



## Herbert Spencer.

By PETER KROPOTKIN.

### IV.

The narrow spirit of the middle classes reappears in this manner amidst the noblest conceptions; in this Spencer is strikingly akin to Fourier, another man of genius, having similar returns to the shopkeeping medium from his most brilliant flashes. Here it is well not to forget the Collectivists who have the same terror of the sluggard, veiled only by their palaver and formulae.

But if you modify Spencer's conclusions where he sins too obviously against what we learn by the reading of man; deepen his most middle-class observation to extract its true motive, which will always be the hatred of all impositions on the full and entire liberty of man, the desire to provoke a maximum of initiative, liberty, and strong self-reliance; correct the system where Spencer has insufficiently considered the consequences of modern capitalism; seek for the real meaning of his respect for private property, which you will always find to be, as it was with Proudhon, hatred of the State and horror of the convent and barracks; make these corrections—it is the beauty and advantage of all inductive and scientific research that its errors may be corrected without ruin of the whole—and you will find in Spencer a social system greatly resembling that of communistic Anarchists.

If Individualist Anarchists, such as Tucker, have accepted Spencer as he stands, with his bourgeois Individualism for industrial property and his bourgeois "retribution," they have accepted the letter of the system rather than its spirit; for it would be enough to make the corrections authorized by Spencer himself, by introducing his voluntary co-operation and his attacks against private property in land, to come to our conclusions. This has been regretfully observed by many of the English papers in their obituary notices on Spencer.

\* \* \*

Up till now, in all social theories offered us by philosophers, the individual has been sacrificed to the State. Comte, after Kant and many others, fell into the same trap, and the German metaphysicians exaggerated further and were ferocious in their worship of the State.

Spencer's system is the first that, on the one hand frees itself of all religious superstition and metaphysical superstructure, and, on the other, roundly and bravely states the sovereignty of the individual. The State is here no longer enthroned as the aim of human evolution in the German style. On the contrary, the individual is placed first, and it is given him to choose the kind of society he will have, and to determine how far he will give himself to this society.

Spencer teaches us that in man we have to fight, not his independence of character, but his too great submission to the common herd; while all religions and all social systems have, on the contrary, fought the independent spirit in their fear of making revolutionists.

Unfortunately, here again, Spencer does not remain faithful to himself. He has no sooner made a revolutionary statement than he hastens to soften it, by offering a compromise. And

once on this road he is obliged to proceed from one concession to another so that at the last he compromises the whole of his work.

After having given the insolent title "Man versus the State" to one part of his "Sociology," he goes on to admit a negative and conservative part for the State. Thus the State must not employ public money to found a national library or universities: this is not its business. But it will see that individuals be protected from one another. It will protect the rights of proprietors. And since judges are necessary to explain the laws, and elected charlatans—I should call them representatives—for the making of laws, and universities for the teaching of the making of laws—the art of befooling and enslaving men,—thus by bits Spencer rebuilds the State in its worst functions up to the prison and the perfected guillotine.

Here again, and more than ever, does his courage fail him. The golden mean holds him back. Perhaps he felt himself hindered from lack of knowledge, since, at the time when he sketched his philosophy, his field of knowledge was narrow, and he was hampered all his life by this ignorance of all but the English language.

Perhaps, again, his nature and education barred him from rising with the impulse that a philosopher of his immense intelligence should have had.

\* \* \*

In a few words, these are Spencer's distinctive characteristics.

To create a *synthetic* philosophy—which is an abridgment of human knowledge as a whole, and gives a material explanation to all national facts and to the intellectual life of man and the life of societies besides; this is an immense work, and Spencer has accomplished it.

But even while we recognize the service he has rendered, it would be false to let ourselves be carried away by our admiration into thinking that his work really contains the last results of the inductive method and science as applied to man.

The fundamental idea of the work is just, but in its applications it is often spoiled through various causes. Some of them have been stated; others, such as the use of the fallacious methods of analogies, and above all the exaggerated attention paid to the struggle for life amongst individuals of the same species, and the overlooking of mutual aid—also a principle of nature—have been mentioned in our pamphlet on "Modern Science and Anarchism," which is known to our readers.

We cannot accept all of Spencer's conclusions. It is even necessary that we should correct the greater part of his "Sociology," as a Russian writer, Mikailovsky, has done, on a very fundamental point—the theory of progress. In one place we must be more faithful to the scientific method, in another we must clear the ground of remaining prejudices, or press further the study of some group of phenomena.

But above and beyond all this, one fact of the greatest importance remains that has been proved by Spencer.

As soon as we try to construct a synthetic philosophy of the universe, including the life

of societies, it is necessary to come, not only to the denial of a creative god governing the universe, not only to the denial of the immortal soul or any special vital force, but we come to overthrow that remaining idol—the State, the government of man over man. We come, so far as concerns the future of civilized societies, to foresee Anarchism.

In this sense it is that Herbert Spencer has immeasurably contributed to the Anarchist character of the philosophy of the century on which we have entered.—Translated from *Les Temps Nouveaux*.

### A Letter from France.

The trades-union congress took place on Sept. 18. One thousand two hundred and four unions were represented by more than four hundred delegates. For the first time in the history of the labor movement did we see delegates from agricultural organizations, representing eighty-three unions.

The discussions were warm and animated. The reformists attacked the revolutionary attitude of the executive committee and recommended political action. The sentiment of the congress, however, was shown by a vote of 825 (against 365) in favor of revolutionary methods, i. e., for continuing the struggle on economic grounds. The reformists (Socialists) then endeavored to have a resolution passed proposing proportional representation, a trick by which they thought to gain numerical strength among the railway and tobacco workers (unions so dear to Millerand) and thereby check revolutionary methods. The resolution was defeated by 823 votes against 379.

It was then decided, unanimously, that a great agitation for an eight-hour workday for all laborers be carried on, as one of the means toward the emancipation of labor, and that after the first of May, 1906, the workers should refuse to work more than eight hours. Political action will be utterly abandoned, which has caused great excitement among politicians.

At Marseilles the dock laborers have been obliged to submit their grievances to an arbitration board, consisting of an equal number of employers and employees.

The manufacturer Crettiez, at Cluses, who with his sons fired at a crowd of strikers, who in turn burned his home, recently returned to the city, and if soldiers had not been on the scene he would have been killed. His sons are still under arrest. It is believed that the strikers will be prosecuted for the burning of property, but so far no arrests have been made.

J. GROS.

With all our industry, with our steam, with our machinery, and with our division of labor, the majority of mankind suffers for want of pleasure, for want of recreation, of enjoyment, of happiness, of bread; that is, in short, for want of virtue. Nothing is more immoral than poverty, ye moralists of heaven! If your God thinks differently about it—which is probable, because "He" is capable of approving the most stupid thing—then I call "Him" a barbarian, which again means: no God!—MULTATULI.

# 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 30, 1904.

488.

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.

A judge in Milwaukee, Wis., has decreed that the eight-hour law as applied to city contracts is "illegal," and thus the agitation and endeavor of labor politicians has been annulled with one stroke of the pen. Did it ever occur to the workers that what they have achieved by virtue of their strength and determination has never been assailed as "illegal"?

\* \* \*

"Dispatches from Buenos Ayres say that in view of the alarms produced by the obvious preparations which have been made for a general strike by the working people thruout the Argentine Republic before the end of the year, the government is adopting immediate measures to set right some of the grievances complained of and so to stave off the conflict," says the *Worker*. "While the reforms granted will probably be only small ones and the gain cannot be considered as permanent, it is something that the working-class has shown a spirit of resolution sufficient so to influence the governing powers." The editor, however, does not seem to realize that this news reflects unfavorably upon the Socialist tactics—political action—if the preparations for a general strike have induced the government to make concessions, a thing which the three million Socialist votes in Germany have not been able to bring about.

\* \* \*

"Why do you take all these pains, you betters and benefactors of humanity?" our opponents inquire triumphantly, says the Chicago *Arbeiter-Zeitung*, "You know that the overwhelming majority of the workingmen do not care a straw about you or your great plans. They mock at you, they detest you, because they know that you ruffle their serenity, that

## FREE SOCIETY.

you teach them the right of self-help, which leads to strikes, to labor disturbances, resulting in loss of wages and starvation. Why, they are contended with their lot, these brave workingmen are, thoroughly satisfied to be allowed to earn their bread in the sweat of their brows. Why do you hamper them in their activity? Your agitation and propaganda will accomplish nothing."

You tell us nothing new, you wiseacres. We have told ourselves often enough how difficult, how painful, how galling our beginning is. Every day teaches us, with what docility the laborers submit to the yoke, how glad they are to be allowed to work at all.

If despite of this, we still raise our voice it is because we hope to be able some day to convince them of the unworthiness of their situation. Persistent dripping erodes the stone, and thus we drill and drill thru them, until they will learn to think for themselves, to regard the world with their own unaided eyes, and to discern, what is wrong, miserable, or abominable.

\* \* \*

So-called civilized humanity shudders at the barbarian custom of murdering the feeble and aged members of the tribe. Yet, the usage can be explained and justified to a great extent. People were hardly able to provide for themselves, living from hand to mouth, and when the old and feeble realized that they had become a burden upon the community, their retirement from life was an act of philanthropy. We search the records of anthropology in vain to find that there ever existed savages or barbarians among whom a few idlers revelled in luxury and plenty while the industrious masses lived in misery and privation. That was left to "civilization". We are often told it is due to the merits of this or that great man that workers have found out that they are robbed and oppressed. Why, the savages would look upon us as a lot of lunatics if they were told that among civilized people the toilers suffer misery and starvation, while those who neither spin nor toil wallow in plenty and pass their time in entertaining their dogs and horses. And when posterity will read that the old and feeble of our age, an age in which every man can produce all he necessities of life in a few years to last him a lifetime, were doomed to starvation and slow death at the bidding of a few railway magnates and other idlers in society, it will stand aghast and find no explanation of such cruelty and abnormality other than the most profound ignorance and stupefaction brought about by church and state.

\* \* \*

"The capitalistic highwaymen of Colorado," says the *Freiheit*, "whose infamies have thrown into the shade even the monstrosities of despotic Russian, are very far from taking refuge in the hushing-up system, the embellishment, or denial of their unheard of outrages in view of the approaching elections. On the contrary, they have the effrontery to boast of the infamy. They have issued an inflammatory manifesto thru which they attempt to stir up to frenzy not only of the fattened mercenary citizens of Colorado against organized labor in general and the Western Federation of Miners in particular, but try to array the entire capitalistic class against everything that smacks of trades-unionism. If one is to believe their statements, the miners of Idaho, Colorado, etc., are nothing but a gang of robbers who perpetrated wholesale

murder, and thru terrorism secured impunity. Therefore, it was only a matter of self-defense when the law-abiding citizens were compelled to take extreme measures. The election will show, the manifesto continues, that the great majority of the population of the state approved of the acts of the law-and-order element, and condemned the 'anarchistic' miners. And as the 'Anarchists' everywhere soon may raise their heads, it is necessary that the law-abiding citizens of the United States support the saviors of society in Colorado, and that the suppression of trades union tyranny be undertaken everywhere before it is too late. The manifesto has been reprinted by many dailies accompanied by silly cartoons and comments, and it will surely have its effect. And if organized labor of this country were up-to-date such provocations would call forth dashing revolutionary waves. However, one hears, for instance, that the labor leader (fakir) Weinsheimer could boodle \$80,000 from the bosses, without being in danger of detection by the dupes, much less of being bounced after the revelation, then one is at a loss to comprehend why the employers have not long ago perpetrated even worse infamies upon organized labor. Workers—above all!—be ashamed of yourselves!"

\* \* \*

Some twelve years ago a few Russians in this country tried in vain to stir up sentiment against a treaty then pending between Russia and the United States. Well-meaning Americans felt confident that such a thing would never come to pass. But the treaty was consummated, and never since have the Russian political refugees felt safe in this "glorious" republic which so readily embraced Russian despotism. Again, when it was pointed out by a few sober-minded men that there was a tendency toward imperialism and militarism in this country, they were ridiculed even by the most conservative and staunchest patriots. Yet, the prophecies have been vindicated sooner than was expected. And during a few years' cries in the wilderness have been heard that history would repeat itself if the American people failed to perceive the approaching danger of monarchism. These admonitions have fallen on deaf ears and closed eyes, while the sinister powers have been active and wide awake, as can be seen from the Boston *Herald*, the editor of which does no longer conceal the true sentiment of American snobocracy. In commenting upon the rapid growth of Socialism, the editor says among other things:

If its baleful manifestations can not be prevented by existing governmental methods, then, on the ground of self-protection, such changes will be made in our system of political control as will give the central government the authority and power needed to check the growth of Socialism. Of course this would mean the end of the republic as our fathers founded it.

The Des Moines *Globe* is still more brutal in its frankness. Says the editor:

Now is a good time for America to do away with her old, absolute constitution and adopt a form of government that will be logical with our new expansion ideas and will give ample protection to capital. A constitutional monarchy is probably the most desirable plan that we could adopt. Everything is right for the change. We have a large army, and it can be increased under almost any pretext without causing alarm to the masses. This country has been so prosperous that the voters have lost that spirit of patriotism and honesty that are necessary to the successful operation of republics. The strong hand of discipline will have to be used to bring the masses to a full sense of their proper behavior.



Commenting on the above, the editor of the *Miners' Magazine* points out "that the conditions that are being created thru the greed of corporate brigands are arousing a discontent that menaces the fortress of organized wealth" and thus "propose to use the powers of government to subjugate the masses," and urges political action in defense against these encroachments — to establish another government, of course. "Always the same dream," says Comrade Kropotkin, "the dream of Schiller's Marquis of Posa, trying to make autocracy an instrument of enfranchisement, or the dream of the gentle priest Peter in Zola's, 'Rome,' wishing to make the church a lever of Socialism." The fact is, the sole purpose of government is "to subjugate the masses" and it never was intended for any other purpose, no matter under what form or name it was imposed upon the people. And this the people must learn before they can entertain any hopes of establishing an era of freedom and plenty for men, women, and children.

INTERLOPER.

### Parentage and Prevetives.

Laura J. Langston says woman needs freedom. Agreed. Man, needs it too. The laws even of our boasted land of liberty conspire against woman, she says. Right again. But they conspire against men also. The rich man is above the law. So is the rich woman. The poor woman and the poor man are alike the ones conspired against. Is not that so?

It is necessary to remove the evils from motherhood. Yes; and from fatherhood, childhood and manhood in general as well.

She says that a harmless preventive of conception would do away with overpopulation, and hence with wars, plagues and other evils.

May I ask her how she manages to reach such a sweeping conclusion?

The fact is, we do not at all suffer from an overplus of population, any more than we suffer from an overproduction industrially. It is rather an underconsumption that we are afflicted with. Not getting the full product of their labor, the masses are unable to provide themselves with all their wants. But instead of calling the thing by its right name, our pseudo-scientific economists call it overproduction.

The same is true of population. Does not nature produce enough for everybody? Does Comrade Langston still believe in the long exploded theories of Malthus with his arithmetical ratio of production and geometrical ratio of population?

Our masters wage war, not because of overpopulation, but on the contrary because of underproduction. They want more markets, where to sell their goods. Hence the present war in Manchuria and all the wars of modern history. But if the wants of the semi-starving peoples of the civilized world were to be half satisfied, there would be no overproduction, no bloody wars for the markets of Cuba, the Philippines, Transvaal, Asia or anywhere else.

What is the cause for all our crises, famines, and crimes, if not this very same underconsumption?

Or is it perhaps really because there are too many births and too few harmless preventives? Why should there be any preventives at all? Has not nature intended us to live normally sexually, as well as in all other respects? Why is woman afraid of conception today, if not because she is either too poor to beget and rear children or too rich and luxurious and hates to be bothered with them? You tell me, it is injurious to the woman's health and dangerous to her life to give birth to too many children. I flatly deny it. No natural process can possibly be injurious or dangerous, unless there is some artificial interference on the part of the individual or that perpetual meddler—society, with our lives and liberties.

Is it less injurious or less dangerous to use preventives, no matter how "safe" and "harmless," or to cripple the woman and murder herself and her offspring by abortions and premature deliveries than to beget children? Do away with economical and political slavery—all rule and oppression of man by man—and you will have solved the problem of sexual, as well as all other life. Wars, famines, crises, plagues and all other ills will be no more. And even your "harmless" preventive will not be wanted.

However, I do not think that Comrade Langston need be afraid of the law to publish her effectual preventive. Anna Besant's book on this subject is being sold in England and America freely. So are hundreds of such books, pamphlets and articles of other authors, medical and lay, published and spread broadcast without molestation on the part of the law.

As for myself, I never heard of a safe and reliable preventive yet. There are many of them, but they are one and all injurious to both the man and the woman, or else do not prevent at all.

Out with it, then!

Let us hear of your new panacea, that will do away with all the evils flesh is heir to.

MEDICUS.

### Mullins and Macdonald.

Judge Mullins, of Colorado, says he will not sentence man to death, whatever happens. Five murderers are awaiting his action, in Denver alone; and the State of Sherman Bell is having the fan-tods. Eugene McDonald, the editor of the *Truth Seeker*, apparently agrees with the yellow press of Denver that Judge Mullins should get his black cap and skipping-rope in order—for all murderers less inexcusable and noxious than Sherman Bell. Judge Mullins says, very judiciously: "The state does not give life; it cannot take life." Eugene replies, "That the state cannot give life is true; the state cannot give life to a blade of grass. But the state can protect life; and if the protection of many involves the taking of one (life?) is the state bound to be influenced by the argument that it cannot give the life it takes from man or beast?" It might occur that a leading part of Judge Mullins' argument was to deny the effect of capital punishment in protecting life. He says: "Capital punishment in Colorado has not deterred the commission of crime." And, indeed, everyone, who knows anything about the actual condition of Colorado, must see very plainly that it has not. But in this we neither need Judge Mullins nor Sherman Bell to teach us. The first penologist in America says, "Intimidation does not intimidate, reformation does not reform, and prevention does not prevent." The state, then, cannot protect life. The state can do nothing. That is the sum of what all penologists and criminalologists have concluded—very creditably to the former for it is dead against their interests and prepossessions. "Is the state then bound to be influenced by the argument that it cannot give the life it takes?" By no means. The state is bound to do nothing. The state is a mirror of the people's collective stupidity. The state is a corporation, without a body to be kicked or a soul to be damned. But Judge Mullins thinks he has both. He, therefore thinks he is bound to be influenced by the argument that he cannot give the life he takes. The yellow press of Denver says, that Judge Mullins' decision is likely to cause all sorts of complications. Bully for Judge Mullins! Complications are what discover the absurdity of states. Complications are the eggs out of which revolutions are hatched. Sherman Bell has just been laying a whole nest full. The state cannot prevent this insolent rebel, the hired bravo of a treasonable vigilance committee called the Citizens' Alliance, from bullying the courts, threatening the police, and murdering the people. Neither can the United States—at least as long as their name is Terri-fied Ted. But Judge Mullins can do what is right; and they can no more make him do other-

wise than they can make Bell and Roosevelt do anything but what is wrong. C. L. JAMES.

### "The State must Go."

The originals of Henrik Ibsen's "Letters to Prof. George Brandes" are soon to appear in Christiania and Copenhagen. From a translation being prepared in London the following extracts are taken:

I am disgusted with Rome since the Eternal City passed into the hands of politicians. Before the era of Victor Emmanuel Rome was the only place in Europe where a man of my sort could live in peace. There was liberty—that is, freedom from political liberty-tyranny.

I do not want to see Rome again. Everything precious, including the historic dirt, will be swept away; for every statesman trained in Rome an artist will be ruined, while the shouting for liberty ceases because the Italians grant it as a matter of course. And what I love in liberty is to fight for it; its possession does not appeal to me.

\* \* \*

Old, historic France is dead. The destruction of Prussia will mark the beginning of a new age. Then you will witness such a crashing of ideas. And after all, it's high time, seeing that we lived off the crumbs that fell from the banquet-board of the French Revolution a century and more. Do you not think we chewed that cud, and rechewed it, long enough?

There must be a change of ideas, a new interpretation of things. Liberty, equality, fraternity are not the same to-day that they were in the time of the departed guillotine. The politicians will not understand that. Hence, I hate politicians.

Nowadays people want only partial revolutions; they want to abolish exterior things, political customs etc., which is all rot and nonsense. What is wanted is the revolutionizing of man's imagination, his intellect.

\* \* \*

The state must go. I will shoulder a gun myself if a revolution is started for purposes of undermining the state idea, which should be the alpha and omega of all intellectual movements.

Transmutation of the mere form of government will not do; one degree more or less of the present state idea does not cut the least figure. Only a radical change will do. But the main thing is not to allow myself to get frightened by that venerable bug-bear, "property," "possession." The state roots in time; it will die—in time.

And still greater things than the state will perish: religion. Neither our ideas of morality nor of art will endure. And, pray, what interest have we in perpetuating them?

Who will answer for it that two plus two are not five on Jupiter, for instance? Of course the Paris Commune spoiled my state theory, even for poetical purposes; but there is truth in it nevertheless, and that it will conquer some day I am sure, without caricatures.

\* \* \*

The more I think about the world's history the more it appears to me in the light of a shipwreck—every man for himself and for himself only.

### Letter-Box.

Mrs. M. J., Riverton, Utah.—Sent sample copies. Subscription price is \$1 a year, and the book-list you will find on the eight page. *Lucifer* is still published by Moses Harman, 500 Fulton St., Chicago, Ill.

M. H., Paterson, N. J.—Ciancabilla's companion has left San Francisco, and her present address is: Ersilia Cagenogni, 1092 Stanford Ave., Golden Gate, Oakland, Calif.

Corner-stone of all which is, stumbling-block of all which ought to be, — such is property. — PROUDHON.

## Public School Problems.

I am somewhat at a loss to understand the meaning of Francis B. Livesey's article on "Public School Problems," which appeared in *Free Society* of Sept. 11. Every intelligent person must deplore the injudicious "cramming" that goes on in these institutions so often resulting, in the case of high-strung, nervous children, in mental and physical collapse. But while I do not hold a brief for either state or municipal education, it is at present the only means of instruction open to the children of the workers.\* We are between the devil and the deep sea—public schools or no education. It seems to me that we must have something to take their place before we talk so sweepingly of their total abolition.

Mr. Livesey says: "Herbert Spencer in England and I in America have called for total public school abolition." Does he mean by this that he endorses the anti-school board-agitation of the English Spencerians and their "Liberty and Property Defence League" associates? I have had some little experience of these tactics, which are purely capitalistic, and not dominated by any wish to get better education. In my home town, Leeds, England, Mr. J. Greevy Fisher, a prominent Spencerian, well-known to readers of *Tucker's Liberty*, a few years ago militantly opposed the operations of the Leeds School Board, frankly from the standpoint that wage-earning hands were withdrawn from assisting in the support of the family. In this he had the support of Mr. Wordsworth Donisthorpe, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Auberon Herbert, and the rest of the small group, which surrounded the latter's *Free Life*.

Mr. Livesey seems to endorse this when he quotes such men as Henry Clews, who maintains that "schools unfit a boy for the work of life," and Admiral 'Bob' Evans, who tells us that every boy and girl should be compelled to work with their hands for a living!

This is a view that will be endorsed by our capitalist friends of child labor, for to them also, education unfits the children for the position it pleases their lords and masters to place them in.

It has been my experience during my 14 years connection with the labor movement, that illiterates were our worst enemies; that they composed the vast majority of the thugs and scabs who were hurled against us during strikes or disputes; that they were the least capable of understanding their life's problem, while among the educated workers, advanced views were, if not accepted, at least listened to and intelligently discussed.

And I must say, that my prison experience more than ever predisposes me to insist upon the necessity for education by any means; for I see from my associates that the vilest and filthiest criminals belong to the illiterate class, and I gather that in proportion as illiteracy is conquered, the worst forms of viciousness disappear. Even the mere ability to read is one of the best means by which the downtrodden in society have of conquering the environments with which poverty and degradation in its most abject forms surround them. They are then more or less able to judge of their actions by a standard different from that set by their conditions.

I refrain from saying more now, for I do not wish to misunderstand Mr. Livesey; I would like him to clear his position, so that we may know where he stands. I am convinced that the matter of education is one that should be tackled by earnest radicals, but upon entirely

\* This is, unfortunately, a prevalent notion even among radicals. The fact is, however, that, in New York at least, the radicals could easily establish two or three schools, if they realized the perniciousness of the public schools and had an ardent desire, to imbue their children with liberal and rational ideas. Thousands of Catholic workers pay \$1.50 and more a month for every child to their parochial schools, and this amount would also suffice to support Anarchist schools.

A. I.

different lines from those adopted by the English Spencerians, who "are now organised for total public school abolition." But of this more anon.

State Prison, Trenton, N. J.

## Slavery to the Truth.

Hugh O. Pentecost delivered an address on Sunday, October 16, in Lyric Hall, New York, on "The truth will make you free." It was an excellent address, full of sound reasoning, but its conclusion was fallacious. He endorsed the statement that "the truth will make you free," and advised his hearers to tell the truth invariably. A little calm reasoning, I think, would convince him that the truth is not to be told at all times and that it does not always lead to freedom. In Mästerlinck's "Monna Vanna" a glorious lie made Monna Vanna free, whereas if she had persisted in telling the truth she would have been a slave and a murderess. Lies are just as useful and sometimes as necessary as truth, altho they derive all their value from truth. If our actions, as well as our words, are considered, we tell lies far more often than we tell the truth. When we wear cheerful faces, when suffering from great annoyance, we are virtually lying, but it is far wiser to do so than to let our unpleasant emotions be known. Everyday politeness is more than one-half sham, but it is none the less useful, in that it makes pleasanter our relations with our fellow creatures.

Mr. Pentecost says, he has resolved hereafter to speak only the truth. But he must also invariably act the truth, if he would be truthful. When he is accosted by a man, who is a bore to him, he must show his annoyance and let the fellow know, that he is a nuisance. I hardly think he will do that. If he should invariably speak and act the truth for six months, he would be an outcast from human society. "But I would be free," he may say. No, he would not be free; he would be a miserable slave of the truth fetish.

Common sense should be used in deciding, when it is advisable to tell the truth, just as it should be used in all the other affairs of life. It would be equally foolish to lie without carefully considering whether it was worth while. Lies are too valuable to be wasted, but they are of little or no value to a person, who becomes known as a habitual liar. The rule "Always tell the truth" is a dangerous and foolish one to substitute for the rule "Always use common sense and never tell a lie unless there are stronger reasons for lying than for telling the truth."

JONATHAN MAYO CRANE.

A man with an income of a million a year eats the whole fruit of six-thousand men's labor thru a whole year, for you can get a stout spadesman to work and maintain himself for a sum of £40. Thus we have private individuals whose wages are equal to the wages of seven or eight thousand other individuals. What do these highly paid individuals do for society for their wages? Kill partridges. Can this last? No, by the soul of man, it cannot, and will not, and shall not. — THOMAS CARLYLE.

\* \* \*

Recipe for bringing up children to be patient, polite, kind, considerate, gentle, and courteous: Be patient, polite, kind, considerate, gentle, and courteous. — THE PHILISTINE.

\* \* \*

A happy marriage — a mutual admiration society. — B. G. RICHARDS.

## The Cause of Prostitution.

Only a few days ago I read in the capitalist press where one of these poor creatures called at the entrance to the House of the Good Shepherd in New York City; she asked for food and a place to sleep. 'Twas a pitiful tale she told the matron in charge. She told of her parents having died and left her alone in the great dark city; she told of the jobs she had secured but was discharged owing to her physical inability to keep pace with the machine, and, as a last resort, she appealed to this institution for succor and support. The matron in attendance, after having heard this terrible tale of woe and being thoroughly convinced as to the girls honesty and integrity as well as to her virtue, informed her that she could not take her in there, as that institution was established for the reclamation of fallen women only. The poor girl went away, but on the following night she returned. And now old hydra-headed hypocrisy bow low! For what follows is an indictment which should arraign the capitalist system as a public criminal at the bar of the nation's conscience. "You may take me now, for I am a fallen woman." — Ex.

## New York, Attention!

A concert and mass-meeting will be held at 8 p. m., Nov. 17, in Grand Irving Palace, 214 Broome St., by the "Licht and Wahrheit Circle" for the purpose of raising a fund for a "Free-thinkers' Home." The initiators are liberal Jews who wish to establish a meeting-place where radicals of all schools can have a free platform to discuss religious and social subjects, and invite any speaker they please, without being interfered with by the police. It is hoped that all radicals will help to make the undertaking a success. More about the enterprise can be learned by addressing Marcus Hershcowitz, care of N. Hillel, 219 E. Fifth St., New York.

\* \* \*

Next Sunday, October 30, 8 p. m., Comrade James F. Morton, Jr., will speak at the Radical Lecture Club in Brooklyn, at Military Hall, Scholes and Leonard Sts., on "Is there Hope in Politics."

\* \* \*

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. Tickets, 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 East 56th st. Tickets, 15 cents.

\* \* \*

A meeting to commemorate the Eleventh of November of 1887 will take place November 10, 8 p. m., at the Grand American Hall, Second ave. and First st. Emma Goldman, Lucy E. Parsons, James F. Morton, Jr., and Harry M. Kelly will be the principal speakers.

November 11, 8 p. m., the same speakers will address a massmeeting on the occasion at the Labor Lyceum on Willoughby ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.

## 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.