



From the Heights at Dawn.

The voice of a comrade at dawn,
To the weary below;
To the souls that till darkness be gone
Grope their way as they go:

"In the East there is light; 'tis the Sun:
Do not droop, be of cheer;
Bear the torch, lift the burden; let none
Think of pain, speak of fear.

"We have followed the path through the night;
Kept the perilous way;
Shall we fail when the East all alight,
Gives a promise of day;

"Give o'er when the end we desire
That has led us so far,
That shone forth in the dark as the fire
At the heart of a star,

"Lies plain in the distance, and fair,
Inviting access;
In a region of light and of air,
In a land made to bless;

"A glory, a grandeur, a good
Unvalued; above
All worth, all the rest that ye would,
All else that ye love?

"Ye who gave to it body and soul;
Gave, to live or to die,
Can ye pause at a step from the goal;
Can ye falter or sigh?

"Ye were filled with its beauty, its worth,
And your spirits were strong,
All fear ye did use for your mirth;
In your hearts dwelt a song;

"Is it less than at first, when at last
Possession is near?
Look back: Ah the strife of the past!
And rejoice: We are here.

"Follow on; We are Men; Set your faces;
We are nearing the end;
The fairest, most perfect of places,
Worth the strength that we spend.

"We shall gain the fair goal, we shall stand
And rejoice with the Host
Who with us have pressed on to that land,
Forgetting the cost;

"A land full of glories; of good
Unvalued; above
All worth; all the rest that ye would,
All else that ye love."

WILLIAM FRANCIS BARNARD.

Ethics for the Times.

It would be an interesting study to compare the Russian humanitarians, the Tolstoy and Kropotkins, with the Stoics. And the parallel would be a fair one, for both work towards perfecting the individual, and both advocate a certain conscious simplicity of life. The chief difference, we imagine, between these protestants of the Cæsars and those of the czars would be that with an equally definite sense of the ends of life the ancients had a far clearer idea of means. Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius lay down a manner of life for the individual; the Russian idealists set before nations apocalyptic visions of a transfigured state to which,

however, they build not even a cloud bridge. Such reflections come inevitably to every reader of Prince Kropotkin's notable article, "The Ethical Needs of the Present Day," which is published in the current *Nineteenth Century*. For his reasoning is as appealing to the rationalist observer of society as it is devoid of practical counsel for the social reformer.

Upon the practicability of swift and radical amelioration of society, however, Prince Kropotkin insists at the outset:

"For the first time in the history of civilization, mankind has reached a point where the means of satisfying its needs are in excess of the needs themselves. To impose, therefore, as has hitherto been done, the curse of misery and degradation upon vast divisions of mankind, in order to secure well-being for the few, is needed no more: well-being can be secured for all, without overwork for any. We are thus placed in a position entirely to remodel the very basis and contents of our civilization — provided the civilized nations find in their midst the constructive capacities and the powers of creation required for utilizing the conquests of the human intellect in the interest of all."

But, he continues, moral ideas have lagged hopelessly behind science and invention. Our ethics is adjusted not to the possibilities of the new, but to the limitations of the old economic order. And this new ethics must be no less progressive than science itself, and as free from reactionary elements: "A new, realistic moral science is the need of the day — a science as free of superstition, religious dogmatism, and metaphysical mythology as modern cosmogony and philosophy already are, and permeated at the same time with those higher feelings and brighter hopes which a thorough knowledge of man and his history can breathe into men's breasts." Such a desideratum, a morality calculated, yet not cold, Prince Kropotkin does not despair of attaining, and he scouts with a most scornful civility the Brunetieres who proclaim the bankruptcy of science, and the sentimentalists who seek moral certitude in traditional faiths the very basis of which they profoundly disbelieve. One must admit the courage that would choose social despair rather than accept an irrational cure for the evils of society; one must commend the optimism that not only seeks a vigorously scientific ethics, but believes it can be imposed upon the thoughtless majority.

And this point of application remains virtually untouched even after "mutual aid," the cardinal principle of Prince Kropotkin's system, has been thoroughly expounded. Many people will remember the delightful essays in which Prince Kropotkin, elaborating a hint of Darwin's, showed that what we call the moral instincts and claim solely for human kind are found far down in the scale of animal creation. For the good of the group, the beasts even will sacrifice convenience and often life. Discipline is enforced and justice administered among many classes of birds. The higher one goes in every class the more complete is the identification of the individual with the interests of his group, so that bees and ants, for example, are not unreasonably held before collective man for his guidance. In fine: "It appears that not

only Nature does *not* give us a lesson of a-moralism, which needs to be corrected by some extra-natural influence, but we are bound to recognize that the very ideas of bad and good, and man's abstractions concerning 'the supreme good' and 'the lowest evil,' have been borrowed from Nature. . . . They contain the fundamental principles of equity and mutual sympathy, which apply to all sentient beings, just as mechanical truths derived from observation on the surface of the earth apply to matter everywhere in the stellar spaces."

So the great Russian idealist takes issue with all egotistical theories of morals, and finds in the habits of our animal friends the origin and the confirmation of a revised social utilitarianism. In other words, he attempts to give scientific warrant for all the altruisms which science has denied or turned over reluctantly to religion. Social progress, in his belief, lies simply in the increasing acceptance of "mutual aid" as a guiding motive. And here, of course, arises the very practical problem, How is the principle to be spread broadcast? Here Prince Kropotkin candidly admits the difficulty of establishing a scale by which the individual may estimate his reasonable personal surrender to the common welfare, and turns over eloquently but vaguely the work of propaganda to "poets" who are to produce in the throng "those very ecstasies which were formerly considered as belonging exclusively to the province of religion." It need hardly be said that our supposed rational basis of ethics would fare ill in such transmission. Granted that the basis of morals is evolutionary, it is hard to see how the personal color that such a "poet" must inevitably give to the pure doctrine would be in any way more rational than the supernatural warrant claimed by the prophets and Messiahs of old. Nor is it clear to us that the mass which obeys but languidly the great ethical leaders of the past will soon consider the ways of the ant and be wise.

And yet we believe that Prince Kropotkin's lofty mode of thought is valuable for the ideal it holds up and for the rebuke it administers to recreant or discouraged children of a scientific age. It is a fair challenge to the new industrialism to require it to justify its existence by showing that it has increased the general well-being; while it is an added stimulus to rationalism to realize that the dearest instincts of human nature may receive scientific validity without sacrificing their human efficacy. So if the prophets of Prince Kropotkin's kind never quite show us the way out of the wilderness, their passage at least makes the air more fragrant while we wait for the revealing of the way. — *New York Evening Post*.

COMMENT.

"The proof of the pudding is in the eating," says a very plain proverb, which has strong affinities with the scientific inductive philosophy; yet recalls the saying of a great intuitionist: "By their fruits ye shall know them." If the teachings of the Russian humanitarians result in no practical good works, then they are "idealists," preachers of a barren faith, which is

"dead, being alone." But if their doctrine give rise to consecrated lives, sublime deaths, martyrdoms, social regeneration on a scale which, tho limited, increases amidst the flames of persecution, then there is something suspicious in the statements that it does "not quite show us the way out of the wilderness," and "sets before nations apocalyptic visions of a transfigured state to which, however, it builds not even a cloud bridge." Because, there are none so blind as those who will not see; and *qui male agit odit lucem*. Then, too, even the comparison with the Stoics is unjust to the Russian humanitarians. Stoicism was an aged effete philosophy before Epictetus or Marcus Aurelius was born. It was munificently patronized; introduced into Rome by Panætius under the Republic; wrought into the eclectic systems of Cicero and Seneca, illustrated by the life and death of Cato (Minor); and stated in its native country; long before it fell back in despair on "the individual," under a decaying civilization, which, tho it was eminently social and political, it had failed to save. The Russian humanitarians are a school of yesterday. The most plausible criticism on their method is that its results are still in the eggshell. But they have come thru blood and fire. They have been called enemies of human nature, of morality, of society, of God. They have, however, by sheer force of reason, conquered the attention of the world already. They will sustain a parallel with the society of Blandina a good deal better than with that of Marcus Aurelius. They are much more like, in historic attitude and significance, to the Christians of his time than to himself.

Peter Kropotkin is an Anarchist. He has been a prisoner, and is an exile, for being an Anarchist. He would not be allowed to visit the United States again, as he did in 1901, unless, indeed, ex-secretary Curtail-You and his set have exhausted their capacity for making asses of themselves in the John Turner case. He is one of those whom the president said, in his first inaugural, ought all to be held guilty of murder as accessories. These facts are usually ignored by the critics who patronizingly describe this brilliant cultivator of the positive physical sciences as an amiable dreamer. But they are familiar to every reader of his "Autobiography," which is in every public library. There is no more doubt that Peter Kropotkin is the most actively militant Anarchist agitator in Europe than that he is an honored and principal contributor to the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, the *Popular Science Monthly*, etc.

What, then, have been the actual fruits of Anarchism? Remember it is a thing of yesterday. Until about 1848 it had not even a name.

Tum neque nomen erat, aut honores aut gloria, monti. Until the rupture of the International, in 1872, it had no organization. It is younger than Christianity was, not under Marcus Aurelius only, but even Nero. It is younger than Protestantism was under Mary. It has had to fight as hard as both; and, even allowing for difference in the means of disseminating ideas, it has spread faster than either. Vital power, capacity to live and grow, it has shown in far higher measure within forty years than Stoicism in four hundred. Capacity to triumph over resistance, it has shown in a measure which makes the comparison ridiculous. Stoicism wilted at the frown of Vespasian, and vanished be-

fore the grimace of Commodus. Anarchism thinks it has condescended if it is aware that Mr. Roosevelt abuses it, or that Mr. Wettin plays bacarat. Power, then, is one of the fruits of Anarchism. It is no "garrulous, canting, wrangling philosophy," as Macaulay said of Stoicism. Its severest critic will not deny that it shows abundant practicality.

The high practical virtues of the individual Anarchists are no doubt the secret of their success — supposing the virtues themselves to be first explained. The blood of martyrs has long been regarded as the seed of faith. It is true there have been sects whose desperate fanaticism furnished such seed; but who, having nothing but fanaticism, soon became extinct, like grain without life in it. The Circumcellious, White Doves, Sicarii, etc., are examples. But the Anarchists are not an example of that sort. In 1887 the cry of their enemies was "Anarchism is dead!" In 1894 it was, "We must do something to stop the increase of Anarchism!" In 1901, a whisper ran thru the land, arresting the first howl for riot and massacre suddenly: "*The increase of Anarchism has gone too far to be stopped.*" At that rate in 1908 it should be: "We are all Anarchists now!" Doubtless, very silly speakers and writers, addressing very ignorant readers and listeners, still try to class Anarchists with Circumcellious, White Doves, Sicarii, etc. But they are no longer worth our notice. This remonstrance is not addressed to a demagogue, but to a critic — not to the Tory candidate for the presidency, but to the editor of the *New York Evening Post*. He does not need to be told that the success of the Russian Anarchists is largely due to their personal grandeur. He calls them "humanitarians." He is aware that Tolstoy is an Anarchist; that Ibsen is an Anarchist; that Reclus is an Anarchist, who narrowly escaped being murdered by the hoary butcher Thiers; that Kropotkin, the typical revolutionary Anarchist, is universally recognized (by those better informed than Roosevelt or Curtail-You) as one of the masterminds among scientists, alike qualified to keep readers of the principal American magazine in physics informed on the latest discoveries in all branches, or to modify the speculations of that very Darwin whose misfortune was gravely said to be that he knew more of his subject than any other man living. Perhaps, however, our critic thinks that Anarchists like these are few. For he seems thruout his article to insinuate, while praising them, that they lack a hold upon "the masses" — however those two words should be divided.

Of course men as great as these are rare among Anarchists, as they always have been everywhere. But nothing is so contagious as virtue; and if we look for that among ordinary Anarchists we shall find it far more widely spread than learning like that of Kropotkin or poetic genius like that of Tolstoy. How happens it that Tolstoy can address the "Great White Czar" as Elijah addressed Ahab, and not have to hide himself like Elijah? Why was it easy to hang Anarchists here upon the Rooseveltian principle in 1887, but impossible in 1901? Surely it is not because they had no hold on the masses. It was because, in spite of Roosevelt, and Garys, and Curtail-Yous, and stupidity, the masses had partly learned to understand them. And it is only on the moral side the masses are accessible from such heights.

A little reading of the Anarchist press would soon show our critic that a large proportion of Anarchists are no Tolstoys — that they are almost as anti-Malthusian as Roosevelt, and as much opposed to important lines of scientific progress as Dowie, in short that they do not know much. But their "failings lean to virtue's side." They oppose vivisection and Malthusianism because they ignorantly suppose them to be cruel. High intelligence is not universal among Anarchists. Eager humanity is.

It would be observed that the elevated moral standard, in which all Anarchists agree, is wholly independent of convention. In the three countries where Anarchism is exercising most influence — France, Russia, and the United States, — it is intimately associated with emancipation of women. If you do not know what that means, the nearest libeller of Anarchism — who may be found in the nearest pulpit or the nearest grog-shop — indifferently can inform you. That it means no harm, is one of those things you must learn for yourself. But among the thousands of private families which have adopted it in theory and practice, a marked difference from their neighbors is seen only when they are called to prove their better faith in a way as little suggestive of Stoicism as Philistinism. There was nothing about Blandina to recall either the Empress Faustina or the Princess of Saxony. With Emma Goldman, Louise Michel, or Hessa Helfman, she might be compared, and not made ridiculous either.

That our critic should not have remarked the destructive revolutionary, emancipating character of Russian humanitarian ethics would be remarkable, but that critics, since the one who sifted the grain for Apollo, have had an uncritical habit of observing what looks weak about the author criticized in preference to what is manifestly strong. Kropotkin says the first need of ethics is "a justification." Not how our moral sense originates, but what motive we have for cultivating it, is the practical problem. He also says its greatest need is to effect "a synthesis — not a compromise" — between egoism and altruism. The solution of both difficulties he finds in this truth, that *the ethical life is the life of full individual development*. Adam Smith long ago traced all actions to sympathy in his "Theory of the Moral Sentiments," and all actions to greed in his "Wealth of Nations." He did not attempt to resolve the paradox; but Buckle and others have to a great extent resolved it since. All properly individual action does spring from sympathy. But corporate action, like the working power of a slave-gang is limited by the capacity of those members who amount to least. That on which all of a church, party, nation, clique, etc., can agree, is what the best have in common with the worst: and the determining cause of a corporation's actions is therefore selfishness, as little relieved by the sympathy which measures personal force of character as possible. He, therefore, who obeys an external law of any kind, must be exceptionally mean if he does not behave worse than he would without it; he who cuts loose from the world's standards, will almost certainly be better than the world. That this is exactly the reverse of time-honored moral teaching need not be said. To follow the custom of one's neighborhood, is the barbarian's sole idea of obligation. With the Greek, it became a little elevated — it was to act well one's part; but still

one's part in society. Christianity excited renunciation of the world; but soon made a new world within the cloister, which was no better. Protestantism first decidedly brought the man and his conscience together. Thus Anarchism is the climax of an Aeonian movement beginning with the evolution of man, — the movement which has raised us out of devil-worshippers and cannibals. For convenience, Kropotkin has described it in terms of a moral movement. But our critic has been sifting Kropotkin's wheat and taking the chaff for his reward when he detects one sentence to prove that Kropotkin relies for propaganda upon "poets." Kropotkin perfectly knows that the poets — who are prophets — save many individual souls, one invention like that of illuminating-gas does more to moralize society than all the gas which has been set to music since "David's harp of solemn sound." In other words, he knows that the movement is mainly intellectual. The strength of the Anarchist doctrine that to conform is to be wicked, to be wicked is to be weak, and to be weak is to be miserable, lies mainly in their scientific character. For the virtue is more contagious than vaccine, knowledge is required to eliminate moral small pox. Novel as they are, these doctrines may be said to have conquered the world. The movement away from corporate barbarism into personal civilization is proceeding with unprecedented rapidity since it took the form of Anarchism, because in that form it attains the acme of direct energy. As science, it states by the mouth of Lombroso that penal laws, like other laws, do nothing but increase crime. As act, it dominates the great works of France and Russia during the last twenty years. For other nations — have they produced any great works of art during that time? If not, why not? I say that Anarchism has already virtually conquered the world, because it has conquered the world's art and science. What remains to conquer, after that? Even Roosevelt airs his contempt for law, and cants about "the strenuous life." If there be anything over which we do not need to worry, it is "the way out of the wilderness." The way is with the current. C. L. JAMES.

The Integral Life.

A FORECAST OF THE FUTURE.

Anarchists, when asked for a social program, very properly answer: we have none. When liberty is assured to every individual, the internal forces — emotions, desires, determinations — which actuate men and women, will develop an order of society suited to their several and common desires and requirements; just as, undoubtedly, they have developed the present order, (?) imperfect as it appears to us. We, whose ideas, desires and requirements, have outgrown the present order, see and feel its imperfections, and wish to change it to one which more nearly accords with the life we seek. It is true, however, that many of us have some idea of the form which society will assume in the future; because we know some of the things and conditions we now require, and which the present order does not furnish or permit. But, inasmuch as, with every change of conditions in the direction of freedom, will come a change in the character of the individual, which in its turn will demand and create still other conditions, it is evident that no program, unless expressed in the most general terms, is likely to prove correct.

Nevertheless it may be permitted us to indulge in forecasts, — to build "castles in the

air" — even as poets and seers indulge; and to give them to the world for what they are worth. The following, while in some sort a castle in the air, has nevertheless its foundations on the earth, and is builded of stones hewn from the quarry of nature.

Reader, have you ever taken part in tableaux vivants, and had to stand, say, with extended arms, or with the body in a constrained position for a minute or two? Then you know how the muscles tire, and begin to tremble, and what a blessed relief it is when curtain is rung down, and you are free to resume the equilibrium of repose. As an occasional experience, what with the companionship of your fellow-positers, the lights, the music, and the applause, this strain of muscle, attention and purpose forms a delightful episode. But, suppose you should have to repeat the same pose, at the shortest possible intervals, for three, six, or ten hours at a stretch, simply to "make your living," would it then prove so delightful, or would it be wearisome even to disgust? Change, variety of activity, is one of the essentials of continued enjoyment, and without enjoyment, what is life worth? Variety of occupation, change of scene, breaks in the continuity of attention by shifting its object, is as necessary to the enjoyment of life, as a varied diet is, to the satisfaction of the appetite.

Now the *integral life* — the life I sing — is a life wherein every part and faculty of the individual has opportunity to perform its function, and is in fact exercised in alternation and due proportion with every other part. Such a life will necessarily result in, and consist of the highest enjoyment of which the organism is capable. But in order to this life, and as part of it, activity and experience in various regions and departments of nature is required and first and especially in those which contribute to the satisfaction of fundamental demands as those for food clothing, habitation, society, amusement, and the intimate associations connected with the generation and rearing of offspring.

This life is so widely different from the *fractional life* — which for most of us is the rule — wherein only one part, one faculty, or exceptionally two or three, are habitually exercised, that very few people consider it possible; and there are not many who comprehend its desirableness. Some of us indeed, have caught a glimpse — nebulous at best — of its blessedness; and desire to make it possible, and to realize it in our experience.

Nature, you may say, is so vast in extent, and work so various in kind, as to make it impossible for single individuals to experience and participate in anything but a small fraction of either one or the other. This is doubtless true. But, on the other hand, the human organism is so constituted as to be fitted for, and to demand, a great variety of work and extensive transactions with nature; and as a matter of fact we see here and there individuals who make excursions into departments of knowledge and acquire skill in handicrafts and the aesthetic arts entirely foreign to their daily employment: even the common laborers and mechanics in their scanty leisure time study music, sing and perform on the violin, flute and trombone, or acquire a knowledge of foreign languages, and science. Elihu Burritt, "the learned blacksmith," while working at the forge, studied languages; Hugh Miller, a laborer in the stone quarries of Cromarty, and later a stone-mason, studied geology and paleontology, to such lengths as to become an authority on these subjects. Professional men, statesmen and philosophers not unfrequently seek relief from the monotony of their specialties, and make their leisure hours rich in enjoyment by working at cabinet-making or gardening, at blacksmithing, wood-chopping or fishing. Herbert Spencer, when "run down" by his work as philosopher and litterateur, took to salmon-fishing; Gladstone and Horace Greeley alternated their politics and literature with agriculture and felling trees. Our athletic sports, Cricket, Rowing, Base-ball, Foot-ball, etc., all good enough in their way, are merely

substitutes for these and other useful and interesting occupations. There is no reason however in the nature of things, why this alternation should not be the rule of life with all, instead of the exception.

These exceptions, by the way — and every one's experience can furnish a number of such, — are indications of the natural reaching out for a fuller and broader life than the common work-a-day routine furnishes. People with "fads" are cases in point and the numerous fraternal societies secret or otherwise, clubs, associations, orders, etc., wherein the members, in rotation or by election, perform the various functions pertaining to social or business organizations; and certain benefits of membership (quasi citizenship) are shared by all the participants, are indications of this same widespread desire to enjoy more of life than common citizenship places within reach; and this in addition to the special objects or missions of the respective societies.

There is however, a reason why it is not the rule; and this is to be found in the unwise search for riches — abundance of things in possession — as the great good of life. But surely, healthy and happy men and women and children, well fed, well clothed and comfortably housed, with leisure for social intercourse and amusement are much more to be desired in a nation than an abundance of marketable commodities intended for exportation — things which possess "exchange value." The "balance of trade," which means the importation of gold, and the exportation of useful articles — wheat, cotton, timber, and manufactured goods in excess of the useful articles imported, can not be considered an indication of real prosperity; nor can it possibly conduce to the wealth of a nation; for the gold is useless until it be parted with — exchanged for something useful, something which sustains or enhances life.

If we look at the positive benefits which this integral life would bring, in its change and alternation of industrial pursuit, it is easy to see that they comprise a multiplicity and variation of enjoyments, and consequently an amplification of life. And its negative beneficence is not hard to perceive: it provides against and abolishes, the exhaustion and disgust, the weariness and loss of interest in life which uniformly accompany and follow on long-continued activity of a single part or function, or the uninterrupted occupation of the mind with a single object or pursuit. Moreover, it will abolish many of the vain and unhappy longings caused by the frustrated impulses to activity of organs lying unused and fallow, and the thwarted desire of the active and inquiring mind for knowledge and experience in regions of nature and art other than those already become familiar.

Is life worth living? At first blush, the question would seem fatuous, but with many people at the present time, and those not the most ignorant, it is a question of serious import. And the reason is not to be sought from afar. With an organism of great complexity, of varied wants, of impulses to activity in many directions, such as constitutes a human being; with the exigencies of life under existing conditions, requiring — nay compelling — over-activity of one, or perhaps a few organs, while the rest of the body and mind is condemned to nearly total inactivity; what is the inevitable result? *Ennui* the most intense. With the so-called laboring man, — the hewer of wood, and drawer of water, and mender of roads, the blacksmith's striker, and digger of ditches, — it is the muscles which are over-taxed, while the intellectual and emotional faculties are deprived of opportunity for activity: with the professional man, on the contrary, it is the brain which is overworked; and the muscles, either in single action, or in coordinated and purposeful combination, are neglected and unused. This disuse inevitably leads to more or less of atrophy. The resulting nervous exhaustion and mental or muscular fatigue as the case may be and simultaneously, the unsatisfied desire for activity in

(Continued on page 5)

FREE SOCIETY

Formerly *The Firebrand*.
Issued Weekly by FREE SOCIETY PUBL. ASSOCIATION.
A. ISAAK.....Editor.

ONE DOLLAR A YEAR.

Address all Communications and make all Money Orders payable to FREE SOCIETY, 230 East Fourth Street, New York, N. Y.

Entered as second-class matter March 3, 1904, at the postoffice at New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

The publishers as such are not necessarily in agreement with any opinions expressed by the contributors.



SUNDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1904.

485

If these figures are ahead of the number printed on the wrapper of your FREE SOCIETY, it indicates that your subscription expired so many weeks ago.

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*.

If you receive this paper without having paid for it, some friend paid for it. It will not be sent any longer than your friend paid for. Will you not subscribe?

All delinquent subscribers are earnestly requested to renew their subscriptions if they wish to receive the paper. A blue pencil mark on the wrapper indicates that the subscription expired.

By the Wayside.

The letter that Roosevelt was supposed to have written to Michael Donnelly was one that a president of intelligence and integrity should have written, according to the *Evening Post*, but Roosevelt denies the authorship.

Since the iron and steel trust has reduced the wages of its employes, the world is informed that the "earnings" of the corporation in the quarter ending September 30 will approximate \$18,000,000. And yet the toilers accepted the reduction in wages almost without a murmur.

The *International Wood-Worker* reminds the Socialist parties that the wage-workers do not number 35 per cent of the voters of this country, a great percentage of whom are members of the Catholic church, and that for these reasons the "political triumph of a Socialist party is an utter impossibility."

"I do not think the last two issues of FREE SOCIETY will excite much interest among its readers: fault-finding is tiresome," says a friend of the paper in a private letter. "I am glad to see the paper getting lively for the last few weeks: philosophical dissertations are wearisome," writes another reader. "Peccavi!" cried the editor.

"Sacred confusion, have mercy upon thy disciples!" exclaims a Socialist organ in commenting upon the suggestion that during a general strike "the toilers will take bread where it can be found." "If the bakers stop working and the housewives quit baking," the paper asks, "where is the bread to come from?" Hold on, sacred simplicity. Who said that the housewives and bakers should quit baking? During

a partial strike at Barcelona, Spain, about two years ago, the bakers continued to work and supplied themselves and their brothers on strike with bread, only excluding the military and other parasites in society from the blessings of "free consumption." By the way, the universal strike is being highly commended by the leading spirits of Social Democracy as an excellent means to achieve "political rights," and a "confused" soul is confronted with the query, What are the people going to eat when the Socialists decide to proclaim a general strike? Will our Socialist friends enlighten a curious soul?

The Japanese Socialist organ, *Heimin Shim-bun*, gives its opponents some hard nuts to crack. If individual violence cannot be justified, the editor argues, under the pretext of maintaining law and order and the preservation of life, then it is plain that collective violence, such as wars and punishment, can no more be justified from the standpoint of the established moral code. And if preachers, statesmen, and scholars defend war on the ground that a nation is justified in resisting "the encroachments of other nations by force in order to maintain its own existence," then the laborer whose existence is threatened by the robberies of capitalism is also justified in resorting to violence in order to maintain his life and welfare. "When a man's life is threatened by a robber or a violent fellow, the right of self-defense is recognized by society, yet these cases are few in proportion of those in which man's existence is endangered by the lack of employment," and when they can find no work "their existence is plainly endangered not by their own fault," and "if existence is the supreme good, laborers may well assert their right of self-defense by robbing capitalists or society." This is not our idea of morality, the editor concludes, but the defenders of law and violence can come to no other logical conclusion. "If the violence of laborers cannot be justified, the that of nations cannot be justified."

Rev. E. G. Updike, of Madison, Wis., predicts that a great conflict between "corporate wealth and the people" is imminent in this country, but the "divine" is confident that "the people will establish a government of the people and by the people and for the people," which shall bring about the millennium. Heavens, is history and its lessons of no avail to these well-meaning but harmful reformers? Are we not supposed to live under a government of the people? Since the migration of the Roman toilers to the holy mountain (*secessio in montem sacrum*) tyrannized mankind has been deluded by these catchwords "of, for, and by the people," only to find that the "dear people" had been duped. The revolutionary forefathers of this country provided this nation with the Declaration of Independence and a "government of the people". Both are being worshipped, altho the famous document of independence was a still-born child and the people's government has developed all the attributes of an autocratic monarchy — the prop of the rich and the scourge of the toilers. "Government requires force," says J. Wilson in his book "The New Dispensation," and the perusal of which would not harm Rev. Updike, "because it is always in the wrong, and because it always opposes the wishes and sentiments of the people." "Freemen need no laws; and

brave men will not tolerate them. Laws are for slaves only."

The end of class struggles and class rule, of master and slave, of ignorance and vice, of poverty and shame, of cruelty and crime — the birth of freedom, the dawn of brotherhood, the beginning of man. That is the demand. This is Socialism. — EUGENE V. DEBS.

Yes, that are some of the phases of Socialism, but not of Social Democracy, with its narrow platform and the belief in majority rule, both of which are incompatible with the free development of man. Socialism includes every school of thought which endeavors to obtain a state of society in which the recognized ills shall be eliminated and be in accordance with the aspirations and ideals of so-called utopians. These aspirations are the result of the ever present desire to free ourselves from the misery and strife prevalent in society and the continual intellectual growth of striving mankind. The attempt to realize our ideals and aspirations thru the ballot-box is as absurd as if the scientists would determine the truth or falsity of their researches by a majority of votes. Socialism is the product of knowledge, of freedom of thought, of experience, and to bring about its consummation men must be free to experiment, to live their own lives, regardless of platforms and parties. To subject our ideal and knowledge to platforms, is to assume that we can arrest intellectual growth, hence the intolerance and stagnation of thought in political parties; and to subject our knowledge and aspirations to the decision of a majority, is to degrade ourselves below the beast.

In speaking of the calling out of troops against strikers, the Socialist party organ of Switzerland, the *Grütliener*, says among other things:

We are of the opinion that governments are only in rare cases culpable. . . . As regards the strike-breakers, we have no right to prevent them from working. But the question whether an augmented police force would not furnish the necessary protection can certainly be raised. . . . But the most abortive means of combat in the labor movement is the refusal of military service. It is revolutionary in the wrong sense of the term, for it attacks the foundation of government, and it is the right and duty of the executive power to uphold order.

Now, since we are told by a Socialist party organ "that governments are only in rare cases culpable" (consequently the rebellious workers are the real culprits); that they agree with Parry as regards the interference with strike-breakers; that a larger police force is necessary "to protect the citizens and property," as the editor says in No. 97 of the *Grütliener*; and finally—which caps the climax of opportunism — "that the refusal of military service revolutionary in the wrong sense of the term because it strikes at the foundation of government" — I hope we will no longer be accused of misrepresentations and wanton attacks. And, let it be remembered, it is not the mere desire of fault-finding which prompts us to devote so much space to the disclosure of the doings of the Socialist political parties. It is my honest opinion, verified by events, that Social Democracy in its present course is seriously imperiling industrial emancipation and social progress.

INTERLOPER.

Theology ever tries to block evolution, and its chief characteristic is a lack of faith. — THE PHILISTINE.

The Integral Life.

(Continued from page 3)

other parts of the organism, together, produce such disgust with ourselves and the world, as to prompt the inquiry: is it worth while?

And a not inconsiderable number of our fellows — of all occupations, and in every station of society — answer the question, alas! in the negative; and slip out of life by one or other of the scores of open doors. When however the integral life becomes the rule in human society, such a question will rarely — very rarely — be asked; and that only under the most exceptional and untoward circumstances.

The science of living things — Biology — show us that only thru functioning can an organ be maintained in health and power: indeed it has been shown with tolerable clearness that function is before the organ, — a paradox rather startling at first sight but easy of explanation — for in the more simple form of life all the operations are performed by the whole body, indifferently: now, when a particular operation or function is called for in greater force or frequency by the surrounding conditions, certain portions (cells) associate themselves together for that work, and in this manner form an organ. So we see that, organs have their genesis — their beginnings — in the necessity and demand for, and impulse towards function. Organs grow and perfect themselves by exercise (function) and the power of an organ increases with its growth: the two things organ and function are reciprocal in action. The same underlying principle is applicable to the mind — the intellect proper, and the feelings: activity of one or the other in this or that direction strengthens its power; and that for the simple reason that the bodily organs thru which these mental traits are manifested, receive, during their active period, more blood (and nutriment) in proportion, than organs which are quiescent; and this extra supply of nutriment is continued for a larger or shorter period after activity has (temporarily) ceased.

From these considerations then, it is fairly to be inferred that, in order to produce and maintain perfect men and women, — and it is only of such that a perfect society can be constituted — we must make it possible, — and natural impulses will make it imperative, — that each and every individual may and shall vary his activities so as to bring into play a healthy growth of every part and family of his being. If I remember correctly concerning the discussion preceding the constitution of Plato's Republic, one of the interlocutors defines *Justice* as "the due proportion of things;" that is, the due proportion of the various parts respectively, to each other and to the whole. Now, as justice must be the foundation of a desirable and durable society, it is of the highest importance to estimate and approximately define the relative value of human parts, functions, and opportunities and to order the lives of individuals in such wise as to observe due proportion in their use and enjoyment.

Agriculture, using the word in its widest signification, is undoubtedly the fundamental, because the most necessary, occupation of a settled human society. The production of food-stuffs, in regularity and abundance is one of the essential conditions of life where large numbers of people are gathered together for permanent associations. Almost of equal importance are the productions of raw materials for clothing, and the cutting down and hewing of forest trees for the erection of dwelling houses. As an alternative and complement to agriculture comes fishing, and hunting for food supplies, and the breeding and feeding of tame animals not only for food, but also for clothing and shelter. Next to these are the so-called mechanic arts — skill and handicrafts, the making of tools, the weaving of fabrics for clothing, basket making and pottery, the quarrying of stone, the making of bricks, and the construction of dwellings.

Evidently there are in these employments conditions giving opportunity for the exercise

of the basic faculties of man — muscle and brain — in many different ways, as well as for the coordinated action of both, according to the dictates of necessity, and choice, and to satisfy the desire for social enjoyment. The agriculturist indeed, from the nature of his subject and occupation, has opportunity for that alternation of activities already insisted upon as a condition of the integral life. The seasons prescribe it, he must obey their behests. The time required for the growth of many of his staples, leaves him ample time for rest in the intervals between periods of strenuous exertion. As society is at present organized, however, the agriculturist seems to be cut off from and denied many aesthetic enjoyments — music, the drama and painting — and participation in the more purely intellectual pursuits.

The reason of this divorcement of intellectual and esthetic pursuits and enjoyment from the life of the agricultural, lies, not in the nature of things, but in the perverse arrangements of our boasted civilization — a civilization which it is true dates back some thousands of years and has therefore the prestige of age and ancestry, but which nevertheless is to be condemned in many of its prominent features. Man seems to have been continually repeating what the fabled builders of the tower of Babel did; saying: "Let us build a city and a tower, whose top may reach unto heaven, and let us make to ourselves a name, etc." And *Nemesis* in the shape of confusion and disappointment continues to pursue close on the heels of his foolish endeavors, just as in the days of the fabled tower.

Division of labor is the Shibboleth of civilization! Specialization the road to perfection! But a question is pertinent here: is it the road to the perfection of the man, or of the thing which the man makes?

So much has this idea of specialization and the exclusive pursuit of one form of activity thru life, permeated our civilization that, men of science have incorporated it with their thinking, as tho it were a law of nature in connection with human life. Lombroso, writing concerning the Man of Genius and his relationship to the Insane man, notes as a mark of insanity in certain geniuses whom he particularizes, that they have written books on subjects foreign to their vocations or professions: an architect for instance, writes on music, or a sculptor on religion. It would appear to a sober thinking person, that, the ability to think and the desire to express himself on subjects other than those habitually and professionally handled marked a strong and active intellect, rather than a tendency to insanity.

Without doubt specialization is a fact of nature. Organization is specialization. Specialization tends to ascertain economy of labor and perfection of function. But it does not follow that specialization in human society tends to perfection of individuals. And I am one of those who hold with the Galilean teacher, that institution and society were made for man, and not man for institutions.

In parenthesis: speaking of institutions, it may in passing be well to notice that of marriage, and to consider its relations to the *integral life*. The Jewish and Christian Bible says that in the beginning God blessed the man and woman whom he had made, saying: "Be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth." We know too that, this is the course of nature, which neither laws nor locksmiths have been able effectually to frustrate. Yet because of the institution of marriage, — a purely human convention, differing in its conditions with differing political arrangements and among different people, — which like the sabbath may be good enough in its way, the fruitfulness of woman is condemned, *except within its boundaries* and under its sanction. God, or Nature, (whichever you will), says: Be fruitful; we say: Be not fruitful except ye be married; thus, to quote again the Galilean teacher, making the commandments of God of no effect by our traditions.

To resume: we have a standing example of the pernicious effects of extreme specialization, daily before our eyes. Observe how the division of labor in connection with machinery and out of such connection, reduces men to the level of machines. Machine did I say? nay to the level of parts of a machine — a cam, a wheel, a lever! Look at the effect on a man of starting and stopping a machine, for eight, ten, twelve hours a day!

But why pursue the subject farther: this is not, surely, a revolutionary essay? No more so than LeVerrier's calculation of the perturbation of the planet Uranus, which led to the discovery of that other planet — Neptune. In like manner, a study of the perturbations of society which have made a fractional life for most people the rule instead of the integral life, — so much more desirable, — may be expected to result in social arrangements making the latter possible for all. The *idea*, let it be understood, must go before action and the fact, even in the making of an axe or a mouse-trap, much more so then in the building of a city or the ordering of a commonwealth, and still more so in the search for a desirable way of life, wherein we may tread. Let no one be deterred from seeking a better and fuller life, by fear of the bugbear revolution! Independent America is the result of revolution; France was freed from her aristocracy and seigniorial rights, by revolution; the divine right of kings shown to be a myth by the deposition and execution of Charles I and Louis XVI; the inauguration of constitutional government came of revolution. Revolution has changed dynasties, overthrown oppressors, given liberty to slaves, and cleared the way for the onward march and healthy growth of the people.

We are here dealing with life — the life of individuals. Now life may be considered from two standpoints — from without and from within. As it appears to the philosopher viewing it from the outside; and as it appears to the man himself in his experience. To the philosopher on the outside contemplating human society as at present constituted with its governors and governed, its upper and lower classes, its machinery and elaborate division of labor, and more than all its enormous output, when he sees the great majority of the people continually at work, and a small minority living in elegant idleness or engaged in a busy round of merely governing activities, he is astonished and pleased with this brilliant example of adaptation of means to an end. Some to feed and others to be fed; some to clothe, and others to prepare the clothing; the many building houses for the few to live in, and living themselves in hovels. Industrial and orderly multitudes; wealthy and idle groups; beautiful, pampered, and richly, adorned women; powerful ornaments; glorious array; the heavens full of fiddles, and the bands always playing!

But if we consider the matter from within — take a subjective view, — the experience of the multitude of actors in this admirably philosophic arrangement, we see a very different picture. The experience of the great multitude we have seen consists of exhausting labor in one or two directions only, and of thwarted desire for free action in other directions, and for other faculties. When to this is added the experience of insufficient or inferior food, too little opportunity for rest, social intercourse and aesthetic enjoyments, the contrast between this picture and that presented to the philosopher on the outside is great indeed.

A being with a structure fitted for varied work, and a mind hospitable to new impressions and ideas, to be condemned to waste his energies for ten hours a day on some little detail of work, as the pointing of pins, or the filing of saw-teeth, is certainly neither logical nor just. With bodies strong and vigorous, with muscles adapted to heavy labor, to be confined to "keeping books" — making figures all day and balancing accounts, just to inform some drone how much money he has gained in

his various transaction, is not making the most of the human organization and opportunity. To condemn some of our fellows, who love the sunshine and the sight of field and flowers and forest just as much as we, to work underground eight, ten and more hours per day digging coal is not working either justice or righteousness.

The economist will retort, however, by showing the increased production of articles for exportation — the increase of wealth accruing to the nation by this oppression of individuals. Wealth indeed! Is there any wealth other than life? And can that nation be deemed wealthy, the larger number of whose people are deprived of opportunity to enjoy the sight of trees and sky and lake and river, to hear the singing of birds, to breathe the balmy air, to bask in the warm sunshine, and to enjoy the rest for which their natures continually do cry?

But look at the honey bee, they say! In the hive you see complete division of labor, which seems to work to the satisfaction of every member of the bee-community. Thus, they say, is fractional life vindicated, and the utmost specialization shown to be advantageous. Softly Mr. Economist; softly my philosophic friend! Let us examine into this matter a little more closely.

The honey bee presents us it is true with a noteworthy example of a fractional life, as viewed by a philosopher from the outside. A fractional life which, as an economic arrangement, is certainly beyond all praise. The bee-society appears to be and is indeed an organization wherein certain of the individuals constituting the society perform only one or at most a few functions, while another individual or group performs other and different functions exclusively. The sterilized females — sterilized by arrested development — constituting by many times the larger number, do the main work for the community; they gather honey and pollen and wax, construct and fill the combs, attend to the hatching of eggs and the nurture of the pupæ, and carry out the debris from the hive. They are called worker bees. The males, in only small number, do no work proper; their only business in life is to attend upon the queen bee and make sure of her impregnation. The queen bee is the mother of bees, but only to the extent of depositing eggs in the proper cells in order to their being hatched. The result of the joint labors of these three groups is: First they have all been fed; second their number has been augmented by a new brood of bees; and third the production of a store of honey and wax, perhaps to serve as food during the winter, perhaps to be eaten by the philosopher and economist.

There is another side to this bee economy, however. Long before civilized man became acquainted with the honey bee, the constitution of the various groups had been developed as we see them at present. The workers are constituted to find their life work and happiness in collecting honey and wax and pollen, and in caring for the eggs and offspring of the queen bee. The drones or males have no desire, nor need, to engage in the work of gathering stores: their nature is to seek association with the queen, to attend to the perpetuation of the species; and when their work is finished they are ruthlessly killed off by the workers.

In these bees then, we have actually an example of the integral life. Every individual bee and every group lives the life for which it and they are severally fitted; exercising in freedom to the extent permitted by their environment every part and faculty of their organization. With specialization of function is associated specialization of structure. Thus, while the queen bee and the drones have a gay time in performing their special functions and while they fare sumptuously every day, the workers appear also to enjoy life, humming while they fly from flower to flower, filling

their pockets with pollen and their crops with nectar, and resting in the sunshine when weary with their long flights. This is faultlessly beautiful. Then all follow their impulses, gratify their desires, and doubtless are happy. They find their enjoyment in activity such as their structure impels them to engage in.

Not thus however is it with human beings; for it is to be noted here that, except in one particular namely that of sex, all human beings are constituted alike in respect of bodily structure. What the result of the division of labor and specialization carried on for thousands and thousands of years would result in, it is useless to inquire or guess. We deal here with the present and the immediate future.

But can we contemplate with equanimity among bees, while we retain the organization such a state of things as we see existing of human beings? How would the bulk of the men relish the idea of celibacy, and condemnation to perpetual labor, in order to feed the favored few of their sex set apart for the propagation of the race? How would the women welcome an arrangement by which the greater number of them were denied the joys of sex-association and maternity in order to devote themselves to providing and cooking and serving food to their more favored sisters? how would they relish being made slaves to these same highly favored sisters' offspring — rocking their cradles, washing their frocks, combing their hair and singing their lullabies? How would they like having to do the work of the whole community and only have their board and lodging for their pay? But this is the logical outcome of specialization and division of labor and to what end? That more honey may be made and stored. For whom? For the stranger to eat. And more wax for whom? for exportation to be sure; for other people to make candles of, to give light to other lands!

It goes without saying that change of direction in the mass means change of direction in its constituent parts. Where the mass is constituted of discrete parts, change of direction must originate in one or more of the parts, and by communication of motion to the others, (perhaps) ultimately change the direction of the whole. Human society, being constituted of discrete parts, namely individual men and women; it follows that, in order to change from the fractional life of the present regime to the integral life herein crudely sketched in its broad outlines merely, individual men and women must endeavor and commence to live integrally for themselves. This, as in the mechanical case for illustration, will involve more or less collision of parts, and more or less inconvenience, and perhaps suffering to individuals. It will bring also, however, the pleasure and satisfaction of a return to nature's ways which are paths of peace. To a certain extent, many will find the change of habits possible and easy; many will find it difficult; but every attempt to move in the right direction will make it easier for succeeding efforts; every individual beginning the new life will aid others in their efforts to begin. It is useless attempting to disguise the fact however, that the integral life involves an entire change in our estimates of things. We must once for all become convinced that a man's life does not consist in the abundance of the things he possesses, but on the contrary in the acts which he does. We must cease to consider "getting on in the world," that is distancing our fellows and competitors in the race for life; we must cease to worship the golden calf, and cease to measure our success by the size of our bank account.

In conclusion of the whole matter: the organization of man — male and female — requires, in order to its full life and satisfaction, that he shall have opportunity to engage, in alternation, in several different kinds of activity or labor. First — and this is of prime importance — in agriculture in some of its departments or in some of its complements, as

fishing etc.; second, in some one, or even several mechanical, operations or handicrafts; third, in what are called intellectual pursuits — scientific, literary, and aesthetic. Added to these for completeness will be travel and social converse — interchange of the amenities of life, and the conduct of amusements in friendly association. Complete integration of life for women must include maternity and the rearing of offspring, which again involves, as a necessary factor, association with men as men. Celibacy means an incomplete life, either for men or women.

GEO. PYBURN.

Herbert Spencer.

By P. KROPOTKIN.

Herbert Spencer, who was born in 1820 and died in December last, was one of the brilliant group of scientists to which Darwin, Huxley, Lyell, J. S. Mill, Bain, and others, belonged in England, and which contributed very powerfully to the glorious awakening of natural science and the triumph of the inductive method which took place in the sixties. On the other hand, Spencer is connected with such radicals as Carlyle, Ruskin, and George Eliot, who under the influence of Robert Owen, of the Fourierists and St. Simonians, and of the political radicalism of the Chartists, gave a radical and vaguely socialistic character to the movement of ideas in England between 1830-1870.

Spencer began as a railway engineer, then became a writer on economics. At this time (1848-1852) he formed a friendship with the physiologist George Lewes and his wife,* the author of "Felix Holt," "Adam Bede," and other novels of an advanced character, who wrote under the pseudonym of George Eliot. This remarkable woman, not yet forgiven by British hypocrisy for having married Lewes openly without intervention of Church or State, exercised a powerful influence on Spencer. In 1850 he wrote his best work, "Social Statics."

He had not at that time that narrow respect for bourgeois property and that contempt for the victims in the struggle for existence that we find in his later works, and he pronounced himself clearly in favor of land nationalisation. There is a breath of idealism in the "Social Statics."

It is true that Spencer never accepted the State Socialism of Louis Blanc or the governmental collectivism of Pecqueur and the Marxist followers of the latter. He had already developed his anti-government views in 1842 under the title of "The Proper Sphere of Government." But he recognized that the land should belong to the nation, and we find a breath of Communism in some passages of the Statics.

Later, he revised this work and attenuated these passages, but he maintained his rebellion against the usurpers of the land and against all oppression, whether economic, political, intellectual or religious. He always protested against the unprincipled policy of the Conservatives; at the time of the South African war he openly expressed his blame of the English aggression, and quite recently he declared himself strongly against the protection of the adventurer Chamberlain. All his life long he refused the titles of nobility and decoration that were offered to him, and when a university sent him an honorific title he did not even acknowledge it.

This explains the silence maintained about Spencer by the robbers of the upper classes.

The greatest service, however, rendered by Spencer is not to be found in his "Social Statics," but rather in the elaboration of his "Synthetic Philosophy," which may be considered as the philosophic work of the nineteenth century.

The philosophers of the eighteenth century, and especially the Encyclopædists, had already tried to construct a synthetic philosophy of the

*) Not Lewes' wife, but Marian Evans, better known as George Eliot, the novelist, with whom Lewes lived outside the marriage relation because he could not secure a divorce from his wife. A. L.

universe, — a summary of all that is essential in our knowledge of nature and man; on the plants and the stars, on the physical and chemical forces (or rather the physical and chemical movements of molecules), on the facts of vegetable and animal life, on psychology, the life of human societies, the development of their ideas and of their moral ideal. A "picture of nature," as Holbach had tried to make it, from the fall of the stone to the dream of the poet — the whole conceived as material facts.

Later on Auguste Comte continued the same work. He tried to construct a positive philosophy, which was to summarise the essentials of our knowledge of nature, without any intervention of gods, occult forces, or metaphysical formulae with their veiled allusion to supernatural forces.

The positive philosophy of Comte (whatever the English and Germans, who imagine that they have not suffered its influence, may say) impressed its mark on all the speculations of the 19th century. It provoked that awakening of the natural sciences in the sixties, of which we have written in "Modern Science and Anarchism." It also inspired Mill, Huxley, Bain, and all the Positivists and gave Spencer the idea of constructing his Synthetic Philosophy.

But Comte's philosophy, apart from the fundamental religious error, of which we speak in the pamphlet just quoted, presented a formidable gap. Comte was not a naturalist. Zoology and botany were unknown to him. He denied the variability of the species. This obviously hindered him from conceiving evolution and development as we conceive them at the present day.

Already in 1801 the great naturalist, Lamarck, giving a further development to the ideas of Buffon, affirmed that the various species of plants and animals that now people the earth, had developed gradually out of other species of plants and animals which, under the influence of the conditions amongst which they lived, had acquired ever new forms. In a dry climate, where evaporation is very great, the tissue of leaves will change, leaves will even disappear to give place to a hard and dry prickly. An animal forced to race thru deserts will gradually acquire lighter proportions than one that lives in the mire of swamps. And so on.

Everything continually changes in nature: forms are not permanent, and both the plants and the animals which we find nowadays are the result of a slow adaptation to conditions that in their turn are always changing.

But such was the reaction that reigned after the great Revolution that these ideas of Lamarck were forgotten and boycotted. German metaphysics ruled at that time, and reinstated, together with the cult of royalty, the god of the Hebrews, and the immortal soul part and parcel of god.

Nevertheless the idea of natural development, of evolution, was going its own way. If our system of planets and our sun are the result of a slow development — as Laplace and Kant had already proved them to be — why should not the masses of nebulous matter that we see in the starry sky represent worlds as yet unborn?

Is not the universe a world of solar systems constantly evolving and starting afresh to infinity? If Buffon and Lamarck had already guessed that the lion, the tiger, and the giraffe are so well fit for the conditions in which they live, because it is those conditions which have made them what they are, the facts that were being accumulated at the beginning of the century, or by travelling, constantly brought new proofs in favor of the variability of the species.

Transformism, and thence the ever-renewed development of new species, were ideas that imposed themselves on men's minds.

At the same time geology established that thousands of centuries had passed before the first fish, then the first lizards, then the first birds, then mammals, and at last man, had made

their appearance on earth. These ideas were very widely spread during the first half of the century — only people did not dare to affirm them openly. Even in 1840, when Chambers put them into a system in a book, "Vestiges of Creation," which created a great sensation, he did not dare confess his name, and hid his identity so successfully that during forty years no one could discover who had been the author of the book.

It follows that when metaphysicians tell us today that Hegel discovered, or even popularised, the idea of change and evolution, these gentlemen only prove that the history of the natural sciences is as unknown to them as the very alphabet of these sciences and their method.

The idea of evolution had imposed itself in all the fields of science. It was, therefore, absolutely necessary to apply it to the interpretation of the natural system as a whole, to human institutions, to religious and to moral ideas. It was necessary, while maintaining the fundamental idea of Comte's positive philosophy, to extend it, so that it should embrace all that lives and develops on earth. To this Spencer consecrated his life.

Like Darwin, he was physically of the "weak." But by submitting rigorously to a physical and intellectual hygiene he managed to complete this mighty task.

In truth he wrote a complete system of synthetic philosophy, describing, firstly, physical and chemical forces; then the life of innumerable suns, in formation or in decay, which people the universe; then the evolution of our solar system and of our planet. This forms the "First Principles."

After this comes the evolution of living beings on our globe, treated in the "Principles of Biology." This is a very technical book, to which Spencer gives much original work, and in which he shows how, by the action of chemical forces, life first appeared on our globe; how out of small collections of microscopic cellules, the immense variety of existing plants and animals, from the simplest to the most complex, has been able to develop gradually. Here Spencer has in part preceded Darwin; and if he was far from possessing Darwin's knowledge and having probed as deep as he had into each question, he sometimes had on the other hand greater and juster general views than those of his great master and contemporary.

According to Spencer, new species of plants and animals originate firstly, as Lamarck had stated, in the direct influence of the environment on the individuals. This he called "direct adaptation." Then, these new variations, produced either by the dryness, the dampness, the cold or warmth of the climate, or by the kind of nourishment, etc. — if they are serious enough to be of use in the struggle for existence — will permit those individuals who possess them, and who are, therefore, the most fit, to survive and to leave the healthier progeny. This is Darwin's survival of the fittest which was called by Spencer "indirect adaptation."

This double explanation of the origin of species prevails today in science. Darwin himself hastened to accept it.

The next part of Spencer's philosophy is his "Principles of Psychology." Here he takes an entirely materialistic point of view. He does not use the word "materialism." But, like Bain, he definitely leaves out all metaphysics, the soul, and the rest. He lays the foundations of materialistic psychology.

Then he gives us the "Principles of Sociology," the foundation of the science of societies, based, as Comte had foreseen, on the gradual development of customs and institutions.

Lastly, he gives us the "Principles of Ethics," that is to say — Morals. Two parts of this last division — "The Data of Ethics" and "Justice," published separately in cheap editions, are very generally known.

Thus we have a complete system of revolutionary philosophy.

To be continued.

News from Comrade McQueen.

"McQueen, who in New Jersey is imprisoned for pretty much the same reasons that the inmates of the Paris bastille at one time suffered for the pleasure of the courtlings," says the *Freiheit*, "has again given a sign of life. He is not sick, but one can read between the lines that to be buried alive is not to his taste. That Kropotkin has written him a sympathetic and encouraging letter has filled him with joy. From this it can be seen that letters from friends are greatly desired. All such communications he can freely receive. Letters from the outside world are restoratives for a prisoner, provided that they contain no gossiping, for such stuff has the effect of ratsbane." Books and letters should be addressed to Wm. McQueen, Drawer N, State Prison, Trenton, N. J.

Letter-Box.

M. C., Baltimore. — Correct: "the writers of FREE SOCIETY are not infallible"; but if they "misrepresent" or make "false statements concerning Socialist parties," the columns of the paper are open to the political Socialists for a reply. If you will take the trouble to induce your "German Socialist friend" to write for the Socialist periodical, *Grütli*, Nos. 97 and 99, which will cost you only a few pennies, you will find that the editor not only justifies the calling out of troops against strikers, but vindicates all sorts of violence perpetrated by governments, as is shown by "INTERLOPER" in this issue.

J. A. E., Cripple Creek. — I think it best not to publish your article. It is more or less a personal affair; besides, inconsistency is not appreciated even by our adversaries. As to martyrdom, I am inclined to think the greatest martyr is the man who lacks the courage of his convictions. We do not "suffer" by being persecuted — we derive satisfaction and pleasure from it. Regarding the term "philosophic Anarchist" I am as much at sea as your friend, for so far I have not been able to learn the distinction between "philosophic Anarchists" and "Anarchists," unless the term "philosophic" implies that the bearer of the adjective is determined to remain inactive until the millennium has been prepared by those upon whom he looks down as inferior creatures.

Attention.

Kindly announce in FREE SOCIETY that the St. Louis Debating Club has closed its doors owing to the lack of interest on the part of the comrades.

The different periodicals are requested to discontinue sending copies to the club. Communications regarding the propaganda should be sent to the address given below. I. WACHTEL.

1110 Franklin Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

For New York.

A concert and dance will be given by the federated groups of Russian-American Anarchists on Saturday, November 5, 8 p. m., in the Pacific Hall, 209 East Broadway. Ticket, 15 cents.

* * *

The German singing societies "Freiheit" will give a grand vocal and instrumental concert and dance on Sunday, November 6, 7 p. m., in the New York Männerchor Hall, 203—207 E. 56th St. Tickets, 15 cents.

For Boston.

Under the auspices of the group "Progress," a concert and performance, "The Innocent Walking Delegate, or Justice by Force," will be given for the benefit of a library fund in Paine's Memorial Hall, 9 Appleton St., Sunday, Nov. 6, 7:30 p. m. Single tickets 20 cents; 35 cents for man and woman.

Book-List.

- "Essays on the Social Problem".... 05
 "The New Hedonism".... Grant Allen 05
 "God and the State".... Bakunin 05
 The Same. London edition..... 10
 "Whitman's Ideal Democracy and Other Writings".... Helena Born 1.00
 "Prodigal Daughter; or, The Price of Virtue".... Rachel Campbell 25
 "Love's Coming of Age"..... 1.00
 "Evolution of the Family"..... 05
 "Conduct and Profession"..... 05
 "Crime and Criminals"..... 10
 "Realism in Literature and Art"..... 05
 "Resist Not Evil." Cloth..... 75
 "Tolstoy"..... 05
 "Crime and Punishment"..... 10
 "The Worm Turns"..... 10
 "The Emancipation of Society from Government"..... Dallon Doyle 05
 "Roosevelt, Czolgosz, and Anarchism"..... Jay Fox 03
 "Moriund Society and Anarchy." Cloth, 60c..... Jean Grave 25
 "Origin of Anarchism".... C. L. James 05
 "Anarchism: Its Philosophy and Ideal"..... Peter Kropotkin 05
 "Anarchist Communism: Its Basis and Principles"..... 05
 "An Appeal to the Young"..... 05
 "Anarchist Morality"..... 05
 "Expropriation"..... 05
 "Field, Factory and Workshop"..... 45
 "Law and Authority"..... 05
 "Memoirs of a Revolutionist"..... 2.00
 "Mutual Aid, a Factor of Evolution"..... 2.00
 "Organized Vengeance"..... 03
 "Paris Commune"..... 05
 "The State: Its Historic Role"..... 10
 "The Wage System. Revolutionary Government"..... 05
 "Socialism and Politics"..... 05
 "The Coming Revival of Socialism" "Government Analyzed"..... Kelso 50
 "The Economics of Anarchy"..... 25
 "Anarchy." (Is It All a Dream? Jas. F. Morton, Jr.).... Malatesta 10
 "A Talk About Anarchist Communism Between Two Workers".... "A Chambermaid's Diary"..... 05
 "Octave Mirbeau"..... 10
 "Do You Want Free Speech?"..... 10
 "James F. Morton, Jr."..... 10
 "The Deistic Pestilence".... John Most 05
 "God and Government: The Siamese Twins of Superstition".... W. Nevill 05
 "The Pyramid of Tyranny"..... 05
 "F. Domela Nieuwehuis"..... 50
 "A Cityless and Countryless World: An Outline of Practical Co-operative Individualism." Cloth \$1..... 50
 "Henry Olerich"..... 05
 "Mating or Marrying, Which?"..... 05
 "W. H. Van Ornum"..... 10
 "Sine Qua Non; or, The Core of Religion".... Dr. Geo. Pyburn 05
 "Evolution and Revolution".... Reclus 10
 "Pure Economy".... J. H. Rowell 10
 "Pages of Socialist History"..... 30
 "W. Tcherkeoff"..... 10
 "Bethink Yourselves," the Russian-Japanese War. Leo Tolstoy..... 10
 "The Slavery of Our Times." Cloth..... 75
 "Our Worship of Primitive Social Guesses"..... E. C. Walker 15
 "Vice: Its Friends and Foes"..... 15
 "What the Young Need to Know"..... 10
 "Anarchy on Trial"..... 05
 "Social Democracy in Germany"..... 02
 "Landauer"..... 05
 "Responsibility and Solidarity in the Labor Struggle." Nettlau..... 05
 "Direct Action vs. Legislation." J. Blair Smith..... 05
 "The New Dispensation" Cloth. By J. Wilson..... \$1.50
 "Living Thoughts." Cloth. By J. Wilson..... \$1.50
 "Life Without a Master." 338 pp. Cloth \$1.50..... J. Wilson 1.00
 "The Chicago Martyrs: The Famous Speeches of the Eight Anarchists in Judge Gary's Court; and Altgeld's Reasons for Pardoning Fielden, Neebe and Schwab".... 25
 Order from Free Society.

History of the French Revolution.

By C. L. JAMES.

A new history of the French Revolution, and a history written from a new point of view—this is in little a characterization of a work which is exciting intelligent interest and appreciative criticism among historical scholars and readers of history in general.

The author of the work, C. L. James, is in a literary as well as the physical sense the son of his father, G. P. R. James, who was well known both as a scholar and imaginative writer to an older generation of book lovers. With a trained literary faculty, an unbiased judgment, and a capacity for painstaking investigation and emendation, he has produced a piece of writing which cannot fail to become better and better known as time goes on, and which will take a place among authoritative pronouncement upon those events which it chronicles.

C. L. James approaches the problem of the French Revolution in a thoroughly scientific spirit, and equanimity opposition at once by giving due consideration to all the facts having any importance in that memorable strife. But ere the reader has gone very far into the book he discovers that it is a vindication of the human race in its long, long struggle to free itself from restrictions upon its liberty and life; in short, he discovers that the author views the evil of the French Revolution as a thing arising mainly out of oppression—prior thereto and authoritative interference during its progress, and the good as those liberties which it gave to the world and which its ideal and example predispose men to augment according to their strength and individuality.

Monarchy, democratic, religious histories we have had; the French Revolution is now presented to us from a libertarian point of view.

Printed from large, new type on good book paper, and handsomely bound in cloth; 343 pp. Price \$1, postpaid.

Order from Liberty Group, 427 Park Ave., Chicago, Ill.

SURE CURE FOR "THAT WAR SPIRIT" Resist Not Evil 75 CENTS postpaid

By Clarence S. Darrow.

Write for list of other Darrow books.

"Reveals a strong man at his mental best." — Chicago Tribune.

THE COST OF Something For Nothing...

By the late John P. Altgeld

THE BOOK OF THE HOUR !!! Dealing fearlessly with recent social, business and political developments, the late Governor of Illinois warns those who enter into the spirit of modern business speculation and political corruption that there is a moral law which will exact swift and fearful retribution from those who transgress it.

Every young man and woman should read "The Cost of Something for Nothing."

12mo, cloth, gilt top price \$1.00 net

Is There An Agent For This Work In Your Town? Write Us For Terms To Agents.

Send us 10 Cents for a Copy of "BETHINK YOURSELVES"

Tolstoy's Famous Letter On the Russian-Japanese War

64 pages. The only complete 10 Cent Edition published in America.

THE HAMMERSMARK Publishing Co.

151-153 Wabash Ave., CHICAGO, Ill.

M. N. Maisel's Book Store

194 EAST BROADWAY
New York

The best ten plays of HENDRIK IBSEN.

A Doll's House, 25c.
 Rosmerholm, 25c.
 The Lady of the Sea, 25c.
 The Wild Duck, 25c.
 Young Men's League, 25c.
 Hedda Gabler, 50c.
 The Master Builder, 50c.
 The Pillars of Society, 25c.
 Ghosts, 25c.
 The Enemy of Society, 25c.

The last three plays named are also published in a cheap edition in one volume, cloth, and sold at 50c. or 40c. postpaid.

The above ten plays, paper, sent to one address, postpaid, for \$2.50.

The same ten plays, seven in paper, together with the last three in one cloth volume, sent postpaid for \$2.25.

MAXIM GORKY'S.

"Orloff and his Wife" and seven other stories, 485 pages, cloth, published at \$1; my price for the copies on hand, 45 cents, with postage, 60 cents.

LEO TOLSTOY'S.

"The Slavery of Our Times," cloth, published at \$1.25; my price 40 cents; with postage, 50 cents.

I have only a few copies of this book on hand.

"History of Civilization in England."

By Henry Thomas Buckle.

Three vols., cloth, 1' mo., 1720 pages, large type and good paper. This best edition of Buckle's great work was originally published at \$9.00 a set. My price is \$3.25 or \$3.60 postpaid.

I have only a few sets on hand. **Walt Whitman's 'Leaves of Grass.'** Elegant artistic cloth binding, 12mo., 446 pages. This is the copyright edition of 1897 by Bucke, Horned, & Traubel, literary executors of Walt Whitman. My price is 85 cents, or \$1.00 postpaid.

Modern Science and Anarchism

BY PETER KROPOTKIN.

By some critics this book is considered one of Kropotkin's best work, dealing with all phenomena of life scientifically. The author reviews and analyzes the intellectual movements of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, as well as the teachings of the Church. He shows what place Anarchism takes in science; the object of the ideal, its origin, and how it developed. In conclusion he treats law, mortality, economic ideas, government, and revolutions and their birth.

Price, 25 cents.

Address orders to N. Notkin, 1332 So. Sixth St., Philadelphia, Pa.

LUCIFER — Son of the Morning — a fortnightly Journal of Radical Thought — Devoted mainly to the Emancipation of Womanhood and Motherhood from Sex Slavery, and to the Right of the Child to Be Born Well. Send 25 Cents in Stamps to 500 Fulton St., Chicago, Ill., for a three month's trial, and get a Catalogue of books and pamphlets in the line of Sex Reform.

THE ANARCHIST CONSTITUTION

By D. I. STURBER, Anarchist.
Price, 50 cents.

Sent prepaid on receipt of price. Sold by The Radical Publishing Co., San Francisco, Cal.

SUBSCRIPTIONS for FREE SOCIETY can be paid at the following addresses:

ALLEGHENY, Pa.—H. Bauer, 73 Spring-garden Ave.
 ATLANTIC CITY, N. J.—M. Kisluck, 1108 Baltic Ave.
 BOSTON.—K. A. Snellenberg, 127 Center St., Roxbury.
 CHICAGO.—T. Appel, 790 Girard Ave.
 H. Gordon, 427 Park Ave.
 BROOKLYN.—M. Metzkow, 174 Ralph St.
 CLEVELAND.—E. Schilling, 34 Elwell St.
 LONDON, Eng.—T. Cantwell, 127 Ossulton St., N. W.
 NEW YORK.—M. Maisel, 194 E. B'way.
 Alfred Schneider, 230 E. Fourth St.
 PHILADELPHIA.—Natasha Notkin, 1332 S. Sixth St.

FOR NEW YORK.

The Slavic Group meets on the first and third Tuesday of the month, 8 p. m., at 543 East Sixth St. Free discussions. All are invited.

Liberal Art Society meets every Wednesday at 8.15 p. m. sharp, at Terrace Lyceum, 206 East Broadway. Free discussion.

New York Literary Society meets every Wednesday, 8 p. m., at 206 East Broadway. Free discussion.
 Wednesday, Oct. 12, — "Reforms as a Means to Achieve Anarchy." — L. Stein.
 Wednesday, Oct. 19, — "Morality." — H. Kelly.

Manhattan Liberal Club meets every Friday evening at 220 East 15th street. Admission fees 10 cents for men, 5 cts. for women.

Friday, Oct. 7, the subject: "World Socialism, as advocated by the Socialist Party, be an Improvement on the Existing Social, Economic, and Political Institutions?" will be discussed between Gaylord Wilshire and James M. Brinson.

Friday, Oct. 14, — "Prohibition as a Partial Solution of Pressing Economic Problems." Rev. Dr. J. K. Funk.

FOR BROOKLYN.

THE RADICAL LECTURE CLUB of Brooklyn meets every Sunday evening, 8 p. m., in the Military Hall. Scholes and Leonard sts., entrance 90 Scholes st. Admission, 5 cents. Free discussions.

Sunday, Oct. 9, "How Freedom is Realized." A. Isaak.
 Sunday, Oct. 16, "The American Superstition of Majority Rule." Chas. B. Cooper.

TO BOSTON COMRADES.

Comrades of Boston and Vicinity who are obliged to room out, and who would prefer to room where personal liberty is understood and respected, can secure such lodgings if they so desire.

For further particulars address Bertha M. Stone, Hotel Pelham, Boylston st., Boston, care of G. P. Wiksell.

CHICAGO, ILL.

The Social Science League meets every Sunday evening, 8 p. m., in Room 913. Masonic Temple. Free discussion after each lecture.

Sunday, Oct. 16, — "Injunctions; their Cause and Cure." E. L. Masters.
 Sunday, Oct. 23, — Subject not known.
 Sunday, Oct. 30, — "The 'Open Shop' Conspiracy." Jay Fox.

FOR COOPERATORS.

If you have something to sell, or if you want to buy at cost, or to have the full product of your labor, or if you want to acquire knowledge in any branch of science — then address the Golden Rule Society, 566 Carroll ave., Chicago, Ill.