

FREE SOCIETY

ENTERED AT SAN FRANCISCO POSTOFFICE AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER.

An Exponent of Anarchist-Communism: Holding that Equality of Opportunity alone Constitutes Liberty; that In the Absence of Monopoly Price and Competition Cannot Exist, and that Communism is an Inevitable Consequence.

NEW SERIES NO. 24.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., SUNDAY, APRIL 24, 1898.

WHOLE NO. 160.

EPICRAMMATICAL.

I.

Dost thou lament oppression?
Thou fain wouldst embrace thy freedom?
Free of illusions thy mind:
There has oppression its root.

II.

Freedom thou cravest?
I hear to God thee plaintively crying:
Suppliant, fool on thy knees!
Can a beggar be free?

III.

Wouldst thou fulfill thy desires?
Enjoy thy general birthright?
Claim no more than thy needs:
Then thou canst gather thy dues.

—Herman Eich.

EVOLUTION AND SOCIOLOGY.

[At the Seventh Congress of the Australian Association for the Advancement of Science.]

At Chicago, during the great World's Fair in 1893, a congress of evolutionists was held, and, with a view to facilitate matters, the following questions had been some time previous to the date of meeting sent to most of the prominent evolutionists of Europe and the United States, with the request that answers should be sent in as briefly as possible:—

1. Can the doctrine of evolution in its sociological aspects offer wise suggestions for the solution of the grave social problems of our time? And
2. What should be the next step of society in view of those suggestions?

Some two hundred replies were received, and, as you may imagine, they furnished most interesting matter for study; and, I may say of some of them, for amusement also. However, what surprised me very much was the apparent ignorance of the evolutionists themselves upon what might be called up-to-date theories of evolution. One and all of them, without a single exception, stood by the "struggle for existence," "survival of the fittest," "tooth and claw," or "natural selection" as the one and only principle of evolution. As a result it happened that the "wise (?) suggestions for the solution of the grave social problems of our time" were either, as those of Mr. Alfred Wallace, reserved, or misleading, or pernicious in the extreme, as when they urged with all effrontery the remorseless commercial axiom of the day, that since "survival of the fittest" is the law of nature, the weak among men, as among animals, must go to the wall.

In the face of such terrible thoughts, which have unfortunately written themselves in the best blood of this 19th century, no apology is needed, I am sure, to review critically, if briefly, the origin and development of the evolution theory.

THE STRUGGLE FOR EXISTENCE.

This century came into existence in all the sunrise glory of song of perhaps the greatest poets that ever lived, for they were essentially the poets of Hope—Shelley, Wordsworth, Byron, Keats, Landor, Burns. But a blighting influence soon followed in the shape of Malthus, who turned the thoughts of men to pessimism and despair, when he convinced the most potent thinkers of his time that population has a tendency to out-grow its food supply. We now know that the greater the population among men the greater is the food supply; that as a matter of fact, population is only limited by our ignorance, and that the more of us there are the wiser we become. But the damage was done before these truths were realized, for Charles Darwin, then a student, had become a convert to

Malthusianism. Darwin went out into the world reading into everything he saw the necessity for struggle among animals, and ultimately arrived at his completed conception of survival of the fittest by a process of natural selection. Darwin states in the "Origin of Species" that the struggle for life is greatest among members of the same species. This, however, is a fallacy, as will presently be proved beyond all doubt.

The idea of struggle for life which thus originated with Malthus, and was adopted by Darwin, received particular emphasis from Huxley, and was finally developed and elaborated into the so-called synthetic philosophy of Herbert Spencer. And now American millionaires swear by Spencer, and call him friend, shielded as they are by his philosophy in their struggle for monopoly, which they misname a struggle for life.

CO-OPERATION FOR LIFE.

Just in the same spirit that Darwin went out to see the world in the Beagle, impressed by the works of Malthus, in 1860 Pierre Kropotkin, then a young enthusiastic explorer, went traveling in Siberia full of Darwin's then newly-published book, the "Origin of Species," prepared to see everywhere the struggle for life among animals. But he saw something else, and his heart leapt for joy, as with a flash of genius he realized that the struggle for life is only a half truth; not even that. On every hand he saw the animals, with which Siberia teems, not only not fighting, but actually assisting each other in a thousand ways. He saw herds of deer which would pass signals of common danger for miles; he saw the bulls of wild cattle herds form rings round the cows and calves, showing a solid front of horns to an enemy. Birds were seen on every hand flocking together on utmost terms of friendship, assisting each other in building nests, or catching fish, by common effort. Crows' parliaments were observed with their watchful sentinels posted on convenient trees. The humble bees, and humble ants, in their myriad forms of mutual work, all spoke to Kropotkin of a deep underlying principle of mutual aid, a principle which he has so ably proclaimed and proved to exist, beyond the shadow of a doubt, universally throughout the animal world. As a friend and disciple of Kropotkin, it has given me unbounded pleasure to verify to my own complete satisfaction the truth of his magnificent discovery that associated animals have survived in the great struggle, while those of more pronouncedly individualistic instincts, however strong, have gone to the wall, and are still continuing to go that way. Rabbits, kangaroos, pigeons, sparrows, rats are familiar examples of progressive survivors, while eagles and the great solitary prowlers of desert and jungle, strong as they are, and howsoever magnificent, are going, and will soon be gone altogether. Lest I may not have said enough to convince on this point, let me mention how monkeys cross a river by forming a suspension bridge, by clasping each other, and swinging from tree to tree; and, again, how beavers cut down trees by common effort, float them down stream, and make dams and houses so mathematically correct in proportion as to astonish architects and engineers. Nor have the beavers specialists among them, nor authoritarians of any sort; no bosses, nor gangers—they work in harmonious fellowship, in terms of strict equality. There are no lazy ones among the beavers. They love work, so much so that a beaver in captivity

has been known to build a dam of boots, shoes, bushes, and sundries when the opportunity offered.

I have watched prairie dogs for days in the Rocky Mountains, but never saw a fight, only play, or strict attention to duties of sentry. Who has not seen cockatoos rob by concerted action? And, lastly, man is the most social of animals. Through being so he has risen to the top and keeps there. Yet the despised worm patiently waits for him, and will doubtlessly survive him in the long run unless he gives more attention to the problem of how to preserve the species than he has hitherto done.

INDIVIDUALITY.

My reason for thus rapidly touching upon the history of the philosophy of evolution was mainly to show that there has been a dual principle at work in the development of the animal world, including man. First, we have the struggle for life, which is the basic principle of all individual rights. No one questions the right of an individual to self-preservation, but men do not so readily grant to individuals their natural right of preserving their individuality. All tyrannies of the past have been encroachments upon the rights of the individual. He was denied the privilege of thinking for himself, and of speaking his thoughts; and he is still denied the right of acting as he thinks best to a very grave extent.

In the name of social rights the individual has been crushed and kept down in all ages to the detriment of the race. But again the individual has reacted against his cruel environment. All revolutions of the past bear evidence of his power to obtain justice when his consciousness of wrong has once been aroused. I can conceive the existence of no ethical principle apart from the desire to preserve and develop individuality. We have in this conception a touchstone to test the spuriousness or otherwise of all the great questions of the day, such as those concerning government, the equal rights of men and women, the equality of all, compulsory education, etc.

The truth is, if we respect the rights of the individual to live a complete life, instead of recognizing his bare right to existence only (sometimes not only that), there is no room for authority in any shape or form on this our planetary home. The ethics of freedom, the only true ethics of life, forbid compulsion of any kind, as inconsistent with the best interests of men, and in so far as it infringes one of the fundamental laws of social evolution.

FREE ASSOCIATION.

It naturally follows that any association of individuals should only exist upon terms of absolute freedom. The principle of society is an economic one, as that of individualism is ethical. If society does not exist for the mutual benefit and equal rights of all individuals composing it, it has no rights of existence at all, and must be looked upon as immoral.

Instinctively the animals in their long history of development have felt this, as one can trace in studying the species of termites. Their earlier colonies show more or less inclination to the use of authority. Political government of a socialistic nature has in the process of evolution of the termites given place to a completely autonomous or anarchical form of society. It is well known also that the intelligence of advanced termites is greater than that of the less free societies. They harvest grain, keep milkers, and build most beautifully.

Although it is of the utmost importance to bear in mind the part association of animals plays in evolution of the animal kingdom, it must not be overlooked that associations are strong only from an economic point of view. The moment they use their strength for any other purpose they must be ruled out of bounds; and individuals have a right to protest, and rebel, against their authority.

Purity of principles can alone make a pure society, and so it happens in offering suggestions as an evolutionist to those engaged in social reform. I urge the great necessity for recognition of the ethical principle of individual freedom and the economic demand for associations of men for mutual assistance.

If the associations of men were maintained pure by operations of the law of freedom, what a beautiful process of action and reaction for mutual advance one can conceive. One year of freedom in the world would be worth centuries of authority. For there is plenty of everything and to spare for all; the supply of the earth is unlimited.

FREE INDIVIDUALS FREELY ASSOCIATED.

In answer then to the first question proposed, viz., can the doctrine of evolution in its sociological aspects offer wise suggestions for the solution of the grave social problems of our time, a consideration of the principles of evolution will give, as an ideal for sociologists to work for, this final conclusion: that society can only truly exist when it is composed of free individuals freely associated.

In answer to the second question, viz., What is the next step society should take in view of those suggestions from evolution? I would say, abolish all institutions of authority, and trust implicitly to the honor and ability now spoiling for want of use in the hearts and brains of all men and women.

When have volunteers for any service failed if called upon by the spirit of honor, freely to help? See how the life-boats are rushed by willing hands at the call of rescue! Do not men, women and children save life at the risk of their own every day? Men will do for honor and love that what they never would or could for money.

In conclusion, I for one believe that if the call were only made tomorrow, every bit of essential work in the world would be cheerfully, and with enthusiasm, performed by countless bands of social volunteers.

"Before the slave when he breaks his chain,
Before the free man tremble not!"

—Dr. Fauser MacDonald, in *The Tocsin*, Melbourne, Australia.

THE MAN WHO WOULD NOT SET A GOOD EXAMPLE FOR APES.

"AM I MY BROTHER'S KEEPER?"

This was supposed to be a deceitful and vicious answer of a very bad man. Millions of bible readers have supposed from this scripture text that man is his brother's keeper. Religion teaches self-sacrifice and obedience to authority. Altruism of the severest order has always been the heart of religion. Man was by divine command bound to love his neighbor and also his enemies. Poverty, charity and obedience well observed make tools and fools of people.

While God enjoined love of one's enemies, and the priest most devoutly preached this commandment, yet we notice that neither God nor his priest will forgive his enemies. They will see them in hell first.

Egoism shows us that we love ourselves first and best, no matter how much we profess to love others. It is human to do so—it is best because it is human, to love ourselves first and best. Egoism is a rational and practical explanation of the motive to action. Man is a law unto himself,—he acts from the broadest views of life, of this life. He rejects authority for truth, but accepts truth for authority. He is not his brother's keeper. He is under no obligations to him. He discovers that self-preservation and self-development are the highest aims he can have. Of course he rejects superstition, the bibles and gods, and christ—also kingcraft and despotism of all kinds. These superstitions and despotisms may be and are imposed upon him as a law and gospel. The free

man has no obligations to fill except such as he has contracted for. He is not living for others but for himself. He is not his brother's keeper. He is from his own nature compelled to view life from the point of his own happiness. Many people go to the objective side of the question, and turn back to look at it from there. They say: "Of course you are your brother's keeper, because we are all woven together into society, and that which is best for the majority will be best for the individual." But this is sophistry. No society can do better than to leave each person free—free in the enjoyment of all his rights—rights which do not invade, and rights which must lead to repelling the invader.

You are not your brother's keeper. To take care of people, as the Church does by taxing, tything and stuffing the believer with superstition, and as the State does in taxing, and enslaving by laws, and finally conscripting him to send him to war to be shot. This is becoming your brother's keeper with a vengeance. Taking care of people is doing them the greatest injury. Individuality is the modern mainspring to conduct. It is the case where man assumes the responsibility of taking care of himself.

To keep man under tutelage, under restraint, under thousands of bad laws, is to dwarf him. He becomes fossilized at an early age, and with open mouth and empty head he is gaping around to see examples. He has lost his growing nature. Growth stops when the mind and body are enslaved. I am not my brother's keeper, that is I am not responsible for his conduct. I am deeply interested in the conduct of those about me, but it is because of the happiness or unhappiness their conduct confers or imposes upon me.

I shall do many kind deeds to others, not from any moral or spiritual obligation (if anyone can tell what these terms mean when the rags are torn off them), but because it pleases me to do so rather than to do otherwise. I don't feel impelled "to set an example." I recognize no duties but those I contract for, I find it all I can do, and that but imperfectly, to be my own keeper. My friend over the way insists that I ought to set a good example, and urges the fact people learn more from example than any other way. He says we learn by imitating others. Suppose we do how does that, if it were a fact, show that I am under obligation to govern my conduct for the benefit of others and not for myself? It cannot be shown that I am under moral obligations to do so, for egoism demonstrates that there are no such things as moral obligations. Morality today is a ghost, and my neighbor who may reluctantly relax his grasp of this antiquated ghost, has nevertheless two other ghosts at his side which he never dreams of relinquishing, the Church and the State. Modern science has issued a writ demanding their abdication.

But is it true that we get most of our knowledge from examples? Children, monkeys and saints get nearly all they know by imitation—they ape those about them, and swallow the traditions of the past, but if they ever escape childhood, apethood, or saintship, they must unlearn a vast amount of what they learned in following the example of people going the wrong way.

Growth and progress consist in a protest against the traditions of the past. Most of our child-life is filled with fable and falsehood—if they have learned something of truth it has been nothing more at best than half truths. This is what example does for us. We learn by imitation for the simple reason that our fathers learned by example and they taught us to follow good examples. We come into this world therefore as much monkey as man. What was wanting? Better parents who would teach us to reason on all things; who would train us into responsibility; who would inspire us with a love of equal liberty. Now this following examples is directly hostile to equal liberty. When a person with great devotion sets an example, he is pretty sure to cut a club at the same time to make those within reach follow his example. He believes he is his brother's keeper, and is therefore going to keep him following after and in his footsteps. There would not be much in it, if one man was obliged to set an example and nobody obliged to copy it. The imitating business is *ausgespielt*. We have had patriarchs, prophets, saints and apostles to follow, but they were poor patterns, and their paint is worn off. Hence the end of walking in the ways of our fathers is drawing him. Men still have ideals, but like ghosts they are too thin to stand interview. I must repeat that all copying after others begins with self-

* Played out.

rejection. Individuality is the backbone of manhood.

If children need copy-books before their face it is because they are children. We should not think of keeping a copy-book forever before the child's eyes. He must soon become self-reliant. We make him puzzle over arithmetical problems on his slate. He is, in doing this, simply beginning to take up the responsibility of life. If he should keep on working the same problem over and over again for years he would lose his reason. He needs something new to think about and to call out the different powers of his mind. Should the pupil be utterly unable to comprehend the methods of solution in any example, and the teacher work it out on the slate before his eyes, for months and years, possibly both might become insane, or become senseless like the saints who work on the unsolvable problem of salvation until they don't know even a little bit.

Man needs to "go as you please," that is to go as he pleases, and not as Abraham, Isaac and Jacob pleases.

Society is degenerate because it takes the wrong methods of escaping from its thralldom. Equal liberty is the way out, but society votes for less liberty and more law.

W. S. BELL.

VIOLENCE IN EDUCATION.

It is high time to awake from sleep—in things intellectual, as well as in things spiritual, in things educational as well as in things material. We have begun to deprecate "contempt or neglect of the rights of man," but it has hardly yet been admitted that children have any rights which grown people are bound to respect; so, though we have ceased to club woman, we still beat children and make the best excuse we can for our brutality.

Where do we get the right to assault a child of whose conduct we disapprove? Legislation can give a parent no such authority, for the legislator's authority is only "to secure justice to all." Surely, to make an indignant person judge, jury, and executioner, to have the little prisoner tried on the spot and anyhow, whether guilty or not, punished if he tries to defend himself, is hardly "equal justice." We are driven back then to the arguments that it is necessary or that it is enjoined by religion, the familiar arguments of the fool and the fanatic.

Solomon, with his seven hundred wives, must have had a numerous flock of little ones, and the wisdom he had to spare for governing other people's children has been handed down to us in an aphorism, "Spare the rod and spoil the child." That sort of "education" may have been better than nothing for slaves or subjects, but we have to educate sovereigns so that they may govern themselves.

Experiment which began with Dr. Arnold at Rugby shows that children can govern themselves; and an intelligent father or mother, if they will take the pains, will find that it is never necessary, because it is never right, to do violence to a child. You can teach a child nothing by hitting him with a stick, except that you are a bigger animal and as revengeful as he, and that a blow hurts, which he knows already. The object of all our education, moral and physical, should be to teach children that which we do not generally know ourselves, namely, "That whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap." This education should begin at least as soon as a child is born, and time and anxiety can be saved to the mother by promptly teaching the infant regular habits even of body, to go to sleep without being petted, to stay still when it wakes early, and so on, by letting it suffer the consequences of its little mistakes. As babies, just as in later life, the only teacher from whom mankind can really learn is Old Experience.

For example: The baby wants to play with the fire, stretches its little hands towards it—that is natural. Now put your own finger near the fire, draw it quickly back, blow on it, and make the little one understand by signs that fire burns. The child wisely means to find out as early as possible whether you are to be trusted or not. Therefore it will put its own little finger on the bright hot metal—it burns, just as you said! Baby has learned its lesson and begins to trust you.

A child gets hold of matches. Do not snatch them away. This is your opportunity! Explain that matches also burn. If the child is not old enough to understand words, do it by signs, and if the little one insists on experimenting, as it probably will in the first of such experiences, let it burn its fingers. Happily you are there to see that no serious or per-

manent damage occurs. Then soothe the burns with a little oil and comfort your baby. It has learned what you never could have taught it without the experiment, and it has learned in addition that you are comparatively wise and trustworthy. The burned child dreads the fire, and if you have once given the little one to understand that you are not to be relied upon, it will never implicitly rely upon you again.

We must never deceive our children. It is sadly common to hear mothers endeavoring to persuade their children to take medicine by assuring them that it is not very bad, or even that it tastes good. It is better and easier to appeal to the child's courage by telling him that the medicine is nauseous, and making it understand that it is horrid, but that nevertheless you think it had better take it. By acquiring confidence in you it acquires control of itself. You must choose between being a friend or a governor, and if you choose the latter you will have, either in practice or in theory, to answer the question, "Who made you a ruler over your little brother?" We have the same right—and no more—to force our children to do right that we have to force grown children to do right. In other words, the limit of our right of control over them is that we are entitled to prevent them from doing what will be an infringement on the rights of others if those others object to the infringement.

Were you to see a grown person endeavoring to throw himself off a roof, you would catch him by the neck and prevent him. In such extreme cases you may do so with your child, but if you saw a grown person handling a pocket knife carelessly, so that he was likely to cut his fingers, you would have only the right to warn him, and that is all the right you have with the child. Of course, experiments of this kind with a young savage, or with one whom you have trained as a young savage, will at first be unsatisfactory, but the right course will always work well.

Parents generally endeavor to deprive their children of the education that is best worth having, the education of self-control. They put away the candy box, often furtively, lest the child see it. They conceal the fact that there is to be ice cream for dinner, lest baby should cry to sit up. Those are the very opportunities provided by the nature of things in order that the child may learn. So the best plan is to so accustom the child to the experiences of your greater wisdom that even such an incredible statement as that candy will make it sick is accepted, not without question, but as being probably reasonable.

To sum up the principle of education, we should appeal to the good in the little human breast, and we should abandon every kind of violence as being an infringement of human rights.

BOLTON HALL.

New York.

SEXUAL AND ECONOMIC REFORM---A QUESTION OF PRECEDENCE.

I am not of those who hold it is impossible to carry on the propaganda of several reforms simultaneously. It can be done, but I think if it is attempted by one paper, unless that paper is very strong financially, the publisher will have a stiff fight to make. A man can easily work through several journals and organizations for various reforms, making each the representative and machine of one movement. It will be easier for him to do this than it will to endeavor to run counter to all the prejudices of all the persons who are interested, each in not more than one or two of the issues. Yet the work he does will be more effective, I believe, if he carries the whole front of iconoclasm, although his adherents will be much fewer than they would be if he pursued the other method. It seems indisputable that the sexual problem is one that if we forbear to study we forbear at our peril. To leave it for future settlement is like an army leaving in the rear the strongest and most quickly-moving army of its enemy as it enters that enemy's country. I am well aware that many economic reformers who are at the same time sex radicals deprecate any extended agitation of the marriage question at this hour, while they think it is simply folly for a paper to make the issue of the relations of the sexes its only topic, or even its main topic. For instance, in "Free Society" of March 13 there is a criticism by a correspondent of the method pursued by Lucifer. Animadverting upon the answer of Mr. Harman to a critic, this writer says:

"It is absolutely certain and apparent to sane minds, not meandering over 'psychic planes,' that sexual

freedom for woman will never usher in free land, free exchange, etc., etc., but that all the freedoms he mentions may, and probably will, usher in sexual freedom, or self-sovereignty for both man and woman. Economic freedom, industrial independence, is absolutely necessary to the emancipation of both man and woman; neither can win freedom alone, nor can one or the other be free while industrial slavery reigns supreme and is, in reality, voted for by the working people of this country, at every election, national or state. Think of it!—free speech, free press, free mails, to follow sexual freedom!"

The one fundamental factor of which sight is lost by this man and by those who think with him is that of mental freedom, of emancipation from the dominion of superstition. While it is unquestionable that we must have economic reorganization in order to give all the opportunity to practicalize any theories of sexual liberty which they may hold, it by no means follows that mere economic independence would bring practical sexual freedom, and especially for woman. It has not done so heretofore in the classes which have been free from the stress and cramping environments of penury. There has, to be sure, been a great deal of irregular living, particularly on the part of men, but this form of rebellion against convention has been disastrous in its effects, in almost every way, and its damnable hypocrisy has been and is not the least of its evils. Crimes of violence and numerous other forms of wrong have resulted from the acceptance of sexual superstitions by men and women who were economically independent. And those crimes and vices would continue to curse humanity under changed and improved industrial conditions so long as the people remained under the sway of the false and anti-natural morality to which they have so slavishly bowed for centuries upon centuries.

I do not believe that it is wise to carry on the campaign for sexual enlightenment and liberty before that for industrial reformation nor that for industrial reformation before that for sexual enlightenment and liberty. The march toward the two goals should be continuous and parallel, the two armies supporting each other. But if we must give precedence to the one or the other, if we can do but one thing at a time, then it is my strong conviction that emancipation from sexual superstitions will bring economic reorganization much more quickly than economic reorganization will bring emancipation from sexual superstitions. One of the considerations which force me to this conclusion, I will state in this way: Given the man or the woman who has thrown off the mental shackles of the old numbing and dwarfing morality and you have a man or a woman who is profoundly unwilling to continue living the old slave life, sexually. If this man or this woman is a victim of present economic institutions—and the chances are as a hundred to one that he or she is, for those who suffer therefrom vastly outnumber those who profit therefrom—it is certain that this person will ardently desire to bring about such changes as will give the opportunity to live in harmony with the principle of sexual liberty. Therefore, all the energies of this sex radical are likely to be called into play to help on progressive industrial movements. Self-interest will impel him or her to do all possible to remove the obstacle of poverty. That is, to the desires that now spur men and woman to labor for the destruction of privilege—the wish to be well fed, well-clothed, well-sheltered, well-educated, to have abundant recreation—will be added another most powerful desire, the desire to enjoy sexually in freedom what has now come to be regarded by the mind as innocent and necessary. To me it is absolutely beyond question that the man or woman who is freed from the bonds of sexual conventionality can never again willingly be content in the environments which our existing economic institutions provide for the millions.

On the other hand, there can be no doubt that there are multitudes of industrial reformers who are dominated by the ancient superstitions regarding sex, and it is clear that if their wishes industrially could be gratified this moment they would settle down into a condition of apathy from which it would be as difficult to arouse them as it is now to arouse great numbers of the middle class either to take an interest in economic questions or to study the sexual problem. It can not be doubted that these "old ideal" labor reformers would mark out a new dead line for social agitators, and that the battle for sexual freedom would remain to be fought. Contented with their domestic arrangements, or believing that if they suffered it was the fault of their "imperfect natures," not of the monogamic ideal and practice, they would be as strenuous in their opposition to the experiments of

the free lover as they and their middle class allies are at this moment. So I see nothing to be gained and very much to be lost by relegating the sex issue to a subordinate position.

There is another consideration that I look upon as of vital importance. So long as men and women are dominated by the prevailing ideals regarding sex and its manifestations, it is vain to hope that any substantial advance can be made in co-operation of any kind. The monogamic ideal, and all that grows out of and is connected with it, is squarely in the way of co-operation, communion, or any other form of really free association. Family pride, jealousy, envy, and all the rest of the concomitants of the monogamic union, and especially of the legal monogamic union, are obstructive of cordial and effective combinations of brains and hands for the elimination of rent, interest and speculative profits. The conception of exclusive possession of the object loved makes every man fear every other man who is brought near his human property and every woman fear every other woman who is brought near her human property. And we all know that it is only one short step from fear to hate, from hate unexpressed to hate expressed, from hate expressed to disruption and disaster. The sexual superstition must be killed if we are to be economically free and happy.—James S. Denson, in Lucifer.

BIBLE TEACHING UP TO DATE.

"Wherefore do ye spend your Labor for that which satisfieth not?"

This was the question asked by Isaiah under the old dispensation of kings, priests and prophets; when those who profited from the Labor of others were loud and frequent in calling upon god (good, truth, love) to destroy the enemies of the church, other children of the same god, who dared to rebel against kings, priests, prophets and the church. Well might the prophet Isaiah say, "like a crane or a swallow, so did I chatter," for he did not give any clear, intelligent reply to the question he propounded. We know that in those days there were many gods, but the god who made one man and then had to make another man to tell the other what was right, was a fool.

Today we are in a better position to give a satisfactory reply to the important question—by far the most important question before the world—for we have done considerable evolution since the days of such wild ravings as are recorded of Isaiah; and now, too, we have only one god—gold. It governs kings, presidents, (another name for American kings) parsons, (a more comprehensive name than priest, because it will include Booth and the missionaries whose descendants now own most of Honolulu) and the man who sells prayers at five dollars each, with which to brace up our misrepresentatives when they concoct laws by which to rob Labor.

Workers can cease spending their Labor for that which satisfieth not, just as soon as they en masse withdraw their consent to be governed; and as gold governs, the first step must be to dethrone gold.

Millers and bakers will soon be unemployed by the thousands, for a machine has been invented to make bread direct from wheat, the cost being no more than that of making flour. But bread will not be cheaper; those who own the gold will simply rake in more bloody gold. If it were cheaper, those thrown out of employment would not have the wherewith to buy it. They will certainly still be in possession of the only liberty now left to those who perform all the useful work in the world—the liberty to starve.

Labor makes all the machines which are continually adding to the already vast multitude of despairing or desperate men and women. Gold has been made a prime necessity of life, and there will soon be sufficient desperadoes to render it positively dangerous to be in possession of any of that yellow metal. Then our salvation will be near. This appears the quickest solution of the all important question.

J. ALFRED KINGHOEN-JONES.

To live fashionably is to live improperly.—Foote.

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

NOTE AND COMMENT.

Comrade A. Levin of New York requests us to remind comrades Heilig, Rabotnik and Siff that they ought to respond to his letter in their own interest.

We have frequently been requested to publish pamphlets of American writers, and as comrade Van Ornum offered us some of his writings for the purpose we are enabled to comply with the requests. The pamphlet treats the following three subjects: "Mating or Marrying, Which?" "A Lesson from History" and "The Problem of Criminality." No. 6 of Free Society Library will consist of a selection of comrade H. Addis' writings which he is at present revising.

The Universal Equity Club has removed and will henceforth hold regular agitation meetings every Monday evening at the Temple, 117 Turk St.

Mention has been made of this club in F. S. heretofore. It is the most liberal club in this city. While it makes a specialty of the discussion of woman's emancipation, its platform is free to everybody and for the expression of opinion upon all topics pertaining to the elevation of society.

Radicals of all shades should avail themselves of this splendid opportunity for propaganda. A. I.

President McKinley has at last been able to formulate a message to congress in which he says, "Our trade has suffered; the capital invested by our citizens in Cuba has been largely lost and the temper and forbearance of our people has been so sorely tried as to beget a perilous unrest among our own citizens which inevitably found its expression from time to time in the national legislature so that issues wholly external to our own body politic engross attention and stand in the way of that close devotion to domestic advancement that becomes a self-contented commonwealth, whose primal maxim has been the avoidance of all foreign entanglement."

England is drawing more out of American Labor than Spain is out of Cuba. Spain cannot bleed Cuba to the tune of \$1,500,000 a day, as England does America. McKinley knows this—and further, he knows it is done quietly and in the dark (with regard to most of the sufferers) by means of England's domination of the rulers of America. McKinley can unblushingly protect the bond holders, but has not the pluck to cut off the money entanglement of England, and forsooth, goes on bended knee to ask aliens if we may use silver on a parity with gold. "Our citizens," who invest in bonds, care naught for "domestic advancement." The bond holder's pet puppet that can, under present conditions, call America "a self-contented commonwealth, whose primal maxim has been the avoidance of all foreign entanglement" is worthy the same treatment that would be accorded a mangy cur who is past cure! ! !

HERO—"A man distinguished for valor, fortitude, or bold enterprise; anyone regarded as having displayed great courage, or exceptionally noble or manly qualities or who has done a deed or deeds showing him to possess such qualities."

The men who took to training as sea butchers, as a means of living, because they have been robbed of their birthright (land) and were blown from their sleep into that place where the wicked cease demanding rent, and the wary usurers have given up their blood sucking are to have a monument erected to them as Heroes, but those who will not go into the butchering business, and bravely fight against existing evils in high places, suffering want, but nobly doing the work of the nation, are accounted as the scum and off-scouring of the earth, whereas they in reality are the Heroes and do not object to be known as Anarchists. Such are the ways of God who rules all the "civilized" world. J. A. K.-J.

Many politicians of our time are in the habit of laying it down as a self-evident proposition that no people ought to be free till they are fit to use their freedom. The maxim is worthy of the fool in the old story, who resolved not to go into the water till he had learned to swim. If men are to wait for liberty till they become good and wise in slavery, they may indeed wait forever.—Macaulay.

In vain you tell me that artificial government is good, but that I fall out only with the abuse. The thing—the thing itself is the abuse.—Edmund Burke.

Whoso would be a man must be a nonconformist.—Emerson.

Centuries of government as shown in the historic records of civilization, have been centuries of tyranny, bloodshed and pillage. Let us have done once and for all with political vivisection and legislative experiments, and with their untold miseries and suffering—sad and almost irreparable results—and trust in reason, persuasion, example and intelligent self-interest, as the most potent factors in the upbuilding of the temple of Liberty! That is our watch-word, and that liberty "the greatest possible liberty, compatible with equal liberty."—William Gilmour.

The following address of the millionaire Tom L. Johnson, congressman of Ohio, is refreshing and indicates that the "public conscience" is after all gradually being moved:

"What the world needs is not charity but justice. I shall refuse the same as ever to issue checks for charitable institutions, and I shall not bequeath money for building churches and libraries.

"My family shall be well provided for, but the balance of my wealth shall serve to teach the people how to prevent me and others of my kind from robbing them. As long as any person is permitted by the monopolization of natural resources and private ownership of public utilities to accumulate wealth that does not belong to him, just so long will people of my kind be willing to commit such theft. It is my task to open the eyes of the people to the process whereby they foolishly permit themselves to be robbed and to point out to them the way to abolish a system which enriches me and impoverishes themselves."—Exchange.

Speaking of Utopia, it is not we who claim that evolution will naturally tend to lead humanity into a more harmonious and perfect social system or conditions, that are utopians, but they who imagine the possibility of men's remaining forever wedded to the undignified and irrational condition of being the drudgehorses of a comparatively few idlers and being forever denied the possibility of enjoying the advantages of the natural resources of old mother earth and the fullness thereof.

It were a declaration of bankruptcy of man's reason to hold that with the facilities created by modern science, invention and discoveries, it would be impossible to inaugurate conditions under which each member of society would have an opportunity to develop his faculties, to display his capabilities, and to enjoy the fruits of his efforts.

Indeed it is the very progress upon all fields of science, modern inventions and discoveries and particularly the advancement upon industrial lines that will force upon us a readjustment of conditions. The liberated forces of nature, the results of the mental aspirations of many generations, are bound to lead to new ideals and finally to a realization of those ideals. It is impossible to presume that mankind will not take an upward tendency as a consequence of this evolutionary process.

We are therefore quite willing to be called utopians and visionaries; the further development of things will justify our predictions and will prove that we are dealing with facts while our opponents who totally underrate humanity's evolutionary tendencies have been the real utopians.—Exchange.

It is said "Revolutions are not made." Of course, that is true, but they may be prevented.

"No-one can make a revolution" is only a phrase invented at the dainty offices of "systembuilders."

When Camille Desmoulins stepped upon a table of the Palais Royal, plucked a leaf and cried: "To arms!" he did more for the cause of revolution than all the

declaimers of the rights of man had been able to accomplish in a century.

Nations do not make any more revolutions since they are receiving an anti-revolutionary training. History tells us about extinct nations whose social structure was based upon castes who were perfectly contented with their lot and considered it a matter of course to be the slaves, serfs and menials of their fellow creatures. It is just as easily possible to stem the tide of progress now and cause the retrogression of the most liberty loving nation. A thorough system and a rigorous discipline is all it requires to accomplish it. Sometimes such systems of "popular education" are of an astonishing simplicity. Often a mere shibboleth, a phrase, which is perseveringly inculcated into the minds of the people, poisons and enervates them and makes them the easy prey of the crafty few.—Adolph Gercke in "Volksanwalt."

A FEW POINTERS.

EXPROPRIATION IS A BOON TO POSTERITY.

An eminent conservative writer once used the following argument against democracy: "The masses, at least in all old countries, are so poor that it would be for their immediate interest to rob the rich if they could. Not until this process had been repeated two or three times, would it appear that, in destroying security for the fruits of industry, they had destroyed the motive to be industrious, and so made their poverty worse. They would gain something; but their children would be the sufferers. Therefore, to preserve industry and civilization, there must be government by thrifty people who look forward to the next generation, as shown by their accumulating wealth." The same argument is now used, with more appearance of force, against Anarchy. But the test for the truth of all arguments is experience. What does experience say to this one? The two great expropriations of modern times occurred during the French Revolution and the American Civil War. In both cases, the poor were at first made poorer. Security was shaken, and industry discouraged. The managers of productive industry were ruined and alienated. A large class of employees were turned adrift to beg or compete with others. Not until the new system had been in operation a good many years, did it appear that the poor were abundantly compensated by getting rid of the parasites who had preyed upon their labor. They suffered some hardship; but their children were the gainers—which is just the reverse of what Macaulay said.

"RICH MAN, POOR MAN, GOVERNMENT—THIEF."

What is a rich man? What is a poor man? It is commonly supposed that a rich man is one who has a good deal of money or other labor products; and that a poor man is one who has not so much. But any economist will tell you that that is not the distinction. The economists say truly that if a "communist mob" were to plunder a multi-millionaire's house, they would get very little they could use. Some furniture, only suitable for one luxurious dwelling; a few bottles of wine, which they would not like as well as whiskey, some horses, not fit for the plow, a few coins—in gross a few hundred thousand dollars' worth of labor-products, the greater part unavailable, would be all. In what, then, is the rest of the multi-millionaire's possessions? Evidently, in something which is not labor-product. If the scene were in our Southern States a few years ago, a great part would be in slaves. Anywhere, a great part would be in land-titles, shares of railroads and other chartered corporations, patents, places and mortgages, bonds, etc. which the mob could not convert to its own uses. What are all these things, in one word? They are claims on the future products of others labor. A rich man is one who can make others work that he may consume their product without returns. All the means which enable him to do so are created by governments. The rich man is he who has "saved" some money, and bought, into this one great thieving ring. C. L. JAMES.

WHY A MONUMENT?

"Boston Central Labor Union has passed resolutions, urging labor organizations to erect a monument to the coal strikers shot by deputy sheriffs at Lattimer, Pa."

Why a monument? Some of the greatest scoundrels that ever lived have the grandest monuments. Besides it seems to be a fashion to erect a tombstone

and then forget all about the death. Tombstones pay a vast amount of debt in the eyes of living simpletons. Men who are worthy the name of men, need no marble shafts as a voiceless token, to remind them of the cruelty and injustice meted out to their fellows. Let the memory of Lattimer's victims live in burning words that will strike a responsive chord in the hearts of the living; that will speed the day when the hired thugs of capital will find the volley that will prove to be the last straw on the back of labor.

A monument is no solace to those, who bitterly hold in their hearts the memory of countless men, who have been shot down in this country alone, during the past 20 years. And all this murder is done at the behest of the State, that "divine" entity that in the poor man's brain weaves as fantastic shadows, as did ever the holy loom of the church in her fairest day of power and tyranny!

They who are emancipated from the yoke of religion wonder how nations of people in the past so apathetically submitted to the awful crimes committed in the name of God. It can only be accounted for by the fact that the people were mentally enslaved by superstition; they dared not question the right or wrong of their "dear lord" for fear of losing their "immortal souls."

In the 19th century we behold a like effect from a different cause. A new fetish, the "State," has woven a web in the human brain, and is protected much as was his predecessor, God, i. e. by the gallows, dungeons and standing armies but most of all by slavish fear and reverence for the law as interpreted by its priests. In the sheltering folds of this octopus that has enscribed the earth, mammon shares the profits that are wrung from labor. And capital with a greedy hand doles out to workmen enough for the bare necessities of life. If there are any heretics among the workers who protest or criticize, or condemn, they are treated much the same as were the heretics of the church. A rifle shot, prison or the gallows is their reward. But some day labor will stand face to face with the majesty of the State and be amazed and disgusted with what, it sees, namely frail men, drunken with the long misuse of power, very human, very fallible after all. To speed the coming of that day let labor unions agitate for the right of armed resistance to such invasive acts as injunctions; restraining strikers from assembling and listening to speeches from their comrades or from marching to different localities to confer with fellow workmen. If working men have lost this right, their lot is indeed pitiable, and this right, that of conferring with and advising one another that the members of all great corporations freely exercise, belongs of a right to the employees of that corporation. If labor unions will boldly agitate for this right and back up the demand by a judicious use of powder and lead, they will have less need of monuments, and the law and order party may need something in that line also.

KATE AUSTIN.

Caplingers Mills, Mo.

THE FOLLY OF WORSHIP, OR THE CURSE OF GODISM.

I should like to republish the above pamphlet, and if I can get sufficient encouragement will do so. Single copies 10 cents. By the dozen or hundred from three to five cents. If I can I should like to issue 10,000. In that case I could let them go much cheaper and not suffer loss. Who will help me? Address me in care of FREE SOCIETY.

LOIS WAISBROOKER.

WHY COMSTOCK IS KING.

Our German contemporary of Buffalo makes the following interesting compilation of prohibitory laws against cursing, blasphemy, etc., which are yet plentiful in some of the States of the Union and which are occasionally brought to light by some fossilized and bigotted judge to the terrification of liberal-minded people:

In Arkansas no one can hold office or appear as a witness in court who denies the existence of a god. Thus the liberals have no rights in that state.

In Dakota blasphemy is a penitentiary "crime." That is to say, reason must give way to insanity in that state.

In the whipping-post state of Delaware the same god-protective provision holds sway. Witnesses before court, be they believers or unbelievers must take an oath "by the eternal living god, the searcher of all

hearts." The oath terminates thus: "As I shall answer before God on the day of judgement." Anyone not wishing to be a hypocrite in that case is considered unreliable and disreputable.

In the state of Indiana godlessness and swearing are prohibited, but here the laws are liberal enough to simply impose a fine of from one to three dollars upon culprits.

In the state of Maine they have the following beautiful law: "Whoever blasphemes the name of God, in denying God, his creation, his reign, day of judgement, Jesus Christ, the holy ghost or the name of God in denying, damning, insulting, heaping contempt upon or ridiculing God, his creation, his reign, day of judgement or Jesus Christ, the holy ghost or the holy scriptures as contained in the canonical books of the old and new testament, shall be punished with not over two years' imprisonment or a fine of not over \$200.

In Mississippi it is necessary to believe in a "supreme being" in order to run for office.

The criminal code of New Jersey imposes a fine up to \$100 or to three months' imprisonment or both for either purposely or maliciously blaspheming God, Jesus Christ or the holy ghost or denying the holy scriptures. Every person of the age of sixteen or over cursing or in a profane way using the name of God, Jesus Christ or the holy ghost shall be punished for each one of such offenses by a fine of 67 cents or 24 hours' imprisonment.

The list of similar inquisitorial ordinances could be increased at length. That such miserable hypocrisy, operating with club and jail, is vigorously supported by the State and the courts and is officially recognized and sanctioned has been proven in the recent arraignment and conviction of the publishers of the Firebrand and Emil Ruedebush, the publisher of "The Old and the New Ideal."

Under such circumstances it is no wonder that a London magazine in a discussion over the prevailing hypocrisy in this country sarcastically remarks that Anthony Comstock, the famous crank and detective, is king and supreme judge in America over all public expressions of a religious and moral character.

If this state of affairs continues the United States will occupy first rank among the most hypocritical and retrogressive countries of the world.—Exchange.

The Letter-Box.

J. J., Toronto, Canada.—Thanks for encouragement. I wish all readers were so well pleased with FREE SOCIETY and realized that we are poor devils, and cannot live on wind-pudding and love alone.

W. A., Palmer, Mass.—Yes, Brann was shot and killed in Waco, Tex. I do not think the Iconoclast will be continued—at least not in the old style. There are very few people who have pluck enough to expose rascality and bigotry as he did.

A. C., Pasadena, Cal.—Thanks for immediate response. Of course "a man without food is a poor fighter," but most of our readers are poor devils and it is therefore not merely negligence that prevents them from paying their subscriptions. Regarding your advice to "leave as soon as possible the No. 13 because it is a bane of progress" we do not share your view. The house had been empty for quite a while on account of this superstitious belief and we could rent it cheaper than other houses of the same size, and so we considered it rather good luck.

Various Voices.

T. M., Lansing, Kans.—Free Society is an excellent paper for propaganda among the workmen, but I believe it would be expedient not to run the pamphlets through its columns. In the first place you would sell more pamphlets, and secondly, articles which run from week to week are almost unavailable for distribution. Continued articles ought to be avoided.

We will not run the articles purposed for pamphlet through the paper as soon as we are able to acquire more type.

A. I.

W. M. A., Delta, Colo.—Although my reading is mostly along the lines of Socialism, I believe your paper is teaching the higher law. How the present ignorant, miseducated, mentally deformed race of slaves can ever be fitly schooled to recognize and abide by the higher law except by means of evolutionary, or Industrial Socialism, is the problem that looms up between my point of view and the ideal state of a free society.

I have no use for the Political State in solving the problem of freedom. The beginning of progress toward Anarchy must come with the triumph of industrial organization and its substitution as a force or power antagonistic to political government. Thus far I think I see clearly on the road to Anarchy. But it seems to my mind a positive fact that nothing short of an industrial organization, national in scope and governmental in power, can hold the people away from their false gods long enough to secure to them the full benefits of a free society.

Whether a government of and by the industrial forces would evolve toward freedom or become the instrument of unscrupulous politicians may be a question.

But I think the drift of evolutionary forces would lead upward and onward.

Withal I am neither a Socialist who condemns the Anarchist nor, as an Anarchist, could I condemn the doctrine of State (?) Socialism as I understand it.

The above letter raises the old question of the practicability of Anarchy, and the belief that we must pass through State Socialism to become fit to live in a free condition.

State Socialism hopes to be established by means of political action, and yet Friend A. hates the political State. But "an industrial organization national in scope and governmental in power" would put the individual in a more helplessly dependent condition, with infinitely less opportunity or power for development than he now possesses. What assurance have we, then, that the power of that organization would be used to secure to the people the benefits of a free society?

Give a child greater liberty as it grows older, and its strength increases. Its legs become strong and it learns to walk, to run, skip, jump and play. Remove the legal restrictions from people as they are today and they will gain self-control, self-reliance and develop mutual assistance amongst themselves in exact proportion to their increased liberty, and to the sense of solidarity amongst them. These things they cannot be taught by law.

Associated co-operative effort is to be desired, and will lead toward liberty, provided such effort is voluntary. If, however, such effort is compulsory it must of necessity cause inharmoniousness—despotism on one side and rebellion on the other.

There are but two fundamental principles that can be used as guides to human association: one is liberty, the other authority. If Friend A. will look the matter up he will fail to find one instance where authority was ever used to establish liberty, and in the nature of things such a happening is impossible. Liberty is, and must be, gained as a result of the repudiation of, and rebellion against authority. State Socialism has authority as its foundation and for this reason cannot possibly evolve a free society—a condition of liberty.

H. A.

Literature.

INTERNATIONAL VOLUNTARISM is the title of a new pamphlet, published by Marlborough, 51 Old Bailey, London, E. C., England.

The name of the pamphlet is very alluring to the lover of freedom, but a glance over the pages is enough for the intelligent student of sociology to see that the author gropes about in the dark and is somewhat confused in his thinking apparatus. A few quotations will suffice to vindicate my assertion: "We ask you to renounce force, or compulsion of each other, as a wrong instrument for securing political advantage for yourselves, or for advancing your own opinions and interests," and in the very next paragraph he says: "We ask you not to allow any governing body to pass laws which restrict and regulate the actions of those who live honestly and at peace with their fellow-men—laws, which interfere with their social habits," etc. To renounce force and "not to allow" is more than I can grasp.

"We ask you to choose full perfect freedom," etc. This sounds radical indeed, but then comes the contradiction: "Those, who on principle bear injuries without resistance, are the only persons who have no need for a government." And as these "Voluntaryists" believe in self-defense they propose a "national government, voluntarily supported, always kept subject to the rights of self-owners, and only entrusted with force for the protection of person and property."

MATING OR MARRYING, WHICH?

BY
W. H. VAN ORNUM.

(CONTINUED FROM LAST WEEK.)

At certain regular periods the female ovaries give off what is known as the "ovum," germ cells, which, if they come in contact with the germ cells of the male, are likely to become impregnated. If so, they pass on into the womb where they are developed until birth. But without such a blending of these opposite cells, the germs of either are incomplete. If connection takes place at a time in the month after ovulation has ceased, so that this blending is impossible, there can be no conception. I contend that at the time of conception the part which the female plays in determining the character of the child is equally as great as that of the male; and that, for the whole nine months following, her influence is not lessened one particle, while that of the male is greatly lessened; and, under some circumstances, ceases altogether, so far as exerting any direct influence beyond the initial point. Every particle of nutrition comes from the mother; and every emotion, every thought, every aspiration which she experiences carries its impress to her unborn child. It is her soul, her spirit, her ideal that is being stamped, indelibly stamped upon its young and plastic being. Let her experience fright, disgust, horror, or any other strong emotion, and she will register that emotion upon her unborn child with absolute certainty in some way.

Nor does her influence cease with the birth of her child. While nursing a babe, the ready sympathy between the mother and child is scarcely less delicate and active than before birth. Strong emotions act almost as promptly through the mother's milk as they formerly did through the umbilical cord. And then it is the mother's love that comforts and soothes it in its little troubles; her approbation and encouragement that stimulates it to early endeavors; and her lullaby that wafts it to dreamland. Whatever influence the father exerts, up to a comparatively late period, is purely secondary. It is an influence upon the mother, mainly, as already shown, through her emotions and the building of her ideals, which she in turn stamps upon the child. He fills a larger place in her thought than all other men combined. If he impresses her with the idea that he is an ideal man, that he possesses ideal qualities, she will fix those same qualities upon her child, even to physical conformation. His conspicuous habits, his walk, his methods of expression, his ways, every kind of a peculiarity she will photograph, as it were, upon the child. If, on the other hand, he proves to be something different from her ideal of a man—if he is mean, vulgar, vicious, dishonest, brutal, so that her emotions become those of disgust and loathing, the chances are good for a child strongly marked with some hereditary taint, some congenital defect, physical or mental, or some degenerate reversion.

More than this, the very habits which prevail in married life actually do tend to produce these very effects. When men and women are constantly thrown together in such close relationships as they are, it promotes excesses, if nothing more, which are unfavorable to the preservation of lofty conceptions of the character which each may have formed of the other. Excess always produces satiety; and satiety leads to repulsion. It is even probable that a large proportion of the female diseases, those which are peculiar to the sex, are the result of sexual excesses. Could but a tythe of the physical sufferings, the sorrows and heartburnings of married life be told, it would be appalling. It is only when exceptional cases find their way into the divorce courts; or startling tragedies are enacted in real life, that the world gets a peep behind the scenes. And yet, we regard it as a matter of special wonder that children are born with undesirable hereditary characteristics.

I am fully convinced that the family life as now commonly lived, wherein the husband is the breadwinner, while the wife attends to the domestic labors of cooking, washing, ironing and the general housework, is bad; and promotive of anything but harmonious relations between them, or lofty ideals in either as to the qualities of the other. The adage, "familiarity breeds contempt," here finds an abundant verification. After the night's rest, each is engaged in their own way at their peculiar duties, until the labors of the day are mostly done. They are then brought together again when each is wearied with his or her own cares and labors. Oftentimes they are irritable and worried, or inclined to find fault. Then bickerings arise, too often ending in criminations and recriminations; or one is moody and exacting or is careless of the other's feelings. To make it still worse, they commonly occupy the same bed, which should never be done habitually. Aside from the excesses which it promotes, the sanitary objections are conclusive. And then, it is well calculated to dispel any high ideals which they may have formed of each other. If neither ever entered the presence of the other except under such conditions as would stimulate a mutual love and respect there would be less necessity for the interference of the law in the relations of the sexes.

Coming back now to the influence of the mother upon her child, if the social atmosphere in which she lives is unfavorable to healthy growth: if her lot is cast among those whom we call criminals, those who must live by preying upon others; if she is called upon to resort to stealth, cunning or strategy, or depend upon the exercise of these qualities on the part of her husband or others, for the supply of necessities, so that these qualities come to be regarded as desirable, ideal, even for the time being, she will be sure to give birth to a child marked by cunning, secretiveness, or given to strategy and deceit. She will give it the qualities of a criminal. And further, if her children continue to live in this atmosphere of criminality, as is frequently the case, because society closes and bars the door of their exit, we are likely to head a race of criminals, or rather, several generations of men with criminal instincts. And then the social Pharisees will compile long genealogical tables to show the tendency of crime to become hereditary in certain families. Of course, as long as the conditions continue the effects of those conditions will be felt. The thing that I wish to make clear now is, that it is the female, far more than the male, who determines the character of the offspring; that she does it through her emotional, impressional and idealistic nature, in response to the conditions which environ her; and she does it, not as a reproduction of her own character; but, first as a representation of what she sees, or thinks she sees in the male; and second, of the predominant feelings, emotions and aspirations which

govern her during the time of conception, gestation and lactation. And I am so strongly impressed with the power which favorable or unfavorable conditions exert, that I fully believe that if no woman ever mated with any man except one which fulfilled her best ideal as to noble manly qualities; and the conditions surrounding her during gestation and lactation were favorable, even to a normal degree, it would be impossible to produce a deformed or depraved child, or one possessing congenital or hereditary taints. As I have before said, heredity, regarded as a transmission of the undesirable qualities of ancestors, is a reversion; and, under favorable conditions will be thrown off, just as one strong in vital force, can, within certain limits, resist the attacks of disease. Nature, when free to act, is capable of overcoming the tendency to reversion, otherwise it would be impossible to make any progress whatever. All this goes to show how direct is the influence of the surroundings upon the making of the individual. It is the way that nature works to adapt man to his environment. When there is a bad social environment those who must live in it, in this way are fitted to it. If we want better men and better women we must change the conditions—the environment.

The influence of low ideals upon the mother and through her upon her child, is well illustrated among the lower animals. It is well known among the breeders of dogs that a thoroughbred female, if once paired with a mongrel, will taint her future offspring long afterward, even when it has been fathered by a thoroughbred. I see no way to account for this except that the mother becomes debased in her ideals by association with the cur. The same thing too, has been observed in the breeding of horses. There is a probability that the same distinguishing characteristics run all through the animal kingdom, only varying according to the degree of the animals' development; and that it is the quality which gives direction to natural selection. This impressionable characteristic of the female, when it has its natural and proper action, is fraught with untold good to the species; but when thwarted by low and debased ideals born of bad social conditions, or by legal restrictions, it carries with it an awful punishment.

So far we have dealt with conditions and laws which apply to women in general; but I do not wish to be understood as maintaining that the principles laid down, while universal in a degree, apply to all women equally. The coarse, uncultivated and undeveloped woman, who has been trained under a system of restriction; who has been taught that the first duty of a wife is subjection in all things to her husband; who is ready to shut her eyes to all his imperfections; and who thinks that any thought of another is an act of infidelity to him, will not feel as keenly as another would his deficiencies; and therefore, she will be less susceptible to feelings of disgust at his shortcomings. Such a woman may continue to cohabit with a brutal husband without serious danger to her offspring. But under favorable circumstances, even she may lose her balance and be carried into open or covert revolt by a power she little dreams of. Let her be brought in contact with another, who, from personal qualities or peculiar relationships, she regards with esteem and veneration; and the chances are good that formal marriage ties will be broken. She does not understand that she is acting in obedience to a natural law which impels her to select the best possible paternity for her child. She may succeed in stifling her natural promptings in obedience to her early training; but if she does, it is at the expense of her woman's nature; and thereafter, if she accepts the embraces of the husband, when he no longer fills her ideal, it must be at the risk of bringing into the world a monstrosity. Nature has little respect for human laws, even when made to preserve so sacred a thing as private property; but it punishes any infractions of its own laws by penalties which the guilty cannot avoid.

But the woman of independent spirit, of refined and cultured tastes, who instinctively revolts at manifestations of brutality and sensuality and who yearns to realize her ideals in her association with the male sex, dares not, must not accept the embraces of one who fulfills none of those ideals, but who excites in her nothing but disgust, no matter what may be the ties which an artificial marriage institution has imposed upon her.

Several facts have now been established, in the course of this study, with sufficient clearness to be accepted as a basis for further inquiry.

The first is, that marriage, in so far as it interferes with freedom in sex relations, is an arbitrary social regulation imposed solely for the purpose of determining and maintaining property rights. The question of marriage is not a religious one at all. The Church, in attempting to make it such, has succeeded in giving it only the sanction of its theology, which is quite another thing.

The second fact is, that a natural mating of the sexes, free from any interference of society, fulfills all the requirements of human needs apart from determining and maintaining property rights. It satisfies the requirements of religion, regarding religion to mean, a social force proceeding from and operating upon the emotions for the purpose of fitting mankind for association one with another in this life. Love is but another name for religion.

The third fact is, that the function of sexual selection naturally rests with the female. It is she who is to determine with whom she is to mate; and she must do it with reference to her own ideals. Any restraint placed upon her freedom of choice must operate disastrously in the building of the race.

The next question is, is the institution of private property of such vital importance to mankind as to justify so great an interference with the operation of the natural law of sexual selection as is involved in the institution of marriage?

I shall not undertake here to answer this question fully; because I have sufficiently done so in my forthcoming work, "Co-operation, Past and Present," wherein I have shown that the institution of property is but a passing phase of human development; that it has had a definite mission to fulfill in that development; and that when that purpose has been accomplished, it will disappear and be replaced by common rights, common duties and common property. In the mean time, it is enough to call attention to the fact that the world is paying a very high price for what little good it can get out of these restrictions to liberty. When we take into account the domestic infelicities, sometimes resulting to awful tragedies; the moral, mental and physical monstrosities which are born to mismatched couples; and the poverty, strife, degradation and crime which result from property, not to say anything of the anxiety and worry from which none can wholly escape so long as it continues, we shall be likely to ask ourselves, what can we do to hasten the time when private property shall be no more?

So, it will be seen, that the reasons to be for the prevailing moral codes, or customs which uphold the marriage relation, are still operative and must continue to operate until people realize the necessity of abandoning the institution of property. I do not mean by this that sex reformers, by reason of their preachments, will not be able to induce a few women, who chance to be possessed of independent sources of support, to act independently of moral codes; but I do mean that no considerable headway can be made in that line. Such women, in number, are to the great mass of women about like a dipper of water to the great Atlantic. A thousand times more can be done by uniting in practical methods of co-operation—in such a full and adequate co-operation as will replace private rights, divided interests and individual properties with a common property. Then the economic question will be eliminated from the problem of the relations of the sexes. The production of wealth will be carried on for the common account, by means of the best appliances and under conditions which will insure the best results with the least expenditure of labor. Every one will be provided for from the common estate. Then no woman will be compelled to depend upon any particular man for a support. Her support will come just like the support of all others. There will be no question of legitimacy to arise to place her offspring at a disadvantage with others. She can seek her ideals as associates. She will not be compelled to accept a man who fulfills none of her ideals, and thus risk bringing into the world a brood of degenerates. If men wish to enjoy the association of the other sex, they will be compelled to make themselves worthy of it; not one time but every time. This will make better men and better children, children freer from the taints of heredity, from congenital defects and degenerate reversions. And it will make better women. It will take away the drudgery of woman's life; and give her such an object in life as she can never realize under present conditions. It will give her leisure and opportunity for improvement. It will give her the absolute control of her own person. Under the workings of such a system, it is reasonable to expect a higher physical, mental and social development than anything ever heretofore known.

These changes will necessarily come gradually. As co-operation takes the place of capitalism, the economic conditions must become easier and woman's lot more independent. Then the old forms and customs will respond less and less to the manifest needs; while the new way, for a time, be regarded as immoral and disreputable; but they will continue to approve themselves and justify their practice until they become finally established. In this way a new morality, or custom will arise.

Then the association of the sexes will be purified from every sordid or base consideration. It will be the highest expression of love unmingled with greed or ambition for social station. So far from being in any way degrading, it will be the highest and purest form of association. Nor need there be the least fear of what purists are pleased to call promiscuous sex relations. If those relations depended upon the volition of the male, there is no doubt that this would follow; because the male is lacking in that form of ideality which is so strong in the female. It is perfectly natural for a man to mate sexually with women, with little regard to selection; and any pretense of moral scruples may generally be set down as a pure pretense. He may, by a sort of religious phrensy, cultivate certain scruples, especially if his amativeness is weak; but those scruples constantly run counter to his impulses, which are always in revolt against them. And when the opportunity comes, the scruples are apt to be forgotten. But the case is different with women. That quality of ideality is nature's own safeguard of the race. If woman could be left perfectly unhampered in the exercise of it, her own natural promptings, which are always good when healthy, and when freed from sordid considerations, would be adequate to its perfect use. So, there is not the slightest danger to be apprehended in the utmost freedom on the part of the woman in the matter of sex. But, on the other hand, there is the greatest danger in every form of restriction not imposed by nature itself.

A LESSON FROM HISTORY.

The following extract is taken from Ridpath's History of the United States. It is a part of the concluding chapter of the early history of Connecticut.

"The half century preceding the French and Indian war was a period of prosperity to all the western districts of New England. Connecticut was especially favored. Almost unbroken peace reigned throughout her borders. The blessings of a free commonwealth were realized in full measure. The farmer reaped his fields in cheerfulness and hope. The mechanic made glad his dusty shop with anecdote and song. The merchant feared no duty, the villager no taxes. Want was unknown, and pauperism unheard of. Wealth was little cared for and crime was of rare occurrence among a people with whom intelligence and virtue were the only foundations of nobility."

Remember, this was in Connecticut; and in time extended over a period ranging between 140 and 200 years ago. Massachusetts had been settled under the authority of the Plymouth Company, which had obtained a royal patent from the English Crown, vesting in that company, not only the title to the lands of Massachusetts, but the right to govern the Massachusetts Colony; while Connecticut was settled somewhat later, not under authority of any special grant, but by enterprising pioneers who had previously settled in Massachusetts. These settlers, for various causes, had left the older settlements and pushed further into the wilderness until they reached the valley of the Connecticut, where they stopped and established themselves beyond the jurisdiction of the Massachusetts Colonies. Being beyond that jurisdiction they felt that they were under no obligations to pay rents to the proprietary governors, as those were expected to do who remained within the limits of the royal grants. They were seeking for free land; and here is where they found it. The result is stated by the historian already quoted.

This picture of prosperity was realized under what would now be considered, in many respects, very adverse circumstances. It was before modern invention had made it so easy to bring wealth into being. It was before a railroad had been built; the telegraph had been invented; machinery had been applied to the manufacture of the thousand and one articles which we find so essential to the comfort of every day life; and before the increase in population had made possible the almost infinite subdivision of labor with its endless saving of labor required to

produce wealth. The population was confined to a few scattered villages and farms. There were no cities and scarcely any commerce. There was not even a stage coach in the whole colony; and not more than two or three stage routes within the entire thirteen colonies. And yet, mark the statement! "Want was unknown, and pauperism unheard of. Wealth was little cared for." Why was it little cared for? Because it was so equally distributed that there was no rich class on one side and poor class on the other; and no one lived in fear of being brought to want. "Crime was of rare occurrence." The conditions which produce crime were absent. The farmers were not oppressed. They feared neither the landlord nor the sheriff. The account says: "They reaped their fields in cheerfulness and hope. There were no strikes among the workmen. The full product of their labor was the measure of their wages. 'The mechanic made glad his dusty shop with anecdote and song.' It was before the modern contrivance was adopted whereby the people tax themselves rich. Mr. McKinley had not been thought of yet, for the account says: 'The merchant feared no duty and the villager no taxes.' It is common to accuse a man of being visionary who attempts to depict an ideal condition of society, as if he were picturing something outside the limits of human experience. But here was a realization of almost perfect Anarchy, not in the dreams of a future utopia, but in the practical experience of one of the early colonies in this country; an experience which lasted more than half a century. Can we find a place like that in Connecticut today? Can we find a place like that within the broad expanse of these United States today? To the people of Connecticut the progress of these 200 years has been a progress in some respects backward instead of forward. And yet, during this time vast improvements have been made in everything pertaining to the satisfaction of human needs. New sciences have been constructed and old ones enriched with vast stores of knowledge; literature has been purified and exalted; and old superstitions have been shaken to their very foundations, or swept away altogether. The arts have flourished beyond the wildest dream of the enthusiast. The earth has been girdled as with a shoe string, so that any important event which takes place anywhere throughout the civilized world is fully reported in the morning's newspaper; and we read the account of it at the breakfast table or on the way down to the office. We have found out how to produce almost everything that we eat, drink or wear with but a small fraction of the labor and expense which used to be required to obtain them. We can build houses in a few days which formerly required months or years; and build them a great deal better. We can bring articles of comfort, convenience or luxury from the uttermost ends of the earth in exchange for our own handiwork within a few weeks; sometimes within a few days.

Taken by themselves, these improvements tend directly to make the burdens of life easier; to shorten the hours of labor; to increase the rewards of labor; to elevate and enoble human life; and to increase the sum of human enjoyment. But it has not done it. On the other hand, it is harder today; and it is constantly growing harder for a poor man to get a living. The struggle everywhere is growing fiercer and fiercer. In Connecticut, instead of progressing from good to better, the condition of the people has changed right the other way. Want, and the fear of it, has become well-nigh general and pauperism is almost, if not quite, as prevalent as in any of the countries of Europe. Crime is of so frequent occurrence that prisons have been multiplied everywhere; and yet they are kept filled to overflowing. Not only the villagers but everybody else is crushed down under a load of taxation. The mechanic no longer whiles away his hours of work with joyous song, but is driven by the lash of hunger to a servitude as exacting and arbitrary as a galley slave. What is it that has reduced a once free people to such straits? Were those early settlers unmindful or careless of the real blessings of liberty that they have allowed themselves and children to be robbed of the fruits of liberty? No! Their hearts were right; but their heads were at fault. They did not realize that human authority once set up, no matter how mildly, and no matter what safeguards are provided against abuse, it grows and grows till liberty is subverted. Once make men accountable for their conduct to other men: once allow one man to sit in judgement upon another: once allow him to pass laws for others to obey and we have planted a deadly upas tree, which, in time, will grow and choke out the tender tree of liberty.

This is what those early settlers of Connecticut did. On the 14th day of January, 258 years ago, delegates from the scattered hamlets in Connecticut met at Hartford to form a constitution. The one made was said to have been the most simple and liberal ever adopted. "An oath of allegiance to the State was the only qualification of citizenship. No recognition of any English king, or foreign authority was required. Different religious opinions were alike tolerated and respected. All the officers of the colony were to be chosen by ballot at an annual election. The law making power was vested in a general assembly; and representatives were apportioned among the towns according to population."

This was a very mild sort of a government; almost no government at all. Its growth was slow, attracting slight attention, just as a farmer may give slight heed to a single Canada thistle which he finds in his wheat field, until it has so multiplied and spread as almost to choke to death all the other crops of the field. The settlers of Connecticut were a sturdy and robust people; ready to resist to the last extremity anyone who should attempt to encroach upon their liberties. Over and over again they beat off the representatives of the English crown sent out to set up its authority over them. They refused to acknowledge that authority, only admitting a vague sort of allegiance which carried with it no right of taxation or legislation; and finally, when the war of the revolution broke out, they cast off even the slight semblance of allegiance which remained. But they failed in one thing. They did not realize that a foreign landlord is no worse than a domestic one; that a foreign tyrant is just as good as one of home production; and that the tyranny of the majority is just as relentless and grinding as the tyranny of a king. They brought to this country their old country notions of property, especially in land. It was true that land was free; and every one took as much as he wanted or expected to want. But they regarded it as property—as a chattel; and as such it must have laws to protect the so-called owners in the possession of it. True, for a time, little law was needed, because land was so plenty; and there was no occasion for much dispute until it was all monopolized. But the laws grew, little by little; and taxes grew with them. Poverty, pauperism and crime kept equal pace until the conditions in Connecticut became exactly like the conditions in the older countries in Europe, so far as the relative positions of the rich and poor are concerned. After a half a century of almost perfect Anarchy, when there was a nearly complete absence of law, and under which the people enjoyed the greatest prosperity, happiness and freedom from crime; we find it now, under the law, with its people pauperized, its prisons overcrowded with criminals; and its industries paralyzed.

(The third essay of the pamphlet "The Problem of Criminality" will not appear in the columns of Free Society.)

160

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 and subscriptions for FREE SOCIETY:

Chicago, Ill. C. Pfuetzner, 469 Wabash Ave. W. F. Borland, 504 Trade Bldg.
New York City. I. Rudash, 363 Grand St. A. Levin, 340 Cherry St.
Buffalo, N. Y. G. Lang, 514 Hickory St.
Philadelphia, Pa. L. Rabotnik, 731 Plover St.
Allegheny, Pa. A. Frey, 138 Madison Ave. H. Bauer, 73 Spring Garden Ave.
Baltimore, Md. B. Morwitz, 1005 E. Baltimore.
Providence, R. I. Bookbinder, 31 Robinson St. J. H. Cook, 40 Hanover St.
St. Louis, Mo. Otto Rinke, 3859 Kostume St. R. H. Schneider, 3824 Calif. Ave.
London, Eng. F. Goulding, 39 Meredith St. [Paislow, London E.]
Glasgow, Scotland. Wm. Duff, 9 Carpin 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 April 18.

Agitation Committee, Allegheny, Pa., \$6.00
 Frank Marseller, \$2.25
 A. Levin, New York, \$4.50
 Kinghorn/Jones, \$1.00
 Bushwell, 75c
 Ruebenstein, Eugster, Shanker, Kirschbaum, Quis, each 50c
 Caswell, Hourwich, each 25c.

Emma Goldman's lecturing fund on the Coast.

Previously acknowledged \$13.05
 Schuler 1.00
 Schubert, Vlass, Gallagher, Hoffman, 2.50
 Stork, each 50c
 Perdrutti, Zanetini, Zeus, each 25c
 Petrosi .80

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN.

The purchasers of the following articles are requested to send the receipts with their name and address to the undersigned and the articles will be sent immediately:

Flower Baskets:

6659 1445 6427 6302 4427 A635
 1618 5048 6742

Rocking Chairs:

1937 3377 926 6505 6261 1096
 942 5694 3467 6097 1834 1261
 2052 3016 2156

Watch Chains:

6276 2845 2552 3161 1564 6429
 A976 1591 2277 4130 2907 2879
 2418 2697 2342 2754 3834 3744
 3561 4837 A1155 3206 4175 5364
 5247 5834 A185 201

Bound Books:

A1431 6303 6364 5469 5111 3960
 575 5539 2516 A1383 5752 3778
 6357 6502 1077

Crochet Needle and Tooth Picks:

A1157 352

Pen Holder:

4403

Tooth Picks:

A743 6857 1629

Photographs:

A293 A247 1864 3557 656 3669
 A672 5124 5956 162 3287 1226
 3199 4815 995 A258 1186 2867
 5438 6311 1596 6905 A420 A660
 A842

Unbound Books and Pamphlets:

17 4662 6134 5249 6103 6151
 2542 3683

Pamphlets:

1733 A410 797 3885 A603 4255
 5709 2752 251 A411 38 2660
 5270 2697 3886

H. BAUER,
 73 Spring Garden Ave., Allegheny, Pa.

Free Society Library.

These pamphlets are issued monthly at 5 cents each or 50 cents a year:

No. 1, "Law and Authority," by P. Kropotkin.
 No. 2, "A Talk About Anarchist Communism," by Enrico Malatesta.
 No. 3, "Emancipation of Society from Government," by Dallen Doyle.
 No. 4, "Anarchist Morality" by P. Kropotkin.
 No. 5, "Mating or Marrying, Which?" "A Lesson from History" and "The Problem of Criminality," by W. H. Van Ornum.

IN QUANTITIES.

	10	100	1,000
No. 1, 25 cents	\$1.75	\$15.00	
No. 2, 25 cents	1.50	12.00	
No. 3, 25 cents	1.50	12.00	
No. 4, 25 cents	1.75	15.00	
No. 5, 25 cents	1.50	12.00	

Labor Exchange Branch
No. 295, of New York City.

All sympathizers of labor ought to consider it their duty to purchase our products and support our aims in obtaining the full value of our labor. The following articles, made by co-operative effort, are on hand:

Men's shirts, ladies' waists, suspenders, hats, shoes, wash boilers, brooms, belts, cereal coffee, etc.

Our shirts are of different qualities, colors and styles. Orders from a dozen up will be sold at wholesale prices.

A. LEVIN,

87 Essex St. New York.

A PHYSICIAN
IN THE HOUSE.

A NEW

Family Medical Work.

IT IS THE BEST MEDICAL BOOK FOR
THE HOME YET PRODUCED.

BY

DR. J. H. GREER.

It has 16 colored plates showing different parts of the human body.

This book is up to date in every particular. It will save you doctor bills. It tells you how to cure yourself by simple and harmless home remedies. The book recommends **No Poisonous or Dangerous Drugs**. It teaches simple common sense methods in accordance with Nature's laws. It does not endorse dangerous experiments with the surgeon's knife. It teaches how to save **Health and Life** by safe methods. It is entirely free from technical rubbish. It teaches **Prevention**—that it is better to know how to live and **Avoid** disease than to take any medicine as a cure.

It teaches how **Typhoid** and other Fevers can be both **Prevented and Cured**. It gives the best known treatment for La Grippe, Diphtheria, Catarrh, Consumption, Appendicitis and every other disease. This book is **Not an Advertisement** and has **No Medicine** to sell. It tells you how to live that you may **Prolong** life. It **Opposes** medical fads of all kinds and makes uncompromising **War on Vaccination** and the use of anti-toxine. It has hundreds of excellent recipes for the cure of the various diseases. The chapter on **Painless Midwifery** is worth its weight in gold to women. It has a large number of valuable illustrations. "The Care of Children" is something every mother ought to read. It teaches the value of **Air Sunshine and Water** as medicines. This book cannot fail to please you. If you are looking for **Health** by the safest and easiest means, do not **Delay Getting The Book**.

This book is printed in clear type on good book paper, beautifully bound in cloth with gold letters. It has 800 Octavo pages.

PRICE \$2.75.

Send Orders to FREE SOCIETY

WHEREFORE INVESTIGATING COMPANY.

BY
LOIS WAISBROOKER.

An interesting book, written in story form, showing the inevitable and bad results which arise from monopoly in land. A splendid missionary book of 313 pages.

"LEND A COPY TO YOUR CONSERVATIVE NEIGHBOR."

"THE HOMELESS MILLIONS OF THE WORLD CRY LOUDLY FOR"—THE LAND.

This Book is Printed in Large Clear Type, and on Good Book Paper.

Regular Price, 50 Cents.

OUR PRICE, 25 CENTS.

Radical Exchanges.

L'agitazione, an Italian Anarchist weekly. Address: Cialdini No. 10, Ancona, Italy.

Libertaire, a French Anarchist weekly. Address: 26 Rue Sainte, Marseille, France.

Der Sozialist, a German Anarchist weekly. Address: Elisabethstrasse 66, Berlin N., Germany.

Freedom, an Anarchist monthly, 36c. per year. Address: 7 Lambs Conduit St., London W. C., England.

Freiheit, a German Anarchist weekly, price \$2.00 a year. Address: 317 Genesee Street, Buffalo, New York.

L'Avvenire, a Spanish Anarchist-Communist paper. Address: G. Consorti, Calle Uruguay 782, Buenos Aires, Argentine.

Volne Listy, a Bohemian Anarchist monthly, published at 50 cents a year. Address: Franta Lefner, 43 Johnson Ave., Brooklyn N. Y.

The Adult, the journal of sex. Office: 16 John Street, Bedford Row, London W. C. England. 3d. Monthly. 4d. Post Free.

Solidarity, an International Review of anarchist-Communism. A semi-monthly, 50 cents a year. Address: J. H. Edelman, 50 First St., New York City.

Sturm und Drang, 50 First St., New York City, an Anarchist-Communist paper printed in German, semi-monthly. 80 cents per year.

Der Arme Teufel, a radical and literary German weekly. Price \$2.50 per year. Address: R. Reitzel, 675 McDougall Ave., Detroit, Mich.

Le Temps Nouveau, a French Anarchist weekly. Address: 140 Rue Mouffetard, Paris, France.

Le Pere Peillard, a French Anarchist weekly. Address: 15 Rue Lavieville, Montmartre, Paris, France.

La Tribune Libre, a French Anarchist weekly. Price \$1.00 a year. Address: Charleroi, Pennsylvania.

Germinal, a Spanish Anarchist weekly. Address: B. Salbans, Castilla Correo 1034 Buenos Aires, Argentine Republic.

Miscarea Sociala, a Roumanian Anarchist weekly. Address: Matasariu 22, Bucharest, Roumania.

Sozialistische Monatshefte, a radical monthly magazine. Address: Marien St. 27, Berlin N. W., Germany.

Deinliche 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.

The Altruist is a monthly paper issued by the Altruist Community, 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, 2819 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 trial and these five thought stirring essays, which are worth an equal sum, as premium: "Subsistence and Justice," by Lucinda B. Chandler; "The Sexual Emancipation of Woman," by E. C. Walker; "Thomas Jefferson as an Individualist," by Gen. M. M. Trumbull. Address: M. Harman, 1394 Congress street, Chicago.

NEWS STANDS.

Where FREE SOCIETY can be obtained:

SAN FRANCISCO—Paper Covered Book Store, 1203 Market St. Anarchist and Freethought literature also on sale.

Boston—Columbia Stationery Store, 935 Washington St.

Brigham's Restaurant, Washington St.

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.

A. Levin, 340 Cherry St. Has also pamphlets in the English, Hebrew and German languages, which out of town news stands and comrades can get by addressing him.

I. Rudash, 363 Grand St. Radical literature of all kinds, including English periodicals on hand.

BOOK LIST.

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

*Appeal to the Young. By P. Kropotkin. \$ 05
 Anarchism: Its Philosophy and Ideal. By P. Kropotkin. 05
 Anarchist Communism, its Basis and Principles. By P. Kropotkin. 05
 Law and Authority. By P. Kropotkin. 05
 Expropriation. By Peter Kropotkin. 05
 Anarchist Morality. By Peter Kropotkin. 05
 The Commune of Paris. By P. Kropotkin. 05
 An Anarchist on Anarchy. By E. Reclus (one volume). 05
 Anarchism vs. State Socialism. By G. Bernard Shaw; 3 for. 02
 A Talk About Anarchist Communism. By Malatesta. 05
 Anarchist Communism in its Relation to State Socialism. By Agnes Henry. 05
 Let us be Just. By W. Tcherkessoff. [An open letter to Liebknecht.] 05
 Social Democracy in Germany. By G. Landauer. 02
 Socialism in Danger. By D. Nieuwenhuis. 05
 Social Conditions and Character. By "Ireland." 03
 Bases of Anarchism: Historical, Philosophical and Economical. By W. Holmes. 05
 God and the State. By M. Bakounin. 05
 The True Aim of Anarchism. By Steinhilber. 05
 Anarchism and Violence. By Beverington. 03
 Speech of August Spies in Court. 05
 The Emancipation of Society from Government. By Dallen Doyle. 05
 Wants and their Gratification. By H. Addis. 10
 My Century Plant. By Lois Waisbrooker. 1.00
 Wherefore Investigating Company, regular price 50c, but while present supply lasts "they go at" 25

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

Public Meetings.

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 335 Blue Island Av.

Anarchist Headquarters of San Francisco 1274 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, 4104 Market St., Room 7, meets every Friday evening at 8 o'clock.

The People's Union, a free discussion club, meets every Sunday evening at 935 Westminister St., Providence, R. I.

Social Science Club, Leer's Hall, 61 E. 4th St., New York City. Free lectures and discussion every Wednesday evening at 8 o'clock.

International Workmen Association, of Buffalo, N. Y., meets every Sunday morning at 10 o'clock A. M. at Blume's Schweizer Hall, 483 Broadway.

The International Group, Chicago, meets every Thursday 8 P. M. at 400 Halstead St. The object of the group is to spread FREE SOCIETY and other radical literature.

Wendell Phillips Educational Club will meet every Saturday 8 P. M. at 31 Robinson St., Providence, R. I. Pamphlets in English, German, French, Jewish and Russian languages on hand.

The Equity Club meets every Monday 8 P. M. at 117 Turk St., San Francisco Cal. for the purpose of discussing any question that may arise; especially the sex question. Free platform for everybody.

DR. FOOT'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.