

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. 14.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1899.

WHOLE NO. 202

TRUST LIBERTY.

Trust Liberty, Equality,
Sweet parents twain of Harmony.
Their's is the test you must apply,
All binding forms of men to try,
For linking gold of sympathy.
Yea, friend, these lines of life you see
Run straight, nor ever change for aye;—
To right our awkward, awry.
Trust Liberty!

If neighbors, hamlets, thus can be
Rightly related, orderly,—
How shall a people's bond be?—
Fear not!—the light is in your eye,
The morning dawns upon the sea,—
Trust Liberty!
—From "The Red Heart in a White World."

OUR GLORIOUS CONSTITUTION.

VI.

"Promote the General Welfare."

It is easy to generalize. The political orators and writers of America are masters of the art. Political platforms are crowded with vague promises of wholesale benefits to be obtained by placing a given party in power. Yet, when the election is over, we look in vain for a specific realization of these promises. At the outset of the late war with Spain, the most glowing professions of humanitarian spirit were made. This was not to be a war of conquest. Our sole aim was to restore liberty to an oppressed people. Today the statesmen of the country, from Hypocrite McKinley down (or up), are busy explaining that these eloquent words meant nothing. The Cubans cannot be "allowed" to attend to their own affairs for some time, following the Peckensiffian precedent of England in Egypt. Porto Rico is to be seized, without once asking the consent of the inhabitants. As to the Philippines, their fate is to be determined mainly by financial considerations. A little thing like common honesty cannot be suffered to have any weight in the matter. In fact, with relation to public affairs, the American people is a race of liars.

What is "the general welfare"? Manifestly the personal advantage of a handful of individuals cannot be so defined. Nor is it sufficient to apply the term to the whims or even the interest of the bare majority. "The greatest good of the greatest number" is a catchword which may cover the most inconceivable tyranny. "The general welfare" must involve what is for the benefit of all, excluding, at the outside, only those who bar themselves out by becoming invaders of the rights of others, and only to the extent to which they render themselves obnoxious by such invasion.

How does all this comport with majority rule and authoritarian organization, as laid down in the constitution? Clearly the two conceptions are diametrically opposed to each other. The will of the majority is not the general welfare. We have been hounded by a three-card monte game. A tyrannical majority can place as many fetters on our limbs as the most absolute monarch. It is a poor consolation to look forward to a time when we shall come into power, and retaliate with interest. If a man gouges out your eye, you cannot restore it again by slicing off his ear. To prevent the mischief is vastly more satisfactory than to take revenge for it. A single legislative body may enter into a contract in the name of the people, which cannot be terminated at any future time. The monstrous privileges conferred on certain corporations by venal legislatures have been held by the courts to be so firmly vested in those bodies that

only a voluntary surrender can divest them. So we may be constitutionally robbed and enslaved for generations, in consequence of a single act of legislation, passed before we were born. So it must continue until we see the folly of this abdication of individual sovereignty, and understand that "the general welfare" is only attainable through universal freedom.

All this is no matter of mere theory. A simply study of the past history and present condition of the inhabitants of the United States of America will demonstrate conclusively that one hundred years of constitutional government have accomplished but little toward the promotion of the general welfare. The concentration of wealth and power betokens the advancing despotism. The industrial question is approaching nearer and nearer to a bitter crisis. Discomfort, uncertainty, worry, become more manifest on every side. The pauper and criminal classes continue to increase in alarming proportions. In every rank of society, men and women are plunging feverishly into all forms of excitement and dissipation, simply to drown thought. The struggle between the classes and masses is daily becoming more intense. "The general welfare" is completely lost sight of, in the frantic exertions of each individual to save himself from being trampled under foot.

Here, then, we find once more that our constitutional government, tested by its own promises, is "weighed in the balances and found wanting." Why should on effete republic claim any more respect than an effete monarchy? The latter has long since been pronounced a failure by all honest and untrammelled thinkers; and the former is easily proved to be impotent to accomplish its ends. Failing to confer the promised benefits, let it cease to demand loyalty and obedience. Assuming that a rightful contract was ever made, the people as the party injured by its many flagrant breaches, have a right to treat it as terminated. Let us repudiate the irksome domination, and resume our native freedom.

JAMES F. MORTON, JR.

ADDRESS TO THE LORDS OF CREATION.

Ordinary men reiterate, "You must have government; you can't do a thing without it. If you don't have stuffed prophets and a set of men rogues inflated with a sixth sense of their great importance, where'll you be in a short time?" They ridicule the idea of Anarchy. They have an idea that a big gang of governmental blood suckers alone insures the continuity of men and women getting up early in the morning to do their share. Honorable gentlemen like Grier Kidder and other kidders seem to think the pigs won't get their swill nor the cows get milked if we don't have some great moguls to force matters. A government that will develop such benevolent mongrels as Mark Hanna, Grover Cleveland and Czar Reed and establish them in power to steer the political economy machinery, ought to be hoisted higher than the Chicago Masonic Temple. It matters very little whether the exponents of rampageous Christianity or ardent Indulity argue convincingly that Anarchy is the non plus ultra of absurdity and the negation of that which is reasonable.

Despite the profound and powerful reasoning of apologists for government, the hideous fact nevertheless stares them in the face that the classes are arrogantly arrayed against the masses. Mr. Kidder and all other kidders will please note the fact. Triumphant democracy is triumphant and it progresses admirably when the ditch is filled up with carcasses of devilish poor cusses, eh? So be it. Talk about

Gehenna being paved with infantine occiputs. How about the paradise of our multi-millionaires being richly carpeted with the craniums of senile adults? It might be more plainly expressed but we must not offend the canon of good taste nor break the fastidious rules of the fast "400," hence the thin disguise of polished words.

Property owners rejoice of course that our government is able to cope with the millions of tramps, and to keep Coxey's army off the grass. Homeless, friendless wanderers on this globe, not with the brand of Cain, but branded penniless tramps! They bear the semblance of men, but they are jestingly called, "Weary Raggles" or "Dusty Roads." Their coat of arms is a tomato can couchant, a ragged coat rampant for the spectator to regardant, and many other points that are open to the searching winds that blows through their whiskers. Their pleasure by day consists of riding from place to place between freight cars standing upon the shaky jolting bunters.

The best of us folks are creatures of circumstances and the fraternal order of guttersnips depend upon the smile of Dame Fortune no less than we. Knights of the Road while strolling through villages have adopted a new countersign. They saunter up to the blue-coated guardian of peace and give the sign as follows: "H'orificer, I'll smash one o' them ere big show windows if yer don't watch out." Whereat the officer raises a flag of truce, Weary Willie trudges along a willing prisoner with his stalwart companion in arms. His dernier resort, his only hope for shelter from the chilling blasts of a blizzard winter is an overt threat to demolish a \$100 window. That's one way the matter stands. We don't expect to remedy matters, only we thought we'd mention the fact, in a "just-tell-them that-you-saw-me" reminder. Yet there are vain-glorious men who will rise up and declare with a proud swelling crest that our United States government of millionaires is the finest, the most splendid, the sun or moon ever scintillated upon. We must whoop'er up with stuffed ballots bi goeb. Sink or swim! The vile syndicates, trusts, monopolies and other shrewd combinations have got to be tenderly nurtured and protected. They are false industries and the devil fish is a very appropriate coat of arms for them.

According to the middle class, government is a very sensible thing, Anarchy very insensible. In the middle man's eyes the government is a sort of lottery. He perceives its rottenness, etc., but he doesn't wish all the same to be deprived of his one chance in a million of getting the grand bulge over some of the other nicks.

The question before the house of the Lords of Creation is this: "To be rich or to be poor?" Whether 'tis better for a government to dally with money bags and foster the growth of prodigious gold bugs, or stick to its purely democratic pledge: "Of the people, for the people, and by the people." Kingly power was busted long ago and it is time the money power be among the busted. Fifty million tramps and slavish shop keepers open wide your mouths, a few thousand millionaires must be taught a new catatichism. We must remind them that they have crossed the danger line. "Similia similibus curatur." (Like things are cured by like things.)

W. S. ALLEN.

It has been my good fortune to have traveled quite extensively in this country, literally from Maine to California and from Georgia to Vancouver, for I wanted to know what we meant when we said America. And as a result of this experience I have to report a very low standard of intellectual life among the youth of America, a very tepid curiosity regarding the things of the spirit. We are prone at Cambridge and other centers of culture to take too favorable a view of this matter. I think that Cambridge is not the typical of the culture of America any more than Oxford is typical of the culture of England. At both places we are studying high tide.—Prof. C. Hanford Henderson.

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.

Myron Winslow Reed, the well-known reformer, died in Denver on January 30. He was born on July 24, 1836.

An attempt is now being made in this city to cut the salaries of public school teachers and to raise the salaries of the police. And yet there are people who do not believe in the wisdom of governments.

The poor Filipinos are now slaughtered wholesale by the "brave American soldiers" for the awful crime of demanding independence. According to the sensitive language of our newspapers 2,000 Filipinos were "killed" and 20 Americans "murdered" in a late battle.

The New York Journal, in speaking of persecution of Anarchists, comes to the sound conclusion that persecutions are about as apt "to destroy Anarchism" as was the old method to combat Protestantism. This paper admits also that there are very brainy men among the Anarchists. It says:

Reclus, the great French Anarchist, for instance, is a scientist of great ability. Such a brain as that of Kropotkin is far superior to the bloodshot brain of the German Kaiser.

Plain everyday, level-headed justice, with the instinct of self-preservation for a partner, will always be able to take care of Anarchy. Only dangerously vengeful legislation can make Anarchy dangerous.

And, by the way, why is it worse to kill King William for a theory than to kill Bill Jones for his money? Did you ever think about that?

Yes, "plain everyday, level-headed justice" is the proper course to take, but as justice is incompatible with government nothing but absolute freedom in our relations will make Anarchists contented.

The following paragraphs may be of some benefit to our friends, the so-called Individualists, who can never think of freedom without a proviso or an adjective:

Lucifer's readers, as such, have not been greatly afflicted with vicious senseless talk about "equal freedom." But elsewhere there has been great wear and tear of type and a great expenditure of paper and ink in advocacy of this crudity. The man who proposes equal freedom is a slanderer unless he can escape the charge by pleading ignorance of the character of freedom. Equal freedom means an equal length of rope, or it means nothing. Who is to hold the other end of the rope? When equal freedom is proposed the inference is that freedom, with no adjective, is inadmissible.

As slavery is the greatest evil, freedom without restriction is the greatest beneficence. Every man, woman and child, animal, insect and reptile has a right to absolute and unconditional freedom.

It does not require an extra intelligence to see that freedom needs no qualification. During my first lecture trip, forty-three years ago, I said wherever I went: "Freedom is not a lengthened chain, but the breaking of all chains. The freedom of one is the freedom of all. The moment I trespass in the least degree upon the least right of any being, that moment I violate freedom."

The man who advocates "equal freedom," who says, in other words, that we all ought to have an equal length of rope, needs to go to school. He doesn't know the difference between freedom and invasion.

Just before going to press the news reaches us that the authorities in Barre, Vt., have prevented comrade Emma Goldman from holding her last meeting there. The owner of the hall was ordered to keep it locked. So much for the glorious right of free speech in this country.

Congressman Cummings brought a bill before that "devine" body of the people's representatives, amending the law so that the president would not have the power to order out the troops against striking workmen. But congress rejected the bill and the slaughtering of poor workmen has thus been sanctioned by the representatives of the people.

WANTS TO LEARN.

If I understand the principle of Anarchy, it means the abolition of all law, or at least laws made by government. I am, and always was willing to learn, and I am conscious of the abuses existing under our present system, but how a mixed population is to be held in check, so as to cause every one to respect the rights of others, in the absence of all law, is indeed a mystery to me, and I shall be very glad to have it explained, so that I can comprehend its workings. When we come to consider that the universe is governed by law, natural though it be, yet it is nevertheless law. I do not pretend to know the origin of this law, or what keeps it in operation, yet I know that it exists. All men know that it is a law of nature that a sufficient number of degrees of cold will cause water to change to solid ice, and that a sufficient number of degrees of heat will cause it to change to water again. This is only one among thousands that might be cited. (1)

This is only a crude little article, and I hope you will excuse its brevity, or perhaps you will be glad it is no longer than you find it; but before I conclude I want you to answer a question; I do not ask it to puzzle you, and hope you will be able to solve it satisfactorily. The proposition is this: Suppose a number of people, say 50,000 selected as they exist in any State in this Union, with all their mixture of nationalities, and politics, and religion, and their difference of degrees of intelligence, and we will suppose that a new uninhabited country is opened up, and they should all start on a journey to occupy it and settle there, and live in the new country without any recognized leader or head, that every man consider himself the equal of his fellow, how in the name of common sense are all these people, or a greater number, to be caused to occupy the land agreeably to each other, and to live on it and at all times and under all circumstances, to live amicably together, in the absence of all law either written or implied. If you can tell me how this can be done, you will confer a favor on an earnest enquirer. (2)

Phoenixville, Pa.

WM. B. LAIRD.

1—There are yet many people who earnestly believe that society could not get along if it was not for the fear of God and hell. Infidels ridicule this idea, yet it is just as ridiculous to believe that government and laws are indispensable. The fact is, though, that the very beliefs in gods, kings, rulers and laws, is the cause of all the strifes and miseries in society, and the circumstance that people are not in greater warfare with each other is due to the recognition of each other's so-called rights in spite of government. The people with their superstitions and prejudices accomplish nothing; the few cunning and shrewd politicians are uniformly determined to overcome and rule the many, no matter what happens. This is what all government proves to be in the end. It is always the rascal that gets the most assistance from the government. It must not be forgotten that the tendencies of a government and its agents are strictly those of a robber and extortionist. The "officials" are mere parasites; they fatten upon the people and suck their blood; none of them is a producer. Can anyone point out that government has ever prevented a crime? Of course not. With the increase of misery crimes increase, and vice versa. But the State reserves for itself the exclusive privilege of committing crimes. The Bible tells us not to kill; the laws of our government tell us not to kill, and yet the government does not hesitate to slaughter hundreds and thousands at a time, if the occasion seems to render such a step expedient for the gain of our millionaires, as is done now in Manila. And what is the tendency of our education in public schools and colleges? To make willing soldiers, good servants and submissive slaves.

The universe is operated by forces or processes which for convenience generally are called "natural laws," but to compare those forces with man-made laws is an absurdity. It must be evident that, if we are a part of nature, the same force that operates the universe must also manifest itself in society, and the attempt to improve or to interfere with those forces by legislation is to assume that the legislators are more powerful than the forces in the universe. But it is not the depravity or wickedness of men that renders laws necessary: governments are necessary to protect monopoly and all sorts of robbery. Only a few people are aware how little the government really does for the protection or security of its citizens. It does not guarantee that it will keep them from injury, but that it will punish the offender if it succeeds in apprehending

him, and when the culprit is caught and punished, that fact can do little of itself toward alleviating the sufferings of the victim.

2—If 50,000 people, with all their superstitions and prejudices, would settle in "a new country" they would soon be in the same condition they are now in, i. e., if they would establish a government and recognize as a proper thing the monopolization of the resources of that country. But if they would realize that one man is as good as another; that no one has a right to rule over us, that monopoly is nothing but robbery protected by government, and that land and the means of production and the products ought to be free for use to everybody, then they would need no government, because there would be no incentive to rob and kill.

Here is what Prof. I. Wilson says of government: "The fact must never be lost sight of that the right to govern implies everything; it implies absolute control over a man's peace, his person, his property, and his life. That is the power possessed by the State, even in so-called democracies like ours. The State determines a man's course in life, and to a large extent also the number of his days, and, finally, while he lives, it fixes the limit of his sufferings and enjoyments. Properly considered, the subject of a State is the most miserable slave that the imagination can conceive of."

"People are entirely mistaken about the amount of government—that is really needed in civilized life. There are those who imagine that things would promptly go to ruin, if we should happen to have an interregnum and people should be compelled to go along without a government for any considerable time. But did God make any governors? Who are our born masters that are found to be indispensable in this world? Who are the men that we ought to know and recognize on sight as our lawful and natural-born rulers? Show us even one of these God-created and God-chosen beings that can readily be distinguished from ordinary mortals."

"Yet, in this country we continue to flatter ourselves that we at least have representatives. But how far do these men represent us? Do they make any laws just as a thousand other men want them? No, they do not in one single instance—they could not do so if they tried."

"Where the majority rules, or where the party rules, it is the height of nonsense to talk about the people ruling as a body. There never was such a thing; there could be no such thing. When we come to analyze the matter fully, we shall find that one set of men rule another set of men. There can be no other kind of rule—no man, no people rule themselves. With us, the caucus consisting of a few men does the whole business, while a boss, like Senator Platt or Senator Hill, sends out his orders and controls the caucus."

"But these men who are the State, these kings, these conquerors, these leaders, these ministers, who and what are they? Divested of their robes and emblems of office, they are at best mere men, and as often happens, they are very corrupt, very wicked and sometimes very weak men. They are usually selfish men, intriguing people, designing creatures, and unscrupulous and ambitious persons. What just claims can they have upon the homage or adoration of men? By what right shall they demand sacrifices from the people? I am not able to see that they have any right except so far as the homage is rendered or the sacrifices are made by men of their own free will."

"But we cannot have brave men unless we have free men; and we cannot have honest and virtuous men, until we have men who fear neither God nor man. Men who are afraid fail to do what they know they ought to do. A man who is under the law is a slave, and a slave can have no virtues, certainly no virtues of his own. He can never be himself—he must be some other than himself—a sort of fraud or hypocrite, a nondescript, a kind of centaur that is half horse and half human being. How can a man develop himself, fully and naturally, when he is always kept in a strait-jacket and is always under restraint?" A. I.

"AN AMERICAN INTERNAL POLICY."

First: Public ownership of public franchises. The values created by the community should belong to the community. Second: Destruction of criminal trusts. No monopolization of the national resources by lawless private combinations more powerful than the people's Government. Third: A graduated income tax. Every citizen to contribute to the support of the Government according to his means, and not according to his necessities. Fourth: Election of senators by

the people. The Senate, now becoming the private property of corporations and bosses, to be made truly representative, and the State legislatures to be redeemed from recurring scandals. Fifth: National state and municipal improvement of the public school system. As the duties of citizenship are both general and local, every Government, general and local, should do its share toward fitting every individual to perform them.—W. R. Hearst.

The above appeared in Sunday's Examiner under the heading, "Editorial Section: Art, Science, Humor, Literature, Drama."

It is certainly artful, as Hearst knows full well, for under our unscientific medium of exchange Hearst knows that King Gold will not permit such things, as he in his humor proposes. If his literature were used to free Labor from robbery, instead of degrading San Francisco by bonding her, as he is now urging through the Examiner, the Drama might possibly be prevented from turning into tragedy. One good thing can now be said of San Francisco—the sink of corruption,—she is not bonded; and let us see to it that she never shall be.

KINGHORN-JONES.

ON CO-OPERATION.

The announcement in Free Society that some of our comrades are seeking an opportunity to establish another co-operative colony in California, and the fact that I am myself deeply interested not only in co-operative movements in general but more particularly just now in a plan which a few old and tried comrades are endeavoring to inaugurate here, impells me to send a few thoughts on the subject for the benefit of whom it may concern.

It is announced that one comrade is travelling in the state in search of a favorable location for the colony; I am glad to notice that it is to be near a city; the nearer the better chance the colony will have to survive. Usually a spot is chosen far from the markets of the world, away from later day transportation facilities, where land is cheap, which possesses natural resources such as fertility of the soil, etc., but which lacks those other valuable resources which modern civilization has placed where population is the densest. In the proposed location of the new colony this mistake will at least be avoided; I wish I felt as certain that the new venture would as carefully guard against other mistakes common to all co-operative enterprises started on a democratic basis. For it is presumed that the California attempt will, in many of its features, be like other efforts which have been launched with so much hope and confidence, and which have been chiefly instrumental in giving the world examples of misdirected enthusiasm and devotion. In the hope of bettering their condition, and living the ideal life of the Free Communist, a heroic band of radicals will be induced to leave their homes and settle in the new colony. They will willingly, cheerfully endure all the privations and tribulations which may fall to their lot in the new life, in their zeal for the cause and the eagerness to prove the world the social value of their theories. They, being imbued with that spirit of democracy which all radicals love to idealize, will doubtless fashion their simple institutions after the manner of the ideal: all will have a direct voice in the affairs of the colony; the "voice of the people" will be the only law; all will be equally owners and controllers of the property, etc., of the new association. In all this they will but have copied (with possibly some slight modifications) the devoted idealists who have made similar attempts before, and the wrecks of whose well-meant endeavors already strew the country from ocean to ocean. Is it not a little strange that with the experience of Icaria, Topolobampo, Kaweah, Mills' colony in northern Michigan, Hustburg in Tennessee, the recently reported disastrous failure in British Columbia, and other once promising but now defunct concerns, all established on democratic principles—for it is principally these that have proven failures—we have learned so little? We still continue, heroically, hopelessly pretty much in the same old way to try to demonstrate to an incredulous world the multiplied miseries of capitalism and the superiority of a system carried on according to the theories of the idealists. In the same old way; copying the same mistakes; ignoring the lessons of history; ignoring practical methods; paying no heed to human nature as we find it, but ever planning and building upon an impossible foundation of human nature free from greed, free from jealousy and unworthy ambition—in short, on the per-

fect human nature which is our common ideal. Is it not about time we saw the almost inevitable failure of old methods and tried new ones? Should we not use as much common sense in co-operative work as we do about our daily avocations?

In contemplating co-operation, two main facts stand forth prominently and clearly from the mass of theory and sentiment which surrounds the subject; one of these is that co-operation in some form or other is inevitable; this is surely shown by the teachings of history as well as by the progress of economic development. The other important fact is, that with few exceptions, in this country at least, co-operative efforts on a democratic basis have been mostly failures, and that in no instance has any co-operative enterprise, authoritarian, religious or otherwise proven the ideal conception of Socialism Communism, or individual liberty which we have built in our minds. It is useless to point to any of the Communistic colonies now in this country; they are based and carried out on authoritarian ideas. It is equally useless to refer to Ruskin or Equality; not for worlds would I write one disparaging word against either of these two attempts to carry out the Socialist ideal, but these are both in the experimental stage, and if the tongue of rumor can be believed, the seeds of dissention and discord are already bringing forth fruit which may number these with the well-meant but misdirected attempts of the past.

There must be a cause or causes for these repeated failures, and the weakness of still surviving enterprises. If co-operation is right, if co-operation is the coming mode of life, there is no reason why we cannot make it successful now. The causes of non-success are not difficult to find; in fact I have already hinted at them when picturing the line of conduct hitherto followed by co-operators, and (presumably) proposed by the comrades who are about to establish another colony in California. These causes will be found to inhere in the methods employed and the plans of co-operation adopted.

But before pointing out clearly and in detail what these causes are, I wish to refer to some of the features of the present system, which, with all its defects and shortcomings is daily proving by its very existence that it is the fittest to survive—that is, that it is the most complete and perfectly fitted to the needs and desires of the great mass of the people; and with all our condemnation of trusts and monopolies, let us not forget that those huge combinations of capital are also the best adapted to our present economic development, furnishing us on the whole cheaper and better service than any other form of productive enterprise. Now how have the present wealth and power of the country been built up? Has this been accomplished by idealizing the efforts of mankind? Has it been by a course of altruism? Has it been by ignoring self? No, the capitalistic system has been built up and is maintained by usury in its many forms, and by appealing to men's selfish interests; and it is useless, it is idle to suppose that a system can be started in its very midst which can successfully compete with it that ignores and will not use the methods of the capitalistic system, but depends for its success upon those idealistic methods and measures about which all radicals love to theorize. Remember, the question at present under consideration is not the relative justice or morality of two methods. We know that co-operation, that Socialism (in the broad meaning of the term) that Anarchism are right and just; we know that our ideal is the true one and that it will sometime prevail; but let us no longer make the mistake of supposing that we can put this ideal into practical operation and compete successfully with capitalism as long as we persist in ignoring the methods which alone have made the capitalistic system the fittest to survive.

I have often thought that every radical who really and earnestly desires the full fruition and culmination of his hopes, and who will make sacrifices to achieve them, must be to a considerable extent Jesuitical. The end sought, if noble and holy, justifies the means adopted. Bakounin's advice to his followers to leave no stone unturned and no means untried to weaken the enemy's position proves him to have been of this opinion also. If we would fight the capitalistic system with any hope of winning the victory, we must adopt the methods of capitalism; we must fight the enemy with his own weapons. We must fight the devil with fire. It is useless longer for us to batter the strong walls of capitalism with our naked fists and heads. We must undermine the stronghold: pit cunning against cunning, force against force, even adopting

Shylock's determination: "The villainy you teach me I will execute; and it shall go hard but I will better the instruction." Either this, or continue as many of us have in the past to be passive victims of the system which enlaves us; either this or be willing to suffer even martyrdom for the truth's sake.

Now, how can we successfully cope with the present system and achieve the ideal society? Two things—mistakes of past endeavors—must, I believe, be avoided. First, we must no longer separate ourselves from the centers of civilization, from the markets of the world, from that great mass of wealth and source of supplies which we the producers have built up with such infinite pains. Second, we must no longer trust to majority rule or the principles of democratic government in any form, either through direct legislation or the so-called representative system. These are the two principal rocks upon which so many honest endeavors have been wrecked. It seems hard indeed to say that we cannot trust our fellow men. We can trust them in matters of honor, but unfortunately we cannot trust their judgment; at least not yet. The best and wisest measures have been frustrated by submitting the decision to a majority vote; the best plans have been destroyed by the power of a democratic principle. This is so well recognized that even in associations where the majority are supposed to rule, the actual government gradually falls into the hands of a small minority, and often to the advantage of such associations; only in such cases, the majority, knowing that they are entitled to an equal voice, become discontented, jealous and rebellious. Again, we must, for the sake of the cause we are seeking to advance, take advantage of every method used in the capitalistic system. Let us have done with the altruistic foolishness of the past when seeking to found and carry on a business venture. In our fight against capitalism we must use the weapons of capitalism, at the same time so carefully surrounding ourselves as an organization with safeguards as to ward off every possible attempt at rupture by the enemy. Against the capitalistic system all means are justifiable, and our only concern need be to guard ourselves against invasion.

WM. HOLMES.

(To be continued.)

THE WOLVES AND THE BUFFALOES.

For a number of years a few wolves had regularly attacked a large herd of buffaloes, and meeting no resistance the wolves killed as they pleased. So frequent had these attacks become that the oldest buffalo called a meeting of his whole tribe to consider ways and means for their protection. Many and various were the remedies suggested.

The younger and more energetic element favored resistance. "We are fifty to their one; nature has endowed us with considerable strength and we should meet force with force," they claimed.

"Our enemies act in union while we are torn into factions," said another one. "Let us work in harmony; let us first forget our own dissensions, then we may be able to withstand the common foe."

"Diplomacy, statesmanship, is the proper thing," remarked a third one. "We must send some representatives to the wolves and they will arrange matters peaceably to our satisfaction of all."

The last proposal was carried by a large majority and two buffaloes were sent to the camps of the wolves. They were received with marked and special honors. The wolves vied with each other to do them homage; they treated them courteously and the buffaloes were happy.

At the conference an old wolf rose from his seat and made the following remarks: "You are asking us not to kill you. Do you not know that God and Nature have intended you for our food? Have you ever heard of a buffalo herd not being attacked by wolves? To change that you would have to change the nature of the wolf,—and that is impossible. But we recognize that you have some grievance and we are ready to give you justice. For we wolves believe in justice! Up to now you have not been fit to manage your own affairs, we have therefore given you no voice in it, but conditions are changed. We will give you justice; for we wolves believe in justice. Henceforth we shall leave it to you to designate those wolves who shall kill you; you and you alone shall elect them by parliament-

ary methods. We will grant you universal suffrage. By your own votes you shall say who your executioners shall be."

The two delegates listened with astonishment. They could hardly trust their own ears. Were these their enemies? Surely, no buffalo could ask more than the wolves had granted them voluntarily. Since it could not be gained that the wolves must necessarily live on the bodies of the buffaloes, what could be more fair, more just than the proposition of the wolves. Verily, the wolves believe in justice.

Returning home they reported the glorious result of their mission. With the exception of a few grumblers and chronic kickers the herd waxed enthusiastic over their newly acquired rights and the air was rent with the exclamations: "The wolves do believe in justice; really and truly, the wolves are just!"

But the killing of the buffaloes by the wolves continued until the last buffalo was gone.

EUGENE LIMEDORFER.

SUE MOORE'S STORY.

"You remember, my dear friend, that I promised to tell you my history since we were school girls together. A sad one it has been, but, alas, it is like the history of most married women. Tonight as the rain beats against the window and that law case is keeping the men at the office, I will give the promised story."

Mary said, "Do not tell it, dear Sue, if it will make you unhappy. Your coming has brought so much happiness and peace that I do not want to see even the shadow of a cloud."

"But," answered Sue, "I want to tell you what led me from bondage into freedom. Soon after leaving school I met a man in whom I saw all the heroic qualities. To my romantic imagination he was handsome, loving, pure and good. Our courtship was all that I could desire. Surely so attentive a lover, so thoughtful, courteous and kind a lover, would prove an ideal husband. We were married. I, a timid, untaught girl, ignorant of the functions of womanhood, went away on a bridal trip with this man. Mary, I cannot forgive my mother for her terrible mistake in allowing me to sink into that whirlpool of misery! Mothers so modest that they cannot tell their daughters of the dangers as well as pleasures of the sexual relations! Modesty, indeed! It is a crime, and the daughters of such mothers have to endure the penalty."

"In a large hotel, in the midst of strangers this man, my husband, took me. A room with but one bed; but I trusted him and loved him. After retiring, instead of taking me in his arms and soothing my fright, instead of waiting until I became accustomed to my new situation, he insisted upon his right as my husband. I begged and pleaded, 'I am so weary, the excitement and long journey has been so tiresome, let me rest, let us get acquainted.' He laughed at my fears and asserted his right. From that moment love died and my heart crushed to the earth, humiliated beyond the words to describe, I endured what I have found out since hundreds of women have to endure. No sleep, no rest, with dry eyes and a heavy heart that night passed."

"The rest of our wedding journey was much the same, with this exception: I realized that I was a slave and that to protest only added to my misery. I thought I was doomed to slavery, and blindly, humbly submitted. We visited his relatives. Instead of the happy, bright-faced girl they expected to meet they saw a dull-eyed, sad-faced woman, silent from the weight of misery—a constant pain in hip and back told the story. I did not understand the cause, but dimly I felt that he was to blame."

"One evening I was resting on the couch in the room we had been occupying, the door opened quietly and his mother entered. I had loved her from the first time she had taken my hand and pressed it so lovingly with both of hers. She came to me and kneeling beside me, she drew me to her and said, 'My dear child, you are unhappy and suffering; tell me the cause of your trouble, tell your mother.'"

"Oh, I cannot, I cannot, I wish I were dead," I sobbed as the tears rained down my cheeks. She soothed and petted me and was silent until my grief had spent itself and my aching heart had been relieved by the shed tears. A few questions and the whole shameful story was told."

"She sighed as she said, 'I knew it as soon as I saw you, my poor child, it is but a repetition of my own experience. I suffered as you did; I lived long years of misery, hating mankind and loathing myself for being a woman, and when I saw my husband in his coffin, I had no tear to shed, no sorrow in my heart; for I knew that at last death had set me free.'"

"Is there nothing to be done? Must women always suffer? Must I go on and endure this? I will not, I will die first," I passionately exclaimed.

"My poor Sue, you are like a tiny bird in an iron cage. It is worse than useless to beat against the bars, for you but injure your own frail wings; the bars are still there and unbroken. Law, church, religion, custom, all allow it, in fact demand it."

"Then I am a slave in the very worst form, I do not even own my body!"

"No, you are not your own unless freed by death."

"But, mother, why did you not teach your son? Why did you not show to him the terrible consequences of such a course? You surely will not let your daughters go into any such bondage, ignorant and helpless?"

"I can do nothing, it is woman's lot in life," she answered.

"Hopeless and miserable I returned to the city in which we were to make our home. I soon found that maternity was thrust upon me. I did not rejoice, I could not, and I lived in constant dread of giving birth to a girl. It seemed a crime to me to bring another being into the world to suffer. My time of trial came. I had everything money could supply: a trained nurse, a noted physician. After hours of agony, my child was born—a girl—she lived but a few hours, and when they brought her to me for the last look, I kissed the cold lips and the tiny waxen hands and said, 'If there is a God, he has been good to take you away.' The nurse said, 'Poor lady, she is delirious.' The doctor shook his head and looked pityingly at me. I felt that he understood. Three children were born to me in four years—old, faded, sorrowful. I had no charms to keep my husband home, I made no effort to keep him there, for I did not want him. Rumor told of a woman to whom he was very attentive. I felt that it was a disgrace to me and that it was but another burden to bear. Our old family physician had called occasionally and one afternoon asked me to go with him to visit a patient several miles in the country. I went, and he that day opened the gates of heaven to me. In a few plain words he told me that he understood my situation, that it was only one of many. He told me of my husband's love for other women and told me I was equally at liberty. That a man had no right that a woman did not have. I was surprised, aroused from my torpor. I began to think, and to think to some purpose. That night my husband remarked sneeringly, 'You are not so sulky as usual; hope you've come to your senses and will no longer look like a thunder cloud.' I had never replied to his brutal speeches and so astonished him by saying, 'I have been away this afternoon. A buggy ride with Dr. Beldon proved very pleasant.'"

"The demons of hell were loosened. That I, his humble servant, his wife, should go out riding with another man, that his reputation should be so injured, that was a blow he would not endure."

"Madame, I forbid you doing such a thing again. But I did do such a thing again."

"Dr. Beldon was many years my senior, and at first no thought of love came to me. He was kind and thoughtful, not by word or act did he show the tenderness he felt for me. But the awakening came when he told me that he was going to leave the city. My first words betrayed me, for I exclaimed, 'Oh doctor, what shall I do without you?' I knew then what he was to me, and when he said, 'Sue, would you miss me very much, I, an old man?' I acted upon the impulse of my heart, and placing my arms around his neck, I kissed him as I said, 'I cannot live without you, I love you.' At this moment a sneering voice was heard: 'A lovely scene, surely, am sorry to interrupt, but am glad to at last fully understand the situation and to see the beautiful faithfulness of my wife.' Dr. Beldon placing his arm around me drew me close to him and holding me there replied: 'John, I have known you for years, I know many of the secrets of your past life; I know how you have loved Ellen, of the children she has borne you. I know of loves less honorable. I know of your treatment of your wife whom I love very dearly and who loves me.'"

"I cannot give the whole conversation, but my husband, when he found that his life was known so fully,

when he found that I had known all his actions for months, he had but little to say. I asserted my freedom, explained my position and declined to live with him longer. My children were dead; we had nothing to keep us together. A few weeks and Dr. Beldon and I began a life of happiness and peace as I scarcely expected to find, in fact did not know it existed. For two years we lived in what could be called heaven, and then he died. His head on my shoulder, his last thought and words for me."

Sue's sweet voice trembled, but composing herself, she added, "I have been lonely since my friend left me and I wanted to see you, to renew our old friendship, so I came. My friend has been dead a year, it has been a lonely year, but why mourn? He would wish me to be happy could he know, and I am happy in our new life."

Sue still bore the marks of suffering, but love is a great beautifier and she was a very attractive woman. "Where is the man you married?" Mary asked.

"He applied for a divorce and of course obtained it. Then he married the woman he had loved, but they are not happy. She has lost her beauty, and is very unhappy. I am truly sorry for her. They were lovers for years and she always appeared well dressed and charming. They have been married not quite three years and she is a wreck."

"Why is it so?" Mary asked.

"When a man knows he owns the woman he will not make the same effort to please; you do not keep on baiting your hook after you have caught your fish—not for the same fish. The man asserts his rights, the woman yields, suffering and misery results. My ex-husband went to our western home while Dr. Beldon was still with me, and meeting the doctor he was invited to take tea with us. I was called to the telephone and the doctor said: 'Company to tea—your former husband.' Our meeting was embarrassing to both, but I was soon at my ease. He spent the evening and was invited to call again before returning east. He came again and again, and, Mary, he began to love me. Strange as it may seem it is true. We spent one evening alone and a very plain talk we had. I told him of my past unhappiness and misery; explained how and why he caused it; told him the probable reason of Ellen's broken health and consequence quarrelsomeness, and I think he saw the truth or a glimmer of it. There, my friend, you have the outline of my past life and it is the outline of many other lives. I hear the steps and voices of the men; let us hope that we have learned the lesson of the past and are ready for the new life in its fullest sense."

E. LONGMAN.

RECEIPTS.

Week ending February 4.

Eugene Ross, 45. Eugster, Heinze, Huling, each \$1. Herman, 55c. Griffiths, Reed, Dodson, Godefrin, Huss, McKelvie, Minn-wegen, Machacek, each 50c. Locur, Nusbeck, Wenking Erbe, each 25c.

The Letter-Box.

J. A., Waterbury, Conn.—Thanks for new names. They will be supplied with sample copies. The pamphlets have been sent, excepting "Anarchist-Communism" by Peter Kropotkin. We hope to receive some from London soon.

E. S., Boston, Mass.—If the Free Life, in your opinion "is the best paper printed in Europe," your conception of freedom must be very narrow. The editor, in speaking of conscription, says for instance: "The only healthy system is the free system—enlist your men, free to come and free to go, on short notice."

Don't allow barrack life. A free system in which some people can allow and not allow is not my ideal of freedom. Free people will not "enlist on short notice" either, but spontaneously combine and defend themselves when they are invaded. Tucker is a gifted writer, but his "liberty" has too many ifs and buts for me. I want freedom without qualification.

M. S., Kansas City.—You do not believe "in abolishing governments by force, because two wrongs can never make a right," but you are for a change, "for it is conceded that the people of every country have the right to better their political and economical condition by means of revolution." And yet "revolution" can be attained only through treason, conspiracy and rebellion, and so according to your logic three great "wrongs" do make a glorious right, for you will admit that treason, conspiracy and rebellion are capital crimes according to our laws. But we have never advocated force: we simply say freedom will never be given, but must be taken. The ballot implies as much force as the gun. Whether we conceive of a "good government?" No; not any more than we can think of a "good tyrant" or a "good murder."

I. W. Herman, Rockville, Neb.—I will state here that you intend to establish a little colony of Anarchist Communists on your place; that land (prairie) can be bought from \$6 to \$8 per acre, etc. This may induce some people to communicate with you.