

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. 44.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 1898.

WHOLE NO. 180.

FREE COMMUNISM OUR HEAVEN.

Those who fail to appreciate the benefits of Free Communism are mainly of two classes, viz. (1) half baked Socialists, whose mental horizon is bounded by the stupefying conditions at present prevailing, and who therefore cannot see, and (2) "plumblines" and other choice varieties of Individualists, who generally meet argument with ridicule or misrepresentation, and and who therefore will not see. The latter gravely tell us their through chief spokesman that "Free Communism is as absurd and impossible as a white black man or a square circle," which of course is such a convincing and unanswerable way of settling a disputed point that only the veriest dolt would fail to be convinced. Argument in reply to this method of flooring an adversary is utterly out of the question—valuable time deliberately wasted—and I for one refuse to be placed upon the defensive by such contemptible methods. The doctrine of Free Communism is not now and never has been under arraignment. It is not required to defend itself against either of the two classes mentioned above. It does not need to go begging for defenders or supporters. Confident in its ability to solve for all time the great social question, lofty as highest Heaven in its aspirations and ideals, serene in its noble aspect as the coming savior of mankind, it does not need to go begging for defenders or supporters. Tested in the light of experience, of history, of philosophy, of scientific knowledge it invites the most searching analysis, the keenest of fair criticism, and fears not the outcome.

Given the emancipation of individual from invasive control, Communism—Free Communism—follows naturally as day follows night. This can be shown in a variety of ways. It is stoutly maintained by individualists that free money and free organization of credit would cause such an expansion of capital that production would increase at a tremendous and hitherto undreamed of rate. This being so—and I do not deny it—both capital and product would constantly tend to become cheaper and cheaper. Articles now considered as necessities in middle-class life would soon cease to have exchange value; they would become so common and cheap that all could be abundantly supplied with but little cost of time or labor. Even many of those articles now considered luxuries, especially manufactured goods, as musical instruments, fine carpets and furniture, bric-a-brac, etc. etc. would so enormously increase in quantity and diminish in price as to be available to everyone. The sense of private ownership in many things would entirely disappear. Even at the present time we learn that in many of the cantons of Switzerland the habit of using in common the less expensive tools of agriculture, such as spades, hoes, wheelbarrows, etc., has resulted in such confusion of ownership that the real proprietor is often lost sight of. How much more would this be the case under a system of free production, with all the restrictions of money, exchange, and government generally removed. As the line of private ownership in a pin or a toothpick is now dimly defined, so under free conditions, when many articles would be produced as cheaply and as abundantly as pins and toothpicks are now, the sense of exclusive ownership would become quite as shadowy.

We claim exclusive ownership in many of the things we have because we fear that through deprivation of them we may be brought to want. Abolish the haunting spectre of poverty from men's minds, and we will no longer cry in fear: "This is mine; trespassers and thieves beware of the law!" Occupancy and use, not only in the land but also in the products of labor will become the only valid title.

Under free conditions the mutual desire for closer and ever closer unity of individuals will have no restraint except such as springs spontaneously from the instinct of self-preservation. Mutual aid will have wide encouragement, and the highest expression of this noble sentiment is found only in Communism.

Where can be realized the greatest security, the fullest assurance and measure of peace, of order, of all human virtues, if not in Communism? That the mutual aid principle reaches its highest expression in Free Communism is proved by studying the habits and modes of life of many animals inferior to men. The bee, the ant, the squirrel, the beaver—all peace-loving and constructive animals are Communists.

A beautiful illustration of the adaptation of ends to needs and of the natural tendency of society toward Communism is found in the operation of the law which urges individuals and communities to seek to gratify their desires with the least possible exertion, which is only another way of stating that progress moves along the line of least resistance. Our individualist friends—Free Commercialists as they are well named—are continually prating about the necessity for money and banks to control its issuance and circulation; for associations for defence, with their attendant paraphernalia of jails, jailers and possible hangmen; for competition with all its waste of time and energy; for private property with its harassing combinations and perplexities. Imagine now the thousand and one restrictions which oppress us removed; imagine the wonderful increase in production and consumption which will make wealth cheaper than poverty; imagine the hours of labor reduced, as they could well be, to three or four a day; imagine all kinds of wealth, all facilities of travel, communication and exchange so cheapened and made easy of access that want and business anxiety would be practically removed: following this line let your imagination soar to heights of luxury and enjoyment hitherto unknown, for it is admitted by all that you can safely do this and then try to imagine, if you can, a people having this great abundance, this power to multiply wealth, this "peace and joy that passeth all understanding," driving petty bargains, banking, issuing money, hiring private detectives to guard property from thieves, going to law over petty business transactions, punishing offenders with all the rigor of a Russian czar, advertising wares to catch customers.—Pshaw! The supposition is so absurd that it reflects upon the intelligence of mankind. Is it not absolutely certain that the law mentioned above, which causes us to seek happiness by the expenditure of the least exertion, would cause us to throw aside all this useless paraphernalia of trade and business and that Communism would be the inevitable result? Why, all the dictates of reason and common sense would demand it. The instinct of economy would demand it. Justice would demand it. Every sentiment of humanity would insist upon its recognition and demand it.

Thus we see that Free Communism is the natural step in the evolution of society, and that it is the system most conducive to general happiness. We see also that it will come freely, spontaneously, and in obedience to the laws of our being. Let us then cease to apologize for our advocacy of this glorious ideal. We should be proud of the faith that is within us, and of the reason for that faith. We should devoutly wish for the consummation of our desires, for by so doing we shall increase the possibility of their realization. We should work with untiring zeal and energy for this ideal of Heaven on earth. The Millennium? Aye, the Millennium. We need not be ashamed of it. We have had about as much Hell as we can stand. Let us work for Heaven here and now.

WM. HOLMES.

THE COMING CONFLICT.

I am haunted with a sense of the dominant, persuasive nature of the ancient moral law. It has ever reckoned sternly with the disregard that men have held it in, following as a sure, though often slow nemesis, long years after generations had come to feel quite secure in the practice of agreeable wickedness, and to believe that no disturbing hand ever would be

lifted to trouble them. But Egypt tasked her Israelites a straw too much; France, of the old regime, her third estate taxpayers, and the slave power America. Pride and power based on wrong is ever unstable, and there is a form of pride and power in our present politics which daily becomes more confident and more menacing.

The great political ferment and struggle of the near future will, probably center in our great American cities. New York and Brooklyn, Chicago, Philadelphia, Denver, Omaha, San Francisco, New Orleans and perhaps a score more will witness its slow, long tug for mastery, or register the fever heat or ebb to normal temperature of its fight for victory. It may call itself the movement for better city government, for civil service reform or purer politics, but back of varying, more or less descriptive terms, in which the phenomenon seeks to express itself, will be the fierce tooth and claw of almost primeval forces, rending and biting like great antediluvian beasts driven to the contest by a spirit of irreconcilable antagonism. Unscrupulous capital on the one side—not that capital is so—coagulating swiftly and inevitably into strong corporate forms, is grasping for its uses the great forces of modern scientific discovery—steam, electricity and the thousand conveniences to which their varied modern applications have given birth. With instinctive voracity it is wielding them in its Briarean hands to its own enrichment and advantage. On the other hand, the people—some rich, some poor, some wise, some unwise—perceiving dimly or clearly that popular rights, popular institutions are in danger, that popular legislatures and executives are being steadily undermined by a thousand subtle or potent corrupting influences, seek to fathom the meaning of the situation, and, more or less perfectly comprehending it, they begin to arm themselves and to close ranks for the battle.—Herbert Welsh in The New Review.

• • • • •

Immigration Commissioner Powderly has been the recipient of a great deal of notoriety since his authorization of the deportation of Rudolph Rocker and Amelia Witeroff because they were not married when they reached this country and refused to get married after their arrival. Powderly, it will be remembered, was for a long time the general master workman of the Knights of Labor and was the revered prophet of organized labor of this country. He annually led his devoted sheep to the ballot box to vote the Republican ticket. After a time his sheep threw him over and the Republican party naturally took him in out of the cold. And his sheep? They are now being led to the ballot box by other prophets. The sheep have become so accustomed to the prophets now that the latter do not even have to wear sheep's clothing.—I, Wellesley, Mass.

• • •

"It is openly charged by a staff correspondent of the Chicago Daily News at Washington, that Secretary of War Alger is at the head of a syndicate of Michigan boomers who are going into Cuba to gobble up all the special privileges they find lying around, and that Alger has used his official position and opportunities to secure a lead on the balance of the commercial pirates already on the islands or headed for it. It's a long descent from a "war of humanity" to a scramble for the monopoly of franchises in Cuba, and American capitalists are capable of the most shameless excesses in this colony business.—The Independent.

• • •

"You say that all who sympathize with the Haymarket victims are Anarchists. Well, if you understand what the word Anarchist means, I answer, yes, they are Anarchists. But let me tell you if you mean by Anarchist a man who is ready to slay right and left, good and bad, I say, no, we are no Anarchists. That kind of Anarchists are the money-lenders, the usurer, the politician of today, who cares not who goes under, just so he gets on top. See? What a fine Anarchist he is of the bomb-throwing kind. Only he uses others to do the throwing; he lacks the nerve."—Thoughts of the Hour.

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.

"Das Freie Wort," is the name of a new Hebrew Anarchist weekly. Write for sample copies to Rudolf Rocker, 4, Ponoma street, Liverpool, England.

The Comrades of Allegheny, Pa., are endeavoring to help Free Society along, but on account of our magnificent postal laws we are not allowed to specify the effort. If the readers of Free Society, however, are able to send 10 cents (or any amount they choose) till October 1, to A. Schneider, 330 Past st., Allegheny, Pa., they will hear from him directly.

The New Time (Chicago) asserts that the Merrimac was sunk in Santiago harbor to destroy the evidence of a colossal steal. A coat of paint and a barrel of white lead costs the government \$400,000, for the Merrimac had been condemned before the war and lay rotting in the dock. Another boat, the Mayflower, had been offered to a New York Yachtsman before the war for \$70,000 and was sold to the government for \$450,000. The Hanna family sold a boat to the government for \$100,000 which was built eighteen years ago by Mark Hanna for \$48,000. But this is only a small part of the robbery that has been perpetrated during the war. Government is an organization of robbers and the bird of prey its emblem.

"I am against murder, no matter how it is done, except in disposing of tyrants," says the editor of Thoughts of the Hour, Los Angeles, Calif. Shake hands Bro. Thourmoux!

According to the Coming Nation, George M. Paine, the millionaire of Oshkosh, Wis., was asked by a reporter of the Dispatch what kind of a weapon he would use to suppress a strike, and the millionaire promptly replied: "A Winchester!" He also said, "that the workmen themselves were to blame for the low wages that they receive." If the average workmen had as much common sense as this millionaire, they would soon rid themselves of the oppressors and enjoy freedom.

The Labor Day picnic, arranged by the Labor Council of this city, was not so well attended as one could have expected from the "avant-garde of the labor movement," but the worst feature of the picnic was the utter lack of interest taken in the speeches by the attendants. The average union man seems to consider the struggle between capital and labor as a mere business transaction. The first speaker was far in arrears of the average reformer. The second speaker, editor of the Coast Seamen's Journal, was more up-to-date and concluded with the advice that the workers should neither depend on the government nor on the legislature for relief, but think and act for themselves in behalf of their welfare. I hardly think though, that the speaker was aware of the fact that such utterances are extremely revolutionary and coincide with the teachings of the Anarchists. "The greatest victory of the people is the defeat of their own leaders," said Bakunin.

According to our great dailies the mountains and cities of Spain and Portugal are crowded with Anarchists and Socialists, and these countries are at the eve of a revolution. I wish we could for once trust the reports of the associated press.

"What is the predominating sentiment that causes them to forget what they are taught" asked a

reporter a... The good man sighed and answered: "Sardonically: 'The sentiment of hunger.'" This same sentiment makes also the Americans oblivious of what the have been taught in the public schools—that they are "free American citizens." One would suppose that the predicted bloodshed would cause the dailies to reflect upon prevailing conditions, but nothing of the kind seems to excite their sentiment; it is "the loss of capital that a revolution may cause" that bothers them.

It is a lamentable manifestation of ignorance of those reformers who hail the disarmament proposition of that monster called the Russian czar. Governments are based on force and violence, and can no more dispense with their armies than the eagle can get along without its beak and claws. Only when the czar resigns the throne can his proposition be taken seriously.

Says an exchange: "We cannot see what the American people have gained through the war with Spain." How shortsighted. The transport companies got rid of their old ships, sportsmen have sold their old yachts, wholesale dealers sold their rotten bacon and hams to the governments, politicians "have made thousands and millions of dollars as "commissioners" and "purchasing agents," the modern buccaneers and highwaymen have a larger field of robbery, and above all, every man, woman and child of the United States has the honor to pay \$7 taxes for the above mentioned gain. Governments are expensive luxuries.

I cannot agree with friend F. B. Livesey's proposition to lull the slaves asleep in the belief that they can secure their freedom through forbearance and persuasion. We are at the door of a revolution and the better we are prepared for it mentally and physically, the greater will be the gain. The victory of those opposing the present regime means more freedom, while the victory of plutocracy means a terrible massacre, reaction and abject slavery.

OPEN LETTER TO THE ARENA EDITOR.

Nine pages of September number are taken up with "Four remarkable Psychical Experiences" by Reverend B. F. Austin, B. A., D. D., Principal of Alma College, St Thomas, Ontario.

You waste your valuable space, and injure your Magazine as a reform factor, by printing any article bearing the prefix Reverend to the author's name. These parasites have always taught the poor to be content with the position in which "God" has placed them," sucking their life-blood, and in return inculcate idiotic superstitions. The chickens are beginning to mistrust these foxes in the management of their ranches. The concentrated knowledge of all the Reverends in the world does not exceed that of one poor "wayfaring man though a fool," as to the future state of disembodied souls.

The article on "Prayer" by Mrs. Boalt, in August number, was both interesting and educational; but the nine pages you devote to its criticism in the September issue, by Virginia Yeaman Remnitz, and Annie G. Brown, will only raise a feeling of pity from thinking persons, on account of their childish, ignorant superstition; and the influence on readers of weak intellect will be as degrading as the christianity taught by the priests during 1898 years, has proved to be.

Annie says "Man cannot live by bread alone," (material food) "but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God" (spiritual food). We can readily see that the spiritual side of this clause is its important part. But we are not to understand that "our Father" does not regard our temporal welfare, or feel for our sufferings. He has made ample provision for all our creature wants, and "He himself originates none of the sufferings of His children."

As Annie does not explain why this Omniscient, Omnipotent, Omnipresent, Omnivorous, Omnibus (for all sins) permits the few millionaires to live like Solomon (concubines included), without work, we would like her to study up the question further, by conferring with our 4,000,000 hungry, ragged, and homeless tramps, then pass on to interview our 14,000,000 "sovereign people" who are in daily dread of being forced into a similar awful condition. Also—as Annie knows all about God—will she inform us why a few of "His children" own millions of acres of "Father's" land, while millions of

His children... though land to be buried in.

It would be interesting to know Annie's age, and if she has reasoned out the fact that, if "God is all and in all," she must be God, and how extremely absurd it is for one part of her anatomy to kneel to another part of her anatomy—God kneeling to Himself.

Annie also makes the remark "If the Bible teaches us anything," etc. It most certainly teaches and tells things that are considered great crimes by our present christian nations, and according to United States laws too vile to pass through the mails!! (See 1 Sam. 18: 27. Gen. 16: 2. Gen. 19: 33, 34, 35, 36. 2 Sam. 16: 21. Amos 2: 7). It also teaches us that the God who gave such orders as recorded in the Old Testament out-devils the devil, whoever that individual may be.

Again, Josephine Rand in her "Cuba" says:

"Alas, dear God, and must war still obtain—
— Yea, from the heav'n's a Voice proclaims God's will—
Thou, the oppressed, downtrodden, struggling land,
Shall yet be freed from the oppressor's hand;
Thy fields shall drink no more thy martyr's blood,
But feed thy famished ones, obey thy word,
Bring forth the wealth with which thy soil is stored,
And cause thy ransomed ones to praise the Lord."

If the poet does not realize the facts, you know Mr. Editor, that the Cubans instead of being crushed and robbed by Spanish governmental tax gatherers, it will be the American tax eaters who will crush and rob them in future—it is only a change of tyrants. There is more truth in the following doggerel (the result of the first five minutes spent in writing verse since my beard developed):

Liberty and life, longed for by Cubans,
The Almighty God of the Americans
Will never grant thee, this greatest boon,
Which he withholds from "native son."
They, by the millions starve, and languish.
'Tis millionaires who feast, the tramp must perish.
Wherever uniforms of priests and armies
Flaunt and luxuriate by means of lies,
Laborers in youth grow old
And die, before this great God—Gold.

Every "live" American should read John Clark Ridpath's article "The Republic and the Empire." It begins: "A revolution is at the door. It impends like a cloud on the horizon. Whether we shall accept it and its results remains to be determined; but that a great transformation of political society is in the dawn let no man longer doubt."

"Woman's Future Position in the World," by Lizzie M. Holmes, is exceedingly good, and of course, to the point. "Social and Economic Condition, Yesterday and Today," are clearly stated by B. O. Flower.

Why do you not boldly advocate the only line of action that can evolve the millenium, i. e. Anarchy, whose principles were so clearly defined by the Nazarene: "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them," and dare to use, in its correct sense, this much abused word.

KINGHORN-JONES.

WOMAN AND RELIGION.

Does religion help a woman to gain her freedom? Does it do anything for her happiness and pleasure? The clergy, by ephisthry which a child should comprehend, will tell you that without religion—the religion of the Bible—woman can have no freedom; and only on the continuance of that Bible religion does her happiness now and forever depend. Let us go back to the "beginning." She was first created, formed and fashioned from man's rib, and was made simply for him, for his use and pleasure. Study the Bible carefully from Genesis to Revelations and you will see that woman is considered man's inferior, according her no social nor political rights. But Eve was just a little smarter than Adam, for she discovered that "the tree in the midst of the garden," the tree of "the knowledge of good and evil" was desired to make one wise, and she plucked and ate, finding it good and following out her generous impulse she persuaded Adam, and he ate also. A sad time it has been ever since then for the woman, for the curse "thy desire shall be unto thy husband and he shall rule over thee" is still in force. Here you see is the mandate making the husband the ruler of the wife. The priest, the preacher, have from the earliest days taught this, the church teaches it, and even now the promise "to obey" is given at the marriage altar. Is it any wonder that women are still in bondage, suffering untold humiliation and misery?

During the sixth century, I think it was, a council consisting of fifty-six bishops met in solemn conclave

to discuss and decide the great and momentous question, "Has a woman a soul?" They deliberated upon it long and carefully; they prayed over it and finally adjourned without coming to a decision, but the majority of the evidence was convincing that she had no soul. The early church Fathers were unanimous as to the wickedness and utter worthlessness of woman. St. Bernard said, "Woman is the organ of the Devil." St. Chrysostom, while a little more complimentary, has no high opinion of woman. Listen: "Woman is a necessary evil, a natural temptation, a desirable calamity, a domestic peril of a fascinating character and a painted mischief." There are hundreds of such libelous utterances, but these are sufficient to show you the trend.

Coming a little nearer our time, in 1860 a man by the name of Payne, in Nashville, Tenn., wrote two pamphlets to prove that women and negroes had no souls. He, being a Hebrew scholar, referred to the "original Hebrew" as well as to the St. James version and proved by both that Eve was simply an animal and did not leave the garden of Eden with Adam, but left with the "other animals."

"Therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden to till the ground from whence he was taken," Genesis 3: 24, 25.

In 1889 the Rev. J. B. Simmons, D. D. at New York said: "It cannot be denied that in morals and religion woman, when God created her, was a deplorable failure; from the day she turned her back on God she became a reprobate."

Think of that! An "allwise, allpowerful God, who could make no mistake, according to all the teachings of orthodoxy, making such a failure as woman! Is it not dreadful? And the preachers have not changed, for in this year 1898 in Nashville, Tenn., a baptist minister said: "The sentence of God against woman still lives in this age, and the guilt necessarily lives with it." Notwithstanding this opinion is held by the priests and clergy, and it must be if they believe in and teach the Bible, women uphold all the institutions of religion. The churches could not exist were it not for the women. Is there no way to arouse them? Is there no way to bring before them the narrowing, dwarfing effect on their minds and their lives of this terrible doctrine? It has been very forcibly brought to my mind these last two days. A great camp meeting has been running full force for nearly two weeks; I attended two meetings; that was enough. Nothing new taught—the same old heaven and hell, but it was noticeable the slighting way in which they referred to the women. But the poor foolish "sisters" did not realize it and sat there listening to the "man of God," and they constituted fully one half—yes, two thirds of the audience. They endure any hardship to attend "divine service," taking all the family with them, and the Tennessee family is rarely a small one. How I wanted to throw a "bomb in the camp" and by asking a few questions open their eyes.

Just once during the two sermons the need of the "weaker sex" was spoken of. That was when the young women were urged to "come into the fold so that the brothers would come." The preacher probably did not think or did not understand that the young men would be "drawn into the fold" not by "saving grace," "holiness" or anything of a religious character, but because the attraction between the sexes drew them there.

Mother nature asserts herself every time. Woman must free herself; the first step is to come from under the domination of priest, preacher and church. Prove to yourself that these are all preaching and teaching fraud; that the church is based upon fraud; that this religion has served its purpose in evolution, then step up beyond it, out from it and the gates of freedom will open unto you. But so long, oh woman, as you kiss the priestly heel that tramples upon you, just so long you will endure the humiliation that is now heaped upon you. It requires courage and an asserting of self, but it pays to come out from among them. You will find yourself in good company.

Hustburg, Tenn.

NELLIE M. JERAULD.

WHAT ONE MAN CAN DO.

No. 3.

COMETOCKISM.

Mr. Chamberlain sends me an advance sheet of the "American Press Association," containing an article of his "Our Boasted Freedom—The right of Free Press Trampled Upon for Partisan Ends," which is admirable. This article will probably appear in many papers.

He sends me another article, apparently an editorial by him in the Advertisers Guide, of New Market, N. Y., for August. This article also proves that Mr. Chamberlain would be a valiant champion for an anti-Comstock crusade. There ought to be a score of men like Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Tucker right in New York who would jump at the chance to divest the country of Comstock, and there ought to be a score of lawyers like Bolton Hall and Ingersoll who would jump at the chance to afflict him with their legal power. But Comstock belongs to the Outlook crowd and Bolton Hall seems to write for it, so, how will the antagonism of this reformer stand? Then Ingersoll would probably want an immense fee if his services were availed of. And then there is the old Truth Seeker, of New York, whose founder, D. M. Bennett, suffered vastly from Comstockism—it ought to be able to banish the long-winded theorizations of some of its correspondents and publish the trivial and simple facts of an anti-Comstock crusade; but, as it is, it will hardly dare to publish an intimation thereof. Thus Freethinkers, Anarchists, Socialists, Single Taxers and reformers generally have it all "in your mind" and not in the hand. Look, however, at the Christian Citizen, 151 La Salle st., Chicago, and see how its writers and others come down to practical work in their respective lines. Yes, and just this kind of effort is coiling the curfew, another compulsory law, about the people of the country.

It's a free country, comparatively, and if these church people can accomplish things without bombs and blood, why cannot we? We ought to have powers of reason, persuasion and practical adaptableness just as good.

SINGLE TAX IN BALTIMORE.

Dr. William N. Hill, of 1438 E. Baltimore st., Baltimore, is the leading spirit in a proposed Single Tax political movement in Baltimore. Having heard that Single Tax would do away with the public schools, as it would with all other forms of State charity, I wrote Mr. Hill for information. He said, in part: "I think my friends, the Anarchists, who oppose State education altogether, are as much in error as those who go to the opposite extreme of compulsory education. In a strict sense, public schools may not be numbered among the functions of the State; but they belong to that category of social functions which can be performed cheaper and better by society organized as a State than by individuals." As our friend Mr. Barnes is a Single Taxer, I will let him digest Dr. Hill's statement. Dr. Hill says further: "There is no probability of compulsory education being adopted in Maryland." This proves that the doctor is not very well "up" in Maryland matters, unless he confides in my ability to continue the regular fight against bills introduced in our legislature for it. Unless the Single Taxers get too earnest in their advocacy of State measures, I am disposed to let them stir up things in Baltimore to what little extent they can, that some benighted people may come to know that there is something in the world besides the Republican and Democratic parties.

ALL SORTS OF SUBJECTS.

Mr. Barnes sent me a Single Tax pamphlet, entitled "Why." It contained an able Single Tax article from his pen—able as that theory goes—and an advertisement of Mr. Post's new Chicago paper, The Public. I thought from its title it would certainly be a paper brimful of letters and articles from the people; but a number of sample copies showed me that it only contained selections and editorials. Of course, these were excellent; but such papers are out of touch with the people.

Bolton Hall has exhibited a great sympathy for children of late. I am sorry he did not exhibit it in time to frustrate compulsory education for his State of New York. This is the greatest of tyrannies to both children and parents. All the many old fashioned chastisements I got when a boy, were as nothing compared to the torture of mind and body I underwent in the best of the conventional schools.

Dr. Nichols sends me August Free Life. I am sorry to not see some friendly word in it for Bedfordshire. There can be no "free life" until there is free speech, free pen and free mails. [And what about the bread? A. I.]

The Baltimore American, of August 13, gave a dispatch stating that Anarchists in Brussels had been shooting policemen and others and that some among them had been shot and captured in return. I immediately dropped the American a letter stating that the American Anarchists were no longer of that type;

however, if the American pointed me to "The Lovers of Liberty" in Free Society of August 7, where an organization is called for embracing secrecy and revolution, I would have to ask Messrs. Oliver, Quinn and Puetzner what I should reply. Comrades, tell me your aims and let us see if we can't secure them without bombs and blood.

I have noted in some back numbers of the Salt Lake City Deseret News and New Orleans Picayune some sex problems discussed very much in line with Anarchy. Of course, there are really more Anarchists than we have any knowledge of. I was, myself, one who recently came to the surface.

"The Law of Service" is a strong letter by Jas. T. R. Green, of Des Moines, Ia., in Farmer's Voice of Aug. 13. He says: "When reformers learn to use the omnipotent force of force and voluntary service, not for selfish ends but for justice, they will wipe out every monopoly in existence. Meantime reformers worship other gods."

Comrade Small longs for a few more men to do just what he and I are doing, viz: swap papers, keep each other posted and take up pens against enemies and for friends. All this can be done sitting at home, with very little expense, and will tend to change the current of men's thought as effectually as the lectures of a man out on an expensive tour.

My old and appreciative Socialist friend, J. T. Irons, of Athol, Idaho, sends for my endorsement the pamphlet of the Majority Rule League, which he says is the most direct way of reaching direct legislation. He says also he thinks it will meet with the approbation of the International Voluntaryists. I must tell him that I have not voted for many years and that I am finding, as the years roll by, less and less encouragement to reform through political methods.

Sykesville, Md.

FRANCIS B. LIVESLEY.

"PATRIOTIC" PARAGRAPHS.

Much indignation is being aroused in "patriotic" circles about the inhuman treatment accorded the "brave boys" who flew to "their" country's defense in her trying hours of need. Which has suggested the question, "Does one lot of slaves deserve better treatment than another?"

If the industrial slaves who stayed at home and manufactured the munitions of war, gold mounted harness and princely fare for Miles and his staff, received a wage that would enable them to purchase sufficient of the common necessities of life to insure a healthy existence: there might be some logical justification for this surreptitious outburst of rage.

Why don't these yowling mealy-mouthed idle politicians cry out against the injustice and inhumanity of the mine and factory owners, whose avaricious greed is the cause of more misery and death in one day than all that of the Cuban war "mismanagement?"

But that is not a part of his trade: his business is to attain to power where he can rule and ride the ignorant working slaves, who at his command will take up arms and wade to the bridges in each other's gore that he may have "glory," bonds and fat contracts.

And here arises the question, "do these menials deserve any better treatment than they received?"

If I desire to destroy the life of my neighbor that I may take possession of his property, and hire Weary Willie and Jonny Blockhead to do the job, should I have any more respect for or treat them with any more regard for their personal comfort and health, than if I had hired them to thrash my wheat or plant my corn?

Trimmed of all his gauzy adornments, what else is the soldier but a hired assassin who for a stipulated sum per day contracts to kill, maim and ravish his fellows; men, women and children alike, go down to earth to satisfy his fiendish desire for plunder and false glory.

Of those who took part in the late war some may have been influenced by that superstition known as patriotism. But a desire for strange scenes, dreams of adventurous glory and \$13 per month were the chief attractions that lured the "boys" into the defense of Cuban "freedom."

Liberty! Bosh! What does the American workman know or care about liberty for Cuba, himself a most subservient slave, who cringes before his capitalistic master 364 days in the year, and on July 4 howls about something that has been dead more than 100 years. "Cuban liberty" means exactly what American liberty signifies; the liberty of a new set of masters to freely exploit and enslave the consummate asses they mockingly call "sovereign free citizens."

But our poor soldiers were starved and otherwise ill-used by the "champions" of freedom—McKinley et al. Indeed, any man who went to Cuba at the behest of such notorious rascals thinking thereby he was serving the cause of human liberty is a fool, and deserved no better fate. And as for the adventurer who would exchange the lives of his fellows for the gratification of his own lurid fancies, he ought to have been shot.

Come home, O ye libertarians, heroes of Cuban emancipation, and strike the shackles from the withered limbs of your own countrymen; then will the world applaud, and your deeds be emblazoned in letters of fire upon the dome of the temple of liberty.

Fear not, kind masters, the "boys" have no intention of taking any such steps. Your agents in command may ill-use and abuse and starve them, yet their "noble" sense of loyalty to you and your country predominates over any petty selfish thought that might creep into their lofty altruistic "minds." Why, they are now as I write hurrying in all the ardor of their patriotic zeal, and scarce ere the hearts blood of their Spanish brethren is dry upon their bayonets or the noise of their murderous gatlings has ceased to echo on their ears, to the rescue of your brothers the coal barons of Pana, Ill., whose slaves have dared resist a reduction of the pittance it has pleased said barons to so kindly allow them. Need I foreshadow the result? No! Glistening steel, machine guns, naked and starving wives and babes can produce but one result: submission.

The plutocratic Chicago Tribune has collected and published the names of 1300 fighting serfs who died from exposure, caused, it says, by the criminal negligence and incompetency of the commanders. Now then, let us have another table showing the number of industrial soldiers and their dependents, whom the gross indifference and murderous rapacity of the captains of industry have sent to premature graves. But that would be "Anarchistic howling" while the other is "revelations."

JAY FOX.

SOME REMARKS.

I am an Anarchist, and yet not an Anarchist. I fully believe in the principles, but I would be sorry to have all government destroyed in a moment. I believe in progression and growth. I am well satisfied with the growth as I see it. I would hurry it if I could and do by spreading the light. When Fremont proclaimed freedom in Missouri, I enlisted to aid him, and was terribly disappointed when Lincoln annulled the order and recalled him. Now, I believe Fremont was premature and that the Emancipation Proclamation was issued at the right time to be successful.

I bide my time and teach, fully believing that when the time comes, step by step, the right will win. I am sorry to see the belligerency of reformers toward each other. Anarchists, Single Taxers, Socialists—especially State Socialists—bitterly denouncing each other. I have no such feeling. I am glad for every step taken from the present chaotic system. Though such reforms may still be loaded with a multitude of traditions, and oppressive conditions, I gladly welcome their success. If I see what I think to be errors, and if it will do any good, I point them out in love, never with denunciation of persons. I am sure that people generally want to do what is best. The few that are benefited by the wrong are the only ones not open to conviction if prejudices are removed. Denunciation never removes prejudices, put love and gentleness does.

O friends, let us love and suffer. The unselfish devotion of the Portland and San Francisco Anarchists has done more to win me than volumes of tirades would have done. Your unselfish devotion to spreading the light will tell more than all the bombs in the world. Resistance to oppression, when resistance can be effectual, but love and patient suffering all the time

to win the hearts of even enemies.

B. F. ODELL.

Flagler, Colo.

Comrade Odell seems to be under the impression that we endeavor to destroy all governments "in a moment" and yet we never fail to emphasize that such is an impossible proposition, that it necessarily must be a matter of growth. But I freely confess that when I see the suffering and misery inflicted upon mankind by government, I am not satisfied with the slow process of growth and would destroy all dominating powers with a sudden blow, for I am convinced that people would even in their present stage of development live more harmoniously and happier without government. Realizing though that the desire for freedom must first be awakened in the minds of the slaves before they will free themselves, I do all I can in spreading the idea of freedom.

The action of Fremont was not premature but simply a logical sequence of the situation. Without the preceding propaganda of emancipation and the so-called "premature actions" of the agitators, Lincoln would not have issued the proclamation.

So long as the belligerency among reformers does not develop into personal hostility it is a very encouraging phenomenon, for harmony in ideas is intellectual death. On the other hand, we cannot too strongly antagonize ideas which, if realized, would lead us deeper into the mire of slavery. That not all reform ideas have a progressive tendency christianity has clearly demonstrated. Christ's ideas were in some respects in advance of those prevailing at that time, but the anxiety for success prompted the "leaders" to compromise with the dominating powers and customs and so we had the "dark ages," the catholic church with all its terrors—far behind the civilization of the Greeks and the Moors in Spain.

As to the "unselfish devotion" of certain Anarchists I will emphasize again, that there is no such quality in man. We all act to satisfy our own self. We may endure hardship, privation and suffer persecution and prosecution on account of our ideas, yet we cannot help it. To disavow my ideas would cause me greater suffering than the sight of a gallows, consequently I am selfish. Self-satisfaction is what we all seek.

A. I.

SOME MORE QUEER THINGS.

The excellent article in Free Society by Nellie M. Jerauld, entitled "Some Queer Things," made me think of some more queer things. For instance, I found in a recent number of the Christian Register a review of E. V. Zenker's book "Anarchism," which review, if you have space to print, will be rich reading for some of your readers, * and in the same number the enclosed article entitled "The Coming Conflict" is given a prominent place. These are queer things to me.

It is also queer to read in our metropolitan newspapers of "Imperial America." Her flag waving over new and vast possessions, etc.—yet, perhaps, it really isn't queer after all. For the tendency so long has been toward imperialism that even the dullest can understand that there is a conspiracy existing to overthrow even the semblance of a republic. (We have, what Bro. Streeter of the Vineland, N. J. Independent calls "a mine man government.") Another queer thing is to hear our political friends talking about "emancipated Cubans."

They don't see the money power behind the scenes taxing the Cubans to starvation and then bonding us for trying to help the Cubans "shake" their brutal task-masters. Nor did we even try to help them till the money power got ready. The tobacco trust, the sugar trust, the railroad trust and the holders of Spanish bonds in Cuba had to be consulted first. These are only a few of the queer things we notice every day.

MYRA PEPPERS.

FINDS FAULT WITH ANARCHISTS.

In your issue of August 7, there is a call to Anarchists to write a "declaration of principles" for a proposed "organization." Such declaration of principles to be "given over to a committee, consisting of five representatives."

Is not this a strange proceeding to organize themselves? What is organization but government? (1)

* The review will be published when we are able to issue eight pages. At present we must devote the space of Free Society to more urgent questions.

A. I.

What are Representatives but Governors? (2)

To a simple mind it certainly seems odd. It also seems odd that we nowhere meet Anarchists demonstrating their ideas. We nowhere meet a lot of Anarchists living together without government. If it is a good idea for the whole, it ought to be a good idea for the part. (3)

You do not certainly desire to deceive yourself. You do not desire to vainly waste your life in the field of the impossible. You advocate the multitude living together without organization, i. e. without government. Surely if you know it to be the impossible—if you know that it would be absolutely impossible to get a handful of Anarchists to live together without organization, without government, then you know it also absolutely impossible to get 100,000,000 people to dwell together without organization or government. (4)

QUESTION.

COMMENT.

1.—When it is pointed out to a Socialist that the participation in capitalistic legislation is incompatible with Socialism, and that social conditions cannot be altered by legislative methods, he is ever ready with the reply that we are not yet living under Socialism and their present efforts must be considered as a question of tactics in their propaganda. But when propositions relating to methods of propaganda come from an Anarhist source, then it is a horse of a different color, and our Socialist friends immediately imagine that we are living in a condition of Anarchy and finds occasion to point out the inconsistency of Anarchists.

The promulgators of the above mentioned call do not pretend to carry out Anarchist principles, neither are the Anarchists as a body responsible for the call. It is simply an individual effort to hasten the downfall of our infernal social system, and the demerits of the proposition have already been pointed out in the Anarchist press.

As to organization it may be government or it may not—it depends entirely on the character of the organization or on the definition of the term. If thereby is meant collective action of those who unanimously agree to do one thing, it is not government. But if it is a collective body in which the majority decides the action to be pursued and the minority has to submit, whether it agrees with the decision or not, then it is government—tyranny. I may insert here that, to my mind, people can only—without committing themselves to an absurdity—associate (or organize, if you prefer the term) on a proposition agreed upon in advance. To agree to respect what has not been determined, is ridiculous.

2.—Yes, representatives with legislative power are governors.

3.—Why, my dear State Socialist, why "do we nowhere meet a lot of "scientific" Socialists demonstrating their idea," etc. "If it is a good idea for the whole it ought to be a good idea for the part." But if the anonymous writer will pay us a visit I will introduce him to Anarchists who do live without government and are trying to demonstrate their ideal so far as possible under existing conditions, and none of the Anarchists accuses them of not being Anarchists. We see also that there are some Socialists who endeavor to demonstrate their idea by co-operation and colonizing, but their ballot-box-wire-pulling comrades do not hesitate to denounce them as "utopians."

4.—If "Question" had read Free Society, or any other Anarchist publication, he would know that we do not consider it impossible "to dwell together without government," and would not have wasted this effusion. Some little thinking may also convince him that government is the greatest disturbing element in society.

A. I.

This our earth this day produces sufficient for our existence, this our earth produces not only a sufficiency, but a superabundance, and pours a cornucopia of good things down upon us. Further, it produces sufficient for stores and granaries to be filled to the roof-tops for years ahead. I verily believe that the earth in one year produces enough food to last for thirty. Why, then, have we not enough? Why do people die of starvation, or lead a miserable existence on the verge of it? Why have millions upon millions to toil from morning to evening just to gain a mere crust of bread? Because of the absolute lack of organization, by which such labor should produce its effect; the absolute lack of distribution: the absolute lack, even, of the very idea that such things are possible. Nay, even to mention such things, to say that they are possible, is criminal with many. Madness could hardly go further.—Richard Jeffries.

RECEIPTS.

Week ending Saturday, September 3.

Task, Crauk, each \$1.
Barto, Hamon, Schenck, Aronberg, Shisgall, Troop, each 50c.
Kaplan, G. H. Berg, Bock, Fryburn, Daniliewicz, each 25c.
Behrman, Malice, each 10c.