



A Critic Answered.

In the criticism of the anonymous writer in No. 32 of *FREE SOCIETY* I had no difficulty in recognizing an old friend and correspondent, one of the ablest writers and speakers on economic subjects in this country, a debater who has met in the public arena some of the strongest men the two Socialist parties can produce, and withal, a thoroughgoing Anarchist. True, my friend, the "Critic," is an Anarchist of the Tucker school, an Individualist, and an ardent believer in the "sacred right" of property; but that is his privilege, as it is mine to advocate free Communism. I do not doubt our Critic's ability to give a good account of himself in a debate with any reader of *FREE SOCIETY*, and as it is probable we shall hear from him again, I will take the trouble to call his attention to what I consider two or three weak points in his criticism.

And first as to Communism. It is quite evident to me, both from his article in *FREE SOCIETY* and private letters I have received, that our Critic, with all his reading and study, has never even remotely grasped the program of Free Communism as it is understood by advanced students of economics at the present time. The Communism which, to use his own words, "would result in the most autocratic despotism" is a very different conception from that which we have in mind. A close reader of Proudhon, our Critic has evidently imbibed the great Frenchman's ideas as to Communism, and I fear has not kept pace with the more modern research. Proudhon never had the faintest comprehension of a state of free or Anarchist-Communism which would inevitably result from the abolition of privileges and invasive government, and his followers from Tucker down have shown like incapability of understanding. Living at a time when labor saving appliances were practically unknown, when production was by the simplest processes, we can not blame Proudhon for his inability to see the outcome of swift and cheap production; but those of his followers who at the present time deliberately ignore self-evident facts are scarcely entitled to so much consideration. Josiah Warren seems to have been a much keener observer and more profound thinker, for, according to Comrade James, he did perceive that the logical outcome of development in production would result in "A Millennium of Communism." This great truth dawned upon me years ago, when I was anxiously striving to reconcile the flimsily masked government of Tucker's creation with my own ideas of liberty. It probably grew out of that other profound truth, so little considered by many radicals, viz., that production tends to increase faster than consumption, which was taught years ago by Victor Drury.

The whole program of Free Communism is very simple and easily understood. The development of labor-saving appliances has been so rapid that it is now possible to produce many useful articles in immense quantities and remarkably cheap. In some instances this has resulted in the factor of price becoming nearly eliminated, and it is a fact that private property in articles produced in great quantities and at

small cost is of a very loose tenure. Take, for instance, matches, pins, and toothpicks. If in need of one of these useful articles, we either take it without asking or ask without the remotest idea of paying for it, certain that our request will not be ignored. The only reason why we are not as free and careless in the matter of shoes and hats is because it costs more to produce those articles, and the processes of their manufacture have not been so fully developed. And yet, despite the thousand handicaps incident to monopoly and the profit system, hats and shoes can be and are manufactured so cheaply and abundantly that no one need suffer for the want of them. Shoes that sell at retail at \$3.00 to \$4.00 cost at the factory (allowing for manufacturers' profit) 50 to 60 cents. Fine felt hats, for which we pay \$4.00 to \$5.00, are bought at the factory for 60 to 75 cents, and so on. Now suppose those articles being manufactured under libertarian conditions, is it not apparent that even with the present imperfect development of machinery, etc., the cost of manufacture would be very much less, and the price to the consumer reduced to almost nothing? Apply this principle to the thousands of other useful things that could be produced and distributed equally cheap, and it is not difficult to comprehend that the desire for private property in articles of common usage would soon be eliminated. Under freedom, as the cost of production became less and less, price would have a constant downward tendency, and finally disappear altogether, and with it the exchange value of the common articles of daily use. Private property, with its countless vexations, would literally go out of fashion, simply because it would not be worth while to keep track of goods that one could have for the taking. Aside from a few things necessary for private use, I believe that the desire for private property springs from the fear of not being able to secure things when we need them, and not because there is an inherent craving for ownership.

Nor is this mere baseless prophesy, or the wild dream of a visionary enthusiast. It is a calculation based upon self-evident facts and laws, as capable of demonstration as a calculation in astronomy. All economic development makes for cheapness in production, distribution and exchange; under freedom the limit of cheapness would only be reached when everybody had enough and to spare. But the subject is too large to be treated comprehensively in a single article, and there are other points in our critic's article which should be noticed.

I am not in sympathy with his ideas concerning the function of government. It seems to me that he makes a great mistake when he assumes that government exists for the purpose of preserving order and protecting the weak. The more I study this question the more I find myself in harmony with the ideas of Lysander Spooner, that government had its beginning in the strong arm and the cunning brain; that its purpose always was and is now to protect the persons of rich and powerful and the property which they have filched from those who toil; that the only "order" which it preserves is

that which is born of the subserviency and meekness of the masses. To say that government is a defender of order because it protects scab workmen and makes war upon labor unions is indeed a far fetched idea. Does our critic suppose for a moment that the silly assertion of the capitalist newspapers is true: that scabs are protected because every man has a right to labor when and where he can? Nonsense! Government (politicians in office) cares nothing for men's rights. They do see however that if the labor unions are successful a new party, a party of labor—may spring up and oust them from their comfortable and remunerative berths. What do the politicians and officeholders care for scabs? It is simply a phase of the class struggle, which exists whether our critic chooses to ignore it or not. The interests of the government and the capitalists are one, and government exists primarily for the purpose of protecting the plutocrats in their merciless robbery of the common people.

Now as to the appeal to and use of violence in attempts to force the capitalist class to recognize the rights of the class which feeds and clothes them. It has always seemed to me childish in the extreme to condemn the use of force when employed to resist invasion. And that is exactly what justifies force. This is a very different thing from invasive force. If our critic were attacked by a wild beast or a mad dog would he not use force to protect himself? Waylaid by a highway robber would he not defend himself if able to do so? Then why single out labor unions as a target for abuse because they resist starvation wages and other wrongs by violence? They have tried supplication, argument, appeals to justice, and the law; they have offered to submit their grievances to arbitration. Of what avail has all this been? What wonder, then, that in their desperation they should appeal to the last resort, even tho they know it must prove a failure. I, too, am in favor of peace and the doctrine of Tolstoy, but I would make my appeals for peace to the class in power; I would vent my righteous indignation upon the oppressors of labor and the politicians who support them in their infamy.

The doctrine "Resist not Evil" may be a beautiful ideal for philosophers, who are not haunted by the struggle for existence to dream over, but out in the tempestuous ocean of life the rule of action is far different. And in my opinion this mighty struggle for justice, with its accompaniments of force and bloodshed will continue until the working people shall receive the full product of their labor.

WM. HOLMES.

Mediocrity is all-powerful because it almost always has the majority in its support.—B. G. RICHARDS.

The truth of Christianity did not survive the apostles; the Gospel, commented upon and symbolized by the Greeks and Latins, loaded with pagan fables, became literally a mass of contradictions; and up to this day the reign of the infallible Church has been a long era of darkness.—PROUDHON.

FREE SOCIETY

Formerly *The Firebrand*.

Issued Weekly by FREE SOCIETY PUBL. ASSOCIATION.
A. ISAAC, Editor.

ONE DOLLAR A YEAR.

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

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

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



SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 1904.

483

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

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

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

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

By the Wayside.

In Italy the government — protector of the weak — is now feeding its hungry subjects with lead, and the Socialists are already pleading for peace. Why not: let the workers vote, wait, and starve.

The *Evening Journal* gives the toilers the following ironical encouragement: "You can keep down and bamboozle almost indefinitely the real workers who actually produce something . . . But look out when you begin to step on the toes of the leech class, the thoughtful middle man and lawyer who feel that they, too, have a right to live happily off the vulgar crowd."

"Down with violence! . . . Down with war! We demand peace and brotherhood between nations — that each nation should be free to determine its own destiny; we demand universal disarmament and that the present standing armies be replaced by national guards!" says a Socialist appeal to the workers. I may lack "scientific" training and frankly confess that I am unable to solve the above puzzle; for if violence and war are to be abolished and peace and brotherhood to prevail between nations, then I can see no reasons for the existence of the militia. Will our Socialist friends enlighten a curious soul?

The bare-facedness of our "captains of industry" opens even the eyes of some ministers. The Williamamtic Linen Company pays its employes ninety cents a day and asserts that their business would be ruined if they were compelled to yield to the "unreasonable demands" of organized labor. But when the company paid an eighty per cent-dividend and some of the shareholders subscribed \$300 cash toward the erection of a new parsonage, the pastor, Rev. C. E. Beals, thus showed his disgust: "Is it to be wondered at that discontent is rife? Men deserve to be slaves, if they consent to be slaves, and I believe that the church

preaches the wickedest kind of heresy when it says to the workman, 'Submit, be content, in heaven all things will be made right.' . . . The condemnation of the existing industrial system is that it brutalizes manhood. Dividends are of more importance than manhood and character."

If there are still intelligent and amiable men and women on this god and government-ridden planet who entertain the hope that Socialist political parties will cleanse politics from its odious qualities, they should read the Socialist party organs, and if that does not have a curative effect upon their credulity, they must be dismissed as incurable invalids. At present the "bosses" of the Debs' party are at odds in San Francisco, and the schemes and tricks that both factions resort to in order to push their respective candidates to the front, and the epithets that they hurl at each other, such as "traitors," "fusionists," "grafters," etc., remind one of the Republican primaries where "graft" and club-law triumphs. Now imagine these people owning the means of production and distribution of the nation! Perhaps some of the San Francisco Socialists will now remember and heed the words of one of their speakers who declared himself against woman's suffrage. "Why I am against it?" he replied to a query. "Because I don't want woman to be dragged into the mud that we men are in. Politics is the most pestiferous superstition mankind has ever been afflicted with."

It is said when the king of France was told Voltaire had predicted a revolution, the "amiable" king replied: "Well, Voltaire has said so many good jokes that we can easily forgive him a bad one." But the "bad joke" beheaded the king. Again intelligent men hear the rumblings of a bloody upheaval, but the Teddys, Peabodys, Rockefellers, et al., will not heed the admonition. Only recently Rabbi Hirsch, the scholar and orator of Chicago, said: "The powerful of earth should realize that we are in the midst of the same conditions that existed in France which brought on the revolution. The rich and powerful classes in France refused to take warning from what was going on about them and relied upon the power which they fancied they had. The revolution came like the eruption of a volcano, and we in America should take warning. Right now we are standing over a volcano which may burst forth with all the fury of Pelee."

That Social Democracy would finally be one of the strongest safeguards of the present order of things has long ago been pointed out by the Anarchist press, yet hardly was it expected to become apparent before its representatives would gain absolute control in some branches of government. But it seems that in their zeal to show themselves capable of taking care of society they precipitate "economic determinism" or even prudence. "Free" Switzerland has repeatedly called out troops to quell strikes, and the Socialist party organ, *Grütliener*, thus argues in defense of the government:

The government is bound in duty to protect its citizens against injury, and if ever the calling out of troops was justified it was certainly during the strike in Basel. Wherever public security is endangered, where property and citizens are invaded, and where people resort to rioting in an unreasonable manner, there we justify the calling out of troops.

"Thus Social Democracy becomes more and more agreeable," says the Chicago *Arbeiter-Zeitung*. The Frenchman Jaures declares that it is the foremost duty of Social Democracy in France to support the government. The German Bebel solemnly assures the government that in case of war the Social Democrats of Germany will be in the foremost ranks to protect the fatherland. The Danish Socialist Marott dines with the King at one table and sets the old man's mind at ease as to the dangers of the Anarchists. The American Hillquith protests — in spite of Karl Marx — against the

participation of the Negro proletariat in the work of emancipation." And in Switzerland, I would add, Social Democracy vindicates "General" Bell and Governor Peabody of Colorado fame. "We don't know what is still to come," continues the above quoted editor, "and what paths lie once to proud Social Democracy is yet to enter — a party which today is already trickling with rhetorical loyalty and resignation like the country swell with badly smelling pomatum."

INTERLOPER.

The Critic Again.

Have you read Tolstoy's latest — "Bethink Yourselves"? (1) It is a noble arraignment of government and war. And war, he claims, will cease only when the individual appreciates that the one crime he, as an enlightened man, cannot commit, is murder. It is an appeal to the individual as the regenerating force; a discrediting of machinery reform.

What Tolstoy says of war must, if true, apply all round. If violence is to cease only when men have grown to hate it, so will monopoly and all oppression cease only when the individual has grown to regard them as unworthy. Which is merely the evolutionary doctrine that all progress is a growth, and that what is wanted now, is moral growth. (2)

Messrs. James & Co. do not like such doctrine; they brand it as cant and declare that it is specially designed to put the masses at the mercy of the few. I am sorry, but that is not the question. The question is not who likes it, but whether it is true.

I ask a scientific question, Does not like begot like thruout all nature, and must not therefore violence beget violence and monopoly monopoly? (3)

For at least a generation past the labor movement has been a tremendous fact; it must, therefore, have left its mark on both public thought and on events. Yet, if I were asked to state the most salient features of the thought and movement of the past twenty years, I should name, first the growing belief in force as the solution for social difficulties, and, therefore, a vast increase of government by force; (4) secondly, the great increase of monopoly; (5) regarded by many as inevitable and by others actually as desirable. And this is largely, as I see the matter, because labor has thrown the whole weight of its organized movement into that scale. At the bottom of the whole labor movement lie these two delusions, first, that force is to be overcome by physical force; secondly, that monopoly is the cure for monopoly. (6) In other words, that it is the devil to whom we must look for the overthrow of the devil.

Do you realize that such a creed is contrary to all the historical common-sense of the race; that mankind has always believed that it was God who had to triumph over the devil, and good that had to banish evil? (7)

There is just this much about it — to climb I must step upward; I shall never scramble out of the mire of violence and monopoly by wading deeper in the mire. If I want the relief of equity I must myself do equity, and if I run to that court for relief I must be able to show that my own hands are clean. (8)

Let us apply these very simple propositions. I am invited to cry, "Down with Gen. Bell," (9) and my first natural question is, "Who is he, and how came he on the scene?" I find that it was the Western Federation of Miners, way back in the strike of 1891, that paved the way for him and brought him there, and I further find that the work of the Federation had its root in the monopolistic rule-or-ruin teachings of Karl Marx, more than half a century ago. I hate to find it so, but I find it so. (10)

In short, as rankly as ever there flourishes today the grand delusion that we, the workers, must get the force on our side and rule or we shall be ruined. (11) Which is to regard

ourselves as crabs, and to believe that we make progress by going backward.

Moreover, I say, and believe it truly, that this appeal to physical force and this reliance on monopoly is a game at which the classes hold all the cards, and at which the masses have been and will be always whipped. (12)

Mr. James charges that these doctrines are music to the listening tyrant's ear. (13) Do not delude yourself. Kaiser Wilhelm will never canonise those who preach to the Germans that their "War-God" is only a cheap gun-man; nor will Rockefeller hug to his heart those who dig to the roots of monopoly and deprive it of its soil. But it is true that the Bells regard all scrap-promoters as their kindest benefactors, and that every politician in the country, in his heart, wants the sphere of the state enlarged.

Why should we be so fearful of criticism, when all progress depends on experiment and the faithful record of the results of each experiment? To keep that record true, is the thing; not to claim success, where success has not been achieved; (14) when we have got upon a false trail to acknowledge it and to hunt a better.

I claim that the appeal to violence, and to monopoly as the cure for monopoly, have been already tested and found wanting; that they have engendered the evils they sought to overthrow, and that the movement based on them is breaking down before our eyes. For the labor movement misses a great historical fact, viz., that in spite of temporary set-backs, we are passing out of the shadow of militarism and rule, and into the sunshine of industrialism and liberty.

A thousand forces are pulling us that way, and to be effective we must pull with and not against them. We must have the courage to break with party and sectarian ties; to recognise that in the most enlightened opinion (which is the opinion that must ultimately prevail) the revolver argument is altogether out of date, and that what is wanted is to establish firmly the limits of individual rights and to place them beyond all jeopardy. The natural current of evolution sets all in that direction, and it should be unfalteringly our direction.

Where I have lived for the last five years we have had always what is called an active labor movement. Strikes galore, as often lost as won; boycotts on whose advertising the big establishments that were boycotted have thrived. Go to any one of the innumerable labor meetings that are always being held and you will find — not serious discussion of the great principles, on which the movement should rest, and on which all progress must depend, but vituperations of this and that employer, denunciation of our fellow-working-man the scab — in short, all the paltry thought, the misrepresentation and the intriguing that spring up like mushrooms in the atmosphere of guerilla war. This is not progress; it is reaction of the most fatal type.

Meanwhile invaluable franchises have been given or bartered away; tracts of land that would have supported tens of thousands, and water rights without which the country is a worthless desert, have passed into the hands of soulless syndicates; gambling in the primest necessities of life is regarded as the most honorable of occupations, and plutocracy is czar.

What has the labor movement done to check all this? Absolutely nothing. And to encourage it? Almost everything. For it is the workingmen that have tumbled over one another to snatch gain out of the general scramble, and without their voluntary contributions the boomer and the get-rich-quickster would starve. (15)

It is high time we faced these facts; it is high time that, instead of whining about the wrongs of the workingman we recognised that in this country he has an enormous say, and that if violence, chicanery, and a disregard for the most elementary of human rights so largely

prevail it is he who has to shoulder a large portion of the blame. Instead of holding him immune from the operation of great fundamental laws, and justifying his infraction of them as justified by the sanctity of the struggle, in which he is involved, we must preach obedience of those laws as the only road to success. A great disciplining to the labor movement is imminent; I could wish that it should get it at the hands of its friends rather than its foes. (16)

COMMENT.

1.—Yes. It is an excellent argument against taking any side in any contest. It is not an argument for taking the Bell, Cleveland, and Gary side of the labor contest.

2.—I wonder what evolutionist you go by. Buckle, Lecky, (Herbert Spencer, Bagenot, Lubbock, in short all the evolutionists I know anything about, find the thing always wanted to be either physical or intellectual growth.

3.—The question is not scientific. Violence begets violence is a mere piece of rhetoric. If you think differently, please state what sort of violence the Bell, Cleveland, Gary-violence is begetting; and how you can justify that kind of stock-breeding?

4.—I think you are off. Since a little bomb was thrown among blue-bellied butchers in the Haymarket at Chicago, there has been a marked decrease in one sort of government by force — the kind which consisted in calling out the militia as often as a strike occurred, with instructions to "shoot the sons of b—," as they proposed at Chicago; under pretense of violence which had not been committed.

5.—What do you mean by increase of monopoly? Monopolies are increasing, but nothing like as fast as the class of small capitalists. Your ideas are like the famous trousers and the two French cities — they are Too Long — and Too Loose.

6.—Oh, no, no, no. At the bottom of the whole labor movement lies belief that the tools belong to the toilers and the product to the producers. That is the gospel; the rest is all a question of revival methods.

7.—No. Those who ever believed anything else than that force was to be overcome by force, and monopoly by monopoly, might be counted on your fingers. Run over the list of such amiable individuals — Buddha, Laotse, Jesus, Benedict, George Fox, Tolstoy; observe how short it is in numbers and how long in time; and then tell us what all their preaching has done in the way of social change?

8.—Yes; you must; and no one objects. If all you want is to save your own soul, why, "Come to Jesus." But if you want to regenerate society, explain why Jesus failed so signally in doing that? Was it perhaps because he thought what was wanted was moral growth, instead of considering physical and intellectual?

9.—Who invites you? I invite the president to hang up "Gen." Bell, a rebel and traitor, in the employ of a revolutionary vigilance committee; because that is the president's sworn duty, which he deserves impeachment for not doing. But nobody objects to your letting Bell alone. It is no official duty of your's to interfere with him. Get it straight in your head once what the end of the labor movement is, and then perhaps you will see the beauty of leaving every true radical, from Tolstoy to Angillolo, to take the means he judges best.

10.—Where did you find it? In McClure's Magazine account of the Colorado trouble, by Mr. Baker, perhaps? I swear I could not find it there; tho the author evidently meant I should.

11.—Wrong again. We Anarchists do not want to rule.

12.—If you mean strikes by reliance on monopoly and appeal to monopoly, the facts are against your assertion. Strikes have involved great suffering, but they have been a steady series of successes won by experience — of victors snatched from the jaws of defeats.

13.—You are my witness that they displease

the producers and do not the thieves. I only tried to show you why.

14.—As by intimating that Jesus, Buddha, Benedict, and other preachers of moral growth have done much, in all these ages, towards casting out the devils of violence and monopoly?

15.—Surely you confound the labor movement with your proteges, the unorganized scabs. Workingmen never learned in unions to do all that.

16.—Correct. It must get it from those who would have labor see its ends clearly, and understand that, as concerns means, "wisdom is justified of all her children." Surely you cannot be afraid that labor will get disciplined by the "Gen." Bells? Violence, you keep on telling us, begets violence. Then, by your own logic, the McKinleys make the Czolgozs; and it is government, the great organization of violence, which gets discipline — as it "orter."

C. L. JAMES.

International Socialist Congress.

The division in the camp of international parliamentary Social Democracy, which dates from 1898, reached a crisis at their latest Congress at Amsterdam. On one side, headed by Jaures, stand those who are in favor of the participation of Socialists in parliamentary and ministerial combines. On the other side, Bebel, Guesde, Ferri and those who, being equally for parliamentary action, repudiate the participation of a Social Democrat in the ministry of a capitalist state. The discussion provoked on this subject at the Amsterdam congress attracted such an interest among political parties and the bourgeois press of Europe that during the whole week of the congress the great dailies were debating the question of reformist and revolutionary tactics. Bebel, Guesde and Ferri being classified as revolutionists in opposition to Jaures as reformers.

The term "revolutionist," applied to a fraction of parliamentarians, is taken by the press from the lips of the Social Democrats themselves, who proudly insist on being called "revolutionists." In their mouths that word has not the ordinary "vulgar" signification. We "ordinary people" mean that a party is called revolutionary if in its struggle against oppression and exploitation it has recourse to revolt, street fights, uprisings. Thus Garibaldi, Mazzini and their friends were revolutionists; the Republicans and Socialists in France in the middle of last century, the Irish and Polish Nationalists were revolutionists. Quite different is the definition of "revolutionary," as given by Ferri, Bebel, Kautsky and other parliamentarians. In their conception every partisan of a large humanitarian idea which aims at the ultimate transformation of society is a revolutionist. People of action, like the followers of Mazzini, as M. Ferri says in his "Socialism and Darwinism," were not revolutionists but people of a criminal type. So that such peaceful persons as Saint-Simon, Fourier, Robert Owen, even Kingsley, were revolutionists; but Blanqui, Sophie Perovskaja, Garibaldi, Mazzini, were criminals!

This definition must be kept in mind by our readers in order to understand that when German Social Democrats speak of a social revolution they do not mean an uprising, barricades, or street fights, but simply the political education of the working classes and the increase of Socialist votes and deputies, so that by a peaceful and legal agitation they may obtain the consent of the majority of the voters for social legislation. This is why Bebel, answering an observation of Jaures at the congress, that German Social Democracy with its three million votes has attained no practical result, said: "three millions of votes is not sufficient for us; having in Germany eleven million votes, we must have at least seven or eight millions; then we shall see!"

"Those who live another fifty years will see their peaceful revolution!"

But we who saw the very beginning of the parliamentary tactics of Social Democracy, we knew, and said many times, that notwithstanding their revolutionary and socialistic phraseology, they had abandoned Socialism for petty reforms and legal tactics.

We know that they always employ high-sounding revolutionary phrases without any practical meaning. For instance, Liebknecht, imitating Bismarck's famous words, "We Germans fear nobody except God," said, "We German Social Democrats fear nobody, not even God."

This was said by the man who could not open a public meeting unless a police inspector was present on the platform, and who, with his fearless comrades, obediently left the hall as soon as the police officer, perhaps finding some expression of an orator not suitable, put on his hat. They fear nobody, but they dare not bring their women comrades to their political meetings because it is prohibited by the law of the German empire, which was so extolled by Bebel in his answer to Jaures. No Frenchman, Swiss or Englishman would submit to such humiliating political conditions, but the leader of German Social Democracy did not even see the irony of his boast.

It is the same when a leader of Social Democracy is speaking about Socialism; he does not mean Socialism in the ordinary sense of Communism or Collectivism, but liberty of press, of religion, universal suffrage, national education, abolition of standing armies, an international court of arbitration, equal rights for men and women; measures for the protection of the working classes (limitations of hours of work, sanitary regulations) and similar reforms, not only adopted theoretically but realized already in many countries by a bourgeois democracy.

Do not let the reader think we exaggerate. Liebknecht himself declared that all those so-called Socialist claims "are reforms already accomplished or on the point of being carried out in advanced countries and they fully agree with democracy."

Lower still is the standard of Socialism in the so-called program-minimum of the French Marxists formulated by Guesde. This program is really the minimum of all moral, economic, and social claims. And yet those men appeared at the Amsterdam congress as the defenders of revolutionary Socialism. They who for the last thirty years have fiercely denounced every revolutionary attempt in Russia, Italy, France, and Spain; they who are preaching to the German working classes, instead of Socialism, political democracy, and that not of the most advanced type, they attempted at the congress to give a lesson in political radicalism and democracy to nations enjoying a far greater freedom than themselves.

This profound contradiction between revolutionary and Socialist phraseology and moderate bourgeois practice was discovered at last even by the more enlightened Social Democrats. Bernstein, Jaures and Turati did not fail to indicate that the program and tactics of Social Democracy are in reality not Socialist, not revolutionary; that Social Democracy in Germany adopted the program of English, French and Swiss democracy, and hoped to realize by parliamentary tactics some economies and political reforms carried out in England by Gladstonians, in France by radical Republicans of the type of Ledru-Rollin and his successor, in Switzerland by the representatives of the self-governing peasantry.

Once this contradiction was made clear, they honestly proposed to the party to put aside their Socialist and revolutionary garb and to declare themselves moderate reformers, to follow thoroughly parliamentary tactics of progressive democracy, and to take part not only in the elections but also in the formations of ministries.

In Germany, with its medieval feudal organizations, where the emperor has nearly unlimited power and the ministers are appointed by

him, certainly no Social Democratic deputy has a chance of being invited as a minister; but in countries such as France, England, Switzerland or Holland, where democracy has gained political freedom by revolutionary struggle, such a possibility is not at all excluded. In France the thing happened. When the republic was threatened by clericals, Bonapartists and other enemies of democracy, the advanced radicals invited into the ministry a Social Democratic deputy, Millerand. It was in the heat of the Dreyfus affair, when every honest man in France was fighting against reaction, our Anarchist friends in the streets and public meetings, moderate reformers — in parliament, Jaures, Viviani, and other Social Democratic deputies helped Millerand; they did not betray principles or tactics. It was a logical outcome of the whole Social Democratic teaching.

But, as the minister of a bourgeois state, Millerand was obliged to sanction all governmental acts, including the sending of troops against the strikers. The workers in France began to denounce the doctrines which led to capitalist and state oppression carried out under a Social Democratic minister. At that moment the Marxists understood what danger lay ahead for them and began to cry, "No Socialist can enter a bourgeois ministry, no Socialist deputy can ally himself to another political party." Formulating this demand they did not think of the necessity of adapting themselves really to Socialist and revolutionary tactics. They only denounced as non-Socialists their comrades who understood that once being reformers they must do something for the sake of their convictions.

For an impartial observer there is no difference between Millerand, Jaures, Bernstein, Turati, on the one side and Bebel, Kautsky, Ferri, and other would-be revolutionists on the other side. Reformers and political radicals they all are; Socialism with its ideals was forgotten by them a long time ago. Notwithstanding the opposition of the self-styled revolutionists their own teachings will force them to follow the steps of Millerand and Jaures. Once in parliament, they must ally themselves with and help progressive democracy, otherwise they will be in the politically immoral condition of German Social Democrats, who, as Bebel said himself, are "sometimes with the Center (clericals and reactionists) against the Liberals."

No honest liberal and radical can ally himself even for a moment with conservatives and clericals, those hereditary enemies of Socialism and the political and intellectual emancipation of the working classes.

By what process of logic did Bebel and the German Social Democrats who in the Reichstag ally themselves with conservatives, reproach Jaures and his friends over their alliance with French Radicals; or their support of a ministry which has freed national education from religious influence, which is struggling now with clericalism and papacy, and which is engaged in many thoroughly democratic reforms?

We could understand such a condemnation from a true Socialist and revolutionist, from an Anarchist point of view; but coming as it does from those who have abandoned Socialism and condemned revolutionary tactics, it is more than astonishing. — *Freedom*, London.

The Progressive Stage.

In order to increase the fund and the membership of the Progressive Stage Society, a dramatic recital will take place Sunday, October 2, 8 p. m., in the New York College of Music Hall, 128-130 E. 58th St. Admission 50 cents. JULIUS HOPP.

For Paterson.

A vintager's festival takes place on Saturday, Sept. 24, 8 p. m., at Poillon Hall, 296 Straight St. Admission 10 cents.

Letter-Box.

F. B. L., Sykesville, Md. — Your articles will not appear for the following reasons. (1) Anarchists do not believe that the postoffice is any safer in the hands of capitalists than in the hands of a government. (2) The election of Parker & Davis does not mean "a complete clearing out of the rascals . . . and the repeal of all that have made the postoffice a sleuth in the detection of crime." Parker was instrumental in sending John Most to prison for republishing an article from Karl Heinzen's book published in this country fifty years ago. The election of Parker, therefore, would mean nothing else but the shifting of thieves and sleuths. (3) We are opposed to the making of "criminals" by law, and then have them "detected and arrested by proper legal authorities," for the latter are the worst criminals in society. And Comstock is as much justified in doing "God's will" than the rest of government sleuths are in abiding by the "will of the law." (4) The Anarchists are certainly opposed to the public school system; but to make the public school responsible for all the ills and crimes prevalent in society is to make ourselves ridiculous, to say the least. It smacks too much of the apple story in the garden of Eden. And it seems to me there were some evils in society before mankind ever thought of public schools.

For Boston.

Sunday, October 2, 8 p. m., James F. Morton, Jr., will lecture on "The Ballot — Is it a Means of Emancipation to the Workers?" in Pain Memorial Bldg., 9 Appleton St. Free discussion. Admission 10 cents, to defray expenses.

Attention.

COMRADES:—It is my intention to visit the east the coming fall on a tour of propaganda and especially to try to put in circulation the "Life of Albert R. Parsons," as I believe this book is one of the greatest sources of educational work along anarchistic lines extant. It is the one desire of my life, to get it among the masses.

I will be in the east about the first of November, and will remain for four or five weeks, intending to address commemorative meetings of the 11th of November. And if groups desire me to do so, I will also address trades unions. My subjects will be "Trades Unions and the 'Open Shop,'" "The Struggle for Liberty," and "Anarchist and the World-wide Propaganda."

Comrades will please bring this matter before trades unions and groups, and communicate with me regarding the result as soon as possible, so I can arrange my affairs here accordingly.

LUCY E. PARSONS.
1777 North Troy St., Chicago, Ill.

"The Immediate future is all dark. It is not even certain that the future will be one of light. Credulity has deep roots. Socialism may bring back by the complicity of Catholicism a new Middle Age, with barbarians, churches, eclipses of liberty and individuality, — in a word, of civilization. But the remoter future is certain. That future, we may be sure, will no longer believe in the supernatural; for the supernatural is not true, and all that is not true is condemned to perish. Nothing endures but truth. Poor truth: she seems now very lonely, served as she is by an imperceptible minority. Be calm: she will triumph. All that serves her is laid up like capital, — a little capital but invested; and nothing of that little treasure is ever lost. All that is false, on the other hand, will pass away. Falsehood founds nothing, while the little edifice of truth is of steel, and grows ever higher and higher. . . . Socialism will not definitely win the day; liberty, with its consequences, will remain the law of the world. But each man's liberty will be purchased by large concessions made at the expense of all. Social questions will no longer be suppressed; they will more and more gain upon questions political and national." — From Renan's "History of the People of Israel."