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PREFATORY NOTE.

On Sept. 5, 1901, William McKinley, President of the United States, was shot by Leon Czolgosz, a self-declared anarchist. On Sept. 13 the President died of his wound. On Sept. 15, while the people were naturally in a state of wild excitement over the tragedy, A. M. Simons, editor of the International Socialist Review, delivered the following address at the Socialist Temple, 120 South Western avenue, Chicago. The hall was packed to the limit and hundreds were turned away.

In response to the general desire of those present, the address is now published, in the hope that it may have some effect in removing the prejudice existing against socialism by those who ignorantly confound it with anarchy.
Socialism vs. Anarchy.

Once again the anarchists have proven themselves the dearest foes of capitalism. The story, long grown old in Europe, has been repeated here. The act of one fanatical criminal at Buffalo has rallied every force of reaction and exploitation as no avowed defender of capitalism could hope to do. It has long been recognized in Europe that in every great emergency, when the forces of oppression are hardest pressed, they can always hope that some such deed as this will come to their rescue. Indeed, Bismarck, who must always hold the palm as the ablest defender of capitalism and the most cunning opponent of socialism that the nineteenth century has produced, did not hesitate, when necessary, to commit deeds of violence through the police in order to arouse public opinion. The German socialists have proven to the satisfaction of any reasonable man that at least one of the alleged attacks made upon Emperor William was made by agents of the police. Of course, no one imagines that this was the case with the attack on President McKinley. It has not been necessary in this case for the capitalists to pay for this work. The anarchists have done it for them free of charge.

Throughout Europe, as Lafargue and other socialist writers have often pointed out, anarchy has long been a fad of the radical bourgeoisie. In Paris University it is notorious that the anarchist groups are mainly made up of the sons
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of the small capitalists. These groups are never interfered with in any attempt to "stamp out anarchy," as the police are well aware of their value in maintaining the established order by throwing discredit on all sane attempts to change that order. When one of their dupes commits a deed of violence he is ferociously punished, but the leading spirits are left to breed more trouble.

That the capitalists of America are learning the lesson of their European fellow exploiters has been evident for some time. Already it has become quite a fashionable thing to startle your friends and acquaintances with the statement that you are an anarchist. It means nothing and serves to make a drawing-room sensation. Never was this fondness for the anarchist fad more evident than at the time of the recent visit of Kropotkin to Chicago. The papers that are now demanding "special legislation," "deportation," "summary execution," and in general having "throes of indignation" over the presence of anarchists in this city, then gave Kropotkin front-page notices in profusion, praised his scholarly attainments, and in general treated his doctrines with careful consideration. One paper that published a cartoon that might have been interpreted as slightly disrespectful, promptly apologized in its next issue. He was under the patronage of Mrs. Potter Palmer, a recognized leader of plutocratic society, not only in Chicago, but throughout America. She wined and dined him at her house, where he was petted and praised by the exclusive Lake Shore Drive set. His headquarters were at Hull House, where
he was the petted guest of the philanthropists and professionally good people of the city. To be sure, he was a "prince," and as such appealed to the American love of "snobocracy." It must not be forgotten that all this time his manager was Abraham Isaak, the same man who is now so fiercely denounced by these same "good people." The few who have not hastened to join in the cry of "crucify him" are cautiously explaining that they have no sympathy with his position. The question might arise, is this because Isaak is only a working man instead of a prince? Their doctrines are identical. The men and women who were arrested are the ones who acted as ushers and sold literature at his Central Music Hall meeting, when he was being patronized by Mayor Harrison and the others whom we have named.

These people told us that Kropotkin was only a philosophic anarchist, and not in favor of violence, and that he denounced assassination equally with his respectable patrons. Let us see if this is true. I shall here simply discuss the facts as to this particular incident and endeavor to determine the specific fact as to whether Kropotkin did actually stand for violence. I might easily quote from many of his published attacks on "parliamentarianism" and socialism to demonstrate that he really believes in "individual warfare" and the "propaganda of the deed." But at this point I simply want to call attention to the plain fact that assassination was directly encouraged at the time when his respectable patrons were in closest touch with him. The following quotations are taken from Jean
Grave's "Moribund Society and Anarchy," a book which was sold at the Central Music Hall lecture and is the accepted text-book of anarchy.

"It is impossible for the anarchists to be pacific, even if they so wished; they will be urged into action by the sheer force of circumstances. Can one endure the meddling of officials after one understands the contemptible part they play? Can one submit to the insolence of lawyers when reflection has robbed them of the sacred aureole by which they were formerly surrounded? Can one respect the rich man wallowing in luxury when one knows that it is wrought from the misery of hundreds of families? When one sees that poverty is the result of a bad social organization, that people are dying of hunger only because others are gluttons and heap up fortunes for their descendants, one is not satisfied to go off and die in a corner of the poor-house. There comes a moment when, pacific though the sufferers be, force is answered by force, and exploitation by revolt."

"But," the bourgeois defender of anarchy will say, "this simply states the possibility, or at the most the probability of an armed insurrection, and in no way justifies assassination." To be sure, if taken by itself and apart from the rest of the book, it might admit of this interpretation. It is a characteristic of most anarchistic literature that when methods are discussed the language is left ambiguous. But when we turn to another page of this same work, the mask is thrown entirely aside, and we have an explanation of the sort of "revolt" which is expected.
"Let us suppose a struggle between employers and workmen—any sort of strike. In a strike there are surely some employers more cruel than others, who by their exactions have necessitated this strike, or by their intrigues have kept it up longer than was necessary; without doubt these employers draw upon themselves the hatred of the workers. Let us suppose one of the like executed in some corner, with a placard posted explaining that he has been killed as an exploiter, or that his factory has been burned from the same motives. In such a case there is no being mistaken as to the reasons prompting the authors of the deeds, and we may be sure that they will be applauded by the whole laboring world. Such are intelligent deeds, which shows that actions should always follow a guiding principle."

Do not think that such statements are isolated instances. Thousands more could be found by searching the literature of anarchy. Nor are they peculiar to the writings of any particular division. They are contained in the works which are circulated by practically all so-called "communistic or philosophic anarchists." Still the apologist for anarchy will answer that these statements are not an integral part of the anarchist philosophy, and will go into raptures over the "beautiful philosophy" of anarchy. Later it will be shown that the violent conclusion is by far the most logical conclusion that can be drawn from this "beautiful philosophy," and that the only other conclusion which is drawn is one of imbecile and cowardly retreat from all attempts to solve the problems of so-
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Society. Just now, however, let us look into this philosophy itself and ascertain what merits it has that are peculiar to itself. The mere fact that we find beautiful dreams in the writings of anarchy does not prove that they are an essential part of anarchist philosophy. Especially when we are contrasting anarchy with socialism it behooves us to ascertain if there is anything of good in that portion of anarchy which particularly differentiates it from socialism.

The fundamental tenet of all anarchist doctrines is that every form of government shall cease to exist at least in so far as they are founded upon force. In place of existing forms of social organization, whether industrial or governmental, they propose to substitute free groups of associated individuals, united only by interest in a common work. One group will devote itself to the production of machinery, another to the manufacture of clothing, another to agriculture, etc. It is then supposed (although on this point anarchist literature is almost as ambiguous as on methods) that these groups will in some way exchange products until each member of every group can receive whatever he wishes. Sometimes ridiculous and fantastic ideas are added to this dream, as for example when Kropotkin said in his Central Music Hall speech that if a man desired any article he would join the group of workers producing such articles and create it for himself. To show just how intelligent his scheme was, he used for an illustration the making of telescopes, saying that if he desired such an instrument he would join the "group of telescope workers" and make
him one. He seemed to forget that a life time of training had not been sufficient save in the case of the members of one family (that of the Clarks) to give the skill requisite for the manufacture of telescope lenses. Incidentally this silly illustration exposed a weakness in the anarchist ideal in that it would be ridiculously impossible with the present highly specialized and centralized industry. Hence we see them either declaring with Tolstoi that all pursuits save those of agricultural and handicrafts should be abandoned, or else with Kropotkin going into elaborate calculations to prove that the movement toward concentration has reached its limit and that there is now a tendency toward decentralization. To sustain this position, they gather immense masses of details and use the cumulative method of arguing, but keep carefully away from the only important point; i.e., as to whether the class of small producers is as a class retaining its economic importance. To raise this point would be to answer it and overturn their entire argument. But at this point, as at many others, they are doing just the sort of work that capitalism needs most of all. They are helping the defenders of the established order to prove the permanence of competition and the equality of opportunity for the small capitalist.

The main importance of the anarchist propaganda at the present time, and especially for the discussion which we now have in hand, lies in the fact just mentioned, that they are furnishing the defenders of the present capitalist class with a large number of alleged arguments
against socialism, the only movement that is seriously threatening the present system of exploitation. They all echo, with tiresome mendacity, a series of lying platitudes against a straw man labeled "State Socialism." From Spencer's "Coming Slavery" down to the latest issue of "Free Society" the changes are continuously rung on the old falsehood that socialism proposes to place all industry in the hands of an autocratic state and subject every one to a terrible tyranny labeled "the will of the majority." Recently the Single Taxers have joined in this cry and we have the amazing and somewhat laughable (although not wholly illogical) situation of orthodox capitalists, Single Taxers, several kinds of anarchists, including Tolstoi, "non-resistants," all assisting to raise on high, athwart the path of progress, this enormous stuffed figure labeled "State Socialism." When socialists insist with some warmth for the thousandth time that this bogie man is born of the imaginations of its opponents, the anarchists have lately begun to declare that this is a new position for socialists. Kropotkin especially declared on his late visit to Chicago that socialists changed their position so often that he no longer pretended to keep track of them, and particularly stated that this disavowal of state socialism was something very recent.

So long as there are some socialists, even, who are not clear on this point, it is worthy of further comment. So long as men who insist that they are entitled to the name of socialists assert that "socialism means a further extension of the powers of government." and instance the present
postoffice as an example of socialism, one cannot blame the anarchists alone for this confusion. Yet, as I shall proceed to show, there has never been any necessity for this ignorance on the part of socialists, which furnishes such valuable material to the enemies of socialism, since from the very foundation of modern scientific socialism, every writer of any ability has pointed out its opposition to "State Socialism," which, by the way, as Liebknecht has pointed out, should be known as "State Capitalism," since it has absolutely nothing in common with socialism.

All socialist writers have insisted with emphasis upon the distinction between the "government of persons" and the "administration of things." All have declared that when things are properly administered the necessity of restraining the actions of persons would to a large extent disappear. More than twenty years ago Frederick Engels, in his work entitled "Socialism, Utopian and Scientific," a work which shares with "Capital" the right to be considered the great text-book of socialism, made this statement: "In proportion as anarchy in production vanishes, the political authority of the State dies out. Man, at last the master of his own form of social organization, becomes at the same time the lord over Nature, his own master—free." Gabriel Deville, a prominent French writer and authority on socialism, in a work written in 1895, entitled "The State and Socialism," is even more specific in his statements.

"State Socialism has been conceived precisely in order to equip the state with a means of combatting pure socialism, which is the only social-
ism, and to arrest its expansion. Therefore let us not confound State Socialism with the infiltration of socialism into the state, and let us endeavor to increase this infiltration as much as possible until socialism shall be master of the state. That day will be, not the last day of the state, but the first day of the last phase of its evolution. When the socialization of capitalist property shall have been effected, and legally effected, there will no longer be any economic subordination of some to others, there will be no more classes, and the state, made a necessity by the existence of classes, can at last be suppressed, or, rather, it will disappear of itself when it shall have accomplished its task of transformation. This is not equivalent to saying that the socialist society will have no organization. But the future social organization, when antagonistic classes no longer exist, when constraint no longer has to be exercised over some for the benefit of others, will not be a state any more than the means of production will be capital after they shall have lost the power of exploiting the labor of others, or than the future remuneration will be what we call wages when it shall no longer pre-suppose surplus-value."

As was previously stated, Liebknecht's last published pamphlet, "No Compromise, No Political Trading," insists that the control of industries by the present state has no relation to socialism and is properly called "State Capitalism." It would be easy to multiply such quotations to any length, if necessary, in order to show that the negative reason, which is sometimes given for the existence of anarchy, that
socialism proposes a governmental tyranny, has no basis in fact.

The Socialists have always maintained that the state, in common with all other social institutions of the present time, is but an instrument with which to express the will of the ruling class. Its main reason for existence is the protection of the rights of private property in the instruments of exploitation. Its functions are almost wholly restrictive and negative. It is concerned with the control of persons rather than the administration of things. When this state does undertake to operate an industry it does it from the same point of view that it performs all the rest of its functions. It is tyrannical and paternal and makes it its principal object to further the interest of the present ruling class. The present administration of the post-office is an excellent example of the tyranny of a class administered industry. The second-class division is used as a means of censoring periodicals hostile to capitalism. The greatest discrimination is exercised in favor of the great capitalist publications. The surplus value extorted from employes and patrons of the post-office goes to pay the franking expenses of officials and to fill the pockets of railroad stockholders. To make use of such an industry as an example of socialism, save merely to show the economies that come from highly concentrated management, is proof that the speaker does not know much of socialism or else that he is deliberately seeking to furnish ammunition to the enemies of socialism. When workers control the govern-
ment then government-owned industry will be socialistically operated, and not before.

The materialistic interpretation of history, or as Enrico Ferri has better expressed it, “Economic Determinism,” is the basis of modern socialism. This philosophy is simply a recognition and statement of the fact that the economic relations determine all other social relations. The economic system of capitalism, with private property by a few in the means of life for all, has given rise to a certain set of institutions. It has given form to a certain character of religious institution, a certain set of “moral principles,” and a certain set of governmental institutions which constitute the present state. All this philosophy is antagonized by the anarchists, who maintain that institutions and social forms are the product of the acts and ideas of individuals who are responsible for whatever is good or bad in such institutions.

Socialism points out that the next stage of economic evolution will be the co-operative ownership and operation of industry. There will be no personal advantage in the possession of private property, as such ownership will have lost the power to take the fruits of others’ labor. Hence there will naturally be no need of laws to “protect the rights of private property.” Under such conditions all the disagreeable features of government would disappear. Government would simply become an administrator of industry. This does not mean that it would be a gigantic “boss,” saying to this one “do this” and to that one “go there.” On the contrary, as is happening even at the present time under the
manifestly imperfect forms of co-operation existing in the midst of competition, the directing function, the superintendence side of industry, would constantly grow less and less. The capitalists have been quicker to see this fact than most anarchists and their sympathizers. They are continuously seeking to avoid the expense of slave drivers by various forms of sham co-operation, such as profit sharing, pensions, stock sales to employes, etc. In a co-operative commonwealth the government would be little more than a gigantic information bureau furnishing to its citizens exact knowledge regarding the amounts of all kinds of commodities required by the community and notifying them where there is need of labor to be performed. If comparison is to be made at all with present institutions, the government of the future will be much more like an enormously developed "statistical bureau" of to-day, rather than an overgrown police department.

Thus we see that the bug-a-boo of "state tyranny" and "governmentalism" fades away. All that is good in the "beautiful" philosophy of anarchy, of which we are told so much by its capitalist patrons, is really a part of socialism. The dream of the future in both cases is practically the same. But neither can claim any originality on that score, for it is the same old dream that mankind has been dreaming ever since suffering came upon the earth. It is the picture of perfect freedom for which the race has ever longed, of which poets have sung and romanticists drawn visions. To praise a philosophy because it has at last comprehended that such a society would
be desirable is, to say the least, rather foolish.

From this, however, it is plain that those persons calling themselves socialists who make use of such phrases as "socialism is simply the opposite of anarchy," or that socialists believe in "an extension of government to all functions of society," are only a little less criminally ignorant than those who seek to confuse the two. Both are placing valuable weapons in the hands of the capitalists. Both are slandering socialism. It is in no small degree owing to such ignorance on the part of socialists that anarchy has been enabled to secure any foothold whatever in the world of intellect. It represents a reaction from an imaginary threatened official tyranny.

In the same way the statement that "anarchy is the next step in social evolution after socialism" is seen to be absolutely meaningless. Socialism is not a stage but a philosophy of society. One deduction from that philosophy is that competition and private monopoly will be succeeded by co-operation and common ownership of the essentials of production and distribution, with a great decrease in the restrictive function of government. Should the time ever come when invention shall have progressed until the production of wealth shall require so slight an exertion as barely to furnish amusement and necessary exercise for the people, then there will be no need of organizing production in any manner. The dream of Wm. Morris' "News from Nowhere" will be realized and people will go about good-naturedly disputing with one another over who shall have the chance to do what little work is
needed. This would simply be one more proof of the philosophy of socialism that the economic organization determines all other social relations.

But when it comes to an analysis of the causes of present conditions and methods of reaching this ideal, the antithesis is sharp. And this method and analysis is really the only thing that is peculiarly characteristic of anarchy. It is all that is really entitled to the name. Let us then turn our attention to this, which is the real heart of anarchy. In the first place it is the gospel of individualism gone mad. It is the aim and object of socialism to give the individual every opportunity to develop his individuality, and it is one of the strongest indictments brought by the socialists against capitalism that it stifles all individuality. But just because our present society does stifle individuality the anarchist analysis of that society is ridiculous. He would have it that individuals are responsible for present social conditions. It is because some people are officials that tyranny exists. Capitalists are responsible for capitalism, says the anarchist. History is but the biographies of "great men." It will be seen that there is much in common between this and the copy book philosophy of capitalism. From this premise the anarchist deduces the natural conclusion that if there were no officials there would be no tyranny, no capitalists, no exploitation. But from his previous position he is bound to believe that the persons who take those offices and become the instruments to the accomplishment of evil, are responsible for so doing. Now we are at the turning
point. So far all schools of anarchy, including most capitalist moralists, agree. But now how shall we get rid of these responsible individuals? Tolstoi and those who follow him declare that all that is necessary to abolish all these evils is for every one to refuse to serve in any official capacity or to function as a capitalist. In other words, to retire into a sort of Hindoo Nirvana of self-renunciation and wait and hope until all the world shall be of the same mode of thinking and tyranny and exploitation will disappear for lack of people to serve as officials or capitalists.

This is the phase of anarchy that particularly appeals to the “parlor anarchist,” if I may be allowed to add one more to an already over-long list of varieties of anarchists. This enables them to make a great exhibit of self-righteousness with little personal discomfort, allows them the use of the name anarchist for drawing-room sensations, furnishes a new fad to show to one’s friends, permits the patronage of distinguished anarchists and the “study” of the violent ones, while it leaves one free to disclaim all connection with any act of violence which may be committed. This is the kind of anarchy that we hear so much about as having such a beautiful philosophy. Whether it is beautiful or not, I will not attempt to say, being no judge of aesthetics, but if I know anything of logic and reason it is only a little short of idiotic.

But when this doctrine comes to a workman who has nothing but his chains to renounce, whose only “office” is a job and whose only “capital” is his brain and muscle, he does not see how he can share in the conclusions of his
bourgeois friend. With him the social question is one of life and death. When he is told that present economic conditions are traceable to a few individuals he is apt to be rather impatient of the process of waiting until every one will refuse to longer serve in official or capitalistic capacity and decides that it would be well to make it a dangerous thing for any one to hold such offices. This is the logic of "terrorism" as set forth in many anarchist pamphlets. Knowing the sort of human nature that capitalism produces, it is a much more logical and sensible conclusion from the doctrines of individualism than is Tolstolism. This is the sort of logic that produces a Bergman, a Bresci and a Czolgosz. It is the only logical deduction from the premises of anarchy, and has been so recognized by far more than a majority of the writers on anarchy. It is the doctrine which is openly preached by John Most and the anarchist organs of Paterson, N. J., and Spring Valley, Ill. But because these papers are not printed in English, they are less known than the works of some of the "philosophic anarchists." But these men recognize Kropotkin, Reclus, Bakunine and Proudhon as their classic writers or present leaders, and these are also the writers of the text-books of this "beautiful philosophy" of communist anarchy.

The only other alternative which is even suggested is that of armed organized rebellion. But modern methods of warfare upon the one hand and the spread of intelligence and consequent recognition of the possibility of effecting social changes by peaceful measures among the work-
ers, upon the other, have combined to make this method so ridiculous that a search through a large number of anarchist pamphlets fails to reveal one of recent date in which it is suggested, although hints at assassination are frequent enough.

The socialist antagonizes these positions of anarchy at every point. Socialism insists and demonstrates its position by a host of facts drawn from history and contemporary society, that economic relations and not individual caprices are at the bottom of social institutions. The social institutions thus determined constitute the environment which forms the character and determines the nature of individuals. The socialists maintain that at the present time that basic economic development has reached a point where a great change is imminent. It is the great triumph of socialism to be able to predict what that change will be, and the methods of its accomplishment, and to substitute for the Utopian dreams and anarchistic speculation of former ages scientific deduction from established facts. The socialist points out that this impending change must necessarily consist in the transfer of the great complex instruments with which wealth is produced and distributed from private to co-operative ownership. More important still, the socialist is able to demonstrate the manner in which this change is destined to come about.

When the ballot was put into the hands of the worker, when universal suffrage was attained, the need of forcible revolution passed away. This is especially true of any change in
the interest of the laborers, since economic development has made them an overwhelming majority in all modern states. Moreover, since the coming society is to be ruled by the producers of wealth, that change should not come until the laborers are sufficiently intelligent to use their ballots to effect the change.

But the anarchists are not alone in their emphasis upon individual responsibility. As has been repeatedly pointed out, the ruling capitalist opinion is in accord with anarchist philosophy at this point. All during the last campaign, and ever since, both the republican and the democratic parties have agreed in declaring that McKinley was responsible for economic conditions. The Republican papers have hailed him as the "advance agent of prosperity," while at the same time the yellow journals have denounced him as the murderer of the Filipinos, the oppressor of the workingman, the upholder of trusts, and, in fact, have generally made him responsible for all the abuses of the present system. Any man reading the average yellow journal, especially of the Hearst type, would not be logically wrong in saying that the conclusion from the premises which were put before him was that McKinley being responsible for all the abuses, if McKinley were removed the abuses would cease.

Let this point be made clear. There is a widespread idea among professional philanthropists, scholastic economists and so-called students of society (most of whom would find it to their economic disadvantage to tell the whole positive truth) to maintain that if only the evils of so-
ciety are set forth with sufficient vividness, the cure will develop in some mysterious, spontaneous manner. When asked to join with the socialists they profess themselves as averse to accepting a specific name, and declare that if they only continue to call attention to present conditions, such calling will help all reforms. Nothing could be further from the truth. In the light of the present prevailing individualistic philosophy, the conclusion from the reports of the misery and degradation of the laborers which are published by such people, is that certain definite officials or employers are responsible and should be attacked.

But these same capitalists who preach the doctrines of individualism upon which anarchy is based somehow realize that the system of exploitation is safe so long as only individuals are attacked. Hence their patronizing gentleness with anarchy which has been referred to. Viewed from this same standpoint, the hollowness of their attempts to “stamp out anarchy” appears. This stamping out of anarchy, like “wiping out the slums” in great cities, when attempted by capitalists, is an individualistic measure. It is an effort to punish individuals for social crimes. Not that anarchists who commit crimes of violence should not be punished under present society. Society must do this in self-defense. But such punishment will have no more effect in wiping out anarchy than anarchist assassinations will have in abolishing capitalism and exploitation. The anarchist, like the capitalist and the governmental official, is but a natural, I had almost said a necessary,
part of a social organization resting upon a certain definite economic foundation. So long as that foundation remains undisturbed all the abuses will remain, whether those abuses be official tyranny, capitalist exploitation, or anarchist assassination.

Now it so happens that the present ruling class profit by the continuation of the present economic system. Hence they are willing to tolerate and indeed even encourage anything that will perpetuate that system. But the socialists have come to realize that the days of the economic system of capitalism and anarchy are numbered and that the world is now ready for the next step in social evolution, the dawn of the era of co-operation and human brotherhood. They are seeking to educate the people to use their ballots to the end that the workers may actually become the rulers in the present state and may then use the governmental machinery to abolish all exploitation and oppression. This is the only movement that really antagonizes anarchy at every point. For this reason anarchists and socialists have ever been sworn enemies.

This again makes of anarchy the ally of capitalism. It is one of the strongest bulwarks of the present society against the coming of socialism.

Its philosophy is in no way at variance with capitalism. Its logical violence serves as an excuse to inflame the minds of the ignorant against all those who would seek to change the established order. Thus it comes about that over and over again the violent deeds of
anarchists have been used as an excuse for attacking the only real enemy of anarchy,—socialism.

Is the line of evidence plain? I have shown that all that is good in the philosophy of anarchy is but the commonplaces of every religion, reform, or social dream that the world has ever known, and that it is found in socialism in a much more intelligent and logical form. I have shown that it has been able to attract the attention of intelligent people only because of a false conception of socialism, for which to some degree alleged socialists are responsible. I have shown that the logic of capitalism and the logic of anarchy are identical, that they are sister products of the same economic organization. I have demonstrated that all that is peculiar to the doctrines of anarchy are its individualistic interpretation of society, which is false, and its method of attaining its end, which is either through an imbecile quietism and affected humility and self-sacrifice, or else murderous private warfare and assassination. I have shown that this conclusion of violence is accepted by all the leading anarchist writers, including those who have been so much patronized by bourgeois society. I have shown that capitalism looks with favor upon anarchy because it sees in it a valuable ally against its only dangerous foe, the socialist movement. I have shown that the supporters of the established order have no particular desire to abolish anarchy, and could not do so if they wished. I have shown, finally, that the only sincere opponents of anarchy, the only ones who dare to
attack it root and branch and to demand that it, together with the murderous society that gave it birth, shall give way to a better order through the peaceful, intelligent action of the producers of wealth are the socialists.

Press and police unite in telling us that the murder of President McKinley was the result of a conspiracy. Whether this be true or not in the sense of which they speak, whether the victims that have been gathered into the police drag-net of this and other cities were really associated with the man who did the deed is, of course, beyond my ken. But when the historian of the future shall look back upon the present age to chronicle the event we are now describing, he will see it as the result of the most gigantic conspiracy the world has ever known; a conspiracy so tremendous as to take a generation for its preparation and include a nation among its conspirators; a conspiracy, the chief actors in which moved with that marvelous accuracy which the mind only attains when working unconscious of the dictates of reason. When in the perspective of time the events of to-day shall be seen in their proper relations, some future writer will draw up an indictment, “In re the Murder of William McKinley. The People of the United States vs. Czolgosz, et al.”

But there will be many parties upon that indictment that not even the most sensational press or the most zealous police officer of to-day has dared to suggest. First and foremost, as the actual responsible agent, as the true accessory before the fact, will come the present ruling class. They are the ones whom economic
I

development made the arbiters of the destiny of our social life. They have formulated in their interests the social institutions, governmental organization, and to a large extent the thought of a great mass of our population. They have controlled press and pulpit and lecture platform and have used these agencies to formulate a public opinion out of which anarchy could not but develop. They alone reap an advantage from this terrible catastrophe. It is the members of this class who have with ghoulish greed for gain been gambling upon the stock market on the bulletins from the bedside of the dying President. It is they who will reap the benefit from the blow which this act will enable their reptile press to deal to union labor. Already we can see their smile of satisfaction over the effect this assassination has had upon the struggling steel workers, leering through their crocodile tears over a nation's sorrow. Most prominent among those who made up this first body of responsible conspirators must be put the great financial interests that control the destinies of the Republican party. They it is who have resisted every attempt at change in social conditions and who see in the assassination but one more weapon ready to their hand with which to drive back all enemies of exploitation and oppression. They it is who for their own profit insist upon holding down the safety valve upon a social boiler long past the bursting point. They are the ones who have interpreted the philosophy of society along the same lines as they were interpreted by the man who fired the fatal shot at Buffalo. They have for a generation preached,
with all the power which a complete control of school and church and press and government could give them, the doctrine of individualism in all its brutal nakedness, the doctrine of the competitive struggle as the religion of modern society, the doctrine of a "nature red in tooth and claw" as the only means of progress, the doctrine of the "survival of the fittest" in a murderous private warfare upon the field of trade,—all this is the doctrine at once of the orthodox teachers of capitalism and the apostles of anarchy. Were we not told from ten thousand platforms in every city and hamlet in this land by the orators speaking for the election of William McKinley that every man had an equal chance for success in this brutal economic fight, that the position which every man held in society was determined by his own exertions, that each individual was the arbiter of his own destiny? Have they not told us over and over again that individual responsibility was the key note of modern social organization? More than that, have they not insisted that their class, and their party, which they themselves personified in William McKinley, was capable of controlling social relations, and determining economic conditions so as to give or take prosperity from the workshops and the multitude of workers of this country? All these are fundamental principles in the philosophy of anarchy.

As the next party to the indictment, the second accessory before the fact and accomplice in the deed, must be placed that other great political party, who with identical logic, op-
posed the election of McKinley, and who, after the election have declared that he was responsible for the formation of trusts and all the abuses that have grown out of them. The spokesmen of this party preached the doctrine that McKinley had it in his power to stop or to continue the process of trade expansion, to set limits to economic development. They declared over and over again through their press that economic conditions were controllable by those in possession of the powers of government, and could find no words strong enough in which to denounce the man whose death they are now foremost in deploiring, whose character they are now loudest in praising. This party especially adopted the anarchist cry for the reversal of economic development and the destruction of organized production. In agreement with their accomplices in the Republican party, the Democratic party refused in any way to permit a transformation of society that would make such horrible outbreaks impossible. They insisted that the poison should be mixed, they demanded that the weapons should be prepared, they helped in the maddening of the brain, but when the natural result followed they hastened to disclaim responsibility.

Because of the conditions fostered and the philosophy preached by these two arch conspirators, as a certain conclusion from the conditions to which they gave assent, there arose a third conspirator,—the doctrinal or the “philosophic” anarchist, with his sympathiser. In this count of the indictment must be included Mayor Harrison, Mrs. Potter Palmer and the philanthro-
pists and social celebrities of this and other cities who extended so cordial a welcome to Kropotkin and others of his kind, and gave every reason to believe that they were accepting the full logic of the premises laid down by their previous political actions.

Finally we have the men and women whose names appear upon the indictment as it is now drawn. That there was much of any closer conspiracy between these individuals than the others we have mentioned I see no reason to believe. At the most they are but the last and logical expression, the final expression, the necessary conclusion of the mighty chain of events and social relations that have been pointed out. But just because they are in the grasp of this mightier force their power for evil reaches far beyond that of the isolated individual.

The only body of men, the only portion of present society, against whom this indictment positively cannot read, the only individuals whose hands are wholly clean of the blood of the Chief Magistrate, the only body that has consistently and constantly fought each and every one of these conspirators, that has denounced them publicly and privately and through its press with all the power that it can wield, is the party which I represent here to-night,—the Socialist Party. Therefore it is that we alone need no excuse at this time. We are the only ones who dare to say that our skirts are wholly clear of any part or parcel in this horrible tragedy.

From the time of Bakunin and Proudhon down to the present time, in every land on the face of
the earth, the only party that has fought the philosophy, denounced the individual representatives, exposed the propaganda, and by every means in its power sought to make anarchy impossible, is the Socialist Party. They alone have always dared to denounce murder, whether it be of ruler or of ruled, whether it be on the throne or in the work-shop, whether by slow starvation or the bullet of the assassin, and they alone can go into the court of equity of the future with clean hands and rest assured of what the verdict will be.
Socialist BOOKS at COST

The cost of a book is inversely proportioned to the number of copies published. Socialist books in America have been relatively expensive, because they have been printed in small editions. To print them in large editions, as well as in the necessary variety, requires capital, and more of it than any socialist publisher can furnish.

To provide this capital, the co-operative publishing house of Charles H. Kerr & Company has been organized. Over 550 individual socialists and 100 Socialist Party locals have subscribed ten dollars each and the money has been used to publish more than a hundred books of scientific socialism, a list of which will be sent to any address on application.

This is only a beginning. More capital is urgently needed to supply the literature that the Socialist Party of America will require for the campaign of 1904, and to answer the millions of inquiries into the aims of our party that the vote of 1904 will call out.

We expect to raise this needed capital by the sale of single shares of stock at ten dollars each to a large number of those who desire to see socialist books published. We do not solicit subscriptions on the ground that it will be a paying investment. No-dividend has ever been paid, and every dollar that can be raised for some years to come will be urgently needed for the printing of more socialist literature. The advantage to the one who buys a share of stock is in the privilege he thereby secures of BUYING SOCIALIST LITERATURE AT COST. A complete catalogue with special prices to stockholders will be mailed to any one requesting it.

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY, Publishers,
56 Fifth Avenue, CHICAGO.
The American Farmer

By A. M. SIMONS.

The aim and object of this book is to bring Socialism to the farmer and the farmer to Socialism, as well as a knowledge of the economics of farming to the Socialists.

An historical review of agriculture by sections is followed by a study of the economics of the subject and the final chapters treat of "The Coming Change."

By far the most valuable contribution to the study of the farming industry in the United States which has yet seen the light.—H. M. Hyndman in London Justice.

Mr. Simons shows a thorough knowledge of his subject and a full command of many authorities.—Boston Transcript.

The book is well worth reading, not only by the farmer, but by everyone interested in or connected with the farmer in business. The chapter upon "The South" is carefully written and impartially intelligent.—Louisville Courier-Journal.

The author goes into his subject in a careful analysis that is bound to interest the lay reader fully as much as the political economist or sociologist.—Oklahoma Farm Journal.

It is well written and the subject is exhaustively handled.—Milwaukee Sentinel.

A book which all who are interested in social phenomena ought to read.—The Public.

Every farmer should buy the book.—Southern Mercury.

"The American Farmer" deals with an intricate problem in a really able manner; it enlarges the field of Socialist activities immeasurably and the writer, both in historical analysis and speculative forecast, has given to the movement a decidedly valuable contribution.—Social Democratic Herald.

The book is worth the reading by any student of Socialism. If you can just get a farmer to read it "you've got him."—Los Angeles Socialist.

Cloth, Fifty Cents, Postpaid.

Charles H. Kerr & Company, 56 Fifth Ave., Chicago.