

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. 33.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., SUNDAY, JUNE 26, 1898.

WHOLE NO. 169.

THE ATHEIST'S PRAYER.

Who then are you? Speak out at last. The hour is come.
You can not always keep your tongue within your head.
Appealed to you have all men, wept and wailed have some,
Why have you nothing said?

Why stay you in the sky, huge bronze of lived hue,
With mocking smile on lips that all speech else avoid?
Impenetrable face and phantom form, are you
Of brain and heart devoid?

Why do you nothing say? Why do we see described
No wrinkle, stubborn spectre, on your brow austere?
Why that stupid air and aspect circumscribed?
Are you too deaf to hear?

If you speak not, then try at least to understand.
Despise me, if you will, but let me see, I pray,
Your face relax to show that I may lift a hand
And you know what I say.

To transform into faith the doubt that me o'erpowers
You need but put a yea into those eyes I spy.
You need but make a sign; my hate no longer towers:
It at your feet will die.

O, stately proud, wrapped in your dismal veils,
He whom men call father should be one indeed.
If you are my creator, in the shades and veils
How can you see me bleed?

How can you see me humbly kneeling on the stone,
My arms stretched toward you, drowned my voice in accent
wild,
And yet not tear beneath your eyelid trickling down?
Am I, then, not your child?

Alms give, in pity's name! So poor am I and weak!
I am not wicked. Good be thou, and look at me.
My poor love-laden heart has naught that it can seek
But to exhale to thee.

But no! I still see on your face that stupid smile,
My cries, my tears, my insults bear no fruit, I fear.
No, you do not speak; you have no thoughts the while;
You have no ears to hear.

Then, after all, do you exist? When I sound space,
Within the infinite depths your shape I never miss.
Is what I see, perchance, the reflex of my face,
Mirrored in that abyss?

Is it my soul that lends a soul unto the world?
Were my heart's dream no more an object of my thought,
Would you in vain, like image on the wild waves whirled,
When sun goes down, be sought?

Yes, yes, your haughty silence now is solved for aye.
But I too long have suffered: revenge is now my share.
These lips henceforth shall be of blasphemy the way,
Never again of prayer.

O God, thou floating fog above a field of lies!
O God, thou vain mirage of wishes her below!
Thy glory and thy pride but on our dreams arise.
Without us thou must go.

From the French of Jean Richepin. Translated for Liberty
by B. R. Tucker.

THE BATTLE.

Translated for Free Society from "Der Arme Teufel."

He who wishes to preserve his individuality must fight. Only in battle, by fearless advance, by all-disregarding opposition, can the individual beat off the many powers that wish to rob him of his personality, that attempt to regulate his thoughts and feelings according to certified rules.

"I won't back!" These words of poor Lenu should be the watchword and the guiding rule of every truly free man, no matter if he thereby calls forth the uneasiness and ill-feeling of those who want to always trot smoothly and untroubled along the old ruts; for the many who with him use up their span of life cannot, put together, give him that which he receives from himself. From himself the man gains his strength, and from himself takes the ability to enjoy or suffer. As we, to use the words of the poet, have from life ultimately nothing but ourselves, so in the finality we always are thrown back on ourselves if we wish to gain our aims without becoming untrue to ourselves. Therefore every healthy, thinking man strives for a strong development of his individuality, strives

to live according to his faculties and inclinations, even if he can do so only under unceasing enmities and fights.

But this with all our might striven for development of our personality in no wise demands that the individual shall hold aloof from others, nor become a hermit and fly to the desert. Neither does it ask of him to fossilize into a heartless egoist. Far from it!

Not only the strong impulse to see others partake of acquired freedom, powerful in the breast of every truly free man, compels him to champion the cause of his fellows, but plain common sense tells him that man is here as much for humanity as for himself, that men need each other to make this fleeting life agreeable and comfortable.

Naturally he who looks for his greatest joy in the untrammelled growth of his ego, will have a different opinion about what constitutes the pleasures and joys of life from him who, grown up in the belief of mundane and supermundane authorities, subjects himself without protest to established usages and rules. As the free man combats all that cramps the rights of the individual, so he opposes every guardianship of society and is the mortal enemy of every tyrant.

He denies the right of higher authorities to control either his thoughts or feelings, or those of his fellow-men. The self-determination, freed from every fetter and pressure, which he demands for himself, the free man wishes to guard also for those who have not yet risen to the height of his emancipation.

But this goal cannot be reached without fight. Already the battle is waged, the battle between those who herd in flocks, who need the leader and written laws, and the individualists who are their own leaders, who acknowledge no laws except the promptings of their hearts and heads. It is the ancient fight of the Barbarians and the Hellenes, of those who believe themselves bound to old worn-out formulas against those who with the strength of the rights born with them, wish to build their own world.

On the one hand fight all who are either themselves enslaved or gain by the enslavement of others, on the other those who are free already or strive for freedom. These rain heavy blows upon the idols, erected during many thousand years by superstition and greed, by intolerance or cowardice. With the world liberated from these four great evils, they hope for the growth of a more happy race. Whether they will gain the victory over the powers of darkness, who can tell? But the fighters must persevere in this battle regardless of success—and they will persevere from joy of fight.

Everywhere the daring spirits revolt against the old rules and laws of society. Everywhere the standards that heretofore ruled the life of mankind are subjected to fierce criticism—and found wanting. The world re-echoes from the merry sounds of swords crossed in mental combat.

On to joyful battle!

MARXIANS ON THE CRIDIRON.

Your genuine Marxian Socialist is a queer bird, and his assumption of superior knowledge of economics is one of the things which makes him an object of great interest to other students of sociology. His "scientific" attainments are a never-ending source of gratification—to himself; in fact

he is nothing if not "scientific." And bear in mind, he is not a State Socialist. Indeed, he indignantly—though perhaps not altogether consistently—repudiates that term when applied to himself; humorously hedging by putting the burden upon such statist as Bismark, Napoleon, and others. At any rate, we will be charitable, and not deny him the right to define his own terms.

It is the Marxians—the Simon-pure, dyed-in-the-wool Marxians—who persist in presumptuously arrogating to themselves the right to the term Socialists. Indeed, if one may believe them, there are no Socialists but they; all other doctrines except that promulgated by Marx and Engels are spurious, and not worth a moment's consideration. The followers of Gronlund, Bellamy and Debs are fools or knaves; Tuckerites and disciples of Proudhon are ignoramuses; Anarchist-Communists are hybrids, and so on. They and they only are the genuine article, hence they alone have a right to dub themselves Socialists. To be sure, when asked to define the term Socialism they show a remarkable variance of opinion, necessitated, we will charitably assume, by the great variety of definitions given by different writers on sociology and by lexicographers, a score or more being at present in use. But this does not in the least disconcert them. Believers, as they are, in monopoly on a large scale, they evidently desire to get their hands in by practicing it in a petty way, and often become very abusive when that peculiar "right" is denied them.

These "scientific" Socialists have a strange weakness for reproachfully dubbing as Anarchists all who do not embrace the doctrine of Marxian Socialism; always using the word Anarchists in its most opprobrious sense—a synonym for disorder and chaos. Thus all Republicans, Democrats, Populists, Single-Taxers and followers of Tucker and Proudhon are alike "Anarchists" to them; not because they do not know better, but for the mistaken reason that they count on strengthening their own cause by falsely, impudently and maliciously besmirching a movement which is alleged to be less respectable than their own. In adopting such tactics they make themselves liable to the serious imputation of seeking to curry favor with conservatives and the capitalistic class by truckling to popular prejudice and folly. If they expect to gain by joining in the hue and cry against Anarchists and Anarchism, their expectations are doomed never to be realized. I am often amused by the peculiar tactics of these "scientific" gentlemen, who evidently are not above seeking to gain converts by using such unscientific and disreputable methods.

If there is one thing more than another that the Marxians pride themselves upon, it is their "scientific" knowledge. Marxism is not merely the only Socialism; it is "scientific" Socialism par excellence. Notwithstanding the fact that Socialism is as yet an untried theory, a speculative doctrine based upon future developments, the Marxians continue to prate about their "scientific" Socialism until confounded by pointed questions as to the management and administration of the Socialist state, when they flounder in a hopeless maze of contradiction and absurdity.

The Marxian analysis of modern production is no doubt very fine, but with all its ponderosity it is not sufficiently complete or comprehensive. In lumping all those portions of created wealth which

do not go to labor as "surplus value," and ignoring other important factors of distribution, Marxians give evidence of superficiality in reasoning illy befitting professors of science. What those factors are, and what are the laws which govern them, is too well-known to readers of Free Society to require especial elucidation. Besides, Anarchist-Communists (whom our Marxian friends contemptuously designate as hybrids) are not so much interested in hair-splitting analyses of the present industrial condition as they are in determining the nature of future society from present tendencies.

But Marxians are not the only analysts of modern production and distribution. In the elegant language of drawing room slang, "there are others." As stated by B. R. Tucker, Professor Ely and others, Proudhon was years before Marx in proclaiming the doctrines of surplus value, the theory that labor is the source and measure of value, etc. The former, in "Instead of a Book" (page 479) makes this strong and emphatic statement:

"We stand ready to give volume, chapter and page of his (Proudhon's) writings for the historical persistence of class struggles in successive manifestations, for the bourgeoisie's appeal to liberty and its infidelity thereto, for the theory that labor is the source and measure of value, for the laborer's inability to repurchase his product in consequence of the privileged capitalist's practice of keeping back a part of it from his wages, and for the process of the monopolistic concentration of capital and its disastrous results."

Further criticism of the Marxian doctrine might be made in treating of the subjects of capital and product, but this article is not intended as a critical review of that theory, but rather as a well deserved rebuke of methods of Marxian Socialists in different parts of the country—methods which make them the laughing stock of advanced economists, cause them to be viewed with suspicion by the uninitiated, and which arouse the thinly disguised displeasure of liberal members of their own party. Personally I am on terms of intimate friendliness with many of them, and aside from their ludicrous presumptions and questionable tactics, they are really fine people—the very "salt of the earth."

A. ROASTER.

SHAKESPEARE'S TEACHING UP TO DATE.

"Thou concludest, like the sanctimonious pirate, that went to sea with the ten commandments, but scraped one out of the table—Thou shalt not steal."

These words of Lucio, (Measure for Measure) are most appropriate to the present government: Hawaii as a beginning, Philippine Islands, Porto Rico, Cuba to follow and the end not yet in sight.

The first land grabbed, has, what every other country of any importance except America has, Government Savings Banks for the benefit and safety of those who labor; the bankers have so far been able to frustrate the wishes of the people in this respect, will they now abolish this institution in Honolulu, or will the Hawaiians take advantage of their rights and establish branches in all the other States? This is but one of the many complications which will soon arise for settlement.

Those who pirate the produce of Labor, and thus prevent Labor from consuming what they produce, are now simply finding other markets in which they may sell the results of their piracies.

Anarchists and Socialists with most of the reform element look upon this piratical war with sorrowful disapproval, but the churches are loud in their praises of butchery and piracy and long in their prayers to "Almighty God" to kill the Spaniards. This is of course to be expected, but sad to relate, the editor of "The New Time", a magazine of social progress, says:

"We have no disposition to quarrel with those who differ from The New Time on the war question. The future will justify our contention that the war is a just one and that it will result in the uplifting of mankind especially those who are killed. K.-J.] and in the advancement of the human race." Surely this is sufficient to convince the many who have had misgivings, to the genuineness of the social progress advocated by such a magazine.

The war is first and foremost, to increase the stand-

ing army; which could not by ordinary methods be accomplished; it is also a political war, the trend of the appointments show this; and grab at home as well as abroad. Hanna's contract for 250,000 tons of coal at one dollar per ton more than Alabama coal of equal quality, proves this—Alabama being about half the distance between Hanna's Ohio mines and Key West. The Government pays the freight!

We have not yet paid for the Civil war, thirty three years ago. The English have not paid for the Napoleonic wars, nearly a century ago. Now more bonds are forged with which to chain us to slavery for generations, we are entering the lists with the older fools, evidently trying to emulate England and France, where every child is born a slave to a debt of \$81 in the former and \$162 in the latter country. The Frenchmen, or women, or both, are evidently shy at such a fearful responsibility—so few comparatively are born.

A. J. KINGHORN-JONES.

IDEAS AND MEN.

It has always, until quite recently, been a part of the christian program to denounce the advocates of heretical ideas in order to prevent the multitude from listening to the heretic, or to detract from the force of the ideas advanced. To a certain extent this program worked. Honest persons were driven away from investigating ideas and theories that were advanced by those they were caused to look upon with mistrust, fear or horror. But this has not been fully successful, and some ideas that were championed by men against whom everything vile was said have won their way into general acceptance. In fact many of the advocates of once dreaded but now popular notions and theories were inconsistent, dishonest and very far from ideal persons.

Ideas and theories are worthy of acceptance in proportion as they seem suited to bring about a betterment of conditions, or add to the general well-being, and the personality of the advocate cannot in the abstract affect the ideas. On the other hand the personal character of an advocate should play no part in the acceptance or rejection of the theories advanced by him or her.

How many self-styled radicals are there who are swayed by this same sentiment? How many are there who are ready to say of some one whose life does not accord with their ideas, "he is no Anarchist," or "if she is an Anarchist, I am not!" How many are there who are ready to repudiate the work of a propagandist because that propagandist is not, personally, "what he ought to be?"

This is a vital question. Are the Anarchists going to allow themselves to be dominated by a sentiment that has long been used by the foes of progress to scare away investigation from new ideas? Let us hope not, and let us be careful that we do not contribute to this sentiment by denouncing those who act in a manner that is displeasing to us. Let us endeavor to recognize the work of each other and encourage each other in the work of propaganda, instead of finding fault, and carping about questions of personal character.

To be more definite: I understand that Comrade Merlino and myself have greatly detracted from our usefulness by "dabbling in politics." That may be so, but, if it is it only shows how professed thinkers allow themselves to be influenced by prejudice, and by the sentiment that an advocate of a grand ideal should be above reproach personally.

I cannot speak for Comrade Merlino, except that he unquestionably is entitled to his opinions, concerning political actions, as well as all things else, and his personal actions, or private life, cannot, in any manner add to or detract from the correctness or force of the ideas he advocates.

As to myself I will say this: I long believed that much could be accomplished by legislation, and while an Anarchist advocate took part in politics, but one season of lobbying, in the Colorado legislature convinced me of the futility of attempting to correct evils by legislation, and I went to the K. of L. Assembly that had sent me, and told them so. I still thought, however, as Comrade Merlino now thinks, that much good could be accomplished by the agitation that can be carried on at election times, but in this country agitation can be carried on at any time, and at election time the minds of listeners to stump speeches are closed to reason, or largely so, by the appeals to prejudice of the partisan speakers. This makes election times the poorest time for propaganda, in this part of the world at least. Having observed this I have given

up trying to make propaganda by mingling my voice with the voices of office-hunters at election times, but I do not condemn Comrade Merlino, or any one else who may still hope to accomplish good thereby, nor consider that their usefulness is destroyed thereby.

I have been told it is not best for me to make a lecturing trip to New York and the east because of the highly colored and largely untrue reports of my private acts that have been assiduously circulated there. I consider this deplorable—not from a personal standpoint, for I have no personal ambition to gratify—for I cannot see, even if the worst said was true, how that can detract from the correctness of the ideas I advocate, or from the force or clearness of what I have written, or might say or write.

I might be one of the vilest of men, and yet be able to clearly and forcibly advocate the purest and most lofty ideas. But as a matter of fact my personal acts, my private life is such that I am not ashamed of it, or have any desire to hide it from view.

This brings to mind an article I wrote in an early issue of The Firebrand, in which I decried the attempt to mould the lives, not ideas, of others to our own liking, and I must again enter my protest against that tendency, for this asserting that it is wrong for an advocate to do so and so, or that propagandists destroy their influence by doing this or that, is an attempt to mould the action of the advocate or propagandist. It is connecting the theory to the man, and actions as though the theory was made good or bad by the personal acts of its advocate. Let's try and rid our minds of this false sentiment, and look at ideas as such, regardless of who advocates them.

HENRY ADDIS.

WHY NOT RECOGNIZE THE FACTS?

I find myself utterly at a loss to account for the oblivion of the plainest facts exhibited by all the opponents of American intervention in Cuba. To illustrate: Mr. Oliver says that "the politicians have contrived to launch this country into war at last." On the contrary, the politicians were at last forced by the people to take cognizance of a state of affairs in Cuba that was intolerable to the most rudimentary sense of justice, and that grossly affronted even our very imperfect civilization. Again "The bosses have managed to get themselves insulted." It is not a matter of "insult," as every fair observer knows, and instead of the "bosses getting themselves insulted," they scornfully groveled in the dust at the feet of Spain until the people fairly kicked them into an upright attitude. Why so persistently ignore the truth, why continually make such wholly unwarranted assertions? Are we a political party, hustling for votes, that we must try to make capital for ourselves by misrepresenting the party in power?

You wish to know if we are to take sides with injustice simply because an "obnoxious crowd favors justice." There are two answers to that question. The first is that it is not at all sure that the "obnoxious crowd" favors justice; the very fact that they favor a certain policy colors that policy with suspicion. But why I pointed out the anti-intervention attitude of Hanna, Elkins, Caffery, and the rest was very apparent, it seemed to me; I do not understand how I could have been interpreted as arguing that we should favor war merely because these men had opposed it, and had you inserted the paragraphs written by Arthur McEwen, which I sent as part of my article, your readers would have seen that I was making a point against the claim of those who assert that the capitalists and politicians plunged us into war to further their own ends. I showed that the most offensive representatives of monopoly were bitter opponents of war, thus disposing of the claims made by those for whom Mr. Oliver speaks in a later issue of Free Society.

As to a "war of aggression and conquest," some of us are not frightened by those words, for in this instance they stand only for war against the cruel aggressor and the unscrupulous conqueror, and what he loses he is unfit to have and the islanders that will pass out from under his yoke will be the gainers, whether they secure political independence or become parts of the United States. This is said with a full knowledge of the criminality of all governments and the gross wrongs that are committed by our own, but there are degrees in crime, as there are degrees in civilization, and I choose the better rather than the worse of each. Spain depleted her blood by drawing

out of her veins for centuries the life currents supplied by her thinkers and humanitarians, and so to-day she is intellectually and morally bankrupt as compared with almost every other Caucasian civilization in the world, and especially as compared with this young civilization of ours. There is possibility of development here; that is the difference between us and inquisition-seared and poisoned Spain. She must not slaughter and torture longer at our doors.

E. C. WALKER.

AN OPEN LETTER.

Dear friends—Wednesday June 8, the U. S. Marshall came to the jail and asked me, "Will you go out if I let you?" I replied: "Yes, gladly." So after packing my bed, books, etc., I was let out without a penny and in ragged clothing, after having been in jail thirty-seven weeks and six days—12 days in solitary confinement. I was greeted and received by the comrades with a hearty welcome to the pure air and free sunshine.

Although I talked freedom, liberty, self-government and self-development more or less daily, I met but three men, while in jail, that had a desire for freedom.

I have my photo taken and any person can have one by request, enclosing four cents in stamps to pay postage and any further amount they feel free to aid me.

A. J. POPE.

Portland, Oregon, Gen'l Del.

HOW TO GO AHEAD.

It is encouraging to see that J. A. Kinghorn-Jones and other comrades from time to time discuss the Exchange problem in your columns. There is evidently a determination to arrive at something better than the present system of cutthroat competition. Our Co-operative Exchange here is steadily though very slowly advancing.

Certain principles seem to be necessary to practice as well as preach, for it is strange but a fact: that nine will preach for one to practice, and the most of our reform ideas are laboriously worked out to apply to "the other fellow."

In industrial co-operation the very first and most essential thing is to abolish or ignore legal tender and adopt a cheap money of our own. No matter what it looks like so that it is understood and accepted for a medium of exchange and a representative, if only temporary, of values. Every dollar we accept and use of bankers' money or legal tender is a concession to the money power. The cut and dried and long rubbed-in prejudice of rich and poor in favor of this legal tender is the main obstacle confronting co-operators, and always has stood in the way of any proposed amelioration of the condition of the world's workers. Another obstacle is another firmly fixed prejudice—that it is degrading to labor, and laborers look forward to the happy time when they will need to labor no more. Who then will do the work? Shall we in time become tyrannical taskmasters like those who now oppress us, over another set of complaining abject, non-resisting slaves like ourselves?

One would conclude that the present race of workers and voters would, lacking all true self-respect or appreciation of the dignity or nobility of the mission of labor, be only too happy to assume the role of master and like the former slave drivers of the cotton fields taste the sweets of retaliation by wielding the lash of power.

Many experimental colonies are using various forms of co-operation, few of which can claim success. One reason is probably bringing strangers together who have not patience to wait until they become adjusted to one another; a "previous condition of servitude" to various habits and customs widely diverse operating against the only tie that finds them, a desire to better their condition and obtain a chance to rise.

But for those who are "for those", as we call it, the colony plan is worth testing. There are, however, a large number of people who can be colonized as it were, at home; people who own a little home and have a small business near to schools and other advantages who gladly pool their issues in buying of, selling to and helping each other.

These co-operative Exchanges find a mission and by diverting the customary patronage from the insinuating money lender, the onesided grocer, the plausible merchant and the army of fee takers to the labor and products of their immediate friends and neighbors in all their various trades and callings supply at advanced

rates to all on terms of equality a large proportion of their wants without the use of legal tender.

Thus a community acquainted and accustomed to each other, knowing one another's needs can, if they will, set in motion this mutual exchange much more rapidly and satisfactorily than an aggregation of strangers in new and strange environment.

However, the use of legal tender with its appreciation of its own value and its depreciation of the value of labor creates confusion and hindrance in the adoption of a labor tender designed to raise the price of productive effort and to lower the cost of its mere representative, money, so that in this regard abstract colonization (allow the use of this term as distinguishing it from concrete or separate establishment) meets with some difficulties. Still it can be done.

People who will, may abjure and ignore legal tender to a far greater extent than they would have believed possible; and in time the thought takes precedence; the practice familiarized grows into custom, objections vanish, possibilities open out and multiply and glimpses of long deferred freedom and comfort come to cheer us on.

ALBINA L. WASHBURN.

Fort Collins, Colo.

NO RENT, OR SINGLE TAX?

What hope is there that those who frame our laws will allow all taxes to come from the natural source—land—instead of frame, as just used, the term concoct would be more correct therefore appropriate, for the law makers are landlords and legislate for themselves; of course every one, who thinks, knows that Labor pays all the taxes, so it really matters but little how they are schemed. If the butchers at \$13 a month would only use their reasoning faculties, they could arrive at the fact, that after peace is arranged, and they return to some useful (therefore patriotic) employment they will begin paying back to Uncle Sam the \$13 per month they have received, and the \$125 a month which their moral policeman receives, as well as the annual pay of \$6,875 to Brigadiers—\$5,575 to Major Generals—\$4,375 to Colonels—\$3,750 to Lieutenant Colonels—\$3,125 to Majors—\$2,500 to Captains—\$2,250 to Adjutants—\$2,250 to Quartermasters—\$2,000 to 1st Lieutenant and \$1,875 to 2nd Lieutenant.

O law! O law! how can the \$13 men hold their heads up before such superior beings as army parsons and officers? Only God can answer this question, and probably we should have a different answer from each God—American Protestant God—American Catholic God—Spanish Catholic God—Spanish Protestant God, if they have one (by the way, is not Spain more consistent than the United States by sticking to one God?)

The "no rent" plan of easement for Labor appears to be feasible, and the first step is, not to pay rent in advance. I have felt the degradation so intensely that on May 21 last I wrote the following letter to my land-lord.

"D. Esterbrook Esq. Dear Sir—I have been here from re-construction and strongly object to the mode of collecting rent in advance. The degrading effect is such that I will not consent to be a party to such a course. You can decide if I shall remain and pay for the 'goods when delivered' or leave; if the latter, I shall go where the rent paid the Land Lord will be spent for the good of America, and feel I am doing my little share in preventing the impoverishment of America a la Ireland.

"Americans are fools to object to foreign entanglement, and at the same time live under the English gold-standard domination, which robs them of \$1,500,000 daily.

"Lord Scully owns (but did not make) 55,000 acres in Marion county, Kansas; he takes \$110,000 a year for allowing Americans to cultivate American soil, and spends the amount in England, as well as similar amounts from Illinois, Iowa and Indiana.

"Lady Hesketh spends the rent of The Palace Hotel, San Francisco, in London.

"These are but two examples of thousands that exist.

Your faithful, etc.
Esterbrook owns the Esterbrook Building on Geary St. (he lives in Europe) it used to be a lodging house, but murders and raiding by police for gamblers gave it such a bad character, and rents fell so low, that the building was reconstructed for business offices. Murder and gambling are the results of our disinherited condition.

The rent of the Mills' Building, Montgomery St., goes to New York, it probably amounts to \$400,000 a year.

J. ALFRED KINGHORN-JONES.

ANARCHIST LEAFLETS.

ANARCHISM THE CURE FOR PESSIMISM.

Pessimism is the marasmus of the soul. It teaches that happiness is unattainable; that progress is impossible; that action is a vortex in conflicting currents of evil whose badness is measured by their intensity; that the minimum of suffering is secured by the most gradual descent into the vortex of annihilation. In abolishing hope it extinguishes zeal. Neither liberty, nor science, nor equity, is worth the pain of a useless struggle. It is the natural reaction from pursuit of external things. It originated in the effete sensuality of India. It is becoming popular in the western countries, because the desperate struggle for lucre and its benefactions is wearing them out, like the peau de chagrin. The remedy is to proclaim external objects secondary, and the Anarchistic ideal of free self-expression the chief good. Like some genie architect of sepulchral gloom, the pessimist builds on ground cleared by the utilitarian: showing how every path by which men pursue the phantom happiness, ends in a dead well, a labyrinth, or a pit. But the whole city of despair vanishes at this disenchanting spell "Men seek primarily their own way. Happiness is a mere incident of doing as one chooses."

HOW LAZINESS PROMOTES VIRTUE.

As the first law of organic life is to express itself, so the second is to do so in the easiest manner. Energy and laziness are the flexor and extensor muscles, whose reciprocally conditioned force controls all action. To say that "so and so does not like work" is as silly as to say "the very boys in the streets hoot after him." The boys in the streets hoot after every body. No age, no dignity, no personal merit, is any protection against their impertinence at all. Equally true it is that no one "likes work." The object of all work is to get rid of work. The economic law that men seek to gratify their desires with the least exertion is but a subjective expression of the mechanical truth that motion follows the line of least resistance.

popular way of trying to get rid of work is trying to exploit others. But those who can get rid of work in this way are few. And they only heap up vengeance for the future,—as witness French Revolutions and Secession Wars. "On slippery rocks I see them stand; and fiery billows roll below." There are other ways to get rid of work. The blessed gift of laziness produces all invention. If labor-saving machinery augments wealth, as it obviously does, it would lighten toil, but for the other, injudicious kind of laziness, which aims at exploiting mankind. Thus, we need but enlighten men, in order to make laziness the capital incentive to virtue.

C. L. JAMES.

AN APPEAL.

We inform all those that are anxious to see Comrade Berkman released that his case will be brought before the Board of Pardons next July, and will come this time to a definite decision.

But there are not yet sufficient means on hand to defray the necessary expenses, and we therefore appeal to all friends and comrades to send in their mite immediately. Let us do all we can at present. We hope that our efforts will be rewarded with the liberation of our young comrade.

HARRY GORDON, Treasurer.

P. HEIBERT, } Secretaries.
H. BAUER, }

73 Springgarden Ave. Allegheny, Pa.

"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.

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**, 15 Oak Grove Ave., San Francisco, Caln.

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.

FOR NEW YORK AND BROOKLYN.

For the benefit of Free Society a grand entertainment will be given on Saturday July 9, at 8 p. m. in Capdner's Hall, 21 Suffolk St., New York City. Admission 10 cents. Tickets are sold by S. Fridson, 130 Attorney St., D. Hurwitz, 946 Trinity Ave., New York and A. Levin, 555 Stone Ave., Brooklyn.

All friends of Free Society are cordially requested to invite their acquaintances and help to sell tickets in order to make the entertainment a success.

GROUP PROLETARIAT.

NOTE AND COMMENT.

When The Firebrand was suppressed last year by the authorities we were told that it never would have happened if we had been prudent enough to leave the ticklish sex question alone. Such people did not realize that it was only a phenomenon of a new regime—of a more tyrannical government. The last victim is a Democratic weekly newspaper, The State, published by the Printing Company at Milton, Pa, to which transmission through the mails has been denied. The refusal was based on the ground that the paper had not complied with the postal laws. The editor protested and said in his letter to the Third Assistant Postmaster, General Merritt, who had issued the order, "that the State was a legitimate enterprise, with no source of revenue except subscriptions, containing no advertisements and that no money had been received from individual or party for anything that had appeared in its columns," etc., but his protest was of no avail. The paper was outspoken in advocacy of free coinage silver and in opposition to Senator Quay's corrupt rule and that was sufficient for the authorities to suppress it. "Evolution" seems to have entered a wrong direction.

An old man who attempted to commit suicide wrote the following letter to the Examiner of this city:

"To the Reporter of the Examiner: I decided to write nothing—the life of a poor old pauper is of no account. Before to-morrow morning I shall leap from the rear end of a ferryboat. The reason I go is owing to the brutal treatment I have received at the County Poorhouse. My parents had the name of being christian people. They taught their children to serve and believe in a just God. The stars and stripes float daily over the County Infirmary. I had two brothers that gave up their lives that the flag might still wave over a reunited land. I myself enlisted; was rejected for physical disability. When the draft was ordered in the State I lived I paid \$200 into the bounty fund to help raise volunteers to fill our quota. Now I have got to be a sick old man, past seventy-five years old and an inmate of Alameda County Poorhouse and treated worse than a black slave. I cannot help believing the flag is a humbug and the teaching my honored parents gave me in my youthful days are not true."

"If you Anarchists would advocate the ballot" said a Socialist to me not long ago, "you would not be molested by the government." I replied we had not gained Socialism yet, nor did I think we ever would realize a better condition unmolested by the powers that be. Two prominent members of the Social Democracy, Messrs Osborne and Lloyd of Chicago, were recently arrested in St. Louis, for making a speech in a public meeting, although they had a written permit from the Mayor which was confiscated by the police. Nevertheless we are going to free the Cubans!

The poor miners in Pennsylvania are starving while millions are spent at present in the attempt to relieve the famine afflicted Cubans. The miners have issued

a petition to congress for relief, but the "Representatives of the Nation" are deaf in such instances, and the only salvation for the miners is to help themselves.

Our friend E. C. Walker seems to be very optimistic in regard to the politicians. They were not "forced by the people to take cognizance of a state of affairs that was intolerable to the most rudimentary sense of justice." Ever since the rebellion in Cuba a certain set of newspapers did their utmost to create sentiment for intervention, but utterly failed to arouse the people. It is also a well-known fact that monopolistic concerns of this country supported the insurgents with money, etc., to further their ends. Only when the Maine was blown up was it possible for the tricksters to arouse patriotism and the sentiment for intervention, and it was this power that forced Congress to act in favor of war. This was plain to any man reading the dailies. The reason the paragraphs Friend Walker refers to were not printed was in the first place lack of space and because such utterances in the daily press are utterly unreliable. They tell us in one breath that America does not hanker after conquest in the present war and in the next make calculations how much commerce will gain by the annexation of Cuba and the Philippines.

The Star, a Single Tax periodical of this city, in speaking of the war policy, says among other things: "The real dangers arise from our own rulers and the plutocrats who control them. They see in this war an opportunity for foreign conquest and aggression, an imitation of the annexation policy of the bandits known as 'the great powers' for the purposes of providing more places for politicians in the newly conquered countries, increasing the army permanently tenfold for keeping down strikes and carrying future elections by force, and eventually suppressing the form as well as the fact of a 'people's government' in an expectantly widely-spread mania for extension of territory."

It appears to me that Comrade Addis' contention that the actions of the individual "should play no part in the acceptance or rejection of the theories advanced by him or her," is synonymous with the vindication of a catholic priest requesting his flock to judge him not by his deeds but by his words, when it becomes known that he has been in the company of gay women in the back of a saloon. "By their work shall ye know them" said a reformer some 1800 years ago, and I think he was nearer correct than the priest of today. Of course, a vile person can advance lofty ideals, but he will have no influence whatsoever upon those that know him personally and also very little in general as soon as his inconsistencies become known to the outside world. Theories must proceed actions, but if people would not act consistent with their ideals there would be no progress. How can we, then, separate the action of the individual from the ideal or theories he advances. If I repudiate rulership—governors, all authority and interference—and act accordingly I am an Anarchist. But when I help electing rulers, try to interfere with the private affairs of others, I am not an Anarchist, no matter how much I repudiate authority in theory. Comparatively very few individuals among more or less advanced thinkers would be hostile toward the christians if the actions of the latter were consistent with their teachings.

If I or anyone else would attempt to mould Comrade Addis' tastes, his inclinations in accordance with mine or theirs, or if I would try to drag him into the enjoyments I like, his protest against such moulding would be perfectly justified; but people are as much justified in criticising his actions when such are not consistent with the theories or ideals he advances. If criticism of our actions is not admissible we might as well quit the propaganda of our ideal.

The Tennessee boys arrived this morning, June 17. They presented a heart-rending appearance, such as might be expected after a war with hunger and poverty; many without hats, almost bootless and ragged. At least eighty per cent advertised the fact that it was the kind of patriotism known as hunger that caused them to enlist for the ostensible purpose of freeing and feeding the overtaxed and underfed Cubans. A simpton, such as the writer, wonders why these volunteers to free Cuba did not proceed through Georgia to Key West, instead of through Missouri, Kansas, Colorado, Utah, Nevada and California; but those who know the real owners of America, say that would not pay the Railroads—and America does not own her

Railroads! Government, thy ways are inscrutable. Oh that men would think! Love begins at home, and Anarchists are about the only ists that would abolish government, and consequently soldiers, war ships and parsons—leaving the world free for the pursuit of happiness.

J. A. K.-J.

Correction: In the article "No Rent" of J. A. K.-J., No. 31 of Free Society, in the second paragraph the word "enjoyed" should read employed.

THE NEW SLAVERY.

The Texas Workman is highly indignant over the recent sale on the auction block of a hundred white convicts in Florida. They were sold to the highest bidder. Having grown comparatively callous to the constant buying and selling of the laborer to the lowest bidder the spectacle of selling them to the highest bidder is not so startling and shocking. The open sale of human beings as chattels is too crude to be generally practiced and tolerated, hence there is little to fear along that line. The more subtle and refined—if no less cruel and galling—methods of industrial bondage are infinitely more to be dreaded. There are many men who would be only too delighted, in order to protect their families from the horrors of want, to sell their services for life—as slaves, if you please—for less than the price of a negro in antebellum times. Instances have occurred where men have submitted propositions to medical societies in perfectly good faith for the sale of their own bodies and lives as subjects for medical or surgical experiments. Slavery being but a means by which the master appropriates the earning of a man, the more refined and subtle modern forms of slavery are far safer, more comprehensive and more profitable. While apparently giving the wage slave a large degree of personal freedom and a limited choice of masters, avocations and home, yet the purpose is similar, and the results—financial gain—much greater. It also relieves the master of any care for the health or welfare of the wage-earner. If he dies the master sustains no loss; other men can be hired for the price. Probably a dozen men are scrambling to take his place. Under the savage system men run—not from servitude—but to it. Their desire is, not to escape, but to secure a master. The slave driver's lash has been supplanted by the scorpion whip of necessity. The latter is often more to be dreaded. "The destitute laborer," says a United States judge, "might better be a slave than a free laborer, for the slaves must be supported by the master while the free laborer is left to starve." "Give a man power over my subsistence," said Alexander Hamilton, "and he has power over the whole of my mortal being." Submission thereto means the partial surrender of manhood—moral degradation.

The shrewdest system of bondage, however, is the bond system. The owner of the bonds, mortgages, or chartered privileges, is relieved from any care for the laborer. He draws his revenues from his tributary provinces with the minimum of financial risk and personal security. Mark the striking progress in the art of spoliation. His prototype, the mediæval baron, jeopardized life and limb for comparatively insignificant booty.

The essence of slavery consists in yielding up something for nothing—in being constrained by circumstances or physical compulsion to render service without receiving an equivalence of service. Now-a-days this is done, not by absolute ownership of the bodies of the men, but by monopolization of the land from which every living creature must like the fabled Anæus, draw their daily sustenance. "Madam, the Greeks are at your doors," exclaimed John Randolph, when approached by a lady who solicited fund, "to send to the poor Greeks." The workman need not look beyond the borders of his state or city for instances of the sale of human flesh and blood—and dirt cheap at that.

And the poor devils seem to enjoy it. Ditto the rich. Some day the great truth must receive practical recognition that economic dependence is the basis of all slavery, that no class engulfed in debt or dependent on others for their livelihood, can act as free men; that without industrial independence political independence is a misnomer, a hollow mockery.—A. M. C. in Armstrong's Autonomist.

FOR NEW YORK CITY.

Comrade A. Levin has volunteered to collect subscriptions for Free Society, and we hope the readers in arrears will make the task as easy as possible for him.

THE WAGE SYSTEM.

BY
PETER KROPOTKIN.

I.—REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT AND WAGES.

IN their plans for the reconstruction of society, the Collectivists commit, in our opinion, a double error. Whilst speaking of the abolition of the rule of capital, they wish, nevertheless, to maintain two institutions which form the very basis of that rule, namely, representative government and the wage system.

As for representative government, it remains absolutely incomprehensible to us how intelligent men (and they are not wanting among the Collectivists) can continue to be the partisans of national and municipal parliaments, after all the lessons on this subject bestowed on us by history, whether in England or in France, in Germany, Switzerland or the United States. Whilst parliamentary rule is seen to be everywhere falling to pieces; whilst its principles in themselves—and no longer merely their applications—are being criticized in every direction, how can intelligent men, calling themselves Revolutionary Socialists, seek to maintain a system already condemned to death?

Representative government is a system which was elaborated by the middle class to make head against royalty and, at the same time, to maintain and augment their domination of the workers. It is the characteristic form of middle class rule. But even its most ardent admirers have never seriously contended that a parliament or municipal body does actually represent a nation or a city; the more intelligent are aware that this is impossible. By upholding parliamentary rule the middle class have been simply seeking to oppose a dam betwixt themselves and royalty, or betwixt themselves and the territorial aristocracy, without giving liberty to the people. It is moreover plain that, as the people become conscious of their interests, and as the variety of those interests increases, the system becomes unworkable. And this is why the democrats of all countries are seeking for different palliatives or correctives and cannot find them. They are trying the Referendum, and discovering that it is worthless; they prate of proportional representation, of the representation of minorities, and other parliamentary utopias. In a word, they are striving to discover the undiscoverable; that is to say, a method of delegation which shall represent the myriad varied interests of the nation; but they are being forced to recognize that they are upon a false track, and confidence in government by delegation is passing away.

It is only the Social Democrats and Collectivists who are not losing this confidence who are attempting to maintain so-called national representation; and this we cannot understand.

If our Anarchist principles do not suit them, if they think them inapplicable, they ought, at least, as it seems to us, to try to discover what other system of organization could well correspond to a society without capitalists or landlords. But to take the middle class system—a system already in its decadence, a vicious system if ever there was one—and to proclaim this system (with a few innocent corrections, such as the imperative mandate, or the Referendum, the uselessness of which has been demonstrated already) good for a society that has passed through the Social Revolution, is what seems to us absolutely incomprehensible, unless under the name of Social Revolution they understand something very different from Revolution, some petty botching of existing middle class rule.

The same with regard to the wage system. After having proclaimed the abolition of private property and the possession in common of the instruments of production, how can they sanction the maintenance of the wage system under any form? And yet this is what the Collectivists are doing when they praise the efficiency of labor notes.

That the English Socialists of the early part of this century should invent labor notes is comprehensible. They were simply trying to reconcile Capital and Labor. They repudiated all idea of laying violent hands upon the property of the capitalists. They were so little of revolutionaries that they declared themselves ready to submit even to imperial rule, if that rule would favor their co-operative societies. They remained middle class men at bottom, if charitable ones; and this is why (Engels has said so in his preface to the Communist Manifesto of 1848) the Socialists of that period were to be found among the middle class, whilst the advanced workmen were Communists.

If later Proudhon took up this same idea, that again is easy to understand. What was he seeking in his Mutualist system, if not to render capital less offensive, despite the maintenance of private property, which he detested to the bottom of his heart, but which he believed necessary to guarantee the individual against the State? Further, if economists, belonging more or less to the middle class, also admit labor notes, it is not surprising. It matters little to them whether the worker be paid in labor notes or in coin stamped with the effigy of king or republic. They want to save, in the coming overthrow, private property in inhabited houses, the soil, the mills; or, at least, in inhabited houses and the capital necessary for the production of manufactures. And to maintain this property, labor notes will answer very well.

If the labor note can be exchanged for jewels and carriages, the owner of house property will willingly accept it as rent. And as long as the inhabited house, the field and the mill belong to individual owners, so long will it be requisite to pay them in some way before they will allow you to work in their fields or their mills, or to lodge in their houses. And it will also be requisite to pay wages to the worker, either in gold or in paper money or in labor notes exchangeable for all sorts of commodities.

But how can this new form of wages, the labor note, be sanctioned by those who admit that houses, fields, mills are no longer private property, that they belong to the commune or the nation?

II.—THE COLLECTIVIST WAGE SYSTEM.

Let us examine more closely this system for the remuneration of labor, as set forth by the English, French, German and Italian Collectivists.

* The Spanish Anarchists, who continue to call themselves Collectivists, understand by this

It comes very much to this: Every one works, be it in fields, in factories, in schools, in hospitals or what not. The working day is regulated by the State, to which belong the soil, factories, means of communication and all the rest. Each worker, having done a day's work, receives a labor note, stamped, let us say, with these words: eight hours of labor. With this note he can procure any sort of goods in the shops of the State or the various corporations. The note is divisible in such a way that one hour's worth of meat, ten minutes' worth of matches, or half-an-hour's worth of tobacco can be purchased. Instead of saying: "two pennyworth of soap," after the Collectivist Revolution they will say: "five minutes' worth of soap."

Most Collectivists, faithful to the distinction established by the middle class economists (and Marx also) between qualified (skilled) and simple (unskilled) labor, tell us that qualified or professional toil should be paid a certain number of times more than simple toil. Thus, one hour of the doctor's work should be considered as equivalent to two or three hours of the work of the nurse, or three hours of that of the navvy. "Professional or qualified labor will be a multiple of simple labor," says the Collectivist Gronlund, because this sort of labor demands a longer or shorter apprenticeship.

Other Collectivists, the French Marxists for example, do not make this distinction. They proclaim "equality of wages." The doctor, the schoolmaster and the professor will be paid (in labor notes) at the same rate as the navvy. Eight hours spent in walking the hospitals will be worth the same as eight hours spent in navvies' work or in the mine or the factory.

Some make a further concession; they admit that disagreeable or unhealthy labor, such as that in the sewers, should be paid at a higher rate than work which is agreeable. One hour of service in the sewers may count, they say, for two hours of the labor of the professor.

Let us add that certain Collectivists advocate the wholesale remuneration of trade societies. Thus, one society may say: "Here are a hundred tons of steel. To produce them one hundred workers of our society have taken ten days; as our day consisted of eight hours, that makes eight thousand hours of labor for one hundred tons of steel; eighty hours a ton." Upon which the State will pay them eight thousand labor notes of one hour each, and these eight thousand notes will be distributed among the fellow-workers in the foundry as seems best to themselves.

Or again, if one hundred miners have spent twenty days in hewing eight thousand tons of coal, the coal will be worth two hours a ton, and the sixteen thousand labor notes for one hour each received by the miners' union will be divided among them as they think fair.

If there be disputes: if the miners protest and say that a ton of steel ought to cost six hours instead of eight; or if the professor rate his day twice as high as the nurse; then the State must step in and regulate their differences.

Such, in a few words, is the organization which the Collectivists desire to see arising from the Social Revolution. As we have seen, their principles are: collective property in the instruments of labor, and remuneration of each worker according to the time spent in productive toil, taking into account the productiveness of his work. As for their political system, it would be parliamentary rule, ameliorated by the change of men in power, the imperative mandate, and the referendum—i. e., the general vote of Yes or No upon questions submitted to the popular decision.

Now, we must at once say that this system seems to us absolutely incapable of realization.

The Collectivists begin by proclaiming a revolutionary principle—the abolition of private property—and, as soon as proclaimed, they deny it, by maintaining an organization of production and consumption springing from private property.

They proclaim a revolutionary principle and ignore the consequences it must necessarily bring about. They forget that the very fact of abolishing individual property in the instruments of production (land, factories, means of communication, capital) must cause society to set out in a new direction; that it must change production from top to bottom, change not only its methods but its ends; that all the everyday relations between individuals must be modified as soon as land, machinery and the rest are considered as common possessions.

They say: "No private property"; and immediately they hasten to maintain private property in its everyday forms. "For productive purposes you are a commune," they say: "the fields, the tools, the machinery, all that has been made up to this day—manufactures, railways, wharves, mines—belong to all of you in common. Not the slightest distinction will be made concerning the share of each one in this collective property."

"But from tomorrow you are minutely to discuss the part that each one of you is to take in making the new machines, digging the new mines. From tomorrow you are to endeavor to weigh exactly the portion which will accrue to each one from the new produce. You are to count your minutes of work, you are to be on the watch lest one moment of your neighbor's toil may purchase more than yours."

"You are to calculate your hours and your minutes of labor, and since the hour measures nothing,—since in one factory a workman can watch four looms at once, whilst in another he only watches two, you are to weigh the muscular force, the energy of brain, the energy of nerve expended. You are scrupulously to count up the years of apprenticeship, that you may value precisely the share of each one among you in the production of the future. And all this, after you have declared that you leave entirely out of your reckoning the share he has taken in the past."

Well, it is evident to us that a society cannot organize itself upon two absolutely opposing principles, two principles which contradict one another at every step. And the nation or the commune which should give to itself such an organization would be forced either to return to private property or else to transform itself immediately into a Communist society.

III.—UNEQUAL REMUNERATION.

We have said that most Collectivist writers demand that in a Socialist society

there should be possession of the instruments of labor and "liberty for each group to share the produce of labor as they think fit," on Communist principles or in any other way.

remuneration should be based upon a distinction between qualified or professional labor and simple labor. They assert that an hour of the engineer's, the architect's or the doctor's work should be counted as two or three hours' work from the blacksmith, the mason or the nurse. And the same distinction, say they, ought to be established between workers whose trades require a longer or shorter apprenticeship and those who are mere day laborers.

This is the case in the present middle class society: it must be the case in the future society of Collectivism.

Yes, but to establish this distinction is to maintain all the inequalities of our existing society. It is to trace out beforehand a demarcation between the worker and those who claim to rule him. It is still to divide society into two clearly defined classes: an aristocracy of knowledge above, a horny-handed democracy below; one class devoted to the service of the other; one class toiling with its hands to nourish and clothe the other, whilst that other profits by its leisure to learn how to dominate those who toil for it.

This is to take the distinctive features of middle class society and sanction them by a social revolution. It is to erect into a principle an abuse which today is condemned in the society that is breaking up.

We know very well what will be said in answer. We shall be told about "Scientific Socialism." The middle class economists, and Marx too, will be cited to prove that there is a good reason for a scale of wages, for the "labor force" of the engineer costs society more than the "labor force" of the navy. And, indeed, have not the economists striven to prove that, if the engineer is paid twenty times more than the navy, it is because the cost necessary to produce an engineer is more considerable than that necessary to produce a navy? And has not Marx maintained that the like distinction between various sorts of manual labor is of equal logical necessity? He could come to no other conclusion, since he took up Ricardo's theory of value and insisted that products exchange in proportion to the quantity of the work socially necessary to produce them.

But we know also how much of all this to believe. We know that if the engineer, the scientist and the doctor are paid today ten or a hundred times more than the laborer, and the weaver earns three times as much as the toiler in the fields and ten times as much as a match girl, it is not because what they receive is in proportion to their various costs of production. Rather it is in proportion to the extent of monopoly in education and in industry. The engineer, the scientist and the doctor simply draw their profits from their own sort of capital—their degree, their certificates—just as the manufacturer draws a profit from a mill, or as a nobleman used to do from his birth and title.

When the employer pays the engineer twenty times more than the workman, he makes this very simple calculation: if an engineer can save him £4,000 a year in cost of production, he will pay him £800 a year to do it. And if he sees a foreman is a clever sweeter and can save him £400 in handicraft, he at once offers him £80 or £90 a year. He expends £100 where he counts upon gaining £1,000; that is the essence of the capitalist system. And the like holds good of the differences in various trades.

Where then is the sense of talking of the cost of production of labor force, and saying that a student who passes a merry youth at the University, has a right to ten times higher wages than the son of a miner who has pined in a pit since he was eleven? Or that a weaver has a right to wages three or four times higher than those of an agricultural laborer? The expenditure needed to produce a weaver is not four times as great as the necessary cost of producing a field worker. The weaver simply benefits by the advantageous position which industry enjoys in Europe as compared with parts of the world where at present there is no industrial development.

No one has ever estimated the real cost of production of labor force. And if an idler costs society much more than an honest workman, it still remains to be known if, when all is told (infant mortality among the workers, the ravages of anæmia, the premature deaths) a sturdy day laborer does not cost society more than an artisan.

Are we to be told that, for example, the 1s. a day of a London workwoman and the 3d. a day of the Auvergne peasant who blinds herself over lace-making, represent the cost of production of these women? We are perfectly aware that they often work for even less, but we know also that they do it entirely because, thanks to our splendid social organization, they would die of hunger without these ridiculous wages.

The existing scale of wages seems to us a highly complex product of taxation, government interference, monopoly and capitalistic greed—in a word, of the State and the capitalist system. In our opinion all the theories made by economists about the scale of wages have been invented after the event to justify existing injustices. It is needless to regard them.

We are, however, certain to be informed that the Collectivist wage scale will, at all events, be an improvement. "You must admit," we shall be told, "that it will, at least, be better to have a class of workers paid at twice or three times the ordinary rate than to have Rothschilds, who put into their pockets in one day more than a workman can in a year. It will be a step toward equality."

To us it seems a step away from it. To introduce into a Socialist society the distinction between ordinary and professional labor would be to sanction by the Revolution and erect into a principle a brutal fact, to which we merely submit today, considering it all the while as unjust. It would be acting after the manner of those gentlemen of the Fourth of August, 1789, who proclaimed, in high sounding phraseology, the abolition of feudal rights, and on the Eighth of August sanctioned those very rights by imposing upon the peasants the dues by which they were to be redeemed from the nobles. Or again, like the Russian government at the time of the emancipation of the serfs, when it proclaimed that the land henceforth belonged to the nobility, whereas previously it was considered an abuse that the land which belonged to the peasants should be bought and sold by private persons.

Or, to take a better known example, when the Commune of 1871 decided to pay the members of the Municipal Council 12s. 6d. a day, whilst the National Guards on the ramparts had only 1s. 3d., certain persons applauded this decision as an act of grand democratic equality. But, in reality, the Commune did nothing

thereby but sanction the ancient inequality between officials and soldiers, governors and governed. For an Opportunist parliament such a decision might have seemed splendid, but for the Commune it was a negation of its own principles. The Commune was false to its own revolutionary principle, and by that very fact condemned it.

In the present state of society, when we see Cabinet Ministers paying themselves thousands a year, whilst the workman has to content himself with less than a hundred; when we see the foreman paid twice or three times as much as the ordinary hand, and when among workers themselves there are all sorts of gradations, from 7s. or 8s. a day down to the 3d. of the sempstress, we disapprove the large salary of the minister, and also the difference between the artisan's eight-shillings and the sempstress' three-pence. And we say, "Let us have done with privileges of education as well as of birth." We are Anarchists just because such privileges disgust us.

How can we then raise these privileges into a principle? How can we proclaim that privileges of education are to be the basis of an equal Society, without striking a blow at that very Society. What is submitted today, will be submitted to no longer in a society based on equality. The general above the soldier, the rich engineer above the workman, the doctor above the nurse, already disgust us. Can we suffer them in a society which starts by proclaiming equality?

Evidently not. The popular conscience, inspired by the idea of equality, will revolt against such an injustice, it will not tolerate it. It is not worth while to make the attempt.

That is why certain Collectivists, understanding the impossibility of maintaining a scale of wages in a society inspired by the influence of the Revolution, zealously advocate equality in wages. But they only stumble against fresh difficulties, and their equality of wages becomes a Utopia, as incapable of realization as the wage scale of the others.

A society that has seized upon all social wealth, and has plainly announced that all have a right to this wealth, whatever may be the part they have taken in creating it in the past, will be obliged to give up all idea of wages, either in money or in labor notes.

IV.—EQUAL WAGES VS. FREE COMMUNISM.

"To each according to his deeds," say the Collectivists, or rather according to his share of service rendered to society. And this is the principle they recommend as the basis of economic organization, after the Revolution shall have made all the instruments of labor and all that is necessary for production common property!

Well, if the Social Revolution should be so unfortunate as to proclaim this principle, it would be stemming the tide of human progress; it would be leaving unsolved the huge social problem cast by past centuries upon our shoulders.

It is true that in such a society as ours, where the more a man works the less he is paid, this principle may seem, at first sight, an aspiration toward justice. But at bottom it is but the consecration of past injustice. It is with this principle that the wage system started, to end where it is today, in crying inequalities and all the abominations of the present state of things. And it has ended thus because, from the day on which society began to value services in the money or any other sort of wages, from the day on which it was said that each should have only what he could succeed in getting paid for his work, the whole history of Capitalism (the State aiding therein) was written beforehand; its germ was enclosed in this principle.

Must we then return to our point of departure and pass once more through the same process of capitalist evolution? These theorists seem to desire it; but happily it is impossible; the Revolution will be Communistic; or it will be drowned in blood, and must be begun all over again.

Service rendered to society, be it labor in factory or field, or moral service, cannot be valued in monetary units. There cannot be an exact measure of its value, either of what has been improperly called its "value in exchange" or of its value in use. If we see two individuals, both working for years, for five hours daily, for the community, at two different occupations equally pleasing to them, we can say that, taken all in all, their labors are roughly equivalent. But their work could not be broken up into fractions, so that the product of each day, each hour or each minute of the labor of one should be worth the produce of each minute and each hour of that of the other.

Broadly speaking, we can say that a man who during his whole life deprives himself of leisure for ten hours daily has given much more to society than he who has deprived himself of but five hours a day, or has not deprived himself of any leisure at all. But we cannot take what one man has done during any two hours and say that this produce is worth exactly twice as much as the produce of one hour's work from another individual, and reward each proportionately. To do this would be to ignore all that is complex in the industry, the agriculture, the entire life of society as it is; it would be to ignore the extent to which all individual work is the outcome of the former and present labors of society as a whole. It would be to fancy oneself in the Stone Age, when we are living in the Age of Steel.

Go into a coal mine and see that man stationed at the huge machine that hoists and lowers the cage. In this hand he holds a lever whereby to check or reverse the action of the machinery. He lowers the handle, and in a second the cage changes the direction of its giddy rush up or down the shaft. His eyes are attentively fixed upon an indicator in front of him which shows exactly the point the cage has reached; no sooner does it touch the given level than at his gentlest pressure it stops dead short, not a foot above or below the required place. And scarcely are the full trucks discharged or the empties loaded before, at a touch to the handle, the cage is again swinging up or down the shaft.

For eight or ten hours at a time he thus concentrates his attention. Let his brain relax but for an instant, and the cage would fly up and shatter the wheels, break the rope, crush the men, bring all the work of the mine to a stand-still. Let him lose three seconds upon each reverse of the lever and, in a mine with all the modern improvements, the output will be reduced by from twenty to fifty tons a day.

Well, is it he who renders the greatest service in the mine? Or is it, perhaps, that boy who rings from below the signal for the mounting of the cage? Or is it the miner who risks his life every moment in the depths of the mine and will end one day by being killed by fire-damp? Or, again, the engineer who would lose the coal seam and set men hewing bare rock, if he merely made a mistake in the addition of his calculations? Or, finally, is it the owner, who has put all his patrimony into the concern, and who perhaps has said, in opposition to all previous anticipations: "Dig there, you will find excellent coal?"

All the workers engaged in the mine contribute to the raising of coal in proportion to their strength, their energy, their knowledge, their intelligence and their skill. And we can say that all have the right to live, to satisfy their needs, and even gratify their whims, after the more imperious needs of every one are satisfied. But how can we exactly value what they have each done?

Further, is the coal that they have extracted entirely the result of their work? Is it not also the outcome of the work of the men who constructed the railway leading to the mine, and the roads branching off on all sides from the stations? And what of the work of those who have tilled and sown the fields which supply the miners with food, smelted the iron, cut the wood in the forest, made the machines which will consume the coal, and so on?

No hard and fast line can be drawn between the work of one and the work of another. To measure them by results leads to absurdity. To divide them into fractions and measure them by hours of labor leads to absurdity also. One course remains: not to measure them at all, but to recognize the right of all who take part in productive labor first of all to live, and then to enjoy the comforts of life.

Take any other branch of human activity, take our existence as a whole, and say which of us can claim the highest reward for his deeds?

The doctor who has divined the disease or the nurse who has assured its cure? The inventor of the first steam engine or the boy who one day, tired of pulling the cord which formerly served to open the valve admitting steam beneath the piston, tied his cord to the lever of the machine, and went to, with his companions, without imagining that he had invented the mechanism essential to all modern machinery—the automatic valve? The inventor of the locomotive or that Newcastle workman who suggested that wooden sleepers should take the place of the stones which were formerly put under the rails and threw trains off the line by their want of elasticity? The driver of the locomotive or the signalman who stops the train or opens the way for it?

To whom do we owe the trans-Atlantic cable? To the engineer who persisted in declaring that the cable would transmit telegrams, whilst the learned electricians declared that it was impossible? To Maury, the scientist, who advised the disuse of thick cables and the substitution of one no bigger than a walking stick? Or, after all, is it to those volunteers, from no one knows where, who spent day and night on the deck of the Great Eastern, minutely examining every yard of cable and taking out the nails that the shareholders of the maritime companies had stupidly caused to be driven through the isolating coat of the cable to render it useless?

And, in a still wider field, the vast tract of human life, with its joys, its sorrows, and its varied incidents, cannot each of us mention some one who during his life has rendered him some service so great, so important, that if it were proposed to value it in money he would be filled with indignation? This service may have been a word, nothing but a word in season, or it may have been months or years of devotion. Are you going to estimate these, the most important of all services, in labor notes?

"The deeds of each"! But human societies could not live for two successive generations, they would disappear in fifty years, if each one did not give infinitely more than will be returned to him in money, in "notes" or in civic rewards. It would be the extinction of the race if the mother did not expend her life to preserve her children, if every man did not give some things without counting the cost, if human beings did not give most where they look for no reward.

If middle class society is going to ruin; if we are today in a blind alley from which there is no escape without applying axe and torch to the institutions of the past, that is just because we have calculated too much. It is just because we have allowed ourselves to be drawn into giving that we may receive; because we have desired to make society into a commercial company based upon debit and credit.

Moreover, the Collectivists know it. They vaguely comprehend that a society cannot exist if it logically carries out the principle, "To each according to his deeds." They suspect that the needs (we are not speaking of the whims) of the individual do not always correspond to his deeds. Accordingly, De Paeppe tells us:

"This eminently individualistic principle will be tempered by social intervention for the purpose of the education of children and young people (including their maintenance and nurture) and by social organizations for the assistance of the sick and infirm, asylums for aged workers, etc."

Even Collectivists suspect that a man of forty, the father of three children, has greater needs than a youth of twenty. They suspect that a woman who is suckling her child and spends sleepless nights by its cot, cannot get through so much work as a man who has enjoyed tranquil slumber.

They seem to understand that a man or woman worn out by having perhaps, worked over hard for society in general may find themselves incapable of performing so many "deeds" as those who take their hours of labor quietly and pocket their "notes" in the privileged offices of State statisticians.

And they hasten to temper their principle. Oh, certainly, they say, society will feed and bring up its children. Oh, certainly it will assist the old and infirm. Oh, certainly needs not deeds will be the measure of the cost which society will impose on itself to temper the principle of deeds.

What, Charity? Yes, our old friend, "Christian Charity," organized by the State.

Improve the foundling hospital, organize insurance against age and sickness, and the principle of deeds will be "tempered." "Wound that they may heal," they in get no further.

Thus, then, after having forsworn Communism, after having sneered at their ease at the formula, "To each according to his needs," is it not obvious that they, the great economists, also perceive that they have forgotten something, i. e., the

needs of the producers? And thereupon they hasten to recognize these needs. Only it is to be the State by which they are to be estimated; it is to be the State which will undertake to find out if needs are disproportionate to deeds.

It is to be the State that will give alms to him who is willing to recognize his inferiority. From thence to the Poor Law and the Workhouse is but a stone's throw.

There is but a stone's throw, for even this step-mother of a society, against which we are in revolt, has found it necessary to temper its individualistic principle. It, too, has had to make concessions in a Communistic sense, and in this same form of charity.

It also distributes halfpenny dinners to prevent the pillage of its shops. It also builds hospitals, often bad enough, but sometimes splendid, to prevent the ravages of contagious disease. It also, after having paid for nothing but the hours of labor, receives the children of those whom it has itself reduced to the extremity of distress. It also takes account of needs—as a charity.

Poverty, the existence of the poor, was the first cause of riches. This it was which created the earliest capitalist. For, before the surplus value, about which people are so fond of talking, could begin to be accumulated it was necessary that there should be poverty-stricken wretches who would consent to sell their labor force rather than die of hunger. It is poverty that has made the rich. And if poverty had advanced by such rapid strides by the end of the Middle Ages, it was chiefly because the invasions and wars, the creation of States and the development of their authority, the wealth gained by exploitation in the East, and many other causes of a like nature, broke the bonds which once united agrarian and urban communities; and led them, in place of the solidarity which they once practiced, to adopt the principle of the wage system.

Is this principle to be the outcome of the Revolution? Dare we dignify by the name of a Social Revolution—that name so dear to the hungry, the suffering and the oppressed—the triumph of such a principle as this?

It cannot be so. For, on the day when ancient institutions splinter into fragments before the axe of the proletariat, voices will be heard shouting: Bread for all! Lodging for all! Right for all to the comforts of life!

And these voices will be heeded. The people will say to themselves: Let us begin by satisfying our thirst for the life, the joy, the liberty we have never known. And when all have tasted happiness, we will set to work; the work of demolishing the last vestiges of middle-class rule, with its account-book morality, its philosophy of debit and credit, its institutions of mine and thine. "While we throw down we shall be building," as Proudhon said; we shall build in the name of Communism and of Anarchy.

WHAT MILITARISM DOES FOR A NATION.

Out of the strong came forth weakness, and out of all this martial ardor against Spain The Friends' Intelligencer (Philadelphia) procures a striking argument for peace. It says:

"Studied however superficially, and from whatever point of view, Spain stands as a representative of the rule of the sword. It needs not to be inquired why; the one fact is at present essential. Its history is that of a 'martial,' a 'warlike,' a military nation. It has most extremely and most perfectly pursued that rule, so precious to some, of not permitting its people to forget how to fight. It has never suffered their 'patriotism' to decay by prolonged periods of peace. It has never allowed the peaceful, or even the peaceable, disposition to grow. Conflicts abroad or at home; colonial rebellions, or civil wars; revolutions, or desperate struggles—these have engaged Spain for centuries. Any one who knows even a smattering of history knows this; any one who doubts can easily read for himself. From a time so remote that history had hardly begun, Spain has been a fighting nation.

"If, then, the prescription of militarists—those in uniform, and those even more fierce in civil life—that 'war is needed from time to time, to maintain a country's vigor,' were a good one, and not a travesty on all that is good, what should be seen in Spain? Plainly, a nation of extraordinary strength. Its 'valor' should have placed it at the head of Europe. Its headship of Europe should have given it the lead of the world. . . .

"The fact is, that Spain exemplifies it perfectly, that the war system grows by the evils it feeds on, and not only consumes and eats out the industrial ability of a nation, but weakens and tends to destroy every virtuous energy of the people. That which might go to the building-up of a national character goes to processes of waste, corruption, and profligacy. Cruelty takes the place of humanity, and callousness of kindness."

DIRECT LEGISLATION.

"No people can be self-governed who are denied the right to vote yes and no on every law by which they are to be governed. This is direct legislation through the initiative and the referendum. Work for it and vote for the party that has it in its platform."

The above words appear on a little red label sent to me by Eltweed Pomeroy, the president of the National Direct Legislation League.

If left to me I should change the wording of the label to something like this:

"No person can be self-governed until he has liberty to govern himself in every action that he does not deny equal liberty to another. This is Anarchism and will be realized when every person attends strictly to his own business and lets other persons attend to theirs."—X. Y. Z., in Age of thought.

169

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

FREE SOCIETY'S AGENTS.

The following named persons will receive and receipt for donations and subscriptions for FREE SOCIETY:

Chicago, Ill. C. Pfuetzner, 469 Wabash Ave.
New York City. I. Rudash, 363 Grand St.
Brooklyn, N. Y. A. Levin, 555 Stone St.
Buffalo, N. Y. G. Lang, 514 Hickory St.
Philadelphia, Pa. L. Rabotnik, 526 Washington Ave.
Allegheny, Pa. H. Bauer, 73 Spring Garden Ave.
Baltimore, Md. B. Morwitz, 1005 E. Baltimore.
Providence, R. I. Bookbinder, 31 Robinson St.
St. Louis, Mo. Otto Hinkle, 3859 Kosciusko St.
London, Eng. F. Goulding, 39 Meredith St.
Glasgow, Scotland. Wm. Duff, 9 Carlin 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 June 12.

Pfuetzner, \$2.75.
 Wagler, Jackson, each \$1.50.
 Cook, Hudson, Bohemian group in Cleveland, Koert, Fassett, Kinghorn Jones, each \$1.00.
 Schmellock, Poppers, Goodheart, Schneider, Peterson, Sedlocky, Hantick, Broadbelt, Striling, Huber, each 50c.
 Thomas, Swoboda, Trojan, Quivers, each 25c.

FREE READING ROOM.

The associated groups of the International Working Men's Association of Chicago have opened a Club and Reading Room at 642 South Ashland Ave.

The Reading Room is open for everybody. Hours, 9 a. m. to 10 p. m.

Revolutionary literature will be provided, especially newspapers advocating our cause.

The groups, in regular meeting, have decided to request all papers interested in the propaganda to send one copy each, free of charge, to be used in said Reading Room.

Radical papers should also announce that strange comrades, after legitimization, can receive information and the address of comrades, at said Reading Room.

THEO. APPEL.
 1360 N. Rockwell St., Chicago.
 N. B.—Anarchist papers please copy.

Three soldiers sat at a canteen-table drinking beer.

"Look 'ere, Blood-an-ounds," said one of them, addressing the companion by his side; "what's all this chow-chow about monarchy an' democracy?"

Blood-an-ounds shook the beer round in his can and considered. "Well," he said, "it's like this. If I was a bally king, an' Gawky Dick there was my bally army, an' you was my bally subject; an' if I ordered Gawky to bash you over the boko, and take your bally beer off you an' put it in my bally can, that there would be monarchy. But if we was all three a bally republic, and you was the bally people, an' Gawky was the bally army, an' I was the bally government, an' if me an' Gawky decided by a majority to raise taxes, an' I ordered Gawky to bash you on the bally'd, an' take your bally beer an' whack it out between 'im an' me, that would be a bally republic."

"But, suppose," said the soldier who had asked the question, "suppose as he was the bally government?"

"That there's impossible," answered Blood-an-ounds.

"What for?" demanded his friend.

"Because," said Blood-an-ounds, "I'm a bigger man than you, Spuds, an' I'd smack you in the eye fust."—Clarion.

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.

No. 7, "The Wage System" and "Revolutionary Government," both by Peter Kropotkin.

IN QUANTITIES.

	10	100	1,000
No. 1.	30 cents	\$1.75	\$15.00
No. 2.	25 cents	1.50	12.00
No. 3.	25 cents	1.50	12.00
No. 4.	30 cents	1.75	15.00
No. 5.	25 cents	1.50	12.00
No. 6.	30 cents	1.75	15.00
No. 7.	25 cents	1.50	12.00

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

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

PRICE \$2.75.

Send Orders to FREE SOCIETY

NEWS STANDS

Where FREE SOCIETY can be obtained:

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

Boston—Columbia Stationery Store, 935 Washington St.

Brigham's Restaurant, Washington St.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.—A. Levin, 555 Stone Ave. (26 Ward). He accepts subscriptions for all Anarchist papers. Sample copies of London Freedom will be sent to anyone enclosing a one cent postage stamp. Is also agent for New York.

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.
 S. Friedson, 130 Attorney St.

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 Lambs 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 Genesee Street, Buffalo, New York.

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

Anarkisten, (Danish) Semi-monthly. Address: Kristofer Hansteen, Vibes gate 8, 4 etc., Kristiania, Denmark.

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

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

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

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

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

Les Temps Nouveaux, a French Anarchist weekly. Address: 140 Rue Montfard, Paris, France.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Altruist is a monthly paper issued by the Altruist Community of St. Louis, whose members hold all their property in common and both men and women have equal rights and decide all their business affairs by majority vote. Twenty-five cents a year; sample copy free. Address: A. Longley, 2819 Olive St. St. Louis, Mo.

WANTED: Light on the Sex Question. This is humanity's greatest need. Read Lucifer, the Light Bearer, the only paper of its kind in the world. Weekly, eight pages, \$1 per year. Send 25 cents now and receive Lucifer three months 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 vs. Monogamy," by E. C. Walker; "Thomas Jefferson as an Individualist," by Gen. M. M. Trumbull. Address: M. Harman, 1394 Congress street, Chicago.

— THE —

WHEREFORE INVESTIGATING COMPANY.

BY

LOIS WAISBROOKER.

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

"LEND A COPY TO YOUR CONSERVATIVE NEIGHBOR."

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

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

Regular Price, 50 Cents.

OUR PRICE, 25 CENTS.

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. By P. Kropotkin. \$	05
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. \$ for	02
A Talk About Anarchist Communism. By Malatesta. \$	05
Let us be Just. By W. Tcherkessoff. [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. \$	10
My Century Plant. By Lois Waisbrooker. \$	1.00
Wherefore Investigating Company, regular price 50c, but while present supply lasts "they go at" \$	25

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

Public Meetings.

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

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

Independent Debating Club, St. Louis, 4104 Market St., Room 7, meets every Friday evening at 8 o'clock.

The People's Union, a free discussion club, meets every Sunday evening at 955 Westminster St., Providence, R. I.

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

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

Social Science Club, of San Francisco, meets every Monday 8 p. m. sharp at sixth and Market sts. (No. 1191). Free discussion on all questions. Admission free. Everybody welcome.

The International Group, Chicago, meets every Thursday 8 P. M. at 642 Ashland Ave., Cor W. 14th St. Also on every Sunday evening lectures will be made by eminent speakers. Free discussion. Admission free. 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.