

THE NEW
PUBLIC LIBRARY
JAN. 1890 AND
TODAY'S LIBRARY

FREE SOCIETY

ENTERED AT SAN FRANCISCO POSTOFFICE AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER.

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

VOL. V. NO. 43.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 1899.

WHOLE NO. 231.

TO A RETIRED JUSTICE.

At least the goal is won:
Victor thou art; the world gives its reward;
Thy work of devils done,
Be crowned with hate among all things abhorred.

What, art thou then a peer?
Do lands and honors fall to thee, and fame?
Thy portion waits thee here,
Greater than these, of horror, tears, and shame.

For thou didst murder Hope,
And gav'st to suffering deadly draughts to drink;
All life within the scope
Of thy dread power in dark despair must sink.

Nay, naught can close thy hands,
Black with a thousand deeds of foulest crime;
Nor titles, nor thy lands
Lift up thy soul from sin's foul native slime.

O thou, who judged and laughed,
And fed with men the yawning prison's maw,
Who cursed and hung, and chafed,
Secure behind the lawlessness of law:

O thou whose trade was death;
Who tortured life and found in this delight:
Beneath whose poisonous breath
Reason and truth sank back and sought the night:

O thou whom innocence
Of begged and pleaded with on bended knees,
While hushed, malign, intense,
Thou didst wait as the beast its prey to seize.

O thou whose dearest joy
Was fixing guilt on woman man, and child;
Who lived but to destroy;
Who scorned to pity, and could not be mild:

Look on the people's gift:
The memory of a race that weeps and bleeds;
And then thy face uplift
To take the mark allotted to thy deeds.

Wear high upon thy brow,
That all may see as though 'twere burnt in fire,
"See me as I am now:
Chief in injustice, murderer, and liar."

Even thus: didst thou repent,
And beat thy breast, nor longer wish to live,
Our wrath would not be spent;
We could not, looking on thy face, forgive.

Nay, live on thou for long;
Till deaf thou growest, and dumb, and blind of eye;
Live, know thyself, be strong;
Thou art not worthy, spawn of shame, to die!

William Francis Barnard.

SOME POINTERS.

The advocates of the Single Tax show a great deal of ingenuity in their efforts to prove that their method of raising government funds is superior to others, and that with it, land would practically be free to home-seekers. But I am convinced that government is a nuisance and ought and must be abolished before equality and freedom ever can be achieved. Sir Thos. Moore, in his book "Utopia," which was written about 1515, says: "Government is a conspiracy of the rich, who on the pretense of managing the public, only pursue their private ends." And all unbiased students of history have come to the same conclusion.

"Yes, I agree with you," I am often told; "government is a nuisance; it restricts the free play of our individuality and monopolizes the natural resources, but we must first learn to walk before we can run; we must go step by step* in this funeral procession of reform; we must gradually evolve up to the highest attainable standard; in short: they are not ready for it at present.

"Really, now! They are not ready for it. Mind you, 'they' does not include you and me; we are, of course, sufficiently educated, we could live in a free

* Comrade John Moet said recently in the *Freiheit* that, when he arrived in this country, he had been told here the people would go step by step and for over twenty years he had in vain been looking for the first step.

society; but the other fellows, these common laboring people without any education to speak of, the low, the degraded, the wicked. Just think of the criminal element, living with a lot of hobos, bums, tramps, and prostitutes, on a plan of equality in a free society without means of restraining their evil propensities. Now, you must admit that would never do."

Of course "that would never do," because such evils would not exist; and why not? Because all classes you mention are the natural and inevitable results of our present social system. Do away with government and you do away with criminals. No law, no criminals; no property, no robber or thief; no enforced idleness, no tramps or hobos; no marriage, no prostitution. See?

"Yes, I see; but what about the fellow who won't work at all, how are you going to make him work without compulsion?"

If a person is so constituted that he has no inclination to employ himself an hour or so a day at some useful occupation, why, he can eat and drink just the same. Of course, if he is a young man the girls won't look at him, and the rest of the folks will simply pity him as a man with a disease who does not know what is good and beneficial for his own welfare. We can well afford to support a few relics of barbarism, just to show our children that formerly there were millions of men who lived without recompense on the proceeds of other men's toil.

"Step by step" the people were robbed of freedom and the means of production which in the first instance is land and which primarily was possessed in common by those who utilized it. The Highlander of Scotland submitted to private ownership only in the last century after a desperate struggle, and most of the Russian peasants still hold the land in common. The Indians of our country are fiercely resisting private ownership. The five civilized (?) tribes of the Indian Territory, although they have adopted nearly all the other customs of the whites, still possess the land in common. In short, it is only by force that man gradually has submitted to government and to be robbed of the land. It is only through persistent stupefaction for centuries, by the church, school and press, that man has submitted to laws and respected the "divine rights" of kings and the institution of legal property as the acme of civilization. While on the other hand, all revolutions, rebellions, strikes and riots, show us that all these ideas—which our masters have taken so much pains to instill in our brains—are laid aside, forgotten in a day, and people return to natural conditions, demolish social iniquities, ignore laws and statutes in order to accomplish their ends and to satisfy their needs, once they succeed in throwing off their yoke for a moment.

"And why have they never been so far successful?" Because instead of trusting to themselves, instead of following their own inherent instincts—if I may call it such—as they did in the beginning, they put their trust in leaders, and delegated their power to somebody else, and as soon as they do that their cause is doomed. The French revolution, our own, the revolution of 1848 over Europe and the last uprising of importance, the Paris Commune, prove the truth of my assertion. The Commune, for instance, would have been successful but for that. After a simultaneous uprising which resulted in taking possession of the city of Paris by the proletariat, they delegated their power to an assembly, and instead of depending on themselves depended on the assembly and consequently were defeated. And

why do workingmen, in spite of the sad experience they have had still put their trust to some extent in leaders? I will discuss that some other time.

♦ ♦ ♦
In an old paper of the Socialist Labor Party I find a splendid cartoon, entitled "Social Contrasts—Night Revels." On one side is an over-fed plute enjoying an oyster supper with a goodlooking fairy whom his money has purchased for the time being. On the other side are a few poorly dressed men trying to gain a few hours' sleep on the benches in a park; and an article entitled "Sermon: What Shall we Do to be Saved?—Turn Fools?" shows very clearly the causes of these social inequalities. But instead of advising the people to assert their rights on every opportunity and to smite the plutes, as one would naturally expect, the editor advises them to do—what? To go on a general strike, to take possession of what they have produced and repudiate all titles of the natural resources? Oh, no!—vote for the S. L. P. which will in the sweet by and by eradicate all these evils that beset us at present. In another article headed "Is it Accident?" the editor proves conclusively that the capitalists are preparing to resist any encroachment on their privileges or vested rights by force of arms. But in spite of that, when the State Socialists control the government—just think of it!—and wave a flag that once was red, but has lost most of its color, and issue their decree, that from this time on all the means of production shall become public property, the wealth-owners and masters will consent to it readily and say: "Yes, gentlemen, with pleasure; here, take them." Then they will have turned fools indeed and lost all their old time cunning.

Of course "it would never do" to advise the people to use any but legal means to resist oppression and exploitation. That would be anarchistic, and next to a capitalist a good S. L. P. member hates nothing more than an Anarchist—one who has learned to act and to think without being dictated to. It does not matter that the Anarchist, too, wants to substitute co-operation for monopoly and exploitation; it does not matter that the Anarchist as well desires to overthrow the present capitalist system; but to bring this about by any other means than the ballot is high treason and deserves the severest condemnation, not to say denunciation. It does not matter that some of their leading men in Germany—Bebel and Liebknecht, for instance—have said "to parliamentise is to compromise." (That was before they were running for office; of course.) It does not matter that history as well proves the futility of the ballot; nor does Gracchus count in the history of Rome; all of that doesn't matter. Good Socialists will not discuss the merits and demerits of the ballot any more than a good orthodox Christian will discuss the existence of God. C. D.

♦ ♦ ♦ ♦ ♦
"Samoans are having their legs pulled by the powers of England, Germany and America. After the leg-pulling is over by the joint commission of royal thieves and the new American brigand who is out for expansion, which means downright robbery in stealing the Samoan's land and liberty, it will be a complete success for the triple associated thieves." "The local election farce is now over and the voting mules have gone and cast what they call the voice of the people. Bonds or no bonds, the burden of taxes will be the same, and the poor will pay them. There is no such a thing in this country as a free vote. The great mass of voters is just the same as the praying machines of the Hindoos; you can have a prayer from two inches to a mile, if you only put up the dough to pay. Keep on voting, you mules, and make hay for to fatten your masters."—*The Under Dog*, Los Angeles.

FREE SOCIETY.

FORMERLY "THE FIREBRAND."

Published Weekly by Free Society Publishing Ass'n.

50 CENTS A YEAR.

Address all Communications and make all Money Orders payable to FREE SOCIETY, 43 Sheridan St., San Francisco, California.

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.

NOTE AND COMMENT.

The current number of this issue shows that *Free Society* failed to appear last week. Our treasury and credit were exhausted on account of the many readers in arrears.

We have been informed that Comrade Malatesta, who recently escaped from a prison in Italy, has arrived in New York and intends to lecture in this country in the Italian and English languages. Later on Comrade Peter Kropotkin is expected to come to this country with the same intentions and in order to be prepared, the Italian comrades of this city have started to raise a lecturing fund.

The street railway strikers in Cleveland remain firm and the street cars are effectively boycotted by the public, excepting a few plutocratic blockheads, labor leader Arthur, and the government. It is to be hoped that the strikers will heed the lesson and direct their fight against their real enemy—government and monopoly—and not against the scabs alone.

In spite of the outrages perpetrated upon the miners at Wardner, Idaho, by the government before the trial, capital was not yet satisfied in its vengeance, and the secretary of the Miners' Union, Paul Corcoran, has been sent to prison for seventeen years, although it was clearly proven that he was not even at Wardner when the crime (?) was committed. He had uttered some aggravating words previous to the trouble and that was sufficient to charge him with the "crime" according to the precedent that was established by the courts during the Anarchist trial in Chicago. McKinley has promised the miners to intercede in their behalf, but they will again experience that their relief will only come when they realize that help depends upon their own intelligence and action, i. e., to take possession of the mines.

According to the New York *World* Nellis Martin was sent to the penitentiary for three years for stealing 15 cents, while Capt. Oberlin, who embezzled millions, "is still at liberty, enjoying the luxuries of life in a fashionable New York club, and drawing full pay from the army." Such is "equality before the law" in the "freest country of the world."

A prominent jurist, Sawyer, suggests that the Philippines be made a penal colony like Siberia where the criminals could be at large, because "the criminals are made worse when kept in restraint." To this the *Appeal to Reason* appropriately adds:

If this be true, it follows logically that restraint made them criminals. And that is just the case. Restraint will make a "criminal" of any man. Deny a man food legally and he will get it illegally, even if he commit murder for it. Make it impossible for a man to satisfy natural needs and he will break over any regulations that you may put around him. That is the cause of crime. The man who commits robbery when hungry is no more a criminal than the hawk that swoops down on your barnyard to satisfy its hunger. When laws contravene natural rights they create legal criminals, but the law is wrong.

Consequently the law makers and rulers are the real criminals, for laws that do not contravene natural rights would be observed in society as a matter of course and are to a great extent recognized in spite of government.

"A machine called a 'mob chaser' is being built at Peoria, Ill. It is an automobile covered with armor plate and having as propelling power a six-horse power motor. Seats are provided for four policemen, and a rapid-firing gun holding 1,000 cartridges is mounted on this 'mob chaser.' This machine is for use in cases of mobs of any kind in cities." Such is the latest news and I sincerely hope the disinherited slaves will now have sense enough to build a parasite chaser. A. I.

DENVER NOTES.

It has been frequently observed by strangers as well as by those who have lived in Colorado for some time that there is something about the environment here highly detrimental to sustained agitation. What it is, whether it is due to the altitude of this mountainous region and the consequent rarefied air, or to the almost perpetual sunshine, or to the fact that the residents of this state, and particularly of the larger cities, are composed very largely of persons in poor health, or whether it is due to all these influences combined with others of a more subtle nature, is a question for psychologists to ponder over and determine. Whatever the cause may be the fact is certain that there is no deep and lasting enthusiasm upon the subject or for any movement. Denver is a "cold" city; unsympathetic, inhospitable, almost entirely devoid of feeling. All efforts to get up enthusiasm by propagandists have thus far failed. So marked is the curious phenomenon that strangers almost immediately notice it. The late Myron W. Reed, the noted reformer-preacher more than once alluded to it in his Sunday lectures. Salvation Army exhorters and workers in other religious bodies have nightly shouted themselves hoarse to gaping crowds of unsympathetic listeners. Faithful followers of Marx and DeLeon have pictured the delights of a State Socialist Eden and the discomfiture of "Anarchy" to dull ears. Local Single Takers have retired from the street propaganda in disgust, and rarely hold meetings to advocate their principles. Remnants of the Social Democracy fizzle attempted, in vain, to interest the people. One of our newest and most devoted comrades, at great personal sacrifice, spent several weeks in abortive endeavors to arouse the people to quickening thought. Carl Browne, of Coxe fame vainly endeavored to get up a working enthusiasm over his proposed second march to Washington. Even the frantic appeals by the newspapers to the patriotism of Coloradans to raise money for the purpose of bringing home the state volunteers just landed from Manila meet with cool response; which goes to show that the lack of enthusiasm is not confined to religious and radical effort. And finally, those comrades who have been noted for their activity in other sections of the country and who have made their residence in this state have become more or less indifferent, or at least disinclined to energetic agitation.

What wonder, then, under such peculiar circumstances, that we have found anarchistic propaganda rather up-hill work, or that the efforts we made have not been crowned with much success? There is no distinctly anarchistic movement here, and what few Anarchists there are apparently have too little interest in "Salvation Army tactics"—as they call the work of agitation—to interest themselves.

Facing such conditions as these a few of us planned the local work of our tireless little visiting comrade and propagandist, Emma Goldman. During her stay of one week five meetings were held; two in the open air, when the bloodless residents of this city were stirred to unwonted interest by the passionate and eloquent appeals of our comrade, who was ably assisted and seconded by J. B. Osborne, recently a missionary in the cause of Social Democracy. Notwithstanding the intense, and for this region, unusual heat, the hall meetings were well attended; the interest seemed genuine (the gods grant that it may continue) and many received their first baptism of libertarian thought. A most encouraging sign was the large sale of anarchistic literature, which we all hope will bear good lasting fruit. On Saturday night (August 19) friends of our devoted missionary were given an opportunity to meet her at a social which was arranged in her honor, and the evening was happily spent in dancing, singing and feasting. On the afternoon of the same day a number of radicals met and organized the Denver Social Science Club. The first public meeting will be held about the middle of September, and an earnest effort will be made to arouse a permanent interest in the work of radical propaganda.

It was anticipated that, owing to the strike of the smelter men here, who for two months had been fighting hopelessly against the Trust, some valuable work might be done by calling meetings near the smelters, and with that purpose in view the regular hall of the Smeltermen's Union was rented; but as luck would have it, only two days before the arrival of our visiting comrade, the men gave up the unequal struggle and

returned to work at terms dictated by the Trust managers. This meeting, therefore, was held under conditions peculiarly unfavorable, and the result was not what had been anticipated. The sullen, sullen faces of these slavishly worked men gave little evidence of an awakened spirit, and the impression given me as I looked over the unresponsive crowd was that nothing but a bombshell bursting in their midst would arouse these stolid wealth producers to responsive action; but that when once aroused the quickening thought would fly from murky brains to brawny arm with lightning rapidity, to the sorrow of more than one plutocrat oppressor. WM HOLMES.

S. F. FREETHOUGHT SOCIETY.

Last Sunday evening at its regular meeting at 1133 Mission st. the separation of church and state was discussed. The speaker of the evening contended that the state—government—was nothing but another superstition whose allurements in so-called advanced countries like our own consisted in the will-o'-the-wisp phantom of majority rule whose dominance was just as injurious to the well-being of the masses, if not more so, than the church; that the state be a logical outgrowth of the church; that therefore Freethinkers who have relinquished the god of the past and still cling to government have simply changed their gods, having adopted the god of the earth in place of the god in the clouds; that both and all gods are based upon the destructive principle of authority which, as Shelley says, is the "bane of all virtue." The separation of church and state, the speaker continued, is a chimera as our own would-be advanced country proved, where sessions of legislative bodies are opened with prayer, where chaplains are used in the army and navy, and where attempts are being made to embody the decaying god into the constitution. Church and state, concluded the speaker, being both based upon the same superstition of authority, cannot be separated, but must both die together, and the only consistent plan for Freethinkers was to work for the cessation of both.

There seemed to be but very little opposition to the foregoing sentiments, most of the speakers participating in the discussion being apparently impressed with the solidity of the advanced arguments.

The subject for next Sunday evening's discussion is: What is the principal cause of poverty. S. D.

ATTENTION!

Comrade James F. Morton Jr., whose series of articles on the constitution of the United States are well known to our readers, intends to go on a lecturing tour in order to reach San Francisco where he will join the Free Society family. His help will undoubtedly improve the paper very much, and if the comrades will join hands with us in our efforts to make it an up-to-date paper by paying their subscriptions in advance, we shall issue an eight page paper as soon as Comrade Morton arrives.

So far New York, Paterson and Philadelphia have arranged meetings for Comrade Morton. Comrades of other cities desiring to arrange meetings are requested to communicate with him. His address is: James F. Morton, Jr., 50 First St., New York.

He will lecture on the following subjects:

- The Scope of Liberalism.
- The Warfare for Religious Liberty.
- Church and State in the Past and Present.
- Political Ideals.
- What Liberty Means.
- Ideal Anarchy.
- The Basis of Brotherhood.
- The Unity of Being.
- The Right of Private Judgment.
- The Purpose of Life.
- Rational Ethics.
- Sex Ideals.
- Why Marriage is a Failure.

Lectures, with illustrative readings, on any play or character of Shakespeare, or the works of Shelley, Wordsworth, Browning, Tennyson, Henley, or Whitman. Recitations of any kind desired.

CO-OPERATION OUR AIM.

What else can we radicals do but co-operate, and try to realize our theories and thus by object lessons draw in the masses who are unable to conceive abstract ideas?

We have no use for the ballot dictating to us what kind of slavery we are to submit to. We only wish to be self-dependent. We can't resort to force and compel others to accept our views, or we should cease to be libertarians. The way out is voluntary co-operation, and as long as we are free to experiment our theory, let us go ahead and try and try again until we succeed. The idea of federating the groups which Kropotkin suggests is nothing new to me. In 1876 I joined Icaria with the purpose of federating the communistic societies and co-operations all over the United States. The idea was well liked; we had many members, but we could not make any practical use thereof; the distances separating us were too great and we had not the means to cover them. What was necessary to maintain the groups then could only be reached in the future, the isolated enterprise being of no avail to our cause, and unable to acquire any vitality. I deem it wise not to begin before we have gained a certain number of people in large centers when we could federate and reach each other whenever required.

One home or colony must be a failure. The congeniality of today may be disturbed by many in or outside factors, and if the preliminary understanding cease to exist, the group is destroyed if there are no other centers where the dissenting members can go to or if the association has not the means to form new groups for the new ideas springing up in this transition period of ours.

For the good of those who desire to practice our principles I will state how we proceed here:

The Mutual Employment Association admits everybody. All have the same material benefit, but those who do not understand our principles are probationary members until they have read enough of our papers, pamphlets and books. We classify our members according to their deeds and ability. Thus for whatever we undertake we get efficient people. We publish a list of all commodities we have on hand and of the services we can render. Later on we propose to make up a catalogue and send it abroad in order to exchange our products for new material or the products of co-operative enterprises in other localities.

Co-operative shops and stores can be started with comparative ease but the homes are very difficult to establish permanently. Before going into such enterprises let us have a good foundation by securing to our members a sure living and a number sufficient to begin several homes at once where we can have new blood circulating as the community requires.

By our catalogue we get the rural population into our organization and exchange not only our products but also give our members outings whenever they are wanted to get in the crops, putting up houses, fixing machinery, or any other occupation for our men, women and children; we enlarge thereby the circulation of the blood of our organization and keep it in a healthy condition.

Our program is very similar to comrade Southworth's of Denver which was published about six weeks ago in *Free Society*. Any one who desires to secure our booklet containing our principles and practical workings can get it by sending in 5 cents in stamps.

It would be desirable for all cities of any size to organize and take up a certain amount of territory; that would bring us into contact with all.

108 Fifth ave., Room 11, Chicago, Ill. C. LEVY.

SAVING AND SAYING.

C. L. James says I have not read his article attentively, and cites from memory a passage which I ought to have taken notice of. I am certain (also from memory) that those sentences were not in the article I replied to; they must have been in some other article, published earlier. However, let us look at them now. In the first place, Mr. James seems to concede my point that the spender is causing production just as much, and therefore doing as much good to laborers in general, if he buys something of permanent value (such as a book or a tool) as he is if he buys something to be immediately destroyed in consumption; while—within limits—he is doing much more for his own future well-being than if he ate his goods up. Certainly if Mr. James does not concede this he will be adopting in full the "broken window" position, which he disavows.

The case he does not reply to is that of the man who "puts a penny in a bank, which loans it out to some manufacturer..... thus enabling him to employ more labor." But, says Mr. James, the manufacturer will not employ more labor, however much the bank is ready to lend, unless other laborers buy his products instead of banking their money.

But, Mr. James, you are growing so interested in other laborers' pennies that you lose sight of your own original penny. Paste a trailer on that particular coin and keep watch of it. It is now in the hands of a laborer again. He will probably spend it for tobacco as you wanted the first holder to, whereby the tobacco-producers will again be half a penny richer and the government also half a penny richer. (I explained this in my former letter, but the printer left out words.) Now it makes no difference to the utility of that penny if the manufacturer goes bankrupt next day for want of customers. That penny has gone into the same channels of trade as if the first holder had spent it, and is doing every bit of the same good, except that it has begun three months later; in return for which, it is a penny in bank to one laborer besides being a penny spent on tobacco for another.

But what Mr. James is probably most afraid of is that the second laborer will also put it in the bank. Well, in that case the penny saved has become twopence saved, fairly offsetting Mr. James' twopence wasted; and is still on the way to become a penny spent besides, or else to become threepence saved.

In general, the saving of a penny in this way by a laborer causes only a slight delay in the spending of that penny for goods, which it gives the laboring class the advantage of having a penny in bank (doubtless to be spent later) in addition to the services of that penny in trade.

We might as well get to the kernel of the thing. The point is that there is an endless chain of capital passing around and serving as a tool of production, and a general help to all producers, wherever it goes. Pennies, pins, peaches are all parts of that chain. When the penny is spent, the pin given to a friend who needs it, the peach sold, they are still keeping up this chain of general helpfulness. When the penny is laid upon the shelf, Mr. James and I agree, the laboring world suffers a loss by its withdrawal from service. When the pin is lost in the road the same thing follows; we agree again, for this is the "broken window" case. When the peach is eaten, Mr. James seems to think the chain runs on beautifully; I say that the result, so far as concerns the usefulness of that pennyworth to the world at large, is the same as if the penny had been laid on the shelf instead of buying the peach. The chain of capital is broken. Of course the peach gives the laborer strength for another day's work, which is of use to all laborers; or if he spends his penny for a copy of *Free Society*, it gives him a pennyworth of culture which is strength to him thenceforth, and which he passes on to those he talks with. And just so with the tobacco if it is a help to health, strength, or culture. But Mr. James in his argument treats it as a useless luxury; and if it is that, then smoking it is destroying part of the wealth which ought to flow in a stream of continual service to all producers.

But the lent penny, which is still a serviceable penny to the lender whenever he wants it, is meanwhile going on from hand to hand, being spent and re-spent, and helping (or, if you prefer, causing) production wherever it comes, just as much as the spent penny.

STEPHEN T. BYINGTON.

AS TO INGERSOLL.

I like A. L.'s remarks in regard to Ingersoll. They make a suitable contrast to Lucifer's warm adulation. His name, as the years roll on, will gather no light, while the fame of William Morris enhances every day. Editress Loud, of the *Rockland Independent*, says to her mixed audience: "O, yes, his creed was all right. We all of us have a good enough creed. The only trouble is in living up to it." In my opinion a greater trouble would be to find out what his creed really was. He blamed Milton for making a battlefield of heaven, but was inexhaustible in praise of soldiers. He spoke volumes for liberty, but explained the feud between the rich and poor as the envy of the barroom loafer for the provident man. He was unstable and inconsistent, and there is an open field for an article entitled, "Some Mistakes of Ingersoll." Somehow or other I always cottoned more to Beecher. Beecher was a delightful old humbug and he knew it, and he knew that we knew it, but Ingersoll always seemed to think that he was fooling somebody. He was bright and witty and eloquent, but if he was deep he never let on. There's where he may have fooled

us. He was liberal with his money, but who wouldn't be—with a certainty of \$25,000 a year made by pleasure excursions? He filled a niche, but he is gone and the niche with him. In the future there will not be so many dollars in the childish task of controverting the Good Old Book. "Live," said Ingersoll, "so that at the end of life you will have nothing more to live for and can throw the old shell aside without a regret." And I will add: And, if it comes handy, live a life so honest that at the end the Christian fakirs will not be quick to claim you as one of them. W. W. GORDAK.

EGOISM AND ALTRUISM.

The word egoism as defined by the dictionaries denotes a state of excessive or passionate love of self, viewing everything from the standpoint of one's own personal interests, selfishness, nay more, selfishness with a vengeance as it were. Altruism is a word coined by August Comte and is understood to mean pretty much the opposite of all that egoism stands for: Excessive or passionate love of others, regarding the welfare of others above one's own interests, etc. Taken the words in this sense we can be normally neither perfect egoists, nor perfect altruists. A state of excessive love either of self or others is an abnormal state of being, an unstable condition of the mind, which tends sooner or later to fall back into that state of equilibrium which is made up equally of self-regarding sentiments as well as of sentiments regarding others. In the sense simply of self-love I maintain that egoism is the natural condition of every living being, but neither more nor less so is also altruism, considered in the simple sense of love for others. Both sentiments are normal components of animal and human nature. Anyone in whom either sense is lacking is psychically unsound. Given a man who has no feeling whatever for the well-being of his fellow-men and you are sure to find in him stigmata of either arrested development or utter degeneration. Per contra, take one who will not care for himself, but will throw away his life for the sake of others at the very first opportunity—what will you call him but a fool and imbecile? The healthy mind is well balanced by the equilibration of these two seemingly conflicting sentiments; in fact the very existence of man in society presupposes him equally endowed both ways.

This view of egoism and altruism might superficially be taken as a mere middle-road position between the two extreme schools of Individualism and absolute Communism; as a matter of fact this view is the more scientific of the two, either one of which is one-sided and only half true at best.

The doctrine of Individualism which considers the egoistic interests of people as the only decisive motives of individual and social actions, is forced to interpret egoism in a way that should also include all acts of an altruistic nature; it must assume two kinds of egoism, a lower and a higher one. To appease one's own craving of hunger, for instance, never caring how hungry one's neighbor might be, is put down as an act of a lower sort of egoism; whereas to divide your morsel with the next fellow-man at the price of going hungry yourself is praised as a higher kind of egoism for the reason that the consciousness of sacrificing to the needy may be more pleasant than satisfying one's own hunger. But such higher pleasure can come only by invoking a profound state of self-consciousness, weighing on the scales of reason, so to say, which act will be more pleasant to one; he must feel that his fellow-man's happiness is his own happiness, otherwise why should an unconscious act though a beneficent one, be called "higher" than a plain selfish act? When we see therefore acts performed for the good of others under conditions which preclude deliberations of self we have no ground to call it egoism of any kind, but must resort to the idea of altruism as a co-existing sentiment in the nature of each social creature.

On the other hand, the doctrine of what I call absolute Communism, that is the doctrine that personal happiness can be attained only through annihilating all personal interest and live entirely for others, can never be completely true although it does contain a part of the truth. For admitting even that by caring for others our own interests are best cared for, we declare at the same time that our personal interests are of prime importance to us, that our own welfare is the final aim and the care of others only a means how best to realize it. In other words, pure altruism must needs look for its support in an essential egoism.

We Anarchists, although Communists at the same time, are in the habit of interpreting all human conduct from the point of view of pure egoism. Having rejected the idea of obligations the individuals were supposed to owe to society, together with the idea of

the supremacy of social above individual interests, we have accepted unqualifiedly the thought that man seeks naturally only the gratification of self and consequently will in the best natural order find its realization in that condition of society which allows of the widest opportunities for each to care as best he can for himself. This philosophy of egoism was the first basis of Anarchism. The egoistic philosophy of the 18th century has given birth to the anarchistic idea of personal liberty, of equal rights and all excellent thoughts opposing tyranny and denying authority. But in view of the immense progress the sciences pertaining to human life—psychology, anthropology and sociology—have made since that time, it has become impossible for the doctrine of Anarchism to stand on its speculative basis; it must build its foundation not on theories alone but mainly on facts, and the facts concerning the question at issue seem rather to support the view which I expressed right at the outset.

Says Spencer (Data of Ethics, ch. 12): "If we define altruism as being all action, which in the normal course of things, benefits others instead of benefiting self, then, from the dawn of life, altruism has been no less essential than egoism. Though primarily it is dependent on egoism, yet secondarily egoism is dependent on it."

Under Altruism in this comprehensive sense I take in the acts by which offsprings are preserved and the species maintained. Whatever action, unconscious or conscious, involves expenditure of individual life to the end of increasing life in other individuals, is unquestionably altruistic in a sense, if not in the usual sense." After citing a few instances from primordial life up the scale of evolution where such altruistic expenditure of life is an essential condition of development, Spencer continues as follows: "Those who understand by altruism only the conscious sacrifice of self to others among human beings, will think it strange or even absurd, to extend its meaning so widely. But the justification for doing this is greater than has thus far appeared. I do not mean merely that in the course of evolution there has been a progress through infinitesimal gradations from purely physical and unconscious sacrifices of the individual for the welfare of the species, up to sacrifices consciously made. I mean that from first to last the sacrifices are, when reduced to their lowest terms, of the same essential nature: to the last, as at first, there is involved a loss of bodily substance. Self-sacrifice, then, is no less primordial than self-preservation. Being in its simple physical form absolutely necessary for the continuance of life from the beginning, and being extended under its automatic form, as indispensable to maintenance of race in types considerably advanced; and being developed to its semi-conscious and conscious forms, along with the continued and complicated attendance by which offspring of superior creatures are brought to maturity, altruism has been evolving simultaneously with egoism." And further on: "As there has been an advance by degrees from unconscious parental altruism to conscious parental altruism of the highest kind, so has there been an advance by degrees from the altruism of the family to social altruism."

Indeed, the best instances of altruistic action we find in the social life of animals as well as man. The fact alone of mutual aid, without which it were impossible to imagine the existence of any true society, already presupposes a high grade of altruistic feelings. With the lower social animals moreover, where we cannot explain away altruistic acts on the presumption that the creature weighs the advantages it will reap in the future from a friendly act toward others, we are forced to admit that there is in them a natural inclination to act altruistically in certain cases, as to act egoistically in other cases. Acts of altruism, we must conclude, spring from motives that are altogether independent of those which have personal gratification as their aim. The true motive of altruism is simply the desire to do good to others.

As an illustration of the truth of this position I will mention a few instances of undoubted altruism taken at random from Romanes' book on "Animal Intelligence." Lubbock once observed a certain ant, which was congenitally destitute of antennae, attacked and injured by an ant of another species. When separated by him, another ant of its own species came by. It examined the poor sufferer carefully, then picked it up tenderly, and carried it away into the nest. It would have been difficult, adds Lubbock, for any one who witnessed this scene, to have denied to this ant the possession of humane feelings. Edward,

the naturalist, having shot a tern, which fell winged into the sea, noticed its companions hovering around the floating bird manifesting much apparent solicitude. He was wondering whether the manifested emotions were really those of sympathy or mere curiosity, so he set about watching their movements. "To my utter astonishment and surprise," he writes, "I beheld two of the unwounded terns take hold of their disabled comrade, one at each wing, lift him out of the water, and bear him out seawards. They were followed by two other birds. After being carried about for six or seven yards, he was let gently down again, when he was taken up in a similar manner by the two who had hitherto been inactive. In this way they carried him alternately until they had conveyed him to a rock at a considerable distance, upon which they landed him in safety." After describing their further actions in detail, Edward concludes his narrative by saying: "I willingly allowed them to perform without molestation an act of mercy, and to exhibit an instance of affection which man himself need not be ashamed to imitate."

An instance of sympathetic feeling manifested by a cat toward a parrot with whom she was in amiable relations, is told in the following: "One evening there was no one in the kitchen. The cook had gone upstairs and left a bowl full of dough to rise by the fire. Shortly after the cat rushed up after her, mewing and making what signs she could for her to go down; then she jumped up and seized her apron, and tried to drag her down. As she was in such a state of excitement the cook went, and found "Polly" shrieking, calling out, flapping her wings and struggling violently, up to her knees in dough and stuck quite fast. No doubt if she had not been rescued she would have sunk in the morass and been smothered."

James Forbes in his "Oriental Memoirs," quoted by Romanes, narrates the following remarkable instance of the display of solicitude and care for a dead companion exhibited by a monkey. One of a shooting party under a banian tree killed a female monkey and carried it to his tent which was soon surrounded by forty or fifty of the tribe, who made a great noise and seemed disposed to attack their oppressor. They retreated when he exhibited his fowling-piece, the dreadful effect of which they had witnessed and appeared perfectly to understand. The head of the troop, however, stood his ground, chattering furiously. At length he came to the door of the tent, and finding threats of no avail, began a lamentable moaning, and by the most expressive gesture seemed to beg for the dead body. It was given him; he took it sorrowfully in his arms and bore it away to his expecting companions. They who were witnesses to this extraordinary scene resolved never again to fire at one of the monkey race.

These few instances, picked up from a lot of similar cases, leave no room for doubt as to the highly developed sentiment of self-sacrifice found among the lower as well as higher animals. We certainly cannot assume that the cat possesses the faculty of what we might call the sense of a higher egoism; nor can we ascribe the truly sympathetic acts of the ant, tern or even monkey to the promptings of a so-called higher sort of selfishness. We cannot help seeing the true altruistic motive of such actions, which appears in the case of these animals as the plainly natural inclination of their social beings. It might be that they, like man, feel a kind of pleasure accompanying the exercise of their sympathetic functions; very probably they feel impelled under the circumstances to act as they do, the violent suppression of which impulse would bring them pain; but the fact remains the same that the sympathetic act is done for its own sake and not for the sake of personal happiness.

"Sympathy," to quote Spencer again, "is the root of that higher altruism which produces the desire for the happiness of others. It is a state of the individual which may at one time be pleasurable and at another time painful, according to the states of the surrounding beings. When there exists around a large proportion of pain, sympathy may entail on its possessor more pain than pleasure; contrariwise, in course of the general evolution of humanity and society, it more and more happens that the states of consciousness existing in those around are more pleasurable, and in proportion as this happens, the effect of sympathy is to increase the pleasure of the possessor."

We cannot deny that there is an agreeable emotion accompanying a benevolent deed; but must we, because of this concomitant pleasure, deny to sympathy an essential existence apart from its mere dependence on selfishness? We will admit that our immortal Albert Parsons, when refusing to sign the petition to

the governor of Illinois and thereby sacrificing his life for the sake of his comrades whose chances of escape he thought would be lessened if he did sign it—Parsons, I say, we will admit, felt an intense pleasure in sacrificing his life for his comrades. So also was it certainly pleasure that impelled those fine folks, the *cream de la cream* of official French society, to trample on women and children and thus gain their own escape from fire at the memorable *charite bazar* at the expense of the lives of their weaker friends who had a right to expect every protection from those gallants. Could you give one name to those two actions? Were the motives in both cases the same? Could you convince anybody that Parsons was essentially as much of an egoist as any one of those French *cavaliers*? Try to make a mental picture of the sort of society we should have were all like Parsons and again if all were like those French "noblemen!"

(Concluded next week.)

Literature.

"LIVE QUESTIONS" by Ex-Gov. John P. Altgeld. Published by Geo. S. Bowen & Son, Unity Building, Chicago, Ill. Price (cloth) \$2.50.

This book contains over 1000 pages of the ex-governor's writings, speeches, interviews, etc., which will be of great interest to the student of political movements in the United States history. He is fearless, sincere and is seeking to lift the burdens of the laboring classes by purifying the government and "by peaceful measures of just legislation." It is this dream of his that prevents us from recommending the book to *Free Society* readers. No doubt, if all governmental officials were intelligent, honest, and the real servants of the people instead of being their masters and oppressors, conditions could be slightly improved even under government, but as such hopes are not entertained by people who are aware of the fact that power will always be abused and honesty remain a rare article when temptation to corruption presents itself they see the remedy in the abolishment of the causes which create abuse and dishonesty rather than in wasting time and energy in battling with the effects. Of great interest, though, is the part of the book in which the author gives in detail his reasons for pardoning Schwab, Fielden and Neebe. A. I.

The Letter-Box.

S. L., Welborn, La.—There are a few good points in your article, but too prolix for a small weekly like *Free Society*. Try to be less verbose and come again.

K-J., City.—No, money is not the government; it derives its power from government, and with the abolishment of monopoly and authority it has no power.

A. G. L., Grove City, Fla.—*Moribund Society and Anarchy* will be sent as soon as ready, but as we are continually hampered by lack of the "filthy lucre" the book will not be out before October.

E. S., New York.—You made no mistake: the subscription price for *Free Society* is only 50 cents a year.

J. M., Reavley, Mo.—Why not write prose, friend? Not everybody is given to write poetry. Greetings.

G. G., Charleroi, Pa.—Thanks for your encouraging words. We have sent you a bundle of back numbers for distribution. Hope you will be successful spreading "the gospel." The book "Physician in the House" has also been sent.

R. McK., Greenville, Tenn.—"Greenback" arrived. Thanks. You can always see whether you are in arrears or not by comparing the current number with that on the wrapper of your paper. I was glad to hear that my remarks on Ingersoll were endorsed by an old Freethinker. Too much is said about "his love to humanity" when he himself wondered how Thomas Paine could have loved humanity.

The Under Dog, Los Angeles, Cal.—I admire your spunk and boldness in your fight against despotism, Comstockism, mock-modesty and perverted morality, but you are not "telling the truth" and abuse your best friends—the Anarchists—when you say that "the country is in a state of Anarchy" because the negroes in the south are lynched by ignorant bigots. On the contrary, government, restraint, christian morality, ignorance and bigotry are the direct cause of the horrible and lamentable affairs in the south. Anarchy means freedom and order, while government means slavery and disorder. It was government, Captain James, that buried you in a prison for three years "for telling the truth." See?

RECEIPTS.

From Aug. 19 to Sept. 3.

Pluetsner, \$1.75. Simon, McKee, Meyer, each \$1. Abel, Ganuett, Fineberg, Elsborg, Berger, Kieger, Snellenberg, Langberg, Allen, Levitt, each 50c. Barnes, 30c. Hanna, Harvie, Jorgensen, Mayers, each 25c.