

# FREE SOCIETY

ENTERED AT SAN FRANCISCO POSTOFFICE AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER.

AN ADVOCATE OF COMMUNAL LIFE AND INDIVIDUAL SOVEREIGNTY.

NEW SERIES NO. 12.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., SUNDAY, JANUARY 30, 1898.

WHOLE NO. 148.

## HYMN OF THE LIBERATED NATIONS.

Elders of things, divine Equality!  
Wisdom and Love are but the slaves of thee,  
The angels of thy sway, who pour around thee  
Treasures from all the cells of human thought,  
And from the Stars, and from the Ocean brought,  
And the last living heart whose beatings bound thee.  
The powerful and the wise had sought  
Thy coming; thou in light descending  
O'er the wide land which is thine own,  
Like the spring whose breath is blending  
All blasts of fragrance into one,  
Comest upon the paths of men!  
Earth bares her general bosom to thy ken,  
And all her children here in glory meet  
To feed upon thy smiles, and clasp thy sacred feet.  
My brethren, we are free! the plains and mountains,  
The gray sea shore, the forests, and the fountains,  
Are haunts of happiest dwellers; man and woman,  
Their common bondage burst, may freely borrow  
From lawless love a solace for their sorrow!  
For oft we still must weep, since we are human.  
A stormy night's sereneest morn,  
Whose showers are pity's gentle tears,  
Whose clouds are smiles of those that die  
Like infants, without hopes or fears,  
And whose beams are joys that lie  
In blended hearts, now holds dominion:  
The dawn of mind, which, upward on a pinion  
Borne, swift as sunrise, far illumines space,  
And clasps this barren world in its own bright embrace!  
My brethren, we are free! the fruits are glowing  
Beneath the stars, and the night winds are flowing  
O'er the ripe corn, the birds and beasts are dreaming—  
Never again may blood of bird or beast  
Stain with its venomous stream a human feast,  
To the pure skies in accusation steaming;  
Aveing poisons shall have ceased  
To feed disease and fear and madness,  
The dwellers of the earth and air  
Shall throng around our steps in gladness,  
Seeking their food or refuge there.  
Our toil from thought all glorious forms shall call,  
To make this earth, our home, more beautiful,  
And Science, and her sister Poesy,  
Shall clothe in light the fields and cities of the free!  
Victory, Victory to the prostrate nations!  
Bear witness, Night, and ye mute Constellations  
Who gaze on us from your crystalline cars!  
Thoughts have gone forth whose powers can sleep no more!  
Victory! Victory! Earth's remotest shore,  
Regions which groan beneath the Antarctic stars,  
The green lands cradled in the roar  
Of Western waves, and wildernesses  
Peopled and vast, which skirt the oceans  
Where morning dyes her golden tresses,  
Shall soon partake our high emotions:  
Kings shall turn pale! Almighty Fear,  
The Fiend-God, when our charmed name he hear,  
Shall fade like shadow from his thousand fanes,  
While Truth with Joy enthroned o'er his lost empire  
reigns.  
—Percy Bysshe Shelley.

## GOD AND GRUNDY.

Anyone reading the bible carefully cannot fail to see that the "God" of that book is but one of many gods, for he acknowledges that he is jealous, not of the children he has created (?) but of other gods; the first commandment, the first of the ten so well known, says, "Thou shalt have no other gods BEFORE me," thus showing that the god of the bible acknowledged that he was not the only god. Any student of the "gude book besitten to every occasion," as the Scotch woman said, knows that every passion of humanity this god also possessed. That he was not pure, is well known from the counsels given to priest and Levite. If I quoted said counsels FREE SOCIETY would probably be suppressed for obscenity. That he was not all wise nor all powerful is acknowledged in the so-called "word of God," for it says, "And the Lord was with Judah and he drove out the inhabitants of the mountain, but could not drive out the inhabitants of the valley; BECAUSE THEY HAD CHARIOTS OF IRON." And yet to this one of many gods, this jealous, hating, impure, powerless god, costly temples are reared, prayers are made, and children are taught to

love and fear him. Paradoxical terms—love and fear! When will humanity learn that man is a prayer-answering god; that he contains the divinity within himself; that he himself is god? The creed-bound who will not hear the word "evolution," who claim to believe that man was created full-grown and that Eve was made from one of his ribs, and that they were made in the image of God should read what "Freedom" says, i. e., "I would rather grow away from the monkey than to have been made in the image of God and then been flattened out into man." When will humanity learn to think? The women especially; they keep up the churches; they still bow the knee to the ancient deity. They stop the wheels of the car of progress by their prayers, their tears, by their training their daughters and sons; to be married, to have a home and a husband is the highest aim in life for the daughter, and this is true of both rich and poor. It is a common occurrence here to hear a woman say "I won't have Lucifer in my house." Another woman, the mother of a well-developed young girl, said "I do not dare to let — see Lucifer. I do not know where it would lead her." I tried to get her to understand that such lessons as were taught by that paper were the only safeguards for girls and boys, but it really "makes me tired" to try to "start the wheels" in the almost empty brains. Oh, Grundy, Grundy, "how many times are committed in thy name!" Granny Grundy says nature is all wrong; every act not sanctioned by the priest or preacher, is nasty. The wife who has promised to love, honor and obey till "death do part" often does not know the meaning of love and very often knows she cannot honor the man by her side, but she does know that obedience in sexual affairs will at least bring peace. There they stand, a perjured pair, and Granny Grundy smiles, even if it be a beautiful young girl united to an old bearded rake, and says "God bless you, my children; you have obeyed the law and God Almighty." Is there anything more humiliating, more degrading to a woman than the slavery she takes upon herself? Love, the sweetest, purest, holiest sentiment which can fill the human heart, is dragged into the foul mire of orthodox filth. Free thought, free love, does not everyone know that they are free; that they come and go as they please; that love cannot be bound? Anyone who understands anything of nature's laws knows that it is but the natural law of attraction and that all the man-made laws of the universe cannot compel you to love. The fear of the law or the fear of Grundy may induce us to repress the expression of that love BUT IT IS THERE JUST THE SAME.

As to monogamy, variety, promiscuity, what's the odds? If you are true Anarchists you will let each be a "law unto himself." In such matters would it not be wise to stop arguing over the "mint, anise and cummin" and attend to the "weightier matters of the law." Freedom to think as we please; freedom to MIND OUR OWN BUSINESS, would be glorious! FREE SOCIETY, do all you can to speed the day.  
NELLIE M. JERAULD.  
Hustburg, Tenn.

## MORALITY IS SAVED!

The adherents and followers of Anthony Comstock, the latter-day Puritans, have gained another victory; the publishers of the Firebrand have been found guilty. There is joy in the camp of the philistines, the morals of the inhabitants of these

United States have been protected by the suppression of the obnoxious journal. The virtue of our mothers and wives, the innocence of our maidens will not be contaminated any more by the vile articles appearing in the columns of this Anarchist sheet; the offenders will meet their just reward. All hail to Anthony Comstock and his disciples!

What boots it that this is supposed to be a free country; that the right of free speech and a free press is guaranteed by the constitution, when the sacred institution of marriage is attacked, when women are advised to escape the curse laid upon them in the garden of Eden by the great Jehova, to bear children in pain? What boots it that these men and women, guilty by an intelligent (!) jury, tried to escape the stigma of woman from that of a slave to that of a free person who should not be bound by the laws and customs handed down to us from hoary antiquity?

Slavery has been abolished, and with it many a point to the part they have taken in the war for its overthrow, but the slavery of marriage must last forever, to agitate for its abolition is a crime which cannot go unpunished. Owen Lovejoy was murdered by a fanatical mob in Alton, Ill., for publishing a paper in the interest of the freedom of the negro slave; a monument has been lately erected in that very town to commemorate the life and deed of this brave man, while those who have taken part in his murder are ostracised from the town and the jury who found our comrades guilty will also go down to their graves branded as the servile tools and lickspittles of the powers that try in vain to stop the progress of the world. The God-in-the-constitution party, the priests who feared to lose their marriage fees, the religionists of all creeds are rejoicing in their hearts. What is history to them but a book with seven seals never to be opened; what is the past experience of mankind to them but as something not to be considered, when there is an opportunity to squelch these Anarchists.

Four million of men are out of employment in this land alone; women and children die for want of food and shelter; the penal institutions are full of people whom our present society has forced into an infringement of its laws.

Our insane asylums are full to overflowing with people who have lost their reason in this heartless struggle for bread, suicides are increasing from day to day, but to lay bare the causes which produced all these evil results, to openly agitate for the removal of the origin of all these crimes, that is criminal in the land of the free and the home of the brave. So be it! But a future age will scan carefully the pages of the past and with scorn the historian will point to those who have taken a part in this villainous deed.  
CHAS. DOERING.

## THE RELATION OF LABOR AND CAPITAL.

From "The Examiner," Jan. 8, '98, under "Single Tax."

One of the chief difficulties between capital and labor is that their relations are improperly adjusted. Though dependent, they are, and have long been, more or less antagonistic. The cause of this antagonism lies more in the respective developments than in their essential natures. (1)

Capital has developed rapidly; labor is undeveloped. The former is strongly organized in every regard; the latter nearly completely unorganized. Organization means power, activity and good results. Disorganization implies the reverse.

With capital there is working together, i. e. co-operation; with labor it is endless underbidding of man against man, i. e. competition.

Labor is but another term for the race; its constant increase means the gradual reduction of a man's work value. This reduction is accelerated by the continually augmenting consolidation of capital.

Each new pool and syndicate is a milestone in the history of lower wages and consequent pauperism, under the present system of taxation.

What autocracy effected in long gone years is now accomplished by corporations, pools and syndicates.

The fellah of Egypt, the ryot of India, is reproduced in the laborer of the nineteenth century. In our own land immigration aids natural increase in bringing about these results. (2)

A good remedy to the present evil is that the work and the workman should no longer be dissociated. The producer should be directly interested in the product. This change can only result from action of the worker. To adapt themselves to the requirements of the age they must do what capital has done—namely, combine. It should have one basis—mutual helpfulness; and one end—personal amelioration. Thus a system of industrial co-operation could be instituted. Humanity has always instinctively associated together. Marriage, with home life and rearing a family, is the earliest form of human co-operation known to us.

Such are the natural forms of human association, and the sentiments and principles underlying them are natural principles which give them life, value and permanence.

"Am I my brother's keeper?" was Cain's answer to the inquiry for his murdered brother. "Am I my brother's keeper?" is ever the answer of the egotist to the inquiry for anyone's welfare.

Selfishness is his aspiration. It prompts cheating, robbery and knavery of all kinds. Slavery was its offspring, as is all oppression, and these react in treachery, falsehood, idleness, shiftlessness, and general demoralization. To slave labor succeeded wage labor, bought at the lowest market price, with incidents resembling those of slavery. Scant wages result in scant living, and poor service, poor pay in poor work. The action, reaction and interaction of wrong are more wrongs. Like produces like in the moral as in the physical world. Capital, at first the product of labor, has by the present system come to oppress labor, which should be its master, as indeed it might be, were it as wisely directed as is capital. What would capital be without labor? When Phillip drove the industrial classes out of Spain he struck a blow at his country's prosperity from which it has never recovered. (3)

When the children of Israel left in a body their Egyptian taskmasters it caused such an industrial panic that an army was sent to bring them back.

Labor may do without capital, as it can always produce it, but capital is worthless without labor. Labor is constantly increasing in knowledge and power. But laborers hesitate in consolidating into organizations for mutual helpfulness. This is their weakness. Capital knows this, and so long as they remain purely wage laborers the workers will be in a servile position. (4)

Equitable co-operation, such as the single tax would foster, would place the workers in their natural relation with each other and upon a basis of true manliness. Their brains would work with their hands in using their own or borrowed capital, and they would be its master and not its slave. (5)

RICHARD CAVERLY.

#### COMMENT.

1.—Friend Caverly is usually a very logical reasoner, and if he had accepted George's definition of wealth, or capital, he could not have penned this sentence. If George truly says, "much that commonly passes as wealth must really be only legalized robbery, and nothing can be more offensive to those enjoying the profit of robbery than to call it by its true name."

2.—All these facts are only possible through the dishonest medium of exchange, designed for one purpose only and that to rob Labor.

3.—The only remedy for all the evils named and the only peaceful way to regain one's birth-right—the land—is for Labor to unite in using their own honest medium of exchange, which will stop the creation of capitalists.

4.—Through the wicked money system Labor is not allowed any time to think of anything but satisfying the claims of his stomach, the law not allowing him even to do this unless he has first worked for the landlord and landlord.

5.—Those in control of the finance system of the world will never allow the restoration of the land to the people for use, except by actual compulsion; they know their power and they know that every greenback retired, and every tax imposed makes it still more difficult for starving men to co-operate. The point of concentration of all reformers is on a medium of exchange by which they cannot be robbed of the result of their labor. No freedom can be gained unless free exchange of labor is first gained.

J. ALFRED KINGHORN-JONES.

#### OBSERVATIONS.

Here are two newspaper clippings:

"A notorious blackmailer," Dr. Montague R. Leverson admitted having called Anthony Comstock, of the Society for the Suppression of Vice, and a jury in the United States circuit court yesterday decided that Comstock's reputation and character had been damaged to the extent of six cents. This verdict does not entitle him to costs. He had sued for \$50,000 damages for defamation of character. Counsel for the defense said that Dr. Leverson at the time believed and still believes Comstock was a blackmailer, and asserted that Comstock had sought to provoke the aged physician into making some statement that would furnish grounds for a suit. He recited the fact that Dr. Leverson had stood up in a railroad station and said: "Ladies and gentlemen, this man is Anthony Comstock, a notorious blackmailer, who never earned an honest dollar in his life."

The suit was the outcome of a wordy wrangle which started in the senate chamber and was continued at the railroad station in Albany on Feb. 19, 1896. Dr. Leverson said at the latter place Comstock called him "a liar, vilifier and old scoundrel."

#### COMSTOCK AGAIN DEFEATED.

The court of special sessions, New York, acquitted today Meyer Chinskey, a book seller, of 19 Ludlow street, against whom Anthony Comstock had brought a charge of selling an immoral book. The work in question was a Hebrew book and translations were presented both by complainant and defendant.

The above gives the news of the two latest slaps in the face received by Comstock. Of course, his jaws, like the Rev. Parkhurst's, are copper-fastened. The upper stories of both are impenetrable to any sense of honor or decency. It is, however, pleasant to know that very many conservative men and women detest the methods of Comstockism and of Parkhurstism and feel a loathing as regards the personalities of the two spies.

And so "our glorious colonel," as the editor of Truth-seeker calls Ingersoll, has joined the vast horde of liars—ignorant and otherwise—as to Anarchism and Anarchists. However, the colonel had already utterly disgraced himself (in my opinion) by his meddling in the political arena in Illinois, when and where he did all he could to prevent the re-election of John P. Altgeld. Colonel Ingersoll has no excuse for his utterances as to Anarchists—he is not ignorant and must know that he lies.

I am inclined to think that there is no safe halting place between the radically extreme and the conservative.

What a pity it is, indeed, that Ingersoll is not an honest man. Not that he is not an Anarchist or Individualist or all-around radical, but that he should descend to meanest falsehood. It would have shown more consistency on his part to have left lying to priest and clergyman, professor and editor.

Here is one more clipping, from Lucifer this time:

"Two Chicago ministers affirm that Colonel Ingersoll is insane—morally insane at that! 'Tis the unkindest cut of all. Following hard upon the heels of the genial and misguided colonel's expressed agreement with the clergy that all Anarchists are crazy and should be incarcerated in madhouses, the cruel utterance of these Chicago dominies smacks of the basest treachery. Oh, ingratitude, thy cognomen is preacher! And how they pile it on!

"A man may be a mental giant and yet be a moral idiot—utterly incapable of moral distinctions, especially in the higher realm of worship, and duty to God. His mouthings are the mouthings of a madman, whose malignant hatred of everything sacred is proof positive of his moral dementia and spiritual insanity."

"These are awful things to say of an ally in the war for the salvation of society. Why, they are quite as severe and fully as untrue as Mr. Ingersoll's assertions concerning the mental condition of his fellow Infidels, the Anarchists. W."

I suspicion the above is by E. C. Walker—quite aside from the "W." It reads plausibly and wittily at first sight, but it is not sound. I am on the side of the "two Chicago ministers"—as they best know their own kind and should recognize insanity and mental depravity with unerring certainty. I do not think they are "as untrue" as Ingersoll is in his "assertions concerning the mental condition of his fellow Infidels, the Anarchists." And their having been able to tell the truth for once is no more strange than Ingersoll's shameful lying. Think it over.

CLINTON LOVERIDGE.

#### SOLD ON THE HOOF!

That pauper bodies are regularly sold from the morgues of our poorhouses is a well-known fact, but now it seems that they are picked out by the purchasers before death. In the Chicago Times-Herald of Jan. 9, appear the following questions:

"Are inmates of the county institution at Dunning offered for sale to medical colleges like cattle and then slaughtered for use in the dissecting-room—if a buyer is found?

"Is there one ward in the asylum known as the 'killer' ward, where desirable candidates for dissection are put so that they can be allowed to disappear—'wander off' or 'escape,' as the records read?

"Is anybody's kinsman who happens to be the ward of Cook county because of infirmities likely to be murdered for the price which an official at Dunning can obtain for his carcass?"

It seems that a certain Dr. Smith, of Kentucky, bought four stiffs for \$210 cash down to be used in his dissecting class. The bodies were taken in the night and by mistake the corpse of a lunatic named Humpel was packed up with the others. Mrs. Humpel made inquiries about her husband and this led to the exposure of the whole business. At first blame was laid on the night watchman, then upon Dr. Smith, who paid for the bodies. A warrant was made out for Smith for stealing four sheets, the property of Cook county, but he could not be extradited. Dr. Smith rejoined by publishing in the Times-Herald facts about buying bodies on the hoof and that has literally torn up the town. He states that he was offered live paupers for dissecting at \$50 each by the officials in charge of the dead house and the killer ward.

It must be clearly understood that the Dunning Poor House and Lunatic Asylum is essentially a typical socialistic institution, where everything is worked exactly on the Bellamy lines. All eat together, all dress alike, all go to sleep and rise at the same hour, and, if there is a demand for corpses, they get killed off and sold to the highest bidder—to the college physicians, in another State institution.

How will it be when all things are organized upon this delightful basis? Heaven on earth will then be here for sure!

W.

#### ANTHONY'S TROUBLES.

The vice suppressor came to grief the past week in Judge Lacombe's court, New York City. Anthony Comstock had sued one Dr. Leverson for \$50,000 damages for slander, the offense being the statement to a crowd, "Gentlemen, this is Anthony Comstock, a notorious blackmailer, who never earned an honest dollar in his life." Able counsels were on both sides. Dr. Leverson maintained his honest belief in the truth of his statement. Comstock under the skillful cross questioning of Mr. Pierce lost his temper, his face be-



coming the color of a boiled lobster as he wiped the perspiration from it. The defense confined itself to the plaintiff and his witnesses.

In the closing address Mr. Pierce roundly scored the portly Comstock. "This man," he said, "has a morbid desire to get somebody into jail, he jumps at a prospective prisoner as does a dog at a rat, he dreams of arrests at night. It's his business and it grows on him. He had goaded Dr. Levenson into giving his honest opinion of him, his manner was menacing. Look at him going up to this little old man, Comstock with 200 pounds of flesh, nearly six feet tall and hands as large as soup plates. Knowing the statements that Dr. Levenson had made before the committee were privileged, he purposely forced him into an expression outside, which should give him a chance to arrest him and then again obtain notoriety, and perhaps cash."

The jury gave a verdict of six cents damages and left Comstock to pay the cost of suit.

Close following on this comes the announcement of a pamphlet, written and published by another of Comstock's victims, entitled "Life of Anthony Comstock, the Penny Reformer." Shall we be entertained by another slander suit? Time will tell. J. A. W.

Philadelphia, Jan. 10, '98.

## NEWS FROM EVERYWHERE.

### FRANCE.

The Dreyfus affair now attracts more public attention than at any previous time. It has become at the present time the highest pitch of the national and international question, as well as to the question of keeping up the regular army or to do away with militarism altogether. It is a well-known fact to us radicals, acquainted with the French political parties, that the so-called Republicans in France are nothing else but lovers of despotism—the proof of it are the festivities in Toulon, Marseilles, Paris and Havre in honor of the most contemptible despot, the czar of Russia, crusher of all known liberty-loving people. All these modern representatives of "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity," which inscriptions they have in big letters on all the public buildings, are nothing but a gang of scoundrels and hypocrites, whose hearts are only filled with the desire to establish Russian despotism at home, as they are training the young generation in a desperate way to that effect. This is another reason why the pope in Rome delights so much in Republicanism, as then the Jesuits are again masters in the schools through their methods of hypocritical charity. And look at the international ambassadors, councils, military attaches, etc., who are performing only the duty of spongers and loafers at the expense of the people, bargaining in everything, provided they can get decorations or some money for it. Now, then, the Anarchists reason this way: If Dreyfus sold fortification plans to the German government he is no better or no worse than the rulers of the government, who are nothing else but lackeys to the czar of Russia, as they turned billions of francs over to the despot to keep up the tyranny in the eastern hemisphere. The Anarchists contend if Dreyfus is guilty, the leaders of the French government are guilty of treason as well, and all of them ought to go and join Dreyfus to keep him company in his banishment.

These are reasons, in my opinion, for the fight in Tivoli Vauxhall last week: Government suckers and Jesuitic proteges started the meeting with the object of inciting hatred and ill feeling against the Jews, who are practically innocent or unconcerned in this affair. The Anarchists saw the desire of black and decaying consciences, which are after blood, to wash themselves under the guise of patriotism and they went to the meeting and imposed, with violence, the new ideas on international brotherhood.

### ITALY.

Bread rioting is the order of the day in the sunny land. Amona, Senigaglia, Maleota, Forli and other small localities in the lower plain of the Po could witness how the hungry can be fed on lead instead of bread. The police were unable to protect bakeries and groceries until they were re-enforced by the regular troops, cavalry and infantry. Law, order and hunger are re-established! For how long?

### BOHEMIA.

In spite of martial law, the watchfulness and severity of the wholesale robber firm, F. J. I. & Co. (Franz Joseph I and his partners), some bold youths succeeded in expropriating the private residence of the manager of the Vienna Banking association. The Czechs decidedly understand properly the revolutionary condition in which they are placed: Good luck and progress. A. K.

## NOTE AND COMMENT.

There has been some "kicking" done by old comrades because we moved to this city and reissued the Firebrand under a new name, and they tell us that it showed cowardice on our part to leave Portland, "as the authorities could not stop you from mailing the paper," and that the "defense fund" ought to have been utilized solely for our defense. If some faithful citizen, who believes in the justice of law and juries, had made such ingenious remarks I would not have been surprised, but when comrades, who have had some experience with law and government, tell us that "they could not suppress the Firebrand" I am astonished. They do just as they please, comrades, and don't give a snap what the law says about it. If it had not been for a fair-minded judge we all—Pope, Addis and myself—would be in the penitentiary by this time, as we had no legal ground for a new trial. If the jury finds the articles obscene, and the prosecution can prove that we mailed them, that settles the "hash." And we were told by the authorities that the Firebrand would not go through the mail, and when we wrote to the postmaster general and received no reply we thought it best to leave.

As to the second charge, regarding the "defense fund," I will say that those on trial refused to fee the lawyers with the money that our poor comrades had sent in, and I think everybody who has the propaganda at heart should be glad that the greatest portion of the money was utilized for propaganda purposes. Some comrades wrote us that we had wasted too much time in reviving the paper, and so you see that it is a hard matter to please everybody.

At present I feel as though I am "no good for anything." The jury, 12 intelligent (?) men, thought I ought to be in the penitentiary. J. A. Gillie tells us that tobacco, whiskey and beer "deprives us of our brain," etc., and F. A. C. assures the readers that he will ignore my "foolish talk." It makes me feel "sore all over." But there is some consolation in the fact for me that I consider the jurors "dummy heads," that Mrs. Gillie don't always practice what she preaches, and that F. A. C. has not yet monopolized the philosophy of sex relations. I know that the jurors were pious church members and could not help but convict such demoralized fellows as the workers on the Firebrand; I know also that the users of tobacco and beer are the real supporters of the radical press, and I noticed also that F. A. C. did not mean at all what he said. If he did, why didn't he comment upon and answer my question, instead of commenting upon my "foolish talk"? That would have been more consistent, Comrade F. A. C.

But, somehow, I am lost. The historians tell us, for instance, that some of the old nations did not recognize any legal marriages, but led a monogamic life. The other day, coming down from Portland, I read a book about the horrible persecution of the "Spirit Wrestlers" in Russia, in which the writer says that these people did not marry in the customary way, that love was all that was necessary to live together, "but they led strictly a monogamic life." Probably these historians and writers had not "looked up" the dictionaries and did not know that there could be "no monogamy without marriage."

Another comrade grieves thus: "I am sorry to see you fellows quarreling about your love ideals and would like to state my ideas. Any form of living together as long as agreeable (voluntary) is in my eyes correct." "I can raise no objection to you being of another frame of mind as long as you mind your own business." Right you are, comrade, but the trouble is that people will never mind their own business, no matter what they call themselves, as long as they think I am immoral or consider it wrong for me to practice my love ideal. They will never leave us alone; they will always mind our business.

Even Comrade Kropotkin does not think it wise to devote space to the sex question. He says: "We Russian Nihilists have worked out forms of life entirely free. But we worked them out and despised talking about them," and "free men and women will better find the ways for arranging their mutual relations than we can even foresee now," etc. The Russian Nihilists, with whom Comrade Kropotkin associated, were all well educated and learned people, and were called Nihilists because they repudiated all authority, all institutions, all so-called morality, and did not recognize any authority in their sex relations, either. They were, in short, free-minded people, and acted accordingly. But will people work out forms of life entirely free who are not rid of old superstitions and prejudices? Never! About three years ago some Anarchists from Chicago intended to colonize in Oregon and live as near as possible a free life. "But," says one of them, who is a great admirer of Kropotkin's writings, "there shall be no Communism of woman or else I will use the ax and pistol." This man thinks different now since he has read the Firebrand and will act as a free man. A. ISAAK.

## Various Voices.

You have been sending me the Firebrand and later FREE SOCIETY. I am leaving Blackpool and am going to Liverpool, so do not send any more copies of the paper until you hear from me again, when I will send money for a year's subscription. I consider FREE SOCIETY to be the best Anarchist paper that I have ever seen. As the advertisements say, it supplies a long-felt want. I have not read one dry or dull article in it. I think it was a mistake for the space of the Firebrand to have been taken up so much with discussions upon the different points of free love. I do not speak from a hypocritical morality (?) standpoint, as I believe in free love myself, and variety for those who wish to practice it. But my idea is that such articles have little or no interest for the majority of people who are not Anarchists. The first aim of such a paper should be propaganda, and until the public have learned what Anarchism is they fail to see the truth underlying free love. We in England have a Marxist organization, a branch of which I was a member of before I heard the truth about Anarchism. Judging from articles in FREE SOCIETY it is a brother organization to the American S. L. P. In it we find the same petty despotism, intolerance and bigotry. Like the S. L. P. they speak in the name of liberty. Oh, Liberty, how you are dragged through the mud by would-be popes of humanity. WILLIAM ANDERSON.  
Blackpool, Eng.

### COMMENT.

That the attitude of The Firebrand was not "a mistake" has been proven by its success. It was started without a cent, and yet has gained more subscribers among the American farmers and workmen than any other Anarchist paper ever printed in the English language. If the discussion of the sex question is so pernicious why is it that Anarchist papers which had at least some money to start with, which were more or less supported by the different groups from the beginning and did not devote any space to "free love," had no success? And strange as it may seem, readers who were won for Anarchism through The Firebrand, have never raised any objection to the discussions of the sex question—they have encouraged us to continue the discussions, but such objections came from old comrades, who probably feared that their wives might demand their freedom. On the other hand there has never been an Anarchist paper published in any language in which the women have taken so much interest as in The Firebrand, which was shown by their participation in the discussions.

People who are not Anarchists do not take any interest in any of our articles; the repudiation of all government is as horrible to them as the repudiation of the marriage institution, and to make propaganda for Anarchism includes all phases of our mutual relations. To exclude such an important part as our sex relations would be the greatest "mistake" we could make. Not long ago I heard a young person say: "My parents have been Anarchists for several years, and knowing how despotically my father domineered my mother I had no use for Anarchism. Only after I had read The Firebrand for a while and 'The Old and the New Ideal' from Rudefbusch, I began to realize that Anarchism meant something more than economical freedom."

The Firebrand is still alive under the name of FREE SOCIETY, and I hope it will also in future discuss all questions concerning social relations.

A. I.

It seems to me that FREE SOCIETY is a clearer exponent of Anarchy than was the Firebrand, Enclosed with this find MS. It may be you can use it for your paper. I would like to set some of the sisters to thinking, if it is possible. For, once get the women started on the right path and they will sweep all before them; you see I have a high idea of the "dear creatures."

NELLIE M. JERAULD.

It was a pleasure to me to learn that the Firebrand's place in the fight against persecution and oppression has been so ably filled by FREE SOCIETY. The latter seems to be making a stronger and more bitter attack on prevailing laws and is more interesting.

Philadelphia, Pa.

JOHN H. FAGAN.

My dear comrades, you are publishing, in my judgment, the finest journal in the reform movement, and it is far superior to any other Anarchist journal I ever read. It is a credit to the Anarchist movement, and I hope that you will be able to keep it up to the present standard. I like its policy better than that of any other of our Anarchist journals, and yet I am not exactly a Communist either. I trust that you will not make the mistake of the Firebrand and have too many articles on the sex question—it will injure the influence of the paper. It seems to me that freedom is sufficient for the marriage question—the right of each to settle the question for himself in his own way. Dallas, Tex. ROSS WINN.

# 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, 13 Oak Grove Ave., San Francisco, Cal.

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.

## LAST NOTICE.

With this issue we shall "set out" all names on our mailing list that are very far in arrears, except those who have notified us that they wish the paper. Poverty is no bar to the receipt of the paper if you want it. One cent will pay for a postal card with which to notify us that you want it but can't pay for it. If you do not want it badly enough to do that, we'll send it to some one who does want it. We have no objections to your paying up if you can do so. If you can't you can at least say so.

Your subscription expires with the number of the paper corresponding with the number printed on the wrapper. The number of this issue is 148. If your number is smaller than that you are delinquent. A few numbers "cut little ice" but as many are away back they count up in the grand total. It costs us just about \$33 per week to issue this paper, including living expenses, for if we are to work we must live.

Remember that payments formerly made to the Firebrand are good on FREE SOCIETY, and debts to the Firebrand should be paid to FREE SOCIETY.

## THINGS AND THOUGHTS.

FREE SOCIETY has on hand about 100 copies of the "Barcelona supplement" to the Firebrand which was at first one of the charges upon which the Firebrand publishers were arrested. They will be mailed on receipt of postage—one cent each. As the demand for them is great those who wish them will have to order now. If you order one and do not receive it, take it for granted that the supply was exhausted when your order came.

"You haven't got anybody to pack in that carload of goods have you?"

I was in a business house down in the wholesale district the other day when an intelligent, honest-appearing and strong-limbed man, dressed in rags, made that inquiry of me. I had to inform him that I was not the owner of the property in question.

"They would not work if they had the chance," is the sneer of loafing parasites who live exclusively off of the labor of others, when referring to the unemployed. Yet here was a splendid specimen of physical manhood seeking a temporary master and hard labor in order to pick up, not a living, but a few cents to make starvation a little more tolerable.

"The property in question," I said, and there is the key to the economic question before us. The very fact that the property is handled for profit makes it necessary that laws shall be enacted and enforced to protect it from seizure by those who need it and would use it if it were placed in their possession. Would this man have used this particular "property" if placed in possession of it? Probably not; it was printing material, and he was probably not a printer. But this material and its profit-making possibilities were protected by the same code enacted to bolster up property rights in all other useful materials, that property right being granted for the purpose of extorting profit from the would-be user, who, ragged, homeless, hopeless, is but one of millions of victims of a system of laws and governments that crush them down that a few may rise. Honest-seeming today, this seeker for odd jobs may tomorrow raise his hand and strike back at that false society which has struck him down and despoiled him. And if he strikes back with the united power of an hundred million of his fellow proletarians of various countries of the world and turns the so-called "social" structure upside down who can blame

him? "Even the worm will turn when trodden upon," and is man less than the worm?

The pulpit pounders of California are springing or trying to spring a scare upon the people of the state, by stating that two-thirds of the school children of California are growing up in ignorance of "bible history." They express their belief that if they can only befuddle the parents into swallowing their bible fables as good secular history, the parents will turn the wolfish parsons loose among the flocks of school children, to poison their minds and deaden their brains with the superstitions of the bible. It is to be hoped the parents are knowingly "neglecting the instruction of their children in bible history."

One press dispatch in a daily paper carries a big scare head stating that "Anarchy reigns in Havana," and another states that Gomez announces to the Cuban bourgeoisie that he will respect lives and property if the revolution succeeds. Respecting lives is all right, but respecting property, i. e., property held for profit, not use, is no part of Anarchy. More than this, if Anarchy reigns in Cuba, it is not at all likely that Gomez can make promises for the whole body of revolutionists. The Anarchy scare is only a newspaper bogey.

One comrade, an Individualist, writes that I am bound to become an Individualist because study will force me logically to adopt Proudhon's theories. Another friend, a thinker, writer and theorist, of more than local renown, writes that the only Anarchist works he has read are those of Proudhon, but by carrying the logic of Herbert Spencer to its legitimate conclusion Proudhonism results in Anarchist Communism. That is what he calls the philosophy of Individualism. If my friends keep on Proudhon will have as many meanings as the bible.

There are Anarchists—and Anarchists. Some of them content themselves with the dream of what might be, plodding along in the harness of an exacting master meantime. Others get out and try to make the dream practicable, and wherever they are they always accomplish something. One of the latter lived in Yale, Kan., a little town that may be on the maps, though I am not sure of it. From that little place he got a large list of subscribers to the Firebrand. Then he went to another unheard of little burg in Iowa, and soon sent in a list of subs to FREE SOCIETY from there. That man is not only an Anarchist but a propagandist as well. Evidently he is not afraid to TALK ANARCHY and thus attract the attention of those who are really looking for a solution of the economic question that will settle it forever. There are lots of people all over the country who only need to be shown that their past conception of Anarchy has been totally wrong in order to induce them to investigate its claims. Each one of us can do something, if we only will, to get them started. Suppose you "stir up the animals" in your vicinity.

Dollar Mark Hanna has been chosen by "ways that are dark and tricks that are vain," to represent the dignity of Ohio in the United States senate. To prove that money is mighty and the gauge of success he will be known among men careless of niceties of the meaning of words as "Honorable."

Another alleged Utopia is to be started, this time near Pittsburg, Pa. It is to start in with the job ahead of paying \$196,000 for land. I have before me a history of the failures of similar movements started under far better conditions. If any one wants my opinion, here it is: Let well enough alone!

The "Knickerbocker Grays" is the name of an organization being formed in New York to protect the wealthy from the consequences of the oncoming revolution. It is modeled after the "Marie Louises" of the time of Louis XVI., who were formed of the aristocrats of France to protect royalty. The "Grays" are to be under the supervision of New York's "75," and here the trouble begins. Exclusiveness keeps their fighting numbers down, and as it is to be composed of children trained from their earliest infancy to look upon a "common" child as a probable future foe, the "common" children can't possibly be trained in "mob battle" tactics. It won't do to train the enemy, and there is their fix.

Wait till that revolution comes and that "Knickerbocker" crew won't make a decent mouthful.

The Portland Oregonian eases itself of this: "It has been fairly said that this country, founded upon individualism, 'will remain as it always has been, a poor boy's country, and whatever party administers it, a poor man's government.'"

Sometimes—in fact, quite frequently—differences of opinion are honest ones, but when, as in this case, all facts are coolly set aside and we are told that this is a poor man's country in any other meaning of the term than that most of its inhabitants are poor and likely to remain so, then we are constrained to call such papers as the Oregonian liars. It is so obvious to all who look around them that this is today essentially a government owned by the rich that a contrary statement by an editor of a great daily only bears the earmarks of the prostitute hireling's dish-up of taffy on behalf of his master.

F. A. COWELL.

## A FRANK APOLOGY.

I hereby retract the statement which I made in the last issue, charging A. J. Pope with purposely breaking up the Firebrand in order to gratify his vanity.

A spirit of anger caused by his actions before and during the trial, of which I nor any of the other comrades approved, but to which he had of course a perfect right, caused me to make them. Having had time to look at the matter in a more unprejudiced light, I feel very sorry for accusing a comrade, whose white hair and devoted labor to the cause of freedom should have entitled him to more consideration, with intentions of which I have no proof. I hope our aged comrade as well as his many friends will consider this sufficient.

CHAS. DOERING.

FREE SOCIETY group did not like the publication of Comrade Doering's article of last week, but an Anarchist paper cannot bar out an honest expression of opinion properly worded, when sent in by the owners—the readers and workers for the paper and the cause. We were much pleased to receive Comrade Doering's manly apology, which we hope will end the matter.

## COMRADES.

I notice in FREE SOCIETY of Jan. 23, the remarks of Chas. Doering in reference to Comrade Pope, and I also note with pleasure your comments.

As I am much better acquainted with Comrade Pope than any of you—have known him longer—you will please permit me to express my belief that he is not understood, and when martyrdom is supposed to be sought for his own glory he is wronged by the idea. He is as unselfish as a man well can be, and it is not himself, but the CAUSE which he thinks martyrdom would benefit that makes him happy.

He may have told Moses Harman what is stated, to wit: that his own turn "would come soon," but that he contemplated doing, or did anything with the purpose of bringing it about, is NOT TRUE. I know him too well for that. There is such a thing as sensing, feeling the shadow of what is coming. I do not attempt to account for it, but I know it to be true. I sensed the shadow of my arrest years before it came; when it came the shadow passed and I have not felt it since. The night before I was to be tried I was never happier. It was not an intellectual, but a soul joy. Waves of peace seemed to flow over me. A. J. Pope is organically a non-resistant, born of Quaker stock, he inherits their peace principles, and would not, I do not believe he could, fight for his own defense, or to defend another. I have had many a conflict with him on that point. That he is always wise in his methods I am not prepared to say; who is? I believe, however, he would go joyously to the stake if he believed he could thereby advance the cause of human freedom.

He inherited \$30,000 from his father's estate and he has used the most of it for the CAUSE. He took the ground that the rise in the price of his father's property came from the labor of others—from the growth of a city, and consequently did not belong to him, but to the public, and that the only way he could be honest was to use it for the public good. Much that is attributed to me I did not have done but for his money. Yes, he DID take into "consideration that the paper was suppressed," but he believed the injustice of its oppression would so waken thought that the agitation produced would do more good in the end than if it had continued unmoled. Let us be just—let us be careful that we do not attribute wrong motives to our comrades.

LOIS WAINBROOKER.



# A TALK ABOUT ANARCHIST COMMUNISM, BETWEEN TWO WORKERS.

BY ENRICO MALATESTA.

(Continued from last week.)

W.: There is just one thing: to take the fortune of rich men who have robbed and starved the poor is all very well, but if a man by hard work and saving has put by something to buy a little field, or open a little shop, what right have you to take from him what is really the fruit of his labor?

J.: That is not an uncommon case in these days when capitalists and governments make a clean sweep of so much of the produce; but anyway I have told you that each person has a right to raw material and the instruments of labor, and, for that reason, if a man has a bit of ground which he cultivates with his own hands he might just as well keep it, and he would be given besides all the best tools and manures and everything else he required to make it produce as much as possible. Certainly it would be the best plan to put everything in common, but there will be no need to force people to do so because a like interest will urge all to adopt a Communist system. Things will go better with common property and work than with isolated work, especially as there is much machinery, and very likely there may be more, which it is most convenient to use in common.

W.: Machinery! The machines are what we ought to burn! It is the machines that break our arms and take away our bread. Here, in the country, as sure as a machine comes, we can reckon on our wages going down and some of us losing our work and having to go somewhere else. It must be worse in the towns. If there were no machines the gentlefolks would want our labor more and so we should live a bit better.

J.: You're right, William, to think the machines one cause of poverty and loss of work; but that happens because they belong to the rich. If they belonged to the workers it would be just the other way; they would be the principal cause of human comfort. For, after all, machines only work in our place and faster than we do. Thanks to machinery man will not be obliged to toil for long hours to satisfy his needs, will not be condemned to painful exertion exceeding his physical strength. This is why if machinery were applied to all branches of production, and belonged to everyone, a few hours of light and easy work would suffice for all the needs of consumption, and each worker would have time to gain knowledge, to keep up friendly relations, in a word, to live and enjoy life, profiting by all the conquests of science and civilization. Remember that what we have to do is to take possession of the machines, not destroy them. You may be sure the owners will do just as much to defend their machines against those who want to destroy as against those who try to take possession of them; therefore, as there will be the same effort to make, and the same risk to run in either case, it will be a downright folly to break rather than take the machines. Would you destroy corn and houses if they could be shared by all? Surely not! Well, we must do the same with the machines; for if in the hands of employers they are instrumental to our poverty and servitude, in our hands they will become instrumental to wealth and freedom.

W.: But if things are to go well under such a system everybody must be willing to work.

J.: Of course.

W.: And suppose there are some folks that would like to live without working? Toil is a hardship, even dogs don't like it.

J.: You confuse society as it is today with society as it will be after the revolution. You say that even dogs don't enjoy toil, but could you spend whole days doing nothing?

W.: I? No, because I am accustomed to work. When I've nothing to do my hands seem to itch to be after something, but there are folks who would stay all day long at the public house playing cards or lounge about with their hands in their pockets.

J.: Now a-days, but not after the revolution, and I will tell you why. Now-a-days work is disagreeable, ill paid and looked down upon. Now-a-days the working man must fag himself nearly to death or be half starved, and he is treated like a beast of burden. The working man has no hope; he knows that ten to one he will end his days in the workhouse. He can't attend to his family as he ought and he has scarcely any enjoyment in his life, while he continually suffers ill treatment and humiliation. On the other hand, the man who does not work takes his ease in every possible way; he is looked up to and esteemed; all men and all pleasures are at his service. Even among working men, those who do the least and whose work is the least disagreeable earn most and are thought more of than the others. Is it to be wondered at that folks are disgusted with work and are eager to seize any opportunity to do nothing? But when work is done under conditions fit for human beings, for a reasonable time and according to the laws of health; when the worker knows that he is working for the well being of his family and of all men; when everyone who wishes to be respected must necessarily be a worker and the lazy are as much despised as are spies and procurers today; who will then wish to forego the joy of knowing himself useful and beloved that he may live in an idleness disastrous alike to his body and his mind? Even now-a-days everybody, apart from rare exceptions, instinctively loathes the idea of being a spy or a procurer. And yet by these vile callings more can be gained than by digging the ground; there is little or no work and more or less State protection. But as these trades are reckoned abominable nearly everyone prefers poverty to the infamy of following them. There are exceptions, there are weak, degraded creatures who prefer infamy, but this is because their choice lies between infamy and poverty. But who would choose an infamous and contemptible life when by working he could secure comfort and public esteem? Certainly such a man would be mad. And there is no doubt that this public reprobation of idleness would arise and make itself felt, for work is essentially needful to society. Idle folks would not only harm everyone by living on what others produced without contributing their own work to supply the wants of the community, but also break the harmony of the new order of things and become the

elements of a discontented party, who might desire a return to the past. Collective bodies are like individuals; they love and admire what is or what they think of use and hate and despise what they know or believe to be hurtful. They may be deceived, and too often they are, but in the case before us no mistake is possible, for it is clear as daylight that the person who does not work, eats and drinks at the expense of others and is wronging everybody. Why, suppose you join a party of men to do some work all together and share and share alike in the produce, of course you will be considerate to any of your mates who may be weak or unskillful, but as for a mere shirker will he not be led such a life that he will take himself off or else feel inclined to set his shoulder to the wheel? That is just what will happen in the community at large if the laziness of some of its members threatens to become a serious danger. If we could not go ahead because of those who would not work, which seems to me very unlikely, the remedy would, after all, not be far to seek; they would simply be turned out of the community. Then, as they would have a right to nothing but raw material and the instruments of labor, they would be forced to work if they wished to live.

W.: You are beginning to convince me; but, tell me, will everybody have to work in the fields?

J.: Why should they? Men do not need only bread and beer and meat. We want houses and clothes and books and all the things that workers of all sorts of trades produce and no one can by himself supply all his own needs. Even to till the soil, do we not want the help of the blacksmith and the implement maker for our tools, and, consequently, of the miner who unearths the iron, the mason who builds houses and shops, and so forth? It does not follow, therefore, that all must till the ground, only that all must do some useful work. Besides the variety of trades will allow each person to choose what suits him best, and thus, as far as possible, work will be nothing more than exercise and an ardently desired enjoyment.

W.: Then everyone will be free to choose any trade he likes?

J.: Of course. Only we must be careful that some trades are not overstocked, while others want hands. As we shall be working for the public interest we must arrange so that everything really necessary is produced while individual preferences are consulted. But you will see that will come right when we have no masters to force us to toil for a crust of bread without knowing what is the object or use of our work.

W.: You say it will all come right, but I don't see it. I think that no one will do disagreeable work; they will all be lawyers and doctors. Who will work in the fields? Who will risk his life and health in a mine? Who will go down into the black man holes of the sewers or clean out cesspools?

J.: Oh, you may leave out the lawyers. Lawyers and priests are a sort of gangrene in society that the revolution will cure. Let us talk about useful work, and not about occupations carried on at the expense of one's neighbors, otherwise we might count the burglar as a worker; he often has plenty of exertion. Now-a-days we prefer one trade to another, not because it is more or less in accordance with our tastes and faculties, but because it is easier to learn; because we earn, or hope to earn, more by it, or because we think we shall run the best chance of employment in that line; it is only in the second place that we consider if such and such work is more disagreeable than another sort. In fine, the choice of a trade is mostly imposed upon us by our birth, by chance and by social prejudices. The work of an agricultural laborer, for instance, would not please even the poorest townsman. And yet there is nothing repulsive in agriculture itself, and life in the fields is not without its pleasures. Very much the contrary; if you read the poets you will see that they are enthusiastic about country life. But the truth is that the poets who write books have very seldom tilled the soil, while the farm laborers are worn out with work and half starved, live worse than the beasts, and are treated as nobodies, until the poorest wretch in town would hardly change places with them. How can you expect people to like to be agricultural laborers? Even we who were born in the country leave it as soon as we can, because whatever we do we are better off and thought more of elsewhere. But how many of us would wish to leave the country if we were working there on our own account and could find comfort, freedom and respect in our work? It is just the same in all trades, because as things are now the harder and the more necessary any work is the worse it is paid, the more it is despised, and the more inhuman are the conditions under which it must be done. Go, for example, into a goldsmith's shop and you will find that, in comparison with the wretched holes we live in, the place is clean, well ventilated and warmed, that the working hours are not very long, and that though the men are ill paid, for the employer takes the best part of what they produce, still they are well off compared to other workers; they can amuse themselves in the evening; when they take off their working jackets they can go where they like, with no fear of being stared or sneered at. But if you go into a cutler's workshop you will see poor fellows knife-grinding there for a miserable wage in a poisonous atmosphere, which will destroy their lives in a few years, and if, after their work, they take the liberty of going where gentlemen are they will be lucky if they are not made to feel themselves ridiculous. It will not be surprising if, under such circumstances, a man prefers gold working to cutlery. To say nothing of the workers who use no tool but a pen. Just think; a man who only writes bad newspaper articles earns ten times more than a farm laborer and is thought of much more highly. When journalists, engineers, doctors, artists, professors are in work and know their business well they live in comfort, but composers, bricklayers, shoemakers, all sorts of hand workers, and some poor teachers and other brain workers, too, are half starved, while they are worked to death. I don't mean to imply that the only useful work is manual work; on the contrary, study is the only way of conquering nature, becoming civilized, gaining greater freedom and well being; doctors, engineers, chemists, teachers, are as useful in modern society as farm laborers and other hand workers. I only mean to say that all useful work should be equally appreciated and so arranged that the worker may find equal satisfaction in doing it; and also that intellectual work, being a great pleasure in itself and giving the man who does it a great superiority over those who remain in ignorance, should be put within the reach of everyone and not remain the privilege of a few.

W.: But if, as you yourself say, intellectual work is a great pleasure and gives those who do it an advantage over others who are ignorant, surely everyone

would want to study; I should as much as anybody. And then who is to do the manual work?

J.: Everyone; because while studying literature and science they should also do physical work; everyone should work with both head and hands. These two sorts of work, so far from interfering with one another, are supplementary; for a healthy man needs to exercise all his organs, his brains as well as his muscles. He whose intelligence is developed, and who is accustomed to think, does best at manual work, and he who is sound and healthy, as people are who exercise their limbs under healthy conditions, has his mind in a more wide awake and penetrating state. Besides, as both kinds of work are necessary and as one is pleasanter than the other and has enabled man to attain to the dignity of self-consciousness, it is not just that a part of mankind should be condemned to the stupefying effects of exclusively manual toil that the privilege of science, which means power, may be left to a few. Therefore, I say again, everybody should work at once physically and intellectually.

W.: I can understand that; but there is manual work which is hard and manual work which is easy, some is ugly, some is beautiful. Now, who would be a miner, for instance, or a scavenger?

J.: My dear William, if you only knew what inventions and researches are being made every day you would see that even now, if the organization of work did not depend upon people who are not working themselves, and, consequently, don't trouble about the comfort of the workers, all manual labor could be carried on under conditions which would prevent it from being repulsive, unhealthy and toilsome. Therefore there is no reason why any work should not be done by workers who have chosen it voluntarily. And if this would be possible today, just fancy what might happen when, everybody having to work, the studies and efforts of all would be directed toward making work less burdensome and more pleasant. And if, after all, there were still some crafts harder than others it could be arranged to make up for these inequalities by some special advantages. Besides, when men are working in common, for the common benefit, we see arising among them that same spirit of brotherliness and compliance which belongs to family life in its best aspect; so that each, far from seeking only to save himself trouble, tries rather to take the heaviest work for his own share.

W.: Right enough, if all this happens; but suppose it doesn't?

J.: Well, if in spite of all this there still remains some needful work which no one will do by choice, then we shall, everyone of us, have to take a hand at it, each doing a little, working at it, for example, one day a month, one week a year, or something like that. But set your mind at rest. If a thing is needful for everyone, means will certainly be found to do it.

W.: Do you know you are beginning to talk me over? Yet there's one thing that I can't rightly see my way to. It's a big job that taking away property from the gentry. I don't know, but isn't there anything else you could do?

J.: How would you manage? While it remains in the hands of the rich they will be corks of the walk and will follow up their own interests without troubling about ours, as they have done since the beginning of time. But why don't you want to take away property from the gentry? Perhaps you fancy that it would be unfair and a wrong thing to do?

W.: No, no; after what you have told me it seems to me that it would be very right, as in tearing it away from them we are snatching from them also our own bodies on which they are feeding. And, besides, we are not taking their fortune for ourselves, but to put it in common to do good to everyone, aren't we?

J.: Most assuredly. And if you look close at the matter you will see that the gentry themselves will also be the gainers. They will have to give up ordering others about, putting on airs and graces, and idling; they will have to set to work, but when work is done with the help of machinery and every possible consideration for the comfort of the workers, it will become nothing but a useful, pleasant exercise. Do not the gentry now-a-days go hunting? Do they not ride on horseback, practice gymnastics and take exercise in other ways which prove that muscular exertion is a necessity and a pleasure to healthy, well-fed men? For them then it is merely a question of putting into production the physical energy they now put forth purely as an amusement. And then how much advantage they will reap from the general well being. Look, for example, at what we see before our eyes. A few gentlefolks are wealthy and can play the lord in their own houses, but for them, as for us, the streets are hideous and filthy, and the bad air which rises from our hovels and elms makes them ill as well as us; with their private fortunes they can't improve the whole country, a thing which could be done easily if everyone set about it. Our poverty is a continual blight upon their lives, acting upon them indirectly in a million ways, without counting their dread of a violent revolution. You see, then, that we shall be only doing good to the gentlefolk by taking their wealth. Though they certainly don't understand this, and never will, because they like to give orders and they fancy that the poor are fashioned of a different clay from themselves. But what matter? If they will not come to terms with us, so much the worse for them, we shall know how to force them to do so.

W.: That is all fair enough; but can't things be done bit by bit, by mutual agreement? Property might be left to those who possess it, but on condition that they would increase wages and treat us like human beings. Then, gradually, we might lay by something, and we, too, might buy a bit of land, and, at last, when we were all property owners we would put everything in common, as you say. There was a chap I heard proposing something of the sort.

J.: Now look here! There is only one way of coming to friendly terms, and that is for the property owners voluntarily to renounce their property. But you know, as well as I do, that it is no good thinking of that. While private property exists, that is, while the land, instead of belonging to everyone, belongs to Peter or Paul, there will always be poverty, and things will go from bad to worse. Under private property each is trying all the time to bring grist to his own mill. The property owners not only try to give the workers as little as they can, but they are always fighting among themselves. Generally speaking each tries to sell his produce for as much as he can, and each buyer, on his side, tries to pay as little as possible. And then what happens? The land owners, manufacturers and large merchants, who can manufacture and sell wholesale, provide themselves with machinery, take advantage of all favorable states of the market, wait until the right

moment to sell, or even sell at a loss for a time, and by ruining the small proprietors and dealers, who sink into poverty and are obliged, they and their children, to go and work for a daily wage. Thus (it is a thing we see every day) men who work on their own account alone, or with a few journeymen, are driven, after a bitter struggle, to shut up shop, and go to seek work in big factories; small land owners who cannot get enough capital for their farming, and cannot even pay their tithes and taxes, have to sell their fields and houses to the large proprietors, and so on. If a kind-hearted employer really wished to better the condition of his work people he could only put himself in a position to be ruined by competition. On the other hand, the workers are goaded by hunger into competing with one another; and, as there are more hands to be had than are needed for the work to be done, they are continually snatching the bread out of each other's mouths. Not that there is not plenty of work that needs doing, but that at any particular time there is only a certain amount which it pays the employer to have done. Thanks to this situation, progress itself becomes a misfortune. A machine is invented; immediately a number of men are thrown out of work; they can earn nothing, therefore cannot consume as before, and thus indirectly affect the bread-winning of other workers. In America wide tracts of land are brought under cultivation and much corn produced; the land owners, of course, without inquiring if everybody in the United States has plenty to eat, ship their grain over here that they may get more for it. Here the price of corn is lower, but the poor do not reap the advantage, for the European land owners, not able to compete with this cheapness, let the soil go out of cultivation, except some of the most productive portions, and thus a number of agricultural laborers lose their employment. When a man has not even a penny in his pocket cheap bread is no good to him.

W.: Ah, now I understand! I've heard say that they would not let the corn come from abroad, and I thought it a rascally thing to try to keep food out of the country; I believed the gentlefolks and the farmers between them wanted to starve the people. But now I see they had their reasons.

J.: No, no; if the corn did not come it would be very bad from another point of view. Then the landlords and farmers, having no competition to fear from outside, would sell at any price they chose and ———

W.: Then what is to be done?

J.: Done? I told you before; everything must be put in common. And then the more produce there is the better it will be.

W.: But now tell me; how would it be if an arrangement were made with the owners of property—they to contribute the land and capital and we the work, the produce to be shared between us and them? What do you say to that?

J.: First of all I say that if you were willing to go shares, ten to one your master would be willing to do nothing of the sort. You would be obliged to use force to bring him to it. But in that case, why do things by halves? Why content yourself with a system which allows injustice and parasitism to continue and prevent the increase of production? And, further, what right have certain men who do not work to come and take half of what is produced by the workers? Besides, as I have told you, it is not only that half the produce would go the employers, but that the sum total of produce would be less than it might be, because where you have private property and isolated labor less is produced than by working in common. It is like when you want to move a rock; a hundred men would not succeed by trying singly, whereas by uniting their efforts two or three can raise it easily. If one man wished to make a pin, I don't know if he could get through it in an hour; whereas ten men working into each other's hands can make thousands of pins a day. Economists, many of whom have let themselves be scandalously biased by class prejudice, have often said that poverty is not the result of the seizure of property by the upper classes, but of the scarcity of natural products, which would, say they, be quite insufficient if they were distributed to all men. This enables the said economists and their disciples to conclude that poverty is an inevitable thing, against which no measures can be taken. Don't believe a word of it. Even as things are organized today the produce of the earth and of industry is enough to enable every man to live in comfort, and if it is not more abundant that is the employers' fault. They think of nothing but how much they can gain, and even go so far as to destroy articles, or let them go to waste, merely to keep up the price. While they pretend there is not enough natural wealth, they are leaving large tracts of country uncultivated and numbers of workmen with nothing to do. But, answer a certain school of economists, even when all ground is brought under cultivation, and tilled as intelligently as may be, still the productive power of the earth is limited and the increase of population is not. Therefore there must always come a moment when the production of food stuffs will be stationary, while population will go on growing indefinitely and with it famine. The sole remedy, they conclude, for social ills is that the poor should have very few children. I'm not very learned about the law of rent, but I'm sure this remedy is no cure for our social evils. You have only to look at countries where there is plenty of land and a scanty population; you will see as much or more poverty as where population is dense. We must change our social organization and bring all the land under cultivation, and then if the population seems to be growing too fast we can consider how to check it. But let us go back to the question of produce-sharing between property owner and workman. It is a system which used to exist in parts of France in field work. It still exists in Tuscany, but it is gradually disappearing because the land owners find day labor pays them better. Now-a-days, what with machines, scientific culture and foreign produce, the masters are obliged to farm on a large scale and employ hired laborers. If they don't they are ruined by competition. If the present system goes on I believe property will be more and more concentrated in the hands of a few and the workers reduced to utter wretchedness by machinery and rapid methods of production. We shall have a few big financiers and capitalist masters of the world, a certain number of workmen attending upon the machines, and a number of servants and police to wait on and defend the aforesaid big men. The mass of the people will have to die of hunger or live on charity. The beginnings of such a state of things may already be seen; small properties are disappearing, the number of out-of-works increases, the gentlefolks, from fear or from pity, busy themselves with soup kitchens and the schemes of Gen. Booth. If the people do not wish to be reduced to beg their bread from rich philanthropists or local boards, as they once did at the gates of monasteries, let them lose no time in taking pos-



session of the land and machinery and working on their own account.

W.: But how would it do if government were to make some good laws to force rich people not to make the poor suffer?

J.: The same old story, William! Isn't the government made up of gentlemen, and is it likely that they will make laws against themselves? But even supposing the poor could manage to take their turn at governing would that be a reason for leaving the rich with the means of getting the upper hand again? Rely upon it, wherever there are rich and poor the poor may make their voices heard for a moment during an outbreak, but the rich will always get hold of the power in the end. This is why we, if we are the stronger for ever so short a time, must at once take property away from the rich, so that they may not have the means of putting things back as they were before.

W.: I understand. We must have a real republic, make all men equal, and then the man who works will eat, and the man who does nothing can go with an empty stomach. Ah me! I'm sorry I'm old. You young folks will see a good time.

J.: Softly, softly, friend! By the word "republic" you mean the Social Revolution, and for those who understand you that is all very well. But you are expressing yourself badly; for what is commonly understood by a republic is not at all what you mean. Get it well into your head that republican government is a government like the rest; only instead of a king there is a president and ministers, who really have just the same powers. We see that very plainly across the channel, and even if the French had the democratic republic promised by their radicals, they wouldn't be any better off. Instead of two chambers they would have one, the chamber of deputies, but wouldn't the people be forced to be soldiers and to work like slaves all the same, in spite of all the fine promises of the gentlemen deputies? Don't you see that as long as there are rich and poor, the rich will have the upper hand? Whether we live under a republic or a monarchy the results which spring from private property will always exist. Whilst economic relations are regulated by competition, property will be concentrated in a few hands, machines will take work from working men and the masses will be reduced to misery. Have any of the republics that exist seriously bettered the condition of the working classes?

W.: Well to be sure! And I always believed that republic meant equality!

J.: Yes, the republicans say so, and this is how they make it out: "Under a really democratic republic," say they, "the members of parliament who make the laws are elected by the whole people. Consequently when the people are not contented, they change their M. P.'s for better ones and everything comes right. And as the poor are the great majority, it is practically they who govern." That is what the republicans say, but the reality is something quite different. The very poverty of the poor causes them to be ignorant and superstitious, and they will remain so as long as they are not economically independent and are unconscious of their true interests. You and I, who have been lucky enough to earn more than some and to be able to teach ourselves a little, may have intelligence to understand where our interests lie and strength to face the employers' revenge; but the great mass will never be able to do so as long as present conditions last. In a time of revolution one brave man is worth a score of timid ones and draws along with him numbers who, left to themselves, would never have the energy to revolt. But in front of a ballot-box character and energy go for nothing. Mere numbers are all that tell. And in the present state of things the greatest number will always be for the men who hold their daily bread in their hands and can give or withhold it at their pleasure. Haven't you happened to notice as much? Today the greater part of the electors are poor, but how often do you see them choosing men of their own class to represent them and defend their interests?

W.: No, most of 'em don't like to run the chance of offending the landlord, the parson, or their employer. If they do, they are as like as not to be turned off and even evicted.

J.: Not a hopeful outlook for the benefits to be expected from universal suffrage, is it? The people will always send middle-class men to parliament, and these will always be contriving how to keep the people as dependent and submissive as possible. Even if we were to have paid members and the poor were to take advantage of this to send workmen to represent them, what could they do in so corrupt a medium? The few that have been tried have not cut a very brilliant figure in any country. No! during the next revolution the people must not allow themselves to be hoodwinked as they have so often been by democrats and republicans. Over and over again the people have dropped their arms on being promised a republic, because they have been taught to believe that it is the best possible form of organization and will work marvels in their condition. Next time they must not rest content with empty words, they must resolutely lay hands upon property.

W.: You are right. We have been deceived so often, it is time we opened our eyes. But still there must always be a government, for if there is no one to give orders, how can things go on?

J.: And why must we be ordered? Why can't we manage our affairs ourselves? He who rules always seeks his own advantage, and, either ignorantly or wilfully, betrays the people. Power makes even the best of men giddy with pride. Besides, and this is the principal reason for not wishing to have any chief, men must cease to be led like a flock. They must grow accustomed to think, and learn to recognize their dignity and strength. If the people are to be educated, and accustomed to freedom and the management of their own affairs, they must be left to act for themselves and feel themselves responsible for their own conduct. They may often make mistakes and do wrong, but they will see the consequences for themselves, and understand that they have done amies and must go on another tack. Another thing. The harm the people may do left to themselves will never be one millionth part of that which is done by the best of governments. If a child is to learn to walk, he must be let walk by himself, and not be afraid of the falls he may have.

[CONCLUDED NEXT WEEK.]

### THE MODERN ANARCHIST--ONE MAN'S VIEW.

After all, the Anarchist is nearly like the most of men. I mean the bomb-thrower, the dynamiter, the frebrand, the destructionist. I say that he is like the most of men, because the most of men are ignorant and murderous. It has not been fifty years since a tragedy of crime was staged in this country that equals the darkest days of imperial Rome. Men who called themselves christians, on the one hand, and men who called themselves the friends of liberty, on the other, devoted the resources of the richest and most powerful country the world has ever seen to the destruction of themselves.

The history of mankind has been written by the sword with human blood, with grape and canister for punctuation points.

The destructive Anarchist is a foolish fellow because he has not learned that freedom is never the result of force. Of all the wars that have been waged, not one has been the benefactor of the world at large. It is the common boast of such men as Ingersoll, that the civil war emancipated the negro and really made him a stronger and better man. Nothing is farther from the truth. The great evil of slavery was robbery. The great evil of so-called freedom is disease. The negro should have achieved his own freedom; or perished. Frederick Douglass is an eminent example of what I mean. He emancipated himself, and in spite of slavery and the negro taint became a representative American. In spite of every prejudice it must be admitted that he was a man; pre-eminently so, according to our ideas of manhood. The emancipation proclamation was not written for him. He did not need it. He was the savior of himself.

The mass of American negroes today are no better off than they were in slavery. They are being consumed by lust, disease and public schools. Without a visible master they are still the beasts of burden that they used to be. There is nothing in the history of the race that thrills the hearts and elevates the soul. Think of the Indian—his ferocity and sublime endurance, his unconquerable love of freedom, and song of triumph at the agonizing stake, his purity, his generosity, his simplicity—and then think of the negro—his tameness and fear of pain, his subservient instincts, his fawning on the hand that smites him, his uncleanness, his pliancy, his duplicity.

The negro was the mendicant of freedom, the Indian was its proud and arrogant possessor. I pity the negro and admire the Indian. All men pity weakness and admire strength. The sublime and beautiful in nature are her majestic forms, and not the spawn of slime and heat that crawl beneath the foot. The terror of the ocean is its immensity. Mt. Blanc is grand because the eternal snows rest on its summit.

In nature the vines and insects are beggars. They are the parasites that cling and climb. Among men we do not admire the vine and insect. We despise them because they perish when the object that supports them falls. We despise them because they are not individuals—not indivisible.

The destructive Anarchist is trying to save the vines and insects of human nature. He wishes to dynamite the oak in favor of the lichen—assassinate the elephant that the louse may live. He seems to forget that every man who is worth saving will save himself. He needs no assistance except that which he commands. He asks no Christ to die for him. He meets the world in single combat with all his strength and cunning, and if he dies he is content.

Destructive Anarchism is folly. It is insane, and every man who lights a torch or throws a bomb deserves to die. The true reformer is the man who saves himself, and gives mankind the benefit of his experience. It is just as easy for men to be free under plutocracy as it is under any system. Of what avail is Socialism to the paralytic? How will the idiotic be benefited by the single tax? What will the instinctive slave do with the liberty that the destructionist proposes to dynamite upon him?

Progress is a slow and painful journey. Angiolillo, the assassin of Canovas was insane. He gave his life that millions of worthless human vermin might suddenly go on two legs and look heaven in the face. He might as well have given his life to repeal the law of gravitation, as to have given it as he gave it to repeal the law of the survival of the fittest. The man with his intelligence and heroic fortitude, without his one-sidedness, could not have failed to save himself.

His life might then have become an object lesson, while as it is there are none so poor as to do him honor. I have never liked the character of Brutus. I do not like the man who smiles and stabs, nor him who rashly attempts to stay the cyclone with his hands. Intelligence at last will rule. Show mankind that they are self-destructive and there will come a reformation. Show them that plutocracy is a juggernaut beneath whose knives they fall by millions, and they will cease to fall. The Indian sacrifices himself to please his god or gods, dethrone his gods and the knives will rust. The destructive Anarchist seizes a club to smash the ponderous machine, and is himself consumed. His rashness deserves the death.

All of us believe in freedom when we understand it. No man wishes a master. Let the reformer point freedom out to them. Then let him verify his doctrines by making himself free. If I am sick let the doctor lay down the rules of health. But I will not take his medicine against my will. I wish to kill him if he tries to force me. It is nothing to him that I die.

Society is sick. I offer it a remedy in Individualism. If it casts my physic to the dogs, so be it. They have the funeral expenses. I believe in freedom, the absolute liberty of every man, woman and child. I do not wish to control a single human being. But if they insist that I must enslave them or sacrifice my life, I still live.

JAS. ARMSTRONG (Autonomist.)

### A TRUE DEFENDER OF LIBERTY.

My definition of "liberty" is the right to rebel against imposition of any kind; this is the reason why I sympathize with all consistent rebels of any age or climate. Comrade A. J. Pope was arrested by force; the government officials interfered with his individual ideas and put him in jail—by what right, I would like to ask Chas Doering?

Now, Comrade Pope thinks he can get back at the government officials, and he is right, too, in my opinion; he is very logical; he did not spend a cent in defense since the trouble started; can Comrades Isaak or Addis say the same thing? What difference does it make if some of us have to wear striped clothes as long as we are convinced that we are doing justice to our conviction? I for one don't give a snap. I have already been in jail, and I am ready to return at any time for my position in the social movement.

Chas. Doering only calumniated Comrade Pope, as he don't ask anyone for sympathy nor condemnation, and he will continue in his own way if it pleases Doering or not. Pope has ideas of his own and I give him credit for that, the actions of Comrade Pope show better than all the writings and speaking about him, as everybody acquainted with him knows his honesty and good fellowship for mankind.

A. KLEMENCIC.

## 148

The number printed or written on the wrapper of your paper shows that your subscription has been paid up to that number.

## FREE SOCIETY'S AGENTS.

The following named persons will receive and receipt for donations for Free Society:

**Chicago, Ill.** C. Friesner, 459 Wabash ave.  
P. Vandree, 347 Ward st.  
W. P. Borland, Trade Building.  
Jay Fox, 159 N. Union.

**New York City.** I. Rudash, 888 Grand st.  
A. Levin, 840 Cherry St.

**Buffalo, N. Y.** F. Kohlbeck, 622 Jefferson St.

**Philadelphia, Pa.** L. Rabotnik, 781 Plover St.

**Allegheny Pa.** A. Frey, 138 Madison Ave.  
H. Bauer, 72 Springgarden av.

**Baltimore, Md.** B. Morwitz, 1001 E. Baltimore.

**Providence, R. I.** S. B. Bookbinder, 45 Winter St.  
J. H. Cook, 40 Hanover St.

**St. Louis, Mo.** Otto Bluke, 3850 Keweenaw st.  
E. H. Schneider, 3722 Calif. av.

**London, Eng.** E. Leggatt, 23 Eve Rd. London E.

**Glasgow, Scotland.** Wm. Duff, 9 Carlin St.  
Gowan Hill.

## PROPAGANDA FUND.

Please do not use private checks nor bank checks if you can avoid it.

The safest and most acceptable manner of remitting is by postoffice or express money order. Week ending Jan. 21.

Bookbinder	\$2.00
Shilling, Rothbeck, 21 each	2.00
Schack, Krueger, Casper, Machacek, Huml, Gordon, Gilburg, Crash, Cruzan, Hart, J. Steppi, F. Steppi, Miller, Taylor, Mrs. Smith, D. E. Smith, Nichols, Korge, Sicken, Hanell, Morech, Lawrence, Ely, Vignoni, Romagnoli, Snellenberg, Engaber, 60 each	13.50
Goodheart, Young, Pletzer, Arleson, Hottner, Sacharoff, Danielowicz, Chapman, Loveridge, Ober, Lindgren, 25 ea	2.75
Bronnahan	15
Shields	20
Corr., Yost, Schwartz, 10c ea	30
Sales	08

## SAN FRANCISCO LECTURES.

Comrade A. Klemencic, a member of the local Journeymen Tailors' Union, will lecture on the following subjects on the dates given, at Templar Hall, Pythian Castle, 909 Market street:

1. Labor Unions that They Are and as They Ought to Be. Feb. 4.
2. Labor Unions and the General Strike. Feb. 11.
3. The Place of the Labor Unions in Future Society. Feb. 18.
4. Labor Union Men and Scabs. Feb. 25.

## The Letter-Box.

Skupina "Bezvladi," New York.—Prijeti poslane penizeze in pismo.

Ross Winn.—Have not seen the book you mention. If an Anarchist book and not too individualistic we might handle it. Address of S. D. is 1234 Pine street, San Francisco.

"Quaker."—Stamps received. We send four copies of each.

Mary Elwell.—Please remit stamps next time; cost of collection is 25c. We can't agree to print the article you refer to until we know better what it is. If communistic and filled with good points we can doubtless find space for it.

## HAS NOT ADVANCED.

How far true civilization has advanced in 1800 years can be judged from the fact that a poor Frenchman in New Jersey has just been fined \$107 for keeping five robins in a cage for a few days. Three weeks ago the murderers of 40 workmen in Pennsylvania were let out on \$5,000 bail. The Frenchman is in jail; the cowardly deputies are not.—Commonwealth.

If a laboring man, unable to get work, asks an individual or the government to assist him, he is called a pauper, hobo or a tramp. When a gigantic corporation asks the government to assist it by placing a high tariff it is called "protection to labor." Such industry, it appears to us, is also in fact a pauper, hobo and tramp. It is more, it is a blood-sucker and a parasite.—Saturday Critic.

## A CORRECTION.

In the statement of the defense and publication fund \$12 is credited to E. Goldman, as collected in Chicago. The amount should read \$12.50. Comrade Miller requests this correction so that no misunderstanding will arise.

A biography of Casper Smith (Max Stirner), the first German Anarchist, has been written by J. H. Mackay, and will be published in February.

No human laws are of any validity if contrary to the law of nature, and such of them that are valid derive their force and their authority mediately or immediately from this original.

Like great storms that come against the wind, all great reforms are born in unpopularity, and are the work of a self-sacrificing few who withstand the taunts and jeers of an ignorant or a prejudiced multitude. When a reform reaches public popularity its propagators are forgotten, for the work of the agitator ceases where majorities begin.—The Worker.

My experience is that those who stand foremost in the synagogue and wear long faces on Sunday, and spend the rest of the week bribing aldermen and getting up stock-jobbing schemes to defraud widows and orphans, are the most dangerous members of society.—Governor Pingree.

## DO YOU SMOKE?

Then if you want a good 10-cent cigar, made under good sanitary conditions, warranted long Havana filled, Sumatra wrapped (5-inch Spanish Londres) and bearing the label of the Cigarmakers' International Union, send \$1 for a box of 12 of them, postpaid, and you'll get them.

Dealers, especially on the Pacific coast, should get rates by the 1,000 on our "New Ideal," 10 cents; and "F. S." and "Royal Infants," 5 cents.

By ordering of us you patronize our group and aid in publishing Free Society, for these cigars are of our own make, being under the supervision of a comrade who has had plenty of experience to enable him to send out only first-grade goods at a fair price. Local comrades who use the weed will save money in buying cigars by the box, and might as well patronize the cause as to buy of a man who hates your belief and would hate you did he know you to be an Anarchist.

Address all orders, and make all monies payable to

**FREE SOCIETY**  
SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.

## FIFTH GRAND ANNUAL

BAUERN BALL  
AND CONCERT

GIVEN BY THE

KNIGHTS OF LIBERTY GROUP,

FRIDAY EVENING, FEB. 4, 1898,

AT NEW WINDSOR HALL, EIGHTH AND  
CHRISTIAN STS., PHILADELPHIA.

For the Benefit of the FIREBRAND GROUP.

TICKET: 15 CENTS.

## DR. FOOTE'S PLAIN HOME TALK

EMBRACING

MEDICAL COMMON SENSE.

For the information of those who may be interested, I would call attention to the popular edition of this book, that has been a standard of information, and a source of knowledge to tens of thousands of families for many years. The popular edition has been brought out to meet the ability of the poor to buy, and is sold at the remarkable low price of \$1.50.

Order of Free Society.

THE OLD AND  
THE NEW IDEAL.

A Solution of that part of the Social Question which pertains to Love, Marriage and Sexual Intercourse.

BY EMIL F. RUDEBUSCH.

THE MOST MASTERLY WORK ON THE  
SEX QUESTION IN PRINT.

It is written in language that anyone can understand, and yet is not offensive to the most refined.

Don't fail to read it. You can't afford to.

**CONTENTS:** Our Freethinkers and Christian Young Men. Our Children. Our Love. The Value of Marriage and the Free Love Movement. The Happy Marriage of Today. How long will Love Relations last in a Free Society? Jealousy and Possession. The Old and the New Ideal. Love and Friendship in a Free Society. The Ideal So I say. The Number of Children in a Free Society. Undesired Children. Identification. The Sense of Shame. Obscenity Prostitution. Crime and Disease. Eboricity—An Appeal to the Women. Woman's Emancipation. The Social Question. The Propaganda.

## APPENDIX:

Introduction. The Criticism of a Leader. The Charm and Beauty in Exclusiveness. Woman vs. Man. The Weakness of Woman. "Calling Names." Criticisms of Socialists and Anarchists. Tolstolism. A Paradox. My Hopes and Fears.

PRICE: Paper cover, 65 cents; cloth, \$1.

"A Cityless and  
Countryless World."

AN OUTLINE OF PRACTICAL CO-OPERATIVE  
INDIVIDUALISM.

Written in the form of a novel this book takes the most advanced stand on the Sex Question, treating of it at length. Its economics are not so clear, however, but are in many respects worthy of close examination.

PRICE, PAPER, 50c.; CLOTH, \$1.00.

## ARMSTRONG'S AUTONOMIST.

of Waco, Tex., is a conservative journal of absolute individual freedom. It is against ever-organizing, whether anarchistic or governmental, and advocates a free society in logical accordance with the philosophy of Herbert Spencer. It has secured twenty five thousand readers in three months' time. Its style is at once vigorous, original and sensational. It mingles the melody of Ingersoll with the slang of the gamins and the depth of Spencer. Subscription, \$1.00 a year, 10 cents a copy, sent by the leading news companies and book stands or supplied from office. Subscription refunded if it does not please. Address Armstrong's Autonomist, Waco, Tex., U. S. A.

## MIGHT IS RIGHT;

OR THE SURVIVAL OF THE FITTEST.

NEW BOOK BY RAGNOR REDBEARD, LL. D., U OF C. I. PAPER, 50c. POSTPAID.

This is no ordinary book. Undenially it is the most remarkable publication that has appeared in Christendom for fifteen centuries. It is a treatise on the science of the future, a real life Anti-Christ. With grim and pagan logic it assails the first principles of moral codes, religions, politics and law; affirming that modern civilization is a horrible by-product and continuation of the terrorism and gloom of the Dark Ages. It marshals an overwhelming array of facts to prove that the man of today is a physical and mental derelict, a coward, a weakling and a slave. Upon biologic Spencerian principles it attacks the golden rule, the sermon on the mount, the Jewish decalogue, statute books, written constitutions and representative institutions, affirming that they are all without higher sanction or authority than organized duplicity or armed power. There fore if man is ever to be free, these artificial and dominating "Thou Shalt's" must be entirely swept aside.

Dr. Redbeard contends that fitness to survive must be tested by the clash of armies at other tests being fraudulent. Victors in war are naturally entitled to dominate; and the "defeated"—that is the runaways who feared to die—are equally entitled to dominate. Throughout all organic life the chief selective agency is combat. Women admire warriors above all other kinds of men. Communities of cravens (and their descendants) are rightfully plundered, taxed and enslaved.

"Right" and "Wrong" are decided not by the Meek but by the Mighty, who, consequently write the laws of the future. Throughout all deeds—and re write them at pleasure. Equality ideas are mere millennial illusions, for all life is strife—a combat to the death.

Thus, by demanding his credentials, Darwinism is fatal to the tyrant. It rings him round him ten thousand trained Rivals. It proclaims to all men "Nothing is true; nothing is sacred; all things are open to you; blessed be the Vanquisher." Address

ADOLF. MUELLER (sole agent),  
108 S. Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.

Advertisement.

## NEWS STANDS

Where FREE SOCIETY can be obtained:  
SAN FRANCISCO—Paper Covered Book Store, 1203 Market st. Anarchist and Freethought literature also on sale.

NEW YORK.—A. Tannen, care of Uffner, 309 E. 9th st. Also has for sale Freedom, the English Anarchist paper, at 3c a copy, and Anarchist pamphlets.

Boston—Columbia Stationery Store, 965 Washington st.  
Brigham's Restaurant, Washington st.

## BOOK LIST.

In lots of ten or more, three-cent pamphlets furnished at five cents each.

"Agriculture. By Peter Kropotkin.....	05
"Appeal to the Young, by Kropotkin.....	05
Anarchism vs. State Socialism. By G. Ber-	02
nard Shaw; 3 for.....	05
Revival of the Inquisition.....	05
Anarchist Morality. By Peter Kropotkin	05
The Commune of Paris.....	05
and An Anarchist of Anarchy. By E.	05
Reclus (one volume).....	05
Anarchy on Trial. Speeches by Paris	05
Anarchists.....	05
Common Sense Council. By Bevington	05
Social Conditions and Character. By	05
"Ireland".....	05
Religion and Labor. Part I & II. By Fox.	05
Liberty Lyrics. By L. S. Bevington.....	05
Bases of Anarchism: Historical, Philoso-	05
phical and Economical. By W. Holmes	05
Law and Authority. By P. Kropotkin.....	05
God and the State. By M. Bakunin.....	05
The True Aim of Anarchism. By Steinle	05
Revolution. By S. H. Gordon.....	05
Grandmother's Lessons to Men. Young	05
and Old. By Lois Washbrook.....	10
Wants and their Gratification. By H. Addis	10
When Love is Liberty and Nature Law.....	10
My Century Plant. By Lois Washbrook.....	1.00
Wherefore Investigate? Why, regular	
price 50c, but while present supply	
lasts "they go at".....	25

\*The 3-cent rate does not apply to those marked with a \*.

The Free Lance, Burnside, Ky., 25 cents a year. Samples free.

International Turn-Verein meets at 1524 Ave. A, New York City.

The San Francisco Italian Anarchist Club meets every Saturday night at 111 Trenton st.

The New Generation, 605 South Third St. Philadelphia Pa., open every evening.

The German Group, Chicago, Ill. meets every Friday, 8 o'clock p. m., at 535 Blee Island av.

Anarchist Headquarters in San Francisco 1223 1/2 Polson St. Open every evening from 7 till 10 P. M.

The Independent Educational Club meets every Sunday evening, at 7: 30 p. m. at 1927 E St., Tacoma, Wash.

Independent Debating Club, St. Louis, 414th Market st, Room 7, meets every Thursday evening at 8 o'clock.

The Peoples Union, a free discussion club, meets every Sunday evening at 935 Westminster St., Providence, R. I.

Group Proletariat of New York City gives Anarchist lectures Fridays at 48-52 Orchard st., and Saturdays at 21 Suffolk st.

Sturmvoegel, 50 First st., New York City, is an Anarchist Communist paper printed in German, semi-monthly; 50 cents per year.

New York Debating Club meets and delivers lectures every Sunday 7:45 o'clock P. M. at 1524 Avenue A, near 80th. Free discussion.

Medical Literature of all kinds, including English periodicals, can be found at the news stand of comrade I. Rudash, 383 Grant St., New York City.

Pamphlets in English, Hebrew and German languages can be had by out of town senders and comrades, by addressing A. Levin, 340 Cherry St., New York City.

Wendell Phillips Educational Club will meet every Sunday, 3 p. m. at 45 Winter St., Providence, R. I. Pamphlets in English, German, French, Jewish and Russian languages on hand.

Deutsche Listy is an eight page Anarchist weekly paper, published in the Bohemian language at New York City, 402 E 71st st. by the International Workingmen's Association of America. Send for sample copy.

Progressive Thought and Dawn of Equity, of Olathe, Kan., is the oldest organ of the Labor Exchange movement. It is full of L. E. news and original articles, gives progressive ideas, co-operative facts and advocates the correct way out of hard times. Send for sample copy.

The Little Freethinker, the only magazine published for the young that is free from superstition. Semi-monthly. Fifty cents a year. On trial, six months, twenty-five cents. "As the twig is bent the tree is inclined." start the young right, and the work is done. Address Elmina D. Sinker, Snowville, Va.

The Altruist is a monthly paper issued by the Altruist Committee of St. Louis, whose members hold all their property in common, and both men and women have equal rights and decide all their business affairs by majority vote. Twenty-five cents a year; sample copy free. Address, A. Longley, 2319 Olive St., St. Louis, Mo.

WANTED: Light on the Sex Question. This is humanity's greatest need. Read Lucifer, the Light Bearer, the only paper of its kind in the world. Weekly, eight pages, \$1 per year. Send 25 cents now and receive Lucifer three months on trial and these five stirring essays, which are worth an equal sum, as premium: "Subsistence and Justice," by Lucinda B. Chandler; "The Sexual Enslavement of Woman;" "Love and the Law;" "Variety vs. Monogamy;" by E. C. Walker; "Thomas Jefferson as an Individualist," by Gen. M. J. Trumbull. Address M. Harman, 1894 Congress street, Chicago.