

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. 36.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., SUNDAY, JULY 17, 1898.

WHOLE NO. 172.

THE RED FLAG.

What flag is that, that red as blood
Is floated high in air?
At which the lords of hall and hut
With sharp misgivings stare?
What flag is that, that king and priest
Oft fills with secret dread?
That drives the tyrant from his feast,
And leaves him not of joy the least,
But bitter fear instead?

Men of the country, weebegone,
For thriftless is the land,
Sad is the truth, she walks alone,
Her head is sorrow bent.
No gospel can redemption bring,
All bells toll but a lie.
A thousand hymns of freedom sing,
But you bear chains, you hear them ring,
And—praise the Lord on high.

There is a God above whose word
Is ever good and true;
A thousand heathens slay the Lord
To please one pious Jew.
First hallows theft, and then commands
To steal not, most sublime!
All earth is held by robber-bands—
Lay on a slice of bread your hand,
By thunder! That's a crime!

He sends his Jesus to forgive
The sins he perpetrates,
If you in dire submission lie
You'll enter heaven's gates.
Starve here and freeze, work day by day,
Eternal bliss above.
Your lords and priests live high and gay,
You toil, they snatch the prize away,
And—teach you Christian love.

Civilization! See it stand,
A borrough fierce and tall:
Gluttonous lie from start to end,
Storm it, for it must fall!
Storm it, and raise the red flag high,
It waves 'gainst tyranny.
Stay not at home and droop and sigh,
The time is mad, the end is nigh,
Out, out! For Liberty!

The red flag onward leads the way.
Free be your house and hearth!
Free be yourselves, and from that day
No martyrs on this earth.
In freedom you will plant and plow,
And reap with true delight
Your labor's fruits, nor will ye bow
To king and priest that lay you low
By swords and code of rights.

The throne of God begins to shake,
And with it all its kind,
The morn of happiness will break
When fearless grows the mind.
Ye have been slaves, too long oppressed
By heartless tyrants' yoke,
The red flag gave you its behest—
On! would be freemen, crave not rest
Till every chain is broke!

—Herman Eich.

PRIVATE PROPERTY UNDER FREE CONDITIONS AN ABSURDITY.

It seems impossible for most writers on sociological science, to grasp the full meaning of evolutionary growth. While many of them admit that conditions must change with economic development, and that changes in environment will produce new forms and new tendencies, few seem to realize that the same causes will necessitate a radical change in man's habits of thought, in his desires and modes of expression, in fact a complete change in his nature. And yet that this must be the tendency seems plain enough. Pseudo philosophers may prate all they like about human nature being the same yesterday, today and forever; advocates of "laissez faire" may preach inherent race tendencies; the fact remains that, to a very great extent at least, human character as well as human thought and feeling, are moulded by prevailing economic conditions.

At extent we react upon our environments by

the intelligent use of that mysterious power we call will, I know not. We live in the present and we always live in the present; yet the future ever bears to us the relation of a prophesy, and as the human mind expands it sees, just beyond, greater and greater possibilities in a less fettered life. There seems to be a deep, psychological meaning in the arguments of the christian for immortality: that there must be a happier life beyond the grave because the human soul yearns for it. The unsatisfied longings of the best of mankind for peace, for solidarity, for a greater need of happiness, does undoubtedly affect human environment and mould human character.

When changed-economic conditions shall have made it possible and even necessary for us to adopt new forms; when the condition of the proletariat shall have changed from hopeless servitude to enlightened freedom, we shall no longer hug the delusions which now seem to be a part of our natures. We shall cease to care for many things which now give us most concern. So will disappear, as dissolving mist, our veneration for "rights" now held most sacred, and among other superstitions we shall cast off our deep-rooted reverence for the institution of private property.

I maintain that much if not all that reverence is due to our inability to place ourselves, mentally, outside of and above our present surroundings. We see the future through the eyes of the present. Veneration for private property grows out of the fear of want. Remove the cause of this fear, by enabling all men to secure the full product of their labor, and regard for private property will disappear. For why should we uphold an institution when the necessity for its existence has been removed?

Of course it is not to be supposed that such great and radical changes in the minds of men can come about in a short time. In all probability, long after the institution of private property has been abolished as a cumbersome superfluity, men will have abnormal cravings for the old regime. More than one generation must be born and die before the poor, warped and stunted desires of man will expand to that noble breadth befitting a condition of liberty. But with new forms and new conditions we cannot long cling to old beliefs and tendencies. Methods of natural as well as artificial selection, forced upon us by changed environment, will rapidly produce new types of men. When left to the exigencies of chance, the processes of evolution are slow and uncertain, but not so when aided by the operation of conscious and intelligent will.

The desire for private property has been exalted into a virtue. Writers on sociology vie with each other in setting forth specious arguments in support of the institution. Many of these arguments are almost ludicrous in their straining after effect. We are told that the desire for private property is innate and springs from man's inalienable right to own himself. If it were a mere question of "rights" this argument might have considerable weight, but as it is it is a mere begging of the question. The problem from the standpoint of a libertarian does not involve the right to private property at all. It is wholly a matter of expediency and fitness. The question is, Shall we care to assert our right to private property when all incentives to its accumulation are destroyed? If so then I will ask, to what end? That certainly must be a case of extreme atavism which would persist in doing a thing when the necessity for its performance no longer exists. But it is conceded that we shall not, then the defenders of private property are left without a single peg upon which to hang a thread of argument.

All this applies with equal if not greater force against the argument for competition. It has recently been asserted in the columns of Free Society that competition is the one great factor in development from the ameba to civilized man. It is not necessary here to attempt to refute this superficial statement.

We are all familiar with the arguments of Darwin, Spencer, Wallace and other distinguished defenders of this one-sided theory. We know also that these arguments have been ably met and completely refuted by our comrade P. Kropotkin and others. They entirely overlook the main question—the *SIN QUA NON* of the argument—which is whether under conditions admittedly most favorable to the satisfaction of man's material wants, there would be any necessity, or that he would care to continue that intense struggle to outdo his fellows which now prevails?

WM. HOLMES.

RADICAL IDEAS.

Workingmen all over the world are getting barely enough to live on, and matters do not promise to be any better. On the contrary, every year witnesses a tendency to lower and lower return to labor. There can be no question as to the deplorable condition of the great majority of mankind. A few persons are enjoying blessings and comforts more numerous than were ever experienced by human beings before. The production of wealth has increased hundreds of fold in proportion to population, and yet the great mass of people are not able to satisfy their material wants, and thousands die of starvation every year.

The cause or causes of such a state of affairs must be discovered, and a stop put to the downward movement, or there will come a time when revolution will occur compared with which the social upheavals of the past will appear but trifles. It is a duty that every man owes to himself to learn the exact nature of this inequality of condition, and then to assist in applying the remedy. It is absurd to conclude that there is no remedy, that poverty and misery are ordained by Nature, and that the human family must suffer on in hopeless despair, trusting to some mysterious transformation in the next existence for relief. Nature does not work in such a bungling fashion. Her methods are harmonious, leading constantly onward and upward to a higher and ever higher state. Ample provision has been made for all the needs of every living creature, man included. The lower animals are guided by what we are pleased to term instinct to make such use of that which ministers to their wants will bring them the maximum return with the minimum expenditure of effort, with a continuous development and improvement. But man, endowed with reason, capable of producing greatly in excess of immediate necessity, goes stumbling along, now happy, now sad, sometimes seemingly going backward, ever discontent and complaining, but seldom making use of his reason to alleviate his sufferings. Of a truth these mortals be mostly fools. And yet they are not altogether void of common-sense, and in all ages and at all times there have been some who would refuse to stand still. They were called all manner of names, shunned, persecuted and killed. But through their efforts has all progress been made. The radicals of the past accomplished much, but those of today point the way to a higher and nobler manhood in the future.

What is a radical? Simply a person who believes and preaches that the customs of his time are not perfect and should be superseded by something which he thinks more in harmony with the laws of nature, and which will bring more of joy and comfort to all of mankind. He may be mistaken, perhaps entirely wrong, but almost without excep-

tion sincere. He is never dangerous. Even when wrong he can do no harm. He may disturb some men's minds, and maybe do violence to some property. But that is no harm. Minds are not disturbed enough, and property needs violent usage at times. Some of it may fall into the hands of its rightful owners. The radical who has discovered a new truth is a power for good, and the more energetic such an one is the better for the world. Without him there would be universal stagnation and decay.

There are those in all countries and communities who decry the man with ideas. It is a matter of dollars and cents with some. They are reaping where some other fellow sowed, and enjoy it. They do not wish to be disturbed. There are others, though, who never had two pairs of whole trousers at one time, and never will under present systems, who are more afraid of a man with an "ism" than of a bill collector. They seem to think that they will lose cast, or be looked upon with suspicion by the aristocrats who would much prefer to look upon a bull pup than them. And these creatures pose as "labor reformers," and boast of their union record in season and out, drunk or sober—mostly drunk. As for knowledge of principles, they have none, and will argue on both sides of a question in a single breath. Books of merit are unexplored jungles to them—they know too much to bother reading books written by some crank or other who devoted a life to research and thought. Questions of most vital import are settled by them off-hand—but much to their surprise do not stay settled as they decide. These are the barnacles that should be scraped from off the ship of progress. It would sail much faster without them.

The less a man knows the more rabid he becomes in his denunciation of a new idea and the one who advances it. On the whole the workingmen are not so bad as the business and professional classes in this respect, as there are many workers who have devoted time and study to the subject of economics, while among the others practically none have done so. Of course, there are exceptions, and once in a while we find a business man or a professional man who has discovered the truth. Without exception these men are not frightened by a new and radical idea. They do not tremble in their shoes if someone professes belief in Anarchy, Socialism, Single Tax, Monarchy, Direct Legislation, Proportional Representation, Women Suffrage, Free Love, Free Trade, Free Whiskey or even Prohibition. They know that the advocates of all these ideas are for the most part doing what seems to them right. It is the narrow minded, bigoted, ignoramus (educated or otherwise) who imagines that the inauguration of one of these "crazy schemes" would be immediately followed by the annihilation of the whole human family.

Which of these proposed remedies should be adopted depends entirely upon what the cause of poverty is, for it is poverty that we must abolish. No person can be perfectly happy and necessarily hungry at the same time. So long as a considerable portion of the people cannot get sufficient food there is need for change in our system of government for it is through wrong government that involuntary poverty comes and not on account of insufficient provision by Nature. If poverty comes from drink, then Prohibition may be what is needed. If the cause is the depriving women of a voice in public affairs, then women suffrage is the solution. If tariff, free trade. If competition, then Socialism will bring prosperity. Single Tax will solve the problem if monopoly is the evil that it is claimed to be. If restraint of the individual through man-made law prevents that full and complete development of our faculties of which they are susceptible, and makes us less moral, less honest and less noble than we would be, could we but enjoy natural freedom, the philosophy of Anarchy should prevail.

How much do you know of these matters. Are you able to give a fair and intelligent explanation

of all of them, or half of them, or even one of them? Unless you can do so you are not qualified for citizenship in this or any republic. The man who knows nothing about the fundamental principles of true political economy has no right to bind others through his ignorance, no matter how much or how little property he may be possessed of.

The radical man opens the way for others to follow. Fools, knaves and cowards stay behind, each from a different motive. The honest man takes his position behind some idea, and there he stands and fights so long as the idea seems to him possible of realization. No matter when; perhaps in a day, a year, a century, or longer, but sometime. And these are the men, and women, who go through life shunned by the compromisers, conservatives and cowards, both rich and poor. But they have their reward in their own inner consciousness. They have done the duty they owe to themselves, and made the right use of the powers they possess.

The condition of men today is what they make it. When they know enough to want justice they can get it. Mankind suffers through ignorance, and not of necessity. If the people knew what they wanted there would be no difficulty in securing it, and so long as they choose to remain ignorant they must suffer in poverty. There are plenty of men, radicals, who are telling others the truth, but they will not listen. In this the poor are but a trifle better than the rich. The one who tickles their fancy, flatters, plays upon prejudices, practices subtle deceit, blusters and pugs, is favored and followed, while the honest man who tells the truth regardless of consequences is discredited and avoided.

When men cease to be cowardly slaves to custom, and dare to think for themselves, it will not take long for them to discover that freedom will bring about a state of justice, and that all men will do right when not set about by unnatural and aggravating restraints and restrictions. This is radical doctrine, in fact it's Anarchy, and will no doubt scare some of the weaklings almost to death. The idea that men could be honest and do right if there was no one standing by with a club, or that men and women would be moral if there was no devil to catch them, is strange indeed, and few can grasp it. Church and State have denied this for centuries, and no doubt will continue to do so for centuries to come, but eventually the superstitions of the past will be overcome, and man will become noble and free.

For us this is but a hope, and the thing at hand is the thing to do. There are two roads, one leading to subjugation and domination, slaves and masters; the other to liberty and freedom. Let us determine all questions on the side of freedom, no matter if by another course we may gain a trifling temporary advantage. What makes for freedom is right, and the right is the thing to do always.—Independent, Binghamton, N. Y.

SHAKESPEARE TEACHING UP TO DATE.

"JESSICA: I shall be saved by my husband; he hath made me a christian."

"LAUNCELOT: Truly, the more to blame he; we were christians enow before: e'en as many as could well live one by another. This making of christians will raise the price of hogs; if we grow all to be pork-eaters, we shall not shortly have a rasher on the cook for money."

This christian war by our christian government is raising the price of everything necessary for the life of the poor heathen at home, and before it is over the word christian will stink in the nostrils of all intelligent people; it is greatly to be feared that Spaniards will not be the only nation, who consider the words Americans and hogs as synonymous.

If Rockefeller wishes to endow a christian college, or build a christian church, he puts up the price of oil. If Armour wishes to christianize his name up goes the price of hogs. If Carnegie requires an extra christian affluence, he puts more wind in his armour plates. If Gage desires additional prayers from christian bankers, he issues more bonds for the heathen at home to pay interest on, by their bloody sweat.

If Hanna, the christian briber and perjurer, wishes an extra high gold crown, he puts an extra dollar on his coal and an extra cut in the wages of the heathen at home.

The sanctified McKinley wishes a seat next to the christian's "king of kings," so designs a king-like flag for himself, which "the Ladies Home Journal" in the July issue, glories in having "printed in colors for the first time." Let all christians now fall down and worship-it!! "Old glory" is outglorified!! Is this christian oligarchy soon to be transformed into a monarchy with king McKinley?

There is but one way to make these christian wretches feel their impotency, and actually make them beg for bread, or learn some useful occupation; the only way is to abolish the monopoly from which all their power is derived, i. e. the monopolization of the medium of exchange. Just as soon as producers will use a medium of exchange that will not draw interest, they transfer the power from the parasites to the producers.

Surely all those who believe governments to be an unmitigated curse, must know that the power that enables it to curse Labor is, that exchanges have to be made by means of the cursed governments—cursed money based on cursed gold, and it is surely logical then for all who reason in this way, to do as much of their business as is possible without this curse producing medium, and this is practicable to a much greater extent than appears on the surface, by means of the Labor Exchange check or Labor's money. It cannot be cornered nor can it force anyone to work for the holder.

If all in this city, of this way of thinking, would get together and consider ways and means, a decided step toward freedom might be taken.

J. ALFRED KINGHORN-JONES.

IDEAS AND MEN.

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.—A. I.

That would be the idea exactly, if A. I. had said "judge not christianity," etc. It matters not how many gay, or how many grave women the priest may have been with, one place or another, that cannot affect the correctness of the christian contention, or invalidate the arguments of the priest. If A. I. is an infidel because the priests and preachers are inconsistent he had better investigate the merits of christianity, as such, before condemning it.

I stand by my original proposition that the personal character of an advocate should play no part whatever in determining the acceptance or rejection of ideas or theories. I did not intend to make it a personal matter when I began writing, but the silly twaddle I had heard indulged in concerning Comrade Merlino and myself, having destroyed the good effect of the work we had done by the matter of change of opinion on his part, and of supposed personal conduct on my part, impelled me to write as I did. Then, too, lying reports are assiduously circulated about me, and I wished to make it clear that while I did not consider that what I may have written or otherwise accomplished could be undone by anything I might do, no matter how vile, yet I am not ashamed of my life, and as I once stated before, I propose to go my own way, in my own manner, and while I do not propose to be persuaded, forced or driven in any particular direction, or to combine or associate with any person or persons, yet I will be glad to associate or work with anyone whose path through life may lay in the same direction as my own.

I do not object to criticism of anything I may say or write, but I do object to having my meaning misconstrued, and the misconception criticised to my disadvantage, as was done in A. I.'s note.

Again he writes:

... 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.

Is it true, then, that we seek to exercise personal influence, in other words to impress others with our personality, instead of presenting Anarchy to them as an ideal, or as a philosophy, and allowing them to reason it out for themselves? Perish the thought!

There has been too much personal influence exercised up to date in the Anarchist movement, and the personalities of the advocates has been seen instead of the ideas advocated. This is deplorable, and the sooner this old orthodox way of thinking is got rid of the better for the success of the movement. Again I contend that ideas should be accepted or rejected on their own merits, regardless of the personal characters of the advocates of such ideas, and challenge any one to show why they should not. In so doing I do not seek to excuse inconsistency, to justify hypocrisy nor yet to shut off criticism. I do however want to ask what can be gained by criticising personal actions? Suppose Free Society was constantly full of criticisms of persons, would that help the Anarchist movement? Criticism of ideas, theories and statements is always in order, is always useful, and time spent in pointing out the weak points in opposing theories is well spent. Let us see if we cannot dig below the orthodox mire and find the bed rock of true philosophy, and not simply reject a theory because its advocate is inconsistent, or accept some other theory because we love the personality of its advocate. Let us try to get all persons with whom we come in contact to accept or reject ideas on their merits regardless of who may or may not advocate them.

Persons who are opposed to the drinking habit have been scared away from investigating Anarchy by the charge that Anarchists are all "beer swillers," but I would not presume to urge or advise any Anarchist to become a total abstainer on that account, nor to criticize any one who drinks "because they destroy their influence thereby."

To gain freedom we must get others to desire it: we must try to present to them our conception of freedom in such manner that they will see the idea.

HENRY ADDIS.

POINTERS FOR FREETHINKERS.

I have noted your comment on H. Bauer's "Bible in Prisons," and find it just and sensible. I am a member of two European Universities, and have studied enough of these matters to be able to speak on them. No part of the Bible is smutty or indecent, and Freethinkers who say so proclaim their own ignorance and ruin their own cause. A young lady freethinker in Montreal was foolish enough to lecture on this. The so-called indecent parts of the Bible are just as profitable to read as the other parts. Any part of the Bible can be misused, whether indecent or not. In fact the whole book is misused for the purposes of priestcraft and humbug, and it probably was wrong to collect these writings into one book, and call it a Bible. To form this, the Apocrypha have been thrown out, and the remainder has been sifted and polished and expurgated and explained as far as possible. Only religious prejudice and jealousy have saved the so-called indecent parts that remain.

It has been remarked by Lady Henry Somerset that society and the novels of the day are filled with hysteria. This is true, and this widespread hysteria, resulting from celibacy and nervousness, is what makes the Bible seem indecent to-day. Churches and Sunday-schools want to cram us with the Bible, but they dare not teach it as it is, nor do they know the true explanation of many things in it. If Abraham, Isaac and Jacob could visit us in person, polite society would soon expel them from the country. They could only take refuge among the Arabs. Consider Genesis 24:2, where Abraham tells his eldest servant to put his hand under his thigh and swear. Probably no Sunday-school teacher in America knows the meaning of this or dare explain it if he did. If properly translated and explained, it means that the servant was to grasp Abraham's male organ of sex in his hand and swear. It was a custom among the Patriarchs, when one made a solemn oath to another, to grasp the other one's male organ in his hand, as a solemn thing, and swear. Here the Patriarchs took the facts of human nature seriously, instead of joking about them and ridiculing them. They were very ignorant men according to our standard; Abraham could not write his own name, yet he knew many things that made him wise. A simple, ignorant savage, dressed in coarse barbaric clothing, and filled with indecency, according to our ideas, he would be despised to-day. Yet he was not an idolater, nor to be imposed on by humbug, like thousands of our society people to-day. He probably would have been able to see some of the weak points, on a personal acquaintance. Poor Ham, if he were put down in America, and

somebody were to read him a few pages of Sunday school literature, how sick he would be of such milk and water pulings. Well, never allow any one to say that the Bible is indecent.

A SCHOLAR.

FREEDOM SOLVES THE QUESTION.

As to the sex question we cannot very well leave it out of our educative propaganda. When we assert what nature intended we are getting into deep water. We simply do not know. We can and should only judge for ourselves and choose from day to day and moment to moment our course. But the facts of nature as demonstrated all about us and throughout humanity should be taught from earliest infancy, and to atone for remissness in the past, sex education should be emphasized. If "to the Puritans all things are impure," let us say "to the free all things are pure." Whether varietist, monogamist or single-blessedist, the ideal of liberty ruling the life will give plenty of room for all.

Freedom for men and women to mingle socially everywhere without the intervention and espionage of the law or Mrs. Grundy will go a long way toward settling the sex question.

When we are self-controlled the "still small voice" never fails us and we need no other government nor should we accept it.

Self-assertion, individual independence will eventually populate the world with freemen where legislation must always fail.

ALBINA L. WASHBURN.

Fort Collins, Colo.

RESTRAINT NECESSARY EVIL.

It is the fashion to say that restraint is necessary. Well, we may admit that in certain cases it is. A child too young to be instructed, needs restraint to keep him out of the water or the fire. An insane person too erratic to be harmless, needs restraint to keep him from killing others or himself. A degenerate or criminal too dangerous to be let alone, needs restraint to keep him from being shot or hanged like a savage dog. In all such cases the ground of the necessity is physical. The person must be restrained to prevent a bodily injury. But in all these cases the restraint is morally noxious. That it is so to the child may be known by any one who has seen so familiar a spectacle as a baby in rage. That it is so to the madman is the unanimous testimony of alienists; and that it is so to the criminal, of penologists. Since the mind is more important than the body, though less capable of receiving fatal injury in a short time, it follows that restraint, a thing pernicious to the mind, though sometimes necessary for the body, should always be reduced to a minimum. It can be justified only by the most imperative necessity, and no further than the necessity extends. How this is to be effected, we may take time to consider. We begin by deciding that restraint is always an evil, which those having power should aim not to excuse but dispense with.

C. L. JAMES.

"AMERICA FOR THE AMERICANS."

"The war is a good thing, it will teach other nations that they cannot insult our flag with impunity. As for a standing army to menace us, that is all bosh! You and I will never live to see the day our rights will be infringed upon any more than now. You have been reading to much foreign harangue. People who cannot live in their own country come over here and try and make discontent among the citizens. A majority of the agitators are foreigners; you should quit reading that sort of literature and try and think the stars and stripes float over the best government on earth. I believe in America for the Americans, not foreigners."—H.

This extract, from a friends letter, is a fair sample of the sentiments of the average American citizen, who culls his thoughts ready made from a prostituted press, while his "thinking machine" grows rusty from the want of use.

Devout christians frequently have their pious feelings hurt by the blasphemous utterances of the ungodly and irreligious members of the community in which they live. It is much the same with loyal governmentalists, and any desecration of the flag calls for a blood atonement. When one considers the human sacrifices that have been offered up for the preservation of the symbol of nations, it is enough to cause one to be thankful for being flagless as well as godless.

The reason that a standing army is a menace to the people is because of the fact that soldiers are ready

and willing to turn their guns on the working classes as was demonstrated recently in a terrible fashion in Italy. The great A. R. U. strike furnishes a striking example here at home. And there was significant talk in high places soon after of mobilizing troops over the great centers of population to quell any disorder that might arise. When we consider that the only disorder that can possibly arise comes from men, women and children ground down to the lowest hell of poverty and distress, the brutality of quelling it with troops and machine guns is apparent. And we ought to protest against the military spirit. Let not workingmen willingly put into the hands of the governing class a weapon so powerful as a large standing army, so trained and disciplined that they readily respond to the word of command that orders them to shoot the wronged and suffering of their own land, and if we are forced against our will, to support that army in idleness, while they are being trained, mayhap to murder us in the future, it is an invasion of our rights that justifies rebellion.

If American citizens rich in the conceit of fancied superiority, would spend less time reading "fake" war news and bombastic eulogies of "old glory" and read the "harangues" of foreigners like Kropotkin, Malatesta and other brave souls, they might in the end have more common sense and less foolish pride in the mere accident of a birth that deposited them in the land of "stars and stripes." And though this accident happened in my case, I assert with all honesty, that the grandest thoughts I ever read, the most eloquent words I ever heard, and the martyrs who died for the noblest principles were foreign to American soil. If a majority of social agitators are foreigners, it is a fact to be deplored.

"Ill fares the land to hastening ills a prey
Where wealth accumulates and men decay."

To offset this condition, the only hope is that we respond readily to agitation before it is too late. The cry of America for Americans, is too exclusive for the spirit of democracy. Look at China—that's a sample of China for Chinese. For my part give America the men and women of noble thoughts, the born rebels and the discontented, and if our boasted institutions cannot stand the scattering searchlight of their clear gaze, let the structure fall, that something better may rise in its place.

And as long as men and women are shot, hung and imprisoned, for protesting in a peaceable manner against their wrongs, I respectfully refuse to ever try to think that "the stars and stripes float over the best government on earth." Besides the word best is out of place in connection with the word government; that word has but one meaning. That meaning you may learn in the Siberian hells, in the castle of Mountjuich. On Englands gallows and under the guillotine of France and where the sun kisses the five green graves in Waldheim's cemetery of Chicago's Martyrs. Not only is government defined there, but on a thousand battle fields is the story told.

"In the Silence of tears—in the memory
Of a wrong we soon a day will repay,
Live the brothers who died in all ages,
For the freedom we live for today."

Caplinger Mills, Mo.

KATE AUSTIN.

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 September 21, 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, }
Allegheny Pa.

73 Springgarden Ave.

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

Anarchy.—A social theory which regards the union of order with the absence of all direct government of man by man as the political ideal; absolute individual liberty.—Century Dictionary.

NOTICE.

Several requests have been made to publish the Speeches in Court of our murdered comrades and Altgeld's reasons for pardoning Schwab, Fielden and Neebe, whose death sentences were modified to life imprisonment.

While we are anxious to publish the speeches, we are at present less than ever in the position to do so. For the last three months we have published the pamphlets simply to retain the second class matter postage rates, for we had not sale and orders enough to defray expenses caused by the Free Society Library. But if comrades and groups will pledge themselves to order the Speeches in quantities which will guarantee the expenses, and the readers of Free Society that are in arrears will pay up their subscription to enable us to keep the paper going, we will begin the publication of the Speeches next month.

It rests with you, comrades, whether or not we will continue the publication of Free Society and the Library.

FREE SOCIETY.

NOTE AND COMMENT.

I suppose the readers will have guessed that Anthony Comstock has not condemned F. B. Livesey upon his "look" as was said in last week's issue, but one of his books.

The Santa Fe R. R. has threatened to discharge all its employees who believe in Spiritualism and attend the meetings of the Spiritualists. Still fools and knaves claim we are living in a "free country," Government and the Church, both stand and fall together!

The Governor of New York has given this reason why certain regiments of the militia did not go to war: "To protect life and property during the war in case of internal disturbances." So the rich men's sons stay at home to shoot starving workmen, if necessary, and the workmen's sons want to free the starving Cubans. What will come next in the course of evolution?

According to the New York Herald the government was assailed at a meeting of the Central Labor Union of that city. The rebellious spirit manifested there is really encouraging. Says the Herald:

Following the historic example of the German workmen, who revolted when the price of their beer was increased, the Central Labor Union yesterday indulged in strong words because the war tax had increased the price of the American workman's beer.

George Washington Jones was emphatic. He said:—"It is time for the workmen to rise in arms against the tyrants in Washington. It is time for a second rebellion. There is no tax on the rich man, but the poor man pays it when he smokes his cigar and drinks his beer."

"Let us call a mass meeting and denounce the Senate of the United States for rascality, roguery and robbery. It is only a band of thieves, and it is high time the workmen were protesting with arms in their hands against its tyranny."

William H. Farley, of the Tile Layers' Union, replied to Jones.

"The rich pay their share of the tax as well as the poor," he said, "and I notice that some of them went down, too, at the front in the first land battle of the war. No one should object to the tax. It goes to pay the wages of the soldiers who are fighting at the front."

Uproar followed when Jones took the floor again and began to denounce the government.

"We will never accomplish anything," he said,

"unless we resort to arms. What is the use of freeing Cuba to turn it over to American capitalists, who are worse than Ozars, and who are now increasing the army to use it against you."

While Jones was speaking about half the delegates were cheering him while others were hooting and calling on the chairman to stop him. In the midst of his harangue a motion denouncing the brewers was put and carried and the meeting adjourned.

Sam Jones, who intended to run for governor of Georgia as an independent candidate, has been cheerfully encouraged by some reform papers, because his watchword is, "Work, work of any kind" and "the land for the landless." But it is not more work that mankind is after—we had enough of it. Let us have less work by withdrawing the support to millions of parasites, and more recreation and pleasure by repudiating authority and restraint. The more people go on the land under existing conditions, the more we enable the drones to live in luxury. There is one feature, however, in Sam Jones' platform, which I fully endorse—the obliteration of the public schools, because "they foster paternalism" and that "the State has no more right to educate than to feed and clothe." Obliterate all governments, Mr. Jones, and we may endorse your nomination.

The shooting of workmen who dare to attempt to improve their miserable condition is becoming so general that we seem to be indifferent about it, but it excites all our tender sensations when a Cuban is maltreated by the Spaniards.

The wood workers of Oshkosh, Wis., who have been for years in a starving condition, have been on a strike for a weekly wage of \$7.50. Of course the millionaire who has many mistresses and churches to support could not afford to pay such enormous wages, and the militia was called out and a boy 17 years old was shot. Now the reform press raises a howl for "government protection." When will these deluded fools see that it is government which creates and upholds such outrages! Government never has and never will protect the producers.

Such sentiments as are expressed in the article reprinted from the Independent this week are encouraging and a good sign of the times, especially when we consider that it is neither an Anarchist nor a Socialist paper, but circulates more or less among conservative people. The editor makes one error, however, to which I would like to call his attention—to wit: "Single Tax will solve the problem if monopoly is the evil that it is claimed to be." As long as private property in the means of production and distribution, which includes land, is admitted, just so long is monopolization unavoidable. To abolish monopoly all these means must be free to utilize them as people see fit. Property and the levying of taxes necessitates a governing power which makes freedom an impossibility.

But in spite of the differences of our opinions regarding freedom and monopoly, I hope the paper will receive the support it deserves.

The Manhattan Liberal Club of New York, which is composed of radicals adhering to different schools of thought, lately discussed the merits of the present war from which we quote the following expressing our sentiments exactly:

"Mr. Cooper is not in favor of forcing republican ideas upon other people or of extending our territory. England is marauding in order to create a market for her goods. Let us not imitate her example and become marauders ourselves. Cuba would have become free long ago if our government had allowed private individuals to help her. Mr. Wakeman is a lover of liberty, but liberty and government cannot live peacefully together."

"Emma Goldman is opposed to war, but she was on the warpath just the same. A man who clamors for a large army and navy, she said, cannot be a friend of liberty. We pretend to sympathize with our own starving people? Why do we shoot down our own workmen? Only a few politicians will derive benefit from the present war. The outcome will be that the Cubans will remain slaves and the Americans still greater slaves."

Many of our readers will be glad to hear that the Truth Seeker of New York dares to again print Watson Heaton's cartoons which did splendid work in clearing away religious and superstitious notions. One appropriate picture very often has a greater

impression upon the minds of people than long-winded arguments and deductions, and I often regret that we are not able to bring cartoons in Free Society. Are there artists among our readers who would be willing to give their services free in engraving? We have been promised drawings.

Henry Addis seems to be fond of fighting windmills. I did not assert that ideas should not be accepted or be rejected according to the conduct of the advocate; on the contrary, I admitted that a vile person may be capable of advancing lofty ideas. But I did say that our ideas (not our personality) would have very little influence upon the outside world if we remain vile and inconsistent. I did not say I became an infidel because priests and preachers are inconsistent, but I will say, right here, that the inconsistencies of the Christians was the first motive which led me to investigate other ideas and drove me away from their ranks.

Not long ago H. Addis pointed out in Free Society that during the election time "a big, full bellied priest" had engaged in politics "as openly and shamelessly as any 'hobo' or 'stiff'." Now why this reference? Was it not because Comrade Addis had expected a different conduct from the priest? Otherwise why should not a priest make money in politics as well as a "hobo," "stiff" or others?

Again I will ask H. Addis, what will theories or ideals ever amount to if we do not act accordingly? And if actions must succeed theories in order to make any progress whatsoever, is it not in order to point out the inconsistencies in our actions? Pray, don't ignore the questions this time.

As Comrade Addis has failed to point out where I misconstrued his meaning to his disadvantages, I cannot apologize.

A. I.

Why does not some "happiness seeking" advocate challenge C. L. James' statement that "Men seek primarily their own way. Happiness is a mere incident of doing as one chooses." It is identical with what Comrade Morris dubs my "brand new philosophy."

War cannot be otherwise than cruel, and is never justifiable except as a matter of defense against direct attack. Wars of revenge are violent symptoms of savagery and cannot be defended on any other grounds than the crudest, such as "two wrongs make a right."

H. A.

MICHAEL SCHWAB IS DEAD.

It is with deep regret that I read the death notice of comrade Michel Schwab. Another of the memorable eight has passed from our midst who was condemned for the Haymarket tragedy that culminated in the judicial murder of five noble comrades on November 11, 1887. The inhuman persecution and bloodthirsty verdict rendered at the instigation of corporate tools on December 3, 1886 comes fresh to mind while reading the death notice. I first met friend Schwab after his incarceration in the Cook Co. jail while waiting trial for his life. His thoughtful look during the mental torture he was undergoing will not soon be effaced from memory, and even at that early hour the shadow of death hovered in his wake, his health was poor owing to the grip that the unrelenting foe consumption had upon him.

His association with the labor movement, and the many excellent articles from his pen had placed him in the ranks of thinking men and made him worthy of special consideration. My personal knowledge of him during the last two years has been somewhat limited. But his courage and determination revealed during that trial commanded my highest respect and admiration.

After his release from prison he again took up his life work for humanity, and never relaxed until forced by sickness to lay down his pen.

His revolutionary tendencies were of a mild character; his was not of a nature to get violently aggressive. He seldom challenged an adversary for harsh criticism. It was not for the want of courage, however, but rather for lack of active force or vitality to carry him through.

Comrade Schwab was born in Bavaria in 1858.

of 1853. He leaves a wife and four children to mourn his loss, and a world-wide reputation to commemorate his past. His many gems of rich thought will speak for themselves in summing up his worth. The value of such men can not always be estimated in words.

At last he answered to the call
Of comrades that had gone before.
We lay him in his winding sheet
Wrapped in death's eternal sleep.

Maywood, Ill.

L. S. OLIVER.

CLIPPINGS.

Our ideal is that condition of society or citizenship in which the citizen, whilst seeking his own satisfactions freely, endeavors to do so in a way to avoid interfering with the satisfactions of his own fellow citizens; in which he seeks not only to passively respect, but also to actively assist their satisfactions; and in his own way because they extend the like fraternity to him.—The Worker.

As a matter of mere individual right everyone is entitled to do what he can and have what he can, but this right does not alter that of anyone else to prevent him from doing so precisely the same principle. Social rights are entirely different. A man's social liberty of conduct, his social title to possessions, are simple in the one case what his fellows can be content that he should do, in the other what they can be content that he should have.—The Worker.

When you are inclined to feel puffed up with national pride over the prospect of the stars and stripes waving over Hawaii, Porto Rico, Philippines and Cuba, just remember that you, your children and your children's children for generation must toil and be robbed to satisfy the greed of the few who calculate to reap the benefits. It will be time enough to set up the flag of freedom on the islands of the southern seas when the cry for bread is no longer heard in the land.

If the people of the United States are to be caught by such bait they deserve to be dangled on the hook monopoly until they became hungry enough to think.—The Independent.

A friend and I have had a series of discussions on the questions of poverty, my friend contending that all the miseries of this world (including poverty) were caused by the rum traffic. During our last talk upon the matter he regaled me with a recital of outrageous conduct of "low-down ruffians" while engaged in collecting the garbage along our street. I reminded him of the influences under which these ruffians were born and bred, asked him what he would do with people who were so offensive if he could have his own way.

"I would put them all on an island by themselves," he replied.

"Then you would collect your garbage and do all those things that require cheap labor?"

"O," my friend replied, incautiously but with perfect frankness, "there are hundreds of thousands of respectable poor people!"

"Hundreds of thousands of respectable poor people?" I repeated wishing to get him to commit himself to that assertion.

"Yes," he replied.

"Hundreds of thousands of poor people who are respectable and don't get drunk?"

"Yes."

"Then what causes their poverty?"

My friend was nonplussed. In future he will probably ascribe our wide-spread poverty to some other cause than drunkenness.—Detroit Justice.

Art, with the aid of science guided by religion, ought to make the peaceful associative life of men, now brought about by purely external means, such as courts, police, charitable institutions, regulations, the spontaneous and joyful result of our activities. Art must see that the feelings of solidarity and love of others, now the properties of the best members of society, become habitual, instinctive in all men. The function of the art of our time is to translate from the sphere of reason to the sphere of sentiment, the truth that the welfare of men is found in their union; to establish the kingdom of God—that is, of love—in place of that of force. It is now in the ascendant. Perhaps in future it will open to art new, higher ideals, but at present the mission of art is clear and definite. The task

of christian art is the realization of the fraternal union of men. Count Leo Tolstoi on "Art," in a Russian magazine, "Questions of Philosophy and Psychology.

Will christianity or the religions of today ever do this? No!

"For if they are well educated, and grow into sensible men, they will easily see the way through all this as well as other matters which I do not mention; such, for example, as the possession of women and marriage and the procreation of children, which will all follow the general principle that friends have all things in common, as the proverb says.—"Plato's Republic."

Is there anything new under the sun? The above was written by a Greek philosopher about 350 B. C.

We have reconcentrated right here in California, as evidenced by the fact that Candelaria Frederico, thirteen-year-old daughter of an Indian, died in a tent in San Bernardino, while her father (an Indian, deprived of his rightful heritage of centuries) was vainly seeking employments in Pomona. The causes of death were starvation, exposure to the chills of night and the torrid heat of the day, lying on the bare ground. But there is no acclaim of brass band for those who seek to make such horrors impossible by driving off the worse than Weylers who barricade the land from the people, and no military funerals for the victims of land greed.—The Star.

"Among those whom you see in the garb of peace there is no peace; for a small profit any one of them will attempt the ruin of another: no one can gain anything save by another's loss. They hate the fortunate and despise the unfortunate: they grudgingly endure the great and oppress the small."—Seneca, on Anger.

We are in the same condition today—2,000 years after Seneca wrote the above, and still people are hailing of the progress we have made.

THE ANNEXATION OF THE HAWAIIAN ISLANDS AND CONTRACT SLAVERY.

"Plutocracy is willing," and has so proven it by the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands on the 6 inst. Made secure, after due and careful investigation, that the great majority of the American people had been carried off their feet and had lost their heads by military glory gained in licking weaker Spain and by the consequent territorial expansion, plutocracy's leaders have boldly come out into the open, practically saying: To hell with the Monroe doctrine! To hell with the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution!! To hell with the old worn-out phrase that government rests upon the consent of the governed!!!

That the annexation of Hawaii means all this, has been apparent to many who took the time and pains to watch the tactics of the annexationists. Capitalism, always needing for its growth and very life expansion of territory and new markets, has reached its limits on the North American continent, and the present great labor wars and the march of the unemployed to Washington convincing the "captains of industry" that "something new" was necessary, judiciously shirred the fire of the Cuban revolt. Result: war with Spain, a big standing army and powerful navy. Hawaii, on the road to the Philippines and possessing a perfect system of slave labor laws, copied by the enterprising American missionaries and colonists from the American fugitive slave law of 1792, and the Islands being in fact as well as in law governed by an oligarchy, and moreover desired for some time past as the entering wedge into the Monroe doctrine, their annexation was decided upon. A fight, therefore, right after the declaration of war, was made by the annexationists for speedy action. Certain politicians, however, some actuated by personal motives of gain, others deeming it unwise to throw off the mask so early in the game, opposing annexation strenuously in the Senate, long debates "about it and about" followed. But annexation ultimately won.

That our barons have supreme contempt for the intelligence of the people is emphasized in the defeat of the Pettigrew amendment, calling for the repeal of the Hawaiian contract labor laws, by a vote of 41 to 22.

The "stars and stripes" will now wave over a territory where men and women, once having signed contracts to labor from one to five years, will be hunted down, if they leave before the expiry of their con-

tracts, like the negro slaves before the adoption of the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution. And that slave labor laws are still legal under the stars and stripes the Supreme Court of the United States has plainly laid down as good law in a sailor decision, rendered two years ago. The democrats, jealous of the republicans who by passing this measure for plutocracy would receive substantial support in return at the next elections, fought annexation for party reasons; but mark this: Six democratic senators, all from the southern states, voted with the republicans,—the request of the ex-slaveholders, longing for slave laws, overcame party ties.

The minor fact that out of a population of 100,000 but 3,000 have the right to vote, and that the amendment to the annexation resolution, that all native born male Hawaiians over 21 years of age and all naturalized aliens shall be allowed to vote in the elections in Hawaii, was defeated by a vote of 48 to 16, is also well worth noting. Those reformers who hailed this war as one intending to advance freedom, may well ponder over its first results as shown in the passage of the annexation resolution,—for many years past plutocracy longed for Hawaii, but dared not to show its hand, war gave the much desired opportunity.

A. G.

The Letter-Box.

C. W. Ouray, Colo.—Address letters Emil F. Ruedbusch, Mayville, Wis.

L. R., Philadelphia, Pa.—Good poetry has never been rejected, but it must be poetry, and we have to read it first before promising to print it.

F. F., Buffalo, N. Y.—To refuse the paper after having been nearly for two years in arrears with your subscription is below common decency, and unworthy of a man who labels himself an Anarchist.

F. Livesey, Seykesville, Md.—Neither Emma Goldman nor any other Anarchist favors compulsory education or "force for the propaganda of Anarchy." To advocate an idea by force is simply a nonsensical proposition and no well-meaning individual should repeat such rot. But we do not believe in the non-resistance theory, for if we quietly submit to the impositions of the government, we soon would be beneath the Chinese and Hindu standard of living. Force must be resisted by force. Emma Goldman's address is 50 First St., New York.

R. C., City.—Well, we think Lincoln, whom you seem to worship, would not be as antagonistic toward our ideas as you are. He says, for instance, among other things:

"Any people, anywhere, being inclined and having the power, have the right to rise up and shake off the existing government and form a new one that suits them better. This is a most valuable and sacred right—a right which, we hope and believe, is to liberate the world."

Does this sound as though we "ought to be always satisfied with the existing American government"? Do not read or worship Mr. Lincoln if you have not brains enough to understand him. "Workingmen are as dishonest and greedy as our legislators," you say. Hear what Lincoln says:

"No men living are more worthy to be trusted than those who toil up from poverty—none less inclined to take or touch aught which they have not honestly earned."

At another time he said:

"I appeal to you again to constantly bear in mind that you (the people), and not with politicians, not with presidents, not with office-seekers, but with you is the question—Shall the union and shall the liberties of the country be preserved to the latest generation?"

You may say that Lincoln only wanted a new and better government and we repudiate all governments, but if he had lived till the present time, he probably would also have modified his views—as we did.

C. P., Chicago, Ill.—Letter and the "greenback" received. Thanks. Regarding the Speeches in Court read "Notice" on fourth page.

T. J. G., Montreal, Canada—The paper has been sent regularly to your old address and you will undoubtedly find all back numbers there. Greetings.

S. G., Bernadina, Cal.—You are right, my friend. I, too, believe that "the workingmen ought not to indulge in adulterated liquor and beer," but should drink the best that can be produced. You see that I agree with you anyway.

M. S., City—I read the news that the son of a prominent preacher of this city enlisted and did not in the least feel indignant about it. I only wish that all the preachers of the United States would also enlist and be sent to heaven where they belong. We mortals have very little use for them.

G. P., Mineral Point, Wis.—I think you are mistaken when you say that "this country is always in the lead of progress." For many years back in some European countries people had to rise and be bare-headed when the national hymn was played or sung in public places, and in this country we have only lately commenced to worship a national air, as I have witnessed last week.

ANARCHISM: ITS PHILOSOPHY AND IDEAL.

BY
PETER KROPOTKIN.

IT is not without a certain hesitation that I have decided to take the philosophy and ideal of Anarchy as the subject of this lecture.

Those who are persuaded that Anarchy is a collection of visions relating to the future, and an unconscious striving toward the destruction of all present civilization, are still very numerous; and to clear the ground of such prejudices of our education as maintain this view we should have, perhaps, to enter into many details which it would be difficult to embody in a single lecture. Did not the Parisian press, only two or three years ago, maintain that the whole philosophy of Anarchy consisted in destruction, and that its only argument was violence?

Nevertheless Anarchists have been spoken of so much lately, that part of the public has at last taken to reading and discussing our doctrines. Sometimes men have even given themselves trouble to reflect, and at the present moment we have at least gained a point: it is willingly admitted that Anarchists have an ideal. Their ideal is even found too beautiful, too lofty for a society not composed of superior beings.

But is it not pretentious on my part to speak of a philosophy, when, according to our critics, our ideas are but dim visions of a distant future? Can Anarchy pretend to possess a philosophy, when it is denied that Socialism has one?

This is what I am about to answer with all possible precision and clearness, only asking you to excuse me beforehand if I repeat an example or two which I have already given at a London lecture, and which seem to be best fitted to explain what is meant by the philosophy of Anarchism.

You will not bear me any ill-will if I begin by taking a few elementary illustrations borrowed from natural sciences. Not for the purpose of deducing our social ideas from them—far from it; but simply the better to set off certain relations, which are easier grasped in phenomena verified by the exact sciences than in examples only taken from the complex facts of human societies.

Well, then, what especially strikes us at present in exact sciences, is the profound modification which they are undergoing now, in the whole of their conceptions and interpretations of the facts of the universe.

There was a time, you know, when man imagined the earth placed in the center of the universe. Sun, moon, planets and stars seemed to roll round our globe; and this globe, inhabited by man, represented for him the center of creation. He himself—the superior being on his planet—was the elected of his Creator. The sun, the moon, the stars were but made for him; toward him was directed all the attention of a God, who watched the least of his actions, arrested the sun's course for him, wafted in the clouds, launching his showers or his thunder-bolts on fields and cities, to recompense the virtue or punish the crimes of mankind. For thousands of years man thus conceived the universe.

You know also what an immense change was produced in the sixteenth century in all conceptions of the civilized part of mankind, when it was demonstrated that, far from being the centre of the universe, the earth was only a grain of sand in the solar system—a ball, much smaller even than the other planets; that the sun itself—though immense in comparison to our little earth, was but a star among many other countless stars which we see shining in the skies and swarming in the milky-way. How small man appeared in comparison to this immensity without limits, how ridiculous his pretensions! All the philosophy of that epoch, all social and religious conceptions, felt the effects of this transformation in cosmogony. Natural science, whose present development we are so proud of, only dates from that time.

But a change, much more profound, and with far wider reaching results, is being effected at the present time in the whole of the sciences, and Anarchy, you will see, is but one of the many manifestations of this evolution.

Take any work on astronomy of the last century, or the beginning of ours. You will no longer find in it, it goes without saying, our tiny planet placed in the center of the universe. But you will meet at every step the idea of a central luminary—the sun—which by its powerful attraction governs our planetary world. From this central body radiates a force guiding the course of the planets, and maintaining the harmony of the system. Issued from a central agglomeration, planets have, so to say, budded from it; they owe their birth to this agglomeration; they owe everything to the radiant star that represents it still: the rhythm of their movements, their orbits set at wisely regulated distances, the life that animates them and adorns their surfaces. And when any perturbation disturbs their course and makes them deviate from their orbits, the central body re-establishes order in the system; it assures and perpetuates its existence.

This conception, however, is also disappearing as the other one did. After having fixed all their attention on the sun and the large planets, astronomers are beginning to study now the infinitely small ones that people the universe. And they discover that the interplanetary and interstellar spaces are peopled and crossed in all imaginable directions by little swarms of matter, invisible, infinitely small when taken separately, but all-powerful in their numbers. Among those masses, some, like the bolide that fell in Spain some time ago, are still rather big; others weigh but a few ounces or grains, while around them is wafted dust, almost microscopic, filling up the spaces.

It is to this dust, to these infinitely tiny bodies that dash through space in all directions with giddy swiftness, that clash with one another, agglomerate, disintegrate, everywhere and always, it is to them that today astronomers look for an explanation of the origin of our solar system, the movements that animate its parts, and the harmony of their whole. Yet another step, and soon universal gravitation itself will be but the result of all the disordered and incoherent movements of these infinitely small bodies—of oscillations of atoms that manifest themselves in all possible directions. Thus the center, the origin of force, formerly transferred from the earth to the sun, now turns out to be scattered and disseminated: it is everywhere and nowhere. With the astronomer, we perceive that

solar systems are the work of infinitely small bodies; that the power which was supposed to govern the system is itself but the result of the collisions among those infinitely tiny clusters of matter, that the harmony of stellar systems is harmony only because it is an adaptation, a resultant of all these numberless movements uniting, completing, equilibrating one another.

The whole aspect of the universe changes with this new conception. The idea of force governing the world, of pre-established law, preconceived harmony, disappears to make room for the harmony that Fourier had caught a glimpse of: the one which results from the disorderly and incoherent movements of numberless hosts of matter, each of which goes its own way and all of which hold each other in equilibrium.

If it were only astronomy that were undergoing this change! But no; the same modification takes place in the philosophy of all sciences without exception; those which study nature as well as those which study human relations.

In physical sciences, the entities of heat, magnetism, and electricity disappear. When a physicist speaks today of a heated or electrified body, he no longer sees an inanimate mass, to which an unknown force should be added. He strives to recognize in this body and in the surrounding space, the course, the vibrations of infinitely small atoms which dash in all directions, vibrate, move, live, and by their vibrations, their shocks, their life, produce the phenomena of heat, light, magnetism or electricity.

In sciences that treat of organic life, the notion of species and its variations is being substituted by a notion of the variations of the individual. The botanist and zoologist study the individual—his life, his adaptations to his surroundings. Changes produced in him by the action of drought or damp, heat or cold, abundance or poverty of nourishment, of his more or less sensitiveness to the action of exterior surroundings will originate species; and the variations of species are now for the biologist but results—a given sum of variations that have been produced in each individual separately. A species will be what the individuals are, each undergoing numberless influences from the surroundings in which they live, and to which they correspond each in his own way.

And when a physiologist speaks now of the life of a plant or of an animal, he sees rather an agglomeration, a colony of millions of separate individuals than a personality one and indivisible. He speaks of a federation of digestive, sensual, nervous organs, all very intimately connected with one another, each feeling the consequence of the well-being or indisposition of each, but each living its own life. Each organ, each part of an organ in its turn is composed of independent cells which associate to struggle against conditions unfavorable to their existence. The individual is quite a world of federations, a whole universe in himself.

And in this world of aggregated beings the physiologist sees the autonomous cells of blood, of the tissues, of the nerve-centers; he recognizes the millions of white corpuscles—the phagocytes—who wend their way to the parts of the body infected by microbes in order to give battle to the invaders. More than that: in each microscopic cell he discovers today a world of autonomous organisms, each of which lives its own life, looks for well-being for itself and attains it by grouping and associating itself with others. In short, each individual is a cosmos of organs, each organ is a cosmos of cells, each cell is a cosmos of infinitely small ones; and in this complex world, the well-being of the whole depends entirely on the sum of well-being enjoyed by each of the least microscopic particles of organized matter. A whole revolution is thus produced in the philosophy of life.

But it is especially in psychology that this revolution leads to consequences of great importance.

Quite recently the psychologist spoke of man as an entire being, one and indivisible. Remaining faithful to religious tradition, he used to class men as good and bad, intelligent and stupid, egotists and altruists. Even with materialists of the eighteenth century, the idea of a soul, of an indivisible entity, was still upheld.

But what would we think today of a psychologist who would still speak like this! The modern psychologist sees in man a multitude of separate faculties, autonomous tendencies, equal among themselves, performing their functions independently, balancing, opposing one another continually. Taken as a whole, man is nothing but a resultant, always changeable, of all his divers faculties, of all his autonomous tendencies, of brain cells and nerve centers. All are related so closely to one another that they each react on all the others, but they lead their own life without being subordinated to a central organ—the soul.

Without entering into further details you thus see that a profound modification is being produced at this moment in the whole of natural sciences. Not that this analysis is extended to details formerly neglected. No! the facts are not new, but the way of looking at them is in course of evolution; and if we had to characterize this tendency in a few words, we might say that if formerly science strove to study the results and the great sums (integrals, as mathematicians say), today it strives to study the infinitely small ones—the individuals of which those sums are composed and in which it now recognizes independence and individuality at the same time as this intimate aggregation.

As to the harmony that the human mind discovers in Nature, and which harmony is, on the whole, but the verification of a certain stability of phenomena, the modern man of science no doubt recognizes it more than ever. But he no longer tries to explain it by the action of laws conceived according to a certain plan preestablished by an intelligent will.

What used to be called "natural law" is nothing but a certain relation among phenomena which we dimly see, and each "law" takes a temporary character of causality; that is to say: If such a phenomenon is produced under such conditions, such another phenomenon will follow. No law placed outside the phenomena: each phenomenon governs that which follows it—not law.

Nothing preconceived in what we call harmony in Nature. The chance of collisions and encounters has sufficed to establish it. Such a phenomenon will last for centuries because the adaption, the equilibrium it represents has taken time to be established; while such another will last but an instant if that momentary equilibrium was born in an instant. If the planets of our solar

do not collide with one another and do not destroy one another every day, if they last millions of years, it is because they represent an equilibrium that has taken millions of centuries to establish as a resultant of millions of blind forces. If continents are not continually destroyed by volcanic shocks, it is because they have taken thousands and thousands of centuries to build up, molecule by molecule, and to take their present shape. But lightning will only last an instant; because it represents a momentary rupture of the equilibrium, a sudden redistribution of force.

Harmony thus appears as a temporary adjustment, established among all forces acting upon a given spot—a provisory adaptation; and that adjustment will only last under one condition: that of being continually modified; of representing every moment the resultant of all conflicting actions. Let but one of those forces be hampered in its action for some time and harmony disappears. Force will accumulate its effect; it must come to light, it must exercise its action, and if other forces hinder its manifestation it will not be annihilated by that, but will end by upsetting the present adjustment, by destroying harmony, in order to find a new form of equilibrium and to work to form a new adaptation. Such is the eruption of a volcano, whose imprisoned force ends by breaking the petrified lavas which hindered them to pour forth the gases, the molten lavas, and the incandescent ashes. Such, also, are the revolutions of mankind.

An analogous transformation is being produced at the same time in the sciences that treat of man. Thus we see that history, after having been the history of kingdoms, tends to become the history of nations and then the study of individuals. The historian wants to know how the members, of which such a nation was composed, lived at such a time, what their beliefs were, their means of existence, what ideal of society was visible to them, and what means they possessed to march toward this ideal. And by the action of all those forces, formerly neglected, he interprets the great historical phenomena.

So the man of science who studies jurisprudence is no longer content with such or such a code. Like the ethnologist he wants to know the genesis of the institution that succeeded one another; he follows their evolution through ages, and in this study he applies himself far less to written law than to local customs—to the "customary law" in which the constructive genius of the unknown masses has found expression in all times. A wholly new science is being elaborated in this direction and promises to upset established conceptions we learned at school, succeeding in interpreting history in the same manner as natural sciences interpret the phenomena of Nature.

And, finally, political economy, which was at the beginning a study of the wealth of nations, becomes today a study of the wealth of individuals. It cares less to know if such a nation has or has not a large foreign trade; it wants to be assured that bread is not wanting in the peasant's or worker's cottage. It knocks at all doors—at that of the palace as well as that of the hovel—and asks the rich as well as the poor: Up to what point are your needs satisfied both for necessities and luxuries?

And as it discovers that the most pressing needs of nine-tenths of each nation are not satisfied, it asks itself the question that a physiologist would ask himself about a plant or an animal:—"Which are the means to satisfy the needs of all with the least loss of power? How can a society guarantee to each, and consequently to all, the greatest sum of satisfaction?" It is in this direction that economic science is being transformed; and after having been so long a simple statement of phenomena interpreted in the interest of a rich minority, it tends to become (or rather it elaborates the elements to become) a science in the true sense of the word—a physiology of human societies.

While a new philosophy—a new view of knowledge taken as a whole—is thus being worked out, we may observe that a different conception of society, very different from that which now prevails, is in process of formation. Under the name of Anarchy, a new interpretation of the past and present life of society arises, giving at the same time a forecast as regards its future, both conceived in the same spirit as the above-mentioned interpretation in natural sciences. Anarchy, therefore, appears as a constituent part of the new philosophy, and that is why Anarchists come in contact, on so many points, with the greatest thinkers and poets of the present day.

In fact, it is certain that in proportion as the human mind frees itself from ideas inculcated by minorities of priests, military chiefs and judges, all striving to establish their domination, and of scientists paid to perpetuate it, a conception of society arises, in which conception there is no longer room for those dominating minorities. A society entering into possession of the social capital accumulated by the labor of preceding generations, organizing itself so as to make use of this capital in the interests of all, and constituting itself without reconstituting the power of the ruling minorities. It comprises in its midst an infinite variety of capacities, temperaments and individual energies: it excludes none. It even calls for struggles and contentions; because we know that periods of contests, so long as they were freely fought out, without the weight of constituted authority being thrown on the one side of the balance, were periods when human genius took its mightiest flight and achieved the greatest aims. Acknowledging, as a fact, the equal rights of all its members to the treasures accumulated in the past, it no longer recognizes a division between exploited and exploiters, governed and governors, dominated and dominators, and it seeks to establish a certain harmonious compatibility in its midst—not by subjecting all its members to an authority that is fictitiously supposed to represent society, not by trying to establish uniformity, but by urging all men to develop free initiative, free action, free association.

It seeks the most complete development of individuality combined with the highest development of voluntary association in all its aspects, in all possible degrees, for all imaginable aims; ever changing, ever modified associations which carry in themselves the elements of their durability and constantly assume new forms, which answer best to the multiple aspirations of all.

A society to which preestablished forms, crystallized by law, are repugnant; a society which looks for harmony in an ever-changing and fugitive equilibrium between a multitude of varied forces and influences of every kind, following their own course,

—these forces promoting themselves the energies which are favorable to their march toward progress, toward the liberty of developing in broad daylight and counter-balancing one another.

This conception and ideal of society is certainly not new. On the contrary, when we analyze the history of popular institutions—the clan, the village community, the guild and even the urban commune of the Middle Ages in their first stages,—we find the same popular tendency to constitute a society according to this idea; a tendency, however, always trammelled by dominating minorities. All popular movements bore this stamp more or less, and with the Anabaptists and their forerunners in the ninth century we already find the same ideas clearly expressed in the religious language which was in use at that time. Unfortunately, till the end of the last century, this ideal was always tainted by a theocratic spirit; and it is only nowadays that the conception of society deduced from the observation of social phenomena is rid of its swaddling-clothes.

It is only today that the ideal of a society where each governs himself according to his own will (which is evidently a result of the social influences borne by each) is affirmed in its economic, political and moral aspects at one and the same time, and that this ideal presents itself based on the necessity of Communism, imposed on our modern societies by the eminently social character of our present production.

In fact, we know full well today that it is futile to speak of liberty as long as economic slavery exists.

"Speak not of liberty—poverty is slavery!" is not a vain formula; it has penetrated into the ideas of the great working-class masses; it filters through all the present literature; it even carries those along who live on the poverty of others, and takes from them the arrogance with which they formerly asserted their rights to exploitation.

Millions of Socialists of both hemispheres already agree that the present form of capitalistic appropriation cannot last much longer. Capitalists themselves feel that it must go and dare not defend it with their former assurance. Their only argument is reduced to saying to us: "You have invented nothing better!" But as to denying the fatal consequences of the present forms of property, as to justifying their right to property, they cannot do it. They will practice this right as long as freedom of action is left to them, but without trying to base it on an idea. This is easily understood.

For instance, take the town of Paris—a creation of so many centuries, a product of the genius of a whole nation, a result of the labor of twenty or thirty generations. How could one maintain to an inhabitant of that town who works every day to embellish it, to purify it, to nourish it, to make it a centre of thought and art—how could one assert before one who produces this wealth that the palaces adorning the streets of Paris belong in all justice to those who are the legal proprietors today, when we are all creating their value, which would be nil without us?

Such a fiction can be kept up for some time by the skill of the people's educators. The great battalions of workers may not even reflect about it; but from the moment a minority of thinking men agitate the question and submit it to all, there can be no doubt of the result. Popular opinion answers: "It is by spoliation that they hold these riches!"

Likewise, how can the peasant be made to believe that the bourgeois or manorial land belongs to the proprietor who has a legal claim, when a peasant can tell us the history of each bit of land for ten leagues around? Above all, how make him believe that it is useful for the nation that Mr. So-and-So keeps a piece of land for his park when so many neighboring peasants would be only too glad to cultivate it?

And, lastly, how make the worker in a factory, or the miner in a mine, believe that factory and mine equitably belong to their present masters, when worker and even miner are beginning to see clearly through Panama scandals, bribery, French, Turkish or other railways, pillage of the State and legal theft, from which great commercial and industrial property are derived?

In fact the masses have never believed in sophisms taught by economists, uttered more to confirm exploiters in their rights than to convert exploited! Peasants and workers, crushed by misery and finding no support in the well-to-do classes, have let things go, save from time to time when they have affirmed their rights by insurrection. And if workers ever thought that the day would come when personal appropriation of capital would profit all by turning it into a stock of wealth to be shared by all, this illusion is vanishing like so many others. The worker perceives that he has been disinherited, and that disinherited he will remain, unless he has recourse to strikes or revolts to tear from his masters the smallest part of riches built up by his own efforts; that is to say, in order to get that little, he already must impose on himself the pangs of hunger and face imprisonment, if not exposure to Imperial, Royal, or Republican fusillades.

But a greater evil of the present system becomes more and more marked; namely, that in a system based on private appropriation, all that is necessary to life and to production—land, housing, food and tools—having once passed into the hands of a few, the production of necessities that would give well-being to all is continually hampered. The worker feels vaguely that our present technical power could give abundance to all, but he also perceives how the capitalistic system and the State hinder the conquest of this well-being in every way.

Far from producing more than is needed to assure material riches, we do not produce enough. When a peasant covets the parks and gardens of industrial filibusters and Panamists, round which judges and police mount guard—when he dreams of covering them with crops which, he knows, would carry abundance to the villages whose inhabitants feed on bread hardly washed down with sloe wine—he understands this.

The miner, forced to be idle three days a week, thinks of the tons of coal he might extract, and which are sorely needed in poor households.

The worker whose factory is closed, and who tramps the streets in search of work, sees bricklayers out of work like himself, while one-fifth of the population of Paris live in insanitary hovels; he hears shoe-makers complain of want of work, while so many people need shoes—and so on.

(TO BE CONTINUED NEXT WEEK.)

172

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. Rudasch, 363 Grand St.
S. Friedman, 130 Attorney St.
Brooklyn, N. Y. G. Lang, 614 Hickory St.
Philadelphia, Pa. L. Rabotnik, 626 Washington Ave.
Allentown, Pa. H. Bauer, 78 Spring Garden Ave.
Baltimore, Md. B. Morwitz, 1005 E. Baltimore.
Providence, R. I. Bookbinder, 31 Robinson St.
St. Louis, Mo. Otto Blinke, 2359 Kosciusko St.
R. H. Schneider, 324 Calif. Ave.
London, Eng. F. Goulding, 39 Meredith St.
Glasgow, Scotland. Wm. Duff, 9 Carlin St.
Gowan Hill.

PROPAGANDA FUND.

Please do not use private checks nor bank checks if you can avoid it.
The safest and most acceptable manner of remitting is by postoffice or express money order.
Week ending July 10.

Louise G., \$2.50.
P. H. Anderson, \$1.50.
Schwab, \$1.00.
Barnes, Brockman, Frenzel, Pitzner, Brust, Pfuetzner, each \$50.
Folkovich, 25c.
Cole, 12c.

Art criticism with an axe seems to be approved of in Omaha. We are informed that the Salvation Army virago who hacked to pieces several nude statues at the Exposition for giving offence to her prurient mind, is not to be prosecuted. It is all right in this "free" country to destroy valuable property in the name of Jesus, but the orthodox fetiches must not be assailed even in word.—Lucifer.

"There goes the most remarkable man in town." "What's remarkable about him?" He's the only successful merchant we have who doesn't claim to be a self-made man. He says he got rich through the faithfulness of the men that work for him.—Ex.

GREEDY.

Offic Boy—Please, sir, can't I go to dinner now? It's almost an hour past my time, and I'm awfully hungry?

Employer—Hungry? Well, I wonder if anybody ever saw such a greedy boy. Here you have been licking envelopes and postage stamps all the forenoon and yet you complain of being hungry!—Pearson's Weekly.

MARRIAGE MORALS.

SCENE:—Interval in Ball Room.

Neglected Old Lady: Ah! see that young pair in the corner; how loving and amiable they are. They are not married.

Irascible Husband: Hm, yes they are, but not to each other.

Collapse of old lady.—Ex.

PARISIAN EXPERIENCES.

A young couple appears to rent a suite. The janitor shows them the room; the visitors seem quite delighted.

Suddenly the janitor approaches them and says discreetly:

"Monsieur and Madam are not married for good?"

"Oh, yes, we are."

"Ah! then I regret to tell Monsieur that it is of no use to talk: the landlord dislikes to have scenes made in his house."—Ex.

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	

A PHYSICIAN IN THE HOUSE.

A NEW
Family Medical Work.

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

BY
DR. J. H. GREER.

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

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

It teaches how Typhoid and other fevers can both be prevented and cured. It gives the best known treatment for La Grippe, Diphtheria, Catarrh, Consumption, Appendicitis and every other disease. This book is not an advertisement and has no medicine to sell. It tells you how to live that you may prolong life. It opposes medical fads of all kinds and makes uncompromising war on vaccination and the use of anti-toxins. It has hundreds of excellent recipes for the cure of the various diseases. The chapter on Painless Midwifery is worth its weight in gold to women. It has a large number of valuable illustrations. The "Care of Children" is something every mother ought to read. It teaches the value of Air, Sunshine and Water as medicines. This book cannot fail to please you. If you are looking for health by the safest and easiest means, do not delay getting this book.

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

PRICE \$2.75.

Send Orders To FREE SOCIETY

Free Reading Room.

642 S. Ashland Ave., cor. W. 14th St.
Labor Literature of every description.
Newspapers of all countries and languages.

The Reading Room is open from 9 a. m. until 10 p. m. everyday.

Subscriptions for Free Society and all other Anarchist papers can be made by the janitor.

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. Rudasch, 363 Grand St. Radical literature of all kinds, including English periodicals, on hand.
S. Friedman, 130 Attorney St.

Radical Exchanges.

L'agitazione, an Italian Anarchist weekly. Address: Claidini 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, 35c. per year. Address: 7 Lamb 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, Argentine.

Anarkisten, (Norwegian) Semi-monthly. Address: Kristofer Hansen, Vibes gate 8, 4 etg., Kristiania, Norway.

Volme Listy, a Bohemian Anarchist monthly, published at 50 cents a year. Address: Franta Letner, 48 Johnson Ave., Brooklyn N. Y.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Germania, a Spanish Anarchist weekly. Address: B. Salbans, Casilla Correo 1634 Buenos Aires, Argentine Republic.

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

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

Belnicko 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, 1894 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, its Basis and Principles. By P. Kropotkin..... 05	
Law and Authority. By P. Kropotkin..... 05	
Expropriation. By Peter Kropotkin..... 05	
Anarchist Morality. By Peter Kropotkin..... 05	
The Commune of Paris. By P. Kropotkin, and An Anarchist on Anarchy. By E. Reclus (one volume)..... 05	
Anarchism vs. State Socialism. By G. Bernard Shaw; 3 for..... 02	
A Talk About Anarchist Communism. By Malatesta..... 05	
Let us be Just. By W. Tcherkesoff. [An open letter to Liebknecht]..... 05	
Social Democracy in Germany. By G. Landauer..... 02	
Socialism in Danger. By D. Nieuwenhuis..... 05	
Social Conditions and Character. By "Ireland"..... 03	
"God and the State. By M. Bakunin..... 03	
Anarchism and Violence. By Bevington..... 05	
Speech of August Spies in Court..... 05	
The Emancipation of Society from Government. By Dallan Doyle..... 10	
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 a *	

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 935 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.

International Workingmen's Association, meets every Wednesday evening, German, at 642 Ashland Ave., Chicago. Third Sunday of each month in English. Beginning with Oct. 2 every Sunday lectures will be made in English by eminent speakers.

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 at the remarkable low price of \$1.50

Order of Free Society.