



A PERIODICAL OF ANARCHIST THOUGHT, WORK AND LITERATURE.

VOL. Xb. NO. 6.

CHICAGO, SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1904.

WHOLE NO. 452.

My Confession.

The song my heart would sing
Is like the murmuring
Of peaceful streams when soft they glide away
To far-off seas that call them, journeying;
But sometimes may it ring
Like waters when they fling
O'er sands and shoals and rocks that stem and stay;
A song of battle and of triumphing.

The life that I would know
Is that which free could go;—
he calm, untroubled life that finds its ends,
And moves thru all its ways nor fast nor slow;
But sometimes it must grow
Tumultuous; I must throw
Myself on that which hampers me and bends,
And see it crash in ruin, and lie low.

—WILLIAM FRANCIS BARNARD.

— O —

Ideal Liberty and its Realization.

Authority has had its day, under whatever form it presents itself: dogmas, laws, conventions, morals—whether it be from an educational, economic, or intellectual point of view, the authoritarian system is disappearing more and more from the earth. Representing the past, its achievements are also gradually disappearing in proportion as the brilliant light of the future rises; even considered in the light of current ideas, the authoritarian ideal appears decidedly as a conception worthy of barbaric times, or the perfect symbol of oppression. What is going to succeed it? Will it be ideal liberty?

What is ideal liberty? As I conceive it, it is nothing more or less than a state of society in which all members integrally develop themselves according to the tendencies of their natures, with no one imposing upon others his own economical, intellectual or moral conceptions—an environment where dogma and prejudging will be unknown, a world where individual experience and collective observation only will serve as the educational process and the sole base of free relations between men. In a word, it seems to me that ideal liberty, or Anarchy (the two terms are equivalent), is always a grouping where authority in all its aspects will be banished. That is the original, primitive sense of the substantive "Anarchy"; or the qualifying word "liberty."

The realization of ideal liberty, then, does not involve the general adoption of any metaphysical theory or philosophy whatever. On the contrary, it implies that each member of the future society will himself choose the philosophic conception which accords with his cerebral constitution, or his temperament. The Anarchist or the Libertarian is then no more anti-idealistic or anti-spiri-

tualistic or anti-scientific than he is anti-materialistic or anti-sentimental, for instance. He is only the conscientious adversary of all conceptions which do not repose upon the free choice of the individual, and of which the origin is a teaching imposed by the State, or the Church, or any other authority whatever. He is, in a word, anti-clerical and free thinking above all. Neither does the realization of ideal liberty imply submission of all the members of the society which is to come to a determined economic regime. There again will the question of characters and temperaments be interposed.

If one could imagine that all the world will some day be called to practically live the ideal of Communism, according to my views, it does not follow that all men would be actually or nearly prepared to find their happiness there, or the accomplishment of their desires. There is no proof but that in the actual state of mentalities such or such regime, as comparativism, collectivism or authoritarianism, for example, would more nearly respond to the stage of the evolution of the greater number of human beings. All the free man can demand or impose upon actual societies or upon those of the future, is that they leave to him the possibility of making a loyal application of his economical or moral conceptions, at his own time and with comrades of his own choosing. In a word, that others permit him to freely live his ideal;—for others to determine their ways from the results of their own experience.

The realization of ideal liberty ought not to demand a collective moral conception. The society which it foresees will know no social immorality but violence, and the individual will know no wrong save inequality, in the sense that all penchants are stifled so that men are hindered from moral, intellectual, and physical development—and that will cause them to do wrong to their own liberty in causing them to limit that of others—an inevitable consequence. Thus, as already in actual life, the free man will live to the greatest possible extent outside of established moral conventions, demonstrating that the scorn which he receives cannot, in practise, lessen his activity, his utility, or his love for others.

The realization of ideal liberty implies no constraint or violence, under any form. That which these import is not to be confounded with legitimate defense.

He is not a libertarian who seeks to impose his point of view upon another—

whether it be by the voice, by the pen, or by gesture. Constraint and violence are but the tangible affirmation of authority, and he who makes use of them is simply an authoritarian.

Without seeking applause, without appealing to useless persecutions, the free man will expose, propose, and discuss his ideal with as much warmth as he lives it within himself.

The forms of activity are innumerable, varying according to persons. One could class among the most revolutionary and the most profoundly educative those which consist in the refusal of military service, the payment of taxes and rent, the culture of the soil or salaried work for others, etc. But all the movements of the collective or general body will require, in order to succeed, strongly conscientious individual action simultaneously initiated. Those isolated ones who dare it are by so much the more heroic.

The realization of ideal liberty is not, then, inevitably tied to the success of a bloody revolution, accomplished by enrolled bands, conducted by chiefs—avowed or not—seduced by the gross appetite for purely material ameliorations, made fanatic by the announcement of the good news of the millennium or by reason of the belief that by only transforming the economical conditions of humanity all humanity will be happy. It depends exclusively upon the formation of individual conscience, really decided to leave others to live free. Respecting their neighbors as themselves, substituting for the blind determinism of majorities the experimental example of individual effort, for forced association the grouping by sympathy—because man lives not by bread alone.

Individualities have already shown in society what can be accomplished by free work and common intent, by the formation of groups of education and fraternity, of production and consumption of all kinds, of societies ignoring "mine" and "thine," assured of success as they are composed of free people.

Ideal liberty (still according to my views), should not be, then, that of a society uniformly ruled by a preconceived moral, economic or intellectual regime. It will ignore, from its very foundation, the economic basis of the life of future groups. And, too, we who desire to see free communities established on all sides as soon as possible (since the abolition of the exploitation of man by

man appears to us to be the logical corollary of the cessation of the domination of man over man—(say I), do not think to establish a libertarian or anarchistic doctrine; to establish a dogma; to proclaim a truth; we occupy ourselves much more in trying to succeed in being conscientiously respectful of the liberty of thinking and acting naturally: tolerant, finally, because indomitably resolved not to cede one element of our liberty or of the result of our efforts.—E. Armand, in *Nouvelle Era*. Translated from the French by C. T. BROWN.

The American Republic vs. John Turner.

Under the above heading Morrison Davidson, the well-known English Tolstoyan, discusses the anti-Anarchist act in *Reynold's Newspaper*, from which we quote the following:

We wish liberty and we believe its existence incompatible with the existence of any power, whatever its origin and form—whether it be elected or imposed, republican or monarchical—whether inspired by divine right, by appointment, or by universal suffrage.

The evil, in other terms, in the eyes of the Anarchists, does not reside in one form of government more than in another; it is the idea of government itself, in the principle of authority.

The Anarchists propose to teach the people how to get along without government.

They will learn, likewise, how to get along without property holders. No liberty without equality.—Manifesto of Lyons Anarchists, 1883.

That government is the best which governs not at all, and when men are prepared for it, that is the kind of government they will have.—Henry Thoreau.

Government is in its essence always a force acting in violation of justice. Christianity destroys all government.—Leo Tolstoy.

Force is no remedy.—John Bright.

"It is really astonishing how small and ridiculous the greatest 'governments' are, at times, capable of making themselves," Mr. Davidson proceeds after having given the above quotations. "Every serious student of history is always prepared to find them up to the ears in crimes of all sorts against humanity, and there is but little to choose between the best and worst of them. It is hardly too much to say that human progress has hitherto been achieved, not on account of brute force, put in spite of it, and 'force is no remedy,' has never been, nor ever will be.

"In small matters no less than in great, the mighty republic of the west seems determined to emulate, and more than emulate, the 'pirate empire' in inculcation of the doctrine that force is the only remedy. In the Boer war the mother country fell low indeed, but not so low as America in the Philippines, because we had comparatively such a short distance to fall. Since the Norman conquest we have been practically a nation of banditti, and shall probably remain such till the inevitable Nemesis, which ever dogs the tracks of the shedders of innocent blood, finally overtakes us. With the great republic it has hitherto been different. It has, on the whole, consistently acted up to the ennobling Jeffersonian doctrines of its famous declaration of independence, which, in every line, breathes of freedom and self-government as inalienable rights of mankind, everywhere and always. Hence the immensity of America's moral declension as evidenced by her godless treatment of the Philippines. But for an act of surpassing petty despotism, worthy of Muscovite

bureaucracy, commend me to the case of John Turner, which the press of this country has hardly had the manhood to touch in the most gingerly manner. But it is very different 'on the other side,' where the operation of the New Alien Law has already become a source of the keenest anxiety to every true and tried friend of free speech." . . . Here Mr. Davidson relates the facts which are familiar to our reader, and then comments:

"Such, then, is the situation and such the issues, in this singular case, 'on the other side.' 'On this side,' it is pleasant to record that Mr. Turner's colleagues on the London Trades Council—who are most competent to judge of his integrity and worth, speculative 'beliefs' or 'disbeliefs' apart—at last week's meeting of the council, considered the case of Mr. John Turner, when Mr. Mainwaring, who had obtained precedence as a matter of urgency, moved, 'That this London Trades Council expresses its condemnation of the arrest and threatened deportation of John Turner by the United States government as a flagrant violation of free speech, and calls on the trade unionists of America and England to resist the same to their utmost.' Mr. H. Quelch seconded, altho not agreeing with the principles preached by Mr. Turner. The resolution, with an addition, calling upon the British government to intervene with the American government was carried unanimously, and it was resolved that it be cabled to the American Federation of Labor.

"That Mr. Quelch, whom everyone must respect, should, as a leading Social Democrat, care to differentiate his views from those of Anarchist Communism, was both natural and right. He believes in majority rule, and judges, jailors, and hangmen, to back it up. Mr. Turner and I think, on the contrary, that until these are eliminated, bag and baggage, there can be no true social order whatever in any given community, nothing but *club law*. Here, however, we have to deal neither with Toryism, Liberalism, Socialism, nor Anarchism, but with Free Speech, the *condition precedent* of all possible isms. That lost and all is lost.

"And, be it here noted, Turner's particularism is quite as legitimate as the others. He is charged with no offence except 'disbelieving.' It is not alleged that he has violated any law of the State of New York, much less that he has advocated assassination or any form of violence. What is more, in 1896 he toured the United States, speaking in the principal cities without molestation, and in twenty years of agitation no one has ever dreamed of arresting him. Almost at the outset of his career, when he was a mere stripling, I can well remember presiding over a debate, somewhere in Clerkenwell, between him and an eminently-equipped protagonist of Social Democracy, who needless to say, was all there; but the adolescent 'Anarchist' was by no means far behind the veteran, and I have never forgotten his manifest earnestness of purpose and the fairness of his rejoinders.

"But the cause of Free Speech in the United States is not yet quite at the mercy of Mr. Cortelyou and his brace of inquisitor assessors. Not a few of the very best men in the republic are zealously bestirring them-

selves in the matter, fully recognizing the perils of law which, if it can be made to deport John Turner, would be equally applicable to Peter Kropotkin and, Leo Tolstoy, not to mention 'J. M. D.,' who hopes, next autumn, to attend the great Peace Conference at St. Louis, and for whom the amenities of Ellis Island have not the faintest charm.

I cut the following characteristic (but encouraging) *journalese* from the *New York World* (December 4, 1903), premising that the Ernest H. Crosby in evidence is of the very pink of New England gentlemen, and a poet not unworthy to be named with James R. Lowell:

"Let the statute of Liberty Enlightening the World, which guards New York Harbor, be torn down! This statue is a brazen lie! In its stead let us rear an enormous statue of cold, hard iron, typical of the United States government—a statue with a huge club in its hand, symbolical of this government's desire to club away from America's shores all those free and independent spirits who would cast their lot with us!

"Wild and prolonged howls of delight filled the assembly-room of Cooper Union last night when Ernest Howard Crosby—millionaire, vegetarian, psychic philosopher, who has a noble estate on the banks of the Hudson—uttered these words excitedly from the platform. The audience filled all seats and portions of the aisles. Whenever a speaker praised Anarchy or referred to it in complimentary terms, the joy of the audience was so great that young women split their gloves and men burst their buttons by the vigor of their applause.

"Anarchy means no prisons, no jails, no electric chairs! I think we are all Anarchists here, continued Mr. Crosby, smiling complacently at the enthusiasm of his auditors.

"We are! You bet we are! Hurrah for Anarchy!" shouted dozens of men, leaping to their feet and waving their arms frantically.

"Salutation to the prisoner of Ellis Island and reformation to the great republic."

Letter from Holland.

One of the questions which keep our capitalistic, political-religious as well as radical (except social-democratic) papers busy, is the refusal to serve in the army of a young man, Jan Terwey, who believes in Christian Anarchism. At the beginning of December of the last year he was called to perform his military "duty" in the garrison of Amsterdam; but he promptly told the officers that he was not willing to commit brother murder, because such was against his conscience. Then they offered to let him enter the military hospital service, but his answer was again resolute. Everything connected with militarism he refused to do. He was tried and sent to prison for three months in order "to ponder over his deed."

His comrades stirred up a vigorous movement, protesting against the imprisonment. Dr. Van Rees, professor at the University of Amsterdam, and others organized a "national committee" which distributed pamphlets against military service thruout the country. A number of persons from al-

parts of the country, among whom there were many preachers, issued a manifesto, demanding the right to refuse military service for conscience sake. Men, like Domela, Nieuwenhuis and Luitjes (a well-known agitator against militarism from his boyhood) addressed several meetings on which occasions they exposed the perniciousness of government and the infamy of wholesale murder as perpetrated by the military. And the agitation has evidently been successful, for the conservative press has already found it necessary to discuss the matter.

It is to be remembered that in Holland we are ruled by a Christian government, and have a premier, Dr. A. Kniper, who, before he got control of the State machinery, preached most beautiful ideas of freedom of conscience. "Freedom of conscience," he used to say, "is to be respected by whatever government." Of these beautiful ideas, found in old party platforms, Prof. Van Rees reminded the premier in an open letter, but the latter, like all other statesmen, holding liberal ideas only so long as he was not in power, remained silent.

The papers of his party, the so-called politico-religious press, are now advocating "duty to the State" and severe punishment for those who dare obey their consciences. "If the State would listen to those who oppose military service," they argue, "soon everybody would be opposed to militarism." They are right, of course, from the viewpoint of government, but such arguments do not remove the promises made in their own platforms before election time.

The growth of the anti-military spirit in this country is remarkable. The authorities are constantly troubled with those who refuse service in the army, and the sympathy expressed by the public for these "criminals" who refuse to learn the trade of murder is very annoying to the government. Even some dailies protest against the treatment a young man has to undergo simply because he refuses to become a man slayer. And all this trouble has been caused by one young man—the first who would not serve in the army.

The Swiss government is likewise constantly bothered by these "cranks" who refuse to kill their fellow men, which demonstrates the liberty-loving character of both nationalities. But, strange to say, the social democratic press has no sympathy for such individual deeds, which are not prescribed in their platforms. No wonder, for they are the defenders of the reincarnation of the State!

About the labor movement in general there is little to say at present, excepting that trades unionism is rapidly reviving from the collapse caused by the politicians a year ago, and begins to act more and more independently. Recently the contract dock laborers of Amsterdam went on strike, and, instead of being discharged as the contract demands, the employers made concessions, being afraid that otherwise traffic would again come to a standstill. This after the "defeat" of last year.

Our pioneer in the labor movement, Comrade Domela Nieuwenhuis, publishes "A March Against Capitalism During Twenty-

Five Years," a compilation of the best writings which appeared in his papers, *Right for All* and *The Free Socialist*. H. A. Amsterdam.

From Near and Far.

In Warsaw, Russia, one hundred and fifty Jewish workers were arrested last week for having advocated a more humane society than that which rests on exploitation and tyranny.

The mass meeting at Buffalo, to protest against the anti-Anarchist law, was poorly attended. "The speakers were there," says comrade Emma Bergman, "but the masses, the workmen, were at home nursing their stomachs." It may not be amiss to state the fact that the daily papers willingly announced the meeting, but the Social Democrats of Buffalo objected to having the protest meeting announced from their platform.

The brilliant success of the universal strike of the miners at Bilbao, Spain, has greatly stimulated trades unionism in Spain. Bilbao was the stronghold of the Social Democrats, who for years had promised relief to the miners in their fight against the truck system and the company stores. One petition after another was sent to parliament, Socialists were elected to the city council, but without avail. Finally the miners decided to go on strike. All other labor organizations went out in a sympathetic strike, and after four days the demands of the miners were conceded by the employers. At present 13,000 dock laborers of Barcelona have brought traffic to a standstill, and the government is deliberating an anti-strike law. The trades unions threaten a universal strike all over Spain if such a law should be passed.

The Socialist "national councillor" (congressman), Herman Greulich, has published a pamphlet, appealing to trades unions, the travesty of which surpasses even the "civic federation" of this country. First and foremost this "revolutionary" Socialist urges "that the demands of labor be made in a polite manner, which will compel the employers to respond politely." The workers should also abstain from abusing their employers in the meetings. Furthermore, if the general executive board should consider a strike inexpedient, that all assistance be denied the strikers. He also advocates a greater centralization of organized labor, not to unite labor as one would suppose, but "because only a general central executive board can appropriately survey the local situation and take the necessary steps." That's it: deprive the workers of all initiative and self-reliance and the task of the future Socialist government will be an easy one.

In France the breach between organized labor and the reactionary social democratic tactics is constantly widening. At Armentiers the unorganized textile workers went out on strike for a ten-hour workday. The strike leaders and the Socialist deputy and Mayor of Lills, Delory, immediately clashed. He restricted the strike, as he says himself in report to the Socialist *Vorwärts*, in order to have to deal with a smaller number, and contends that the strike was "hardly justified," and, above all, "the

strikers did not comply with the decisions made at Socialist conventions." Under such circumstances the strikers gained very little, except that they freed themselves from the grip of the Socialist party, and the local party organ, *Avenir*, has since ceased to appear.

Literature.

THE CITY JAIL: A SYMPOSIUM. Edited and compiled by Fay Lewis. Calvert-Wilson Company Press. Price, nicely bound, 50 cents. To judges, prosecutors, and jailers the book will be sent for the postage. Sold by Fay Lewis, Rockford, Ill.

Jails are the very worst and most depressing of the evidences of human depravity as shown in the desire to torture and punish our fellow-beings, and from this little work one might infer that the city jail at Rockford, Illinois, is one of the foulest and most horrible of the pens to which we send unfortunate men for "their good" and our own. The editor and compiler of the work has called in the services of such men as well-known Rockford citizens, C. S. Darrow, Jailor Whitman of Chicago, and Rev. Herbert S. Bigelow, and the opinions of these several men make interesting reading, though not all of the writers realize that jails should be swept away and not reformed. It is announced that a copy of the book will be sent by the editor to any judge, prosecutor, or jailor in the land if five cents is transmitted for postage. All unfortunates of the judging, prosecuting, jailing kind should send for the book at once: they need it.

THE SALE OF AN APPETITE. A Story by Paul Lafargue. Published by Charles H. Kerr & Co., Chicago, Ill. Price, nicely bound, 50 cents.

Emile Dustouches was a hungry man, which is nothing strange; but while gazing into a cafe window with mouth watering and his stomach gone mad, he was approached by one of the privileged few, a moneybags, who offered to buy his appetite. After some parleying a bargain was struck, and the starving man began to digest for the sake of the rich man's pleasure, feeling himself filled day by day with good things which he was not permitted to enjoy, as the other had masticated them. Becoming tired of his intolerable task, and complaining, he was informed that he had sold his appetite to Plutus as a man might sell his labor or his time to another, and that he had no reason to complain. The story is a satire of course, but its apparent madness finds a reflection in the madness in which men buy and sell each others' powers in this mad world. The volume is prettily printed and bound.

W. F. B.

For Boston.

The Boston Social Science Club meets every Sunday at 3 p. m. in room 9, 724 Washington street. The first series of lectures will be on Anarchism—Its relation to other forms of Socialism, "What Anarchism is," "Its Scientific basis," "Its Social application," and "Its political Economy." Free discussion follows each lecture. Admission Free.

For Philadelphia.

The annual Russian Tea-Party will take place March 25, at Pennsylvania Hall, 928 S. 6th St. An excellent program has been arranged.

FREE SOCIETY

Formerly THE FIREBRAND.

Published Weekly by FREE SOCIETY Group.

A. ISAAC, Editor.

ONE DOLLAR A YEAR.

Address all Communications and make all Money Orders payable to FREE SOCIETY, 407 PARK AVE., Chicago, Ill.

Entered at the Chicago post office as second-class matter, October 29, 1901.

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

ANARCHY—A social theory which regards the union of order with the absence of all direct government of man by man as the political ideal; absolute individual liberty.—Century Dictionary.

CHICAGO, SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1904.

452

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

Notes.

Friends are requested to give us the names of persons who are likely to be interested in FREE SOCIETY, that we may send them sample copies.

To anyone sending us \$2 we will send FREE SOCIETY one year and Dr. Greer's "A Physician in the House" or his new work "The Wholesome Woman." Also to anyone sending us one new subscriber and \$2 we will send the same. This applies to renewals as well as new subscriptions.

For Chicago.

The conference of comrades of all nationalities which was to have met January 31, has been postponed to the succeeding Sunday February 7, taking place at Toggenburger's Hall, 105 Wells St., at 2 p. m.

The Sociological League meets every Sunday evening, 8 p. m. sharp, in Jefferson Hall, Fraternity Bldg., 70 Adams St. Admission 10 cents. Sunday, Feb. 7, Lucy E. Parsons will speak on "Trades Unionism, Past, Present, and Future."

Saturday, Feb. 6, 8 p. m., W. H. Mabley speaks on "The Man or the Machine?" at 224 Blue Island Ave.

Liberty Group meets every Thursday, 8 p. m., at 427 Park Ave., corner Western Ave., for business and social purposes. Saturday, Feb. 13, 8 p. m., a social gathering will take place. All friends are welcome.

The Linotype Fund.

At the time of this report, Monday, Feb. 1, the linotype fund stands thus:

PLEDGES.

At last report.....\$ 125 00

PAID CASH.

Previously reported.....\$ 151 00

List No. 15, Pittsburg, Pa..... 19 00

Total, \$170.00

For Cleveland.

"Free Society" meets every Sunday, 3:30 p. m., in Foresters' Hall, 223 Champlain St. All friends of liberty are cordially invited.

FREE SOCIETY

From the Lips of Liberty.
Long live the great ideal.

Free speech is freedom's seeds-plot.

Truth can survive on bread and water.

For president in 1904, John D. Rockefeller.

Government has thousands of good disguises.

Capital early got a divorce from interfering justice.

It would take fifty coroners' juries to hold Mayor Harrison.

The strength of the State is the weakness of the social bonds.

What is the worth of a peace purchased with your manhood?

When the "nation owns the trusts" the trusts will own the nation.

The vulgar rich advertise their empty heads with their full purses.

Another senator has been indicted. Now for another supreme court release.

The Empire of Sahara had as legitimate a beginning as any of the presuming lot.

On February 1, a new governor was inaugurated in the Philippines. The military was there.

Our better impulses spring from opportunity, our worse ones from the force of circumstance or condition.

A Cleveland judge refused to fine a starving man who had stolen bread. It is but a step from bread to houses.

President Hadley of Yale university is pessimistic over political action; but do not expect him to become an Anarchist.

Might is always anxious to establish a theory of rights with itself as the final court of appeal. Thence comes the State, the good State!

The necessity of liberty as the sole foundational means of development will finally make the world anarchistic. Economic determinism does not determine.

The American Bible Society is in financial trouble. Its business is to spread Christianity, but four of its officials receive \$5,000 a year each. Righteousness is profitable.

Dr. Ames, one time mayor of Minneapolis, has been released from prison by the supreme court of the state of Minnesota, a mere technical defect in his trial furnishing an excuse. It is admitted that he took \$600

hush money from keepers of disorderly houses, but as it was not proved that he knew where the money handed to him came from, he is free, and "justice" is triumphant again.

J. Pierpont Morgan offered \$250,000 for the original manuscript of Milton's "Paradise Lost." Having recently unloaded a lot of depreciated steel stocks upon his employees, he can well afford to do things.

"Free love?" some say. "Why, all love is free." And the statement may be allowed to pass as true, if it be also admitted that little love is possible, because of sex slavery.

The recent insult to the American flag in Cuba is to be punished, we are informed. It seems that the blessings Cuba has received from American development of her resources and the accompanying exploitation, are not wholly appreciated.

The cause of unionism in and around Chicago is being tried in the fire of a grand jury investigation. Capitalism is on the alert for means to destroy the workingman's independence, and the workingman must be on the alert to anticipate it.

An excellent subject for a puzzle cartoon: Roosevelt and Hanna standing side by side, one representing a strenuous man—"buster," the other a hypocrite posing as labor's friend; the cartoon to be labelled, "Beauty and the Beast," with the addendum, "Find the Beauty."

The Turner meeting held last Sunday in Chicago, has moved some newspapers to tears, and others, like the Chicago Chronicle, to hysteria. Trades Unionists, Socialists, Single Taxers, and Anarchists met together to protest against an outrage upon free speech! How nice it would have seemed to the editorial chairwarmers of the status quo if the meeting had only been called by labor to move a vote of thanks to the good, kind capitalists who employ it.

Chancellor E. Benjamin Andrews of the Nebraska University is anxious that the doubtful trustees accept an offer of \$66,666 from Rockefeller. He defends in his greed the Standard Oil method of crushing rivals, and opines that such a method will eventually be resorted to in getting rid of weak human beings in general, skilled physicians doing the work. Andrews should beware; the time might come when even sycophants like he could be of no use to Rockefeller. Ahn then!

The last argument of authority, face to face with the ultimatum of liberty, is that Anarchism is impossible, in that it expects too much of men. Do the comfortable creatures of this world whose lips are worn with repetitions of this dogma, have themselves in mind when they speak of "men," or do they think only of those who toil that they themselves may moralize and yawn? Many things have been "impossible" until they made unmistakable appearance. Dead men should lie still in their graves and not sit up and prophesy.

AMERICUS.

By the Wayside.

"Let it not be written on the pages of history that organized labor in the State of Colorado closed its ears to this appeal," says the Colorado State Federation of Labor in an appeal for financial aid. "But rather let it go forth to the world, that we are brothers in an indissoluble fraternity, cemented together in a common cause; until the final emancipation of labor sounds the death knell of wrong and triumph of right." Will Mr. Gompers take notice?

"The worker starves and freezes and suffers," says Victor Berger, "and on account of his poverty and dependence he is not even taken seriously—and he patiently forbears, endures every thing, and continues suffering. Even the ass kicks and becomes obstinate when things go too far for it. Verily, one is tempted to believe that, had the ass the right of suffrage, it would surely vote for more hay and more rest." You are mistaken, Mr. Berger. The ass would surely know the difference between a slip of paper and a bundle of hay, and choose the latter.

In the *Union Leader* of this city, a writer suggests that the politicians should not waste their time and energy in trying to protect the American laborers from immigrants who come here ready to use their muscles in the production of wealth, but to direct their efforts to ridding this country of its self-styled aristocracy, "our would be royalists, our rich and squandering loafers" whose only occupation is to suck the blood of all who toil. This is a refreshing voice coming from the ranks of trades unionism; but in order to rid labor of the idlers of the country the workers must learn that the politician is the first among the loafers to be chased into oblivion.

The travesties of justice in a "free republic" are liable to fool even the greatest sceptics. Two weeks ago I had occasion to observe that stealing and bribe-taking was a profitable business for ex-senators and other rich idlers to engage in, leaving them quite a margin after they had paid the fine which compassionate judges reluctantly impose upon them "only by compulsion of the law." But I was mistaken: Ex-Senator Driggs is still in possession of the bribe-money, for the company which bribed him promptly paid the \$10,000 fine; and the sheriff, having observed the judge's tears, "permitted him to return to his home in the custody of his wife," instead of sending him to prison for one day. But "there is honor among thieves," and government is but the representative of big thieves.

"If the struggle must come—and some say it must—and a labor war come upon us, then I am glad to be where I am tonight, as a Sherman always likes to be—a peer of a Grant and second in command to a Grant," said Father Sherman at a banquet given by pedigreed loafers. This pugnacious and blood-thirsty priest has certainly missed his vocation, for he seems to love the trade of murder much more than the teachings of Jesus Christ, who, if I am not mistaken, never rejoiced over the prospects of having

a chance to club the toilers into submission. It may be safe to play with fire at a richly covered table and tickle the ears of those to whom "God has entrusted the earth," according to Baer; but such provoking threats make quite a different impression upon those who are harnessed in the yoke of Church and State, who are liable to employ the very means against their oppressors which are so highly recommended by the "spiritual father," that is, brute force. And then there will be weeping and gnashing of the teeth.

INTERLOPER.

The Workingman.

The workingman is one big fool. Yea, verily, saith the prophet, he is an ass, and the sound of his braying is heard in the world.

He complaineth aloud at the hardness of his lot; nevertheless he still boweth his neck to the yoke.

He buildeth palaces for the rich, while he himself liveth in a hovel, and payeth rent.

Yes, very muchly and frequently doth he pay rent, as he can raise the price.

When he can no longer raise the price, he getteth a swift kick near the termination of the vertebrae and goeth suddenly out.

His wife and children are also driven forth to perish with hunger and cold.

Then goeth the workingman to the "charities," where are found the angels of mercy, who minister to the needs of the poor at so much per minister and wax fat thereby.

He findeth the chief angel and straightway poureth his tale of woe into his sympathetic (?) ear.

The chief angel listeneth with an incredulous smile and giveth the poor man an order to the charity wood yard, where he splitteth two cords of wood, and getteth a ticket to a soup house as his reward.

Yet the workingman getteth no wisdom. He remaineth an ass all the days of his life.

He diggeth in the bowels of the earth, and bringeth forth her treasures and layeth them down at the feet of the boss.

He also voteth to send his boss to congress.

The boss maketh some laws to keep the workingman in slavery.

Yet the workingman taketh no tumble to himself.—Rev. W. T. Withrow.

A Protest Meeting in Chicago.

The Chicago Federation of Labor has at last joined in a protest with that made in different eastern cities against the detention of John Turner at Ellis Island. The mass meeting last Sunday was well attended, yet considering the gravity of the affair it was a sad thing for a city like Chicago. Most of the four hundred faces there were familiar to those who attend meetings of a liberal nature; but the workers, and especially the members of trades unions, were conspicuous by their absence. In one symphonic voice press and pulpit, exploiters and their hirelings—the courts—demand the extinction of organized labor, but it seems as tho nothing can disturb the American drudge in his comfortable slumber. And the "union men of prominence" were busy making stump speeches for Hearst, who, ac-

cording to Mr. Cohen, a "shining light" among Chicago labor leaders, "will relieve many millions from wage slavery."

And strange to say, none of the men who had been advertised as speakers, such as Judge Dunn, Darrow, Gompers and Mitchell, appeared. These were substituted Western Starr, Seymour Stedman, and Daniel Cruice. In scathing words Mr. Starr denounced the anti-Anarchist law and stigmatized the arrest of John Turner as an act of political insanity. "Free thought and free speech have been strangled in America," he said among other things. "Roosevelt is the first president to exercise the paralyzing power to crush those rights. In John Turner every one of us is crucified. I know little of John Turner or his beliefs. But he stands for freedom of speech, of conscience, and industrial liberty. If Turner believes 'government by force is not the best government, I subscribe. If he sees no need for standing armies and certain courts, I agree. What you representatives of organized labor want to do is to understand John Turner. His fight is against the common enemy, special, privileges and vested rights."

The other two speakers said but little worth noticing, excepting that Seymour Stedman rehearsed the Socialist lie that Peter Kropotkin had been entertained by Mrs. Potter Palmer at her home.

A collection for the defense of John Turner was taken up, and a committee appointed which is to draw up a protest to be sent to Washington.

LETTER-BOX.

E. G. S., New York.—We note here that you received \$7.50 from Comrade R. Fritz, San Francisco, collected for the benefit of Comrade Berkman.

C. Ranard, New York.—The paper has been mailed regularly to your present address, and the cause of your not receiving it lies either with the mail carrier or your "friends at home."

C. N., St. Louis.—Are you quite certain that the author of the poem "Like Begets Like," or "Solitude," as the title sometimes runs, is Ella Wheeler Wilcox? Both she and Dr. Joyce claim the authorship—that's all we know about it.

C. E. N., Boston.—Thanks for pointing out the error. The idea of coming and helping us in our work would be accepted with joy; for the "editor" works about eighteen hours a day, and a little assistance would give him some leisure for reading and other beneficial recreations.

S. S. Rich, Lawrence, Mass.—The story, "A Lodging for the Night" is a satire on respectability. Villon, the "sad, bad, mad, glad" brother, as Swinburne has it, is made to serve Stevenson's purpose in comparison with an "honorable" soldier. One thief is proved to be as good as another; this is the "object."

Confusion and Communism.

Let me state in opening that I welcome this new defender of Anarchist Communism, W. F. Barnard, from the ranks of so-called Individualists. One could almost see at a glance that he is a new "convert," by the zeal with which he plunges into my articles, only to get lost in a "confusion worse confounded" than that in which he thinks he has found me. It is a peculiar characteristic of all movements of this kind that new converts invariably feel themselves called upon to jump immediately to the "rescue" of the ideal from the "destructive" tactics of the old members. Excepting that these premature "plunges" often get them into a tangle and make the ideal appear illogical,

I am not sure the tendency is not a good one. For as we get older in the movement, we are likely to lose the fire of enthusiasm that burns so brightly in the breast of the newcomer, and get more or less fossilized and conservative. And while in such a state there is danger of us, unconsciously perhaps, modifying the ideal to suit our changed attitude toward it. If that could go on unchecked our ideals would surely degenerate; but with the fiery youth ever on the alert to lash us back to the line, such a possible catastrophe is happily avoided.

Mayhap I am one of those fossils who, becoming enmeshed in the snare of a waning enthusiasm, have departed from the beaten path and wandered off among the bramble of chaos and contradiction. If so, my watchful critic is entitled to the eternal thanks of the movement, for having so suddenly brought me to a halt, and thereby saved the ideal from its impending doom.

Let us now examine the charges made by friend Barnard and see what they are made of. I have erred, he says, in two particulars. Here is the indictment in his own words:

... firstly in speaking of it "alternately as in harmony with Anarchist Communism and with the exact opposite of Anarchist Communism, viz., the economic conditions which we labor under today; and secondly, he errs in assuming that "supervision" in the sense in which he uses the word, can be anarchistic.

These "errors" are grievous if indeed they be true.

For the benefit of those readers who may not have read the articles complained of and who certainly could not have got the sense of them from reading my critic's quotations, I will outline, briefly, their contents.

The purpose was to show that the movement would be best served by the formation of groups to take up the work of propaganda; that such groups in order to become practically operative under present conditions, would have to take on some form of organization, distasteful, perhaps, to some idealists; in extenuation of which I wrote that, while living under the present system we are forced, to a large extent, to use its methods whether we like them or not.

But at the same time I maintained that where the ownership and control of the means of propaganda are concerned, it is more in accord with Anarchist Communism for such groups to have control than that the whole machinery be in the hands of one or more individuals. I suggested that some method of association be adopted that would make each and every comrade feel a responsibility for the progress of the propaganda and the work of the group; and that such a method, if carried out, would be "casting over the whole the sweet flavor of Anarchist Communism."

That is the extent of "error" number one; and it would seem that the only meaning to be taken from the whole is that I freely recognize our inability to practise pure idealism in the propaganda, and urge the comrades to at least have their work flavored by the ideal. The matter of alleged contradiction is a bland evasion of the main contention, and so trivial and babyish as to suggest a desperate straining on the part of the critic to make a point against the

Group supervision.

writer without venturing into a discussion of the subject matter of his articles.

In the second article, which was called forth in answer to a comrade who seemed very much alarmed by my use of the word "supervise," I assumed the following as a specific example to show that if the group did not supervise the editor a worse condition of affairs would probably arise, at least that the way is not so rosy as it probably will be after a free society has been inaugurated. Furthermore I said:

Let us suppose that a group of Anarchists have been drawn together by a mutual desire to spread their ideas by the publication of a weekly paper. After they have secured the necessary means, they find an editor must be had who will devote his whole time to the paper. How is he to be selected and upon what conditions is he going to serve after being selected? Suppose Jones to be the unanimous choice, would the group elect him for life and put the business and property in his name with full power to do as he sees fit? Not at all! Such a proposition would be ridiculous. Wouldn't the group be more likely to say to him: "Jones, in appointing you editor we do not abrogate our control of such property as may be in possession of this group. We will not exercise a censorship over what you may write or publish, but we retain the right to remove you upon due notice whenever for any reason you fail to give the desired satisfaction, or whenever we shall have secured the services of someone else, who in our judgment, is better qualified to fill the position you now hold."

This quotation brings us to "error" number two, for my critic says it is not anarchistic. Then he lays down the following precepts:

Communist Anarchism is voluntary in all its comings and goings, the power of anyone over another beginning and ending with the right to withdraw from his society if we do not like it. If we supervise a man we sacrifice our Anarchism, if we introduce other than voluntary elements into our lives we sacrifice our Communism.

I might remark here, before proceeding further, that in the early part of his article, my critic reassures his readers with the following observation:

We must be clear and definite in our theories or else we lay ourselves open, and justly, to suspicion in respect to what we have to offer to the world as wisdom and truth.

Thus fortified we may safely proceed to an examination of the precepts. That "Communist Anarchism is voluntary in all its comings and goings" is sound doctrine. Of the second clause, which says, "the power of anyone over another begins and ends with the right to withdraw from his society," I am not quite so sure. It can best be treated by applying it to Jones, for whom the whole doctrine was meant to apply. Suppose that in the course of a year Jones' ideas relative to certain fundamentals changed, and he began expounding his new ideas in our paper, what would be our remedy? Why, to withdraw, quietly and apologetically, from his society, leaving him everything in sight, from the office cat to the building.

"If we supervise a man we sacrifice our Anarchism" is another of those "clear and definite" statements of theory we were promised in the beginning. The important fact as to whether or not the supervised has given his consent, should be considered. It evidently has no place in the new philosophy; for the inference is that the group, in supervising Jones, sacrifices its Anarchism. In other words, that it governs him; for my critic says: "government by a group is as much government as government by an

individual is." And all this sets me wondering what government is, according to the new philosophy.

I have long regarded forcible subjection only as being government. Jones is not compelled to accept our terms: we have no monopoly. He can, if he chooses, organize a group, or individually start a paper. On the other hand, if he accepts our terms, having full freedom to reject them, he is exercising his largest rights as a free man. And, the exercise of a supervision over his work being part of the agreement he thus voluntarily entered into, is no violation of liberty on the part of the group.

Now suppose Jones violates his agreement in some particular and insists upon remaining in his position against the wish of the group, does Anarchist Communism give us no remedy other than to withdraw from his society? Have we not the right to eject an invader or to assert our right of self-defense against a fellow who would govern us? Haven't we got the right to reclaim our liberty? Is not liberty the right to do with ourselves and our belongings that which we chose? Have we not the right then to take the editorship of our paper from Jones and give it to Barnard, and to take it from Barnard and dump the paper into the East River? Most emphatically, yes! and that kindergarten philosophy, which says we must "withdraw" and that we are sacrificing our ideal when we see that a man does that which he has agreed to do, should be returned to the incubator. JAY FOX.

New York, 57 East 99th St.

Rejoinder.

It is a maxim of legal disputation, or that form of argument which is popular with lawyers in addressing juries, that if his client has not a good case an attorney should indulge largely in personal abuse and detraction of the man who is unfortunate enough to find himself on the other side of the case; and that often cheap wit and bombast may supply weapons ready to hand, enabling him, if liberally mixed with detraction, to confuse the minds of the jurymen and win for his anxious client a favorable verdict. And certain types of controversialists, following the lawyers, are prone when on the weaker side of a discussion to fall into similar methods of disputation; drawing upon the arsenals of ridicule, irony and patronage, to substitute their noisy and smoking weapons for the rapiers of reason and the daggers of demonstration. One of the last resorts of a closely pursued and breathless advocate is to cry out that, being older than his antagonist, he must be the wiser of the two. The appeal from reason to grey hairs is a form of argument always indicating that discussion is at an end.

It is plain to me, as I read the article by Comrade Fox in this issue of FREE SOCIETY, than I have "drawn" him, as the English say; but I confess that I was hardly prepared for the storm of indignation and scorn with which he meets my temperate criticisms of his attitude. Clearly he is nettled by my presumption in daring to cross swords with him, and a perfect bombardment of spleen, amused contempt, accusations of "babyishness" patronising retorts, etc., is the result. It seems that Jay Fox considers himself older in the movement

than I, that he believes my position represents, not thought, but the undigested ideals of rash and enthusiastic youth, that my philosophy should go back to the incubator, while he and his superior associates prepare for the triumphant progress of "group propaganda." Being measurably accustomed to controversy, however, oral as well as written, I return to the matter at issue not one whit less determined to confine discussion to that and that alone, sorry only that my opponent has made an exhibition of his poverty of thought, and indulging myself in an occasional private smile at the bad temper which undid him.

To my subject.

Tho I quoted it before in a previous article, I will quote again from a passage (the opening one) in comrade Fox's reply to Viroqua Daniels, in which he professes to explain the purpose of his first article in FREE SOCIETY, No. 44, as well as the one he was then writing; for upon his intent as set forth in this explanatory passage the whole contention respecting consistency may be allowed to rest. The passage reads as follows:

What I endeavored to emphasize was the Anarchist principle as applied to the propaganda. I tried to show that the ends we seek would be best served by a closer adhesion in our practise to the theories we preach.

This means that comrade Fox desired to bring the literary part of the propaganda more into harmony with the principles of Anarchist Communism. What methods did he then propose to use that this end might be attained? He proposed a *bureaucratic* system of group control of the propaganda, including by implication "supervision" of an editor, with the power to control his choice of articles for publication as well as his pen, and the power to put him out of the editorial chair if the group was not satisfied. The subscribers of course are not consulted. Following the just quoted passage, there is another one which must be quoted that the confusion of Comrade Fox may be realized beyond all doubt. He says:

Now, I fancy that, with the limited opportunities which the present society affords, some such "supervision" as the latter proposition suggests, would be necessary. Whatever our ideals may be as to the conduct of a similar enterprise in a free society is quite another thing.

Here is confusion, evident, conspicuous, and not to be denied. In one breath we are told that we need "a closer adhesion in our practise to the theories we preach"; in the next we are advised that "supervision" is necessary, and that "whatever our ideals may be as to the conduct of a similar enterprise in a free society is quite another thing." From the first quotation one would justly infer that Comrade Fox strenuously desired to bring the propaganda closer to this "quite another thing," but the second quotation disillusioizes one thoroly. Bureaucratic "supervision" is what is desired; ideals are youthful and unpractical. Propaganda in harmony with Anarchist Communism is for a far-away future. In my previous article in criticism of the position taken by Jay Fox, I declared that he erred in speaking of his bureaucratic group supervision as representing "a closer adhesion in our practise to the theories we preach" while saying in the next breath that "supervision" would

be necessary, and that "whatever our ideals may be as to the conduct of a similar enterprise in a free society is quite another thing," I now reiterate it: he has erred and erred grievously. He has confused Anarchist Communism and the status quo in representing group supervision as being in essential harmony with both; and making due allowance now, as I did then, for the fact that he is honest and sincere in his interest in the movement, I must tell him that no amount of sarcasm, tho mixed with the beaten froth of a cheap rhetoric and served up with a sauce of patronizing smiles, can so satisfy criticism as to change the lamentable facts that he is involved in a confusion which amounts to bathos. I could multiply evidences of this confusion by quoting from my previous article, but I have already quoted amply enough for my purpose.

The fact emerges that Comrade Fox commits himself to group propaganda plus bureaucratic "supervision" and that in the article in this issue, as well as in his previous contributions to the discussion, he accepts a certain form of authority as an expression of Anarchism and wishes to invest men with power to rule their fellows, and all in the name of liberty. This is the second error, now again laid at his door; and in laying it there I am undeterred by all the irrelevant epithets that he has used or can use, including "babyish" ideas, youthful "enthusiasm," or the "kindergarten philosophy" with which he credits me. His final remarks about "private property," for which he would substitute group property (Anarchism knows no property whatever), his claim for the right of a group to seek its liberty by ruling someone else, his statement that a man is not governed so long as he is willing to be governed, are other evidences of error which need only be mentioned here, helping to make up a body of proof to the effect that Comrade Fox has forgotten, for the time being at least, what Anarchism stands for, and would barter liberty for the tyrannies of group "supervision." His rough-and-ready method of dealing with an editor with whom a group happened to be dissatisfied, tho the subscribers might be quite satisfied, is, no doubt, practical, but it smacks of Social Democratic procedure, and his final words in which he attempts to rush my position with statements about what groups would do whether I liked it or not, and insinuations that I lack common sense, are quite beside the point, which is, what is Anarchist consistency in respect to literary propaganda?

How would a journal be conducted, let us ask, under conditions of Anarchist Communism? A man or men taking from the storehouses or from the makers as much type, paper, presses, etc., as was needed, or by merely taking articles to a willing printer, would start a paper, copies of which could be had for the asking; or which would be delivered at the house door. Those who desired the paper might take it, and a group might work to extend its circulation. What place would "supervision" have under these circumstances? If one who read the paper did not like it he could cease to take it, if a member of the group working for its circulation and influence ceased to like it he could withdraw from connection with it, and by

himself or in association with others could start another journal; presses, type, paper, ink, and publishing facilities being free. If the people who took the paper liked its editor's work the paper would survive, if they did not, it would suspend. No property, no supervision, no group control, no bureaucratic tyranny could exist then and be mistaken for Anarchist Communism.

I, too, desire that the propaganda should be carried on with a "closer adhesion in our practise to the theories we preach," but I assert that such a "closer adhesion" implies an approach to the ideal outlined above rather than a return to government under the form of group supervision. Let there be no "building" nor type, nor presses, nor linotypes, nor any "office cat," even, as *Anarchist Communist property*, either individual or group; let money be gathered to start a paper from the rank and file of the comrades; let a group work to gather this money if a group is formed for this purpose; let the copy be sent out to a printer, if a comrade so much the better; let subscribers be obtained, and as long as a subscriber likes the paper let him pay for it promptly; leave the editor free to be himself, and his associates with him; let the members of the group withdraw individually or collectively if the editor outrages Anarchist Communism in his columns; let them inform the subscribers of their action; let the subscribers withdraw also if they wish, and the two dissatisfied bodies may start a new journal. Let such procedure go on with respect to the literary part of the propaganda in general. With no property involved except an office desk or two, a stove and some tables, would it be worth the sacrifice of Anarchist Communist ideals to quarrel over these with an almost impossible editor having an almost inconceivable desire to edit a paper for subscribers who did not want it? Money subscribed for the furtherance of Anarchist Communism should logically be spent in propaganda, not in acquiring "property." "The sweet flavor of Anarchist communism" would definitely permeate such a method of literary propaganda. Group assistance is a boon to it, but "group supervision" is the death of Anarchist Communist journalism. As for Jones and the group's ultimatum to him in its supervision of his editorial work, no capitalist proprietor of any journal could govern a man more, or surround him with greater restrictions than a group acting thus.

Comrade Fox patronisingly suggests that my "kindergarten philosophy" be sent "back to the incubator"; to my mind the only harm that could come to my friend in pondering that same philosophy would be a possible fracture of his conceit. Lest this harm might befall him I will propose another and easier method by which he may perhaps rid himself of the idea that group or bureaucratic tyranny represents a "closer adhesion in our practise to the theories we preach," and this is that his philosophy be retired to the nursery for second childishness, and, in company with the Anarchist Communist nursing bottle, comfortably shut its eyes. I certainly shall not spend any more time in the doubtful labor of trying to set him right. Larger tasks call me.

W. F. BARNARD.

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.
BROOKLYN—M. Metzkow, 174 Ralph St.
CHICAGO—T. Appel, 1228 Milwaukee Av.
CLEVELAND—E. Schilling, 34 Elwell St.
LONDON, Eng.—T. Cantwell, 127 Ossulton St., N. W.
NEW YORK—M. Maisel, 194 E. B'way.
PHILADELPHIA—Nataasha Notkin, 1332 S. Sixth St.

RECEIPTS.

L. Knoefel, \$10. Atlantic City group, \$5, Wilson, \$2. Mohnen, \$1.25. Goldman, Weber, Crane, Sachs, Rubinowich, Cox, Hofeldt, Robinson, Neitzka, each \$1. Rubinowich, Waldman, Ginsburg, Poggi, S. Ginsburg, Kanzelbaum, Karper, Hoffman, each 50c. Westcott, 25c.

MODERN SCIENCE AND ANARCHISM.

By Peter Kropotkin.

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

Considered by some Kropotkin's best work.

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

CONTENTS:

- I. Two Fundamental Tendencies in Society. The Kinship of Anarchism and the Popular Creative Tendency.
- II. The Intellectual Movement of the Eighteenth Century: Its fundamental traits; the investigation of all phenomena by the scientific method. The Stagnation of Thought at the Beginning of the Nineteenth Century. The Awakening of Socialism: Its Influence upon the Development of Science. The Fifties.
- III. Auguste Comte's Attempt to build up a Synthetic Philosophy. The causes of his failure. The religious explanation of the moral sense in man.
- IV. The Flowering of the exact Sciences in 1856-62. The Development of the Mechanical World—Conception, embracing the Development of Human Ideas and Institutions. A Theory of Evolution.
- V. The Possibility of a New Synthetic Philosophy. Herbert Spencer's Attempt; Why it failed. The Method not sustained. A false conception of "The Struggle for Existence."
- VI. The Causes of this Mistake. The Teaching of the Church: "the World is steeped in Sin." The Government's inculcation of the same view of "Man's Radical Perversity." The Views of Modern Anthropology upon this subject. The Development of forms of Life by the "Masses," and the Law. Its Twofold Character.
- VII. The place of Anarchism in Science. Its endeavor to formulate a Synthetic Conception of the World—Its Object.
- VIII. Its origin How its Ideal is developed by the Natural-Scientific Method.
- IX. A Brief Summary of the Conclusions Reached by Anarchism: Law. Morality. Economic Ideas. The Government.
- X. Continuation: Methods of Action. The Understanding of Revolutions and their Birth. The Creative Ingenuity of the People. Conclusion.

Price, 25 cents

Send orders to Nataasha Notkin, 1332 S. Sixth St., Philadelphia, Pa.

BOOK LIST.

Orders for propaganda purposes will be sold considerably cheaper.

- Essays on the Social Problem..... 05
.....H. Addis 05
The New Hedonism.....Grant Allen 05
God and the State.....Bakunin 05
The Same. London edition..... 10
Whitman's Ideal Democracy and Other Writings.....Helena Born 1.00
Prodigal Daughter: or, The Price of Virtue.....Rachel Campbell 25
Love's Coming of Age..... 25
.....Edward Carpenter 1.00
Evolution of the Family..... 05
.....Jonathan Mayo Crane 05
Conduct and Profession..... 10
.....Clarence S. Darrow 10
Crime and Criminals..... " 10
Realism in Literature and Art.. " 05
Resist Not Evil. Cloth..... " 75
Tolstoy..... " 10
Crime and Punishment..... 10
.....Voltaire de Cleire 10
The Worm Turns..... " 10
The Emancipation of Society from Government.....Dallan Doyle 05
Roosevelt, Czolgosz, and Anarchism.....Jay Fox 03
Moribund Society and Anarchy. Cloth 60c.....Jean Grave 25
Origin of Anarchism.....C. L. James 05
The Social Revolution. By Karl Kautsky. (An excellent work to disillusionize those Social Democrats, who still imagine that Socialists contemplate a Revolution.) 180 pages..... 50
Anarchism: Its Philosophy and Ideal.....Peter Kropotkin 05
Anarchist Communism: Its Basis and Principles..... " 05
An Appeal to the Young..... " 05
Anarchist Morality..... " 05
Expropriation..... " 05
Field, Factory and Workshop " 45
Law and Authority..... " 05
Memoirs of a Revolutionist..... 2.00
Mutual Aid, a Factor 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
Government Analyzed.....Kelso 50
The Economics of Anarchy..... 25
.....Dyer D. Lum 25
Anarchy. (Is It All a Dream? Jas. F. Morton, Jr.).....Malatesta 10
A Talk about Anarchist Communism between two Workers... " 05
A Chambermaid's Diary..... 50
.....Octave Mirbeau 50
Do You Want Free Speech?..... 10
.....James F. Morton, Jr. 05
The Deistic Pestilence.....John Most 05
God and Government: The Siamese Twins of Superstition.....W. Nevill 05
The Pyramid of Tyranny..... 05
.....F. Domela Nieuwenhuis 05
A Cityless and Countryless World: An Outline of Practical Cooperative Individualism Cloth \$1..... 50
.....Henry Olerich 50
Mating or Marrying, Which?..... 05
.....W. H. Van Ornum 05
Sine Qua Non, or The Code of Religion.....Dr. Geo. Pyburn 10
Evolution and Revolution.....Reclus 05
Pure Economy.....J. H. Rowell 10
Pages of Socialist History..... 30
.....W. Tcherkesoff 30
The Slavery of Our Times. Cloth..... 75
.....Leo Tolstoy 75
Our Worship of Primitive Social Guesses.....E. C. Walker 15
Vice: Its Friends and Foes..... " 15
What the Young Need to Know " 10

Life Without a Master. 336 pp. Cloth \$1.50.....J. Wilson 1.00
The New Dispensation. Cloth. " 1.50

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 Mary Dick, 407 Park Ave., Chicago, Ill.

M. N. MAISEL'S BOOKSTORE

194 EAST BROADWAY - - NEW YORK

The best ten plays of

HENRIK 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 30c. 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.

ANTI-SEMITISM;**ITS HISTORY AND CAUSES.**

By Bernard Lazare.

Only recently published and very favorably received by the American critics.

384 pages. Gilt top, elegant cloth binding. Publisher's price \$2. My price for the few copies I have on hand 85 cents each. Postage 15 cents.

(Second Edition)

THE LIFE OF ALBERT R. PARSONS

WITH A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE

ANARCHIST TRIAL

and a brief history of the

LABOR MOVEMENT IN AMERICA

Also Sketches of the Lives of A. Spies, A. Fischer, Geo. Engel, and Louis Lingg. Gov. J. P. Altgeld's "Reasons for Pardoning the Anarchists"

With splendid portraits of the Eight condemned men, and other illustrations.

Price, cloth, \$1. Postage, 25 cents.

Order from the publisher, Mrs. LUCY E. PARSONS, 1777 N. Troy St., Chicago, Ill.

WANTED.

One hundred women to study midwifery. Register now for session beginning Jan. 1st. Address

DR. F. E. DRESSLER,

COLLEGE OF MEDICINE & SURGERY
245 Ashland Boul. Chicago.

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. 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 pronouncements upon those events which it chronicles.

C. L. James approaches the problem of the French Revolution in a thoroughly scientific spirit, and conciliates 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.

Monarchic, 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 Abe Isaak Jr., 407 Park Ave., Chicago, Ill.

SOME APPRECIATIONS.

All must be attracted by your forceful and pointed way of putting your matter. I thoroughly enjoy your reading of this great world movement.—Prof. G. R. MOUTON, University of Chicago.

I was much interested in looking over the work. It seems to me to indicate careful study of the sources, and to be the work of one profoundly interested in democracy.—AZARIAH S. ROOT, Librarian Oberlin College Library, Oberlin, Ohio.

It presents a point of view which entitles it to more than passing consideration.—The Public, Chicago.

It shows ripe scholarship and a profound knowledge of the subject, which is the greatest in the history of the world. It is original and is written in Mr. James' terse, vigorous style. . . . For the ordinary reader it is much better than Carlyle's famous work. It is certainly most creditable to its scholarly author.—Daily Leader, Eau Claire, Wis.

Carlyle gave us the English of the Revolution. Thiers gave us the French of the Revolution: the conventional French. But it has remained for more modern criticism to render up the Revolution to its larger meanings. James belongs to that criticism.—The Conservator, Philadelphia.