

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. 49.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., SUNDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1898.

WHOLE NO. 185.

DEATH AND THE LADY.

The lady rode, with Death beside,
To kill the birds and hares,
Nor dream'd this Prince, who shared her ride,
Pursued her life in theirs!

But beautiful was she as Light,
And he as foul as Hell;
So, whilst he delt her darts to smite,
He timed her movements well

He grinn'd, while whirr'd the widow's bird,
The crippled stag to see:
Shots, not yet fired, he saw and heard;
A boding Seer is he!

He heard, behind her pageant vain,
The dogs of Want and Sin,
Saw worms within her silken train,
And grinn'd his ceaseless grin!

He saw six hundred horses' fed,
Six hundred hamlets pine,
That she might hunt—saw altars red
With blood not pour'd from kine.

Her shafts she drew from out his claw,
But he sometimes strung one
Which all, save this last victim, saw.
He shot the Lady's son!

The Nobe of Austria weeps:
Yet still the deer must bleed,
The paupers starve—the Huntsman keeps
One shot for one last deed!

The Lady has her Huntsman met—
His eyes her beauty slay!
Forth, from those pining hamlets, set
That Huntsman for his prey!

C. L. JAMES.

BOODLE.

The Alturas Plaindealer, published at Alturas, Cal., in its issue of September 22, contained the following two editorial paragraphs anent the republican convention:

There is as much difference between an Anarchist and a Socialist as between a Mahomedan and a Quaker. And yet the late Republican convention uses them as synonymous terms—as twin epithets—bandying them and hurling them at any and every one who dares believe that there should be one law for rich and poor—who dares stand up for the rights of the masses against the injustice and wrongs of the classes. Such a man is Jas. G. Maguire—the bravest and brainiest of all the men of California.

The Republican platform denounces Single Tax as Socialistic and Anarchistic. Any pocket dictionary would have told them that one is directly the opposite of the other, and saved them making fools of themselves. Anarchy is the absence of all law, while the Socialists believe that every thing should be governed by law.

Whereupon I forwarded to the Plaindealer manuscript of the following article:

Editor Plaindealer:

Dear Sir,—In your just criticisms of the Republican convention and platform you assert that Anarchy is the absence of all law. That is an error. Anarchy is the negation of all government made-laws. But in the absence of the laws of governments the law of reason becomes the only guide and eventuates in the natural voluntary adjustment of the industrial affairs of the people, which is the only important factor in society. (See Thomas Paine's "Rights of Man.")

The monopoly of the natural resources, principal among which is land—causing rent, and the monopoly of the medium of exchange—causing interest, are at the bottom of all the misery and wretchedness of humanity. (See Proudhon.) These monopolies are entrenched behind government; in fact any keen observer knows that—particularly in this country—monopoly is the government.

But aside from its ruinous effects upon the industrial affairs of mankind the very principle of government—especially in this country—is a usurpation. To govern means to rule; to rule means to subjugate, to coerce. The Declaration of Independence asserts the freedom

* This was the actual number of Franz Joseph's stud, during the war of 1859, when the Austrian empire was insolvent. The empress was a mighty huntress.

of all men. How can freedom and equality be reconciled with coercion?!

The governmentalist, of course, offers the excuse of majority rule in this country. As a matter of fact only one twentieth of the voters of this country are represented. (See Alfred Cridge's "Proportional Representation.") Hence the minority really rules. And this is not speaking of the females at all who are human beings and ought to be entitled to a voice also, if men are.

But even the rule of majorities, if such did obtain, might become as unbearable as that of one, and in some cases indeed more so.

The affairs of human beings must be adjusted scientifically if they are to be adjusted satisfactorily, and science does not call for the judgment of majorities; in fact it is never found there; it is always the numerically insignificant minority whence science issues.

"No man is good enough to rule another," said Abraham Lincoln.

All government rests upon brute force. The progressive, refined spirit of the age has put its seal of condemnation upon the barbarous principle of brute force as an adjuster of man's relations; it calls for freedom, for voluntary association, for the principle of attraction, which alone can ever insure "peace on earth and good will to man."

The Republican gentlemen from the rural districts who were so liberal in the use of terms of whose meanings they were evidently ignorant, would do well to consult a modern standard dictionary before they attend the next convention or draw up another platform. The Century Dictionary, in the compilation of which the best staff of scientists and specialists were certainly employed, thus defines 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."

The manuscript was returned to me accompanied by the following letter:

My Dear Sir,—Yours received, but regret to say have not space for the discussion of such questions.

While I fully agree with you, and in all you say, regarding the abuses of our social system, the remedy, I fear, would be worse than the disease. We would be simply flying "from the ills we have to those we know not of."

WM. THOMPSON.

Now, what questions does Wm. Thompson mean? Did I wish to discuss religion or metaphysics, or some science foreign to an ordinary newspaper? No! I was offering an article on the science of society, a subject the very discussion of which by himself was my incentive. More than that, in the same issue for which he refused the publication of my article, he published an editorial of half a column on "Anarchy and Anarchists," to which I intend to return some future day if my time permits. Nor can the excuse of lack of space be offered, for the issue teems with trash. Two pages are filled with an illustrated biography of the "greatest statesman of the present century," (Bismarck) articles such as "Mrs. Cleveland's Courtesy," and other similar palaver. And the balance of two pages contains advertisements of two of the greatest enemies of mankind—lawyers (liars) and doctors (poisoners), \$5.00 cards of the regular (Republican and Democratic) boodle parties' nominees, and a few editorial items, for the importance and intelligence of which—outside of the article above mentioned on Anarchism, the following first and last ones are fair specimens:

First: "A Cincinnati brewer owns a hog that gets drunk like a man." (Too bad the hog can't vote, for it would make a fine subject for a \$5.00 nominee.) Last: "Affairs in the Nile region has assumed a more pacific phase," etc. (Thompson's revised grammar.)

Now, to the Plaindealer's policy. It started, I understand, as a Democratic organ, then turned Populistic and finally returns to the first love—the Democratic fold. Why these many changes, it doesn't take a scientist to surmise!—

Thompson says, "the remedy" (Anarchism) "is worse than the disease" and that he fears "it would be simply flying 'from the ills we have to those we know not of.'" Indeed? What worse state of affairs could he perceive than five millions of "free" American citizens tramping over the country in a semi-starved condition, some of them driven into enlisting in the relic of barbarism (war) to murder other poor equally starved human beings; women prostituting their bodies for the want of food, and children starving to death?!

No! sweet William, that is but a subterfuge. Be honest and say, not that you have "no space for the discussion of such questions," (which you belie by your own article on the same question), but that you have no space for the discussion of any question from any standpoint but that of the \$5.00-boodle-politicians that dictate your policy, in short that you wear the boodle collar!

S. D.

AS OTHERS SEE US.

Leon Flutener, a well-to-do Swiss merchant traveling in this country, has given some of the results of his observations to a California newspaper. He does not think we Americans have much to brag of in the way of a free country. He says:

The United States are looked upon all over Europe with great admiration and respect. I find much here, however, that disappoints me. It is true that nine out of ten of your families find it hard to make not that ends meet. Rents, interest, taxes, high prices, and you ing and other necessities make it essent there are so middle and lower classes to labor almost in the con-

Your Rockefeller gives a million dollars to a Baptist college, and then raises the price of coal oil and gets his million back out of the pockets of the people. Your Mr. Stanford founds a university, and follows Mr. Rockefeller's example by charging all the traffic will bear. In the eastern states hundreds freeze to death with mountains of coal in sight. You must admit you have a curious kind of a republic.

In California I find thousands and thousands of acres of land uncultivated and unused. Under your fine system some old men and old women are able to keep the millions of land-hungry people from owning or even renting the broad acres which the monopolists have fenced in and neither sell, improve nor use in any way. Los Angeles could support a half million people if the ranches north of you were broken up.

As you gather from my conversation, I am not at all sure that Americans need to feel any great pride over their country. It is better than Europe, but it is drifting to class government very fast. My experience in my pedestrian tour south will show you how free your people are. Dressed in a rough suit, and often dust and mud stained, I did not look very far removed from a tramp. I asked no favors, paid for what I got, and yet on four occasions I was halted by constables, rudely asked my business, and it was only too plain that they were eager to make a fee out of me as a vagrant. In this alleged free country of yours I find it is a crime to walk your highways and ask for work; and, furthermore, it seems that the rural constables and justices, to use an American phrase, pool their issues and consider it a crime for a man to walk at all. In a little town in Ventura county a constable actually arrested me, and only gave up his prize reluctantly when I showed him letters from the Swiss consul and from influential friends of mine. As I walked away I said to myself, "And so this is the starry land of freedom—the home of the oppressed of all nations." I wondered as I saw an American flag flying over a California schoolhouse, if the children could grow up to respect an emblem which represents a government that protects land monopolists and sends men to jail for walking its highways and asking for work—Ex.

"Government is the great blackmailer."—Buckle.

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, 45 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.

NOTE AND COMMENT.

Comrade C. L. James, Eau Claire, Wis., informs us that he is now almost able to publish his lectures on the History of the Jews, but not quite so yet, and if some readers feel inclined to assist him they may send their contributions to him direct. All those who have contributed toward the publication will receive full value at cost price.

Troops were sent to Pana, Ill., ostensibly to protect citizens, but as far as can be judged from the meager reports they are as usually protecting the interest of the mine owners. It is utterly folly to expect a different attitude from the government.

The whitewashing procedure of the investigating committee concerning the criminals in the war department is nicely advancing. The committee has found that the system and not the individuals are to blame for the outrages perpetrated upon the soldiers. One would suppose the members of the committee are Anarchists and Socialists who have gone in their researches to the root of the evils in society. But the "enemies of society" will still continue to ask, why is not the poor devil who steals a loaf of bread or murders for the sake of dollars excused on the same ground? Is not in his instance the system also re-
ble?

to the great strike inaugurated in Paris, atic mouthpieces express apprehension that as "might throw up their weapons and fire in the air. Therein lies the great damage in the situation." We see "therein" no "damage," but consider it a very encouraging sign of the times, for as soon as the slaves refuse to kill each other there is hope that the social question can be settled peaceably.

The utterances of the Indians, who are now rebelling against the outrages of their agents and the fraudulent manipulations of rich lumber men, show that they possess more common sense and a far greater spirit of independence than the vast majority of the American workmen. Thus reads the report:

They said the Indians had cause to fight; that they had been robbed and cheated generally, and that now they are about to be cheated of their timber and left to starve or die. Sometime a fight must come, they said, for the Indians would rather die from bullets than hunger, and since the braves were aroused to the situation now, and strengthened by what they consider the defeat of the troops last Wednesday, they were ready to fight; and since they no longer hoped for justice from the government, a fight there would be.

The Voice of Labor says very appropriately:

"Another Indian outbreak." Such are the headlines of our daily papers, followed by a list of killed and wounded soldiers, who had been sent to quell the outbreak, and perhaps a few lines at the bottom detailing that the Indians were wiped out, or surrendered to be tried for murder. The popular cry that the only "good Indian is a dead one," does a vast amount of harm, and allows the rascally Indian agent a scope to defraud which is practically without limit. The people of Minnesota, where the Chippewa Indians are now "breaking out," have lived in close proximity to and in harmony with them for many years; they have hired them on farms and employed them in many different ways; have seen them go to school and become educated, and watched and wondered how they could exist—they did not live in the usual meaning of the word—in a section of country where no white people could exist, aside from a scanty allowance by the government, on wild berries and fish from the lake; and yet they have "broke out." Why? Because, we doubt not some rascally lumber firm is in need of what little that is left of timber on their reservation, or a game preserve club wants it for shooting purposes, and the Indian agent must make an outbreak, so that they can be driven off their land. This is the way the Indian "outbreaks" come about. If the United States government would hang the first Indian agent where they made an outbreak they would cease at once.

The history of government and capitalism can be

characterized in three words: robbery and murder.

A. I.

The question has been asked me, "Don't you know religion is a back number, then why do you write on that subject?" No, it is not a back number. It is right here today strong enough to do incalculable damage. Our government is backed by religion, as any reader can tell by a moment's thought. All tyranny is strengthened by religion and it is for that reason I have endeavored to prove it false, to show, as I did in Discontent, the foundation of religion; and to show also that it has had its place in evolution, and accomplished its purpose. Some things may be accomplished by ridicule, but most people demand plain, practical reasons for the faith that is in us, as perhaps, for the lack of faith, and for the benefit of the would-be radical men and women who still feel the fetters of the "old time religion," and who only need to know the origin of it to let it go forever. I have taken time for the few articles published in Free Society and Discontent. Another has criticized me for saying that some ultra radical women dressed in a "grotesque" manner and supposed I meant bloomers and the shortened divided skirt. In writing the word "grotesque" I had in mind a short, "dumpy" women who dressed in waist and bloomers made of bright colored and large figured calico, and the bloomers were fashioned like woman's drawers. She was "no body's fool" either, and I would not think of trying to get her to change her costume, for she surely had a right to the garments, and had a right to wear them, even if she did look like Judy in the Pansh and Judy show. N. J.

While we, and the whole thinking world with us, are busying ourselves to find a final solution of that important and grave question known to the world at large as the labor question, it appears that we are simply wasting our time. That may astonish the readers of Free Society, but such is the case. Though the "solution" offered to the world this time is an article not made in Germany it is still made by Germans—in the Cameroons. A correspondent of a capitalistic sheet writing on the "Doings of the Germans in Africa" gravely enlightens the world thus:

The relations of the governments with the natives have been, on the whole, good. Two different campaigns, one in the southwest of East Africa, the other in the north of Southwest Africa, were successfully concluded. The labor question appears to be solved in East Africa, where tribes have been found willing and able to work. The same may be said of the Cameroons, but in Togoland it appears that the demand is not fully met. The government has issued severe restrictions on the employment of labor with a view to protect the natives from abuses. In the Cameroons it has steadily set its face against forced labor, and it appears with success—as the natives come in for employment of their own accord.

It is hard to peruse a paragraph of this kind without exclaiming in German: "Liebchen, was willst Du noch mehr?" (Darling, what more do you want?)

X. X.

SLAVERY OR LIBERTY, WHICH?

In reading articles from women, and in my correspondence with them, I have been much surprised at the attitude they assume—that of a slave, of a martyr. In the old slavery days, when a bondman felt the stirrings of unrest, the longing for freedom if he was brave enough, he tried to escape and win his way to the coveted freedom. Many wished to escape from bondage, but never made the attempt. It is the same today. It is only the woman who dares, that in any way will better her condition. But first so long as a woman lives in the house that some one, be it either a husband or lover, pays for, as long as the food that nourishes her and the clothes that keep her warm are furnished her by that some one, she has no right to complain if that husband or lover dominate her. It is an unchangeable rule that if a person is dependent upon another for the necessities of life, they are just to that extent that person's slave. For that reason economic freedom must come before sex freedom. But there is no excuse for a woman, unless she is bound by the ties of motherhood, remaining in the slavery they so much deplore.

A woman writes of her misery and says: "When women are placed on an equality with men, then we can hope." Who is going to "place women on an equality with men?" No one but herself, and she will never do it by whining, telling of her misery and still depend upon man for support. She must get up and

out of it herself—by her own efforts. This question of slavery is all too one-sided. There are many men who are slaves to the feminine portion of humanity, but they make no complaint, at least not often. Pride keeps their mouths shut, but women never "suffer in silence;" they cry, complain and whine and still remain slaves. All who are legally married are not slaves; here and there you will find exceptions. They are free, they are still lovers, and for the sake of the children they delight in the mutual home making. They may have other attractions, but love is present in the home. For them the mutual effort, the common purse means common happiness for both. But where there is antagonism, misunderstanding and misery, it is better to break the bond even though it means the breaking up of the home.

The freedom of women must come by individual effort of each woman, each must break the bond where it binds and man must do the same. If women are afraid to make the leap and still cling to their chains, then let them stop their whining. If they will not let go the chain that binds, but prefer "fat slavery" instead of "lean liberty," then stop all complaining. Every woman who is free today has become so through almost heart-breaking trials. The way to liberty is no royal road strewn with roses.

Hustburg, Tenn.

NELLIE M. JERAULD.

MY VIEW OF IT.

In the discussion on the call "To the Lovers of Liberty" I see there is lots of light to shed upon. Most of our critics do not try to argue the question, "Is association necessary?" but jump to the conclusion that we want aggressive tactics, else we would not advocate secret association. And because of this I deem it my duty to explain our position, even if it is claimed that we are impotent, incapable of doing good and expose ourselves to ridicule in this undertaking. Time will be our judge, and I challenge our opponents to prove "that secret societies have always been a failure in the past." But I do know that they have ever been a terror to the uninitiated.

Now comrades, come a little closer and we may possibly agree, if not on secret, then on open organization.

How could the French have held conventions if not organized, or associated? But in every association the members within endeavor to keep out those who are not in the same sphere of interest with themselves. You might try in vain to enter an association of manufacturers; if you are not one of them, you will find the doors barred against you. Class interests bar you out. Then why do you not use the same tactics in return?

I for one cannot agree that priest and rabbi, politician and gambler are fit subjects for an Anarchist association (although they may be very amiable persons otherwise), even though we do not have the "bomb factory" which our critic seemingly abhors.

N. B. in his criticism cites what an English comrade has done in Chicago, and implies, without organization, if I understand him right. But he is way off, if he thinks so. The comrade referred to, said when he got back to England, "That America needs a focusing point, the people are willing to hear us, but a focusing point is sadly lacking." Now what else would this be but organization, however loose it might be conducted. This holds good in distributing literature, and above all, to bring it out first. I am informed that "Mori-bund Society and Anarchy" cannot come out for lack of funds. Now tell me N. B. what, in your estimation, is the best way to raise money. By uniting of action, or run hap-hazard over each other, or lay down in sweet misery and rot through inactivity while waiting for the cultivator to arrive?

By the way, what is the cultivator for but to clear the weeds away from the plants? That which prevents them from being a united association of a kind to bear fruit, whatever it may be.

I read N. B.'s criticism with considerable pleasure, but was much amused at the secrecy of withholding his own name, while opposing secrecy in toto. I assure him that we are able to write up a "Declaration of Principles," but it would be only our own, and we don't want it to be such, for then you might say with a grain of truth "the trio of Chicago," as one of the critics put it.

We want it secret for many reasons. For the purpose of agitation, for education, and when the workers are in trouble to help them in every possible way. We want to keep the flame of hope burning in their hearts for a deliverance—some day. To break

the jack frost in our ranks, even though we might get a set-back, a "tragic comedy", as our critic terms it. We go for the bundle of hay even though it might not prove the best. Is this not better than starve between the two? We want to be world-wide,—what else do we internationalists want? We want to be federated into a world-wide association, so that no central power can lead us to destruction. Don't you see N. B.? even though you do burst your sides laughing at our audacity.

In conclusion let me say, wherever builders work, shavings, chips and even mud flies around, and sometimes fatal accidents occur, and even a good mechanic makes blunders where a half apprentice shakes his head. The son of Schiller, the German poet, (who was very arrogant) said to his sire, "I believe my father has done lots of foolish things," to which the father replied, "and the most foolish of all things was you." I plead. CLEMENS PFUETZNER.
Chicago, Ill.

C. L. JAMES' LAW OF SOCIAL PROGRESS.

Since motion follows the line of least resistance, every man does what on the whole is least difficult for him to do under all the circumstances. The difficulty of any action for any individual is either subjective or objective. If a man's actions are without a purpose, being mere sport dictated by that surplus energy which accumulates in any healthy organism, they will be such as he has least subjective difficulty in performing. The good swimmer loves to swim; but if he is a poor shot he will not shoot without an ulterior purpose such as learning to shoot better, for profit, or self-defense, or to gratify his vanity. It might be, indeed, supposed doing nothing was always easiest of all. But such is not the case. To do nothing long, is to suppress the surplus energy; and that is work, as every child who has endured a Puritan Sunday knows. If a man's actions have an object, they will always be such as lead to procure that object with least exertion. Apparent exceptions to this rule, which is already received as the basis of political economy, are not real exceptions. That "lazy people take most pains" means only this, that the most immediate exertion is not necessarily the least in the long run. But the foresight which perceives this, is only a faculty subservient to that instinct of taking least pains which lazy and industrious people have in common. In the last analysis, all objects for exertion resolve themselves into one object—that of making the least exertion. One man begs rather than dig. Ask him why; and unless he has an object in lying, he will say he thinks it least trouble. Another is devoted to acquiring a fortune. Ask him why, and his answer will amount to this, "That I may rest when I am old, and when less performance would be hard work." Thus if any action is not the easiest subjectively, it is the easiest objectively possible for him who does it, under all his circumstance. Now the objective difficulty of any action are either physical or social. Social difficulties all resolve themselves into this, that others will oppose a man's doing such or such an action. Because men seek to avoid trouble, they have a propensity to put it upon others—that is to make others obey them. And because a contest with others makes trouble, they have also a propensity to do what others require—that is to obey others. The propensity to make others obey and the propensity to obey others depend for their activity on the same faculty; namely on the faculty of discerning whom it is and whom it is not possible to master. Hence this faculty measures the propensity both to command and obey. But this faculty is sharpened by the difficulty of resisting the strong and by the convenience of obedience from the weak. It must be at its height where the strong are most cruel; or where the weak are most kind; or where the unwilling labor of slaves pays best. But all these conditions belong to a low stage of social evolution. Cruelty is eliminated by the mutual destination of the ferocious in each generation. Timidity is cured by increase of power which comes with increase of knowledge. Slave labor ceases to be profitable with the increase of skill, which cannot be coerced. It follows that—

THE PROPENSITY TO COMMAND AND THE PROPENSITY TO OBEY, ARE BOTH MOST POTENT IN PROPORTION AS THE SOCIAL STATE IS BACKWARD.

They are more energetic among savages than civilized men; more energetic in half civilized countries than advanced ones; and notwithstanding the obvious interest of the poor, they are more prevalent among

the poor (because the poor, on the whole, are the ignorant and uncultivated) than among the rich. They are strict measures of barbarism; which decline in exact proportion to civilization. I could wish no better for my fame than that posterity might call this James' law, as astronomers now talk of Kepler's laws and philologists of Grimm's Law.

TWO MORE.

So A. I. has turned moralist! A long and congenial association with him had led me little to expect such a turn. In his "consistency" article, in No. 171, he is almost Christian in his discussion of "faults," and vices, and virtues. He admits that "our actions are just what they must be," but denies that we are all opportunists; and to sustain this inconsistency he commits another—that of making a virtue of declining an opportunity that was neither necessary nor desirable to take advantage of. I refer to the case he cites of the woman who refused to work for the republican party. If she had some slight desire to accept the proposition, her desires in other directions were sufficient to overcome it. But the dear woman was very near to committing the unpardonable sin from necessity, for she "was poor and needed money." But of course the greater the temptation the greater the virtue of "overcoming." These are fair samples of the consistency of the consistency. Opportunism is not the theory that we take every opportunity to better ourselves financially, and A. I.'s citation of Kropotkin and others who might but do not become wealthy by "selling out to political parties" is proof of his utter misconception of the theory. Perhaps wealth is not the dominating desire of these "virtuous" people, and the desire of the individual is the prime consideration in connection with the theory of opportunism. The fact that "our actions are just what they must be" makes us, unalterably, opportunists. A. I. makes the political "sin" one of greater degree mainly by aid of "moral" considerations that are in no way related to Anarchism. May I suggest to him that not all political workers are "trusted," or even known, to the voters, and that not all wage-workers are producers?

As to what he considers the main point in the discussion, that our acts may affect our propagandism, and his complaint that we opportunists ignore it, he seems unable to comprehend that the point is conceded, but that what we are interested in, and what we have successfully done, is to show that not conduct but logic is the measure of a man's Anarchism.

I notice that A. I. defends the proposition of Anarchist "organization" on these same grounds. What is the difference between tweedledum and tweedledee? I suppose the difference is purely one of consistency! To place living-up-to and idea above the physical necessities is a boast for "martyrdom," of which A. I. is loud in denial and denunciation—which is "some more" consistency.

Why does not some "happiness seeking" advocate challenge C. L. James' statement that "men seek primarily their own way. Happiness is a mere incident of doing as one chooses."—Henry Addis.

This crow comes with ill grace, after having let his side of the discussion go by default. It reminds one of the small boy who contents himself with "making faces" at his antagonist after his bigger brother has stepped in to take his part. As if any one was under obligation to "challenge" all the inane, not to say insane, statements that appear in print! But for Addis' special benefit I will say that of course the "way" is a matter of small consequence; so long as it happens to be "their own," men primarily seek it. And men have no object in "choosing" a "way," except for the purpose of doing that way. The "mere incident" of pleasure or pain consequent upon having their own way is a matter of no interest to them—that is, they are indifferent to pleasure and pain. However, there is one disturbing fact. When men find that a "way" is more painful than pleasurable they thereafter seek to have "their own way," some other "way." This is strange, but it makes it look as if men seek pleasure and to avoid pain in their "way"! J. H. M.

A NEW READER.

I have been receiving sample copies of Free Society, and I have read them with care and a considerable interest. But there are things in connection with Anarchy that I cannot fully understand. It may be all clear to you, but it is not clear to me how the

people who are so selfish now, would become pure and generous of heart by the act of burning up all statutes. It looks to me as though some very radical changes in human nature must take place before humanity can live together as they should, and the burning of all statutes, as bad as they are, would make matters worse instead of better. To paint the leopard white does not change him from being a leopard still. It looks to me as though you are presuming upon that which would not work itself out in fact when the time comes; and the time ahead in the future to where it will not be necessary for any written rules to govern conduct is very distant.

Laws do not make the human, but it is the human who makes the law, and the weakness of the law is because the human is weak who creates the law, and the simple abolition of law would not make the human strong. The present condition of humanity according to my view, makes it very necessary that there still must be law and that positive and imperative, but it should be very different in many instances from what we have now, so that its main purpose should be to remove every obstacle from the way of a person expressing his highest faculties in doing right, and putting very positive obstruction, in the way of doing wrong.

As it is a fact that that which is considered right in the actions of an animal, would be very wrong as action of man, and as so many people have such a predominance of animal in their make up there must be something written down to keep them aware of the fact that they are expected to act like human beings. I like to see thought manifest in the direction of trying to exalt the groveling nature of man, but I will say that I am not ready to call everybody who may differ with me in the way to proceed with the work harsh names, or say that they are insincere in their efforts to work reformation. From what I have been able to observe in the past, short lessons are better than long ones, and one well-defined idea can be learned when a whole page would simply stall the school.

I do not like the use of the word Anarchy; not that I am afraid of it so much myself as I understand you would wish to apply its meaning, but there are so many the word itself would drive away from the consideration of a subject, that if the same matter was presented under some other name they would ponder upon it and eventually accept it. The word is harsh and badly associated and leads the mind to think of bomb, assassination, and deep laid-plots of devilry; but I do not think the brotherhood spoken of has any such idea in their minds of that being the way to bring about reform. If I thought it was, I would agree to furnish the hemp to hang the whole outfit. "Blood and iron" has been reforming the world as far back as history goes, but true reform must come through a higher principle than can be involved in the old process. I have written this hardly supposing you will publish it, but enclosed you will find postal order for a year's subscription, as it is probable that I can be able to learn something by reading the paper anyway. Marshfield, Ore. THOMAS BUCKMAN.

COMMENT.

The intentions of the first law makers were not to protect the individual and to maintain equitable relations among men, as Friend Buckman presumes; the first legislators were nothing but brigands who sought to secure their plunder by an imposition of laws which they themselves made. Even today the greater portion of the laws have but one object—to protect wealth acquired by exploitation, and as long as the producer is robbed and deprived of the necessities of life, laws are necessary to keep him in the mire of slavery. Mankind has lived for ages without any written law, even today there are yet many tribes without laws, and their relations are more harmonious and personal rights among them more respected than those of any so-called civilized nations. The Hawaiians, now enslaved by the Americans, know nothing of laws and yet every traveler admires their hospitality, honesty and good-heartedness. There are millions of peasants in Russia who have no conception of laws, who have never seen a lawyer, and yet crimes that "civilized" nations are blessed with are almost unknown among them. In short, laws do not prevent crimes (anti-social acts), they multiply them. Nine-tenths of all so-called crimes originate from the unjust distribution of wealth and not from the depravity of man or the perversity of human nature.

The claim that human nature must be changed before we can live without government is synonymous

with the claim of the priests who told their dupes that men would steal, murder, rape, etc., if it was not for the belief in God—punishment and reward; that life and property would not be safe without a king or emperor. Human nature is always the same, but its expression will ever be in accord with the relations of men. Murder ceases when there is no incentive for it; theft will disappear when monopoly of the necessities of life is abolished; rape is unknown among people where sexual gratification is looked upon as natural as eating and drinking; jealousy and its sad consequences only exists among people where the woman is the property of the man. In a word, all vices are the result of restraint.

On the other hand, laws have never prevented a crime. Statistics show us that where the laws for theft and murder are the severest these crimes are not lessened, but increased. There is no capital punishment in Russia for murder, and in spite of the fact that only 19 per cent of the population can read and write and the people are very poor, less murder is committed there than in "civilized" America.

As to the objection to the word Anarchy I will remind Friend Buckman of the fact that the word "Christian" was once spoken of with terror and connected with murder and bloodshed. Abolitionists were not so long ago feared like a pesthouse. Never have there been reformers who were not branded by our masters as criminals and the "enemies of society."

A. I.

REPLY TO J. H. M.

The question in this controversy is not whether I am a moralist or a Christian, whether I am a consistent or an inconsistent Anarchist, whether I am a martyr or an opportunist, but whether we shall find fault with the actions of the Anarchists and whether mere "logic is the measure of a man's Anarchism." To be clear on these questions seems to me of great significance in our propaganda work.

Why do we agitate and propagate our ideal? We feel that wrong is perpetrated upon us; we realize the degrading condition we are in owing to ignorance and reverence to authority, we feel that prejudices and restrictions hamper our individuality; our inner self rebels against a condition which causes us permanent pain. We then seek associates for two reasons: to acquire more strength to resist what we consider evil, we invite others to revolt also against those who assume the right to oppress us, and to find like-minded people with whom we can exchange ideas and enjoy greater happiness—a greater scope of freedom in our relations. It does not matter then how logical a man's Anarchism may be, if we find that he in spite of his logic continues to submit to custom and conventionalities, we cannot help finding fault with him, for we realize that our environment must remain ever the same so long as we comply with the established customs and laws, and by our actions uphold the very institutions we combat in theory. His actions may be natural, or "just what they must be," as J. H. M. says, but I also obey a desire of my nature when I am disgusted with a man who causes me pain, just as I hate a plant that stinks or the reptile that kills.

J. H. M. forgets that the idea of good and evil has nothing to do with religion or obligatory morality. It is a natural need: a useful and pleasurable thing we consider good, and when hurtful—bad. Of course the conception of good or evil varies according to the intelligence and knowledge of the people, but I am speaking of "logical" Anarchists here. Now I do not say this or that man is bad because he does not act Anarchistic, but I simply say his "logical Anarchism" is of no avail, for if all inhabitants of the world are Anarchists in theory and continue to practice Anarchism we would remain besotted in the mire which we in theory abhor. On the other hand, if we all try to act in conformity with our ideals, with our feelings, we will gain continually a greater scope of freedom, vitality and joy of life, but "act against this feeling," says Kropotkin, "and you will end by paralyzing your will, your active energy. Soon you will no longer regain the vigor, the spontaneity of decision you formerly knew. You are a broken man."

"Never more will you be the complete, strong, vigorous being you were when your acts were in accordance with the ideal conception of your brain." This also explains why so many Anarchists retire from the movement. I consider our actions the most influential method of propaganda—"propaganda by deed," and it is not so long ago when J. H. M. held the same view. Two years ago, when speaking of the then proposed con-

vention, he said: "If we abandon Anarchist principles in our methods of propaganda, what may we expect as a result of the revolution?" "Nothing is of greater importance than the purity of the movement at its inception. Now is the primitive period, and if we build up a heterogeneous mass of Anarchist theory and Anarchist practice, it must inevitably fall of its own weight. A little error today means a little more error tomorrow. Habit is the strongest thing in life." Why did J. H. M. insist upon the "purity of the movement" and find fault with Anarchist practice? Was it not because he realized that the success of the movement depends upon our actions? And it is for this very reason that we measure a man's Anarchism also by his action and not merely by his logic. There have been spies in our movement, trying to persuade the Anarchists to violence, who for years deceived the groups by their "logical Anarchism." But through their obnoxious actions they were finally unmasked.

Do I need to remind J. H. M. that it is not martyrdom when individuals "place living-up-to and idea above the physical necessities"? That it is simply more pleasurable to them and that they "seek happiness in their own way?"

A. I.

AMONG OUR EXCHANGES.

For a man to go to a settlement and burn the people's houses over their heads is wrong. Yet it is only a few months since a Sydney magnate did this, and because he was called "owner" of the land (a piece of wild scrub land on which some unemployed ventured to put up humpies) the public said that though he did a cruel thing he only did what he had a right to do. If they had considered that no man had a right to do anything of the sort, the flames that lit up that settlement would not have quenched till they had burned up every title to land monopoly in New South Wales. It is only because the people have not left off believing in the principles of their own slavery and admitting the possibility of "rights" sanctifying wrong, that they continue to be enslaved.

The trouble always is, when some gross case of landlord or sweeter tyranny is reported, that the people say "It was cruel, but, after all, it was within his rights." And that is what keeps the wrongs alive. When the people recognize that there are no rights contrary to the interest of humanity, and, refusing to sanction outrages committed under cover of institutions meant only to prevent outrage, treat them frankly as wrongs, there will be an end of the difficulty very quickly.

Imagine a state of society in which dwelling sites are free, but the roads and streets are private property, and nobody can move out of doors unless he has bought a permanent privilege for the street he needs to frequent, or unless he pays toll on coming out at his door or gate; where the poor man and his family are condemned to starve for lack of pence to pay the way out of doors to look for work, and the destitute widow with the price of a loaf in her home is called on to surrender it all for permission to cross the street to the baker's, so that she cannot go for the bread without losing the means of buying it—and you will have imagined a state of society not more absurd than the present; perhaps a little less so when you come to think it over.

There are men who say that the instinct for land ownership is natural in the human mind. What is natural is the instinct for the right to dwell on and use and enjoy some part of the earth without being at the mercy of somebody privileged to extort tribute or hunt the settler away. And that can't be got (except for very limited purposes) under present conditions save in conjunction with land ownership. But who ever heard of a man's right to walk in the street (which he doesn't own) being seized by his creditors and sold from under him? Isn't there a hint somewhere hereabouts?—Sydney Worker.

The other day a starving Anarchist stabbed the Empress of Austria to death, and what a howl of rage went up all over the world. Since then dispatches tell the world that it is given out that the Emperor of China has committed suicide, but that undoubtedly he was murdered—and tortured before he was murdered, by those Chinese including the Empress dowager, who are under Russian influence. In this case there seems to be no "thrill of horror" throughout the civilized world. There is no savage berating of his

murderers, and cries for revenge. Its different you see when the ruling class murder. Its decidedly different when the deed is inspired by statecraft, with a big power as beneficiary looming in the background. We must not rob the ruling class of a long cherished pastime by impressing the masses that there is anything horrible about it. Murder with the "powers that be" is a matter of business with purpose clearly outlined. When they murder each other, or murder the lower class, it cannot be construed into an attack on the established order. And there's the rub. It's not murder that is deprecated,—but an attack on the system. When a starved victim of society strikes at one of the upper class, a howl for revenge goes up, for it is feared that the blow was struck at the system that sustains the ruling class.—The Class Struggle.

CUBA.

BEFORE TAKING.

"The sight of these noble self-sacrificing patriots engaged in a magnificent struggle for liberty against a cruel and treacherous foe should fire the blood of every American who loves liberty," etc., etc.

AFTER TAKING.

"The sight of these despicable cowards loafing and eating while the American troops were fighting disgusted our brave boys. Not a soldier but respects the Spanish enemy more than the Cuban allies," etc.—Justice.

A controversy has arisen between the management of the Central Railway of Brazil and a newspaper called the Journal of Brazil. The railway company have forbidden its employees to read the newspapers under penalty of discharge. Such is the coming tyranny of capitalism.—The Clarion.

For New York.

Grand ball and concert of the International Liedertafel, October 22, 8 o'clock p. m., at the Mannerchor-Hall, 203-207 E. 56th St., near 3d Ave. Family tickets 25c.

RECEIPTS.

Week ending October 9.

Plutner, Everts, Bernarding, Valtile, Razulick, Crank, each \$1.
Byington, Nichols, Smith, Briggs, Murray, Lietis, Buckmin each 50c.
Wheeler, Gibson, Hurson, Hausman, each 25c.
Aulman, 5c.

The Letter-Box.

F. S., New York.—Stamps received. Thanks for encouraging lines.

F. H. W., Lynn, Mass.—The pamphlets were sent and if you did not receive them please notify us.

M. P., Oakland, Calif., asks us: "If government is force, why did the government not annex Cuba and the Philippines without sending the Peace Commission to Paris?" Nothing but hypocrisy, my friend. Even before the commissioners had left for France the daily press—the mouthpiece of our rulers—mediated peace with Spain on the following propositions: "Spain must submit to the demands of America." "Delays not to be tolerated!" etc. And now since the peace commission is in session it reads thus: "If Spain does not submit to the demands of America forcible measures will be taken immediately!" That is not force, is it? No my friend, the "Peace Commission" is simply a farce and a pleasure-trip for the commissioners for which you and others have to pay the bill. "Government without force" is unthinkable.

Editor of the Truthseeker.—None of the "arrogant fellows" have ever questioned your honesty. To say that you dare not voice the truth does not mean that you are dishonest, if I understand the English language at all. For your consolation let me whisper to you that even the pen of the editor of an "Anarchist sheet" is muzzled to a certain extent.

B. F. H., Corvallis, Ore.—No doubt, the repudiation of private and public debts would alter things considerably, but it is not a measure tending to solve the social problem. Such measures were taken in Greece over 2000 years ago without lasting results for the betterment of society. Repudiate monopoly and authority and we soon will adjust our relations properly. Government is tyranny and private property is robbery, consequently these institutions must be abolished before we can say "the road to freedom is open."

S., P., R. I.—Mistake has been corrected. The paper has been sent to both Clubs right along.

O. F., San Jose.—We will have "Conquest of Bread," by Peter Kropotkin, for sale as soon as it is printed. Papers for 11th of November will be sent.

N. J. J., Salt Lake City.—Sample copies have been sent to the names given. The Library will revive when sufficient means are on hand.

M. W., Brooklyn, N. Y.—Thanks for names. We do not know that there exists a pamphlet called "Human Rights," by Kropotkin. "Law and Authority," "The Wage System" and "Revolutionary Government," "Anarchism: Its Philosophy and Ideal," and "Anarchist Morality" we have for sale.