

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. 43.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 4, 1898.

WHOLE NO. 179.

UNTIL IT IS SETTLED RIGHT.

However the battle is ended,
Though proudly the victor comes
With fluttering flags and prancing nags
And echoing roll of drums,
Still truth proclaims this motto
In letters of living light—
No question is ever settled
Until it is settled right.

Though the heel of the strong oppressor
May grind the weak in the dust,
And the voices of fame, with one acclaim,
May call him great and just,
Let those who applaud take warning,
And keep this motto in sight—
No question is ever settled
Until it is settled right.

Let those who have failed take courage;
Though the enemy seems to have won,
Tho' his ranks are strong, if he be in the wrong,
The battle is not yet done.
For sure as the morning follows
The darkest of the night,
No question is ever settled
Until it is settled right.

O man bowed down with labor!
O woman young, yet old;
O heart oppressed in the toiler's breast
And crushed by the power of gold!
Keep on with your weary battle
Against triumphant might;
No question is ever settled
Until it is settled right.

—Ella Wheeler Wilcox.

FROM "ETIEVANT'S EXPLANATIONS"

ON PROPERTY.

(Translated for Free Society.)

If you tell me a certain thing belongs to you because you inherited it, I answer to you those that left it to you had no right to it. They had the right to enjoy the manifold articles in the domain of wealth as long as they lived, as we have the right to enjoy them during the term of our life; but they had no right to dispose of them after their death, for as we with our birth receive the claim to all things, so with our death we lose it—then we don't need them any more.

By what right would those who have lived deprive us of the opportunity to live?

By what right could a layer of molecules prevent the molecules composing it to rejoin themselves in some other manner? By what right could that which was, hamper that which is? Why should a man whose span of life was but a minute of eternity, for all time claim a piece of ground, simply because he has lived on it? Does there exist anything more stupid than this arrogation of a puny being that presumes to make everlasting donations to transitory beings, to changing institutions?

We must not respect the claims of people who still want to live after they have died; who want to possess titles to goods when they have no more desires; who want to dispose of things after their death to which they only had a right during their life according to their needs.

And if you tell me they have a right to so dispose of them, as they are that part of the product of their labor which they had saved, I answer to you: if they have not consumed the whole part of the product of their labor, that simply shows they could spare some part of it; if they did not need it, they had no right to it, therefore they could not dispose of it in your favor and leave to you rights which they did not have. The rights disappear where the wants cease.

If you further tell me a certain thing belongs to you because you have bought it I answer to you: those who sold it to you had no right to it. They had only the right to use it according to their wants. They had the right to give away their share of enjoyment and life, but not ours; they had the right to renounce their happiness, but not ours; therefore we need not respect contracts that are made without our sanction and against our rights.

Nature says to us: Take; she does not say: Buy. At each sale there is a cheat and a cheated—one who gains from it and one who is overreached. But if each takes what he needs, then no one is hurt, for if each has what he needs, he then has all to which he can lay claim. The mercantile pursuit is certainly one of the main causes of the corruption of mankind.

It is hardly necessary to state here that all that in the social organism of the present is opposed to the rules of natural philosophy, is at the same time a source of vice and crime.

When to all men the entire domain of wealth were thrown open, when they were assured that today and in the future they would get all that is necessary to their happiness, as is their right, then nine tenths of the crimes of today would disappear, for they can easily be traced to what is called theft.

And as theft would disappear, so would also prostitution as soon as our philosophical theories were applied. Why should a woman prostitute herself when she has all that is required for maintenance and happiness? And how could a man buy her who could only offer that to which she already has a right? And the same applies to all crimes, to all vices: they would disappear because their causes had ceased. What else causes lies, hypocrisy, wile, but the restraint imposed by one person upon another. They are the weapons of the weak and they resort to them because the strong drive them to this.

The lie is not the vice of the liar, but of him who compels the lie. Take away the restraint, the oppression, the penalty, and we will see that he who now lies will speak the truth. Let the oppressors cease to deny to all mankind the right to life, to happiness, and prostitution and murder will stop, for mankind are all born free and good. Our laws make men bad and unjust, make them slaves or masters, robbed or robbers, victims or hangmen. Each human being is self-conscious, independent; therefore the independence of each must be respected. Each invasion into our natural freedom, each compulsion is a crime which very frequently has revolt as a sequence.

I know very well that my views have no similarity with the national economy as taught by Leroy-Beaulieu or the morale of Malthus, or with the christian socialism of Pope Leo XIII, who, surrounded with heaps of gold, preaches the renunciation of wealth and humility, while he proclaims himself the first of men. I know well that the natural philosophy is utterly opposed to all transmitted ideas on the fields of religion, of morals, of politics. But its triumph is assured, it exiles every philosophical theory, every other moral conception, because it does not lay claim to any right for one which it does not grant to all. It does not suit itself to the conditions of time and place—it does not call the same deed now good, now bad.

The natural philosophy has nothing in common with that two-sided morality so common with men of our times; that morality which according to the degrees of latitude or longitude calls a thing either bad or good. For instance, it does not proclaim that theft of a thing and the murder of its possessor at one time infamous, at another exalted. Infamous when it occurs near Paris, exalted when it happens in Cochinchina or near Berlin.

And as it knows neither punishment nor reward, so likewise it does not require in the first instance execution, in the other glorification. It substitutes for all the countless, ever-changing moral precepts that are invented by the few to enslave the many—their multitude and changeability prove how frail they are—natural justice, the unchanging rule of good and bad, which is not the creation of oneperson, but springs from the intimate conception of each. Good is what does us good, what gives us impressions of pleasure; and as the impressions determine the will, so good is that which we like. Bad is what hurts us, what gives impressions of pain, is all that which we do not like. "Do what thou likest"—that is the only law

which our justice knows, for it proclaims the freedom of each in the equality of all.

WASTED EFFORTS.

Viewing the matter impartially, it seems to me we must admit that there is no logical middle ground between Individualism and Communism. We must either accept the slippery LAISSEZ FAIRE doctrine of the extreme Individualists, with its corollaries, private property and unlimited competition, or find refuge from economic unrest on the safe and sure rock of Free Communism. To attempt to secure a safe, permanent resting place in any of the go-between doctrines which vainly attempt the impossible feat of straddling both extremes, is mortifying to the spirit and wearying to the flesh. It is too much like trying to ride two horses going in different directions at the same time. Thus all theories of mingled state control and individual initiative are of the hybrid class—impotent to produce a logical ideal or a permanent system.

For proof of this assertion seek out the most intelligent of the advocates of the Single Tax, of Gronlundism, of Nationalism, of Marxian Socialism: scarcely one of them will affirm his doctrine as the climax or ideal of social reform. Scratch one-half the Single Taxers, and beneath a thin cuticle of policy you will find a simon-pure Individualist; peel the hypocrisy from the other half, and the tendency to Communism stands revealed. None of the leaders of Marxianism deny their tendency toward Communism, while the communistic leanings of all the admirers of Bellamy are patent to everyone.

In seeking to reconcile contradictory theories, and to harmonize inconsistent conclusions, adherents of all these middle ground "schools" render themselves very absurd. It is true, they pride themselves upon their acuteness and "scientific" attainments, but they are really very short-sighted philosophers.

That Communism—Free Communism—is the social ideal of all the "schools," I scarcely think can be denied; and I believe the assertion is susceptible of proof. Many regard Communism as the last step in social evolution. But if it is a good thing why not advocate it as the first step as well as the last? If Communism is the Rome of our pilgrimage, and all roads lead to this much desired goal, why not take the shortest and most direct route? It seems to me that it has been too much the custom to regard Communism as a luminous, far-away point—a heaven of peace and joy to be reached perhaps after centuries of wistful desire and feverish struggle. Yet if the efforts now being put forth to reach Communism, instead of being scattered upon intermediate points, were properly directed and concentrated upon the goal itself, the journey would be wonderfully shortened, and the much-wished for heaven brought very near. W. H.

At the beginning of the war with Spain we were reproached by some radical friends for our assertions that it was instigated by the buccaneering element which, through the prostituted press, stirred up the sentiment of patriotism. "The Cubans must be free," was the howl, and "It is not a war of conquest" the refrain. The Cubans were pictured as intelligent, industrious; people that were able to govern themselves. What do we see and hear today. Not a word is said about the liberation of the Cubans—they are incapable of self-government and we are responsible for order in Cuba." Not a word of joy is to be found in the papers that the Cubans are freed from the Spanish yoke, but the war and its result is figured out by dollar-and-cents. How many miles there have been sold in Missouri; how much the wholesale druggists have made; which monopolistic concern has sent its agents to Cuba to grab everything in reach, etc., etc., is what interests the daily papers now that the "heroes" have conquered the Island. And the people whose "rudimentary sense of justice" demanded the intervention? The success of the American fleet has benumbed their senses and they hail every outrage perpetrated by the politicians.

A. L.

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.

The Wendell Phillips Educational Club of Providence, R. I., has opened a propaganda and free reading room at 31 Robinson Street. The room will be open every evening and on Sundays all day. On Friday evenings discussion and business meetings will be held. Radical papers will please take notice.

The Labor-Day which will be celebrated all over the country to-morrow is nothing but a farce, a new treasure for politicians.

To extort a confession the Chicago police tortured Dennis Monahan to such an extent that he became insane. But we don't live in Russia—we are free Americans just the same.

The proposed disarmament of the Czar looks rather peculiar, when we hear at the same time that the Russian government has ordered so many warships in Germany. But we will wait for further developments.

The highwaymen and buccaners of the olden times had to fight and risk their own lives for the plunder, but the modern ones travel in Europe, or entertain themselves in clubs and the sea baths, and their hirelings do the fighting.

The persecution of the Social Democrats in Germany is remarkably increasing. Two students were lately expelled from a training college for having associated with adherents of Socialism.

In some cities the street car companies have employed young ladies as conductors. The wages dropped accordingly. Soon we will have reached the "good and happy primitive age"; we men will amuse ourselves by hunting and fishing and the women will do the work. Yet our enemies tell us that Anarchism would bring us back to barbarism.

A poor couple, man and wife, were wandering along the Southern Pacific track at San Fernando. "They were dusty and forlorn looking," says the report, and were arrested and sent to jail for ten days for vagrancy. The buccaners of old used to rob people on the highway and then let their victims go on, but our "more humanitarian civilization" has developed: we are sent to jail now after we are robbed of everything.

The Strikers at Pana, Ill., are still firm in their determination to win their cause, in spite of the fact that the mine owners have brought colored miners to the place. The colored men assert that they were told to be employed at the Illinois Steel Works, or else they would not have left Birmingham. They are anxious to return, but have so far been forcibly kept in the mines by the deputy sheriff. Sheriff Touborn has received six boxes of Springfield rifles to arm the deputies. Yet the mine owners are not "bomb-throwing Anarchists," but "peaceable, law-abiding citizens." Another Hazleton tragedy may be expected, and I wonder if our friend Livesey will rush to the scene to persuade the mine owners to submit to the more than moderate demands of the poor strikers?

While I am with friend Livesey in his efforts to show the world that Anarchy means freedom, that the Anarchists seek to obtain a better condition, a condition in which nobody shall suffer want or his or her freedom of enjoying life shall be curtailed by arti-

ficial restrictions, yet I cannot understand why we should endeavor to make the world believe that we will meekly submit to oppression and outrages perpetrated upon us. That men are slavishly rendering up their freedom is a fact and deplorable, and I for one will not encourage such attitude. If Livesey sees any method by which the change can be effected without the use of violence, I shall be glad to hear it, but until then let us resist encroachment on our liberties by every means at our disposal. True, education will bring about the change, but the more the oppressed become aware of their rights the nearer we are to a violent revolution, for the masters will never hesitate to resist violently the most moderate demands of their slaves.

A letter written to this city from Santiago shows the reliability of the telegraphic reports of the sensational press. The following quotations may suffice:

You have heard over and over again how "Colonel Roosevelt, mounted on a magnificent steed, brandishing his sword, charged up the hill at the head of his regiment." The "magnificent steed" was a Texas pony very much the worse for wear, which the Colonel dismounted from at the barbed-wire fence skirting at the foot of the hill. The "brandished sword" was four miles in the rear, tied up in a blanket roll.

You have likewise read how the guns of Moro Castle were silenced by our battery and how it was a heap of ruins. In the first place there were no guns in Moro Castle to silence; the only guns of the castle itself being some beautiful works of art bearing date of 1725 to 1745 and kept in there evidently as relics of a former glory. As to the castle being in ruins, I will say that it stands after all the bombardment practically unharmed, and my private opinion is that it would stand for six years if all the guns of the Navy were turned loose on it tomorrow.

The batteries were not at Moro at all, but on the other side of it, and one further up the bay. You have also heard of Hobson's daring deed and how he sunk the Merrimac directly across the channel in the narrowest part, thus completely blockading the passage.

But instead of the boat being sunk in the narrowest part of the stream it lies in the very widest. Instead of lying crosswise it lies longwise and interferes in no possible way with egrets and never did.

Der Sozialist, the German Anarchist weekly, has pointed out, in a leader, how sheepishly the Parliamentarian groups of the French Socialists have voted in favor of M. Cavaignac's speech being printed and distributed all over France. Der Sozialist points out that it was the Socialist Deputy, Mirman, who proposed this wholesale distribution of the Minister's speech, the other socialist members agreeing. Twenty-four of their number voted for Mirman's motion, whilst 13 others obtained from voting so that all the parliamentarian Socialist groups have voted with the government, and are shamefully abandoning Zola and his friends to their enemies. What do the English Socialist press say to this cowardly desertion of a righteous cause by their French comrades?—Clarion, London, England.

And thus the French Socialists prostitute their own intelligence and sacrifice their better judgment for the sake of political success. Until recently the Socialists stood bravely by Zola, but since the sentiment of the ignorant and misled populace is growing stronger and stronger against Zola they see their position endangered and compromise with the government, or rather with the prejudiced and ignorant populace.

Suit was brought to compel the express companies to pay the war tax and although the courts decided that they must do so, the corporations pay no attention to the law and still nothing is done about it. It is said that the eastern stockholders have directed the express companies to ignore the decision of the courts. The laws are not made for the rich, and if the rich can defy the laws with impunity, why should the poor obey them? Ignorance and servility are at the bottom of such anomalies.

Nellie M. Jerauld attempts to criticize in the Autonomist H. Addis' article "Anarchism and the Farmer" and concludes: "We have lived this theory and tried to be practical and have come to this logical conclusion, that the more who come together as co-operators the less work is accomplished and that not so thoroughly." That less can be accomplished through united effort is a new discovery, Nellie, and I dispute its "logic." On the other hand you did not live under Anarchism, but were surrounded by monopoly and government, and even the few participants were not all Anarchists.

I was born and raised in the immediate neighborhood of a Herrnhut community and have found

just the reverse. The communities were the richest in the country; drudgery was unknown as all work was done by the most improved machinery attainable; shirking was also unknown, in fact, some worked more than necessary in order to rid themselves of their surplus energy and to satisfy their ambition; they had the best breed of cattle in the country which was sold for high prices; and many envious eyes followed them when they were riding to church in their carriages on Sundays. In short, the wealth of these communities was famous. You may ask why these communities, in which drudgery and the fear of want were absent, dissolved after they had prospered nearly a century? Because there was no individual freedom—it was State Socialism on a small scale. For nearly two generations the colonists had lived an exclusive and undisturbed life. But some of the youngsters were sent to the higher schools in the cities, they were impregnated with new ideas, their mode of life changed, and that settled the destiny of the communities. Strife began, for anything "wordly" was a sin. To play a violin, to drink a glass of beer, to dance, to take a walk with a girl, etc., were pleasures which, according to the puritan views of the old folks, could not be tolerated. The result was that the youth left the community of plenty—preferring to drudge and to live in poverty and to drink, dance and love.

"Some time it will be seen," says the editor of "I" (Wellesley, Mass.), "that the only way to be logical and consistent and reasonable and just is to make a divorce as easily to be obtained as a marriage license. And then 'there will be no more marriage.'" The editor has still to learn that social conditions, reverence to custom and christian morality, and not a mere fiat is at the bottom of marital and other social evils. Remove the superstitions and prejudices prevalent in the domain of sex relationship and the monopoly of the necessities of life, and then "there will be no more marriage."

The following quotation from a foreign exchange makes one's blood boil, and I am inclined to believe that even our peace-loving friend Livesey would like to see such monsters in human form blown into atoms. But hear the story:

"In Lisbon, Portugal, a young girl was sentenced to death for suffocating her new-born babe. She told the court that the judge who had sentenced her to death was the father of the murdered child. She had been the governess of his children, and after he had seduced her she was thrown on the street.

"We want an answer from you, the defenders of law and order. Who deserves to be executed, that monster in judge's clothes, or the despairing infanticide?"

Such are the magistrates who pass judgement over the poor disinherited slaves. Phew!

J. Armstrong, Jr., is an artist of phraseology and verbosity, and consequently of a confused mind. After he ridicules the Anarchist-Communists on one page of the journal, he says on another place:

"The plutocrats are a mere handful, and whatever power they have is exercised by permission of the many. The power that sustains plutocracy is the majority of the people, and they will continue to sustain it until the world outgrows the superstitions of property, money and officialism."

Just so, Mr. Armstrong: Property, money and officialism is what we are combatting and when people have outgrown these superstitions let nature take its course and "the fittest survive." And when you remove property and officialism you have a condition of Anarchist-Communism.

"Away with all sentimentality and you will see that the 'survival of the fittest' is the logical outcome under any and all given condition. . . . Overcome, conquer; be an individual and survive." Thus perambulate the thoughts of a hyper-philosophical mind over the plains of Tennessee. I wonder why the philosopher does not prove himself the fittest, why he does not survive, why he does not conquer poverty, before advising others to survive? Why is he so sentimental to waste time and energy in the effort to propagate the idea of freedom, thereby appealing for assistance to conquer the enemy—ignorance and superstition? Because it dawns upon him that there can be no natural development of our individuality so long as the cannons, the rifles, the penitentiaries and public ostracism stare us in the face at almost every attempt we make to "be an individual," and that's

why we are trying to enlighten our fellow man, and it is "sentimentality" that prompts us to look for a condition in which we expect to be happier.

SHAKESPEAR TEACHING UP TO DATE.

"Thieves for their robbery have authority."

Parties have been, and are, the curse of America, they have been devised to befog the cause of Labor's poverty, and with the object of dividing Labor into two or more factions, fighting against each other, thus preventing them from uniting to secure their own freedom.

Labor's only united action is, that of balloting away their individual liberty, to one or other of the parties, who totally ignore the interest of the voters; every government office is now bought at great expense simply for what can be made, by any means, out of it. Politicians are thieves.

Our object is to re-divide the inhabitants of America, so that present intolerable conditions may be righteously, and, if possible, peacefully settled. Education only can accomplish this, and each honest thinker can assist by continually emphasizing the natural division; those who Labor for their living and consequently pay all the taxes, and those who render no service for their living, and consequently cannot pay any taxes, simply because they produce nothing, this brings out the simple conditions of Labor versus Parasites.

Labor: all who perform any useful service, any useful work of brain and brawn, which benefits themselves without injury to others, and thus consequently benefits humanity.

Parasites: those who perform no useful service, and produce nothing but injustice to humanity, by their practice of living on the best through the Labor of others.

Government will not remedy these evils, because all government is for the privileged few, so that they may legally, but unjustly, live on the Labor of the multitude.

Honest persons require no government to regulate their actions. Man-made laws are all diametrically opposed to natural laws. Government is for nothing (not even humanity), but private property. It began with the baron's land laws, the foundation on which the scheme of all robbery of Labor rises. Then followed the money laws which make robbery easy and complete. The natural law of use, as the only title to land, would settle the Labor question for all time. The money monopoly must be broken up before the land evil can be touched. With all deference to our "Single Tax" friends we make this assertion, and we fear they are wasting their energies for they hope to bring this about through government.

History proves to demonstration that all governments are dishonest, and cause dishonesty of those who are forced to pay to be governed.

KINGHORN-JONES.

PROGRESSION AND ENVIRONMENTS.

[The following was read by the undersigned at 20 Eddy St., San Francisco, Calif., August 14, where weekly meetings are held for the discussion of various questions.]

As the subject chosen for this week's discussion is but a continuation of what we had last week only a little differently expressed, I suppose it will not be amiss to review some of the points handled last Sunday, among the most touching of which was that of the poor donkey who starved to death because of lack of volition by being at an equal distance between two bundles of hay. It seemed to me a great oversight on the part of donkeys in general that they had no lawyers among them to decide such difficult cases. A good donkey lawyer would have soon made a difference in the size of those bundles and thus have relieved the other of its dilemma.

Again, we were told that we proved that we had risen above our environments from the fact that we had (presumably so) remained honest when according to statements made by some, we were surrounded by thieves. As to our being honest remains to be proven, but one thing is, nearly, if not quite certain, to wit: that in nine out of every ten cases in our courts where property is involved, one or both sides are trying to steal legally, that is, by the help of the lawyers. All right for the lawyers. Business is business, you know, and that is the way they live. Yes, that is the way they live, and if everybody turned honest what would they do?

The next question is: What about a system of soci-

ety, that cannot provide a way for all its members to live without some of them being dishonest so as to give employment to others? What about a system of society that cannot give us peace, order and honesty without starving the lawyers? What of one that cannot give us health without destroying the doctor's means of support—that cannot give women work without leaving men idle, and so on to the end of the chapter. Is such a system worth fighting for? Can people who really think feel patriotic under such circumstances?

As to the two methods of judging of which our friend spoke, so far as I am concerned, I think my own state could be better described by saying it is what Henry D. Lloyd calls the new conscience. In an article in the New Time, and quoted in the Light of Truth, I find the following which I take from many others of like character, paragraphs which are given to illustrate what the writer means by the "new conscience."

The banker says: "Our wealth is increasing one billion dollars a year. We have boards of trade, the best railroads in the world, packing houses that can kill ten thousand hogs—"

The new conscience interrupts with: "The sickening stench, the foul sights of the tenements, and the motherhood and the childhood choking there."

The conservative says: "This is the best government in the world. America is good enough for me."

The new conscience says: "Listen to that tramp, tramp, tramp of a million men out of work."

The clergyman says: "The poor ye have always with you."

The new conscience says: "That sewing woman you see pawning her shawl has lived this winter with her two children without a fire. Are you wearing one of the shirts she finished?"

The railroad king says: "Every man makes his own career. I was a working myself twenty years ago, and now I keep a carriage, a butler, four judges, legislatures in four States, and—"

The new conscience interrupts with: "That tired looking man is a railroad conductor of a company owned by a half dozen men worth \$300,000,000, which is not enough for them, so they squeeze a few more dollars a month out of him by making him, on every alternate trip, do 28½ hours work without sleep."

Now, as before said, I think that I, myself, do not deserve the honor of being overbalanced in the sub-conscience side of my nature, but that I was born akin to this new conscience is true, a conscience which I hope will grow stronger and stronger, will call louder and louder, even till the nations will be forced to listen.

Can we progress out of our environments? What is progression? Looking from the banker's standpoint we are progressing. Looking from the standpoint of the little boy standing ten hours a day up to his ankles in the water in the coal mine, what?

We do not need to go to the sub-conscious, the inner sense to see these things. They are before us if we will only look at them. Is that progress which takes the whole people forward, or is it progress that puts a few up in sight of all the world because they stand on the top of a living Caesar's column?

Years since, when Garfield was lying on his bed of pain I spent a few weeks with my daughter. I did not manifest quite the extravagant interest that it was supposed I ought, and one day she said to me: "Why mother, you do not act as if you cared." I replied: "My child, I read an item in a Philadelphia paper the other day which stirred me more than the pain of a dozen Garfields could. It was of a poor woman in one of the tenement houses who was obliged to go out to see about getting the means to support life. She left her babe upon the bed, knowing it was too small to get off. When she returned the rats were eating it."

So last Sunday, when I said I had no patriotism, that the world was my country, do not think that I did not feel, nor that I wanted to insult those soldiers. No, I was looking from the standpoint of the new conscience. I was thinking of what might be the fate of those men, of the hardships they might have to go through when the glamor of the war spirit had somewhat worn off. Of the shot and shell that might go whistling round, till their limbs were torn to shreds, or the heads that had pillowed on a mother's bosom be trapped in the mire, perhaps under the hoofs of maddened steeds, and I was wondering if all the governments in the world were worth a cost like that.

The question is: Can we progress surrounded by such environments? Does the patriotic enthusiasm which creates the psychic current that induces our

sons to rush on to such destruction tend to progression? I do not doubt the picture painted by the gentleman. I do not question but many have left soft beds, rich viands, etc., to become soldiers, but that proves nothing, unless it is that the emotions are stronger than the judgment. The sons of the flower of European nobility did the same thing when they were carried by the psychic current started by Peter, the Hermit, and rushed on to take the tomb of him they called Christ from the Infidel. Similar is the feeling of the eastern devotee who throws himself under the wheels of the car of juggernaut. There are more juggernauts than those made into images of heathen gods. But there is another side to this question of the motives that prompt the enlistment. A clipping from an eastern paper and copied in Free Society states as follows:

"There was a baby born in Denver yesterday morning, a baby whose father is away at the front fighting for his country. There were no clothes waiting for it, not a shred, and there are none yet. Last night the baby was still wrapped in a piece of flannel. The mother lay on a feather tick with no sheet under her. The tick was filthy and sour but there was no money to buy another. An old comfort had been taken from the children's bed to cover her, leaving them without anything. The sad features of the picture can be duplicated in many cases among the families of our boys in blue. Grim want stalks among them. Empty larders greet their eyes, and the bitter alternative of starvation or public charity stare them in the face."

Now friends, I ask if real progress is possible under such conditions?

Another of the many stories that has found publicity, is from Philadelphia: "Mrs. Raymond Herman, with three little children was found destitute, with nothing to pay rent, with nothing to buy food, while her husband had enlisted on account of being out of work and penniless." I could fill pages with such extracts, but these are enough to show the other side of the picture. I leave this room and go where the women's condition is the theme of conversation and effort. I find that over a thousand women have registered for work, women who are struggling to live, and I have since learned that but 25 could, with all the efforts that have been made, be given work last Monday morning, and yet government is deliberately appropriating hundreds of millions of the money it never earned to the making of widows and orphans, calling the men forward under the name of patriotism. Is this progress? Can we rise above the environments which these things create?

Oh if all women, everywhere felt as I do about these things there would be no more war. The absence of woman's sympathy would make it impossible for man to go on in the line he is now pursuing, and we should progress a thousand times faster than now.

Think how the war spirit has been cultivated in this country the last few years. It made me shudder when, during the past week I read in one of your large dailies that President McKinley approved of the idea of the children of this country contributing to build a battle ship. If the prince of devils was a veritable reality he could not plan a more effectual method of fostering a spirit of war in the coming generation, a sort of war hunger.

True, the blowing up of the Maine was a terrible thing, but the injury that this war has inflicted upon this nation is a thousand times more terrible. If it is the national honor that must be sustained, then I will say: It is the duelist's code of honor on a national scale. If, as many fondly suppose, the purpose of this war was to free Cuba, I will say that when our own people are really free there will be no need for war to free other nations, for example is a thousand times more effectual than precept alone, even if backed by cannon and dynamite.

Let us set the nations an example of a country where there are no hovels of poverty; no slums in which physical and moral disease is generated; no courts that imprison people for honest investigation; no millionaires and no tramps; when we can show to other nations all this, then there will be no need of war to open up the gates of freedom and progress to the nations of the earth, for the influence of such a state of society would be stronger than all the artillery of earth and heaven combined.

Oh for a full realization that if we would really and truly progress we must destroy the environments that the ignorance of the past has thrown around us!

LOIS WAISBROOKER.

Freedom is the daughter, not the mother of order.

WHAT ONE MAN CAN DO.

No. 2.

The editor of New Christianity, Ithaca, N. Y., is very partial to Anarchy. He has published Bolton Hall's "On Children's Liberty" in his August issue, and calculates, if his readers admit, of publishing articles he now has on hand from J. T. Small, J. C. Barnes and myself. Of course, he cannot give his readers too much at once, and if anybody has to wait, I can. Anarchists and all reformers must be content to make very gradual approaches upon the conventional strongholds. When Mr. Tucker was asked to furnish an article for the North American Review, and the article was afterward refused, although \$75 was returned to him with his MS., it is very possible that Mr. Tucker went a little too far for even the staunch readers and thinkers of that periodical. The editor of New Christianity has published voluminous extracts from Anarchists of the past; but this is always easy to do, the thing is to bring forward the ideas of live Anarchists of the present, even if they are not the great authorities of the others. "A live dog is better than a dead lion." My Anarchist article in New Christianity for July has drawn a very appreciative reply from George A. Robinson, 5 Crowder Terrace, Winchester, Hampshire, England, and he wants to know where he can secure Anarchistic literature of the peaceful kind. I trust English and American Anarchists will kindly attend to his needs. I have already introduced him to J. T. Small.

Lucifer, of 1394 Congress st., Chicago, gave from me "Unity Among Reformers" on July 9, on which C. L. James made comment in Lucifer of August 6. He apologized for force when the reformer is cornered by the soldier or policeman. I tell him only the fool will stand up as one against what can be made 100,000 against him. Lucifer of August 13 reprinted "Love vs. Marriage," being a paragraph from my pen in Towson, Md. Journal of July 16. This Journal prints much from me of a reform character and as its readers are mostly unacquainted with reform literature, I consider it a great point gained to see some 2000 strangers treated to something new. In fact, for all the objects of reform, I would prefer outside papers to reform papers themselves. Every man that writes for reform papers is abundantly capable of writing for his county papers, and all reformers should make a point of doing this, and all reform papers should note, as Lucifer has done, the work; this would be "bringing in the sheaves."

EMMA GOLDMAN'S GOOD IDEA.

In the Detroit Sentinel, of July 2, I called for Emma Goldman and in the same paper of July 30 she replied. I am glad to note that her ideas on education are the same as mine. She says, in part: "I do not favor compulsory education, nor have I ever lectured in favor of it. Not only do I not believe in it, but I am entirely opposed to our present school system, considering it injurious to the natural faculties of the child." Right here, I would like Bolton Hall to remember this, as he seems to have lately been so tenderly solicitous for children in other regards. Miss Goldman admirably continues: "I know by my own experience that instructors and teachers can seldom regard the individual abilities and inclinations of their pupils; they must follow the lines laid down by the board of education and stuff the children's heads with a lot of rubbish, which only burdens the little minds and which is of no benefit to the children. Until instructors will make it a special study to understand the nature of their pupils, their physical and mental wants, their trials and worries, their pleasures and sorrows, children will leave their schools automatic machines and not thinking and reasonable young men and women."

These are the grandest words I have heard from any present day reformer. I have been fighting on this line for 25 years. All you Socialists, Single Taxers and others who have been wondering why I could not sympathize with you and who have been surprised that I have become friendly to liberty-loving Anarchists may now know the cause.

In the same Detroit Sentinel of July 30, Miss Goldman says: "I have never advocated 'force' for the propaganda of Anarchy, nor do I know of any Anarchist who has done so." But she thinks events of the past and present point to the necessity for force if the "struggling masses" expect to accomplish anything in the future and she says: "They will only succeed through the Social Revolution, never through peaceful methods." I too acknowledge they never will, if the

past and present imbecile methods are continued in; but I have a more excellent and certain way of attaining ends, which I am satisfied from past results, will prove as efficacious as can be expected in the cause of Anarchy and general liberty. Miss Goldman mentions Comstock as the chief standing obstacle to liberty in this country. I acknowledge it; but I also would "give my head for a foot-ball" if my plans put into operation against him did not force him into "inocuous disuette." There are hosts of men and women of all sects and parties who want to see him and his society obliterated and if an even dozen of these hosts would come forward to do what they can in their individual capacities in aid of an anti-Comstock crusade, his days would be numbered. Reformers must stop this thing of wasting time, money and energy in tales and theorizations, and take up one thing at a time, like Comstock, and make practical demonstrations that will amount to something.

"THAT MODEL ANARCHIST."

The Chicago Farmer's Voice, of July 30, gave a capital letter from J. C. Barnes in reply to mine in the same paper of July 9—I might say in reply to the editor also. Mr. Barnes appears to have considered my publication of him in the Farmer's Voice slightly in the nature of an opposing criticism, for he says: "I am surprised that my recital in answer to an inquiry of a comrade Anarchist [Bolton Hall] in Free Society, of my Anarchist life, should excite the least surprise or question by anyone—much less by those who are reaching out for new truth and are receptive to it." I here suppose Mr. Barnes refers to myself. Of course, it was a delightful surprise to me to see Mr. Barnes give the account that he did of his peaceful life and I hastened to lay it before the world to counteract the wrong impression extant regarding Anarchists. There are so few people who have the courage of their convictions, that when we meet with one, like Mr. Barnes, who lives out what he professes, it is really a duty of all lovers of reform to hold him up as an encouragement to the timid and as a reproach to the hypocrite. I am glad to see that Mr. Barnes has also written to the New Christianity. Mr. Small and I have prepared the way for him in many papers, and to follow up these prepared ways should be the happy work of all liberty-lovers.

Mr. Barnes has been a large contributor to his local papers and I see him extolled by them as a most estimable citizen and called by one, "The Hindsboro Sage." He had an excellent open letter to the clergy in the Mattoon Commercial, of Mattoon, Ill., of July 14, and I followed him up with one on "The Dying Churches" in the same paper of August 4. We all know that Comstockism is only a branch of the church's work and we should therefore remember that every blow struck at the church is that much against Comstockism and Blue Laws generally. All secular papers are now willing enough to publish such articles, and this, of itself, is an indication that a change has come over the dreams of the press and that further work can be accomplished through their instrumentality. In fact, the press is my main hope for the reformation of the world. All we have to do is to apply to it the same business methods that we do to other things and wonders will be accomplished. Mr. Barnes wrote me that he hardly felt like requesting the publication of articles in papers he did not subscribe for; but I tell him to diffuse himself over the country, accompanied by a few cents for copies of his articles, and he will, a la Bolton Hall, become of national importance.

FRANCIS B. LIVESY.

Sykesville, Md.

AN APPEAL TO LIBERALS.

Many readers of Free Society have given reasons why they are unable to pay their subscriptions at present, but the reasons given below—by a comrade known to our readers through his writings—are of an exceptional character, and I hope that the publication of the latter part of his letter will induce some liberals to render him the well-deserved aid. Here it is:

"... it may be enough to state that this is the fourth-day since I have eaten anything, and that that is nothing new for me. If you make this fact public, please add that I am not begging. I have plenty to sell, if it were convertible. My History of the World, which has occupied me ten years, and is the cause of my poverty, must wait. But a very moderate sum—

say thirty dollars—would enable me to publish any one of the following pamphlets, all taken from my History, into which has gone all there was in my brains and pockets.

(1) DEGENERACY, second edition, much enlarged and improved. Containing the substance of Lombroso's "Criminal," his "Man of Genesis," Krafft-Ebing's "Psychopathia Sexualis," Max Nordau's "Degeneration," and other works of the same school, with original historical data and applications to social philosophy, not to be found in any of them.

(2) THE NEW ECONOMY, an exposition of economic science, showing that Anarchists have the only sound method, because they reason from the standpoint of the Consumer, who alone is universal man, while orthodox economists generalize from that of the capitalists, and Socialists from that of the proletaires, both of whom are only classes.

(3) COMMENTS. The idea of this work has been in my mind since I was thirteen years old. It embodies what I suppose to be my most original thoughts, boiled down on the method of Bacon's Essays.

(4) LECTURES on the History of the French Revolution.

(5) LECTURES on the History of the Jews, especially interesting to the many freethinking and liberal Hebrews.

(6) LECTURES on the History of the Popes.

(7) LAW OF MARRIAGE, on the sex question, greatly enlarged and improved since the first edition of 1870.

(8) ANARCHY, first published in 1886

(9) MATERIALISM, Utilitarianism, Pessimism, and Anarchism—their relations.

(10) THE NATURAL HISTORY OF LIES, a treatise on historical criticism.

(11) THE MISTAKE OF JESUS, a roster for christian orthodoxy.

"I need scarcely say that the philosophy of all the pamphlets is Anarchistic. Degeneracy, for example, culminates in an exposition of the absurdity of all penal legislation. The History of the French Revolution shows that the Anarchistic tendency, beginning in France and England during the last century, gave rise to 'the Revolution' in its widest sense; that this tendency produced all the good which came of the French Revolution—that the crimes and horrors were due to counter tendencies. The History of the Jews and the Popes show that the original and valuable element in Christianity and Judaism is Anarchistic—that the capture of Christianity by the Roman genius for government is exactly that perversion which Protestants, more or less consistently, consider it.

"I don't want the liberal public to give me any thing in the nature of a pension for what I have done; because I am rugged yet, and able to do lots more. But Liberals who may choose to subscribe towards the publication of these pamphlets will risk nothing but this, that the one they would prefer may not be the one I am enabled in this way to print first.

"I will write to you on the question you mention if I live long enough. If not, you are witness that I die game. Add that so far as my experience goes, starving is a very easy death, and, like death in general, owes all its terrors to association. C. L. JAMES."

Eau Claire, Wis.

"Everybody wants the Philippines," we are told. "Not only politicians, but clergymen, missionaries, and men in all the various walks of life." I suppose so. But then let us throw off the mask and proclaim ourselves what we are. The plain Anglo Saxon for it would spell "liars and thieves," would it not?—Rockland Independent.

"I am quite sorry to hear that a machine for making cigarettes has been invented, because it has always been with sheer delight that I have watched the nimble fingers of girls quickly rolling the cigarettes. One girl working hard can make about 1,400 a day. But now the new machine will make from 550 to 800 a minute. I am told that one of the largest tobacco firms in the North are about to dismiss 500 girls. Other firms have already displaced their women workers by this machinery. In Liverpool alone 1,500 will be thrown out of employment."—Clarion.

RECEIPTS.

Week ending Saturday, August 27.
Pfuetzner, \$1.50
Swisher, Cerynka, Roestel, Stiff, Cohen, Pope, each \$1.
Cook, Studley, Johnson, Mailhet, Baar, Gollarducci, Smiller each 50c
Norman, 25c.
Taylor, 20c.
Berthman, Maisie, each 10c.