

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. 12.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., SUNDAY, JANUARY 29, 1899.

WHOLE NO. 200.

THE DISINHERITED.

They cluster at every corner;
They wearily pace the land;
Their starving eyes devour each loaf;
They stretch the begging hand.

They are hungry and sick and tired;
Their bleeding footsteps lag;
My brothers!—and none to help them!
Their nakedness mocked with a rag!

They bake, but others have eaten;
They burn, but others are warm;
They build, but their heads, unsheltered,
Are bare to the pitiless storm.

They till, but the crop goes from them;
They reap, but "The Harvest Home"
Means to them that their product is stolen;
They brew, and taste but the foam.

Ah God!—how sadly they call thee:
If thou wert thou couldst not withstand;
But always the wicked have triumphed:
The cunning and strong hold the land.

The hearts of the mothers are breaking;
The daughters are bedded with shame;
The fathers are brutish with labor;
The thoughts of the sons are a flame.

And Hatred and Arson and Murder,
Like demons they beckon and tempt,
The hand to the sword is outreaching,
Blood! Blood! O can nothing exempt!

O Wisdom be instant and help us!
Quick rearing their radiant crest,
O brothers the sword is a traitor!
The calm thoughtful methods are best.

The way of the wise is the best,
Which thinkers have pondered and planned;
The Gordian Tangles are slipping,
Behold! your release is at hand.
—From "The Red Heart in a White World."

THE MURDERERS.

There are men, fortunately only a few, whose business it is to kill, to persuade others to kill and teach the art of killing. They are dressed in gaudy colored garments after the manner of savages; their sleeves, collars and hats are trimmed with gold lace. They imbue others with an extraordinary amount of respect for themselves, and the more gold ornaments the greater the respect. From the girdle there is suspended a sort of a tool, not unlike a long knife, with which they may cut down all those who have incurred their displeasure. The number of those who do not fear their dislike is, as a matter of course, very small.

But these richly clad and ornamented individuals have not the sole right to kill; there is yet another man, one out of the many millions that compose the nation who shares this privilege to murder with them. He is called the executioner; but, unlike the former, he has not only no standing among the people, but is even held in contempt because he can show neither a fancy uniform or gold trimmings on his dress. The former, on the contrary, are gazed at with astonishment, admired, almost worshiped and envied. Women find them generally attractive, and it is the life's dream of every young girl to marry one of them; and the ambition of every little boy to become that which they are. Hence they are very proud, and plume themselves on their station. They dye their mustaches and indulge in empty phrases. The time which is not devoted to the art of annihilating human beings is employed in drinking liquors and champagne—the reason so many of them die of delirium tremens—or spend their time in mysteriously secluded houses, for in their very language one may easily notice their strong sexual instincts, to gratify which they prefer to use the wives of other men. Besides they are very clever in many other things, for instance in rolling ivory balls over a green table.

Of course it is the people who pay for their uniforms with the gold trimmings, their cigars and implements of murder, their concubines, their drinks and their billiard parties. But the people feel honored for being allowed to support those who enjoy the privilege of

killing them. They themselves say that the highest rank in the nation belongs to them; and the fact is that their origin can be traced back to our savage ancestors, hence their sense of honor is very ticklish; they resemble the wife of Caesar whom it is not prudent to even suspect. Their honor has therefore nothing in common with that of the ordinary man; they are ostensibly as far above him as the sun above the clouds. The majority of the citizens find this quite in-order, too.

To be sure, in the annals it is recorded that the people revolted a hundred years ago and demanded equal rights for all. They were promised this, too; but would it do to subject such independent men as these manslayers to the same laws with the mob? That is why they call all those who do not go about in varicolored suits "such as the workmen, servants and artists." And it is an indisputable fact that all these common people put on a melancholy and submissive countenance before these independent lords, and accept every law or injunction with reverential awe and the utmost servility. Thus it has become an easy task for these uniformed butchers to transform their iniquity into justice and their power into law. But now, wherein lies their power? Why, the devil! it is the power of the huge knife at their side. They have also a peculiar religion whose import is somewhat obscure, but it may safely be inferred that the object of their devotion is a god or more precisely a goddess, to which they have given the beautiful name of "fatherland." They worship it fanatically and will not tolerate the least fun at its expense. They demand that everyone shall believe in and swear eternal allegiance to this goddess, although they cannot tell us what the name "fatherland" really means. But if one would only believe that which one knows or understands, would there be any merit in this? The festivities they arrange for the benefit of their goddess are sometimes called "wholesale murder" or "massacre."

In spite of their splendid outward appearance and their huge knife, these butchers would not have to be feared if such were their only means, for they themselves are only a very small minority compared to the immense mob. But they keep a great number of slaves who will, at a moment's notice, break forth and massacre everyone who comes their way. Every year they take their choice from among the young men and force them into this slavery. They confine them in buildings erected for this purpose, dress them up in gaudy garments, the cut of which being like that of their own, but not fitting so well and already considerably worn and soiled by their former slaves. While taming these "chosen ones" they use the most terrible threats and in order to render the latter more effective they raise their voices to such a pitch that the sound is not unlike the scream of a bird of prey, and finally they do what they please with their slaves. They supply them with food which is in a state of semi-decay, assure them at least several times, that they may consider themselves fortunate for being here, that their mothers are only prostitutes and their fathers idlers and thieves. In the meantime they are taught to kill human beings at the word of command. At the end of several years they send them back to their families, to a great extent afflicted with terrible diseases, at the same time crying out: "Look here: You sent us only ignorant fellows, but we have made heroes of them."

Thus it is that many of the young men, before they are chosen by the manslayers, have no greater desire, than to be made heroes. But when it really has come to this they would gladly go back without an exception. Many of them commit suicide, others resist their tormentors, and are either tortured or killed outright for this. For this reason, the majority rather prefer to obey. Now and then, they are spoken to in this wise: "Butcherboys, listen: the other side of the mountain is inhabited by a peculiar vicious race. Are they at all human beings? It is difficult to believe; besides they speak a language wholly unintelli-

gible to us, but oh horror of horrors! that which we cannot and will not tolerate: they eat sourcroot. [It is well known that the French call Germany the land of sourcroot eaters.] These savages have cast an eye upon your goddess whom they find very tempting and exceedingly beautiful—they are determined to rob you of her. But, luckily, we are here. We shall lead you against these monsters, when the time comes you will kill them and they will try to murder you. But never fear, we will not abandon you, we will stand behind you. For the time being, in order to diligently practice, and prepare yourself for the art of killing, you must, without hesitating, kill your fathers, mothers, brothers or sisters, if we consider it necessary!"

And, just as those with the huge knife at their side wish, it is done. Whenever the people meet and ask for justice the slaves, at the command of those with the huge knife kill their fathers, mothers, brothers or sisters without hesitation—they do it, for they have learned to know the wrath of their masters.

Sometimes these manslayers take their slaves out for a walk; they'll lead them up and down the street, with a music band in front; one of them heads the procession carrying a pole with a varicolored rag attached to it. The people stop and stare bewildered and enraptured at the many different colors, the gold lace and trimmings, the paint and cosmetics. And when the pole with the colored rag, the symbol of their slavery, is born past them,—they take off their hats. —Les Temps Nouveaux, Paris, France.

WHY IS IT SO?

It has frequently been said that women are harder on their own sex for violating the sex code of morality than men are, and the question is asked why is this so?

Mr. Harman, in a recent editorial in Lucifer, hits the nail squarely on the head in his discussion of this often asked question. I will not give his article in full but simply sum up the argument, as I know your readers will appreciate it. In his illustration of the why, Mr. Harman compares men to employers, women to the Labor Unions and those the world calls "fallen" to the "scabs." He says: "Naturally, woman is much more tender hearted and forgiving than is man, but in this matter of sex morality she cannot afford to be merciful; she cannot afford to be underbid. Self-protection compels her to be hard, unforgiving, unrelenting—to the woman in the case, though she easily forgives the man, and why? Is it because man is the employer, the wage payer, and the woman the employed, the wage earner?"

He of course refers to the fact that the law requires that a man support his wife, that a woman can get a divorce for non-support, while a man can get a divorce if she refuses him that for which he is required to support her. He continues: "What men want, what the employer class wants, is not that all women should be virtuous [?] and subscribe to the 'scale'—Oh, no! Their interests, their pleasure requires that there should be plenty of 'scabs' to take the places of the refractory Union women."

How true it is that one part of this slave system fits with every other part, and when will the sex slave and the wage slave learn this one great truth? There is no way out of this muddle except by the total abolition of both.

LOIS WATSHROOKER.

History is the story of hits and misses of the world. The simple and early developments of education are much the same among all peoples. The problems that perplex us to-day were troublesome to the earlier civilizations, and though the principles by which they solved them may seem to differ from ours, we are such slaves to educational aristocracies that anything that will help free us from the bonds of present jealousy and prejudice, though hoary with age, should be eagerly welcomed.—F. E. Whitacker.

FREE SOCIETY.

FORMERLY "THE FIREBRAND."

Published Weekly by Free Society Publishing Co.

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.

In last week's issue, page 1, column 3, line 60, read "interdependent" instead of "independent."

Comrades could greatly help advancing the ideas of freedom by sending us the names and addresses of their conservative friends, whom we will supply with sample copies.

A comrade offers twenty-five cents per copy of the following numbers of *The Firebrand*, Vol. 1: 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 24, 28, 33, 35, 37 and 47. If some of our readers can spare the above numbers they will please communicate with Free Society.

About 30,000 individuals have been murdered, legally strangled and lynched in the United States during the last three years, and yet some men are afraid that people would murder each other if it was not for "law and order." The fact is that laws and governments are the prime causes for murder, for it is government that fosters ignorance, and laws that create inequalities.

"The president of this nation has promised free speech and free press to the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands," says an exchange. "If he keeps this promise (which he will not do), the inhabitants will have something that the other people of the world, and especially the people under the president's immediate administration, do not enjoy." And never will as long as governments exist, I would add.

The dailies begin to coincide with the claim of the Anarchists that men are bound to become conservative when clothed with power. Says a capitalist editor:

Haverhill, Mass., started the new year with a Socialist mayor; and true to his principles he promised, when taking the oath of office, to do all he could to advance the principles of Socialism. It may be that Haverhill's mayor may show to the world that Socialists are not such a bad lot when trusted with important public office.

Of course, Socialist or whatever else a mayor may be, he is bound down by the law, and any departure from the straight line of duty would soon involve him in trouble. The Socialists, like other advanced people, generally go further in speech than they would go in action, and though they may declaim from the platform the division of property or whatever else may be the tenets of men of that class, most of them would become conspicuously conservative when actually clothed with authority.

Haverhill's mayor has a great opportunity, if not to make his opinions popular, at least to remove some of the odium that attaches to Socialist opinions.

According to the Omaha World Herald, stealing from Uncle Sam can now be settled on a business basis. Nobody, though, ought to steal less than \$5,000, an amount which enables a man to pay the fine if he happens to be caught, as can be seen from the following:

Chaplain McIntyre was dishonorably discharged from the navy because he exercised the right of free speech. Captain Carter is dishonorably discharged from the army and fined \$5,000 because he stole hundreds of thousands of dollars. This brings stealing from Uncle Sam down to a financial basis of punishment. It is only \$5,000 worse to steal a half million than it is to speak one's mind. Truly we are a progressive people.

Says the Commonwealth, New York: "A wealthy merchant in Philadelphia gave his daughter a \$50,000 brooch for a birthday present. The same day a poor widow, who had been making shirts for him at 40 cents a dozen, died at her table with a lot of unfinished work around her. Her children were starving."

When it is pointed out to some Anarchists that we are able to free ourselves today from many customs

and so-called morals imposed upon us by orthodoxy, the typical answer is, "We must shape ourselves to surroundings," or "We cannot do it in our present system." But "why not shape surroundings?" asks another comrade, and this is a legitimate question. Our environment will never be changed unless we bring the change about through our actions, i. e., we must swim against the current.

A comrade, who for years has fought the marriage laws, writes thus: "I got married. We thought it better than spending all our force fighting against such odds, and have found by experience we can fight ten times as effectively under cover of the law." According to such logic we must join a church in order to fight religion, uphold the laws in order to defy government and marry legally in order to fight the marriage institution. Even our 13 year old daughter felt disgusted when she read the letter and exclaimed: "Instead of advancing the people are getting worse."

"Zola has been fined again, but he may console himself by the thought that the world of intelligence believes him in both instances to have been punished for telling the truth," says the Examiner. Very well; but what of those who have been punished in this country for the same reason? History will not fail to record that the Chicago Anarchists were murdered by the government for telling the truth.

According to the daily newspapers the profits for the year 1898 of twenty-five monopolies were \$227,250,000, at the head of which stand the Standard Oil Trust with \$100,000,000, the New York gas companies with \$20,000,000, the Federal Steel with \$20,000,000 and the Carnegie Co. with \$10,000,000. The profits of fifty-one millionaires were \$266,500,000, among whom J. D. Rockefeller is noted with \$30,000,000, Cornelius Vanderbilt with \$20,000,000, W. K. Vanderbilt with \$20,000,000, Russell Sage \$15,000,000, etc., The profits of eight big industries were \$1,280,000,000, of which sum the railways of the United States received the title of \$460,000,000, the National and State banks \$300,000,000, the Street Railways \$200,000,000 and the gas companies of New York \$150,000,000, etc. Verily, the Americans can boast of having the most daring and outrageous robbers on the globe. Yet in the face of the above figures a correspondent of the Chicago Record has the audacity to assert that the overstocked labor market is due to the fact that the penniless laborers, coming from Europe, "have been made voters before they earned enough to pay for their first meal." How long will the American workmen swallow such rot?

NOTES.

I hope all our comrades will read the autobiography of Kropotkin, which is now being published in the Atlantic Monthly, beginning December 1898. No other man now living, probably, has been identified to an equal extent with the extreme radical movement culminating in Anarchism, since it began for Russia about the time of the Crimean War. The history of this great upheaval, whose phenomena will engage attention with posterity to a far larger extent than Sadova or Santiago or any other splashing on the surface of bourgeois society, is still so largely unwritten that, though events have been my own special study, and though I may say that in a small way "quorum pars fui," I still feel as if I knew little about it. Kropotkin's narrative begins with radicalism as it vegetated in the fetid atmosphere of aristocratic life, under the hot house of the imperial court. It is an inside account, also, of anecdote, very interesting in style; and is likely to add a place in literature proper to the author's philosophic and reformatory laurels.

There is always meat for rumination in what Kropotkin writes, and his speech on the Eleventh of November suggests quite a new line of thought to me. Why that "contempt for science and reason" that "general return towards metaphysical mysticism which we have witnessed for the last ten years"? Is it not because the bourgeois have found out that science and reason are as inconsistent with their methods as primitive Christianity, represented by a Saint, Simon or a Tolstoi, always was? They must revert to some sheltering in a midway—to the mystery of the Babylonian harlot—in order to avoid being

caught between these stones. But I think that what they lean on is a broken reed. So far as I can judge from a special study of history, "the cancer of jingo and militarism" never infected the proletariat, at least under democratic institutions, to a less extent than it does now. The most serious peril I can see is this, that the champions of reform are rarely quite emancipated from middle class prejudices; and the test appears to me now, as it did ever since I began to work for freedom, emancipation from sexual superstition. If a radical is as free from that as a thoroughly un-bourgeoisized proletariat—there are some such, though, as C. W. C. says, they are much too few—I have no doubt of his finding his way straight along into the coming Anarchistic paradise.

That Anarchism almost daily conquers an entire new province, is surely a most encouraging sign for those who have eyes to see. Several years ago I received a letter from a Southern man who told me that he considered Dixie a field white for the harvest. After reading Ross Wain's *Coming Era*, I have begun to think he was right. It is not surprising. The South has supped full of planter aristocracy, military despotism, carpet-bag democracy, and returning-board oligarchy. If she does not begin to think that every form of government is the worst until another arrives, she is incapable of learning anything. And now comes a thoroughly respectable literary periodical to inform us, with many tears, that all the French young men of letters are Anarchists! Sad, isn't it, how brains and Anarchism go in company? There was a conspicuous lack of those heresy-breeding organs, all got together in one place at Rome not long since.

An appropriate subject for an Anarchist artist just at present, would be our ancient acquaintance Mephistopheles, in various characters—as doctor, preacher, editor, lawyer, statesman, soldier, and last, but not least, philanthropist—something after the design of Death, in Holbein's series, where all robes grace the skeleton equally well. By way of a starter, I suggest Mephistopheles as Judge; and propose for a source of inspiration the Hon. Joseph E. Gary in the Century Magazine for April 1893, or the brief of W. P. Black and Solomon & Zeisler in the Supreme Court of Illinois, March Term, 1887. The reckless absurdity and Jeffries-like servility to the mandates of bloody-minded tyranny, which pervade Judge Gary's dicta, are familiar. But, perhaps because his usual style is extremely verbose and elephantine, no critic, so far as I am aware, has done justice to the playful skips in which these turgid elements, like thunder clouds surcharged with mutual tension, periodically discharge themselves. A somewhat careful reading of publications devoted to the great Anarchist trial has lately taught me the literary merit of Judge Gary's jokes, and the pity it would be if they were left for that maw of Ancient Night which has already swallowed up his law. Here is one of them:

"On the trial it was urged by the defense that the advice to arm was that workmen might resist unlawful attacks of the police and militia. It is enough in reply to such an excuse to say that no instance has ever occurred of calling upon the police or militia during labor troubles to compel anybody to work; always they have been called upon to protect men who wanted to work or property endangered by those who had quitted work." The old problem, to find a definition of humor which, by covering all examples and applying to nothing not humorous, shall prove itself the purified essence if the thing defined, requires no discussion in the presence of his monumental lie, so placidly assumed as the foundation of a theory before people who know its mendacity just as well as the speaker. The Mephistophelean facetiousness must be felt by every reader, no matter whether it can be analyzed or no.

In one part of the Century article, Judge Gary says, apropos to his own principle that murder may be committed by seditious agitation adapted to result in bloodshed, "The case is without precedent. There is no example in the law books of a case of this sort. NO SUCH OCCURRENCE HAS EVER HAPPENED BEFORE IN THE HISTORY OF THE WORLD!" In another part of the same article he says, apropos to the same issue, "The moral of the fable of the Trumpeter 'He that provokes and incites mischief is the doer of it' had not been before questioned for nearly a hundred generations." That the same principle has not been established for a hundred generations and left till the year 1886 without a precedent to establish

it, is just as evident as that, if Mark Twain were born in the seventeenth century he is more than nineteen years old. And, like Mark Twain, Judge Gary may well say to an objector, "You think there's a discrepancy? Well, now, do you know, that had frequently occurred to me!" Judge Gary is not writing for truth or victory any more than Mark Twain. He is writing to show his art. He is performing a comic afterpiece to the tragedy of November 1887; and even if he were a far worse farce actor than he seems to me, his previous success as the heavy villain would ensure the applause of his bourgeois audience.

I have been told, however, that our comrades generally are tired of hearing about Judge Gary. It seems to me a pity; for merit ought to be appreciated even in an enemy, and considered as a sardonic jester Judge Gary, it appears to me, has few equals—no superior. But since this is so, I will quote but one more "jeu d'esprit"—his best. Talesman Walker, who acknowledged having formed and expressed an opinion unfavorable to the prisoners, was creditably loth to take back what he had said. After a very persuasive cross-examination by the court, he still owned that he would be handicapped in his judgment.

Judge Gary: "Well—of course, the more a man feels that he is handicapped, the more he will be guarded against it."

The prevailing opinion of Anarchists that lawyers are deficient in perspicacity, derives much warrant from the fact that Messrs. Black, Salomon & Zeisler, seriously argued against this cruel jest. To denounce its monstrous indecency or to treat it, as I have done, like a coruscation of diabolical fun, in all respects worthy Faust's traveling companion, would have been pertinent; but to expend logic in refuting it established my view that, as a master of irony, Judge Gary has never been properly appreciated. C. L. JAMES.

OUR GLORIOUS CONSTITUTION.

IV

"Insure domestic tranquillity."

The word "domestic" is used in two senses. In one, it refers to family life, and the private affairs of the individual household. In the other signification, it relates to the internal affairs of a nation, as contradistinguished from its foreign relations. While the latter meaning may have been exclusively in the minds of the framers of the Constitution, it will not be amiss to take a cursory view of the effect of a constitutional government on the private and family affairs of its citizens.

The most limited survey is sufficient to determine the fact that "domestic tranquillity" is not the lot of the average family in these United States; and it does not take long to discover that legislation is far from helping matters. From the first institution of governments, they have sought to invade the private affairs of individuals, and invariably with disastrous results. Peace and harmony cannot be "insured" with a club. They are the spontaneous offshoots of natural affection, expending and expressing itself in freedom. Especially is this true of sex life. The monogamic marriage system founded on force, and maintained by law, is the screaming burlesque of the ages. It establishes a model after which nobody patterns, unless it be a few half-starved starvelings. There is probably less polygamy in Utah than in any other State in the Union. The very Congressmen who in defiance of their own avowed principle of representative government, would unseat a Mormon member because he has three wives, would think themselves sorely misused if they were limited to three sexual companions. But of course what is open and above-board is much more shocking than what is "under the rose." The monumental sneaky W. C. P. Breckenridge, was exceedingly fond of prating about "the sanctity of married life."

"Domestic tranquillity" forsooth! Our divorce courts, the last refuge of the lovers in marriage-lottery, tell but a small part of the story. Thousands upon thousands endure everything rather than a public parade of their sufferings. Tens of thousands find married life a hell on earth, without possessing a "legal" cause for divorce. But the rottenness of the marriage system and the stupidity of the monogamic ideal are facts too patent to demand elaborate elucidation. It is simply to be noted that constitutional government in the United States stands for the perpetuation of the conditions which breed all the evils in domestic life. The legislator cannot learn to mind his own business. The idea of the co-existence of sex

freedom and government is but "the baseless fabric of a dream."

But to consider the larger sense of "domestic tranquillity," if the constitution were a success, we should expect to find peace and harmony, combined with a general feeling of security and prosperity. How far is the contrary the case! The columns of our press are filled with reports of preventable disaster, and of crimes resulting from the hatred between classes and individuals. Everybody is complaining; and nobody is contented—except a handful of gulls, and the liars whose business it is to delude the people. Labor wars with capital; wealth sneers at poverty; monopoly waxes fat on the proceeds of unrequited oil; politicians cheat and lie their way into power; preachers thrive on the credulity and cowardice of the masses; desperate men commit desperate deeds of robbery, arson, and murder; honesty is at a discount in every occupation; millions of unemployed tramp the country, praying only for a master who will give them a crust of bread; millions of women sell themselves for a night or a lifetime, that they may not die of starvation.

Who does not see that much is wrong? Yet how many dare probe the subject to the bottom. These are the very evils from which the constitution was to deliver us. Instead of being "the palladium of our liberties," it has proven the balm of our slavery. Yet we bow in servile reverence before the fetishes of the past. The day we will be free, that day we will be free. Government, on the whole the fairest experiment in government which has ever been tried, has proved a miserable failure. Out of its own mouth it stands condemned of incapacity to attain the object for which it was organized. The root-evils of the day draw the very breath of life from legislation and authoritarian institutions. They are so interwoven with the fabric of government that the two must survive or perish together. In compulsory subjection to vested robbery lies the kernel of the industrial question. We shall never have "domestic tranquillity," until we have domestic liberty; nor shall we have liberty, until we arise and take it.

JAMES F. MORTON, JR.

ANARCHY.

I am reading Yeiser's "Labor as Money" (1894), in which I find this quoted as from "one of the most strictly conservative opponents of Socialism in Germany": "There is one thing which will kill the International and only one: satisfaction, contentment of the masses of the people, in securing for them a proportional increase in the enjoyments of the blessings of culture, and the benefits arising from the growth of national productivity."

Queer, isn't it, that some learned "opponent of Socialism" should have discovered that food will cure hunger?

Forty-seven Anarchists on trial at Lyons, France, in 1883, are quoted as saying in their declaration of principles: "We demand for every human being the right and the means of doing that and only that which pleases him without any other limits than natural impossibilities and the wants of neighbors equally respectable."

"Respectable" is it, my friends? But, say I, don't you know that if the "neighbors" have been long enough deprived of these same "rights" they have become degraded, discouraged, ragged, hungry, desperate—and have thus ceased to be "respectable"? What will you demand for them then? A jail, a rope, a judicial sentence? Then you will have ceased to be respectable! To which quotations the author adds: "On behalf of suffering humanity—in the face of desolation and misery—when one third of all the money in the United States is gathered in the banks of three cities, I appeal to the followers of democracy, republicanism or any other doctrine, in the name of God, take some steps to check this inequality and place money at the service of all. Let our government grant these humble requests and the Anarchists will become loyal supporters of such a government, and in time will respect and revere their government and their creator."

How is it, fellow Anarchists, are you ready? Or do you feel as I do, that by the time equality is established and money is at the service of all the people "government" will be no more, freedom having brought about these much desired conditions and that never in "time" or eternity will true Anarchists "severe" either a "government" or a "creator" other than is

inherent in self and humanity.

In these troublous times doctors of society are not wanting each with his pet nostrum to cure the ills that have beset us, and "of making of books there is no end," each with some thought more or less valuable toward the amelioration of our ills.

Yet how few have in thought or expression discarded the government idea! As thousands of good men who in pure generous youth joined the Republican party (then also itself in its pure and generous youth), and still loyal, expect to attain the new reforms necessary through its ineffective corrupted senility, so these writers with eyes still clouded expect through government to obtain the very freedom which governments are sustained to suppress. When will the scales fall from their eyes? Government of man by man, legal tender money, man made laws must be ignored; abolished by boycott and individual co-operative ennoblement and raise the common standard for human life and labor before equality of opportunity can do its beneficent work and "satisfaction" come.

ALBINA L. WASHBURN.

THE "NEW WOMAN."

We hear so much concerning the "new woman;" of what she will do, how she will change the world and what happiness she will bring. Can the "new woman" be found? Do we mean the woman determined to vote? The masculine woman who does everything possible to hide her feminine characteristics and seems to think the more manly she becomes the better she is? No! We want no more of that kind. We want the woman who does everything she can to make herself attractive; who uses every effort to preserve her sweet and pure femininity.

The "new woman" belongs to the "New Ideal;" to the new societary life. She understands her place there and knowing it is an important place she fits herself for it.

She comprehends the fact that to be free she must earn her own living; that she must not be dependent upon any one; that only by her own exertions can she hold her position.

She must understand what she wants and what love means.

She should study her own physiology and should know, if possible, how to prevent conception.

With economic and sexual freedom she is as free as a man, until she becomes a mother, and then her freedom is limited. When she decides to become a mother she will not allow any foolish sentiment to sway her, but will only have the very best man, physically and mentally, for the father of her child.

Being a woman of strong mentality she will have studied the laws governing the breeding of animals and knowing that "like produces like," she will make no mistake in the selection of the male.

It is a mistake that is often made when it is said a "love child" is always best; observation will soon show the fallacy of the assertion, for love has very little to do with the producing of the perfect animal. Knowing this, the "new woman" will not let her emotion corrupt her judgment, but will follow the law of selection. Having done this she will take a time when she is in a perfect condition herself and then take the responsibility and joy of motherhood.

During gestation she will do all in her power to produce perfection; surrounding herself with all the beauties of art, studying nature, living close to nature, drawing health and strength from the fresh air, the bright warm sunshine and the electrical earth, dressing so that every muscle is free. Under these conditions the child must be remarkably free from physical imperfections.

She will study the best authors including the scientific and philosophical writers, thus giving mental strength to the child, also giving it the desire for knowledge. She should not do any severe manual labor during gestation, nor for several months after birth.

A question comes up: How is support for mother and child to be obtained? In a society where perfect freedom existed the question would not be a difficult one, but under the existing system it is a serious one and must be decided and will be decided by the "new woman" before she takes upon herself the responsibility of motherhood.

The mother may not find every quality she desires in her child, but there is absolutely no excuse for the homely, imperfect children we now see. No father or mother, however homely they may be, need have any

but beautiful children. Let them understand the laws governing gestation and the development of the child BEFORE BIRTH and work according to those laws and the result would be beauty in form and feature.

It is not a question of love, but of science, for love has very little to do with organization of children. It is like the nonsensical idea of a god sending children—"a gift from God!" Some seem more like a gift from the devil! A poor old Swede who had a very large family said to a physician, "I wish Gott wouldnt send me no more shildren, but they keep a roomin' and a coomin'." The time is past when we feel sorry for the people who have large families, and the "new woman" will not be burdened with more than she wants, for she will understand how to protect herself—and she will do it.

And the mate for the "new woman?" Ah, he must indeed be a new man! His perfections will be so great, so numerous that we will describe him another time.

ERASTUS LONGMAN.

A LETTER FROM ENGLAND.

"Some people stand so straight that they lean backward." So it is with some people who try to be so fair that they become unfair. Such was the opinion of a number of people here on reading Lucifer of December 3. "Hear All Sides; Then Decide" is self contradictory after telling his readers that he has a statement from the Free Press Defense Committee and one from Mr. Foote, as well as Havelock Ellis—none of which he prints. The editor gives nearly two columns to an article by E. W. Chamberlain which by no twist of logic can be termed anything else than a defense of George Bedborough.

"There is no use thrashing a dead horse," but there is some use in removing a misconception from the minds of the readers of Free Society, many of whom are readers of Lucifer.

The editor of Lucifer says, "we give considerable space to the opinions of others." Yes, all of it favorable to Bedborough, or at best a weak apology. The Committee's manifesto is too long, the editor tells his reader. Well, how about the statements of Havelock Ellis and Mr. Foote, where are they? I am not acquainted with either person, but I'll lay a wager that their combined statements are not as long as E. W. Chamberlain's. Surely, the statements of Ellis and Foote are as good as Chamberlain's. Again the editor says that the manifesto denounced Bedborough bitterly. I have to inform Mr. Harman that that statement is absolutely untrue and as positive proof I forward to our comrades of Free Society a copy of the manifesto. In their summing up the Committee says: "It is unnecessary to reproach Mr. Bedborough; it is enough to say that he was not strong enough for the battle which he must have known he was seeking." That evidently is what the editor of Lucifer calls "bitter denunciation." The fact is that it was not one tenth as strong as it should have been for Bedborough's traitorous conduct.

Every one who has written on this case has had something to say about Bedborough's cowardice. The cowardice is but an incident and one on which he may be excused; but the great point and one which should be emphasized again and again, is that he became an informer and a police agent. This is the truth and I defy Moses Harman or E. W. Chamberlain or anyone else to prove the contrary.

Mr. Chamberlain quotes Mr. Mathews, the prosecuting counsel, who told the judge that Bedborough went to the police and informed them that Dr. de Villiers of the University Press was the real offender, etc., and he quotes Mr. Digby, the lawyer for the defense stated (in Mr. Bedborough's presence): "the overture for a compromise came from the prosecution." You will notice that Mr. Chamberlain puts "in Mr. Bedborough's presence" in brackets. Why? To impress the reader. Now, Mr. Chamberlain, be honest and also put in brackets that Mr. Mathews also made his statement which branded Mr. Bedborough as a police agent to the world in Mr. Bedborough's presence. And seeing that Bedborough allowed himself to be branded as an informer without protesting we must assume that it was true. Mr. Chamberlain cannot see what Mr. Digby would lie for and so assumes Mathews lied.

Let us see who is Mr. Wyatt Digby? He is a lawyer engaged in that virtuous occupation of Company Promoting with Mr. Oswald Dawson. This latter gentleman recommended Mr. Digby to the committee who were fleeced out of \$1850 by this legal satellite, and if Bedborough could have had his way he would have got \$375 more previous to the trial.

A great deal of sympathy has been lavished on Bedborough because he was deserted by Digby at the trial. Well, what did he want with a lawyer anyway? He had fixed it all before hand with the police and knew he would be released on a peace bond.

Mr. Chamberlain calls the members of Scotland Yard "lewd ruffians." Well, Oswald Dawson at the very first meeting after Bedborough's arrest quite seriously moved a vote of thanks to these "lewd ruffians"—the detectives for their kind treatment of Bedborough when they arrested him. John Turner opposed the motion and Dawson was howled down. Lillian Harman was present at that meeting. This is Mr. Oswald Dawson—company promoter, member of the Liberty and Property Defense League, author of "Outcome of Legitimation"—one of the counts that Bedborough pleaded guilty to—father of the Legitimation League and friend of Bedborough and Digby who "deserted" Bedborough.

Mr. Chamberlain, who defends a poor cause, drags in the case of Mrs. Maybrick for comparison. The two cases have nothing in common and the case of the first will not hide the retreat of the second. Mr. Chamberlain is very profuse with his invectives against the police (and here I must heartily agree with him); but if they are "licentious underlings" and "lewd ruffians" what is George Bedborough? In his speech before the court Mr. Mathews, the prosecutor, after telling the judge about the assistance and information Bedborough had given the police, made the following statement: "Now, my lord, the defendant having convinced us of his actual position, and moreover, after his undertaking I am glad to be able to tell your lordship that he is a young man, as your lordship can see, and moreover, he is a young man of very considerable capacity—" Here the judge interrupted with a question.

This article is too long, but I cannot conclude before making these two statements: The traitorous action of Digby and Bedborough in regard to Dr. de Villiers is doubly perfidious when it is known that Bedborough succeeded in getting Dr. de Villiers to contribute \$1000 to the defense upon the statement that Digby would look after his and the University Press's interest. How they looked after his interest can be seen when Bedborough informed the police that Dr. de Villiers was the real culprit and Digby agreed that a warrant should be issued for his arrest to save Bedborough.

I contributed nothing to the defense fund, because I sided up Bedborough and said to Turner, Wittington, Weiss and Barnard, after the first meeting of the committee, that Bedborough would crawfish, and so he did. The English method in cases of this kind is to let things die as quietly as possible but when Bedborough's friends try to galvanize him into public life again, by making misstatements, it is time to protest.

London, Eng.

H. M. KELLY.

P. S.—Since writing the above report the Free Press Defense Committee has held a meeting which was the last that that body will hold. It was held December 22. Upon investigation it was found that Gladys Dawson, the Honorary Treasurer of the Defense Fund, was short in her accounts a little over \$30. She having been previously notified of her arrears and taking no notice of same a vote was passed that she be given one week to pay up, otherwise legal proceedings be taken against her.

Mr. Wyatt Digby, the lawyer, has disappeared and his whereabouts are at present unknown. The Committee, together with the officials of the University Press, have taken action against him and the case will come before the Incorporated Law Society, January 12. Herbert Burrows, Wm. Platt, Henry Seymour, were elected trustees of the balance in hand, which, including the disputed amount with Mrs. Dawson, is about \$400. The money on hand is to be placed in a bank, and cannot be drawn except on the signatures of the trustees. It is to be held in reserve and to be used in case the freedom of speech or press is attacked.

H. M. K.

NEWS ITEMS.

BRAZIL.—The Anarchists, Socialists, Democrats, and many other liberal societies, held a large meeting in St. Paul to commemorate the Chicago Anarchists and comrade P. Mattei. The latter was killed last September for hissing a patriotic parade. Many others were wounded for the same "crime." The Anarchists are persecuted in Brazil just as in Europe, and since the police have been convinced that arrests and all sorts of molestations could not prevent the spread of Anarchist ideas the postal service now refuses to carry Anarchist

papers. The editors of "Risveglio" have published an open letter to the government denouncing such outrageous acts.

ARGENTINE.—In this republic strong efforts are made to suppress Anarchism, but in vain. Although many Anarchists are imprisoned and their photographs taken, it does not in the least decrease the activity of the comrades. Meetings which had been arranged by the Anarchists, Socialists and liberal Republicans to protest against the violence of the Italian government in suppressing the voice of freedom, were prohibited by the police. Pietro Gori, who was lecturing in the university of Buenos Aires on "Evolution of Criminal Sociology," has been prohibited to continue these lectures. But the comrades are trying to secure a hall where Pietro Gori will finish his lectures on this subject to the young students.

FRANCE.—A soldier during a trial for disobeying orders, tore some buttons from his coat and threw them in the face of the colonel—his judge. For that he was sentenced to death. Another soldier committed suicide while he was on his way to be tried for stealing a watch. Such are the beauties of militarism.

The comrades in France are very active in propagating the ideas of Anarchism.

ITALY.—About twelve Anarchists and twenty Socialists were imprisoned in Milan. The Socialist paper Avanti received a telegram from Messina that twenty-six prisoners, all Anarchists, had arrived from the Assab colony (an island of Africa) to be kept for a while in the prison of Messina. The men were in a miserable condition and looked half dead. The reporter was not allowed to speak to the prisoners, but the officer told him that the government probably would bring all the prisoners back to Italy—a few at a time, because the climate was not endurable. They will all die from the cruel treatment of the police and lack of water if they stay there, he added.

Attilio Boccacchi, a priest of Lanciano, threw a bomb into the rector's house. The house was badly damaged but nobody hurt. The priest was arrested, but he was not in the least repentant, and exclaimed he was ready to do so again. "Society" seems to be in danger when priests commence to use bombs against each other, and that is probably the reason why our "great dailies" have said nothing about it. Had the bomb-thrower been an Anarchist, or a rebellious workman, columns would have been filled about the "wild beasts of society."

SWITZERLAND.—This democratic republic continues to expel the Italian Anarchists. Recently a number of them were sent back to Italy where they were outright imprisoned without charge or trial. Is it any wonder that the Italian Anarchists become desperate and revengeful?

JESSIE LEVINSON.

The Letter-Box.

E. E., Pinon, Colo.—The pamphlets "Appeal to the Young" and "Expropriation" were not on hand. Have sent others instead.

S. C., Chicago, Ill.—See "Note and Comment" and you will see that I coincide with your ideas. Pop-pinsky is not on our list.

F. B., Kansas City.—If the colony is started free people will be accepted without means, too, but at present they colonists must know what means the members possess in order to see what they can do.

C. P., Chicago, Ill.—The address of James F. Morton, Jr., is 35 Melrose st., Boston, Mass.

L. B. Ch., Sewickley, Pa.—You'll find one dollar credited to the publication fund of the Speeches and your number on wrapper changed. Thanks for encouraging words.

Wm. H. Thompson, Longston, O. T.—That Lincoln, Judge Edmunds, Judge Daily, Prof. Lockwood, Dr. Peabody, and hosts of others have been Spiritualists is absolutely no proof of the existence of ghosts and spirits. McKinley, professors and doctors are Christians, yet you will not believe that it is sufficient proof that God exists or Jesus was the son of God. To prove that ghosts exist you must demonstrate it as the electrician exhibits the existence of electricity, etc., etc. That "every Spiritualist is perforce an Anarchist" is an absurd assertion. Among the Spiritualists of this city there are Socialists, Christians, Democrats, Republicans and a few who call themselves Anarchists. But I still stand by my challenge: if Spiritualists can demonstrate the existence of ghosts I will devote one issue of Free Society for the task.

RECEIPTS.

Week ending January 21.

Maisel for sold copies of Free Society \$1. Sperling 75c. Favro, Grosheil, Schmidt, Larson, Heyboer, Travaglio, Robinson, Bonoff, Arison, Behrman, Smukler, each 50c. Dorfman Kass, Hermelin, Lewis, Johnoff, Flax, Mardfin, Wolfman, Culler, Ober, each 25c.