

# 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. 42.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., SUNDAY, AUGUST 28, 1898.

WHOLE NO. 178.

## GODDESS OF LIBERTY, ANSWER!

Goddess of Liberty, listen!  
Listen, I say, and look  
To the sound and sights of sorrow  
This side of Sandy Hook!  
Your eye is searching the distance,  
You are holding your torch too high  
To see the slaves who are fettered,  
Though close at your feet they lie.  
And the cry of the suffering stranger  
Has reached your ear and your breast,  
But you do not heed the wail  
That comes from the haunts of your own oppressed.

Goddess of Liberty, follow,  
Follow me where I lead;  
Come down into the sweat-shop  
And look on the work of greed!  
Look on the faces of children,  
Old before they were born!  
Look on the haggard women,  
Of all sex-graces shorn!  
Look on the men—God help us!  
If this is what it means  
To be men in the Land of Freedom  
And live like mere machines!

Goddess of Liberty, answer!  
How can the slaves of Spain  
Find freedom under your banner,  
While your own still wear the chain?  
Loud is the screech of your eagle  
And boastful the voice of your drums,  
But they do not silence the wail of despair,  
That rises out of your slums.  
What will you do with your conquests,  
And how shall your hosts be fed,  
While your streets are filled with desperate throngs,  
Crying for work or bread?

—Ella Wheeler Wilcox.

## THE GENERAL STRIKE AND THE REVOLUTION.

The tremendous commotion which some of the strikes of the past few years have produced in the social organization proves they may be something far more important than a mere means of resisting the demands of the masters and of obtaining advantages more or less transitory and illusory. The strike can and will probably be the starting point of the Social Revolution at least in great industrial countries like England and the United States. Anyhow it would be the best of all the many possible starting points which Socialists and Anarchists could wish for the Revolution.

The question often poses itself of how the Revolution will come about. How shall we be able to destroy this powerful organization of military and police which protects the bourgeoisie. Where shall we find the strength and unity of action necessary for victory?

A great spontaneous insurrection with the avowed object of overthrowing the government and expropriating the bourgeoisie is a very difficult, perhaps an impossible event, both on account of the mental condition of the masses and the powerful means of prevention and repression at the disposal of the governing classes. Plots and conspiracies can only embrace a very limited number of individuals and are usually impotent to start a movement amongst the people of sufficient importance to give a chance of victory. Isolated movements, more or less spontaneous, are almost always stifled in blood before they have had time to acquire importance and become general.

One opportunity which might be used as a starting point for the Social Revolution would be a war, anyhow in the conquered country, or some political agitation of a section of the bourgeoisie.

But war develops patriotic hatreds and may result in the people, wounded in their national pride, irritated by the insolence of foreign soldiers, and obliged besides to resist invasion, making common cause with the Bourgeoisie and forget their own grievances. And a political agitation presents the great danger of turning aside the people from the social question and mak-

ing it fraternize with the Revolutionary section of the bourgeoisie which will not fail to make show of the best intentions toward the proletariat.

Besides, wars and political agitations become daily more improbable, for the bourgeoisie would derive no great advantage from them \* and has a growing fear of the Social Revolution and also because our propaganda and that of Socialists in general helps to make them impossible.

Thus, while ready to avail ourselves of any opportunity which may offer, and to use all means compatible with our principle and our object, we must seek elsewhere the means of starting amongst the masses the great movement which will sweep away the bourgeois world, and the means which the events of the day point to is—the general strike.

A strike more or less general throughout one of the great industries such as the mining or railway, with the stoppage it would cause in independent industries, would draw into the struggle enormous masses of people and could with comparative ease be converted into a Revolution.

The government would not be able, short of setting public opinion against it, to resort at once to an energetic military repression; the people would have time to get gradually drawn into the movement and understand the necessity for radical changes, and besides one of the chief advantages would be that the question would necessarily be in the realm of economics and its solution would effect the very basis of social organization.

But for a strike to have such results, the strikers must, as the result of previous propaganda and through the influence of a certain number of men amongst them, be conscious of the goal to be obtained, understand the full import of the movement and consider themselves as men struggling not for a small private interest but in the interest of the whole proletariat.

A great strike before it can be converted into a Revolution causes real suffering to the mass of the people who are unwilling to undergo it in the interests of the strikers unless it sees at the end of the struggle some advantage for all. Besides there are always so many men whom hunger drives to replace the strikers that this tends to create antagonism between the militant section of the proletariat and those who would be most immediately benefited by the Revolution, such as the unemployed. The strikers must understand this and conduct themselves so as to draw along with them the whole population, including the scabs.

A few facts selected from those which characterize recent strikes in the United States and which we extract from Stead's book "Chicago Today" will throw light on the situation.

In April 1894 a strike broke out in the bituminous coal trade which spread to sixteen states. The strikers blocked the rail lines and were so energetic that for some time they controlled the whole coal trade. The sympathy or hostility of the public depended on the use they made of this power: they only took into account the special interests of their trade.

"Permission was refused to the town of Demolines to obtain the coal necessary to keep the city waterworks going.

"The Illinois Lunatic Asylum at Kantakee in which were 1100 inmates ran short of coal. To save the miserable lunatics from perishing of cold the strikers at first permitted them to have some coal, but on second thought, strike policy triumphed over humane considerations and the permission given on the 21st was rescinded on the 29th. Per contra permission was given to McBride, the president of the strikers, and also a brewer, to obtain coal for his breweries where he had \$5000 worth of beer which would have spoiled if coal could have been procured."

In the recent strike and boycott of the Pullman cars the strikers helped by many sympathizers, had quite paralyzed the railway traffic, and had at their mercy

\* While a war in Europe would give the bourgeoisie none or very little advantage, the war with Spain has given the American monopolists such advantages that they are turning somersaults for joy.

for a whole week the provisioning of Chicago.

In consequence the fruits and vegetables were rotting in the cars, and it has been calculated that the farmers lost \$30,000 per day as long as the strike lasted. Meat and fish rotted and the loads of ice melted away.

And in Chicago they were short of meat, vegetables and coal; ice rose from \$3.00 a ton to \$10.00; beer ran short; except for corn, of which, fortunately there was a large reserve. Chicago passed through days of want as painful as those Paris suffered during the siege. They began to fear that they would run short of water for Chicago pumps up all its water and the fuel for working the pumps had run low.

Trains full of women and children were sometimes blocked for days and in one case at least a whole hundred of suffering passengers were compelled to lie blistering in the midsummer sun with scanty food and no water. The strikers refused to allow their miserable hostages this necessary of life for thirty hours at a stretch.

Again the strikers used the worst violence against the scabs, who, after all, are but the leaves of misery. Here, for instance, is what a scab told a journalist:

"I have been a railroader eight years. When business got slack last winter I was knocked off, and I have not worked five weeks altogether since the first of the year. I have a wife and three children depending on me and for six months we have been living from hand to mouth. When the agent who hired me to come to Chicago asked me if I would go, I told him I would see my wife first. I went home and found her in tears at the dreary outlook. My children were actually in want of bread and it didn't take me long to make up my mind to come to Chicago. I am a Union man at heart, but when wife and children are in danger of starving I feel it my duty to work for them, even should I be killed in the endeavor. There are lots of men here who feel the same way."

Why are the strikers so pitiless towards their brothers in misfortune whom they might have converted into brothers in arms, when we hear of no acts of personal violence against the big pots of the Railway and of Pullman City?

Clearly it was impossible for the strike to succeed, much less to turn into a Revolution when conducted on such lines. Indeed the reaction started in Chicago and if the troops had been powerless to destroy the strikers they would have been crushed by the populace.

When one is master of a situation one must take on oneself the responsibilities of that situation, otherwise one cannot hope to succeed.

Since the provisioning of Chicago depended on the strikers they should have undertaken it. And the mere attempt to provision a town in the interests of the population instead of in that of the capitalists and tradesmen, even if unsuccessful would have been the greatest stride forward in the right direction yet made by the Social Revolution.

At the time of the London Dock Strike in '89 when all work was suspended a ship loaded with ice arrived. The rumor spread that this ice was for the hospitals and immediately a large number of strikers turned up to unload the ship without raising the question of wages. They said that the sick, especially the sick in the hospitals, ought not to suffer through the strike.

This is a small fact but it proves the existence of human solidarity which if developed would give the labor movement a truly socialistic and Revolutionary aspect.

The grandest role the Anarchist could have in the worker's unions and in strikes would be to direct them in these lines.—E. Malatesta.

Every man who builds a house, or plants an orchard, or invents a machine, or discovers a law of nature, or does anything which tends to promote human comfort or happiness, is a public benefactor; but any man who stands between industry and the natural elements, to levy a tribute upon Labor or to keep a foot of land out of use, is a curse to his country and a despoiler to his fellowmen.—Francis Volney.

As some of the reform papers at present are discussing the merits and demerits of strikes, we deemed it appropriate to reprint the above article, written for the London Torch over three years ago. The arguments made therein are as applicable today as they were then.

A. I.

A. I.

**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**, 43 Sheridan St., San Francisco, California.**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.**Exchanges and correspondents will please note our new address, which is **43 Sheridan St.****NOTE AND COMMENT.**

Mrs. Hattie Lang, 205 Monroe st., Buffalo, N. Y., has volunteered to collect subscriptions and solicit new subscribers for Free Society, and we hope the comrades there will make her task as pleasant as possible.

The Buffalo comrades have donated six imported canary birds to Free Society. Send 10 cents to Mrs. Hattie Lang, 205 Monroe st., Buffalo, N. Y. and it may chance that you will receive a bird in return.

Of nine officers elected recently in the Chicago Federation of Labor, eight hold political jobs under the democratic administration. Some labor unions seem to be hundred years behind the times.

Last week I called attention to the Freeman's Labor Journal, Spokane, Wash., which is willing to discuss in its column the merits of Anarchism, and now I can point out another weekly, The Independent, Birmingham, N. Y. The editor says: "The columns of this paper are open to all for the fair discussion of any and all questions pertaining to the welfare of those who work. The truth is what we are after, and if any one will show wherein anything that appears in this paper is false it will be considered as a favor." I hope that those of our comrades who have the time and ability will not fail to take the opportunity to spread the ideas of freedom.

The politicians and other parasites of this country have discovered that public opinion in Spain is molded by bribing the leaders of the cigarette factory girls and the song and dance women, and this method is much cheaper than to bribe senators, congressmen, and to hire pinkertons or sheriffs, they are now praising the healthfulness of cigarette smoking and the moral influence of the song and dancing women.

Some of our readers have asked why we have not made an obituary notice on Bismarck. Why should we notice the death of a rascal in a high position any more than that of such a creature among the lower classes? His fame, which has been heralded all over the world by the servile press and populace is due to the ignorance and servitude. His deeds are of such criminal character that, had they been committed by a common mortal, would have brought him to the gallows. I need only remind the readers of the famous falsification of the king's dispatch from Ems which caused the war with France in which hundreds of thousands of innocent men were slaughtered, when there was no other exigency for that war but personal ambition. Of course he is an "historical man," but so is Jack the Ripper. The fact that such a man as Bismarck can make history is lamentable, but "it's the fault of the people if they let men like me go on robbing them," said Mr. Johnson, the American millionaire, and it's the ignorance of the people if they let men like Bismarck make history.

The following is Bismarck's own opinion of himself:

Nobody loves me for what I have done. I have never made anybody happy, not myself, nor my family, nor anybody else. But how many have I made unhappy! But for me three great wars would not have been fought; eighty thousand men would not have perished. Parents, brothers, sisters, and widows would not be bereaved and plunged into mourning. That matter, however, I have settled with God. But I have had little or no joy from all my achievements; nothing but vexation, care and trouble.

There is a tender vein in every rascal and murderer.

only the common mortal is not permitted in a moment of tenderness to "settle that matter with God" and then be glorified like the legalized one, but has to settle that matter on the gallows.

"History will be made here to-morrow," begins a communication from the Hawaiian Islands to the Examiner of this city. History made in Cuba, Manila and Hawaii by the perambulatory and devouring highway men of this country by the cannon, bible and whisky. Here is what a native of the Hawaiian Island writes to the same paper:

"At one time we had the fight for our birthright partly won; annexation was a dead letter and our next move would have been to demand of the American people what they took away from us in 1893—our national existence. But in the trouble with Spain the paid friends of annexation saw their chance to force the islands upon the United States as a 'war measure,' and Congress was harranged into perpetrating one of the greatest crimes of modern times. We realize that all is lost. The boundless hospitality of the Hawaiian people has been the sin for which they now must give up name, race, tradition, everything. No one but a Hawaiian can ever know the grief, the anguish that today fills the Hawaiian heart to overflowing. We have loved and trusted the stranger who came to our shores not at all wisely, but too well.

"In one way, however, annexation comes to us as a relief. It means the ultimate ousting from office the men who, like Judas, betrayed the trusting Hawaiian. It means that the natives can invoke the power of the ballot-box and have a chance to direct the government of a country which was once their own."

Thus perpetrates American greed its infernal robbing schemes in the name of civilization with impunity. Whole islands are annexed without the consent of their inhabitants, but when the poor man steals a loaf of bread to appease his hunger he is sent to the penitentiary, and if a man should try to "annex" one acre of unused land to provide for his family, he would be prosecuted as a criminal, as an Anarchist who has no respect for the law.

According to all travellers the natives of Hawaii are "as gentle and as kind as any race of the earth, and who, though sorely tried, have not lost entire faith in the white men," but soon will they realize that the little freedom they enjoyed is vanishing and that they are doomed to perish under a civilized government; soon will they realize that the ballot-box is simply a toy to quiet the discontented slaves of the money power, and that Judas was a gentleman in comparison with our politicians and other adventurers called the governors and administrators.

Even the citizens of Pullman, Wash., are trying to make history by solving the problem of the unemployed in the fashion of "law abiding citizens." Says an exchange: "A gang of these vermin were taken to the creek and thoroughly ducked and then confined to jail, where many willing hands manned two lines of fire hose which were turned in the door and window on the helpless victims until they were thoroughly soaked. The hoboes screamed, shouted and begged for mercy, but they were compelled to undergo the wetting for half an hour when they were left to dry." A reader from the vicinity of Pullman relates to this outrage in a private letter and adds: "We the property owners of Pullman, we are the people; everything we do is 'law and order.' We could burn niggers, if we had any here; we can hang white men, duck and torture tramps, but everything we do is 'law and order'. Mind you, we are not Anarchists." A chain gang is now proposed as a retribution for the torture.

The following appeared in the St. Louis Globe and gives us a foresight of the coming events of this country:

Kewanee, Ill., August 11.—A. H. Mertz, editor of the People's Union Mission, a radical paper circulating in Henry County, has been released from jail, where he has been for the past nine months. He was convicted of slandering the Mount Carroll County officers and courts. Mertz has frequently been threatened that if he did not cease his wholesale condemnation of the institutions of the county he would be mobbed. He has been in jail nine times within the past two years, and has had his printing office raided several times. He again issued his paper today, resuming his same tactics. He upbraids churches and claims corruption among public officials.

To the much vexed question, How to govern the Philippines? A German exchange gives the following answer:

"At the start we sell to the Filipinos all the whiskey we can and that of the worst quality. Under the torrid tropical sun it will work like a charm. Not to forget our other government at arms, we make with the happy inhabitants of those isles treaties of one kind, and another of the purport of which they are ignorant. When the Filipinos then find out that they are being cheated most unmercifully by the Americans and kick over it, then they are simply rioters and treated as such, i. e. we simply shoot them. If these methods, although not provided for in our constitution, worked so well with the Indians that from the many millions of redekens in this country a hundred years ago, now remain but a few thousand, why not apply them to the yellow-skinned Malays." A. I.

**CONTRASTS OF HISTORY.**

History presents some strange contrasts. Take, for example, the treatment accorded prisoners of war on two different occasions by two of the most enlightened of the world's nations. Cervera, a commanding naval officer representing a nation whose cruel exploits fairly haunt history's pages, is captured while attempting to escape from the harbor of Santiago. He is received, a prisoner of war, on board of an American war ship with great civility and distinguished honor. He is conveyed in state into the heart of the country which he has fondly hoped to conquer and devastate and done his best to destroy. He is wine and dined by his enemies and by the enemies of his nation. He is invited to visit distinguished Americans as an honored guest. Nothing seems too good for this man of a cruel and barbarous race, which has done its best to strike a telling blow at the hated Yankee "pigs."

By the side of this pleasing picture of modern gentility let us place another. Again it is a picture of war, and in an enlightened and progressive nation; but with this difference: all combatants are of the same country and language. It is one section of a nation seeking to emancipate itself from the thralldom imposed by another section. It is France in 1871! In this instance the common people are rebels—insurrectionists—and in all ages of the world rebels and insurrectionists have been suppressed by an iron hand. Prisoners are taken by the conquering power, which proclaims itself the party of order, the party of civilization, the party of religion, as the conquering power has done today. How are these prisoners treated? Are they paroled, feted, admired, invited to the homes of the rich and great? No; they are dragged at the tails of horses over cobble-stone pavements. They are shot down while being taken to prison. They are hacked to pieces by their captors. Thousands of them are condemned to a living death in New Caladonia. What matters it that among them are some of the noblest and purest spirits of Europe? Who cares that, instead of engaging in a struggle for conquest, for power, for plunder, as was our dark foe of yesterday, they were seeking for themselves and for all the disinherited peoples of the earth liberty, peace and solidarity? They were branded not merely enemies of France, but ENEMIES OF SOCIETY, and cruelly did "society" avenge itself upon its rebels.

When we applaud these modern sentiments of humanity toward a fallen foe, let us not fall into the error of supposing that "society" has advanced so far in loveliness of spirit as freely to forgive its enemies. Neither should we permit ourselves to be deceived on the question of nationality. Americans are not more lenient or more humane than Frenchmen. Remember, it is only a very few years since loyal and patriotic Americans coolly advocated, with the indorsement of the American press, the slicing and salting of other rebels, whose only crime was their hatred of oppression and sham. Modern war prisoners from the bloodiest nation of the earth may be treated with all the honors, but for active rebels against plutocracy, whatever their nationality may be, there remains only execration, imprisonment, mutilation and death.

W. H.

**THE PARSON AND DISCONTENT.**

When one goes amongst the people and sees the destitution and poverty of those that are honest and worthy, one gets to doubt the justice of God and the humanity of man; and yet the parsons tell destitution, poverty, wretchedness, misery, vice and crime are necessary evils and preordained by God.

These well fed, easy-going, handsomely housed parsons tell us much more; but did it ever occur to any-



one that for gain, i. e., dollars and cents.

The capitalist and monopolist finds it pays well to keep the discontented in control, and the parson is the agent he selects for the wretched business.

Laying up treasures in heaven, the parson says is excellent investment, yet we notice that nearly all of the breed love wine, women and song.

Without discontent none of our evils would be righted. Discontent prompted our fathers to rebel. Discontent prompts us all to elevate and improve ourselves; it is the energy that pushes all enterprises and prompts all reforms.

Are we to lapse into a semi-moribund condition and make no effort to better our condition? Are we to permit robbery of a legal nature and not make a protest? NO! Rather perish like the oyster and be done with it.

Poverty, desitution, vice and crime are not necessary evils; they are not the purpose of God; they are the result of social conditions which are wrong; the result of artificial conditions due to grasping, niggardly men; the result of a false social system. Discontent will do away with them. Discontent will prompt and produce a change for the better, even though the parson says it is not "His" will for us to try and improve ourselves and better our condition. The paid hireling of the capitalist, the monopolist, the slave driver, the landlord, is the parson; 'tis he that keeps the people from thinking, from realizing, from acting, and so long as he holds a place in the social fabric, so long will evils, vices and crimes be. When he is abolished the people will investigate, denounce, become discontented and progress.

LUIGI GALVANI DOANE, M. D.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

#### SHAKESPEAR TEACHING UP TO DATE.

"The child was prisoner to the womb, and is,  
By law a process of great nature, thence  
Freed and enfranchised: not a party to  
The anger of the king, nor guilty of,  
If any be, the trespass of the queen."

We have all been brought into existence for the pleasure of others, and not being consulted in the matter, how can we be under any obligation to our progenitors? It is our natural right to seek happiness in our own way; we cannot attain it by any other method. Under present conditions of society the vast majority could not be thankful to those who have brought them into misery. Instinctively we seek happiness by the road which offers least resistance, and this in itself is a natural safeguard for the happiness and comfort of all, for if the rights of others are invaded, objections and difficulties arise in various forms, and thus mar the happiness of all the parties concerned.

Under the present unnatural conditions of land and money monopoly, which allows the possibility of trade monopolies, the universal incentive is, not to do good, the only sure way to secure happiness, but to get dollars, because, absurd as it is, this is a necessity of life.

The improvements in all departments of production, transportation of sound and matter, in the arts and sciences are marvelous; Labor has accomplished all this, and should enjoy it. Moreover, if the producers and inventors had benefited by their Labors, the advance would have been still more wonderful: but her government steps in and shows its unutterable wickedness by denying free land, and free exchange to the "sovereign people," so that the class who produce all the wealth, and are consequently the only people worthy a moments consideration, instead of enjoying happiness, have sufficient cause to curse the day of their birth.

Even in so-called religion considerable advance has been forced by empty pews, and a falling off of the "collections," the latter being the prime feature in all church matters; the advance is, that we do not now hear of parsons terrifying children by the infernal effrontery with which they preached hell fire and brimstone, and the wailing and gnashing of teeth accompaniment, which only a few years back they hurled in their most vehement manner at the dupes who attended their explanations of the gospel—God is Love.

Parents who bring up their children in superstition, compelling them to attend churches and Sunday schools which nineteen centuries have proved to be the chief factor that has brought the millions of workers into the lowest depths of wage slavery the world

has even... visiting the iniquity unto the third and fourth generation."

Free men and women will certainly not permit any parson to have any voice, act, or influence in connection with their desires for companionship.

Fathers and mothers should bring up their children with the greatest possible amount of liberty of thought and action, compatible with the comfort of the whole family, teaching them "how spite breeds hate, and kindness friends, and patience peace: even while we live, and when 'tis willed we die, shall there not be as good a 'there' as 'now!'" (Edwin Arnold)

Parents have no right to domineer over their children, nothing can produce harmony but freedom and love; no law can force children to support their parents, or parents to support their children, but that of natural love; all civil and clerical laws are diametrically opposed to this natural law—all man-made-law is for the benefit of private property, not for humanity.

Nothing brings into such sharp relief, the absurdity of parts of the bible, as to its applicability, in the "year dot," of its supposed partial inspiration, to this "year of grace" 1898, as the passage, "so are children of the youth, happy is the man that hath his quiver full of them"; after 1898 years of false teaching and living, the Priesthood have only accentuated the great distinction between society, and Society, thus making the quotation a lie if applied to the men of society, and very doubtful as to its truth with the Society man, this the Priests have accomplished to perfection, by living on the sweat of others, and preaching the gospel of damnation and love.

Half the parents who are now bringing up their children "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord," which, interpreted by the sky-pilots, means churchism, are doing so because they lack the moral courage to cut themselves adrift from the church, in which they themselves have lost all faith, no surer course could be adopted to train up a generation of young hypocrites.

If we were enfranchised and free according to the law of "great nature," the bringing up of children in liberty would be easy, but pinched Labor has no alternative but to pinch the children. From birth they are deprived of food, land, happiness, and in many instances of fresh air and water, how can they be images of God—good?

KINGHORN JONES.

#### SEX RELATIONSHIP.

It is some times highly amusing to see some of the writers of Lucifer, Chicago, and the Adult of London, England, flounder about in the dark regarding the fate of the offspring resulting from free sexual relationships. Both journals mostly devote their space to the advocacy of sexual freedom and are doing excellent work in removing the prejudices and ignorance dominant in our present stage of so-called civilization. But both journals are at sea when the question of economical independence confronts them, and it is for this reason that so many of their readers find no other solution than to cultivate the sense of "duty" or "responsibility." Others again having also perceived the ills that follow in the trail of modern marriage life, stand by monogamy and insist with admirable perseverance that it is "more love," or "true love," we need.

All of these men and women are sincere, no doubt; all of them crave for freedom and love, happiness and contentment, of which they have been deprived of in consequence of the infernal teachings of church and state. But they are in the same illusionary position as the believer in "true and honest legislation." It does not occur to them that the institutions of marriage and governments are in themselves corrupting and contaminating, and that they are not founded on nature, but simply the result of perverted morality, and private property in the means to sustain life with. The one clamors for an "honest legislator," and the other for a "true lover" with "a high sense of duty and responsibility"—both lavish their energy in vain.

In speaking of marriage and its solution in the Adult, Mary Reed says among other things:

"In any case, after the conviction of incompatibility was a certain one, and not merely a frivolous pretext, legal divorce should be possible. Thus might marital hypocrisies and secret amours be abolished, and men and women become honest, because the temptation to be dishonest would cease to exist."

and in some states easily obtained, and... tive to be dishonest and the temptation to be dishonest have not ceased to exist; and these contemptible qualities of men and women will exist—exceptions conceded—so long as the cause, the incentive is not removed, to wit: ignorance, economic dependence and servility. There are relatively very few people, even among the radicals, who possess the courage to defy laws, customs and public opinion, and still fewer women who have the daring spirit to take up the struggle for existence, which is—I know only too well—for many absolutely impossible, especially when little children cling to their skirts.

What, then, is the solution? The immediate solution is the eradication of the monogamic folly and the recognition of non-interference even though we happen to be "legally married," and in this respect Lucifer and the Adult are doing grand work. Mutual understanding, between man and woman to be free to act as they please in their sex relations will not only increase their happiness and scope of freedom—irrespective of their economic condition—but it will also work wonder in wedlock to live more harmoniously together. Notwithstanding, sad as it may be, there are even among the Anarchists very few who have rid themselves of the folly of monogamic relationship and who manifest a desire to live up to our teachings, i. e. to cease to dominate over "their wives," and vice versa. For such weaklings a condition must be prepared in which the fear of want for the women and children is non-existent; a condition in which each may select his or her line of activity in the pursuit of happiness; in short, a condition in which each individual can consume the necessities of life without let or hindrance. I can conceive no other condition in which the threatenings of a man—to leave "his wife" and children in case she demands her sexual freedom—can have no effect, and the cause for hypocrisy is eradicated.

We may prate about freedom, of non-interference, etc., but all these terms will remain empty phrases for the great mass till mankind recognizes the fact that freedom requires an adequate condition. So long as our commercial system of exploitation lasts, men and women will continue to marry for convenience, for support, etc.; "all things are subject to its greed, even that which is counted the most sacred thing in human society—the love of man and woman."

Is it not evident, then, that it is only the Anarchist-Communist who advocates the ideal society in which the question of the offspring is solved and a perfect sex association may be realized? There is no doubt that a condition in which the necessities of life, and all other social comforts, are free for all ensures the greatest scope of freedom conceivable today.

But as we are not in a free condition yet, I join hands with Moses Harman, editor of Lucifer, Emil F. Ruedebusch, author of "The Old and the New Ideal," now prohibited from the U. S. mail, and others in their efforts to free men and women from sexual superstitions and prejudices. The intelligent will even today enjoy freedom in their love relations to the extent possible and live a happier life.

A. I.

#### THE BUILDERS OF CITIES.

At the recent Berlin exposition of arts, a work of the Belgian sculptor, Stappen, caused a tremendous agitation. Well, it was something different from the eternal busts of prima donnas, of retired and active statesmen, of Moltke, of court poets and court priests. It was a creation at whose sight one was compelled to think; a gigantic symbol of labor, of the present serf labor which carries on its shoulders the welfare of society and nevertheless is always the oppressed, driven from hearth and pleasure.

The production of this Belgian master is called "The Builders of Cities."

The Future, reviewing it, speaks in the following terms: "Two laborers, bull-necked, robust figures, exhausted from their day's labor, have broken down, their limbs having given away. The one sits on a hillcock, his hands hang down, his head bends forward. The other lies his whole length on the ground, face downwards, his head supported by his naked, muscular arms. A deep, an animal sleep, this is a sleep which only complete physical exhaustion gives and demands. And one can see the life of these two: working up to physical collapse, then sleep, then awakening to like labor. They are the builders of cities and palaces—their dwellers they are not."

...there were not lacking critics and good governmentals who declared this was not a work of art, but the production of a revolutionist, of an incendiary. The artist naturally stands a poor show to be called to Berlin to fill the position of court sculptor, for such a one would have to degrade his art to make the likenesses of generals, of court dogs and horses, of mistresses, of ministers and above all of the emperor in every conceivable position.—Chicagoer Arbeiter Zeitung.

## QUESTIONS.

- (1) Where is the line to be drawn between defense and offense?
- (2) Does conscience play an important part in evolution?
- (3) Is not revolution the very reverse of evolution? I regard evolution an imaginary disease and revolution its remedy.

T. W.

Haledon, N. J.

## ANSWER:

1.—The line must be drawn between invasion and non-invasion. To illustrate: I have an "inalienable right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness," in short, the same right to the enjoyments of life as any other human being on the globe, and must be at liberty to do anything conducive to my happiness, provided I do not infringe upon the liberty of others. If an individual, or set of individuals, invade my rights by appropriating the fruits of my labor or by restrictions curtail my enjoyments, they are the offenders. To ward off or resist such invasion is a matter of self-defense and always justifiable.

2.—When understood as a faculty to form a thought or to conceive a thing, there could be no social evolution without conscience. But when taken as a faculty which decides between "right and wrong," independent of our brain faculties, it is on par with the ghost and soul stories.

3.—In the development of society evolution and revolution are identical—one cannot exist without the other. A revolution—whether violent or otherwise—is the climax and natural outcome of evolution. I cannot conceive of a revolution in our social relations without the preceding evolution of thought and action.

A. I.

## THE SINGLE TAX AGAIN.

Among the "very few Anarchists who have not read or studied Henry George's works" must be included A. I., or else he is one whose reading and study are to no purpose. "Before the Single Tax," he says, "can have the remarkable effect its advocates attribute to it (I suppose he means predict for it), it would be necessary to abolish property in land, and considering the time and energy such a step would require we might as well struggle for free land."

Suppose a piece of land rents for \$800 per annum, and that the taxes upon it amount to \$200 per annum. Leaving out of consideration the effect of anticipation of increase, we might put capitalized value at \$10,000. If the taxes were increased from \$200 to \$400, the next income would decline from \$600 to \$400 (if the increase were made general the decline would be still greater, but to go into that would be a digression). The owner could not put the increase upon his tenants nor upon the price of the goods he was producing, supposing him to be using the land himself. Why? Because the rent of that or any particular piece of land is determined by comparing it with the least desirable land in use for the same purpose, and it is no better in comparison with such land after the increase of taxation than it was before. Consequently the capitalized value would fall from \$10,000 to at most \$6,666 $\frac{2}{3}$ . If you make the taxes equal to the rent the capitalized value falls to zero. The property in the land has been destroyed simply by increasing the taxes until they equal the gross increase. If there are no public expenses to be met, such as maintaining existing highways, laying out and constructing new ones, etc., the taxes can be divided per capita. This disposal of rent is the only way under heaven to make land equally free. As a consequence of such disposal property in land disappears as naturally and completely as the oil in the lamps that you forgot to extinguish. A. I.'s talk about expenditure of time and energy is simply bosh! He is wrestling with the offspring of his own ignorance. To use rent for common purposes or else divide it per capita is land com-

munist pure and simple. The only possible way that such communism ever be brought about. Any tax is an imposition and arbitrary, just as A. I. affirms, but appropriating ground rent for the community is levying a tax in form only, not in essence. Under that plan each member of the community pays the rest whatever the privilege of excluding them from a particular location (to which each and every one of them has as good a right as he) is worth. To call that a tax upon labor is ridiculous.

"The land in Chicago produces much less than the land outside the city." Is A. I. so densely stupid as to suppose that the only productive land is that upon which something grows or out of which something can be dug? If he has yet to learn that production is a process that is not finished till the goods are in the hands of the consumer, what business has he to be discussing economic subjects? All the labor of production consists in moving materials or directing the movements. Is the man who performs the last movements—the salesman for example who moves a pair of shoes from a shelf and fits them upon a customer's feet any less a producer of those shoes than the thousand and one persons who handled them and their various constituents before the salesman got hold of them? Did any of them do anything more than to move the shoes or the part of them?

But it is no use commenting further upon the utterances of a man who doesn't know what he is talking about. It is generally recognized that we must study such subjects as mathematics, chemistry, comparative philology, etc., before he is qualified to discuss them, but any ignoramus can expatiate upon political economy. The real significance of its most ordinary terms may be all Greek to him, but a little thing like that should not deter him from affirming or denying without the slightest hesitation any economic proposition to which his attention may be called. In this field of human knowledge he may disport himself with all the independence of a hog on ice and with the supreme confidence of a ram which is about to try conclusions with the approaching locomotive.

H. J. CHASE.

Cambridge, Mass.

## COMMENT.

The contumelious style of this gentleman's argument is worthy his dullness of perception. Does H. J. Chase imagine that the owners of land will allow its value to be taxed out of existence without resisting to the extent of their power? If not, what more could they do to prevent land from being simply declared free? What A. I. says about expenditure of time and energy is obviously true; and Mr. Chase's argument to show that the value of land can be taxed to death is irrelevant. The single land tax is a tax in substance, not merely in form, notwithstanding his assertion. Like all taxes it falls on labor. But it falls on that identical kind of labor which the world can least spare—on the brain—labor which results in perceiving that land contains resources which, if developed, will make it valuable. The real evil of landlordism does not consist in this, that the discoverer of a diamond mine gains by his discovery. It lies in this, that the legal owner of land can exact a tribute from anyone who proposes to improve it by discovery or in any other way. And that evil cannot be met by the single tax, but only by the anarchistic method of abolishing legal titles to land.

It is probable A. I. does not make the mistake of thinking production ceases until goods are in the hands of the consumer, as H. J. Chase thinks he does. But it is quite certain that the Ricardian dogma that rent is measured by the productiveness of land over the poorest in use does involve a mistake of another kind. It involves, e. g. the mistake of not remembering that land devoted to wholly unproductive purposes, such as racing, bathing, theatrical exhibitions, etc., purposes which, by any economic classification, must come under the head of consumption, or that of non-productive labor, by virtue of its fitness for these purposes, yields rent. In short the Ricardian economy, the common basis of whatever is fallacious in both George and Marx, is altogether behind the age. If Mr. Chase will read the criticisms on Ricardo's law of rent which were written originally by Richard Jones, and adopted, without credit, by J. S. Mill in his Political Economy, he may know better "what he is talking about."

C. L. JAMES.

"Hampsey worked hard for three years trying to get a public office." "Indeed? What's he doing now?" "Not a thing." "Why, how can he afford that?" "He got the office."—Chicago News.

Week ending Saturday, August 20  
Lesser Kreis, Tarentum, Pa., \$5.00. Pfoetzner, \$3. Ross, \$2.50.  
Italian Group, Spring Valley, Ill., \$1.50.  
Morris, Minnie, Bondietto, Doyer, Banker, Frensel, Unthank, Niedermeier, Corra, Cairns, Ruge, Holt, Silsbury, Price, Leue, Podewick, Kuhbeck, Frazer, Struck, Borst, Frank, each 50c.  
Aumer, Wohlleben, Hecht, Siskens, Lieske, Young, 25c.  
Zieger, Gill, each 15c.

## Various Voices.

J. C., Spring Valley, Ill. Comrades,—We are sorry to hear that Free Society is in straitened circumstances and enclosed you will find as much as we can spare at present. We have two lively groups here, but as we only get about 75 cents a day of what we earn—in this great mining camp, we have to make great sacrifices to pay the expenses of French and Italian speakers and support our papers.

The majority of the miners are English speaking people and full of prejudices, and the American speakers that come here are mostly Social Democrats. American Anarchist speakers would have a great field here, but where are they?

Kate Unthank, Desoto, Kans. Friends,—You have almost persuaded (convinced) me to be an Anarchist. I have long been a rebel, and Anarchy appeared to me only a continuation of competition in supplying our wants, but I gratefully confess that I am now more interested in your little paper and its teachings than in any other publication I take, and as soon as I return to my home I intend to put a "take one" box at the gate in which to place much of my spare literature. (This is another good scheme to distribute our literature. A. I.) I have never destroyed a single copy of Free Society, but send them to friends and governmentals.

I am sorry you have such a hard struggle and that I am unable to help you; the best I can do at present is to send you \$1. to extend my subscription. I should be much pleased to see the "speeches" of the murdered comrades printed and to read them. I enclose 30c. in advance for them.

[So far the prospects are such that we cannot say whether we will be able to print the "Speeches" or not. A. I.]

M. F., Enfield, Ill.—I have been anxiously waiting for the development of the discussion in regard to "consistency" or "ideas and men," for I cannot see how our conditions and surroundings can be changed without we begin to defy laws, customs and public opinion. I can understand the indulgence of a State Socialist who expects his representative to change the condition for him (what an illusion), but who is going to change the environment for the Anarchists? The revolution? Well and good, but is revolution or evolution possible unless actions are in accord with ideas? Since I have tried to be an Anarchist in my home I have not only won the love of my life-partner and children, but also the respect of my neighbors.

## The Letter-Box.

F. M., Edison, Wash.—By comparing the number on the wrapper by the "whole No." of the current issue you can always see when your subscription expires. The current number is 178 and on your wrapper you will find the figure 185, consequently your subscription expires after seven weeks.

M. C., Longcreek, Ore.—If we should attempt to refute every lie said by jingoists or ignoramuses in the press, it would be a rather hard task. The statement of the editor of the Torch of Reason, that the projected school in Silverton, Ore., will be "the only Free-thought University in the world" should not excite your indignation as he don't know any better, and probably has never been in a university. The "professor" of the "university" is an ex-minister and a carpenter by trade; very narrow-minded and bigotted; so you may imagine how science, art and freethought will be cultivated there. The book has been sent.

M. F., Enfield, Ill.—Under the heading "Propaganda Fund" the amounts for subscriptions are also acknowledged.

A. Groes, New York.—The 50 cents for Hampe were received, but it was due to a mistake that only 25c. were acknowledged.

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.