

FREE SOCIETY

ENTERED AT SAN FRANCISCO POSTOFFICE AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER.

An Exponent of Anarchist-Communism: Holding that Equality of Opportunity alone Constitutes Liberty; that in the Absence of Monopoly Price and Competition Cannot Exist, and that Communism is an Inevitable Consequence.

VOL. V. NO. 44.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 1899.

WHOLE NO. 232.

FROM "RUBAIYAT."

What! out of senseless Nothing to provoke
A consciousness something to resent the yoke
Of unpermitted Pleasure, under pain
Of Everlasting Penalties, if broke!

What! from his helpless Creature be repaid
Pure Gold for what he lent him dross-alloy'd—
Sure for a Debt he never did contract,
And cannot answer—Oh the sorry trade!

Oh Thou! who didst with pitfall and with gin
Beset the Road I was to wander in,
Thou wilt not with Predestined Evil round
Enmesh, and then impute my Fall to Sin!

Oh Thou, who Man of baser Earth didst make,
And ev'n with Paradise devise the Snake:
For all the Sin wherewith the Face of Man
Is blacken'd—Man's forgiveness give—and take!

By Omar Khayyam.

DIFFERENCES AMONG ANARCHISTS.

V.

One of these arises from our view of trade and commerce, some holding the struggle essential to eliminate the incompetents and effect the survival of the fittest, others contending that intelligence does away with this necessity, so changing conditions that incompetents are no longer produced. Nature devoid of intelligence working on lines of least resistance has introduced competition in trade and government among men. Intelligence coming to the assistance of natural selfishness has moulded both trade and government while love and sympathy, struggle to reform, have awakened an idea, that both should be abolished.

Born and brought up under a system that has prevailed from earliest civilization and under which our sense of justice and equal rights have advanced it naturally appears essential to the progress and perpetuation of that sense. It was such a reform from aggressive force, from robbery, and theft—the traffic or exchange of products, the introduction of money, to facilitate exchange—all tended to create a fraternal feeling and to establish equal rights. Weight and measure came to equalize the exchange, and finally the speculator came and government regulation with its one-sided competition, adulteration and the tricks of trade; it has stimulated progress even as have the wars of conquest it has helped to inaugurate. The law of the survival of the fittest extracts a certain good from evil, but intelligence cultivating just principles effects a greater good. Trade and traffic with its weight and measures, its competition and intrigue, together with its medium of exchange—money, is the result of that ignorant conception that nature cannot satisfy the needs of all, that some must needs suffer, that the fittest should survive and hence the struggle should proceed, justice should be blinded, and mercy prevented from influencing the scales. Can intelligence show a better way? Are there factors in human nature that intelligence may set to work to effect a new evolution of the race? This is the new gospel of Socialism. But how to direct nature? State Socialism says by a force engendered by collective endeavor, centralized as sovereign authority. But the Anarchist repudiating authority as subversion of true principles declares for individual initiative under liberty and equality. Give man power and he develops a tyrant every time. Equal opportunity is all sufficient. As equals men will co-operate to individual advancement. The altruistic idea, that all can be made happy is denied, and the egoistic idea that each must be free to work out his own happiness is affirmed.

Commercialism, without doubt, began as individual initiative, but the struggle for supremacy and the survival of the cunning sought to bind rather than free the people. We differ as to the expediency of restoring commercialism, some claiming that a removal of government authority, with its regulation and restriction, superseded by voluntary organization, would establish or re-establish natural competition, enabling the competent to succeed by giving to labor its just reward, the entire fruits of its toil. Others would remove all authority, trusting entirely to the principle of liberty. They regard commercialism—that is trade for the sake of gain—profits—unnecessary, and they contend that by destroying rent, interest and profits—the aim of all Socialism—you destroy all incentive to "business;" products will be valueless except for use, ambition to accumulate wealth to hold out of use will die. Price is the result of scarcity or monopoly. Endeavoring to regulate it by cost value is like regulating events by the course of the wind.

Scarcity and monopoly is the hope of commercialism. Remove these factors and price would be impossible. Price is an estimation of value, and there can be no more a standard of value than there can be of beauty. A standard can only be established by arbitrary power. Convenience may accustom in certain localities a standard in use. What may develop under freedom is uncertain. But I believe a careful consideration of facts, will lead the unbiased man to see that commercialism is as impossible under freedom as government itself. Our socialistic friends all agree that rent, interest and profits could not exist except for government regulation and restriction, and a large majority also concur that the "business world" with its intrigue, injustice, fraud and crime, depends for its very life upon these three factors—rent, interest and profit. But we differ in our endeavor to remove these props, and our estimation of the result of such removal may appear nonsensical to many friends whose views are influenced from their standpoint. To me it appears clear that with government abolished, the individual unrestricted in his inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, independence, self-reliance and love of kind will do away with commercialism.

A. L. BALLOU.

THE RUSKIN COLONY AGAIN.

The *Truth Seeker* quotes the same sentences from the *New York Journal* which J. H. M. cited in our last issue regarding the failure of the colony, commenting very timely upon the event, using arguments which are also applicable to the views of many Anarchists, who hold that the social question will adjust itself as soon as the economical readjustment is accomplished. Of course, the *Truth Seeker* could also take a lesson from its own comments, to wit: that neither the social nor the economical issues will advance by merely fighting God and the Bible, for there are as bigoted Freethinkers as there are Christians.

The *Truth Seeker* says:

"If the failure of Ruskin was not commercial, it had no business to fail at all; for it certainly will not be said that colonies are founded among men to suppress the dissemination of the doctrines of Anarchy and free love. These colonists hold, I infer, that cooperation and the abolition of the competitive system are the reforms of greatest moment, for in their paper, which I have read for some years, they never talk about anything else. The question of Freethought, apparently, does not excite their interest. The liberty of the individual claims no share of their attention. Abuses that

exist under the marriage laws they depend upon cooperation to abate. The indifference with which a Socialist regards all other reforms but Socialism is nothing less than magnificent. He will not do a stroke to further the solution of the religious question or personal liberty, but if the Ruskin colonists are a sample of the cult, he does not object to preventing the dissemination of those doctrines when they conflict with his own. If I happened to be a co-operator and a member of a colony, it should never be said that such trifles as Free love and Anarchy diverted me from my aim.

"One of the troubles in Ruskin was bloomers, which some of the women insisted on wearing. Now, if clothes are more important than the Cooperative Republic, it is perhaps fit that bloomers should become a divisive issue; but if the opposite is the case, if our motto is to be Socialism first and clothes afterward, the colonists who complained of the bloomers, as well as those who broke up the peace of the community by wearing them were not very sincere in their professions. And it is the same as regards Free love. If that is a subordinate matter it should be sunk out of sight, and the colony should not be imperiled in the first place by its practice, nor in the second place by measures taken to prevent it. In a cooperative colony give all to cooperation. Were I there, and did a brother member, not actually insane, insist on going without any clothes at all, or on the practice of an unorthodox marriage system, or none at all, I should regard it as my duty to say nothing and cooperate with the woodsaw.

"But the experience of Ruskin colony demonstrates that neither is the industrial question the most difficult of solution nor is its solution the answer to *any* other problems. The bread-and-butter question was eliminated from the life of the colonist, who was assured of enough to eat and wear the year around. He also had books, papers, music, theatricals, and social amusements. And yet he found that these worries had been disposed of only to make room for others and to give him more leisure to discuss them. The despised subsidiary reforms, which he was accustomed to say could be safely left to evolution and the resolving influence of commercial prosperity, now began to assert themselves; and he was surprised to find them as serious and as far from settlement under Socialism as under competition. Then he made the mistake of inserting the stopper instead of enlarging the orifice for the egress of thought on these topics, and the inevitable explosion followed, rending the community. I have heard people say that if Freethought means Free love or Anarchy they don't want any of it, and I presume that there were colonists in Ruskin who said that if cooperation meant those things, with bloomers to boot, competition was good enough for them. I have said to Freethinkers who talked in this way that they were bound to accept the result of Freethought or repudiate the principle, and so I should imagine a good cooperator ought to be satisfied with the condition of things produced by bringing a lot of cooperators together in a community, or else give up the system.

"The *Journal*, speaking on behalf of State Socialism, pronounces the doom of colonies by asserting 'the little isolated community which can be ruined by half a dozen disaffected members has never been a success, and in the very nature of things never can be so.' I should guess that in the nature of things a community which prescribes the clothes, the opinions, and the conversation of its members, without any authority from its charter for doing so, would not need to look elsewhere for the cause of its disruption; whereas, with entire freedom of choice in these matters, and with nothing restrained except conduct unbecoming a cooperator, there could be no failure unless cooperation itself should prove not to be a success. I am sorry for the Ruskin dupes, but if the cause of the trouble is as stated in the *Journal*, the 'prevents' will draw from liberal people only such sympathy as happens to get misplaced."

FORMERLY "THE FIREBRAND."

50 CENTS A YEAR.

Address all Communications and make all Money Orders payable to **FREE SOCIETY**, 43 Sheridan St., corner Tenth, between Folsom and Harrison, San Francisco, Calif.

Labor Day, which was given to the American wage slaves by their masters as a day of grace, just as the Roman slaves were let loose for one day in the year to make them believe that they were freemen, was celebrated in this city by organized labor. What a pitiable spectacle to see thousands of slaves gathered with their families who are not even conscious of their degrading condition, interested only in the races and games that promised petty prizes! The speakers were very careful not to offend the slaveholders, eulogizing merely the achievements of organized labor.

No doubt Trades Unions will once play a great part in the emancipation of labor, but at present they are decades behind the times and, to use the words of their own leaders, "are the real supporters of government," in other words, the upholders of slavery. Only when they awaken to their condition of slavery and dare to antagonize and offend their masters by demanding their share, which has been withheld from them by force, will their achievements be of any real value, for the compromising and soothing attitude of the oppressed has ever been their curse. But when organized labor will have the courage to celebrate the International Labor Day, chosen by the workers themselves and direct their fight against wage slavery they will gain the sympathy of the thinking world and be on the road to victory.

Again force and injustice have triumphed in the conviction of Dreyfus, but, although being drowned in the mire he adored—government and militarism—he has the lovers of liberty and justice on his side; and Zola, the untiring soldier of humanity, has again taken up the fight for justice.

When men like Zola, whose novels are read by millions, gives a correct view of the aim of Anarchism, as he does in one of his latest works "Paris," the soldiers for freedom and justice have cause to rejoice. Here is what one of his characters says in a discussion about Anarchism and authoritarian Socialism:

"He expressed all his horror of the Collectivist State as imagined by Mege, a Dictator-State re-establishing ancient servitude on yet closer lines. The error of all the Socialists' sects was their arbitrary organization of Labor, which enslaved the individual for the profit of the community. And, forced to conciliate the two great currents, the rights of society and the rights of the individual, Guillaume had ended by placing his whole faith in free Communism, an anarchical state in which he dreamt of seeing the individual free, moving and developing without restraint, for the benefit both of himself and of all others. Was not this, said he, the one truly scientific theory, unities creating worlds, atoms producing life by force of attraction, free and ardent love? All oppressive minorities would disappear; and the faculties and energies of one and all would by free play arrive at harmony amidst the equilibrium—which changed according to needs—of the active forces of advancing humanity. In this wise he pictured a nation, saved from State tutelage, without a master, almost without laws, a happy nation, each citizen of which completely developed by the exercise of liberty, would, of his free will, come to an understanding with his neighbors with regard to the thousand necessities of life. And thence would spring society, free association, hundreds of associations which would regulate social life; though at the same time they would remain variable, in fact often opposed and hostile to one another. For progress is but the fruit of conflict and struggle; the world has only been created by the battle of opposing forces. And that was all; there would be no more oppressors, no more rich, no more poor; the domain of the earth with its natural treasures and its implements of labor would be restored to the people, its legitimate owners, who would know how to enjoy it with justice and logic, when nothing abnormal would impede their expansion. And then only the law of love would make its action felt; then would human solidarity, which among mankind, is the living

form of universal attraction, acquire all its power, bringing men closer together, and uniting them in one sole family. A splendid dream it was—the noble and pure dream of absolute freedom—free man in free society. And thither a savant's superior mind was fated to come after passing on the road the many Socialist sects which one and all bore the stigma of tyranny. And, assuredly, as thus indulged, the Anarchist idea is the loftiest, the proudest, of all ideas. And how delightful to yield to the hope of harmony in life—life which restored to the full exercise of its natural powers would of itself create happiness."

In speaking of the violent actions of a few Anarchists he says:

"But one must say everything and fully understand the history of the evil hour through which we are passing. It is madness sweeping by; and, to tell the truth, everything necessary to provoke it has been done. At the very dawn of the Anarchist theory, at the very first innocent actions of its partisans, there was such stern repression, the police so grossly ill-treating the poor devils that fell into its hands, that little by little came anger and rage leading to the most horrible reprisals. It is the Terror initiated by the *bourgeois* that has produced Anarchist savagery. And would you know whence Salvat and his crime have come? Why, from all our centuries of impudence and iniquity, from all that the nations have suffered, from all the sores which are now devouring us, the impatience for enjoyment, the contempt of the strong for the weak, the whole monstrous spectacle which is presented by our rotting society!"

Is the war over? As the California soldiers are home, is it because there are no more "niggers on the run to shoot," with less compunction than if the targets were jack rabbits?

Is \$15 a month too small pay for such work?

Why did the gallant "first" come home if others had to be sent in their places?

Are they fettered and glorified because they refused to continue the vile, unmanly work of butchering the Filipinos, who are fighting for home and liberty? If so—good; but if they are only tired of the risk of war and pestilence—home-sick—then why this foolery, this wild excitement that could not be surpassed if they had returned from conquering the world?

It would have been an unmitigated blessing to thoughtful people in this city, to have been both blind and deaf these last few days.

How it shatters hopes for freedom! What can be expected from such unthinking naves?

Transportation companies, newspaper magnates, electric light corporations, bunting, banners, and buncombe manufacturers, of course, feel the fitness of such outbursts of *patriotism*; they feel it in the most sympathetic part of their make-up—their pockets. Greed for gold was the instigator of this display; the same power that brought about the war, and with the same object—plunder.

The scenic artists have displayed very great discretion in the numerous pictorial exhibitions that adorned or disgraced our streets, illustrating the bravery of "our boys," failing to allow a single enemy to appear on the canvases, with the solitary exception of the *Chronicle* artist, who had thoughtlessly allowed the iniquity of the war to be focussed on three dead—unarmed and almost undressed—bodies in front of Paco church, which was fired into, looted and burned by the valiant colonel Duboce. Says the report:

After two days of hard fighting a battalion of Californians under Colonel Duboce came up with a body of insurgents who had made a stand in the church in Peco. From the windows of the edifice Filipino sharpshooters kept up a gallant fire, using General King and his staff as the principal target. An ambulance driver was killed, and then the rebels turned their rifles upon a wagon of the Red Cross Society. Then it was that Colonel Duboce ordered the huts to be cleared and burned and the charge made on the church. The men under his command swarmed out into the open, driving the brown men from the huts. In the face of a terrific fusillade Colonel Duboce and a few volunteers dashed into the church, scattering coal oil inside of it, to which they set fire, and then retired. The old church and convent had been the center of the fiercest of the fighting.

When Duboce made his raid those of his command who had not followed had kept up their attack on the natives who were firing from the upper stories of the church building.

It is the duty of every man to refuse to be a soldier, it is degrading to place oneself under the command of another; officers are degraded by the haughtiness,

arrogance, vanity, show, and ostentation, their position of power is certain to breed.

Freedom and professional soldiers cannot exist in the same country; no soldier is a freeman.

Mr. Atkinson has calculated that each Filipino killed, has cost America \$26,000 and facetiously adds "but as we kill more they will come cheaper;" then it must be borne in mind that Americans bought them from Spaniards, who did not own them, at two dollars a head.

Government would not spend 26 cents for the benefit of a tramp, but perhaps two or three hundred to a police officer for running him in to the clutches of the law—oh law!—We are very far from being civilized!

Doubtless many joined the army from sheer want; possibly had even thought of taking their lives, when the opportunity arose for them to be paid, as well as fed, and clothed, if they would take the lives of men who had never injured them.

Anarchists and Socialists are opposed to war. Churches are in favor of it, quoting their God, the Bible, by the yard. Wellington said, "Ours is a damnable profession." Napoleon said, "War is the trade of barbarians." Sherman said, "War is hell." Franklin said, "There never has been, nor ever will be, any such thing as a good war or a bad peace." Jefferson said, "War is an instrument entirely inefficient toward reducing wrong and multiplies instead of indemnifying losses."

McKinley, put this in a pipe and smoke it, just for once, instead of the costly Manila cigars you accept from uniformed butchers, and according to reports, smoke so many that you have to be boiled, to drive the bad effects out of your weak carcass.

America can sink no lower in the depths of degradation, than it is today under the weight of the Hanna-McKinley greed-for-gold-administration; but if it brings the evils of government to a climax, the Hanna-McKinley conspiracy has not been in vain.

KINGHORN-JONES.

For the people of another country to supinely submit to oppression and wrong is evidence of stupidity, ignorance and superstition; in our "own" country it is evidence of patriotism.

"Labor is King"—that was the motto on one of the banners carried in the procession on labor day in Chicago. The man who carried it wore a borrowed coat that had several patches in the seat of his trousers, and whose haggard face and gaunt form gave evidence of much privation. Whoever heard of a "King" going hungry and wearing cast-off clothing to cover his own tattered garments? Something incongruous about that banner!

The general tone of the proceedings of the recent national convention of printers in Detroit was that "Everything is lovely and the goose hangs high." This in spite of the fact that at the very time of the convention a large body of printers was being completely beaten by the New York *Sun* right in the stronghold of strongholds of the typographical union. It reminded one of Nero who played his fiddle while witnessing the destruction of Rome. The *Sun* received thousands of applications from printers to fill the vacancies caused by the strike. No doubt the strikers will place most of the blame for their defeat on the "scabs" who took their positions. But what would they have these unemployed men do instead of taking their positions? Why, get work at something else, they say. Well, then, why do not they get work at that "something else" which they recommend for others? The question resolves itself into the problem of the unemployed and the disinherited workmen. Wage slavery and monopoly must be abolished. The relation of master and slave—employer and employee—must be changed to that of free men. The institution of capitalism itself must be abrogated.

It is considerable of a triumph for the cause of freedom to have the autobiography of Kropotkin published in one of the most conservative and influential magazines in the United States—the *Atlantic Monthly*. And now the series of articles have been brought out in book form by the publishers, Houghton, Mifflin & Co. of Boston. Doubtless the book will wipe out the prejudices of many of the staid New England descendants of the puritans.

It was a shameful betrayal of the interest of labor on the part of those responsible for engaging as speakers at the labor day celebration in Chicago a lot of politicians who know no more about the labor problem than a Hottentot does of psychology. The speeches

consisted of spread eagle oratory, with the old Judas flatteries about the workman being the bone and sinew of the land, of honest toil being the bulwark of our grand and glorious country from the rock-bound coast of Maine to the sun-kissed shores of California. Doesn't that sound familiar? The labor leaders of Chicago are beginning to be seen in the same light as was Caesar's wife—not above suspicion.

WILLIS M. ANDREWS.

IS STILL CONFUSED.

In comments on my article of August 20 A. I. says: "Correct, and they will be slaves as long as they submit to government and monopoly. Scarcity is the direct result of monopoly."

It seems to me to be only a waste of time to tell the people that "government and monopoly," are the cause of their enslavement, without pointing out a sure, legal and peaceful way of destroying arbitrary monopolistic rule. (1)

It is much like finding a man mired to his waist in a swamp: he begs pitiously for a plank to enable him to crawl out: we tell him it is not a plank he wants, for it is not the plank, but the swamp that is the cause of all his woes, and the only thing that can possibly relieve him is the total abolition of the swamp. But, he says, get me a plank and by its aid I can get upon dry land again, and then we can fill up the swamp, but without help I shall surely perish. (2)

Ignorance of our economic condition is the cause of scarcity; there can be no monopoly of things plentiful; monopolies live upon and are bred from scarcity. If intelligence upon this subject were more plentifully diffused among the people, it would be impossible for the ignorant and wicked to monopolize and rule. If any one doubts of the ignorant and wicked now ruling, let them cast their eyes to the horrid murders daily committed by command in the Philippines, to the immense treasures there wasted, and the great good it could accomplish expended in peaceful pursuits at home. But to talk of the abolition of governmental monopolistic rule to a starving, dependent and helpless people, without pointing out a sure remedy, is parallel to the simile I have used. (3)

Our economic woes and the weight of government arise from a great scarcity of money in constant circulation. Look around us, and see if governmental rule weighs heavily upon those who have plenty of money. Do they not desire a strong government? The stronger it is the better are they pleased; in fact, are they not in reality the government that oppresses the moneyless people? (4)

J. C. PATTERSON.

COMMENT.

1.—"Waste of time" is on your side, my friend. We are constantly pointing out the remedy, and that is the abolition of government and the titles to land and the means of production, which, however, cannot be done in a "legal and peaceful way." Freedom is never given, but must be taken.

2.—It is an easy matter to rescue a single man from the swamp, but the trouble is the wage workers are all in the swamp, and the plank is handed only to those that are needed to produce wealth for their masters; the rest live in the swamp in misery and agony until many perish. Now, if the swamp is the cause of their woes then drainage is the remedy.

3.—Yes, ignorance is at the bottom of our miserable conditions, but to say that "there can be no monopoly of things plentiful" is merely exhibiting our own ignorance. There is no scarcity of land—millions and millions of acres lying idle, and yet neither you nor I dare to occupy as much of it as to build a hut on it without paying the monopolist tribute; thousands of comfortable houses are unoccupied in this city, still thousands of poor workers live in miserable holes or have to sleep in the open air; our stores and warehouses are over-stocked with necessities of life, and yet people go about in rags and with empty stomachs; there are billions of bushels of wheat in Russia in the warehouses and elevators held for speculation, and still we hear that thousands of poor peasants perish for want of food. And these things exist in the midst of plenty and are the direct result of monopoly and government.

The monopolists and rulers may be wicked, but they are not so ignorant; at least those few—comparatively speaking—that rule and rob the laborers are shrewd and cunning enough to fool their slaves

right along, and so it seems to me that ignorance is on the side of those who quietly submit to be robbed and ruled arbitrarily: Thus there is no hope for these "starving, dependent and helpless people" until they have their eyes opened and dare to resist the "wickedness" of the rulers. Then they will see that the "sure remedy" is not more money and a greater share of their products, but ALL THEY PRODUCE, which can be obtained only when government and monopoly are abolished. All "legal and peaceful" means to improve our conditions will simply shift the burden from one individual to another.

4.—Of course many of our woes of today arise from the scarcity of money, but why the scarcity? Because money and everything else is monopolized, and if it were possible to double the amount in circulation under government, the wages and the price of the products would decrease accordingly.

Certainly, those that are in a position to live upon the workers want a strong government to protect them in their game of robbery, and if a weak government is better for the people—as Mr. Patterson infers—then it logically follows that the abolition of all government will help the whole people out of the swamp.

A. I.

THE INGERSOLL CONTROVERSY.

I recently read in your paper an editorial comment on Robert G. Ingersoll, deceased. It was charged that he refused to defend the Chicago Anarchists for less than \$10,000 (guaranteed) although professing belief in their innocence and admitting that their execution would be judicial murder. It was also alleged in the criticism that Ingersoll gave not even a speech to humanity, without charging an admission fee; that he defended Hanna and that villain's accomplices in 1896; and that, finally, he had failed to demonstrate that he loved humanity and justice more than filthy lucre.

As the *Truth Seeker*, of New York, is the leading organ of the Freethinkers in this country, and as that journal has printed a great deal of matter about Ingersoll, I endeavored to place before its readers your criticism. The clipping was promptly returned, and each of the points specified above was marked with the word "Lie". Accompanying the clipping was this letter:

"Friend Tanner,—The *Free Society* piece is a lie. Why will those calling themselves Freethinkers join with the churchmen in lying about Ingersoll? I would not print it for the world. Yours truly,

"E. M. Macdonald."

Now I should like to know, who is the prevaricator, you or the editor of the *Truth Seeker*? T. TANNER.

S. F. FREETHOUGHT SOCIETY.

An exceedingly interesting discussion was carried on last Sunday evening by the above society at its hall, 1133 Mission st. The subject under consideration was: "What is the principal cause of poverty?" The opening speaker treated the question from a political standpoint and traced poverty to government which, he said, was responsible for the existence of land and money monopoly both of which were directly as well as indirectly impoverishing industry. Other speakers following, who in the main concurred with the opening speaker, considered the question from an ethical as well as purely economical point of view.

Mr. Alexander claimed rent and interest were necessary and "inexpungable" features of society, whereupon A. Isaak promptly proved the contrary by pointing out the existence of whole races of people to whom these "necessary and inexpungable features of society" were entirely unknown and who were happier than we in spite of their ignorance upon this point.

Mrs. Smith, an earnest and eloquent speaker, sympathized with the general tendency of advanced movements and wanted the government to remedy existing evils by assuming the position of sole distributor.

T. R. Simpson, chairman of the meeting and to whose indefatigable energy as well as financial liberality the success of the new regime is principally due, scored a point when he said that government so far from being beneficial to the people is retarding progress by repressing individual effort. If those who clamored for governmental control were sincere in their advocacy, all they had to do to realize their ideal was to go to the poorhouse whose inmates, re-fed and clothed and paternally cared for. What we wanted was not paternal care but freedom of the

* There was no prevarication or malice: I simply gave the facts as stated by the *Chicago Arbeiter-Zeitung* and the *Freiheit* of New York.

individual from restraint, equality of opportunities and free access to natural resources.

Mr. Stoddard appreciated the general trend of the meeting and hoped that Bryan and the adjustment of the finance question would save the country, to which J. A. Gillie, the generous furnisher of the radical leaflets and programs of the society, replied that our hopes lied not in Bryan or any other individual or politician nor in silver, gold or any other medium of exchange, but in the foresaking of all of them which were but a neatly devised plan to pull the wool over the eyes of the producers by the cunning non-producers and idlers; it was free production and consumption, "from each according to his ability, to each according to his desires," that is to save society.

S. H. Tarr, the uncompromising foe of religious superstition, claimed that religion was the principal cause of poverty, and Ada Couch curtly and aptly charged it to ignorance.

W. E. Nevill, author of the pamphlet "The Car Conductor's Dream" and who has in preparation another interesting work, deprecated government as the source of social inharmony and misery and pleaded for free play and full scope of individual activities.

The question for next Sunday is: "Is not religion the greatest curse of humanity?" to be opened by Kate DePeatt, state lecturer of the Oregon Secular Union.

S. D.

EMMA GOLDMAN AMONG THE FARMERS.

Her three lectures delivered here were not largely attended, but those who did attend seemed interested. It is a difficult matter to compete with the intense heat and the gospel mill in full blast every night. Man, as a rule, is still deeply interested in the soul-saving business. The development of that which he really possesses, namely a mind of infinite possibilities, is of small moment compared to the preparation necessary to meet the saviour. So it is not at all surprising that, engrossed by the slavish worship of a myth, men should ignore their real saviour—self-reliant, independent thought.

Comrade Goldman's lecture on Patriotism was splendid. The mode of warfare waged by our little comrade in her life-long battle for human rights is a general assault along the whole length of the enemy's line. Church, State and social customs receive an equal measure of dauntless criticism. When we wonder how it was possible for kind old mother nature in the dollar-worshipping age of the 19th century to produce an Emma Goldman, a woman who is neither a coward, a liar or a hypocrite, who has infinite sympathy and compassion for all who suffer, is it at all surprising that this dollar-grasping age should repudiate and condemn her? Only the revolutionists welcome her, understand her, love her, know that she is the incarnation of all the forces that have combated tyranny since the dawn of history, and that have paved the way for the little liberty we boast of today, and that some fools are satisfied with.

Caplinger Mills, Mo.

KATE AUSTIN.

EGOISM AND ALTRUISM.

Concluded from last week.

Admitted, once for all, that every action is accompanied sooner or later, directly or indirectly by a pleasurable sensation, and admitting even for the sake of argument, that whether one gives to his fellow-men or takes from his fellow-men, his motive is the attainment of personal gratification—we ask: Is there not a world of difference between the practice of giving and the practice of taking? Is it not of the utmost importance to find out through which actions men seek their pleasures, by giving or by taking? I see no reason why you should not agree with me that the one who finds his gratification in the practice of taking is an egoist, and that the one who finds his gratification in giving is an altruist. We come again to the question of definition of the terms. One, like Russel Sage for instance, will deliberately expose his confidant to a danger that threatens him, in order to shield his own life—by what name will you call his action? Another one seeing a fellow-man struggling in deep water will throw away his own life to save the other one's—by what name will you call his action? The point that both of them feel a certain pleasure in their actions must be left out of consideration, as offering no characteristic distinction—you cannot conclude that all men are alike because all of them want to eat when feeling hungry. What we must take in consideration is this: We have two distinctly different kinds of action, one springs from the primordial instinct of self-preservation, the other from the no less deeply rooted instinct of self-sacrifice or sympathy. Accordingly we will conclude, that all action which is done with the only purpose of being useful to self, regardless of

whether it will directly be harmful to others or indirectly even useful to them—all such action is purely egoistic. On the other hand, all action which is done with the only purpose of being useful to others, regardless of whether it will directly or indirectly be useful or harmful to oneself—is purely altruistic action. Of course there are a great number of actions that are intermediate between these two general classes, such that have the double purpose of being useful to self and others. We may call these ego-altruistic actions, or if you prefer it, altru-egoistic; this however does not change the fact that there are actions which are purely altruistic.

The question, "which kind of actions is the better one," has now-a-days lost the importance it had when philosophers ex cathedra used to moralize about what is good and what bad. In the words of Darwin, "a savage will risk his own life to save that of a member of the same community, but will be wholly indifferent about a stranger; a young and timid mother urged by the maternal instinct will, without a moment's hesitation, run the greatest danger for her own infant, but not (usually) for a mere fellow creature. But many a civilized man, or boy, who never before risked his life for another, but full of courage and sympathy, will disregard the instinct of self-preservation and plunge at once into a torrent to save a drowning man though a stranger. Such actions appear to be the simple result of the greater strength of the social or maternal instincts than that of any other instinct or motive; for they are performed too instantaneously for reflection, or for pleasure or pain to be felt at the time; though if prevented by any cause distress or even misery might be felt."

Good or bad with regard to conduct is not the question of evolution but of morals, and even "morality," in the words of Leslie Stephen, "grows and is not made; that is, it is the fruit of a gradual evolution of the organic instinct continued through many generations." The true or natural morality which we cannot escape even if we wanted to, has its foundation in our evolved altruistic sentiments. In the words again of Stephen, "Altruism is the faculty essentially necessary to moral conduct, but the altruistic sentiment is not to be identified with morality."

"This natural law of morality," says Hackel, "is much older than all church religion. It has developed out of the social instinct of the animals. The consciousness of the necessity of self-sacrifice is nothing else than a social instinct. But this instinct is always a psychical habit, which was originally acquired, but which, becoming in the course of time hereditary, appears at last as innate."

But speaking of instincts we must remember that the instinct from which the actions spring, as Stephen expresses it, is not something external to the man which moves him; there is not the man plus the instinct; the whole man including the instinct, acts in a certain way, in which he would not act if he did not possess the instinct. So are we accustomed to say that a man has inherited certain qualities; but the man is not one thing and the inherited qualities another; the whole man is inherited.

Modern sociology views the social man just from such a standpoint: as a whole man, the sum total of all his instincts and of all his sentiments; trying thereby to avoid the mistakes which a one-sided conception of him has hitherto been productive of. The old social philosophy of the middle ages had been constantly harping on the strings of human sympathy: happy is he who makes others happy; be good, life is worth living only if you live for others, it is wasted if you live for your own self.... Those were the maxims of the social philosophy of old. The end of the 17th and all through the 18th centuries has seen the pendulum of thought swing the other way, rejecting all ideas of self-sacrifice and embracing the opposite view of life, the philosophy of egoism. This new movement of thought was historically a reaction against the old conception of life and religious morality. The quintessence of the new teaching was: Live for thyself; all in this world is false but the love of self; nothing is of more importance than your personal interests; know thyself and seek your own happiness!

The force of the new philosophy was indeed tremendous. The great French revolution was the thundering expression of the deep revolution these lightning ideas have wrought in the minds of men. They have laid the foundation for the Anarchistic thoughts of *Ni dieu, ni maître*, * freedom of person and individual

* Neither God nor master.

happiness. This philosophy was far reaching and true but regrettably one-sided. Bringing out prominently but one side of human existence, the part of his ego; having built on the principle that animal life is essentially egoistic, they could not escape the dangerous logic that if so, then we recognize no other right but that of might. And in fact, the direct consequence was the rising of the bourgeois system bearing on its banner black the proud inscription: "Might is right and the people be damned!"

The so-called christian philosophy of the middle ages, preaching extreme altruism, sanctioned and fostered barbaric tyranny and a slavish paternalism; the revolutionary philosophy of the 18th century, going over to the other extreme and denying all other but selfish motives, created a political economy which had disinherited two thirds of the people and failed to make even the rest truly happy.

"It was the universal practice in the last century," says Lange in his History of Materialism, to deduce the good of the world from the co-operation of all egoistic effects. However easy it was to protest against exaggerations in Mandeville's notorious "Fable of the Bees," yet the principle that even vices contribute to the general good, was to some extent a secret article of enlightenment, especially in the department of political economy. The sophisms of Helvetius in the glittering garb of rhetoric are yet easily seen through; and every attempt to explain even the virtues of patriotism, of self-sacrifice for one's neighbor, and of bravery, from the principle of self-love, must be shattered by the fact that the natural understanding, agreeing with scientific criticism, contradicts it. It is otherwise in political economy. Here it seems so natural to assume that the progress of the collective whole is simply the sum of all the progress of the individuals; but the individual can only attain to material prosperity by the reckless pursuit of his own interests; let virtue be exercised in other spheres, so far as our means admit!"

Such were the deplorable results a one-sided egoism has led to; but soon a new reaction was naturally called out by excesses of the old one. In the first decades of the present century the so-called utopian socialism has made its appearance and created a new altruism, rejecting entirely the philosophy of egoism together with its best deductions—personal liberty and individual happiness. St. Simon and his followers have built once more on the sympathetic natures of men; the individuality is to be lost according to them in the interest of humanity, the ego is swallowed up by the altruism. The greatest thinker of his age, August Comte, the founder of positivism and sociology, was nevertheless in his political teachings a true disciple of St. Simon. He invented the new term of altruism and founded the famous religion of humanity—a positive negation of the individual.

Of course, those who know the history of ideas will understand that I do not mean to assert that there were no contrary views advanced but those that were reigning in each of the periods I mentioned. I need not dwell therefore on the fact that all possible variations of egoism and altruism have found their advocates throughout these centuries. The Manchester school of Individualism, the early Communists among the Germans, Fourierism, Marxism, Individual or egoistic Anarchism—all these "isms" are one-sided products of either egoism or altruism, and take their origin from the ideas of the past and beginning of the present century up to Comte. The general characteristic mark, however, of the first half of this century is the revival of humanism, the direct contradiction of the 18th century egoism. The second half of our century, just closing, is distinguished by the appearance of the theory of evolution and its application to the sciences of zoology, psychology, anthropology and sociology. A new light has been shed by this theory on all the facts of life, and it not only brought light where darkness has hitherto prevailed, opening up new avenues of research, but moreover its chief merit consists in the fact that through its all embracing character it has made impossible for any single science to be partial and one-sided.

In short, modern sociology assumes more and more of a sympathetic character. It passes in review all the facts of social life from all their different points of view; the egoistic as well as the altruistic inclinations of social man are taken note of and duly balanced in a scientific statement of his debit and credit. All social tendencies must be appreciated, and each social ideal, every sociological "ism"—Anarchism among others—must look for its justification in the facts of

sociology, must find its basis in the modern synthetic instead of the old speculative philosophy.

But to resume the argument: The question of egoism and altruism, although a psychological question in the first instance, is best understood and discussed in the field of sociology. In the social life of men as well as of the lower and higher animals we see the working of both these inclinations, here in the form of an inherited instinct, there in the form of purposive action. Social selection usually favors the growth of sympathetic and altruistic sentiments, for the reason that such, men or animals, who are willing to sacrifice parts of their ego for the benefit of others of their kind, will be more ready to combine and, through their mutual aid attain more and higher gratifications than others who will not form such mutual combinations. Their strongly developed altruistic feelings will pass by inheritance to their children, and so on until, a few generations later, these altruistic inclinations will appear as well formed instincts which will prompt their possessors to perform acts of kindness without the least thought of self. Naturally while acting altruistically one feels a certain satisfaction, a pleasurable sensation let us say, probably a pleasurable of the kind one experiences when fulfilling any other natural function. But surely any pleasure or benefit that might follow the kind act is only the concomitant effect and by no means the cause of that act.

As a case in point, illustrative of a direct benefit resulting from an altruistic act, not contemplated before, I will mention the following: Father Phil, in Lover's story of "Handy Andy" relates an anecdote of an engagement in Spain, in which the dragoons of a regiment, retreating under hot fire paused at the crossing of a river to take up behind them some women of the camp followers who had difficulty in crossing, and thereupon found themselves followed by cheers, instead of shots, from their french foes. There was certainly self-sacrifice on the part of the dragoons in stopping to render aid to those helpless women, and the fact that they have immediately benefited by it cannot change that altruistic act in an egoistic one.

With the further development of society there takes place a correspondingly greater development of the altruistic sentiments of the members of society. "We may often notice," says Williams in his book on 'Evolutional Ethics,' "the growth of altruistic motives, in ourselves; for retrogression as well as progression in altruism is possible with the individual. If we feel bitterly toward some human being, for instance, the best and surest remedy is to perform some act of kindness toward him. We may contemplate and carry out the deed with merely a sense of gratification and egoistic elation at our own generosity, but we are more than likely to experience some degree of change of feeling before we have finished. A certain degree of generosity must already exist in order that we may be able to show kindness to an enemy; but kindly feeling as well as animosity increase constantly with their exercise."

Through the intimate and close relation that take place among people in a highly developed society, there occur innumerable occasions where direct and frequent help freely offered and as freely accepted, become a constant necessity. The smart business man will possibly stop once in a while to count the advantages of a kind act; the philosopher will probably have the thought occur to him at once that an act of kindness will repay with interest in the next generations; a plain man acts and calculates not. If he sees a man drowning, he feels an instantaneous quiver at the heart and rolling up his sleeves, he jumps into the water and tries to save him. He knows that he risks his own life and, were it true that nothing but egoistic motives prevail with every individual, there would be nothing in this world that could influence any one to risk life, the only irrecoverable thing under the sun. On the contrary, if we admit, as by all means we must, that the sense of self-sacrifice for the good of others is just as natural and as essential in human character, as the sense of self-preservation, then we have no necessity to interpret altruism in the terms of egoism.

The very social instinct, in the absence of which we could not explain even the most rudimentary social actions, is itself a direct offspring of the primitive sense of sympathy or altruism. Natural morality, which means essentially the same thing that Kropotkin describes as Anarchist morality, consists in the gratification of our whole nature through egoistic and altruistic actions alike. The philosophy of egoism has led us to Anarchism—where is the basis of Communism if not in altruism?

J. MARYSON.

RECEIPTS.

Week ending September 9.

Pyburn, Peukert, each \$1. Genitt, Meelinger, Neebe, Schmelzer, Kittinger, Greenberg, each 50c. Kahn, McNevin, King, each 25c. Miller, 10c.