



Freedom in America.

Where is thy home, O Freedom? Have they set
Thine image up upon a rock to greet
All comers shaking from their wandering feet
The dust of the old world bondage, to forget
The tyrannies of fraud and force, nor fret,
Where men are equal, slavish chain unmeet;
Nor bitter bread of discontent to eat,
Here, where all races of the earth are met?
America! beneath thy banded flag
Of old it was thy boast that men were free
To think, to speak, to meet, to come, to go.
What meaneth then the gibbet and the gag
Held up to Labor's sons who would not see
Fair Freedom but a mask—a hollow show?

—Walter Crane.

Some Misconceptions of Anarchism.

(A paper read before the Radical Club, New York,
January, 1904.)

There are, roughly speaking, three schools of Anarchism: (1) The *Revolutionary* school of Bakunin and Kropotkin, also known as *Communist Anarchism*; (2) the *Ethical* or *Philosophic* Anarchism of Godwin, Proudhon, and Tucker; and (3) the *Religious* Anarchism of Tolstoy.

When speaking, therefore, of the misconceptions prevalent about Anarchism, it is necessary to bear in mind that, not only is each school misrepresented individually, but that confusion also arises from the very fact that there is more than one school, each necessarily differing in some respects from the other.

Again, those who misconceive Anarchism are also of different types. We will divide them, for simplicity's sake, into three categories: (1) The *Conservatives*, who hate and fear any radical proposition for a social change; (2) *Socialists* and other reformers, who cannot, because they don't want to, see the other fellow's point; and (3) partisan Anarchists themselves, who believe they have a monopoly of the truth.

It is evident, then, that the misconceptions must be many and varied, and to speak of them all would be too great an imposition on your forbearance. I shall, therefore, limit my remarks only to some of them, and more particularly to those of the revolutionary school, the one that makes the most noise and is hated and misrepresented most.

The first and most important misconception, entertained innocently or maliciously by friend or foe, is, that the trinity of Anarchism, Communism, and Revolution is indissoluble; that Anarchism is essentially bound up with

bloody revolution on the one hand, and angelic Communism on the other; in short, that Anarchism presupposes revolution and posits Communism as a social economic necessity.

That there is some ground for such misconception, afforded by the very teachings of some advocates of Anarchism, cannot be entirely denied. Like every generalization not born of induction, the conception of Anarchism was daring but indefinite. And also, not unlike many another doctrine, it could not escape, at its inception, the influence of its environment.

The period of the birth of Anarchism coincides with the revolutionary period of 1848-71. The tradition of the great French Revolution was then yet fresh in popular minds; the air was filled with politico-social changes; men's aspirations ran high, and the building of barricades was then a flourishing industry. It was an age of paper constitutions and social-system making, done while you wait—it was then that the no-authority system of society was born.

The sharpest critics of the tyrannies of the State naturally fell in with the most impatient and most persecuted revolutionists of the time. The ideal of no-authority inspired them to more stubborn defiance of the powers that be; while their burning love for down-trodden humanity could find no satisfaction but in the highest expression of human fraternity—the economic abandon of brotherly Communism.

But, while it is historically true that the first Anarchists were primarily revolutionary Communists, it does not, therefore, necessarily follow that Anarchism is impossible without the economics of Communism and the method of revolution by force. As a matter of theory, there is certainly no essential bond between the three, even tho there be a number of persons who pin their faith to the trinity as a whole. People who disbelieve in the necessity of government may or may not be advocates of revolution and the propaganda by deed, may or may not be believers in Communism. The advocacy of freedom in social relationships of the principle of voluntarism, or the right of secession, in social organization, presupposes, as I shall explain presently more fully, only one fundamental economic condition, and that is—equal opportunity to obtain economic independence.

And again, as a matter of fact, the native American Anarchism, as expounded by its originator, Josiah Warren (also forcibly expressed by Thoreau) is entirely free from both

Communism and revolutionary tactics. The Anarchism of Benj. R. Tucker, usually the most logical and consistent, is strenuously opposed to the communistic system, and is peaceful in its method to an extreme. Even Proudhon, the Frenchman, sought to establish Anarchy by the peaceable means of the People's Bank and the Labor Exchange.

It is evident, then, that to identify Anarchism with either revolution or Communism is a misconception of the theory, and contrary to the facts of the history of Anarchism. Still, we hear it repeated again and again, innocently by the sympathizer who ought to know better, and maliciously by the reactionary and political Socialist alike, who do not want to know better, because it serves their purpose of discrediting Anarchism before the people.

As a sample of such malicious ignorance circulated about Anarchism, I will quote a few passages from a book that appeared only a few months ago, which was highly lauded by the Socialist press and which was called by the editor of *The Comrade* "a remarkable book from a remarkable man." On page 332 of the "History of Socialism in the United States" we read as follows:

Not recognizing the organic character of human society, the Anarchist denies the gradual and logical course of its development. The world is ready for the most radical revolutions at all times, and all that is required for their successful accomplishment is a handful of determined men, ready to jeopardize their lives for the welfare of the oppressed population.

Consistently with these views, the Anarchists reject political action as a useless farce and deprecate the efforts of trade unions and Socialists to ameliorate the condition of the working class as reactionary measures, retarding the revolution by smothering dissatisfaction of the workers with their present condition. Their efforts are directed toward sowing the seed of revolt among the poor and carrying on a personal war with those whom they regard as responsible for all social injustice, the high and mighty of all nations. Their weapons are the propaganda of the word and the propaganda of the deed.

This "remarkable" man seems never to have read even a single pamphlet on Anarchism. Every sentence of those two passages is an absurd misstatement of phrases he caught on the fly from the impassioned speeches of the veteran revolutionist, John Most, some fifteen years ago. But unfortunately the theory of Anarchism is so little understood that such a mess of absurdities finds ready currency even among authors, not to speak of the pious readers, who are simply horrified at the "dangerous theories of those horrible lunatics, the Anarchists."

Another important misconception I want to speak of is one with regard to the fundamental principle of Anarchism, individual liberty.

The term is a much abused one. In the name of liberty the self-satisfied bourgeois defends the very "slavery of our times"; and to the mind of his self-constituted successor, the Socialist aspirant to political power, liberty is quite compatible with "coming slavery." Anarchism is abhorred because it is supposed to stand for unbridled liberty, for rank license, which is destructive of all social life; while Anarchists themselves are still divided on the question of definition. The "philosophic" school rests contented with the Spencerian formula of equal liberty, *i. e.*, everyone is free to do as he pleases, provided he does not interfere with the like liberty of others. But the problem is not solved, only shifted a step further, as the formula does not include a definition of its limiting clause, namely, what constitutes an interference or invasion? The objection is furthermore raised, and it seems to be a valid one, that with such limitation, it is no more the principle of liberty that serves as a guide to conduct, but rather the limits of liberty, which is the same old bourgeois conception of liberty guarded by law.

The school of Anarchism "not philosophic," regard, therefore, this formula with suspicion. To them liberty implies nothing less than that idyllic state wherein every one is perfectly free not only to do, but to enjoy all things. They trust, unphilosophically indeed, in the inherent goodness of human nature and refuse to set a limit to liberty of any kind. It is this aspiration of the Communist Anarchists for perfectly idyllic freedom that impels the kind-hearted but cautious reformer to unload himself of the sympathetic remark, that Anarchism is certainly a beautiful ideal, but oh, how impractical!

And so we find Anarchism execrated on the one hand as a fiendish theory of hell and chaos, and idealized on the other, as a beatific but impossible dream.

Now, the liberty Anarchists advocate is neither so awful as to create chaos, nor so beatific as to be impossible of realization. The trouble is only that it is misunderstood. We always speak of liberty as if it were a positive force, a weapon, so to say, which individuals may use for good or evil. We hear it said: "Give a man liberty and he will abuse it by injuring his neighbor;" or on the contrary, "Give a man liberty and he will be kind and considerate toward others." But liberty is not a thing to be given. It is not a title to a piece of property, or a *lettre de cachet* to go ahead and do what one pleases. Essentially liberty is merely a relation, a negative condition, the absence of something very positive in its manifestation, namely, the absence of restraint.

Furthermore, liberty is a social relation, not an individual endowment. Outside of society you can not have even the conception of freedom. You can do absolutely anything and everything with yourself and still there is no question of liberty involved. Your acts become significant only in so far as they affect

some other than yourself, when they have a definite relation to the doings of others, *i. e.*, when they are social acts. When we say liberty we merely characterize the relation our doings bear to the doings of others; we express then, that our activity did not inhibit or restrain the activity of somebody else. In the relations of man to man, to possess liberty does not at all mean to be endowed with power to do him up; it means to enjoy the blessing of the negative condition of not being done up by him.

We hear people say: "It is all very well to speak of perfect freedom for the future, when altruistic feelings shall have developed in excess of the egoistic feelings and men's concern will mainly consist, as Spencer pictures it, in being helpful to others. But with present human nature, and the complicating relations of conflicting interests, restraint rather than liberty must remain the guiding principle of social organization."

The fallacy here lurking is again due to a misconception of liberty. Liberty is not a sacrifice one makes for the benefit of another. It does not spring from the altruistic feeling of extending aid, of being helpful. There is no imperative, do unto others, etc., it is the purely egoistic cry of hands off! Leave me alone!

The definition of individual liberty is not, everyone may do as he pleases, with the tacit or explicit provision of not injuring thereby, etc., but, everyone may abstain from doing things that don't please him, with no provision, tacit or explicit, attached to it whatsoever.

If individual liberty be incompatible with social organization, well,—all the worse for social organization.

Leave the individual alone; do not in the name of society constrain him to do things he does not want to, and you will have no occasion to restrain him from doing the things he does want to. The aim of society, to speak teleologically, is the development of the individual, and not *vice versa*. Social organization is of importance only in so far as it subserves the purposes of the individuals: the more complete his personal liberty, the more his purpose is served.

Anarchism is the negation of compulsory organization, certainly not of all organization. It does not deny the organic character of society and certainly not the gradual course of its development. But to recognize an organic character in society does not imply that it is an organism in the crude sense of the term, where all the component organs slavishly obey the will of the central authority, the higher sensorium. The political organization of society is quite a different conception from biologic organization. Society is an organization without special organs; it is organized only by virtue of the fact that the individuals stand in mutual relations to each other. What be the character of these mutual relations?—is entirely a political question. What was the course of their development? Political science supplies the answer. What shall be, or rather, what will be the character of these mutual relations? Anarchism teaches that it will be *libertarian*; that these mutual relations, that is, social organization, will be *voluntary* and not compulsory.

The individual owes no-allegiance to any person or set of persons. He is to be free, perfectly free, to unite his efforts with his neighbors' for any purpose, as he pleases, or to stand alone and *not* participate in the work and benefits of such social undertaking. The principle of individual liberty is the right of secession, the right to withdraw from the constituted political organization, the right *not to do* things one does not want to be done, the right to disagree with the decisions of the majority: in short, the right to the absolute ownership of one's own personality.

The idea of Archism, the State, in all its shapes and forms, is based on the theory that one portion of society—a minority in the oligarchic form of the State, a majority in the Democratic form—has the right to constrain all the rest to do its bidding. Every form of State organization denies on principle the right of its constituent members to withdraw, either singly or in numbers, from that organization. No State will suffer the existence, within its jurisdiction, of any other political organization, independent of its authority. To the governmentalist, there is nothing more reprehensible than "the State within the State." Anarchism pleads guilty to holding the diametrically opposite view of that of the compulsory State. It advocates individual choice in place of majority rule, the liberty *not to do* authority's bidding: in short: *Voluntary* instead of *Compulsory* organization.

Anarchism is all that—but *nothing more*. And this brings me to the consideration of one more misconception of Anarchism.

It is invariably assumed that Anarchism presupposes some particular economic system to go hand in hand with it: that without such particular economic condition Anarchism is impossible, or not worth having. I am not speaking against Anarchists who prefer either Communism, or private property, or any other system as a desirable economic condition *per se*; I am only speaking against the view that sees in either one of these economic systems a *conditio sine qua non* to the proper working of Anarchist organization: that denies the possibility of Anarchism without the other supplemental "ism." In this regard, both Communists and so-called Individualists, are equal offenders. The argument of the former is first, that man cannot be perfectly free, so long as he is not free to consume all he wants, of the goods of this world, irrespective of his share in the production. And secondly, that equalization of fortune is an absolute necessity for the safeguarding of the institution of freedom.

The argument of the Individualists, upholding private property is, that Communism is essentially an exploitation of the strong by the weak, which firstly, works against the progress of the race; and secondly, curtails the liberty of the stronger, in favor of the weaker.

To the arguments of the Communists, I would reply: Sure enough, you cannot be perfectly free in this world, since even in Communism you still cannot be free from all care and worry, you cannot be free from disease and from inevitable death, and from

innumerable ills and troubles human body and mind are heir to. Why, it is highly doubtful, whether even a Communist has a "free will" of his own.

Now, I do not deny the desirability of having all these kinds of freedom, but I do most positively deny that we cannot have *Anarchist* freedom without them. Remember, that the liberty Anarchism stands for, is the liberty not to do socially what one does not want to do; not to be coerced or constrained by any organization to participate in undertakings not of one's own choosing. This is Anarchist liberty, and this is all Anarchism stands for, the rest is a question of opportunity and voluntary agreement.

All a man needs to effectively maintain his liberty not to submit to authority, is, aside from sanity of mind, economic independence, made possible by equality of opportunity to utilize the earth and the free gifts of nature. Given that, and by mutual agreement thru voluntary organization, man can live free and happy ever after.

It is not equality of fortune, but equality of opportunity, that, if added to liberty, will result in fraternity. For there is never a chance for the stronger and thriftier to oppress the weaker and the less thrifty, if even the weak and the shiftless are strong enough, and resourceful enough thru equal opportunity to stand alone and be free.

On the other hand, there is no ground for the Individualists' apprehension of a Communism voluntarily organized, and mutually agreed to. There can be no exploitation under mutualism. You can never exploit a man who is not forced to accept your terms, and no Anarchist ever proposed forcing Communism on anybody. As to the progress of the race—well, the thought was gaining ground of late, that mutual aid rather enhanced it than otherwise, so we need not bother our heads about it.

Moreover, to contend for the universality of any one particular economic system, is a sad misconception of the very nature of social progress. Objects will be moving in the line of least resistance in the future, as invariably as they did in the past; but who can prescribe the line all the multifarious human needs will move into to get their satisfaction?

There will be room enough for Communists and Individualists together: Such is Anarchism.
DR. M——N.

Why should a citizen ever, to any degree, wringe or bend his conscience before or to the legislature? To what use to him his conscience if he does? Let us be men first and citizens afterward. It is not nearly so desirable for our welfare to nourish respect for the law as it is to strike out for equity. The only obligation that I have a right to assume is that of doing and pursuing at all times that which I know to be just.—Thoreau.

Jesus has been crucified three times. First, by the Jews, then by his biographers, and finally by the Christians. The latter were his most malicious enemies.—Multatuli.

The Shipwrecked Lawmaker.

A gloomy presentiment crept over me when I read D. I. Sturber's rejoinder in No. 12 of FREE SOCIETY. What else will be expected of Anarchism? Treatises on "Anarchism and the Cat-o'-nine-tails," "The Roman Law in Its Practical Anarchistic Application," and "Anarchism, the Only Legitimate Mother of Law and Order?"

D. I. Sturber's inexorable logic steers zealously toward this alluring aim. His ship would certainly run aground; but, fortunately, such logic is at least not pitiless. You can reason with it.

The conception of Anarchism has neither sense nor meaning unless it conveys the conviction that human relations can shape themselves soundly, and human needs be satisfied, without written laws, imposed decrees and enactments.

The Anarchist distinguishes himself from the believers in authoritarian social regimes, principally thru the confidence in the possibility and capability of the human race to unite and separate—socially, spiritually and physically—voluntarily; presupposing a life without compulsion, without government, without constitution, without the farce of law, and without class or race servitude.

No Anarchist will object to this definition of Anarchism in general. It will be looked upon as a matter of course. But what are we to say about an "anarchistic" logic which intends to erect on such foundation a constitutional building, the material of which consists of a heap of arbitrarily constructed demands, picked out from a confused mass of trash—ancient and mouldy laws and new legislative enactments?

The most charitable answer is: Even nonsense has its logic. This is one mitigating feature for Sturber's logic. The second one he alleges himself, namely, that his "constitution has nothing to do with authority." Does this lawmaker know of a household knife which has neither a blade nor a handle, or of a pot without a handle and bottom? Exactly such a thing is the lawmaking business without authority, or which has no power behind it. It is not worth the ink, much less the paper, that it is written on. Any one who talks about constitutions must also talk about judges, prisons and jailers, or else he talks about a fire that does not burn or about water that is not wet.

MAX BAGINSKI.

He who lets the world, or his own portion of it, choose his plan of life for him, has no need of any other faculty than the ape-like one of imitation. He who chooses his plan for himself employs all his faculties. He must use observation to see, reasoning and judgment to foresee, activity to gather materials for decision, discrimination to decide, and, when he has decided, firmness and self-control to hold to his deliberate decision.—J. S. Mill: "On Liberty."

"Chastity," sordid, haggard and brutal chastity, always turns into torture what would be lovely without it.—Multatuli.

Literature.

SOCIALISM AND THE SOCIAL MOVEMENT IN THE 19TH CENTURY. By Werner Sombart. Translated by A. P. Atterbury. Published by Charles H. Kerr, Chicago. Price, \$1.

The academic view of things was never more aptly and unconsciously set forth than in this book, which, consisting of a number of lectures to middle class people in Germany, goes delicately and patronizingly thru the paths of Socialism, scolding gently, patting upon the back now and then, and all the time assuring the middle class that it has nothing whatever to fear from the noisy demonstration which surges at its doorways; and that all will come in due time and in due order.

Incidentally the book contains a great deal of apt and inapt criticism of Karl Marx, his associates, and the Socialist movement in general, including Anarchism. It opens with the astounding discovery that Marx made a mistake in declaring all history to be the story of a class struggle, and gravely tells us that the struggle between individuals for supremacy has been as important a factor in evolution as the Marxian pet. Kropotkin's masterpiece in English, "Mutual Aid a Factor of Evolution," has counted for nothing with Professor Sombart, who must have heard of the work, if he did not read it, while it was being published in an English magazine. But then its theories are not relished by the worshippers of the class struggle either, so the Socialists and Professor Sombart are quits in that respect. The author assures the reader often that he means no offence in his strictures, and altogether furnishes considerable amusement by his combined toadyism and complacency.

Imagine a man whose life had been lived inside the walls of the university gravely and with careful "good taste" endeavoring to soften the fears and reassure the hearts of an audience of troubled moneybags; imagine an academic style and a mind half influenced by the ideas of Karl Marx; imagine a man saturated in the Darwinism which out-Darwins Darwin; imagine these things, and a man by nature wedded to privilege and ease, and you will have imagined Professor Sombart, and his book.

Quite the most delicious morsel of unconscious humor in the volume is the final chapter, in which the trembling children of gold and bonds are assured that all real progress is legal and lawful, and that therefore they may be sure their interests will not be jeopardized by a revolution. With '76, '93, '48, and '71 to think about, one would imagine that the auditors of the learned professor would have not felt quite reassured at the rounded sentences which fell from their instructor's lips. Legal and lawful revolutions are indeed things which most Socialists delight in, however; and no doubt many of the readers of this book are delighted with it in part. As an Anarchist, I must protest against saddling the progress of the human race with the outworn trappings of irresponsible authority. Give me, rather, as the condition of revolution, the dissatisfaction of brave and wise spirits who know that their chains have been made of moral, legal, and religious laws; spirits who rise up and break these laws, not in the name of a class, and not in a thirst of revenge, but with the strength and glad laughter of the wise and the young.

W. F. B.

FREE SOCIETY

Formerly THE FIREBRAND.

Issued Weekly by FREE SOCIETY PUBL. ASSOCIATION
A. ISAAK.....Editor.

ONE DOLLAR A YEAR.

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

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

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

SUNDAY, APRIL 10, 1904.

460.

If these figures correspond with the number printed
on the wrapper of your FREE SOCIETY, your sub-
scription expires with this number

ATTENTION.

John Turner and Emma Goldman will
speak at Grand Irving Palace, 214-220
Broome St., Monday, April 11, 8 p.m., on
the subject: "The struggle between Capital
and Labor." Bring your conservative
friends along.

NOTICE.

All mail intended for FREE SOCIETY
should in future be addressed to 230 East
Fourth Street, New York City, N. Y., in-
stead of 407 Park Ave., Chicago, Ill., as
heretofore.

On the Watch Tower.

Liberty is not respectable.

Customs are only habits.

Free love never makes slaves.

Freedom has plenty of patience.

There is no progress without pain.

We grow greater as we dare to stand alone.

A bad cause needs an able advocate, but a
good cause wins its way.

The king grows cautious; Roosevelt accepts
a \$35,000 stable.

Affairs in Colorado show what justice is
when unmasked.

A starved life can hardly imagine a life of
plenty.

The anti-cigarette crusade should be met
with an anti-meddler crusade.

As the sun never rises in the west, so prog-
ress never comes from repression.

FREE SOCIETY

Senator Burton, of Kansas, has been convict-
ed. Now the higher courts must help him out.

We are forced to believe that liberty *must*
come, as we see all other expedients miserably
fail.

Alderman Brennan, of Chicago, who was
sent to prison with the blowing of the trumpets
of justice, got out with the aid of the courts!

Governmental institutions are merely
schemes for making money out of the super-
stitions of the foolish people.

The Dreibund, or Triple Alliance, is a union
of three States for the purpose of mutual aid
in robbery.

Liberty will not make man absolutely per-
fect; but that is no reason why slavery, which
makes it certain that he shall not develop,
should prevail.

Chicago courts are now making a regular
business of grinding out injunctions against
labor. Workingmen, who stand and stare at
the operation, do you understand?

Edward Atkinson, the economist, is experi-
menting with peat, or bog mud, in the expec-
tation of developing a new kind of fuel. If he
succeeds we shall soon have bog barons.

Land and labor are the essentials of all
wealth production, and from these, if society
were to start over again, all that is might be
created. The need of capital is not primary,
but secondary.

The kaiser and the queen of Italy recently
met on a royal yacht and exchanged compli-
ments. Of course, their chief subject of con-
versation was the nobility and worth of free
and independent manhood!

A people with imagination is certain to be
a rebellious people, and hence for the good of
the State it is essential that all such things as
art and refinement should be kept as far away
from the "herd" as is possible. Full stomachs
and empty heads—these are our great social
ideals!

In India the people are dying from the
plague at the rate of 40,000 a week, and the
death rate is on the increase. When one thinks
of this State-ridden, famine devastated coun-
try, one finds it hard to imagine that fatalism
which in the mind of India keeps the people
from flaming into revolution.

Justice Brewer recently held forth in an ad-
dress in which he paid his respects to Chicago
in not altogether flattering terms, and inci-
dentally-discussed what he called "free love."
What Justice Brewer does not know about love
would fill several large hearts, and his knowl-
edge of freedom—well, he's a patriot, poor
man!

A Western educator is out with the state-
ment that the growth of belief in authority, as
shown by the progress of Socialism, is the
greatest evil of present day society. The edu-
cator is right, and his utterance is only another
evidence that the progress of Socialism will be
checked when Socialism comes nearer.

The Turner prosecution, Turner's articles in
newspapers, the taking up of the matter by the
Supreme Court, and the general editorial dis-
cussion of the case, have done a great deal to
bring the cause of Anarchism clearly before the
minds of the people; and whether Turner goes
or is allowed to stay, another step forward has
been made.

Our forefathers cared nothing for the cry of
"treason!" when they plotted against King
George; they cared nothing for law when they
threw the taxes and the tea overboard together
in Boston harbor; and they were quite willing
to be called "rebels and criminals" when they
took up their arms. A real American will al-
ways bear these things in mind.

There is a well defined and growing suspi-
cion abroad that the administration at Wash-
ington is quietly fomenting European compli-
cations so that a general war may ensue. The
president, assisted by Hay, can cause immense
trouble by a policy of interference, but his in-
ordinate ambition will lead him on to any ex-
treme that he thinks might ultimately profit
him.

Anarchism is not a scheme or plan of any
kind, but it is a social condition made inevit-
able by the very nature of progressive man-
hood, which always finds the bar of authority
placed exactly across the road leading to better
circumstances and a fuller life. With intelli-
gence to guide and with every other expedient
to try, man will at last turn to liberty because
he *must*.

The emperor of Austria recently went thru
the time honored ceremony of washing the feet
of several old men, an annual event in Austria.
This mock semblance of humility, indulged in
by a petted monarch, is of a piece with mes-
sages to "our loving subjects" and subscrip-
tions to charities; things which are indulged in
by kings, presidents and governors whenever
these desire an effective advertisement of their
"goodness."

The attitude of two powers toward Tibet,
that of Russia and England, is all that an ob-
server of the schemes of States could ask for.
Irritate a people until they can endure it no
longer, and you will have a rebellion; then step
in and kill hundreds of them; and while those
who are left are crushed with grief, quietly
take possession of everything that can be of
value to you in your purposes. If there is any
complaint appeal to "justice."

AMERICUS.

Religious faith is the voluntary imprison-
ment of reason.—Multatuli.

By the Wayside.

At a love feast between capital and labor, Andrew Carnegie, the most unmerciful exploiter of labor, was elected a member of the executive committee of the National Civic Federation, which is about as absurd and ridiculous as if the Czar of Russia or Anthony Comstock should join the Free Speech League. But the greatest insult to labor was the infamy perpetrated by William Weighs, chief of the strikers during the troubles at Homestead in 1892, who degraded himself by participating in the dinner and shaking the blood stained hands of a Carnegie.

* * *

In Switzerland the labor organizations of the two infallible churches—Catholic and social democratic—have formed an alliance. Another "great victory" of political Socialism has thus been achieved, and now the benediction of the pope is logically the next "revolutionary" step of our Socialist brethren. No doubt the numbers of their voters will grow rapidly. But there is another side to the story. "The Roman church in Europe may gain voters," a prominent Catholic wrote some time ago, "but it continues to lose souls," which is equally applicable to Socialist parties. They surely gain voters, but continue to abandon Socialism.

* * *

According to cable reports, the Chamber of Deputies in France has accepted the motion made by the Socialist representatives to devote their precious time of one week in a month for the consideration of labor laws. What a consolation for the drudging slaves to know that they are here and there remembered by their so-called representatives, who are not over-anxious to jeopardize their burdensome positions by radical measures. Only a few years ago it would have been looked upon as a ridiculous occupation to aid present society in patching up a decaying and pernicious system, but today it is hailed by the Socialist press as an approach of the millennium. God bless political action and its results!

* * *

"The Home and the Higher Education of Women" was the subject recently discussed in a Baptist church in Philadelphia. The pastor, Dr. Peterson, recommended "cookology" as one of the most important studies for women, which, he thought, would greatly counteract "the decadence of home life" and induce men to enter the bonds of matrimony. But one of the members took exception to such materialistic views of the divine, and suggested that the highest type of woman was the one who worked for the benefit of humanity, as, for instance, Judith, of holy writ, "who slew Holofernes in cold blood for the good of mankind." He also mentioned Emma Goldman as the highest type of educated woman, "who devotes her life to the amelioration of the wrongs of humanity." . . . Here the speaker's voice was drowned by vigorous hisses coming from the audience, and he is puzzled as to whether the good Christians hissed the name because she had not assassinated a tyrant, or because she works for the good of humanity instead of devoting her life to cookology.

"The American spirit of liberty and tolerance must be preserved!" is now the watchword of those who have occasion to speak on the "Turner case," yet none of them finds it necessary to relate the events in which this much boasted of spirit has been conspicuously manifested. It is merely a traditional phrase, an inheritance of the "revolutionary forefathers," which is exceedingly tedious to those who are familiar with the social, political and industrial developments of this country. Did this "American spirit of freedom" manifest itself in the tyranny of the Puritans, the persecutions of the peaceable Quakers, or the fierce hatred against the Abolitionists? Is Comstockism perhaps one of the concomitants of this spirit—a spirit which harasses the press continually with impunity? Is the burning and mutilation of Negroes a phenomenon of the clamor for "American freedom?" Or are we to look for this precious spirit in the predilection of suppressing radical papers in a most arbitrary manner, simply because some petty postal official happens to be displeased with them? Or has this "American spirit" perhaps been predominant in the struggle between capital and labor, the brutality of which excels that of any European country excepting Russia? And last, but not least, is this spirit perhaps expressing itself in Colorado, where the authorities are outraging the workers in a manner which reminds one of the cruelties and barbarities perpetrated by the despots against the rebellious peasants of the Middle Ages? And yet we hear of no indignation, of no protests, from the people who are supposed to be imbued with this "great American spirit of liberty." On the contrary, the press finds it hardly worth while mentioning the fact that tyranny in its most hideous form prevails in the State of Colorado. The Japanese-Russian war is of a much greater import to our press than the crushing of labor in this country.

INTERLOPER.

Just cast a glance at this society, and tell us whether it acts from virtuous, divine or even moral motives. Is it not, in fact, a *bellum omnium contra omnes*? Does it not resemble a race course where every one does all he can to outrun or even destroy the other? Are we not tempted to say of this society what Burmeister says of the Brazilians? Every one does what he believes he can do without incurring punishment. He cheats and abuses others as much as possible, being convinced they would do the same to him. Any one who acts differently is treated as an idiot. Is it not the most refined egotism, which is the spring of this social mechanism, and distinguished authors, who best know human society, do they not constantly depict in their narrations the cowardly disloyalty and hypocrisy of this European society?—"Force and Matter," Dr. Louis Büchner.

I have been in countries where infanticide thru shame was unknown. And I have seen this intruded shame and its resulting infanticide increase in Christendom.—Multatuli.

Evolution or Revolution; Which Shall It Be?

In this article I intend, briefly, to present a spectroscopic view of the present status of our system of government, its internal and foreign policy, recommending a new system.

The thinking people of the United States see that our republican form of government is a failure. That it is the most expensive and corrupt government in the world is clearly shown by statistics and living history. The legislative branch, federal, State and municipal, is impregnated with corruption from center to circumference. The people no longer have confidence in that body; venality and imbecility in that branch of service stalk the land in bold defiance of the wishes and interests of the people.

As for the federal branch, its bold effrontery and usurpations of power have become so common as to pass almost unheeded. The people have become so used to being tyrannized over and deprived of their natural and constitutional rights by these bodies as to take it for granted that governments are masters and the people slaves. Nor is the executive branch far behind. The judiciary alone, while comparatively pure, falls far short of requisite ability in all the States where the judges depend on popular favor for their places.

It is not that the American people, as such, are more corrupt than the people of Europe. The fault lies in our system of government, where every one may aspire to office. An appeal to the ballot means, as a rule, success to the least worthy and most unscrupulous demagogue, who outdoes his competitor in the use of money, or who is the most successful in deceiving the voters. Against such tactics merit has no chance; and it is seldom that honest merit cares to pollute its principles by contact with men of no scruples. The proverb is fast ripening into a maxim, "While all thieves are not politicians, all politicians are thieves." The man who makes politics a business cannot, in the very nature of things, be honest, and seldom is he capable. He goes into the scramble for all he can make. Terms of office are short; at best, the successful competitor spends his time and generally large sums of money for place; a second term is doubtful, so he at once commences to lay his wires for a second term, unmindful of the duty he owes to the people. Money he must have to repay him for outlays and expenses for a second term. As to the mode of obtaining it, he has no scruples. During his first term he has learned the ways. If elected a second or more times, he becomes more bold in his efforts to plunder the people. All these things are so well understood that further statements along these lines are uncalled for.

The majority of voters, having no property to protect, have nothing to gain or lose by the success of either party; having carried the torch and applauded the speakers, their duties are over. With many of the voters it is simply party, right or wrong; with some others it is the hope of reward in some form; but with too many of the poorer class, they sell their votes to the best bidder—sometimes to both parties. The result, as might be expected, is official imbecility and corruption everywhere where the ballot controls. Even the elective judiciary, with all their training and pride of opinion, are not proof against the wily machinations of the politician or the undue influence of money. Too often favors are given at the expense of law and justice. Quite a library could be written, giving details of injustice and corruption which dominate our country; but it would be a waste of time to tell the people what they already know.

It is now evolution or revolution. That which is rotten never evolves so as to produce good results—maggots are the outcome. Revo-

lution may be peaceful or by force of arms. The latter should never be encouraged as long as there remains hope of securing better government by peaceful means.

Our people are working along different lines. Labor has reached its ultimatum, until to-day, under the leadership of a few men, it is more despotic than capital could ever dream of being. The leaders guide and control, in every sense, the labor movement. The working man has become the slave of his leader, without the slightest power of resistance. This power has become so unreasonable, despotic and tyrannical, that the whole country is trembling in the balance; capital is terrorized; the government is threatened; all in suspense, waiting for the next move. This, at last, has forced a combine of wealth with a union of employers, to defend itself against organized labor. Between the two, the middle men are being crushed. Most of labor, from four to seven dollars for eight hours, has become so unjust as to drive many kinds of business from the field. In some sections improvements of landed interests have come to a standstill, while the cost of living has nearly doubled in such localities. Strikes and lockouts are the order of the day, civil war is already on. In the infancy of this struggle the middle men were in sympathy with the working class. That day has passed. Capital has some respect for law and order—labor has none. Capital possesses most of the brains, all of the wealth, and has the government, with the army and navy, on its side, while labor is poor, hungry, and without means of defence, much less for aggression. In a clash of arms it would not be hard to predict the result. Numbers without money, arms, government or military leaders to back them, could at best make but a feeble contest. Such a war would be of short duration; constitutional liberty would go down in the conflict, leaving an imperial despotism which would make short work of our once boasted liberties; while, if possible, a far worse state of things would follow a success of the laboring people.

All of these things are foreseen by men of reason; but the great herd never reason. All classes, even the least informed, realize that something is radically wrong in our system of government. The very air we breathe is impregnated with discontent. When I say all, the politician, whose life is plunder, is not included. As to the remedy, few are able to foresee a proper solution of the matter. Even they are slow to move, fearing the consequences of a much-needed radical change. Wealth is seeking an empire backed by an army and navy. This means the loss of the last vestige of our once boasted liberties.

Labor is divided; some few men demand the abolition of government, while a larger class call for more government. They would enlarge the very thing which now curses us. The success of either would be ruin to all. The Anarchists are divided; some profess to believe that all the people can be educated up to a standard to live in peace and happiness without government, while others advocate the assassination of all rulers. Neither of these positions require any argument to refute them; the first is a harmless delusion; the second, a crime. As the great herd of mankind has never been capable of thinking, there is no reason to believe it ever will be. Nature never designed them for higher intelligence. When the world is full of criminals, who cannot be held in check without government. Even with this the spirit of wrong is on the increase. Withdraw all force, and anarchy, in its most dreaded form, would fill the land with crime; it would be each at war with all others. As for killing off a few officials, that would be a crime to no purpose, for thousands of others would stand ready to take their places. The few Anarchists who advocate revolution talk

sense; but revolution by force of arms should never be resorted to until the last hope of a peaceful revolution is gone. So much for the Anarchists. Now, a few words about Socialism.

Socialism is no new thing; bits of it existed in early times; later it appeared in full force, in all its hideousness, in France, where it paralyzed every avenue of trade and industry, and threatened the overthrow of civilization; when the government was forced to crush it *vi et armis*; the details of which are too long to be narrated here. Very few of the Socialists in our country know what they want, and still less do they realize what would be the effect of their success; among them there is a great confusion of ideas, if ideas there can be said to possess. The general drift of opinion among them seems to follow in the wake of Bellamy's "Looking Backwards"—that the government should own all property, real and personal; take charge of all its people, feed, clothe and house them; assign to each and all his task, see that each performs his duty faithfully. A more insane scheme than this could hardly be devised. The people would have to be divided into gangs of some twenty each, over which an overseer would be appointed to see that each did his work properly and not idle away his time. These men and women, under an overseer, would have to obey his orders, get up in the morning at the tap of a bell or the blast of a trumpet, move to their work, directed when to go to their meals, how long to work, when to retire, what they should eat and wear. All this, and much more, in detail, would be the inevitable result. African slavery, in its worst days, would be freedom beside it! Where, O, where, would be enterprise? Where progress? Where our great men of learning? Where our improvements? All would while away their lives in slavery. In a few years man would return to a state of savagery, to live in a wilderness, and feed on wild fruits as of old. Under such a government, from one to two millions of officials would be required. These, of course, would come from the common people. The talk about such a system is idle in the extreme; our present civilization would not for a moment tolerate it.

That most of our people are discontented with the present state of things, and that our system of government is about the worst ever devised, there can be little doubt. That some form of government is a necessity is self-evident. Let all who are dissatisfied with the present government cease to quarrel among themselves, stop advocating the ridiculous and impossible, come together, council and devise a better system. In any plan that may be devised, the power must be kept out of the hands of politicians; a class who have at all times worked in their own interests and against the people. In a new government for the benefit of all, we cannot too severely condemn the Jacksonian principle of rotation in office, which rests on the theory that all, or as many as possible, are to hold office at the expense of the taxpayer, *i. e.*, rotate in and rotate out of office at the end of a single term, thus keeping all offices filled with incompetent men. The good of all demands a stable, honest, and efficient government. Such a government can only be had when the officials are paid living salaries, and when once learning to be efficient, kept in office during good behavior, *i. e.*, as long as honest and efficient. Such a government, while not wanted by politicians, is the best for all others. Under the rotation system, which now prevails, men go in for a term or longer, if successful in deceiving the voters. The men who are honest and become the most efficient by practice, are, as a rule, the first turned out, to give place to political tricksters and demagogues.

Our whole country every four years, and the

States much oftener, become political arenas; on which the most disreputable demagogues meet to vilify each other, and deceive their constituents, thus keeping the country in agitation and business paralyzed. After which the successful party, during its term of office, spends most of its time intriguing for its succession, at the expense of the public. Such is our present system; inefficiency and corruption everywhere, and the worst and most expensive government on earth. According to statistics of 1901, our federal government alone, in a single year, got away with a little over \$800,000,000 of the people's money. Then we have the statistics of 1890 of the expenditures of the several States and their municipalities, which at that time were about the same, as those of the federal machine. If we allow the increase, since 1890, of the expenses of the several States and their municipalities, to have kept pace with those of the federal government, our people in 1901 were paying over \$1,600,000,000 for government; for the larger part of it was for the curses of war, for reckless waste and direct stealings, all of which should have been avoided. And now as we are fully launched on the ocean of imperialism, stealing the far off islands and robbing our southern neighbor of the Isthmus of Panama, there is no telling where our thieving government will land us.

So far as our people are concerned, politicians excepted, the government which interferes least with our personal liberty gives us the greatest amount of protection at the least expense is the best. Now, this does not prevail, nor can it exist under our present republican form of government. We have too many elections, too many officials, too many laws, too much legislation. Nine-tenths of our laws, federal, State and municipal, are not only useless, but mischievous in the extreme. This statement is supported by every writer of note on government and political economy. Our congressmen and legislators are constantly tinkering with the laws. Nearly every one of these bodies, on adjournment, leave behind them whole volumes of new laws, nine-tenths of which are a curse to the people and a disgrace to the age. The less a legislator knows (which is but a little with any of them), the more laws he tries to pass; the most of them are so crude that our courts are kept constantly at work trying to unravel them. As before said, the great curse of our system lies in its legislative department. Incompetents and rogues despoiling the people, that the officials may fatten on the plunder. All good governments should be hedged in by written constitutions, whose sole office should be the creation of the three branches of government, with clearly defined limitations on their powers. All beyond this is not only useless, but fraught with dire mischief. Such an organic act, once in force, gave us a few rules for working the government, and the common law, which is common justice and common right, it being pliable, readily yields to all the varying changes in our business relations. This is all any State or community needs. The maxim should be, no enactments to interfere with the natural liberty of the citizen beyond what is indispensable for the protection of all others in such rights. This, say all the writers, should be the rule. All legislation should be deemed mischievous unless the contrary clearly appears.

Long experience has demonstrated the fact that our federal and State legislative bodies are made up largely of venal and incompetent men, working mostly in their own interests. These bodies should be abolished, and a few men, say five or seven, in each State, and about nine for congress, substituted in their place, who might be called senators. Once elected, they should hold office during good behavior, *i. e.*, during life, unless sooner removed for cause; they to appoint all other

officials. As such a government would have no use for an outside executive, the senate could elect its executive official from one of its own body. The duties of this body should be co-extensive with those now devolved on both the executive and legislative departments. These men would be ample for all legislative and executive purposes; they would choose their own presiding officer, and be at all times in session. But where are these men to come from, and how prevented from exercising undue or usurping powers not delegated to them, such as our congress and executive are now doing. Divide each State into five or seven districts, each district to elect one senator, who would hold office until removed for cause by his own district. The same rule to apply to the federal government. In this way all general elections, federal and State, with all their usual corruption and turmoil, would come to an end, leaving the people free to continue in peace their usual avocations. With such a government most of our taxes would be saved, many of the old laws would be repealed, only a few necessary ones be enacted. The people would then feel that they were not to be robbed as now during the sessions of our legislative bodies. So far as the federal government is concerned, it should be absolutely inhibited from making war, except in defence of its own rightful territory. No aggressive wars, no foreign alliances, and no stealing of foreign territories, should be a maxim not to be departed from.

PARISH B. LADD.

Alameda, Cal.

COMMENTS.

Coming from a well-known writer of this country, the above essay is interesting and significant. Interesting in so far as it shows that people who have devoted their life's work to combating the belief in the existence of a deity without which mankind would be subject to murder and destruction, cling to the same metaphysical and abstract deities in terrestrial affairs. They supplant the gods by governments. "God is the power which holds mankind in check," says the Christian. Government is a "self-evident necessity," says Judge Ladd; and his arguments for such necessity are no more valid than those of his opponents, the Christians. The mundane deity—government—is supposed to be the expression of the right of all, limited only by the right of each, i. e., in the abstract. In reality government is the aggregate of governors, who have the power to make laws and to force obedience to these laws. And this power they acquire by deceit, by making people believe that "government is a self-evident necessity" to maintain order, that is, by the same means which priestcraft employs to subjugate humanity. But, stripped from all metaphysical rubbish, both deities—God and government—are the very cause of disorder, strife and bloodshed.

In his writings Judge Ladd has proved that gods have frequently been abolished, always after they had failed to establish order and prosperity. In due time the incapable gods were supplanted by good ones. But the oppressed toilers languished as before, and hoped in vain for the millennium. This is also the history of government and its subjects. "Bad governments" have been abolished and "good" ones instituted, with no better results than the changing of the gods. Judge Ladd concedes that the present republican form of government is a complete failure, and he suggests a kind of oligarchy as a remedy. Thus people travel in a circle, shifting the chain balls from one foot to the other, instead of getting rid of the chains altogether. For in its essence authority remains the same—brute force—no matter in what form it manifests itself or under what name it sails. "In vain you tell me," cried Burke, "that artificial government is good

and that I fall out only with its abuse. The thing! the thing itself is the abuse!"

"The great herd never reason," says Judge Ladd; yet he expects this unthinking herd to inaugurate a "good government" and exercise a strict vigilance over those in power, who are to remain in office as long as they behave nicely. His indictment of labor is equally logical, according to which "it is more despotic than capital could ever dream of being," its unjust demands of wages are so exorbitant as to ruin business (legalized robbery). Yet, strange to say, in the next breath he tells us that the toilers cannot successfully resist the encroachments of the employers, because "labor is poor, hungry, and without means of defence, much less for aggression," while "capital possesses all of the wealth, and has the government, with its army and navy, on its side." And this, in spite of the tyranny, despotism, and unjust demands of labor! The very fact that labor is poor and hungry in a world of abundance, is sufficient proof that it is altogether too moderate in its demands and too tolerant in its relations with the exploiters; and this is due to their ignorance. They have been lulled into the belief that government is a necessity, like the "Almighty," and they reverence the arm that lashes their backs. But let the intelligent workers (who more or less sway the masses) once realize that government merely exists in order to defend the privileges of the possessors of wealth, and they will get rid of the nuisance in short order.

As to Anarchists and their methods of inaugurating an era of freedom, Judge Ladd is utterly at sea, and seems to have read FREE SOCIETY in vain. They neither hold that all the people can be "educated," nor are there any Anarchists who believe that Anarchy can be realized by "the assassination of all rulers." It is absurd. The Catholic Church has not altered its teachings thru the efforts of Judge Ladd and men like him. It is the influence of a small, intelligent minority of mankind that has clipped its wings, and heretics are burned at the stake no longer. Not because the Catholic creed is more tolerant than it was in the Middle Ages, but because society has become permeated with more tolerant and humanitarian ideas. And so it is with government. Its power decreases as intelligence increases.

If all governments were abolished and the system of exploitation left intact, as Judge Ladd evidently assumes, "crime" would no doubt be rampant. But if it is true, as the government statisticians show, that nine-tenths of the "crimes" committed to-day are offences against property, then it is "self-evident" that with the abolition of the prop of monopoly—government—there would be no incentive for crime as far as the means of subsistence are concerned. Besides, the science of criminology (and Judge Ladd has great confidence in science) has proved long before this that punishment does not prevent crime, no matter what its character may be. It is law—restraint—which is the chief cause of all so-called crimes. With regard to the Anarchists who "talk sense," he is again mistaken. The Anarchist simply observes that government and capital become more and more arrogant and oppressive, and the workers, as their intelligence grows, demand more and more of the comforts of life, and thus a clash between these two forces is inevitable; consequently, the Anarchists' mission is to point out to the oppressed that the revolution is impending, in spite of the ballot box and all other humbuggery, and to prepare them intellectually for the coming era.

Judge Ladd's plea for "good government" is hardly worthy of comment. It is too stale and antiquated. We might as well clamor for "good murder," "good violence," "good robbery," "good slavery," etc. Government

never promotes, it always retards progress, as Buckle observes. "The State," says Sismondi, "is always a conservative power, which authorizes, regulates, and organizes the conquests of progress (and history testifies that it applies them to the profit of its privileged classes), but never does inaugurate them. New ideas always originate from beneath, are conceived in the foundations of society, and then, when divulged, they become opinion and grow. But they must always meet on their path and combat the constituted powers of tradition, custom, privilege and error." A. I.

Which is Which.

Listen with both ears. Men do not seem to understand. To women is given the responsibility of child-bearing. Also, for the sake of the child, the mother is given the desire to hold to the father of the child. Nature needs the father for the child, because the child needs the point of view of both male and female parents. Therefore, as long as the reproductive instincts are necessary to the continued development of the race thru children, that desire will be implanted by nature for the sake of the child. Accordingly, oneness and not variety, under natural conditions, will be the outcome. When that reproductive power is used as Helen Wilmans believes, for the development of the individual possessing it (and not for the continuance of the race), then variety is natural.

Now, that desire implanted by nature in the woman, to hold to the father of her child, for the sake of the child and often against the interests of the woman, is a blind desire, misunderstood by both men and women. It is often called jealousy; it is not jealousy at all; it is a form of instinct of race preservation, but when opposed, is as soul-terrifying as the instinct of self-preservation. It is that which we recognize in the general feeling that a woman bearing children to a man is not in the competitive field of sex life any longer, and that no other woman has any rights over the father that the mother need respect.

All this is to show that what is often called jealousy is not jealousy at all. A woman feeling that some one should be the father of her child feels the same way.

So long as sex instinct and reproductiveness is a necessary part of nature's plan, the love of the sexes will be radically governed and controlled by laws and instincts of nature that cannot be comprehended by one who has experienced only friendship. Love and friendship are two radically different matters.

BOLTON HALL.

LETTER BOX.

A. KINGHORN-JONES.—No, the terms "Télémaque" and "Bétiques" do not appear in the Encyclopedia Britannica; but look for the name "Fénelon," and you will find that this archbishop wrote "Aventures de Télémaque" and many other books. His full name is Francis de Salignac de la Moth Fénelon.

M. S. GORHAM, COLO.—The advocacy of freedom certainly involves some sacrifices, so to say. But I think Jean Grave is right when he says: "He who is incapable of making any sacrifice for the principles he claims to prefer does not really believe in them at all; he decorates himself with the label merely for show, because at some time it looked well."

If the moral wave spreads much further over Congress we may expect to see statesmen refusing to remain on the employees' roll of the corporations which sent them to the national legislature.—New York Press.

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

ALLEGHENY, Pa.—H. Bauer, 73 Spring-garden Ave.
ATLANTIC CITY, N. J.—M. Kisluck, 1108 Baltic Ave.
BOSTON.—K. A. Snellenberg, 127 Center St., Roxbury.
CHICAGO.—T. Appel, 790 Girard Ave. H. Gordon, 427 Park Ave.
BROOKLYN.—M. Metzkow, 174 Ralph St.
CLEVELAND.—E. Schilling, 34 Elwell St.
LONDON, Eng.—T. Cantwell, 127 Ossulton St., N. W.
NEW YORK.—M. Maisel, 104 E. B'way. Alfred Schneider, 230 E. Fourth St.
PHILADELPHIA.—Nataasha Notkin, 1332 S. Sixth St.

FOR NEW YORK.

FREE SOCIETY Group meets every Tuesday evening at the Radical Reading Room, 180 Forsyth St. All comrades interested in the English propaganda are cordially invited.

* * *

The Slavic Group meets on the first and third Sunday of the month, 2 p. m., at 334 East Sixth St. Free discussions. All are invited.

* * *

The Radical Club, devoted to free discussion of political and social questions. Meetings open to the public every Wednesday evening at 8 o'clock, ETRIS HALL, 168 West 23rd Str., cor. 7th Ave. April 13, Hugh O. Pentecost will address the audience.

* * *

The Freeland League meets during April, every Monday; after April every Thursday, 8 p. m., sharp, at Etris Hall, 168 W. 23d St. Lectures and free discussions.

* * *

The Italian Group, Studi Sociale Circolo, meets every Sunday, 3 p. m., at 20 Hancock St.

* * *

May 2, 8 p. m., Gorki's interesting play, "The Citizens", will be performed at the Thalia Theater for the benefit of the Freie Arbeiter Stimme. All comrades who have the propaganda at heart are cordially requested to aid the comrades in the sale of tickets in order to make the undertaking a success.

FOR CLEVELAND.

Free Society Group meets every Sunday, 3:30 p. m., at 223 Columbus St. Lectures and free discussion.

FOR PHILADELPHIA.

Emma Goldman will speak Sunday, April 10, 7:30 p. m., at Odd Fellows Temple, Cor. Broad and Cherry Sts. The lectures will be preceded by a musical program and followed by free discussion.

Most's Historical Lectures will take place at Terrace Lyceum, 206 East Broadway, New York, every Saturday, 8 p. m.

Book-List.

"Essays on the Social Problem"....	
.....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".....	
.....Edward Carpenter	1.00
"Evolution of the Family".....	
.....Jonathan Mayo Crane	05
"Conduct and Profession".....	
.....Clarence S. Darrow	10
"Crime and Criminals".....	10
"Realism in Literature and Art".....	05
"Resist Not Evil." Cloth.....	75
"Tolstoy".....	10
"Crime and Punishment".....	
.....Voltaire de Cleyre	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
"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".....	
.....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".....	
.....Octave Mirbeau	50
"Do You Want Free Speech?".....	
.....James F. Morton, Jr.	10
"The Deistic Pestilence".....John Most	05
"God and Government: The Siamese Twins of Superstition".....W. Nevill	05
"The Pyramid of Tyranny".....	
.....F. Domela Nieuwehuus	05
"A Cityless and Countryless World: An Outline of Practical Co-operative Individualism." Cloth \$1....	
.....Henry Olerich	50
"Mating or Marrying, Which?".....	
.....W. H. Van Ornum	05
"Sine Qua Non; or, The Core of Religion".....Dr. Geo. Pyburn	10
"Evolution and Revolution".....Reclus	05
"Pure Economy".....J. H. Rowell	10
"Pages of Socialist History".....	
.....W. Tcherkesoff	30
"The Slavery of Our Times." Cloth.....Leo Tolstoy	75
"Our Worship of Primitive Social Guesses".....E. C. Walker	15
"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 FREE SOCIETY.

M. N. Maisel's Book Store

194 EAST BROADWAY

New York

The best ten plays of

HENDRIK IBSEN.

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

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

MAXIM GORKY'S.

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

LEO TOLSTOY'S.

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

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

Modern Science and Anarchism

BY PETER KROPOTKIN.

By some critics this book is considered one of Kropotkin's best work, dealing with all phenomena of life scientifically.

The author reviews and analyzes the intellectual movements of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, as well as the teachings of the Church. He shows what place Anarchism takes in science; the object of the ideal, its origin, and how it developed. In conclusion he treats law, mortality, economic ideas, government, and revolutions and their birth.

Price, 25 cents.

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

History of the French Revolution.

By C. L. JAMES.

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

The author of the work, C. L. James, is in a literary as well as the physical sense the son of his father, G. P. R. James, who was well known both as a scholar and imaginative writer to an older generation of book lovers. With a trained literary faculty, an unbiased judgment, and a capacity for painstaking investigation and emendation, he has produced a piece of writing which cannot fail to become better and better known as time goes on, and which will take a place among authoritative 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 Liberty Group, 427 Park Ave., Chicago, Ill.

A SURE CURE FOR THAT WAR SPIRIT

Resist Not Evil 75 CENTS postpaid

By Clarence S. Darrow.

Write for list of other Darrow books.

THE HAMMERSMARK Publishing Co.

151-153 Wabash Ave., CHICAGO, Ill.