of previously existing wealth, assurance against the peril of losing it, wages of superintendence, and that part of profits† which is derived from the novelty

* I avoid on principle saying the laborer. The Consumer is universal man, whose interest alone has any business to be considered in an argument addressed to the interested feelings of universal man. The orthodox economist, by always taking the capitalist's point of view; the State Socialists, by always taking the (wage) laborers', are both guilty of an one-sidedness which the coming Anarchistic economy must correct.

† The principal orthodox economists were very great men. Their genius, love of truth, and services to philosophy in general, but particularly to Anarchism, can be appreciated only by those familiar with the extravagant errors and superstitions which encumbered their subject before they instituted a reform. It is remarkable, however, that, partly for reasons traced with signal felicity by Buckle in his two last chapters, they all adopted the deductive method. This was the source of their errors; and is the starting point of that reaction begun by Mill, and carried so much further by the historical school of Roscher. Among the faults of the deductive method, a conspicuous one is that while assuming great precision of language, and even sneering at inductive phraseology as loose, it inevitably leads to vagueness and confusion of thought (except in mathematics). For outside the pure mathematics, whose subject is a mere creation of the human mind, we have no definite ideas given *a priori*. We arrive at such ideas in the natural sciences only by a slow experimental analysis. Until in this manner we get down to mathematics, we know our subjects imperfectly, and therefore ought to describe them loosely. The effect of defining them before we know adequately what they are, is only that we get ambiguous terms in a process where precision is indispensable. All which is illustrated by the common use of this word Profits. The orthodox economists vaguely saw that there is in the gains of capital an item which they could not well bring under any of their stereotyped heads—wages, interest, or assurance. This they called Profits. Induction teaches me that what they seem to mean by profits originates as stated in the text. But the word is such a dubious catch-all that I was content to affirm this of a part of profits.

of a productive operation conceivable only by an original enterprising man. Under the second head come those operations which take out of the public pocket without putting anything in. Of course, I except those which give the public innocent pleasure sufficient to be paid for voluntarily. To invest money in a theater is not to exploit the consumer. But to invest money in slaves, when the law permits, is to exploit the laborers who are the majority, and thus in a less degree to exploit the public. So it is to buy the bonds of a government, which the people are taxed to pay. So it is to hold a monopoly, such as that conferred by a protective tariff. And so, in conclusion, and principally, it is to invest in a business whose returns depend largely on every device by which capital may be employed to lower as much as practicable the remuneration of the common laborer.* If now we try to generalize the illegitimate gains of the capitalist and to give them a common name, we shall find, I think, that they represent, not, indeed, Interest, but the source of interest. What makes a rich man willing to pay interest on a deposit is that, since money represents all forms of wealth and therefore capital, it will give him all the exploiting power of any form.† Now, the exploiting power of capi-

tal in general, which must determine the rate of interest, is an average. The great majority of capitalists, we have seen, are devoured by a very small minority.* But the

sub. tit.) teaches first that all its speculations have been pervaded by the peculiarity of inquiring how wealth is accumulated, not how it is made available for consumption; or to speak more forcibly, the less precisely, reasoning from the capitalist's narrow instead of the consumer's all-comprising premises. I call this the Original Sin of Political Economy; first, because it is a born sin—there was no political economy, in any age, outside the bourgeois ranks—; secondly, because every improvement, such as the fall of that theory so significantly called Mercantile, consisted in partly getting over the primary error; thirdly, because getting over it entirely is impossible except on condition that Economy cease to be Political and become Anarchistic. Adam Smith showed the influence of the Original Sin when he asserted, with so much emphasis, that the immediate cause of the increase of capital is parsimony, not industry. Common sense shows that the only kind of capital which can be increased by parsimony is money. Nay, parsimony will never increase the total of money, but only the amount possessed by an individual, or, as the Mercantilists so much wished, the amount possessed by a nation. Now we need not mention another name than that of Adam Smith himself, to recall his signal proofs that money is only a medium of exchange—not identical with wealth, not identical with capital, nay, till it is invested, not capital at all. In direct opposition to his very inconsistent statement above cited, I assert that the immediate cause of the increase of capital is not parsimony but industry—a peculiar kind of industry, however, that is to say, invention. Capital began to exist when there was no parsimony, no money, and no possibility of growing rich by hoarding. Tools and weapons were the first "wealth employed to produce more wealth," and also the first capital, or wealth employed to exploit those who did not have it. And similarly, all later accumulations of capital sprang from new inventions. Except to facilitate applying them thru exchange of commodities, the accumulation of money has no economic function. As to Interest or Usury, theories about its origin are endless; but we may remark they are all pervaded by a vague notion that there is something immoral in it. How unequivocally this was taught by all early legislators and moralists, among them the Catholic clergy, may be found in any work which treats of the subject (see, for example, Lecky's "History of Rationalism"). That they were wrong will readily be admitted. They conceived usury to be an exaction from the necessity of distressed borrowers; a very inadequate explanation; and they advocated either its prohibition, or limitation of the rate by law, provisions unmixedly mischievous (see Bentham's "Defense of Usury"). But the economists who refuted these errors have never shown us what the true origin of usury is. Surely there can be no occasion to consider such rhetorical tropes as that "interest is the reward of abstinence"; and the analogy with hiring a horse or a wheelbarrow is not much better (see George's chapters on this subject in "Progress and Poverty"). However, as George's one-sided polemic against rent compelled him to defend capitalism and usury, he has enriched the literature of the subject with a new theory, which, though ingenious, appears to me wholly sophistical. (See Hanson, "Fallacies in Progress and Poverty.") The real origin of Interest (in Speculation, as indicated by my text) has been approached only by Anarchistic writers, who remarked its affinities with scarcity, and the dependence of scarcity, in modern times, upon monopoly. (Josiah Warren, "Equitable Commerce"; D. D. Lum, "Economics of Anarchy.") Of course, this is not to be confounded with the old fallacy about distressed borrowers. The borrowers whose demands fix the rate of interest, are rich speculators, mainly of the "forester and regreter" kind; but their prospects depend upon expected scarcity; and that, under the existing system, is almost altogether relative to "over, production" in the lines of thriving monopolies.

* The Marx-Engels school, adopting an old fallacy, exaggerate the effects of this process. (See a recent remarkable publication, "Pages of Socialist History," by W. Tcherkesoff.) They assume that the capitalist class is growing smaller; while uncontested statistics show that it is growing larger. The truth which makes this fallacy circulate is that the active capitalists are becoming fewer; the unsuccessful competitors submitting to be pensioned off as annuitants. The

average exploiting gains of this minority, over an insurance against risk of being in the devoured majority, constitutes, among the Titans of the financial pool, a reasonable expectation of gain by exploitation ("economic interest,") which fixes, "thru the higgling of the market," a lower current rate ("commercial interest"). Since rich men will pay this rate for loans, it follows also that poor men must. Interest falls with increase of wealth; with reduction of prices towards the cost of production effected by those financial battles in which the weaker go to the wall;* and with improved security involved in these processes.† Thus the interests of the capitalist as such, typified by the capitalist who is only a capitalist (the money lender), is opposed to that of others. It concerns the original producer, as such, that wages should be high; the merchant, as such that prices shall be high; the consumer, as such (that is everybody, as a consumer) that production and exchange should be active, an effect of high wages and prices, so all this together means good security, plentiful wealth, abundant credit, and the minimum of "shave" or middleman's gain between original producers whose demands give rise to all exchanges. But it concerns the usurer as such, that wages should be low, prices low, security bad, credit scarce. These are those conditions which favor the middle exploitation upon which he lives, which create demand for cash, raise interest, raise discounts, and promote forfeiture. His harvest is the season of financial panic. "Hard times" for others are good times for him.‡ Whereas the landlord, tho, as such, he is merely a leech sucking the blood of producers, can suck no blood which is not there; and whatever, except abolition of his

difference between this truth and the error springing from a misunderstanding of its nature, is very important to practical Socialism. The Marx-Engels school reasons that capitalists, becoming fewer, must be unable to resist nationalization of wealth; which, becoming more numerous, they are not. But the tyranny of the financial ogres is felt quite as keenly by the annuitant class as by any other; and when the time comes this class will be against, not with the "Money Power"; that is the little ring at London and Frankfurt which now controls the business of the world.

* Karl Marx (chapter on "Capital and Wage Labor") shows with much force and eloquence that it is the financial crisis, "tho they cause the most terrible calamities, and shake, like earthquakes, the foundations of bourgeois society," which effect reduction of prices to the cost of production.

† "Interest of assurance" required by the active, or employing capitalist, who is something else besides a capitalist, is not included in economic or commercial interest. But the latter are raised in analogous ways—"good interest means bad security." A proof that my view of the origin of interest is correct, may be deduced from the notorious fact that as prices approach the cost of production, and opportunities for speculation, which I hold to be the cause of interest, lessen, the rate of interest falls. It is the same process which gives stability to business, and makes good security accompany low rates of usury.

‡ The rate of interest, as distinguished from discount, falls after a commercial panic, owing to the discouragement which speculation has sustained. But it is high in countries like India where times are chronically hard, and the conditions of the text entirely fulfilled; as compared with what it is in prosperous countries. Otherwise, nothing here stated needs to be explained. The antagonism of the usurer's interest with the public's; the coincidence between the landlord's interest and other peoples'; have both been pointed out by orthodox economists ever since Ricardo formulated the law of rent under free competition. This is not a treatise on economy, or it may easily be supposed I would find more to say about such subjects.

* The first and greatest of orthodox economists well knew on how large a scale this is done. "Masters are always and everywhere in a sort of tacit, but constant and uniform combination, not to raise the wages of labor above their actual rate. To violate this combination is everywhere a most unpopular action, and a sort of reproach to a master among his neighbors and equals. We seldom, indeed, hear of this combination, because it is the usual, and, one may say, the natural state of things, which nobody ever hears of. Masters, too, sometimes enter into particular combinations to sink the wages of labor below even this rate." "Wealth of Nations," Bk. I, Ch. VIII, p. 28. The italics are mine. Adam Smith, the comprehensiveness of whose genius was its most remarkable quality, followed, like almost all the great thinkers of Scotland, deductive methods rather than inductive. (See on this subject Buckle, *cit. vol. II*, Ch. VI.) In the "Wealth of Nations" he assumes that all human action is founded on covetousness; and in order to push the consequences of this hypothesis as far as they will go, he takes a brief for covetousness, pleads its cause, and shows very ably to how great an extent "private vices are public benefits"; while, in his less known, but equally philosophical and better written "Theory of Moral Sentiments," he assumes that all human action is founded on sympathy—well knowing, I need not say, that of two hypotheses which thus pointedly contradict each other, neither could be more than half true; but aiming at approximate completeness of view by alternately developing each. The neglect into which the "Theory of the Moral Sentiments" fell, is what caused the "Wealth of Nations" to be once denounced as a gospel of Mammon; and when that folly was over, to be actually made such a text book of "pig philosophy" as it is very clear the author did not intend. Fairly interpreted, the "Wealth of Nations" says that the function of this cupidity in capitalists is to increase those accumulations of wealth upon which the extension of industry depends. The author by no means said, nor meant, as his "Theory of Moral Sentiments" shows, either that such a frame of mind is moral, or that granting it immoral, the sin would have no Nemesis. The Nemesis is now becoming very obvious. The wage laborers, being the majority, are the modern capitalist's best customers. In skinning them, he ruins his own market. The Nemesis is "over-production" and commercial panic; before which Sphinx our Trusts now stand, a very hesitating Edipus.

† The reader will perhaps perceive that my views concerning the beginning of both capital and interest are in some measure original; so that I cannot, as usual, cite authority of admitted value. They form, however, as I conceive, coherent parts of a system whose premises are supplied by received authority. The history of Political Economy (see Encyclopedia Britannica, article

aim to the land, would make others prosperous also makes him prosperous; so that his interest is, not indeed, as has often been said, identical, but coincident with that of his neighbors. It is now clear why the capitalist has always been quite as unpopular a character as the landlord. And equally clear it is that what makes him so depends on his being invested by law with that peculiar right of property as distinguished from possession—the *jus utere vel abutere* of Cicero, who plainly saw the evil tho he did not the remedy. This, indeed, we have still to say more about. My declared purpose at present was only to show that government is the stay of those evils we suffer from the capitalist as well as of those we suffer from the landlord.

It would doubtless be superfluous to show that government is the stay of such more easily analyzed abuses as taxes; tariffs; embargoes; wars; monopolies by charter, patent or "protection"; slavery and serfdom where they still exist; the coolie trade; the cruelties still practised in the name of justice and, for a greater scandal, charity; the law's delays and cost; the caste system, where it exists; the "subjection of women" in its double phase of marriage regulation and prostitution; or, in short, anything which at our stage of civilization represents spoliation and oppression of human beings by others, thus assimilating us to our ruder ancestors, who lived by cannibalism, robbery, or slave-catching. Some of these evils, like others, their congeners, shortly before becoming extinct, are not without champions; and, as my game is government alone, I will not enter into controversy with those disposed to defend them; but only remark that government's responsibility is equally acknowledged by those who attack them and those who defend. The former (except Anarchists) look to government for their abolition, thus tacitly or even openly charging it with their origin; in the true spirit of a fetish worshipper, who blames his idol for causing drought, of which it is innocent, and beats it when his prayers fail to obtain blessings which are not in its power. I, speaking in the name of Anarchism, do the poor thing more justice; I do not, for example, regard government as the cause of the coolie trade, whose source is in the economic condition of India and other countries, or Negro slavery, which was instituted by pirates. I accuse it only of perpetuating Negro slavery by endorsing "the statutes of the buccaneer," and coolie slavery by enforcing an inhuman species of contract which could not be made to hold without it. On the other hand, it once struck me as strange that the canons of divorce and marriage could be revered by one who saw how incongruous they are in contiguous States like Michigan and Indiana. But I ceased to wonder when I had fairly grasped the idea of government worship as a superstition. One set or the other must be very mischievous and immoral. But then they are equally "the law"; and the law, as such, has a divine sanction whatever it is.

That the evils thus perpetuated by government are very great will be disputed by no candid person who looks facts squarely in the face. A single one is of capital importance—the inequitable, which means some-

thing very different from the unequal distribution of wealth. For besides that humanity revolts at the suffering involved in poverty as it continues to exist in the richest spots of the world's richest empires; such poverty is incompatible with leisure and want of leisure with knowledge, which we have seen to be the measure of cultivation. The crimes and vices which appall possessors of wealth, and cause them to shudder at the possibilities of that vast explosive mass lying such a little way below their feet, are perpetuated by the system which condemns a majority to increasing toil, a large minority to severe privation, and a considerable minority to utter misery. False prophets who speak smooth things deny that there is any such system. They assert that wealth is produced by labor and secured by temperance; and that misery in a civilized community is only the natural punishment inseparable from the vice of idleness or of improvidence. But a man who thinks must needs conclude with John Stuart Mill that this is the reverse of the truth; that society is organized on the principle of enabling a minority to live luxuriously in idleness; that the producers, whom it is absurd to call idle, are condemned to poverty not by their own improvidence but their masters' injustice; that what is vaguely called Socialism has an unanswerable argument so long as we consider it only a criticism of existing institutions, and first becomes questionable when we examine its proposals to better them. Now with the exception of Anarchism, all such proposals turn upon the idea that government, hitherto admitted to have enslaved the masses, in democratic States as well as in monarchical and aristocratic, may yet, by choosing the right kind of legislature, be made the organ of the masses. The fallacies involved in such a program are, indeed, so numerous and so glaring that they might well confound the hopes of a thinking man like Mill. Logically, the suggestion seems pertinent that to govern is a transitive verb, and the idea of a system under which governors shall be identical with governed as absurd as that of a brace which shall enable a man to pick himself up by his own heels. Practically, we may hazard the observation, which it would indeed be easy to prove by most familiar and ordinary examples, that a law must either be above the popular standard, or on a par with it, or below it; that a law above that standard is a dead letter; that a law on a par with that standard is quite superfluous, since it only enjoins what the people are willing to do and to exact without it; and thus that the people are always better than the laws under which they live—none having any practical effect but those which are below the popular standard of the present, and, which bequeathed us by a less enlightened Past, exist, only because they are laws, until their incongruity with advancing civilization makes them actually intolerable. It seems to me that the whole delusion of governmental Socialism rests on ignorance of this truth—that no man who had firmly grasped the idea of a people's being as necessarily above their laws as the fountain is above the stream, could seriously think of making a great improvement in the people's condition by giving them more laws of any kind. One im-

portant reservation must, indeed, be made. Laws to repeal laws are generally good; accordingly it does sometimes happen that an enlightened legislature annuls some antiquated and barbarous enactment before the people demanded or even approved of such repeal. The effect may in some cases be beneficial; still, we may easily expect too much. To take quite a strong case, our own laws by which the disabilities of Negroes were abolished had the effect of showing that it is much easier to declare an institution dead than to kill it. But I need not enlarge on this; for State Socialism meditates no mere drawing back from ground which should never have been taken. And here again my usual program of referring to authorities admitted capital in their own branches of inductive science, encounters the difficulty that full recognition of every people's superiority to any system of law which can be made to work among them, is almost confined to Anarchists.* It is one of the few short steps, for, tho important, they are neither many nor long, which Anarchism has taken beyond the best thought outside of it. For abundant evidences of its legitimacy, drawn by the most competent social scientists from vast and varied assemblages of fact, I may, however, refer to the "Wealth of Nations," whose publication and success constituted probably the greatest stride towards Anarchism ever taken; to Buckle, Vol. I., Chs. IX-XII; to Herbert Spencer's essays on "Over Legislation," and "The Coming Slavery"; and also to the articles "Socialism" and "Communism" in the Encyclopedia Britannica. Considered as a remedy for the evils of ordinary society, voluntary Communism like that of the monks, Shakers, Oneida people, Rappists, Menonites, Icarians, etc., is even more easily disposed of than governmental Socialism; because it is essentially reactionary. Much information about the causes of its failure, whenever it is not founded on some dogmatical and enthusiastic religion, may be found in the Encyclopedia Britannica articles on "Owen" (Robert), "Socialism," and "Communism"; but more especially in J. H. Noyes' "History of American Socialism" (he should have said Communism). This book is published by the Appelcons. One cause, particularly worthy to be dwelt on here, is, however, lightly touched, tho it may be anticipated. If communities, thru religious enthusiasm or otherwise, manage to escape the perils of explosion which suppressed individuality involves, if they become rich, and are in a way to become powerful, the government is sure to fall on them, as it did upon the monks in Europe, and upon the Mormons here. It must do so, in self-defence, for when they reach that stage, they threaten its own existence; of course, since they are founded upon principles incompatible with and directly hostile to its own.

C. L. JAMES.

* On the general subject of the State Socialistic schemes and their impracticability, see Rae, "Contemporary Socialism"; Loveley, "Socialism of Today"; Ely, "French and German Socialism," and "Problems of Today"; Woods, "English Social Movements"; Gide, "Political Economy"; Gilman, "Profit Sharing"; McCarthy, "History of Our Time"; Howell, "Conflicts of Labor and Capital"; Dawson, "Bismarck and State Socialism"; Bismarck, "Autobiography"; Roscher, "Political Economy."

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.
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. Richter, 322 Larkin St.

RECEIPTS.

SHILLING, \$2. LEWIS, \$1.50. CANT, THOMSON, YOUNG, SNELLENBERG, CLERU, CHWELM, ALTMOS, LOEFFLER, each \$1. NIGH, 60c. SCHILLING, 50c. HURWITZ, KARP, SCHATZ, each 25c.

FOR CHICAGO.

The Progressive Club give an entertainment and ball for the benefit of FREE SOCIETY, March 28, 7:30 p. m., at Libuse Hall, 936 Twelfth St.

Tickets, in advance, 15 cents; at the door 25 cents.

MEETINGS.

BOSTON.—The Social Science Club meets every Sunday, 5 p. m., at 724 Washington St., room 9. Free Forum for all sociological topics. Anarchist literature for sale.

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

CHICAGO.—The Chicago Philosophical Society meets every Sunday evening at 72 Adams St., 8 p. m. sharp. Free admission. All strangers are invited to take part in the discussions. Feb. 8, W. F. Barnard will speak on "Man and His Work."

The Progressive Club meets every Friday evening at 331 Walnut St., for the purpose of promoting the propaganda and good fellowship.

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

The Workmen's Educational Club meets at 278 Blue Island Ave., 8 p. m. Friday, Feb. 6, R. Grossmann speaks in German on "The Social Question."

CLEVELAND.—Liberty Association meets every Sunday, excepting the first Sunday of the month, in Forester's Hall, 237 Champlain St. at 2:30 p. m. Free discussion.

NEW YORK.—The Radical Reading Room, 180 Forsyth St. Meeting every Sunday at 3 p. m. Lectures and free discussions. 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. Tickets, including hat checks, 25 cents.

PHILADELPHIA.—The Social Science Club holds weekly gatherings every Friday evening in Bricklayers' Hall, 707 N. Broad St.

BOOK LIST.

ALL ORDERS FOR THE FOLLOWING BOOKS

RECEIVED AT THIS OFFICE.

Essays on the Social Problem.....	05
.....H. Addis	
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	05
Origin of Anarchism.....C. L. James	05
Government Analyzed.....Kelso	50
Anarchism: Its Philosophy and	
Ideal.....Peter Kropotkin	05
Anarchist Communism: Its Ba-	
sis and Principles.....	05
An Appeal to the Young.....	05
Anarchist Morality.....	05
Expropriation.....	05
Field, Factory and Workshop.....	45
Law and Authority.....	05
Memoirs of a Revolutionist.....	2.00
Mutual Aid, a Factor in Evolu-	
tion.....	2.00
Organized Vengeance.....	03
Paris Commune.....	05
The State: Its Historic Role.....	10
The Wage System. Revolution-	
ary Government.....	05
Resist Not Evil. 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 Nieuwenhuis	05
Mating or Mawring, 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, diptheria, 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 Develop-	
ment.—Individualism and Solidarity.	
Too Abstract.—Is Man Evil?—Property.	
—The Family.—Authority.—The Matri-	
archy.—The Right to Punish and the Sa-	
vants.—The Influence of Environment.	
"The Country."—The Patriotism of the	
Governing Classes.—Militarism.—Colo-	
nization.—There are no Inferior Races.—	
Why We are Revolutionists.—As to What	
Means follow from the Principles.—Revo-	
lutions.—The Experimental Method.—	
What Then?—Anarchism and its Practi-	
cability.—The Unvarnished Truth.	
The book is printed in large type, and	
consists of 176 pages.	

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

Send orders to FREE SOCIETY.

FIELD, FACTORY AND WORKSHOP.

BY PETER KROPOTKIN.

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

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

Order from FREE SOCIETY.

COLLEGE of MEDICINE & SURGERY, Chicago

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

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