

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. 29.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., SUNDAY, MAY 29, 1898.

WHOLE NO. 165.

STRIKE FOR FREEDOM AND JUSTICE.

AIR: Rock of Ages.

Strike for Freedom while you may,
Strike for Justice in your day;
Work for true Fraternity,
And for equal Liberty;
Work for human happiness,
Spread the power of righteousness.

In this world so full of store,
Man is doomed forevermore
To a life of toil and need,
Caused by mammon's grasping greed.
Curse the power that makes men slaves
From the cradle to their graves!

Why should some this earth possess
While the many know distress?
Why should drones enjoy the wealth
At the cost of life and health
Of the many whom they grind
Into dust, and firmly blind?

Sons of toil, arise once more!
Claim your rights from shore to shore!
Banish greed from your domain!
Drive out hate and break the chain
That has bound you all too long
To the crafty and the strong!

When those happy days shall come,
Each will find a peaceful home;
Free from fear of future want,
Full of joy for such a haunt;
Then the power of gold shall die,
And the poor shall cease their cry.

—C. H. Wesseler.

THE WAR SPIRIT.

Trust Americans for desperate, wholesale, reckless, abandoned patriotism every time. Trust them to let anything on earth be done to them while they are under its exciting spell. It is better than hypnotism—suggest anything in the name of "my country" when the ecstasy is on, and "it goes." The very name of America is a word to conjure with. The whole conglomeration of nationalities that have fetched up on this side of the globe, can be set raving, howling mad with half an hour's hearty, eloquent jingoism. Even I, with two hundred years of Americanism behind me, but with twenty years of cool economic, international study to tone it down, feel a rush of blood to the head and the fire of an idiotic frenzy possessing me when the war-whoop rings out, the drums beat, the brassbands blare out for victory. Anything goes that is American—robbery, oppression, invasion, corruption,—just say it is "American" and we will whoop it up for all it's worth. What's brotherhood? What is the common interest of all workers? In our patriotic intoxication we can hate a workingman who happened to be born in Spain with a good old fifteenth century hatred that would do the old inquisitors good. Blood! we cry. And the results of twenty five years' teaching of solidarity and equality are wiped out in a day.

Organized workmen have fallen into line beautifully. The convention of the Federation of Labor at Colorado Springs passed some rousing resolutions in favor of war. "America and the flag," and finished with three cheers and a tiger for President McKinley. McKinley would as soon turn his soldiers' guns on them if they disturbed their bosses or the capitalistic interests of the country, as upon the Spaniards—sooner than that Spanish bondholders should be hurt. He has approved by acquiescence of the murder of forty unarmed workmen in Pennsylvania and would probably approve of the killing of any others who dared protest against starvation wages. No matter.

He is making a great show of fighting the Spaniards, and the proper thing is to cheer him to the skies. He doesn't really want to fight. Dewey got out of reach or he would not have had his one little chance to cover himself with glory. But whatever his reasons for hesitating, we can rest assured that it is not from motives of fraternity and love of peace. Moneyed interests lie at the bottom of his vacillating policy.

If the war is to help the suffering, starving Cubans, why does he not hasten to the rescue? They must be dying by hundreds now, shut up in a blockaded city. If Cuba is to be freed, what is he waiting for? Every day but prolongs the agony. If revenge is the object, why not speed the avenging stroke and have done with it?

The aspect of the war at present is uncertain. It is hard to get at the incentive behind all this sensational posing. But whatever it is, the evil effects of war are being felt. The militant spirit is being aroused, which is the very opposite of the true progressive principle in civilization. Patriotism, an adoration of government whatever it may be, is being fostered; the feeling of hatred toward our brothers in another country is created and encouraged. And above all passion and prejudices are being awakened—reason and judgment are left to lie dormant. Men will not listen to the teaching of principles which require thought, when with a whoop and hurrah, they can rush to let loose the innate savagery of their natures and call it a virtue.

The cause of liberty may be put back many years, (and our rulers may be wise enough to know it) but it behooves us to be more earnest, more industrious in teaching. No one can prophesy in times like these. No one can tell what changes, what conditions may suddenly bring our cause to the front. Now is the time to be ever on the alert. Let no new phase of the situation pass unobserved. Something may grow out of it all that will show the common people of all countries that their cause is always the same.

LIZZIE M. HOLMES.

"EVOLUTION OF SOCIALISM."

I am requested to review an address, delivered by J. T. Kewish, on this subject, and published in part in No. 26 of Free Society. The speaker is credited with showing, by way of introduction, the principles of evolution; although it would probably have been nearer the truth to have said, that he began with a statement of his own conception of the principles of evolution. That evolution is a fact, no intelligent person, at the present day, will dispute; but of the principles which underlie that fact, and which determine its force and direction, no one knows. So-called scientific men differ as widely as the poles as to the principles of evolution; and when our Socialist friend states, what he calls, "the principles of evolution," it is not possible that he has done more than to give his own interpretation of those principles.

After his introduction, he says: "Suppose then, we examine these principles regarding their significance in determining the science of sociology, and let us see if governmental or compulsory Socialism is practical and scientific as its advocates claim, or if it is impractical, ideal and unscientific as some of its opponents contend."

"The Science of Sociology"! What is the science of sociology, and what are the facts upon which it is based? Webster defines science as, "Knowledge

duly arranged, and referred to general truths and principles on which it is founded, and from which it is derived; a branch of learning considered as having a certain completeness; philosophical knowledge; profound knowledge; complete knowledge; true knowledge."

Does our Socialist friend know of anything which will fit that in the field of sociology? If he does, it will be very interesting if he will tell us of it without such a long rignarole about "matter in motion," "integration and differentiation," "homogeneous and heterogeneous," "transformations and balanced forces," etc. etc. Sociology, if it means anything, means the philosophy of right relationship between man and man; and the social ferment that is going on and the widely divergent opinions that are held, are the best of evidence that the philosophy of right relationships has not been reduced to a science. The time may come when it will be; but the ferment must continue to work until it classifies and then the science will be apparent without all this circumlocution. There is scarcely a humbug in this world that does not come to us with the label "science." It sounds wonderfully big and important to call a thing scientific; but in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred it ought to be marked, "humbug."

The nearest approach to a scientific statement of the philosophy of right relationships, that I know of, was given by Jesus, in the Sermon on the Mount. "Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them," is remarkably comprehensive. So far as I can see, it fits every possible relation of men one to another; but its general application would abolish "governmental or compulsory Socialism," and everything else which depends upon authority, violence, force or compulsion in society. That precept was laid down as the guide to right relationships in a communistic society, a society which was already in the practice of Communism. To such a society it is especially adapted; but it cannot be made to work in one where private property prevails. Private property is the thing which makes war between men by setting every man's interest against every other man's interest under the name of competition. The State, which is the very embodiment of authority, violence and compulsion in society, becomes necessary wherever private property prevails, to protect the possessors of property and preserve the inequalities which result. Communist-Anarchists seek to remove both the cause and effect. They would abolish private property and thereby render the State useless. They would substitute a social order based upon mutual interest and consent, in place of the present disorder supported and upheld by authority, violence and compulsion. May be we are all wrong; and may be Jesus was wrong in laying down the rule he did; but the indications all point the other way. We think that in this way will be evolved a scientific sociology; but it will contain no element of compulsion. We have observed that wherever in this world, one man, or a set of men, are given power and authority over other men to compel them to do what they would not do willingly, they are certain, in time, to abuse that authority. So that we are more than doubtful of the ability of anybody to construct a scientific social order based upon compulsion.

There is only one more point of any consequence in the address, and that is, that competition must always continue to perform an important part in

social progress. That depends entirely upon what is meant by competition. If we mean by it the struggle between men for the possession and ownership of material things—property—or for the opportunity to obtain a livelihood, then I must positively differ with the speaker. Competition, in this sense, is positively a hateful thing which everybody is trying to get rid of. Nobody wants it. Even those who are strongest in the support of the competitive system, are all trying to destroy it. Labor Unions seek to avoid the competition of non-unionists; trust combinations of everybody outside of the trust; and nations, through protective tariffs, against foreign competition in their home markets. Individuals too, scheme and plan in all manner of ways to shut out competitors whenever possible. I know of no more universal principle in sociological life than the opposition of competition. Is not this but a rude, and as yet clumsy, expression of an universal hope of mankind for its abolition? And may it not be that such hopes are prophetic of their own realization? Certain it is that the very nature of competition is self-destructive. Carry competition to its logical conclusion and it ends in no competition at all. Therefore, competition cannot possibly become a permanent factor in human society. It absolutely ceases under a communal system.

Under Communism, however, that thing which is now known as competition, and from which we are all anxious to free ourselves, rises out of the sphere of material things and becomes an emulation between individuals for the attainment of desirable personal qualities. Each will seek to excel in something which will bring honor and win the esteem of their fellow-men. When wealth is held as a common possession for the satisfaction of the wants of all, according to their needs, with production unhampered, there cannot be the slightest excuse for denying anything to anybody. Then, with no anxiety for current needs, each individual can and will devote himself to the cultivation of personal qualities, especially if there is no element of compulsion in society which can drive him out of his own chosen field. We Anarchists believe that in this way, and in this way alone, can both the individual and society reach their highest form of development. We believe also, that if ever there comes to be a science of sociology it will be in the practical working out of such a system.

W. H. VAN ORNUM.

EXTRACTS FROM SPENCER'S PRINCIPLE OF SOCIOLOGY.

In presence of the fact that the immense majority of mankind adhere pertinaciously to the creeds, religious and political, in which they were brought up; and in presence of the further fact that on behalf of those creeds, however acquired, there are soon enlisted prejudices which practically shut out adverse criticism; it is not to be expected that the foregoing illustrations (several hundred) even when joined with kindred illustrations previously given, will make them see that society is a growth and not a manufacture, and has its laws of evolution.

From prime ministers down to plough boys there is either ignorance or disregard of the truth that nations acquire their vital structures by natural processes and not by artificial devices. If the belief is not that social arrangements have been divinely ordered thus and thus, then it is that they have been made thus and thus by kings, or if not by kings then by parliaments. That they have come about by small accumulated changes not contemplated by rulers, is an open secret which only of late has been recognized by a few and is still unperceived by the many—educated as well as uneducated.

And yet so hypnotized are nearly all by fixedly contemplating the doings of ministers and parliaments, they have no eyes for this marvelous organization which has been going on for thousands of

years without governmental help—nay, indeed, in spite of governmental hindrances. Nor will any argument or accumulation of evidence suffice to change this attitude until there has arisen a different type of mind and a different quality of culture. The politician will still spend his energies in rectifying some evils and making more—in forming, reforming and again reforming—in passing acts to amend acts that were formerly amended—while social schemers will continue to think they have only to cut up society and re-arrange it after their ideal pattern and its parts will join together and work as intended. (Sec. 723)

Naturally the member of parliament who submits to coercion by his party, contemplates legal coercions without repugnance. Politically considered he is either one of the herd owned by his leader, or else the humble servant owned by the caucus who chose him; and having in so far sacrificed his self-ownership of the ordinary citizen.

Table conversations show that even by many people called educated, government is regarded as having unlimited resources; and political speeches make the rustic mind think of it as an earthly providence which can do anything for him if interested men will let it. (Sec. 851)

CONCENTRATION OF WEALTH.

A Boston paper recently propounded the question: Would it be desirable to prevent the accumulation of wealth into continually fewer hands by law?

The raising of this query shows the deep prevailing ignorance in "educated circles" regarding the social question. To ask whether the law should interfere with the concentration of wealth is somewhat similar to asking whether the law should not change the rotation of the earth. It is hardly possible to conceive of a more childish question.

The concentration of wealth in the hands of the few is the result of the power of these few to exploit the masses of workers who have nothing to dispose of but their labor-force. Such exploitation is incarnated and gains expression in the American millionaire. In the competition of the single capitalists between themselves the large capitalists gain supremacy. The small ones are taken up sponge-like by the large ones. Every increase of capital of course increases their power. This increase of power and concentration of wealth has finally gained such dimensions that single capitalists have become powerless to operate, and the creation of monopolies, trusts, syndicates and other capitalistic combinations is the outcome.

This process of concentration is an inevitable result of the prevailing system of production, and no laws in creation can prevent its operation. Besides it should be remembered that legislation depends upon and is influenced by the capitalist.

However, this does by no means prove that the prevailing monopolistic regime can never be stopped. It can, but not by legislation. In fact the very accumulative process is the best object lesson for the people and points to the remedy as a very simple thing. For once the people realize the necessity of the overthrow of the present regime, they will have very little trouble to expropriate the very few into whose hands the national wealth has gathered.—Exchange.

A LITTLE GIANT.

The human mind is so constituted that it fain would associate mental vigor with corresponding physical development. When therefore some three weeks ago a number of comrades congregated at the Southern Pacific Depot to welcome Emma Goldman to this city, they little dreamed what a vigorous mentality was hidden behind the little physique that presented itself to their view.

Emma Goldman is a small woman apparently between 25 and 30 years of age. Although pleasing in appearance she is by no means handsome. Her complexion is light and her eyes are of that peculiar grey which with rare exceptions is indicative of the preponderance of reason over sentiment—philosophy.

In her private life she is extremely sociable and affable; free from affectation, simple in manners, unostentatious and unassuming—a true child of nature. She is as gay as a child when in company of children, of whom she is very fond. In company of those whom

nature or opportunities have deprived of the average amount of knowledge and intelligence she tries to teach and convey knowledge without assuming the air of superiority so common with the would-be educated. Yet she is straightforward and scrupulously truthful and honest in all her transactions with everyone. She is one of those few radicals who not only preach but practice their ideals as much as possible. While, however, unostentatious and unassuming, she is self-possessed and uncompromising in matters of principle. Though calm and non-challant in ordinary conversation, her attitude immediately changes when a serious subject and particularly the social question is broached. And when an opportunity for doubt or argument arises—whether it be an inherited trait or an effect of constant use of the faculty, of the eternal vigilance of the logician—her eyes turn up piercingly and assume the look of the eagle that is about swooping down upon its prey.

During her two weeks' sojourn in this city Comrade Goldman delivered eight lectures in the English language to crowded houses upon the following subjects: Patriotism—The Basis of Morality—Charity—The New Woman—The Aim of Humanity—Authority vs. Liberty—Trades Unionism—Absurdity of Non-resistance. She also spoke at the May-Day Celebration in English. Besides she had a public discussion with Emil Lies upon the relative merits of State Socialism and Anarchism and addressed a gathering for the benefit of Robert Reitzel's book, both in German.

Her lectures in the English language will soon be published in Free Society for the benefit of those readers who missed them, which fact relieves the writer of the difficult, in fact the impossible task, of doing Comrade Goldman justice by going into the details of the lectures.

Emma Goldman was not born in this country and although speaking four different languages uses the "Queen's" English in a manner that can be excused only by such charitable judges as the writer. For a woman of her talent and ability the steady, diligent application of three months' study would suffice to enable her to use the English as well as the average citizen, and the benefit of her work would be immeasurably enhanced thereby.

Yet in spite of this imperfection Comrade Goldman shows rare talent in handling her subjects. She is versed in history as well as literature and of course possesses a thorough knowledge of the history and all the phases of the radical movement. She is equally competent to discuss her subjects from a historical, philosophical and ethical standpoint. Her success, however, is not due so much to the knowledge of her subjects as to her eloquence and principally to her ability of presenting her ideas in a popular style and of reaching the hearts as well as the minds of her auditors. She is eminently a popular speaker. She uses the language of the common people and understands the task of appealing to their minds by hard, sound logic and to their hearts by timely illustrations of homely facts and incidents drawn from every-day life and by the depth of her conviction manifested by her eloquence and fervor.

One of the laudable characteristics of Emma Goldman is her detestation of dogmatism and her susceptibility to adjustment—progress. She is a true student—never stubbornly adhering to a doubtful position—ever ready for something new to learn, for some position to change when reason and logic command. She has dropped many of the obsolete notions of radicals. While possessing some ideas regarding reconstruction of future or ideal society she is cautious enough not to press them before her audiences, realizing that that is a matter of secondary consideration, to be left to the tastes of the individuals constituting the new society, and content to stand upon the solid foundation of individual sovereignty.

Her main strength, however, consists in discussion. Her keen perception, her ready accommodation to the most perplexing positions thrown into by her adversary are truly remarkable.

In regard to tactics, too, she is perhaps the most fearless public speaker known. It has heretofore been the policy of the most radical public speakers to make a sort of a concession to the rabid prejudices of the public by retiring the religious and sex questions. Emma Goldman, however, does not believe in making concessions to public ignorance; she does not believe in the retirement—even temporarily—of any question of importance to the weal or woe of the race. Being a thorough iconoclast, believing with Bakunin that the state, the church and the altar are the greatest foes of

humanity, she throws policy to the winds and proceeds to loudly proclaim her convictions and to riddle every one of those barbarous institutions most numerically with the bullets of reason and logic. Her motto is: No compromise; truth to the bitter end!

She even shatters the idols of the so-called "free-contractors" in regard to the sex question. She holds that even a free contract is a means of enslavement; that in the sex relations which involve the grandest of human passions and the most essential to human happiness, the most absolute liberty should exist, and association should not be hampered by even one moment's restriction.

Indeed, Emma Goldman does not mince matters. Although in the opinion of the writer the selection of more refined terms and phrases conveying the same meaning would be less jarring upon the prejudices of the ignorant and accomplish the same result perhaps even more certainly, yet her imperturbability is truly refreshing and can not help challenging the admiration of the thinking.

Most of the readers are probably familiar with Comrade Goldman's history, so far at least as it interests us, and it may therefore suffice to state here that she has gone through the baptism of fire. She has suffered the indignities and humiliations of the modern slave—the wage slave; she has felt the pangs of cold and hunger—the fate of the unemployed proletariat, and she has tasted the reward of the rebel—in the shape of a ten months' imprisonment for denouncing the present diabolical arrangement of things misnamed society. But for all that she is undaunted. Through the storm of adversity and persecution this brave little woman has remained loyal to her convictions and ideals.

We learn and improve as long as we live—and no doubt our brave young comrade, in common with all the rest of us, will yet find many things to learn—regarding tactics, methods of accomplishment—and perhaps even regarding fundamental principles. But she is doing a grand and noble work, and her rare talents and abilities, if coupled with a judicious adaptation of her physical requirements to the furtherance of her ends, bespeak a golden future for her. Not golden, indeed, from a materialistic point of view; nor perhaps golden from an idealistic point; for the accomplishment of our aims may be much further off than our noble comrade's youth and enthusiasm will at present permit her to realize,—but golden in the sense of having lived a useful life and, though perhaps not having realized it herself, having at least been a factor in the realization of the noblest aspirations of the human race—its emancipation from physical and mental slavery.

S. D.

WHO ARE CIVILIZED?

One of the greatest ambitions of the representatives of the so-called good or upper classes of society, of the organized robber horde that arrogates to itself the function of regulating our conduct and actions and makes us pay for it at the mouth of the cannon, protecting monopolies which sap the vitality of nations and impoverish the working people, is to carry this beautiful system with its devastating consequences into the so-called uncivilized countries, rob the savage of his independence and impede his natural gradual development toward a healthy race.

The following conversation recently held between a European traveller and the chief of the Malayan Archipel will tend to show who really are the most civilized, we or the savages.

The traveller complimented the chief upon the healthy appearance and the evident happiness and apparent absence of poverty and misery among his tribe, and deplored the poverty and misery and starvation prevailing among the millions of the civilized countries.

"But," said the savage, "I always heard that the white man possessed immense wealth, and if this be true, how can he be starving, while we who possess almost nothing are able to live well? Have you no means of subsistence in Europe; no material to build houses with?"

"You don't understand me," replied the European; "we have a vast supply of the finest provisions and a very large number of lovely houses; in fact so much provisions that the market is overstocked and that we are sometimes obliged to dump some of them into the sea; and we have so many houses that a great many of them stand idle and are often burned, but—there is not work enough for all and therefore there are so

many thousands who can hardly get enough to live, and those who manage to get work are obliged to work for low wages because of the severity of competition engendered by the monopoly of natural resources."

The savage was unable to comprehend. "Are the whites insane?" he finally burst out disgustedly. "What you are telling me seems absurd. Look at us. We produce for all of us to enjoy and build houses for all of us to occupy, and as long as there is enough, none of us are allowed to suffer, or starve. As far as work is concerned all of us work whenever there is any necessity for it, but whenever we have built our huts and killed our game, we rest and enjoy, for it would be sheer nonsense to waste our energies in the production and accumulation of things that are perishable and go to decay."—Ex.

WHOSE THEORIES ARE MUSTY?

If calling Comrade Addis' theory of enjoyable misery a "brand new" philosophy is a stigma, as he seems to think, he thoroughly "gets even" by calling my contention "old" and "musty". I am quite willing his theory should stand on its merits, and only referred to it as new because that seemed one of its principal characteristics.

It is true Addis spends much space on definitions. But he takes no notice of my point that his definition of happiness, viz., "that which comes by hap, or chance," defines nothing, since pain as well as pleasure may come by chance. Such a definition renders his statement that one may delight in misery, absolutely meaningless; while according to my definition, it is an utter contradiction. He seems to have forgotten the original charge of contradiction, and now lays all his stress on "quiescence". I must hold him to his original statement, which was not that a person could be "quiescent" in a state of misery, but that he could actually enjoy it. He misunderstands my citation of his admission of "the fact that we prefer pleasure to pain," should have made my meaning plain. I do not contend that we must either be in a "highly pleasurable state" or in abject misery constantly. That would be only less absurd than Addis' claim. My claim was that the seeking of pleasure, or the seeking to avoid pain, which is the same thing, in a comparative sense, is proof of sentient life, while the absence of these is proof of the nonsentient. It is the only evidence on that point.

The difference between Addis and myself still remains one of definition, largely, and his charge that I ignore his definitions is not true. He ignores my criticism of them. Besides, calling on psychology and biology, Kropotkin and Darwin, has no power, that I can see, to explain away a contradiction of terms.

Comrade Addis starts out with a denial that we seek happiness all the while, and winds up with the declaration that he has seen people who delighted in misery. Where is the point, anyway? Was delight, or misery, the object sought? If delight, I must say that was a queer way to find it. If misery, the poor fellow was so glad he found what he was looking for that, lo! the prize was gone, for he was delighted, instead of miserable!

I can readily admit that a person of nervous temperament, in pain, may "work himself" into a frenzy. But what is proven? What is this frenzy? Certainly not quiescence. To call it pleasure, delight, happiness, is the height of absurdity.

It is manifestly but the part of good sense to seek that which we desire, and since opponent admits our preference for pleasure rather than pain, a denial of the search for happiness and the avoidance of pain is but an assertion of idiocy.

If Addis' deduction that happiness and misery are as something outside of man, the one to pull and the other to push him, was in any sense a reasonable deduction from what I have said on this subject, I submit that it is as reasonable, and as creditable to the human animal, as that philosophy which represents him as acting, helter-skelter, pell-mell, without aim and without reason, even disregarding his own preferences and desires! I have often heard a certain pessimistic friend declare that the earth is a large lunatic asylum, but I do not believe it.

Acting in obedience to the "instinct of race preservation," Comrade Addis would try to save a drowning child. So would the average person. The average person would also try to save a dog to which he had become attached. What instinct is that? Again, the average man would prevent the escape of another

harmless little animal whose burrow happened to be flooded. That is a different instinct again. Still another instinct is manifested in war and murder. But whence these instincts? Are they based wholly on "preservation" or "destruction" of anything? The pain of seeing those we love perish, has broadened as the nature and sympathies of man have broadened, until it is painful to witness the death of any person against whom we have no enmity. The instinct of race preservation did not prevent the Spanish rejoicing over the destruction of the sailors of the Maine, because there was enmity against them. The harmless little animal is prevented from saving itself, because of the savage pleasure in the taking of game. So one man is saved from death, because of the pain his death would cause us, and another is killed because of the pleasure of gratifying a grudge. One animal is cared for because it in some manner ministers to our desires, and another is destroyed for the mere pleasure of killing. All instincts have grown out of the pleasures and pains of sentient beings. There could have been no other starting point.

J. H. M.

ANARCHIST LEAFLETS.

THE MALTHUSIAN THEORY AN ARGUMENT FOR ANARCHISM.

John Stuart Mill remarked that the Malthusian theory, long supposed an unanswerable argument against Socialism, might turn out to be the strongest argument in its favor. The Malthusian demonstration shows that, at the observed rate of increase (doubling every twenty-five years) the posterity of one pair would, in thirteen centuries, amount to more than one person on each square foot of the earth's surface, seas included. As no possible improvement in the arts could make such a condition practicable, it follows the result must be averted in other ways—by an increase in the death-rate (the positive check), or a decrease in the birth-rate (the preventive check); and that every decrease in the rates of deaths must be offset by a decrease in the ratio of births. All law and government, however, is framed on the principle of producing a high birth-rate. Kings want more soldiers, exploiters more slaves; the fundamental tyranny, of man over man, requires that she should bear lust and its consequences. Anarchism, which limits propagation to the desires of the least amorous sex, alone provides an efficient preventive check. Therefore, the Malthusian theory is the strongest of all possible arguments for Anarchism.

UNCHASTITY THE SAVIOR OF WOMAN.

If chastity be a definable virtue, it consists in abstinence from prohibited sexual intercourse. If not, it is a tendency to condemn and avoid sexual intercourse as far as possible. In either case, it is woman's evil genius considered as a tendency, it glorifies woman only when she destroys her nature as such, and becomes a sexless nun. Considered as a law, it respects her on condition of her being a wife, supported by a man to whose lust she ministers; whose service limits the sphere of her desirable activity and knowledge. That a reasonable majority of women may attain this tolerated condition, there must be a minority who, having failed to do so, pine, as beggarly old maids, in dependence on the more fortunate, and another minority, who, as prostitutes, are kept in common by the men not yet ready to marry. Such being the effects of chastity, we should expect unchastity, which knows no sexual law but inclination, to be woman's savior; and such has always proved. In ancient Greece and modern India, the courtesans have been the only free and educated women. In England, the "polite" and licentious reign of Charles II, abolished, as Blackstone tells us, a man's right to beat his wife. In Italy, the education of woman began with that breaking up of domestic habits during the fourteenth century, which Dante deplored in his Purgatorio, and Boccaccio idealized in his Decameron. In France, it began with the license of the Bourbon Kings under Henri IV. In modern times, the emancipation of woman economically, educationally, and politically, has advanced pari passu with her emancipation sexually. Man concedes a conventional position to the chaste woman, but he loves and reverences only the unchaste.

C. L. JAMES.

A meeting of progressive people for the discussion of the social question will be held next Monday, May 30, at 997 Market St. Everybody is invited. Admission free.

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.

In Russia hundreds of people are dying from starvation, and "the grim shadow of famine is hovering over the poor peasantry in Ireland," according to newspaper reports. I wonder if the United States government will find it necessary to free the poor starving Russians and Irishmen? Not much! There would be no money in it, you know.

A regiment of militia in New York, known as the "Dandy Seventh," voted not to volunteer in the war, but would serve the State in any way desired. This regiment is composed entirely of the New York aristocracy and is willing "to serve the State" in shooting down unarmed strikers and parade the streets and thereby manifest their love for "our country." I don't blame these parasites for staying away from the war, I wish only that all workers would do the same, and let the governors fight it out themselves.

Comrade Malatesta, in Italy, has been sentenced to seven months' imprisonment for having written an article in which he exposed the fraudulent manipulations of Crispi and the government in general. It is in Italy like every where else: the wholesale robbers are honored and enjoy life, while the people who love the truth and dare to express it, are sent to prison. And yet there are still fools who tell us that governments are necessary "to protect the weak against the strong."

Says the Argonaut, an aristocratic paper, published in Los Angeles:

"After this war we will see as in European cities great buildings, enormous barracks—human hives, wherein are congregated thousands of soldiers trained to slay their fellow-men across the borders and to keep their fellow-men on this side in order.

"There will be no more riots, no more Trades Union boycotts, no more railway strikes under our new policy. Our great standing army will settle that. The man of millions need not fear, wealth will be protected and life be safe if liberty is not."

While this infernal war has increased our expenses about two dollars a week (paper alone costs 75 cents more), our income is on the decrease, and if the readers want Free Society to live they ought to pay their subscriptions, or else we soon will have to enlist and go to war.

Comrade Addis writes us that The Firebrand case will be dropped. Thus ends our "fight" for free press.

An individual named Armstrong, living in Wasco, Tex. has sent me a paper called the Autonomist, which he styles a Synthetic Journal. It is altogether misnamed. It is as far as possible from being either autonomistic or synthetic. I began at an article on Anarchism, and quickly found that the author knew just enough about Anarchism to caricature it. I turned to another on Ingersoll. The writer knew just enough about Ingersoll to caricature him. So I ranged, "from grave to gay, from lively to severe," through Free Love, Marriage, Reformation, the war, the presidential function, Tolstoi, book reviews, the late iconoclast Bram, etc. etc. Always one result—the editor of the "Autonomist, a Synthetic Journal" knows just barely enough of every one's ideas to ridicule and misrepresent them. But autonomy is self-expression, with which misrepresentation always interferes; and synthesis results from that mutual collision of views which forces their utterers not to abuse or ridicule but respect each other.

Comrade Van Ornum has convinced himself, if not others, that freedom in sex relations can never be

attained to any considerable extent until economic freedom is achieved. I wonder whether he has also convinced himself that economic freedom can never be achieved until freedom in sex relations is attained. If not, it is in order for him to explain how economic freedom can be attained while bull-necked brutes continue authorized by law to beget cowards, traitors, scabs, and patriots, upon unwilling women. But if he is convinced that economic freedom must precede sexual and sexual freedom economic; he has proved the impossibility of motion. Meanwhile, let us imitate Diogenes, on a similar occasion, and simply move. Free land, free trade, free love, free rum, free religion, and all the other frees, are only freedom. The one obstacle to that is authority. Therefore, all we have to do is destroy reverence for authority. But to do that, there must be no monkey-work. Those who are trying to discourage agitation of any subject should go right over to the authority-camp. They are more out of place among Anarchists than anywhere else.

RETIRE.

I can but agree to disagree with Comrade Pfuetzner's evident conclusion that Anarchism is good only to preach at present, while to expect its realization, even in a degree, before some time in distant futurity is but a baseless hope. I am aware that the leeches of society, including the blood-suckers of State, will find their way wherever tribute can be extorted or a superstition upheld. Nor do I believe this condition will be greatly changed for years to come, despite the ceaseless agitation for liberty. The result of centuries of education is here in the prejudiced, unreasoning mind, the warped mental faculty of the "civilized" animal. It cannot be removed in a day. Yet I do believe that industrial non-dependence (this term should have been used before instead of "freedom" in the sentence criticized) upon any or all the "powers that be," and a practical realization of a New Ideal are possibilities of today.

But I think Free Society's space can be used to better advantage than for personal quarrels; so drawing my covering of skins about my emaciated form I will retire from the field—of controversy.

As "cooing doves" are not supposed to be of a proper nature to ferment anything, nor sufficiently pugnacious to "go to war," I shall remain for the present
Fulton, Wash. THE HERMIT.

AN EXPLANATION.

It is a little difficult for me to understand your editorial utterance in No. 25, concerning my opinion as to the possibilities in reform journals, as appearing in Freedom.

Seeing that I made no "accusation" against your journal I fail to see any cause for your disclaimer. You surely will not declare Free Society to be "the majority of reform journals," nor even one of the majority. If you have succeeded in making it one of the successful minority of Anarchist journals which have retained the support of contributing groups in spite of an unendorsed policy on the sex-question, that does not prove that people are going to pay for what they do not like, but that there was sufficient other matter they did like to make them tolerate the objectionable (to them) part, rather than have no paper at all.

Pray, consider the vast number of freethought, trade union, and populist journals, and say what proportion of them dare maintain an individual policy. Yet these are reform papers quite as much as any Anarchist paper, and maintained by the same methods largely.

A long time before the Firebrand was born I came to the conclusion that a thoroughly independent reform paper required an individual with brains, courage, sympathy, and a quick appreciation of popular movements, together with income enough to foot the deficits out of his or her own pocket until his or her paper should have made its way. I have seen people since then, with more or less of these requisites, attempt the task; people with brains, courage, money, and no sympathy; people with sympathy, courage, brains, money, and no appreciation of popular requirements; people with all the moral qualities and no money; and people with no money, no appreciation of needs, and no brains, but with magnificent courage. For which last my admiration. [Thanks! A. I.]

All these experiments, however, have not shaken my opinion, and I am still awaiting the man or woman who shall start a paper that will command its tens of thousands of readers on its own merits. Most likely I shall die waiting.
VOLTAIRINE DE CLEYRE.

PETTICOATS TO THE RESCUE.

Before her final departure from this city comrade Emma Goldman was induced by some enthusiastic friends to visit Los Angeles with a view of lecturing there.

Los Angeles seems to be a stronghold of conservatism, and there is no solidarity between comrades there. Besides, the patriotic excitement over the butchery business (war) in progress is just at its height there like elsewhere. Thus when Emma Goldman arrived at Los Angeles the monopolistic newspapers besides eluding the customary amount of mud at her raised a terrible howl and predicted violence and bloodshed by the "respectable" element of the community in case she attempted to lecture. No previous arrangements having been made regarding a hall, comrade Goldman experienced the greatest difficulties in obtaining one, but finally succeeded in renting one at \$15.00 a night.

There are but few radicals at Los Angeles who possess courage enough to do aught beyond shouting for the social revolution at a beer-table and those few had their wits frightened out of them by the bullying newspaper items. They were therefore opposed in the first place to having comrade Goldman lecture at all and begged and implored her to desist. But when in spite of their entreaties she had the pluck to rent a hall the hardest task was to find someone to preside over the meetings. One had to stay home to mind the babies, another was troubled with heart disease, a third with stage-fright etc. etc. It was here as in the Spanish revolts the other day that petticoats came handy. A courageous man was at last found in the shape of a woman who without the least hesitation accepted the office. Thus comrade Goldman delivered two lectures in that city before audiences packed to overflowing. She had the audacity to lecture on "Patriotism" the first evening. When she in her blunt style bestowed a left-handed compliment upon the flag of the United States there was an uproar in the gallery as might be expected under such circumstances. But Emma did not lose her composure and finally by some sledgehammer arguments managed to sway the sentiment and gain the sympathy and approval of her audience.

The subject of her second lecture was Liberty vs. Authority which was equally appreciated. S. D.

"Physician in the House."

As a special premium to any one who will send us five dollars and the names of ten yearly subscribers to Free Society or Free Society Library we will send the large volume entitled "A Physician in the House," price \$2.75, written by Dr. Joseph H. Greer, a well-known Chicago physician of the reform school, and who has been an earnest friend and generous helper of The Firebrand and Free Society.

The Letter-Box.

L. B. C., Sewickley, Pa.—Free Society has been mailed to your address regularly, and if you did not receive it for some weeks there must be something wrong with your post office. We have sent back numbers.

To The Readers.—Anyone having No. 16—152 of Free Society to spare will oblige us by returning it to us as we are in need of it to complete some files.

A. Tannen, New York.—Correct; 75cts were omitted in the receipts, but they have been credited in the books to Uffner.

R. M., Guelph, Canada.—Not only the Murphys and McGinns (or Jesuitism as you call it) are enforcing the Comstock law; it is ignorance or idiocy. The protestants are as bigoted as the catholics. All the difference is that the latter are more numerous and their influence is greater. I am told that Comstock and his adherents are not catholics, nevertheless they are the greatest bigots of this country.

Mrs L. M. P., Swanton, Calif.—Of course you are correct: "An Anarchist does not necessarily need to be a varietist," but freedom admits no restraint, and so Anarchists cannot consistently interfere with those that are not monogamists. Women will free themselves as soon as they realize that they are slaves and have the courage to demand recognition of self-ownership. The Social revolution is a growth and will never be attained by a sudden contest of the capitalists and the workers. Such contest is only the climax of evolution.

ESSAYS ON THE SOCIAL PROBLEM.

—BY—

HENRY ADDIS.

Communism.

(Continued.)

In the first place the Communism proposed as a social and economic arrangement by the Anarchists who no longer love the fierce struggle of competition, and the wasteful methods of commercialism, is a condition of affairs where all exercise of authority is absent. In such a condition association according to taste would be the rule. All the resources of the earth being then common to all, that is to say, free for all to use; but not to monopolize, there would be no necessity to associate with others in productive work, or in social matters, when such association was not pleasant. Persons who because of similarity of taste desired to work in the same kind of undertakings would then associate in their occupation of production or distribution because it would give them pleasure to do so. In social matters the likes and dislikes, attraction and repulsions which wield such an important influence in society today, would have full play, and association of a social character would be pleasant because desired by all persons concerned. Under these conditions crime, vice, and contentions of an unpleasant character would be reduced to the minimum, for all these things as they exist today are the direct outgrowth of the restriction of liberty, the strained and unpleasant association and relations resulting therefrom.

The common house, towel, etc., would be matters for each one to decide for him or herself. If any number of persons wished to unite their domestic affairs and live in one common home, using the same dishes, spoons, towels, etc., they could do so. Those who wished to live the most exclusive lives, having their own houses, towels, dishes, linen, etc. made expressly for him or her, and never used by or for anyone else, would be equally free to do so. Those who saw fit to go to neither extreme, but desired to retain much of our present method in these arrangements could go on with their domestic relations as they are today.

Wherein then, you may ask, is the communism? Simply in this: Production would be carried on, as before stated, by those who voluntarily associated themselves together for that purpose, each according to his or her desire. The land and tools of production, buildings necessary for production and exchange, the means of transportation, communication and distribution, and the products of united effort would all be held in common, and the right of everyone to use to the full extent of their needs and desires would be recognized. It is a well known fact that if all able-bodied persons were occupied in production for a very few hours per day, an abundance of everything desirable could be produced. If all were assured of plenty, then no one would have any incentive to take more than they could use and enjoy.

In Communism there being no money, or other representative of value, there would be no opportunity to hoard; for the man who would carry home a hundred hats, or fifty umbrellas, or twenty suits of clothes, when the store was well supplied all the time and free for him to help himself, would be ridiculed and laughed at so much that he would surely refrain from any further exhibition of the hoarding proclivity. The sense of security which would prevail would be a sufficient safeguard against anyone taking too much.

Cheapness would never be thought of. Utility and beauty would always be the objects sought to be attained in all lines of production. Shoddy would be unknown. No thought of adulteration of food would ever enter the head of anyone, and only the best of everything would be sought for. Buildings would be erected with the greatest care and substantial enough to last many generations. Roads would be made level, straight, wide and with substantial foundations; their surface would be kept constantly in repair.

All the necessary and useful occupations of every description would be carried on by voluntary groups, each group doing that particular work for which it was formed. When any work has been accomplished the group doing it would dissolve into its component parts, the various individuals that had composed it uniting with others in other groups for other and different purposes, as the necessities or expediencies of the times called for united action.

Thus the most infinite variety of combinations for specific purposes, either of utility or pleasure could be formed, accomplish their purpose, and go out of existence, and all the necessities and luxuries of life could be provided without curtailing the liberty of any, and the highest individuality now conceivable be attained.

In this condition, above all others that have ever been proposed, would the true equality of the sexes be attained. No woman would feel dependent upon any man for her support, even during her inability to provide for herself, at the period of childbearing. Full knowing that she need never suffer from want, she would scorn the thought of submitting herself to the sex embrace of any except the man she loved. Nor would she bring unwelcome children into the world. Love alone would draw men and women into the intimate relation that results in parentage, and the loathsome institutions of today (prostitution and marriage) with their attendant female complaints and venereal diseases, would be but dim memories of the past.

Natural selection in sexual relations, as well as in all the varied affairs of life, would have full and unobstructed play, and would as surely work out the betterment of the human race as it now perpetuates and improves many species whose natural surroundings are more hostile than ours.

Bread or Power?

The present stir in political and economic fields of activity is rapidly becoming one of conquest. For years Labor Unions and Workingmen's Associations of various kinds have sought to bind the toilers together for purposes of mutual assistance. Generally they only proposed to assist each other in time of need and to present an unbroken front when called upon to resist the encroachments of employer or scab. But in the evolution of industry, and the growth and intensification of present conditions, they have found that they must become conquerors, or

be driven from their last refuge and made the abject slaves of their oppressors—their conquerors. Dimly recognizing this, the question of political action has been more and more noticed, and gained more influence among the various labor organizations as the years went by, and the necessity of a decisive struggle grew upon them.

Here was the politician's chance, and true to his instinct he saw it and began his operations to foist upon the workers the necessity of political action, never forgetting that he was the man best qualified to guide them in the attempts to conquer the powers of the State. "New Trades Unionism," as it is called, pushed on by the rulers of the S. L. P., appeared upon the scene, destined as its promoters believed, to take the place of the old Trades Unionism. Its purpose is the same as that of the old style Unionism with the "conquest of power" attached. Should the fond hopes of the promoters of this kind of workingmen's association be realized, the entire body of union men would be organized in a close corporation ready to march to the polls on election-day with banners flying, drums beating, and deposit their ballots according to the dictates of their union—in other words for the Socialist Labor Party.

As industrial evolution has progressed, the displacement of human labor by machinery, the substitution of child labor and woman labor in occupations once exclusively the occupations of men, the monopolization of all lands and all the machinery of production, as well as the growth of intelligence, has tended to point out to the more thoughtful that the conquest before them must be the conquest of bread. "Bread is freedom, freedom—bread," has been said, and many there are who recognize this saying as a fact and wish to conquer for bread, not for power. They see the hard struggle necessary to gain possession of the powers of the State, and the many pitfalls and snares into some of which the victorious politician, be he ever so honest, is sure to fall. Seeing that power can be upheld only by violence, and that the instruments of power must ever be a constant drain upon the products of those who toil, he turns resolutely away from the conquest of power and seeks only the conquest of bread, for when the freedom to produce and consume his bread in peace is secured he is conqueror of the ills which now beset him so thickly.

The Populists have set out to conquer the powers of the State, hoping, oh how fondly, but how vainly, to make use of that power in bringing about a betterment of conditions. With a zeal worthy of any cause, they began their campaigns of conquest and succeeded in conquering the powers of the State in Kansas, Colorado, South Dakota, and partially so in Nebraska, Minnesota and other states. What has been the result? One after another of those placed in power by this struggle of the producers have found themselves unable to remedy the present evils and given it up, or they have fallen a prey to the same spirit of "thrift" that has ever prompted office holders to "fix" themselves while they had a chance. Still the attempt to carry their conquest "on to Washington" and gain possession of the general government is continued, and while much of the revolutionary fire which characterized the early history of the party, has died out, electioneering tactics like unto those of the old parties have grown up, and only the conquest of power is now their object. In the hope of catching votes they have become conservative, and the starving widow, the honest man losing his home, and the denial of the young the chance to be and do on an equal footing with all others, is lost sight of in the constancy of their gaze, fixed as it is on the conquest of power.

One fraction in the great family of agitators, one fraction alone, stands out boldly advocating the direct and immediate conquest of bread. They see that all energy and time expended in conquering the powers of State is only wasted. They see that it is only swapping masters and that the struggle is not ended by putting the lash into the hands of a new set of masters. The Anarchists alone taboo the idea of gaining freedom by the conquest of power. They it is that boldly proclaim for freedom; for bread for all, and in abundance. At first reviled and persecuted, represented as the enemies of labor and the paid tools of plutocracy, they have continued the propaganda which is so obnoxious to the self-seeking politicians, and little by little the beauty and sublimity of the conquest of bread is dawning upon the minds of the toilers, and they begin to see the uselessness and folly of conquering power for others to use; of wresting the lash from the hands of some and placing it into the hands of others, and as knowledge takes root and spreads amongst the workers, the power of the State will wane and the conquest of bread gains in strength and certainty of success.

Brothers! the struggle is on. We must sink in deeper depths of servitude or conquer the world for freedom. The history of our race shows all too clearly that all conquests of power have finally resulted badly for the useful classes; for those who labor and produce the necessities of life, as well as its comforts and luxuries. Power once acquired requires constant effort to be retained. In fact, so much effort is needed in maintaining it that there is no time for anything else.

Time and again the downtrodden have arisen and wrested the powers of State from their oppressors, but in every instance where that power has been left intact, or some new form inaugurated, its possessors have made use of it to their personal advantage, and its exercise has grown oppressive as of old.

Seeing then that slavery or conquest is before us, which will we try to conquer, political power or bread—freedom? Wisdom and all the lessons of experience show the futility of the conquest of power. Before us lies the world fruitful and abundant. The cool streams laughing and joyous are ready to assist us in grinding grain or weaving cloth, while the constant change of seasons insures abundant yields of fruit and cereals if our attention is turned to conquering the obstacles that lie between us and the free and untrammelled use of all these natural bounties and latent possibilities.

If "bread is freedom," then the greatest conquest of all time, the conquest which is paramount and most urgent, is the conquest of bread. A conquest that will sweep away all forms of oppression and, giving full freedom to all, thrill the world with new life and send it onward to unknown realms of progress, peace and pleasure.

"Let the heathen rage and the people imagine a vain thing," but so sure as the rolling seasons bring their changes in the appearance of the earth's surface, just so surely will the Anarchist propaganda bring a change in social and economic arrangements. When we have conquered the powers of State we have only made masters of former slaves. The conquest of bread will rid the world of both masters and slaves.

Through State Socialism into Anarchism.

The idea that we must of necessity pass through State Socialism in order to reach Anarchism is quite prevalent, especially among those who have recently broken their shell of reverence for the State and are still in the habit of thinking in the same channels as when they were eager advocates of "socializing" everything by law. To such an one it looks perfectly reasonable and natural to suppose that step by step all monopolies will become national or municipal properties, and that thus poverty will be eliminated, ignorance eradicated and a wiser generation thus remove the last legal barrier and usher in a condition of freedom—Anarchy.

Such a view of the oncoming events is not at all unreasonable when held by one whose trend of thought has ever been directed toward State action as the sole means of relief, but when the light of experience, the lessons of history, are turned on, grave doubts of the correctness of such a theory force themselves upon the student. To the natural thinker this view appears as a mere transitional mode of thought which will disappear with an increased understanding of the question in its various phases.

History teaches one lesson very clearly, a lesson of vast importance, but one which many seem strangely slow to learn. That lesson is this: Privileges are never willingly given up by their possessors. The king on his throne holds his place as supreme potentate until hurled from power against his will. The dog-catcher on a city's streets forsakes his job and turns his attention to other pursuits as unwillingly, his protests being less because his power to protest and the emoluments of his office are less extensive. The office holder who became a candidate the first time under protest, and who declared he would not occupy the office longer than one term for anything, will go to the bottom of his "sack" in order to retain his position.

With this undeniable fact as our guide, let us see if State Socialism is a step toward Anarchism.

The State Socialist program, if carried out, would really increase the number of privileged persons, and these privileged persons would undoubtedly try to maintain their privileges. Thus inequalities of power and opportunity would be perpetuated and increased. The amount taken from the product of labor to provide for the privileged class from the president of the national executive committee, the central directing authority, down to "inspector of workshop, mine and home" would increase as the commissions and offices increased, and the proposition that "labor is entitled to all it creates" would be as empty as our present boast of "individual sovereignty."

Regimentation, dictation and constant espionage do not tend to make people free, self-reliant or noble. The degradation that would grow upon a people who would submit to such an arrangement would unfit them for freedom, and the constant surveillance of the masses by the privileged office-holding class would necessitate a violent and remorseless revolution in order to make freedom possible.

No! the road to Anarchy is not through State Socialism. We may be free only by breaking our bonds, not by substituting new and more numerous ones. The State, as a suppressor of crime and a protector of life, has been a sad failure, and to entrust it with the providing of employment and the dispensing of bread is equivalent to putting your purse in the care of one who has criminally or carelessly squandered your property.

The more the powers of the State are curtailed the more nearly we approach a condition of Anarchy: the more the powers of the State are increased the further we drift from it. How then can State Socialism, the governmentalization of everything, lead to Anarchy? It cannot.

If you really want Anarchy, refuse to uphold the State. Decline to run for or hold office. Refuse to do jury duty, and in every way practicable weaken the powers of the State.

Is Anarchism Practicable Now?

It has been stated so often by those who will not oppose Anarchism on principle, but still go on advocating all manner of governmental reforms, that Anarchism is not practicable now; that we must be angels to make it so, and so on, that it is expedient to answer this argument. This argument presumes that men must be perfect in order to live together in peace. It also presumes that government acts as an equalizer and causes men to live together peaceably. Both of these propositions are fundamentally erroneous.

Can people live together in peace without government? Most assuredly they can, and do not need to be perfect in order to do so. It never has been done, some say, but that only shows their lack of knowledge of history. Some good Christians use this argument, basing their belief on the fall of man theory, I suppose. But the Bible tells us that, "In those days there was no king (or ruler) in Israel, but every man did which was right in his own eyes."—Judges, xvii; 6. "Then the five men departed, and came to Laish, and saw the people that were therein, how they dwelt carelessly, after the manner of the Zidonians, quiet and secure; and there was no magistrate in the land, that might put them to shame in anything."—Judges, xviii; 7. Here is evidence from their professed guide that people have lived and can do so in peace without rulers, laws or government.

R. T. Walsh, in the Youth's Companion, some four years ago, telling of his travels in the Caucasus, speaks of the Cossacks thus:

"All Cossacks inhabit towns and villages, some of which are prosperous as well as populous communities. They retain the principle of co-operation in trades, and inherit the custom of the ownership of land in common and have equal access, as far as practicable to all the productive wealth of the community. * * * Among these people crime is almost unknown. They are too far from civilization to be tainted by the vices that mark its progress among the large cities of the world."

It must be remembered in connection with this, that these people had, after hundreds of years of defensive warfare, been compelled to lose a part of their liberties at the point of the Russian's cannons and were to some extent demoralized by contact with the governmental methods of the Russians. Prior to the treaty which put them under the Russian protectorate, they had lived in this simple manner, without law or government, even in the midst of aggressive enemies. The

South Russians, too, lived a similar free communitistic life, defending themselves from the government of Poland on the West, Tartary on the East and North Russia on the North, without any arbitrary authority amongst themselves, all their association for the purpose of repelling foes, wolves or men being spontaneous and voluntary, until the modern instruments of war caused them to allow the "Great Bear of the North" to "protect" them. Herbert Spencer, in his "Great Political Superstition" points out numerous people in various parts of the world, that lived peaceful lives without laws. So much for the truth of the assertion that people never lived together without laws and government.

On what grounds do people assert that none but angels can live together without coercive force, called government? On a narrow and erroneous conception of what "human nature" is. They point to every little trick, every rascally action—the result of our unequal opportunities—and assert that these are "human nature" and that government is necessary to adjust the quarrels that result from these tendencies; that people need to be restrained or they would prey upon each other, their tendency to do so being limited only by the extermination of the race. The first proposition is illogical as well as without foundation. In the first place the petty tricks and shrewd unscrupulous practices pointed out are no more "human nature" than are the most benevolent and magnanimous actions. In the second place, if such is "human nature," then the more power or authority we place in the hands of human beings, the more sure are we to suffer from these very tendencies. The more authority—power over his fellow—sa man has, the more favorable the opportunity for this "human nature" to manifest itself. Thus we see that if this definition of human nature be correct, it is illogical to uphold government. The before given bits of history show that, left without government men do not prey upon each other.

Human beings are gregarious; they associate as naturally, spontaneously and persistently as do so many sheep or cattle. In their association they have developed industry and the division of labor to such an extent that they are now interdependent. The security of each, not only in life and the pursuit of happiness, but also in the daily consumption of food, depends upon the security of all, and in turn the security of all depends upon the security of each. When this fact is understood, selfishness becomes the greatest cohesive force in society and prompts all arrangements that tend to make life, liberty and subsistence secure. The necessity of according fair treatment in order to get fair treatment in return, has ever been so well recognized at all times, that a certain amount of fairness has always characterized trade and social relations, the advantage taken by any given person or persons being in proportion to the protection accorded by organized force—government. It stands to reason, then, that the absence of law, and the necessary equality of opportunities which absence would mean, would tend to cause all men to act toward their fellows in such a manner as to gain their good will.

With these facts in view, and the fact of our ever increasing interdependence, owing to the ever increasing subdivision of labor, it must be evident to all who stop to give that question a careful consideration, that it does not require the intermeddling of officials in order for them to live together in peace.

Without government monopoly in the resources of the earth and tools of production would be impossible, and all would stand on an equal footing. Association would be voluntary, and mutual interest would be the guide in all affairs in which two or more persons are concerned. Why then is freedom, i. e. Anarchy impracticable now?

Herding or Growth?

The minds of many persons who are both bright and powerful have failed to grasp the great underlying principle of growth, or development, and confound it with herding, or worse yet, with regimentation. I will say nothing about regimentation, the plan of the State Socialists, as it belongs in the category of political action—of compulsion.

Let us look for a minute at the propositions of those who propose to herd together, calling it a colony, or association, thinking thereby to solve the questions that so vex and perplex all thinking persons at the present time. They propose to "round up" a lot of persons of varying opinions, habits, desires and occupations in a certain place, and by all these persons working together form a new society, "based on justice and equity" as they put it, and thus show the world a better way to live. Their intentions are as good as need be, and they lack not for energy. Their plans cannot fulfill their dreams, however, and no matter how much they may strive they cannot succeed as they expect. The reason is simple; it is this: They are attempting to work in an artificial manner. I am free to admit that most that we do is artificial, but growth is a natural process, and cannot be made, but must be allowed.

In order to make clear why the herding process, that of gathering people together promiscuously, is inadequate as a method of beginning the work of reconstruction, it is only necessary to point out the "law" of growth. The work and study of scientists for ages has shown that all growth is due to accretion. An atom exists. Another atom is attracted to it and they become a body. Other atoms are attracted to this body and it grows in size. Thus the work of accretion goes on as long as the vitality necessary to attract other atoms remains in the body. Little by little the growth proceeds from the simple to the complex; from one atom to many; from a single function to numerous ones. Natural process never "rounds up" a lot of atoms, nor tries to herd a lot of incongenial atoms together.

The human race is subject to the same natural processes, and each individual is, in a sense, an atom, and will unite with other individuals when attracted by them, but will fail to unite when they are incongenial. That is why the herding plan—like the Topolobampo and other colony schemes—will not work. On the other hand where a nucleus is formed, even though it be of but a few individuals, if it contains vitality enough—has a definite purpose in view—to attract other individuals, it will grow.

With these facts in view it is plain to be seen that in the process of reconstruction it is a waste of energy to try to herd, but directly in line with natural processes to form nucleuses, here and there, and let the natural accretion of indi-

viduals who are in sympathy with the ideal of such nucleuses be the process of growth. Then congeniality of the individuals composing the group, and their oneness of purpose, will insure harmony, and, little by little, the ideal held will become known to others, and as fast as others learn to desire the realization of this ideal, they will seek to attach themselves to an existing group, or to unite with a few others and form a new nucleus.

To make a practical application let us point out that colony schemes that propose the indiscriminate gathering of persons into colonies or associations, holding out inducements and charging admission fees, are not in line with natural growth. On the other hand it shows that small voluntary groups, drawn together by a common purpose, holding out no inducements but a realization of the ideal that prompted their union, and charging no admission fee, are directly in the line of growth, and as they grow they will develop from the simple to the complex, not only in numbers but also in occupation.

As their numbers increase the possibility of diversifying their occupations will become apparent, and one industry after another will develop in their midst. This gives rise to the hope of beginning the reconstruction of society even now, in the present vile system, for, while complete reconstruction cannot take place until the barriers raised by law and custom have been broken down, yet groups living very much nearer the ideal of Anarchists than its members now live, can grow up, here and there, and do much to prepare the public mind for the general reconstruction. Not only that, for as the groups grow up they can open up communication with each other, and the toilers in the city can supply the workers in the country with clothes, shoes, gloves and such other things as can best be produced in the city. In return the country comrades can supply the groups in the city with butter, eggs, milk, fruit, vegetables, honey and such things as the city people must get from the country folks. These exchanges can be carried on without the use of money, and thus the idea of association without money will grow up.

By working in this way a net work of groups can eventually be spread all over the country, all in touch with each other, offering ready assistance to all comrades who may meet with calamities, or come in distress; showing to the mentally lazy, by example, what can be done voluntarily and without rules, laws, or compulsion of any form. It would also tend to stimulate fellowship, that sensation which inclines the will toward generosity and forbearance; toward general good-will and kindness for all others.

In localities where transportation is a serious question the comrades can establish a system of transportation between groups that will best answer their purpose under the circumstances. If there is navigable water a boat can be built. But all these things will suggest themselves as the number of groups multiply and their sizes increase by accretion.

Many of the comrades have bemoaned their life in the present dog eat dog life of bourgeois society, and inquired concerning colonies. I hope they will not try to herd, but will co-operate along the line of least resistance, by congenial persons, no matter how few, forming nucleuses, and these nucleuses growing by the natural and permanent process of accretion—the attraction of congenial individuals.

THE ROAD TO EMANCIPATION.

None of the arguments presented in the articles advocating colonies and communities have convinced me of the wisdom of such plans of action. I still maintain that the only road to emancipation is to stay in the centers of population. To illustrate, take the case of negro slavery in the South. It would have been better for the slaves who left the South before the war for Canada to prove their ability to take care of themselves and that they were human beings, if they had stayed home and suffered with their kind and preached freedom and expended their energy amongst themselves. Then it would not have taken as long as it did for them to be freed as chattels. And all this were possible, mind you, without their having the knowledge of reading and writing and a press at their command. The slaves of the South did not need to furnish proof of being able to take care of themselves. The fact that they were capable of performing any task prescribed by their masters was sufficient proof that they were well able to take care of themselves. Those who escaped to Canada, only left their fellow-creatures in the darkness of ignorance behind them. Now, we are in a similar condition. We do not need to prove our ability to co-operate, when we have nothing except our misery to co-operate with—which is, however, a powerful weapon for agitation. Our masters have everything else, except some old tools of the crude mechanical age which they did not deem worth while taking away from us, just as a modern government does not bother about taking the tomahawk from the Indian. Crude tools are just as useless and harmless in competition with giant machinery as the tomahawk and spear are against the most improved Hotchkiss guns and Gray Jorgensen rifle. We should lay aside those old tools and set our eyes upon the giant machinery. Inasmuch as we produce them and operate them, it were not presumption on our part to demand that they be operated, not for the benefit of the few monopolists and their lickspittles—the priests and politicians—but for the benefit of the workers and those who through the vicious manipulation by this holy trinity of the means of life are thrown on the high-ways and by-ways of the land, to die of starvation or to seek suicides' graves. To do this we must cry out aloud, in ringing voices in all the centers of population. The more we are scattered amongst an ignorant and superstitious populace, the better.

We need to agitate and disseminate literature; we need places where we can find co-workers to lay out plans for propaganda, and by coming into contact with our kind get new energy and heal the scars we get in battle. Only in three things are we ahead of the chattel slave, that is reading, writing and printing. Economically we are below them, which is an important point. We have no guarantee of subsistence on account of being wage-slaves, used only when needed to grind out profit or starve. But they must keep as many of us alive as they need for their own comfort. This affords the only loophole for escape. Our masters cannot measure exactly how much they must give us; they must take the family into consideration. But those that are not entirely subservient slaves do not get married, or if so, do not propagate their species very fast and use some of their wages,

small though it be, in support of the press, and try to arouse their fellow creatures to revolt against their masters, and this is the only thing the latter are afraid of. Their savings would not amount to enough in their life time to start any industries worth mentioning. Everything is monopolized, and their masters only laugh at their childishness. But the laugh gives way to a perturbed and worried look when we start to agitate and try to brush away the cobwebs from the brains of our fellow slaves. The gallows is the only thing they have in view for us then, and they sometimes use it, too, unless the public pulse is in such a disordered condition as to preclude adverse sentiment.

This is the situation we are in. Every step in the direction of stirring up discontent means progress, otherwise stagnation and retrogression.

In Chicago I see my fellow workers trying all sorts of social panaceas—Single Tax, Labor Exchange, Populism and Statism, to say nothing of the communistic community society. Nearly everyone is afraid to go straight ahead lest he offend the monopolists and the plutocratic press.

Now, there seem to be only two ways to bring things to a success; one of them is piecemeal through Trade Unions. But Unionists and "scabs" must cease their senseless imitations of the Kil Kennv cats, which, when thrown over a clothes line with their tails tied together, proceed to scratch and maul each other on the supposition that each is the cause of the other's predicament, instead of snapping asunder the string that causes the trouble of both. Instead of battering the heads of "scabs," the Unionist should study the causes that produce the scab. Self-preservation is the first law of nature, and as the owners of the earth and the fullness thereof offer the only means whereby life may be preserved, the workman is compelled to seek employment by such owners. If the Unionist sanctions monopoly of the means of life, he cannot consistently assume the attitude of obtaining a special privilege from such monopoly to maintain life, that is, if he regards his fellow-man's life as sacred as his own. The thing to do is to pull together for the common ownership of the means of life. In the meantime the Unions should ask for more and more all the time, always demanding sternly, until at the last strike they take possession of the whole shop. They could afford to grant their master a pension, for in producing for use instead of profit, the master as such would fall into innocuous desuetude and be no longer needed. They could afford to let him die a natural death, as his tribe would not survive over a generation.

Another proposition is for a general strike all over the world. In this strike, instead of walking out of the shops, the workers should take possession of them, and forbid the masters to interfere with them; let the masters become producers instead of parasites, else go to hades or any place they may select, and take the priests and politicians along with them.

This, to my mind, is the only practicable way; and to do this we need a press and literature just as we need food for our existence. The more we work in this direction the sooner we will see a race of free men. We seek the co-operation of all those who want to help bring it about, peaceably if we can—but bring it anyhow. None should lag behind to preserve their misery.

In conclusion I wish to suggest that some of our poetic comrades would let loose the divine afflatus of their muse for inspiration to write us a battle song, a "Karmagnole" in the English tongue. The Marseillaise has been brought into disrepute since plutocrats have been guilty of the profanation of using it at their Bacchanalian orgies.

CLEMENS FUERTNER.

A SHORT DIALOGUE.

Son:—What kind of people are those Social Democrats, father?

Father:—Social Democrats are a class of people who think that the government—State—should assume control of all means of production and distribution and communication and operate them for the benefit of the whole people.

Son:—Printing establishments also?

Father:—Certainly, my dear child; printing establishments are included.

Son:—If that is the case, it seems to me that it will be very difficult for a person holding opposite views to express his or her ideas through the medium of the press. I am of the opinion that the State will not help a man in spreading an idea which is against its own interests.

Father:—Then he will have the privilege of renting a hall and propagating his ideas before the public.

Son:—You told me a while ago that everything would be run by the State, so I presume halls would be managed likewise.

Father:—(Excited) Stop your chatting, you d—d fool and don't bother me any more about this thing! (To himself) He must have been to an Anarchist meeting lately.

L. RABOTNIK.

A MISTAKE.

"I am having a better time now than I would have if we lived under an equitable system. I would have to work then and I am positively adverse to labor."

Thus writes Armstrong in the Autonomist. This is an error which is almost incredible as coming from a man of Armstrong's ability. As a matter of fact our friend is doing labor now. Labor is two-fold—physical and mental. To write editorials and do all the work in connection with the publication of a paper, and particularly of a radical paper, is certainly labor, and it is highly useful labor, too. That friend Armstrong's work is congenial to him and that he finds pleasure therein does not strengthen his argument, for "under an equitable system" his work would also be congenial and pleasurable. Nay, if the estimates of students of the industrial question be correct—which I do not doubt—the requisite average labor of each individual for obtaining the necessities and comforts of life would not amount to over half an hour a day. Hence it is safe to assert that friend Armstrong is not only not having a better time, but that he is not even having as good a time now as he would have under an equitable system.

S. D.

165

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. Pfetscher, 469 Wabash Ave.
New York City. I. Rudash, 363 Grand St.
Buffalo, N. Y. G. Lang, 514 Hickory St.
Philadelphia, Pa. L. Rabotnik, 526 Washington Ave.
Allegheny, Pa. A. Frey, 138 Madison Ave.
Baltimore, Md. B. Moritz, 1005 E. Baltimore.
Providence, R. I. Bookbinder, 31 Robinson St.
St. Louis, Mo. Otto Rinke, 3859 Kosciusko St.
London, Eng. F. Goulding, 39 Meredith St.
Glasgow, Scotland. Wm. Duff, 2 Carpin St.

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 May 22.

Agitation Committee, Allegheny, Pa.—\$3.00
 Lellere, St. Louis, Mo.—\$2.00 Hall, Haas, each \$1.00. Siebold, Fernandez, Fuchs, Kramer, Leeders, Carpenter, each 50c. Tannen, Bacon, Feldman, each 25c.

Emma Goldman's lecturing fund on the Coast.

Previously acknowledged \$41.95
 Klemencic 05

Total \$42.00

Expended:

Sent E. Goldman to St. Louis \$15.00
 Handbills 2.00
 Sent to O. A. Verity, Tacoma, to secure a hall 5.00
 Emma Goldman 20.00 \$42.00
 A. Klemencic.

Berkman's Relief Fund.

Received:

"Germinal," Spring Valley, Ill., \$5.65. Schumacher, J. Hlavacek, F. Hlavacek, Telle, each 25c. Kruck, 40c. Stebert, Uecker, each 30c. Total \$7.65

The above amount I turned over to the treasurer, H. Gordon.

In the near future another attempt will be made through the Board of Pardons to release Comrade Berkman, but funds are required, and I hope that the comrades will donate whatever they can spare for this purpose.

H. BAUER.

PERPETUAL MOTION.

Rags make paper.
 Paper makes money.
 Money makes banks.
 Banks make loans.
 Loans make poverty.
 Poverty makes rags.
 Rags make paper again.

UP TO DATE.

"You say you want to talk to me about divorce. Are you having trouble with your husband?"

"My husband? I am not married."

"Then why are you interested in divorce law?"

"I am thinking of getting married, and I want to look at all sides of the question."

Poverty has always been called a virtue by the church; the church has never willingly been virtuous; her dictum helped make her rich and her dupes poor.

E. C. Walker.

NEWS STANDS

Where FREE SOCIETY can be obtained:

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

Boston—Columbia Stationery Store, 935 Washington St.

Brigham's Restaurant, Washington St.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.—A. Levin, 555 Stone Ave. (26 Ward) Has also pamphlets in the English, Hebrew and German languages, which out of town news-stands and comrades can get by addressing him.

ALLEGHENY, PA.—H. Bauer, 73 Spring-garden Ave. Has also other radical papers, pamphlets and books in the English and German languages. Call or send a postal card.

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

Notice.

All parties in New York City or Brooklyn N. Y. wishing to subscribe and pay for Free Society and other Anarchist literature are requested to leave or send in their orders and moneys to 50 First st., or to Comrade Masel, 163 Henry st., New York or to my address.

A. LEVIN,
 555 Stone Ave. (26 Ward)
 Brooklyn, N. Y.

Addresses of Anarchist Lecturers.

Emma Goldman, 50 First street, New York City.

Henry Addis, Gen'l Del., Portland, Oregon.

H. Weinberg, 50 South Second street, Philadelphia, Pa.

Lucy E. Parsons, 1777 N. Troy street, Chicago, Ill.

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-toxins. 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

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 Dallan 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.
 No. 6, "Essays on the Social Problem," by Henry Addis.

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	
No. 6, 25 cents	1.75	15.00	

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: Elizabethstrasse 66, Berlin N., Germany.

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

Discontent, an Exponent of Anarchist-Communism. Address: Lakebay, Wash.

The Coming Era, a semi-monthly Journal of American Politics. Price 50 cents a year. Address: Ross Winn, Dallas, Texas.

Freiheit, a German Anarchist weekly, price \$2.00 a year. Address: 317 Genessee 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 Lefn.r, 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 Vogel, 50 First St., New York City, an Anarchist 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. Keltzel, 675 McDougall Ave., Detroit, Mich.

Le Temps Souverain, 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: E. Sabana, Casilla Correo 1034 Buenos Aires, Argent ne Republic.

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

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

Delnicke Listy is an eight page Anarchist weekly paper, published in the Bohemian language at New York City, 402 E. 7th 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 on trial and these five thought stirring essays, which are worth an equal sum, as premium: "Subsistence and Justice," by Lucinda B. Chandler; "The Sexual Enslavement of Woman;" "Love and the Law;" "Variety's Monogamy;" by E. C. Walker; "Thomas Jefferson as an Individualist;" by Gen. M. M. Trumbull. Address M. Harman, 1394 Congress street, Chicago.

— THE —
WHEREFORE INVESTI-
GATING 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.

BOOK LIST.

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

- *Appeal to the Young. 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. 02
 Let us be Just. By W. Tcherkesoff. [An open letter to Liebknecht] 03
 Social Democracy in Germany. By G. Landauer. 02
 Socialism in Danger. By D. Nieuwenhuis. 05
 Social Conditions and Character. By "Ireland." 03
 *God and the State. By M. Bakounin. 05
 Anarchism and Violence. By Beverington. 05
 Speech of August Spies in Court. 05
 The Emancipation of Society from Government. By Dallan Doyle. 05
 When Love is Liberty and Nature Law. 10
 Wants and their Gratification. By H. Addis. 1.00
 My Century Plans. 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 535 Blue Island Ave.
 Anarchist Headquarters of San Francisco 1274 Folsom 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, 410 1/2 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 Westminster St., Providence, R. I.

Social Science Club, Lee'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.

DR. FOOTE'S PLAIN HOME TALK

EMBRACING

MEDICAL COMMON SENSE.

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

Order of Free Society.