

fleets with which nations are accustomed to interchanging courtesies.

Yet there would be no need for organizing a "floating exposition," if we would but open our ports to the foreign products our people wish to buy. Could we import goods freely in exchange for the goods we are so solicitous to export, our merchant marine would revive, and American "floating expositions" in great fleets would reach every continent. Still, the only objection we see to Mr. Austin's suggestion of an organized fleet of this kind is the fact that when our merchants had sold their goods abroad, the American custom house embargo would fine them heavily for the imports they received in exchange for their exports. Why not strengthen his proposition by coupling it with one to abolish the tariff?

Orville T. Bright, county superintendent of schools of Cook county, Ill., complains of the so-called "educational charts" in use in the schools of the country. He says they contain "the greatest lies ever printed." His complaint is just, if the charts are at all like the one which he describes as a sample. "Here is an object lesson," he says, "on a chart supposed to teach commercial arithmetic. It shows the farmer working hard for little money, the mechanic toiling hard for low wages; and opposed to them is a young man with hair parted in the middle selling ribbon over a counter and another young man over his books. The latter two are pictured as enjoying prosperity, the bookkeeper receiving a salary of \$2,400 a year—the greatest lies ever printed." But these charts are only vulgar expressions of the good-natured lies with which the ambitions of our school children are stuffed. Examples of "self-made men," or of "the man and the opportunity," are held up to children and young people generally as indications of what education and industry will enable anyone to accomplish. The fact that these men have merely drawn prizes

in an industrial lottery in which blanks are to prizes as nine to one, together with the fact that the drawing isn't square, is concealed. This view of life is not only false. It demoralizes the individual, and it puts obstacles in the way of such societary reform as might abolish the industrial lottery.

PETER KROPOTKIN, COMMUNIST-ANARCHIST.

One of the natural laws of verbal expression—natural because it takes account of a characteristic of human nature—discourages the use of words which, however accurate their denotations, have misleading connotations. That law is ignored in our country when Peter Kropotkin is described as a "communist-anarchist."

Though this term denotes his philosophy with more exactness than some other term might, its American connotations are confusing. It states what is true, but it suggests what is false. In this country the term "communist" conveys an impression of immorality, derived from a vulgar tradition regarding the Oneida community, as well as an impression of unrestrained ferocity, derived from newspaper and magazine stories of the Paris commune, while the term "anarchy" suggests a deep-dyed conspiracy for the overthrow of government and the destruction of social order. Yet, in fact, the one is an ideal system of cooperation, and the other is the extreme of the Jeffersonian doctrine that that government is best which governs least.

At its worst, communist-anarchism is an iridescent dream, too irrational for realization, and, even if realized, too oppressively lovely for human enjoyment. At its best, as its advocates see it, it is a practicable Utopia, where all would willingly work and freely share, where crime would be disreputable and honor and honesty would reign, where peace would prevail and the lion would lie down with the lamb—where, in a word, the highest possibilities of human brotherhood would come true.

Violent measures for removing governmental obstacles in the way of this realization are indeed advocated

and promoted by some communist-anarchists. Possibly most of them look forward to a bloody climax to the existing order. But violence as a means of effecting revolutions is not peculiar to them. It has been the accompaniment if not the instrument of all the great revolts against established authority in the world's history. The right or wrong of communist-anarchism must not be judged by this non-characteristic incident. It must be determined by the philosophy and ideals of the agitation. Nor should the fact be overlooked that even the force men among communist-anarchists advocate peaceable measures up to the point at which they claim that government invades their rights as individuals. They peaceably refrain from participating in government, proposing resort to violence only when government attempts by violence to compel their participation. To illustrate, they refuse to vote at elections, and while they are left in freedom in this respect, they would make no violent demonstration against voting; but if government should try by violence to compel them to vote, they would justify resort to forcible resistance. That illustration indicates quite fully the scope of the force idea in communist-anarchism.

It is unfortunate that this sociological movement should have been so named as to foster such radically false notions of its character as prevail. But we are not criticising either the name or those who have adopted it. All revolutionary movements are subject to misapprehension, and every conceivable name has possibilities of being misleading, through its vulgar connotations. So far from criticising, we are trying to point out to those whom the connotations of "communist-anarchist" do mislead, the fact, and what we take to be the chief cause, of their error. The principles involved make the mere question of name a matter of trivial importance. To the principles, then, let us turn.

One of the great scientists of our time, a geographer of acknowledged eminence, Peter Kropotkin, appears before the American people as the leading apostle of communist-an-

archism. He is not alone in prominence in this respect, and within the cult he is not preeminent. But as he does represent the cult correctly, and of all its representatives is best known to and understood by the general public, he may fairly be considered as the world's exponent of the communist-anarchist philosophy and ideals.

At first one would take him to be merely an advocate of local self-government, a civic principle which Americans cannot with good grace oppose. True enough, he does denounce the "state," and here is another cause of misunderstanding. It is due to the common use of that term in America to describe the unit of government in the American system. But Kropotkin does not particularly denounce the state of New York or of Illinois or Ohio. What he means by "state" is better conveyed to the American mind by the term "empire"—a centralized government which reaches out with power into the remotest places and regulates the affairs of localities without the consent of the people affected. American democrats, who, before President Cleveland's centralizing precedent, protested against centralization of power in the federal government, were moved by a similar impulse to that which moves Kropotkin. It is powers of government centralized that he intends to condemn, when he denounces the "state."

He does not condemn government. He would abolish the state, but government he would retain. Apparently recognizing society as an organism, as something which while made by mankind is not organized by men but grows in obedience to natural law, he treats government as one of its instruments. But he observes that there are different kinds of government. "State" or imperial government—"a power placed above society," with "a territorial concentration, and a concentration of many functions of the life of society in the hands of a few or even of all," as he says in his lecture on the historic role of the state—is in his opinion bad; but communal government with federated communes is his ideal.

In defense of this ideal he turns

to history. "Throughout the whole history of our civilization," he says in the lecture quoted from above, "two traditions, two opposed tendencies, have been in conflict: the Roman tradition and the popular tradition; the imperial tradition and the federalist tradition; the authoritarian one and the libertarian one. And again, on the eve of the great social revolution, these two traditions stand face to face."

Thus far Kropotkin is not distinguishable from a state rights democrat of the old school in the United States. We do not allude, of course, to the defense of slavery to which state rights democrats were accidentally committed. The resemblance relates to the idea of federated communes. As Kropotkin seems thus far to treat the commune as his governmental unit, so the state rights democrat treated the American state as our governmental unit. And that is the American tradition.

But there is in truth a lesser unit than the state, or province, or kingdom, or whatever in different countries this political division may be called—a unit which the state rights democrat ignored, but which Kropotkin considers. We of this country would distinguish it as the township or the city, and all real believers in self government here now demand that this unit be given full power to govern itself in all matters of local concern. If that were done, and our states and nation were then formed by federations of townships and cities—as our nation is now formed, nominally, by a federation of states—we should realize Kropotkin's theory of a communal federative government.

That is the ideal that gives to communist-anarchism the first half of its name. The other half denotes the non-coercive character of this mode of government. To quote further from the same lecture, Kropotkin says, alluding to the "imperial" and "federalist" currents of history, or, as he also calls them, the "authoritarian" and the "libertarian:"

Between these two currents, always full of life, always battling in humanity—the current of the people and the current of the minorities which thirst for political and religious domination—our choice is made. We again take up the current which led men in the

twelfth century to organize themselves on the basis of a free understanding, of free initiative of the individual, of free federation of those interested.

Here we find the ideal. It is individualism within communism. The participation of each individual in communal and federal action—that is his participation in government—is at all times to depend upon his free consent. It is assumed that this would establish individual liberty, as well as communal government, in respect alike to political concerns and economic interests, and so give to the principle of brotherhood full scope and incentive to develop.

Kropotkin is a sociologist of the inductive or historical school.

Though this school professes to have substituted induction from ascertained facts, for deduction from assumed principles, as its mode of sociological inquiry, that is not in reality its distinguishing characteristic. What it really does is to rely for its conclusions upon induction from vast but necessarily incomplete collections of what purport to be historical facts, and to abandon altogether, not only deduction from self-evident moral truths, but also induction from the large and simple and ever present facts of human nature and human environment. We should not unfairly satirize the historical school of sociology if we said that if they were asked whether a man who had fallen overboard in the lake would try to catch hold of a life preserver if it came within reach, they would disregard one of the best known of human instincts, that of self preservation, and reserve their opinions until they had collected a mass of historical data indicating what men have done under similar circumstances; or that, if they were asked whether theft is a social virtue, they would disregard the self-evident moral principle of right as between man and man, and from historical data conclude that in some countries and epochs theft probably is a social virtue while in some it apparently is not.

Of the usefulness of history for advice and warning there is no room for doubt. Guizot was right when he said that "a people who can

understand and act upon the counsels which God has given it, in the past events of its history, is safe in the most dangerous crises of its fate." History, that is to say, is experience at second hand, and is to a people what personal experience is to an individual. It is full of practical lessons.

But when it is used as the sole basis for moral and economic philosophy, history furnishes anything but a solid foundation. Even when its facts are indisputable, which is seldom so, and even if all the pertinent facts were known, which is never so, it would prove at most no more than that under certain historical conditions certain effects follow certain events. It does not prove that the historical conditions are either good or inevitable, nor indicate what would have happened had good instead of evil conditions given the historical impulse. One should as little expect to ascertain the laws of normal social development exclusively from the history of a society reeking with the abominations of special privilege, as to ascertain the laws of normal physical life exclusively from a case of smallpox. Yet this is what the historical school has done. It has become a school in which logical analyses of conditions have been displaced by loose and almost arbitrary classifications of miscellaneous data.

The essential defects of that method are strikingly illustrated by Kropotkin. His sociological thought is extremely superficial. This is no reflection upon his mental powers. It does not imply that he would not be clean cut and profound if his method were provocative of analytical thought. In mechanics it is possible to arrange a device by means of which a light draught animal can lift a load which an elephant couldn't even budge with a different arrangement of tackle. It is so with modes of thought. A command of logical analysis will give depth to naturally shallow thinkers, when the historical method would make profound ones superficial.

In economic thought this superficiality was exhibited markedly by Kropotkin when he spoke on the 21st at Central Music hall, Chicago.

At one point he attributed the value of the Central Music hall to all mankind; not only to the living and the moderns, but to the dead and the ancients.

Now, the value of the site of that hall may in a sense be said to be caused by vast numbers of people who have had nothing whatever to do with erecting or maintaining the building. For the site value represents the premium which it is worth one's while to pay for the use of that scarce kind of site rather than take up with one for which there is no special demand; and the people of Chicago—not the owner of the site, but the people generally—make that kind of site scarce. But Kropotkin didn't mean the site. He meant the building. And his reason for saying that even men who lived long ago contributed to its erection was the fact that the knowledge without which it could not have been erected has been accumulating through the centuries. He believed, accordingly, that the building ought to be common property.

A little reflection should have admonished him that the contributions of the past to the knowledge of the present do not affect the moral and economic title to their products of those who actually do the work of the present. Though they do not originate all the necessary knowledge, they do have to make that knowledge their own by their own labor and study. They do have to acquire skill in its use by their own effort. And with the knowledge so made their own, and the skill so acquired by themselves, they become competent, as otherwise they could not, to erect buildings. The building in question was, therefore, the product of those whose work drew it forth from the storehouses of nature. And if there is any truth at all in the principle of free trade, each worker was morally and economically competent to transfer his undivided interest in that building to others until the entire title had concentrated in one man, who in turn was likewise competent to trade it to another. If anyone thereby gets what he has not earned, it isn't because the title to the building is bad or incomplete; it is because freedom of production and trade is so restricted by governmental

interference as to have given him an advantage.

Kropotkin's radical error in this matter consists in his confusion of the body of knowledge, no part of which anyone can utilize without by his own labor making it his own, (injuring no one but rather benefiting all by doing so), with the wealth which the individual laborers who have equipped themselves with that knowledge are able to and do produce.

Another instance. Also in his Chicago speech, Kropotkin drew a picture of a communist-anarchist society. It was made up not only of political but also of economic communities in a complete federation, all resting upon individual consent. To indicate the advantage of this society in one respect, he remarked that he would like to own a telescope, but under the existing order could never hope to do so. Then he explained what he would do if we were living in a communist-anarchist society. He would work five hours a day, say, in his own guild, for the necessaries of life; and to get him a telescope he would join the telescope makers' guild and work extra hours there, for probably a year, when the coveted telescope would be his. Involved in this illustration was the idea that everybody should do some work in handicraft. But its main purpose was politico-economic.

Could any conception be more superficial? Could any suggestion from a sociological and economic thinker to a people accustomed to division of labor and trade be more primitive? If Kropotkin worked overtime at his own trade, he could get a better telescope in less time by swapping with regular telescope makers—or, as in practice would be the case, by putting his products upon the general market and buying a telescope. If this cannot be done now—and truly it cannot—the reason is not because we lack a communist-anarchist society, with its arbitrary methods of ascertaining human wants, and its complex design of federated guilds and communities. It is because the imperial kinds of government we have, and of which Kropotkin justly complains, put obstacles between him and the telescope makers so that they

cannot freely trade. What we need to remedy the evil is not what Kropotkin advocates, but free trade in its fullness.

The same neglect of logical analysis, of clearly distinguishing things that are essentially different, which characterizes Kropotkin's economic thought, also distorts his political philosophy. With his eyes fixed upon the history of governments, he overlooks the fact that there are principles of government which history has ignored. Because history has ignored them he also ignores them. Yet the very name of his philosophy is verbally suggestive of the true key to the whole riddle of government.

Communist-anarchism expresses at once the idea of the community and the idea of the individual. And just as the latter half of the term implies that individual concerns should be independent of government, the former half suggests that common concerns necessitate government. That implication and that suggestion, each correlative to the other, are the very truth. It is a truth, too, which, once perceived, makes political history intelligible, and if applied would relieve Kropotkin's whole social philosophy of its confusions.

As applied to individual concerns, the doctrine of anarchy, or no government, is absolutely sound. Neither one person, nor a large minority, nor a majority however great, has the right to govern any mature and sane man in respect of things that concern him individually.

But there are concerns which are common in their nature. The preservation of the peace is a common concern; so is the prevention of the invasion by one person or set of persons of the rights of others, which is, indeed, a part of the peace question; so is the regulation of land tenure; so is the establishment of highways. These are concerns, so to speak, of the commune, and it is for the commune to regulate them.

How shall the commune do that? There is no rational alternative. It must be done by common consent, of course. No person or clique has a divine commission to administer common affairs. But how is common consent to be ascertained? In the

nature of things there is only one way. It must be ascertained by majority vote. To require unanimity regarding communal affairs is to turn over the commune to the rule of the minority, and it may be often of only one person. No aggregation of intelligent individuals would tolerate the despotism which that would involve. But a majority vote furnishes, as a rule, a fair indication of common opinion; and so long as it affects only common affairs and not individual affairs, it cannot even at the worst work substantial harm.

It is not enough, however, to consider only the government of the commune. There are degrees of communal interests, reaching up to the level of what we now understand by international relations. But there would be no difficulty in applying the principle of government here suggested. With the individual as such (that is, in reference to purely individual concerns) wholly outside the coercive operation of all government, the local settlement or commune would be the unit of government, for there would be the point at which common concerns would take their rise. In the line of the principle, whatever affected that settlement exclusively, would be subject exclusively to its control. But wider interests, necessitating federations, would come under the control of all the communes which those wider interests affected. To illustrate with our own familiar political divisions, township government should be absolute in township concerns; county government should have jurisdiction over the larger concerns in which several contiguous townships are involved; state government over the still larger ones; and national government over those that are national or international.

In that principle of classification lies the political truth toward which Kropotkin vaguely reaches out when he rejects the omnipresent and individual-destroying imperial power of the socialist programme, and endeavors to substitute for it a system of no-government, which involves, nevertheless, a communal government of uncertain and not altogether inviting possibilities. Appropriate gov-

ernment for communal affairs on their different levels, and no government for the individual in what concerns him only as an individual, is the communist-anarchism, or communal individualism, which not only deserves acceptance, but is within the possibilities of adoption in this country. The trend toward it is indicated by the growing popularity in various forms, but especially with reference to taxation, of the movement for local self-government.

NEWS

Aguinaldo's address to the Filipinos has been completed and published. It was given out at Manila on the 19th and appeared in the American papers on the 20th. Following is its text:

I believe I am not in error in presuming that the unhappy fate to which my adverse fortune has led me is not a surprise to those who have been familiar with the progress of the war. The lessons taught with a full meaning, and which have recently come to my knowledge, suggest with irresistible force that a complete termination of hostilities and lasting peace are not only desirable, but absolutely essential to the welfare of the Philippine islands.

The Filipinos have never been dismayed at their weakness nor have they faltered in following the path pointed out by their fortitude and courage. The time has come, however, in which they find their advance along this path to be impeded by an irresistible force which, while it restrains them, yet enlightens their minds and opens to them another course, presenting them the cause of peace. This cause has been joyfully embraced by the majority of my fellow-countrymen, who have already united around the glorious sovereign banner of the United States. In this banner they repose their trust and belief that under its protection the Filipino people will attain all those promised liberties which they are beginning to enjoy.

The country has declared unmistakably in favor of peace. So be it. There has been enough blood, enough tears and enough desolation. This wish cannot be ignored by the men still in arms if they are animated by a desire to serve our noble people, which has thus clearly manifested its will. So do I respect this will, now that it is known to me.

After mature deliberation I resolutely proclaim to the world that I cannot refuse to heed the voice of a