

# FREE SOCIETY

ENTERED AT SAN FRANCISCO POSTOFFICE AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER.

AN ADVOCATE OF COMMUNAL LIFE AND INDIVIDUAL SOVEREIGNTY.

NEW SERIES NO. 5.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALA., SUNDAY, DEC. 12, 1897.

WHOLE NO. 141.

## ILLINOIS.

State! the proudest of the West,  
Martyr's blood is on thy crest;  
Thou shouldst know its value best.

When thy faithful Lovejoy fell  
Was not slavery's dying yell  
Born beneath his passing bell?

And less brave than them are we?  
No more blood for liberty?  
Pen, press, voice and men yet free?

In this drunken city's bed,  
Thou by coward helots led,  
Strike our trusty watchmen dead.

Dead, by murd'rous hangman's hand,  
Dead, at princely thieves' command,  
While agast the peoples stand.

Hear the despots' shouts of glee,  
"Firmly stand our thrones for thee;  
Law, not justice, for the free."

Illinois, thy gory deed  
Shall confront thee in thy need,  
When thy very heart shall bleed.

When 'neath flames thy city lay,  
Was there one to say thee nay  
When for money thou didst pray?

Thou didst beg from door to door,  
And the lean hands of the poor  
Freely swept thine ashen floor.

Now when women, children steep  
In thy tears their dainty feet,  
Find'st no mercy in thy keep.

Harlot! thou shalt sue again,  
Sue with tears of blood in vain,  
When shall break yon cloud of flame.

Hear! while distant peoples mourn!  
Reck not thou the hovering storm  
That shall blight thy treach'rous form?

Freemen's hands that capped thy brow,  
Freemen's hands assail thee now,  
Freemen's hands shall smite thee low.

Lay our heroes gently down,  
Crowning each with martyr's crown,  
Heeding not of curse or frown.

Not a sigh we waste for them,  
Not a tear, their graves to gem;  
Their's a brighter diadem.

Throned in hearts now brooding woe,  
In each hut that grief can show,  
These—their monarchs—only know.

Each hour now's with danger fraught,  
For these huts and hearts well taught  
Bring all tyrant schemes to naught.

Taught, though scaffolds, rope and rod  
Fell at law's death-dealing nod;  
Taught Humanity is God.

—William Clarke Marshall.

## PERSONAL FREEDOM.

What constitutes personal freedom? Opportunity to observe one's surroundings, to think. Opportunity to express the thought in private conversation or in public speech to all those who desire to listen, and in writing or in print to everyone who wishes to read. Opportunity to act in accordance with the knowledge obtained by observation, study and experience. The masses are honest in the belief that in America we have this sort of freedom. Do they not act as they like so long as they act "right" (in harmony with custom)? Do they not think as they please and express their views to whom they choose? Has any grim censor appointed by pope, king, or other ruling official given notice that, "You must not entertain nor give utterance to such or such opinions?" Of course not, and why? Because the opinions of the masses are

materially those which have been transmitted to them by their fathers.

Our forefathers, by copious flow of blood, guaranteed to us the right to discuss the questions they quarreled over! Society was not precipitately annihilated as had been predicted by the defenders of the "established order," the order the doubters, the malicious interrogators, the disturbers of the peace proceeded to disestablish. The bullet test proved those questions were not vital. Their harmlessness being settled no danger to social order is now feared from disputes concerning them.

However, after every upheaval, like the revolt headed by Luther against the pope, or the abolition of chattel slavery in "our late war," changes occur in methods of collecting and distributing tribute that cause some slight inconvenience to the dislodged recipients. It is the spoil and the disbursement of it that is at the bottom of the opposition to innovation every time, although the dissension may appear to be about points in religion or other "moral" will-o'-the-wisps.

Preceding the Reformation, the pope and his satellites divided to suit themselves the "offerings" of rich and poor to the Lord. The rich "caught on," and when they gained their glorious victory by spilling more poor man's blood than the pope could, they, that is, the "state" with its adherent clergy, retained for themselves many sources of supply formerly controlled by the pope. With the American and French Revolutions, another readjustment was made; the commercial man demanded recognition and got it. The "civil war" set aside plantation life upholstered by chattel slave labor, and compelled the easy going Southern gentleman to run his chances with the crafty financier, the manipulator of wage slaves.

Wage slavery is the order we, the present-day innovators, upon whose heads the vials of wrath are freely poured by up-to-date beneficiaries, are bound to upset. When we attack it or any of its many appendages, have we freedom of speech, of the press, of action? Hardly! As experience with new ideas has shown them to be incompetent to wreck society, why is every succeeding generation filled with holy terror at the suggestion of changes? Why do those who valiantly championed one revolt against threadbare institutions, pull back, aghast, from another? We know the world will wag on without an extra jiggle if a king be deposed in some part of it, or if the capability of the pope to think for the entire christian world is scoffed at. We know, too, that at one time the offices of king and pope were considered essential for the right conduct of affairs. The people were wrong. May they not err now when they suppose "government by the people," commercialism and the wage system necessary for order and progress?

Custom is habit. Habit is a harness for animals, but man progresses only as he breaks away from habit and develops perception and reason so as to enable him to adjust himself to altering environments. Unless the people adapt themselves to the new conditions created by the discoveries and inventions of the last century, more "lost arts" may be recorded. It is to the habit we have of unquestioningly adopting current reasoning, customs and institutions that we owe the centuries of miseries of the poor and extravagance and arrogance of the rich.

The rich become rich by audaciously demanding tribute. They combine brute force and sophistry

to collect it. In war, brute force takes a leading part. In the case of ceremonial fees, sophistry is more prominent, and sophistry, that false reasoning that causes black to appear white, sophistry is more slippery than the proverbial oel to catch and exhibit. Sophistry induces the belief that it is the correct thing for people who drudge at manual labor to be poor, and for the "business man" to be wealthy. Sophistry hoodwinks us into acquiescing cheerfully to pay the tribute named tax. The organization of men called, "the government," assumes prior ownership of all lands within described limits. It transfers these lands in fragments to citizens for a stipulated sum (tribute) upon the performance of prescribed ceremonies upon the land and in its houses for collection, the land offices. The central government then appoints the state, via its counties, the landlord. The owner of the land in fee simple continues to be holder as long as he promptly forks over the rent (tax) to county officials. The rent is variously labeled: Road tax, poll tax, poor rates, personal property tax, real estate tax, etc. Any renter (owner) who becomes delinquent is ignominiously given walking papers and the land is re-let (sold under the hammer.)

Is the tiller of the soil, though he own (!) the land he works, a free man? Where, oh, where, is the personal freedom of the American husbandman? The man who pays tribute under penalty is not free.

But the direct tribute I have mentioned is a minor matter. The burden of interest is both direct and indirect. Much more can be obtained without resistance by indirection than openly, so we have tariff, internal revenue, license to sell merchandise, etc. Indirect taxes are paid first by the importer, the manufacturer, the wholesale merchant, but are finally tacked to the price of the goods we buy of the retailer. We do not object to it for we are not in the secrets of the business man, and have not the faintest suspicion of the percentage of tribute we pay, first to our protector, the government, second to the avarice of the transporters and sellers of our shoddy dry goods, adulterated foods and interior hardware. We accept thankfully the market price for our products of the soil and lay down, jauntily the profit exacted by the honest tradesman. Is a people free if in the merciless clutches of merchants?

The government renters of large bodies of land generously sell their bargain to small holders, or, perhaps loan it for a season for amounts far exceeding the original rental; sometimes they prefer to hire laborers to cultivate it under their bossing—or—ah—SUPERVISION, for a trifle of the market value of the product in wages. Portions are mined by hirelings. Small tracts are re-let for manufacturing or mercantile purposes and for dwelling places. Are renters, farm laborers, factory hands, railroadmen, sailors, servants, clerks, free men?

The experience of the Firebrand publishers is so fresh in our minds we need not call attention to the censorship of the press, but there are other obstacles confronting the lovers of learning: Copyright, price of books and papers, inadequate leisure for the perusal of literature, inability to read, etc.

Do statistics mention the tremendous revenue derived from issuing marriage licenses and for officiating at wedding festivities? What a sly old codger he was who first thought of inducing or compelling the multitude to tender fees for the liberty of cohabiting! How stubbornly the multitude

THE NEW YORK  
PUBLIC LIBRARY  
ASTOR, LENOX AND  
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS



insists upon following the regulation—terrified at the thought of its evasion or abandonment. Does the fee insure personal freedom?

If, reader, you believe that he who is tributary to a superior (?) is free, then ferret out for yourself the countless ways I have not mentioned in which you untiringly unburden yourself of your treasure, and feast to repletion upon the manifold sources of your personal freedom. But, if you falter in your faith and allegiance to the well-fed collector, if you express your doubt of the infallibility of existing institutions, what are you to brace yourself to withstand? Just variations of what MAY befall you should you remain ever so loyal, namely: Ridicule, censure, boycott, misrepresentation, malicious slander, appeals of the opposition to the prejudices of the conventionalists, threats of personal guidance (1) along with summons to the public to defend custom with mob violence, arrests, trials in which the powerful side alone is represented, imprisonment without trial (as in the case of A. J. Pope), death sentences and execution.

All these restrictive methods have been in vogue since the birth of this nation. Peaceful personal freedom outside of habitual ruts is an unknown quantity in America. VIROQUA DANIELS.

### OBSERVATIONS.

The article copied into FREE SOCIETY from the Cleveland Recorder was good. The arrest of Addis, Pope and Isaak and the suppression of the Firebrand was not only a shameful and shameless abuse of authority, but, a foolish, a most silly use and abuse, as well. The day is past when the "Conspiracy of silence" can be worked successfully, and it is poor policy on the part of Authority to exercise that conspiracy today.

Church and State have a long, black record and a long, overdrawn account to settle with Humanity, and a free press and free expression of thought is more likely to lead toward a bloodless revolution than any shameful exercise of force.

Free, untrammelled propaganda is in the interest of the theological fools, frauds and hogs—in the interest of criminals in highest places, as well as in that of the ignorant, poor and superstitious.

It goes without saying that the use of authority as to the Firebrand was a particularly mean and cowardly use of "government by force."

Comstockism is, of necessity, mean, cruel and cowardly. But it is to be remembered that thousands uphold Comstock—which is to be regretted—and, that the columns of the religious press are open to him, which, perhaps, is not at all a matter of regret. Men and women uphold him, to whom the authors he condemns are familiar, and whose writings grace their library shelves. But they are cultured and educated and can winnow the wheat from the chaff without dust touching them!—the ignorant cannot be trusted, and so—well, they must be kept ignorant!

Yes; Comstockism is hideous, but what are the educated men and women who uphold Comstock? CLINTON LOVERIDGE.

### REPLY TO MR. WIGHT.

In the first issue of FREE SOCIETY there appeared an article by Alex E. Wight of Wellesley Hills, Mass., in which he seemed to try to show that Anarchists considered Socialism an invasion and seemed to hold that Anarchists were opposed to co-operation. Evidently he does not understand the anarchistic theory any too clearly.

Most Socialists, if I understand their theory right, believe in State Socialism as a means of bringing about a "voluntary association" and some hold it (State Socialism, as an idealistic form of government. Here is the main difference between Socialist and Anarchist. The State Socialist holds that government with a big "G" is perfect. It is the logical following of the God idea, a supreme authority. "Man the priest is falli-

ble, but God is infallible. Man, the politician, may be wrong, but government is always right."

Or course they do not believe in the present order of things and would remedy it by placing everything in the hands of government, while the Anarchist holds that the wrongs of today are due entirely to government and would abolish it as quickly as possible. The State Socialist pins his faith upon a centralized authority, would inaugurate rules for guidance of humanity, sink the individual in the State and make society sovereign; the Anarchist denies the right of any authority, wants no rule, would sink the State in the individual and make him sovereign. The State Socialist thinks that man will never (or hardly ever) go right unless some other man is placed in authority over him.

I know that it will be said that the State Socialist does not advocate putting any man or men in power, but that the society as a whole is to determine its rules, but did you ever know of "society" doing anything? Society, Government and God are unmeaning words unless you refer to some man or men. This government, or what the State Socialist is pleased to call "social organism" is a mere myth, no such being ever did or will exist. Government consists of actions of men who have been elevated to power and it is notorious that those who wear the ermine of authority are no better, and ordinarily much worse, in morals, habits and private life, than the average citizen.

Nearly all Anarchists believe in co-operation and a good many in a sort of an organization which resembles voluntary Socialism. Now I cannot say that I object to such an organization being formed, which is styled "voluntary" because one voluntarily allows himself to be governed, and certainly under freedom any-one would be allowed to be governed if he chose, but if a principle is right I do not think that it can be followed too closely and if government in itself is wrong then also must be organization. I do not think that organization is necessary under co-operation.

Mr. Wight referred to the Ruskin colony in Tennessee, quoting from a Boston paper:

"The people have no use for policemen, judges, courts nor prohibitory laws. They are troubled with none of the evils that necessitate these functionaries. What would a 'bootlegger' do here where there is no such thing as profit in trade?"

And added, "the people it must be admitted infringe upon nobody's rights."

Now, personally I know nothing of the colony, but if I am informed rightly, they charge a sort of entrance fee which amounts to \$500, I believe, and should any-one wish to leave or be expelled for any reason he would forfeit the \$500. (1) Suppose that a man should enter this association with but \$500 to his name and, after living there awhile should become dissatisfied with the place and found living there a displeasure, yet dared not leave for fear of starving, would Mr. Wight say that it was not invading his rights to make him stay in the colony?

Of course it will be said that a contract is worthless if it cannot be enforced, so are the laws, and a person who would advise enforcement of contract should, in my mind, uphold the present marriage laws, for do not the bride and groom swear that they will cherish each other till death should part them?

Does not Mr. Wight know that the Ruskin colony intends, like Eugene V. Debs' "Social Democracy" and King C. Gillette's "Human Drift," to gradually control the several institutions until all are in control of the law. One grand monopoly. He is hardly justified in saying that those who believe in "character-building competition" will be allowed to stay out. I admit that no one will be obliged to use the mails or use the public gas or electricity, but he should have continued and said that no one would be obliged to live on the public land, live in air, or work for the concern—starve.

For an idealistic form of government I can only accept Anarchist Communism, but I welcome every movement for the emancipation of man, be it socialistic, Single Tax or anarchistic, as a means of getting the universe to thinking, although I cannot agree with my socialistic brothers that any good will ever come of the ballot, and I think they will find State Socialism will work about as "Zeno's plan," Moore tells us of.

"To weed the gardens of the wind  
They tore away some weeds 'tis true  
But see, the flowers were ravished, too."

The people have got to work as individuals, in self-interest, and must depend upon self-reliance. Boycott politics and politicians, ignore government or resist it passively. PERRY A. BALLOU. (2)  
Wellesley Hills, Mass.

### COMMENT.

1.—The colony claims to be under no obligation to refund the money, but as a matter of "charity," probably, it votes to do so and then kindly permits the withdrawing member to work for the colony for his board and 50 cents a week till "paid out"—a matter of several years, as there are now about 20 on the withdrawal list.

2.—For a 16-year-old boy Ballou is all right.

### WANTS US TO DESIST.

I ask earnestly that the sex question of the desirability of monogamy versus variety be not taken up in FREE SOCIETY. We must keep our principles of freedom before humanity, and these stupid censors of public morals will work harm for us if we discuss this question in FREE SOCIETY. We have Lucifer doing this grand work of sex education, and Lucifer is starting an educational propaganda for this very discussion.

If Comrade Councilman will write to M. Harman, 1394 W. Congress street, Chicago, Ill., he will receive all necessary information.

The medical doctors who are reaping a huge annual harvest on the nervous diseases of women due to suppression and other miseries of ignorance, mis-called virtue, will bitterly persecute any discussion of sex topics; that in their monopoly and you must not interfere with their trade in human misery.

I hope Comrade Carpenter will agree that the life of FREE SOCIETY is the first cause nearest our hearts and I sincerely believe he is one of the earnest-hearted men who are sick of the lies of conventional society, and that he simply desires the truth shall be spread, but I feel (for one), that Lucifer's educational circle should be advertised every week in FREE SOCIETY so that all the comrades who desire to study sexology shall be put in communication with clean-hearted men and women who are "pioneers of pioneers." Most of the persecutors of sex students are men and women who practice variety of sex companions without affection, boasting that they only intend to have affection for their wife or hubby (incidentally their wives and hubbies complain that these darlings don't possess such an attribute as affection), but many earnest students of sexual attraction affirm differentiation of attraction on affectionate lines, and this they call variety, which is much different from the ideal of variety of attachments lacking affection, but the stupid censors of other people's morals could not understand this difference and our comrades would be forever in jail for obscenity, although a prominent specialist in nerve diseases was never hauled up before court for printing a sarcastic exposure of the suffering of one of his female patients, suffering from reaction produced by securing self relief from nature's demands, thereby augmenting the doctor's purse and keeping herself free from the tortures of society, which would have branded her with filthy names for the crime of being natural without a license from the politician, or the slurs of her brothers. S. A. P.

### MORE USURPATION.

When to government by injunction is added government by immigration officials, it is time either to abolish congress as no longer necessary, or to make a radical change in some of our governmental tendencies. This is apropos of Mr. Powderly's announcement that he will exclude Louise Michel from this country if she comes here to lecture.

One hundred years ago congress authorized the president—not a Powderly, but the president of the United States—to order any alien whom he should judge to be dangerous to the peace and liberties of America to depart from the United States. This legislation was so offensive to the liberty-loving Americans of that day, that the Federalist party, which was responsible for the law, was driven out of power, never to return until now, when it is creeping back disguised in the mask of the Republican party. The law in question was known as the "alien" law. It was associated in the public mind with the "sedition" law. No student of American history should neglect in these days the lesson of the fierce fight of the fathers against the "alien and sedition laws."

Aliens can do us no harm by talking. We as a people are not so far down in the scale of intelligence as to be influenced to disorder by lawless talk. If Louise Michel has a legitimate message to the people of this country they want to hear it and they have a right to hear it. If, on the other hand, her message is not le-



gitimate, they are old enough and intelligent enough to reject it. It is not necessary to place them under the guardianship and tutelage of Terrence V. Powderly, who proposes—"law or no law," to use the words of the Leader's advice to him—to prevent her landing on our shores.—Cleveland Recorder.

### HOT TAMALES.

The radical movement in this city is sleeping the sleep of the brave. It is resting for the time being upon its laurels. Only recently its thundering voice shook the nation from ocean to ocean. Plutocracy still trembles at the vision of torch and knife it introduces, while reformers and agitators—for revenue only—are in hiding from the echo of their own voices.

The intellectual and fearless Clarence Darrow took possession of a liberal church pulpit on Thanksgiving day and reinforced the advance guard by the following indictment against government.

He said that in the ordinary meaning of the word he was not a patriot. He did not believe in patriotism at "all cost," and said:

"This view has been taught in direct conflict with history and human progress. Some of the most progressive men who have ever lived have placed the State and the law at defiance. Among these were Socrates and John Brown. The ordinary view of the State is government in the shape of a policeman. The use and purpose of the State from this point of view is overestimated. People have been taught that law is sacred. Living in this materialistic money-worshipping age and city, it is strange we should have such confidence in law when we see how law is made.

The Chicago city council is a law-making body. There are few persons, however, that do not know that the laws made by this body are all paid for by rich corporations. Yet we are taught that a law which is born in iniquity is sacred when placed on the statute books. When government is by designing men it is not sacred. Our theory of government is very beautiful, but it has never been put into practice. It is that of protection of the weak against the strong. The world is, I believe, slowly coming to this. At present, though, instead of government being organized for the weak, it is very apparent that it is for the strong and powerful. The government has given great rights to the strong, instead of protecting the weak. The chief business of the law makers of Chicago is that of transferring the property of the many to the few. We need not say that all men are corrupt, although injustice even triumphs in our courts. Because this is so it does not follow that we should break the law. All human things are imperfect. Government should be a co-operative organization for a common purpose; so far as this idea prevails and is taught so far we may expect good citizens."

At a recent meeting of Debs' organization No. 1, this place, Mrs. Chandler lectured and in the discussion which followed admitted that she could not argue with Anarchists, and John Lloyd a director of the organization asked those present to identify themselves with the movement for their own protection, but forgot to add that the shekels of the dupes were what was wanted as pope and priests must live now as they have ever lived—at the expense of ignorance and folly.

A well-known and old-time comrade now residing at Denver, Colo., writes me that the rank and file of a Debs organization out there decided by vote to commemorate the Chicago martyrs and invited Comrade William Holmes to speak, but Holmes soon discovered that there was silence regarding what was announced as the principal business of the gathering and had the moral courage to tell them that he considered himself out of place among so many respectables, but he recited a poem\* that made the hair stand on the heads of the wise colonization commissioner present.

Members of the old and only Socialist Labor party present were indignant at the cowardice of the Debsites and invited Comrade Holmes to speak for them on the same night, but Cyrus Field Willard refused permission to even announce the meeting to the people present.

It is time that S. D. should be understood meaning Social Degeneracy.

Typographical Union No. 16 is out with a long set of resolves in favor of the postal savings banks. It is a customary thing for the types to be used by mercenaries in their own ranks and adventurers on the outside. Wonder if "we the intelligent printers" will ever shake our locks and behold the sunlight.

Talmage—Talmage, the younger, with a tongue just as long and a mouth just as big as Talmage the elder, mounted his pulpit on Sunday and demanded the

death penalty for hold-up men, which indicates that the young clown will become a peaceful tramp when religion fails to pay, as it is not in the Talmage creed to enter a risky protest against anything—even starvation.

T. P. QUINN.

Chicago, Ill.

\*This poem appears on page 1.

### BOSTON LETTER.

I wish I possessed a pen powerful enough not only to explain words, but a pen that can translate thoughts, that can make you think and feel that which cannot be expressed in words, no matter how eloquent they may be.

To undertake to give you an idea of the impression Peter Kropotkin made in Boston, is a thing too difficult for mortal being. It is a thing we must see and feel and live through in order to form an idea about it.

Kropotkin stayed in Boston about ten days and managed to deliver seven or eight lectures on very important subjects. He delivered his first lecture at the Columbia theater, where over 3,000 people can be seated, before the Workingmen's Educational club, on the subject, "Socialism and Its Modern Development," the same subject that he lectured upon before in New York. We want to note that fact, because after his New York lecture on the same subject, some of the political Socialist papers reported that Kropotkin, in the course of his lecture said that we should preach our ideas to the rich, and that if they understand how just our ideas are that they would surely accept them and the social revolution will be peaceable.

Kropotkin in his lecture in Boston on the same subject, and on other occasions, distinctly stated that it is only the working people and the middle class, not in the position it stands now, but in the position that it will be when it will be driven into the ranks of the proletarians, on which we can base our hope to abolish the present system and establish a free system in its place. The very same paper characterized Kropotkin, when he first came to this country, as a man who is not likely to please anybody; that he is a most sincere and honest thinker, who speaks only what he thinks right. It seems this paper will never attain such a reputation.

Kropotkin next lectured at Lowell's institute; he delivered two lectures there on the subjects, "Savages and Barbarism" and "Medieval City," before a most intelligent public, which appreciated his lectures very much.

His fourth lecture was before the Woman's Industrial club of Cambridge, on the subject "Siberia, the Land of Exile." His fifth lecture was before the Prospect union of Cambridge, an organization of Harvard students and working people; his subject was "The Socialist Movement in Europe."

Two more lectures were delivered in churches where he was invited to speak. He took for his subjects there "Christianity" and "Morality." It is not necessary to say that his lectures had the greatest effect upon the public at large and upon our antagonists in particular. It will suffice to say that our antagonists, not being able to stand up like men they claim to be and strike back the well-aimed blows on their tactics and theory, they had to use their well-known behind-the-back methods in order to lessen and weaken the effect Kropotkin's lecture had upon their supposed voting lambs. Not being able to digest some bitter pills, composed of well-based scientific truths forwarded by Kropotkin, they so ridiculously answered them in some of their papers that it would make people laugh.

One of the official night (of darkness) organs wrote that Kropotkin is lying in something he said on the socialistic movement in Russia, and the same paper wrote that Kropotkin proposed that the working people shall buy the capitalists out and establish a free society at once.

The thoughtful reader will see at once the tendency of these stupid reports. I don't defend Kropotkin; he is well able to do it himself, if he don't feel like ignoring them.

S. C. B.

A. Isaak left San Francisco on the 3d for Portland to answer on the 7th to the indictment by the federal grand jury. Following wire is latest information on the Firebrand case:

PORTLAND, 10:30 a. m. Dec. 7

To Mary Isaak, San Francisco—Pleaded not guilty today. We will be tried together on the 22d.

A. ISAAK.

### CONDITIONS IN AUSTRIA.

There has been much said about Austria, and especially about Bohemia, during the last week.

It seems to me to be an interesting subject for the readers of FREE SOCIETY to know more about the conditions of the last Roman church empire.

The Austrian empire is divided into two important races: the Germans and Slavs. The latter are divided into several nationalities, as, for instance, in the North are the Czechs, Hanaks, Poles, Russians and Ruthenes; in the South are the Slovaks and the Slavons.

Each of these nations has a distinct literature and tongue, although they spring from the same aborigines.

There are about 10,000,000 Germans, 18,000,000 Slavic, 1,000,000 Italian and a few hundred thousand Roman inhabitants in the empire.

Each of these nations is divided into a Liberal (or Freethinking) bourgeois party, a Clerical (Roman Catholic) party, the Young Czechs, Slovaks and Poles, (Populist party), the International Social Democratic party, and finally the Anarchists all through the empire.

When Count Badeni was premier the reconciliation bill on relations between Hungary and Austria came up for ratification. Badeni, in order to avoid trouble, made some concessions to the demands of the Young Czechs, which aroused the wrath of the German Liberals, and Badeni was obliged to resign.

It is to be remarked that the strongest faction in the reichstag are the Populists, who have about 60 members, mostly Czechs, and they are figuring on establishing in Bohemia a kind of a "home rule" as it exists in Hungary. Of course as soon as the Czechs would obtain their demands the rest of the nations would follow up and the Austrian empire would melt away to the regret of the ruling preachers and plutes.

Prague is, next to Vienna, the most important city as it has nearly 300,000 inhabitants and is a large commercial and industrial center. There it was that the Young Czechs started the racket in order to "annoy" the German politicians.

But the Czech Anarchists proved themselves to be up to date, and turned the political "pow-wow" into an economical expropriation which shows very plainly the results of the campaign led by Omladina, Zar, Volne Listy, Duh Volnosty, Truhlar; besides these periodicals thousands of copies of pamphlets were scattered among the people.

The tactics were to expropriate the rich Germans first because the multitude was that way, but the Anarchists acted, each one of them, according to his or her own judgment; the result was that there were so many attacks on private property that it was impossible for the police and regular army to check it.

The dailies reported on December 3, that 15 jewelry stores were looted in one single street; 20 large stores were first plundered and then burnt out.

Women went freely with baskets and helped themselves in grocery stores; there was hardly one residence of the wealthy German exploiters left without any disturbance.

The cablegram says that if the troops had not used their swords and bayonets freely Prague might have been burned from end to end.

The Ambulance association have issued a report showing that within 24 hours four persons were killed, 150 seriously wounded and 500 more or less dangerously injured.

There were also six regular soldiers and 60 policemen killed.

Several hundred rioters are under arrest.

The Poletik, a Czech national daily, declared that the present agitation was started by persons to whom the fatherland and nationality are matters of indifference, and appeals to all parties to restrain a movement which might be fatal not only to fatherland and its chief city, but to the political aspirations of the Bohemian nation.

On the night of December 3, a severe, cold snow storm commenced to rage, and on the 4th martial law was proclaimed, and this quieted down for the present the good work.

The experience in Prague teaches us that the Anarchists can surprise the police and military authorities, where there are discontented masses, just by giving to the masses the initiative of expropriation.

It is also remarkable that the people tried to follow the Prague example in Chrudin, Schlan, Goblons, Pilsen, Tetschen, Nachod and other places. The social revolution imposes itself all over the globe, and it may break loose sooner than we expect, therefore we must not overlook opportunities to prepare for the struggle.

A. KLEMENCIC.



## FREE SOCIETY.

Published Weekly by Free Society Publishing Co.

50 CENTS A YEAR.

Address all Communications and make all Money Orders payable to FREE SOCIETY Lock 2598 San Francisco, Cal.

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

## THINGS AND THOUGHTS.

A few weeks ago a challenge was issued to a local S. L. P. branch to meet the Anarchists in joint debate. The offer was promptly taken up—and that apparently ends the matter, as the Statists cannot be induced to make arrangements for the debate. One of their best speakers was recently asked the cause of such procrastination. His reply was: "I am ready at any time, but to tell the truth, most of the boys think we would only make propaganda for you Anarchists." I think he was right. Last Sunday night an Anarchist addressed them, and soon afterward a lady arose and said: "I do not think there is an Anarchist in this house who would put a padlock on my lips, but some of you Socialists would. You demand freedom of speech, but you do not always grant it. I do not want to be governed—not even by my husband—so I guess I must be an Anarchist. Anyhow I can't go with you [State] Socialists any longer." The Statists squirmed under this lashing but could find no reply. No wonder the nice young lady in charge of the S. L. P. bookstand (and who doubtless hopes some day to vote us off the earth) was heard to exclaim one evening, "Oh, I do wish those Anarchists would stay away from our meetings. Where did they all come from?"

Accounts of a meeting of San Francisco Statists held Nov. 11 in memory of the Chicago martyrs has appeared in FREE SOCIETY. As mentioned elsewhere in this issue, the address of Comrade Cumming was also delivered under the auspices of the S. L. P. The New Charter, state organ of the Statists, purports to print the news of the Socialist movement but does not mention either of these meetings—two of the largest they have held here—at one of which the editor of that paper was present and addressed the meeting. But—he was followed by a liberal-minded man who does not wear the official collar of the S. L. P., and who told the truth, a grievous offense to some Statists. Soon after this he was called before the section authorities to explain his rash conduct. The silence of the official Statist press savors strongly of the capitalist "conspiracy of silence"—and darkness. They dare not face the light.

The "supreme headquarters" of the A. P. A. were recently closed out by the sheriff. Now if that sheriff will take a trip to Rome and close out his highness Leo, we'll all have something to be thankful for, though we may be a little behind the regulation thankful season.

The fooliest fool in petticoats appears to be one Charlotte Smith, a New York woman who is haunted with the idea that she is the banner reformer. It is her mission to acquire notoriety or make a show of herself. She has succeeded beyond all hopes in doing the latter. She is preparing to petition congress to create a job for her, making her Commissioner of Matrimony. Here are a few laws she wants:

- 1.—That every man and woman of marriageable age be compelled by law to marry;
- 2.—That a national matrimonial bureau be established to aid in enforcing the law;
- 5.—That rich bachelors who refuse to marry shall annually pay a fine which will be equivalent to the support of a family.
- 6.—That poor men who refuse to obey the matrimonial law shall be punished, as for any other infraction of the law, by imprisonment.

It is not necessary to go into details to show why all this fol de rol is idiocy. To do so would be an insult to the reader's intelligence. But I want to call attention to clauses 5 and 6. Just note that stereotyped plan: The rich can buy immunity from fanatical persecution, but the poor must submit or go to jail. Just wait till the Statists rule us, though! Won't we be made to sweat?

A dollar-and-notoriety-hunting pair of variety performers were scheduled for marriage in a lions' cage in San Francisco, but at the last moment the secretary of the Society for the Suppression of Vice stopped the

ceremony. That was a hard rap at the marriage system.

The Preston School of Industry, at Ione, Calif., is a "reformatory" school for boys, but according to statements made public by the secretary of the institution the superintendent is fast turning it into a Fagin school of crime with lessons in brutality thrown in—professorship in this being held by the superintendent himself. But, really, what else should we expect?

Denver, Colo., is afflicted with a brand-new reform movement. One calculated, according to its foxy promoters, to enable all to co-operate and share the products of their labor with each other, on an equitable basis? According to this latest capitalist scheme equity is a division of labor into seven grades of membership. The grades are composed of "common" laborers, "more useful" (1) labor, skilled labor, expert labor, specially valuable "services," the "most valuable services of all."

The pay runs in grades, also, from \$2 to \$25 for eight hours' work. And a very noteworthy feature of the scheme is that their printed matter classes the most poorly paid grades as "labor" of some degree, while the grades best paid perform not "labor" but "services." The thing is known as the New Era Union. Will the Denver health department kindly bury it?

France, the land of "chivalry," has barred women from the practice of law. That is only half of a job. Men should also be barred from the practice of law on non-idolators. What applies to France applies to the state of Delaware, in "free" America.

One state governor crowded his Thanksgiving proclamation into three lines. Let us hope he'll reform by next Thanksgiving and make it three lines shorter.

There lives in St. Louis an esteemed advocate of the monogamous marriage system, by name Burkhart, who ordered his four daughters to get married by Dec. 1 or leave home. The girls had lots of opportunity to sell themselves for a home, but have so far declined to be forced to do so, and have accordingly been "fired out" by the old idealist, who insists that the girls have no right to live at his expense, though they were brought into the world by his will, not theirs. Strange how these christian-code folks try to speak out of responsibility for their own acts, and lay all blame onto their victims.

I do not know of an old idealist who does not know that the marriage system is an attempt to subvert the laws of nature. Ask any old fogey what a natural child is and see if he don't unwittingly confess that the offspring of a marital alliance is usually an unnatural product of forced growth. Hence comes the world's reluctant admission that a love child, even if born out of wedlock, is natural.

F. A. COWELL.

## HAVE GONE TO SLEEP.

One of the most difficult lessons for the average man to learn is to depend upon himself in adjusting his relations with his fellows. So accustomed has he become through living under our democratic institutions to look to the other fellow for assistance that self-reliance with him has become a lost art, and if suggested to him he cannot conceive it to be an earthly attribute, but rather one enjoyed by the angels in heaven!

Almost every such individual with whom one discusses the present economic disorder will admit that things are wrong; that such mal-arrangement of them is due almost entirely to the manipulation of politicians actuated by a desire to get a share of the spoils of the "captains of industry."

But when questioned as to his method of changing the present inequality of opportunity for a more humane and equitable arrangement of the affairs of man this helplessness, this lack of self-reliance, at once manifests itself in the reply:

"Yes, 'tis true. Politics are in a bad way. We are continually robbed and oppressed by the political hirelings of our capitalistic masters. Yet the fault lies in ourselves. We should elect better men—men who are willing to do something for us."

Aye, there's the rub. It never dawns upon the mind of this average man that after 5,000 years of allowing the other fellow to decide for us what we want or need with its attendant train of expropria-

tion, ignorance, suffering, invasion, etc.—through the whole gamut of evils of government—that it is time to try another method! Like the proverbial moth, the poor fool again and again flies into the political candle and gets a good scorching until death finally relieves his suffering. His children and descendants emulate the good (?) efforts of their father generation after generation without gaining one little grain of experience from their own or others' folly.

He cannot perceive or grasp the fact that the ballot is a toy given him by the politicians to amuse himself with while these sleek, oily rascals, who are willing to shoulder the troubles of a whole nation of fools for value received, hand them over bound hand and foot to the exploiters of labor.

Firm in his faith (the heritage of a long line of ancestors) that the politician, whose success depends entirely upon how well he looks out for himself by assisting the possessors of wealth, will become so altruistic as to live a life of self-abnegation, actuated only by a desire to make the other fellow—the poor who have nothing to give—happy, he goes on voting one rascal in and another out.

G. E. M.

## NOTE AND COMMENT.

Cuba has issued an independence manifesto; it is considered a remarkable document for slumbering statesmen to study.—Exchange.

It is probably most remarkable for a vague use of the word independence. At all events, if this should prove to be not the case, then Cuba leads all the world in advance thought—and action.

Prof. Kriehn, of Stanford university, addressed the American branch, S. L. P., San Francisco, recently. He quoted from Saints Clement and Ambrose, who unreservedly denounced private property. He said, "Later the church temporized. They weakened in their communism." Will the professor tell us wherein the S. L. P. differs from the church in this matter?

It will be very stylish at this election, like many previous ones, for workingmen to vote for what they don't want and get it.—New Charter.

They won't all get it. A certain brand of misled toilers will vote for State Socialism, and though they think they want it, a dose of it would soon convince them that "not all that glitters is gold."

Officers of all steamships owned or controlled by the Pacific Coast Steamship company have received orders to provide themselves with uniforms without delay. Heretofore officers have worn caps, but no other insignia of their rank of employment.—Exchange.

And thus does the work of branding and tagging the work cattle progress. Some day they'll all wear brands or fight.

Elsewhere in this issue appears the copy of a speech delivered by an Individualist Anarchist. A close perusal of the same will show more of Communism than of Individualism. With Individualists of as fair minds as Comrade Cumming our only quarrel is that they don't come the rest of the way. Apropos of this speech, I want to note that a Statist who, a week later, futilely attempted to answer the arguments advanced, was offered space in FREE SOCIETY to contrast his bubbles with solid matter. Statist-like he declined to place his visions under such close scrutiny.

In the name of revolution, the Anarchists serve the cause of reaction; in the name of morality they approve the most immoral acts; in the name of individual liberty they trample under foot all the rights of their fellows.—Geo. Plechanoff.

The above appears on a circular announcing a speech by a local light of the S. L. P. on, to quote it literally, "Anarchism; the Last Development of Utopism." The speaker announced repudiates responsibility for the appearance on the bill of that piece of lying demagogism. It was put on by the Statist publisher, the same publisher who, in one of his pamphlets, defined an Anarchist as "One who promotes disorder," but who afterward was forced to admit that he did not know the meaning of Anarchy. And the same fellow, finding himself without argument, got up in a Statist meeting, puffed out his cheeks and proceeded to rail and rage because "every Anarchist has his own opinion, and to defeat them you have got to take them one by one, so they are the most vicious and dangerous, b-e-c-a-u-s-e t-h-e m-o-s-t i-n-s-i-d-i-o-u-s e-n-e-m-i-e-s o-f m-a-n-k-i-n-d ! ! ! + + +"



These may not be his exact words, but they do give the sentiments expressed. The language, in itself, does not convey the tone of venomous hate and longed-for power to silence all criticism; nor do the printed words exhibit the frothy effervescence which so successfully allures the Statists' dupes up to the bait.

Plechanoff's utterance is that of a rabid being who having no argument resorts to vilification and a careful avoidance of facts. His San Francisco pupil has been lashing himself into a fury recently, due probably to the lack of eagerness for S. L. P. bait on the part of the hoped-for victims, some of whom have got up in their meetings and denounced their intolerance.

Three distinct assertions are made in Plechanoff's utterance, all of them as false as the "Socialism" of the S. L. P.

FREE SOCIETY has offered the champions of the S. L. P. space in its columns to state their position on any question wherein Anarchists dispute them, reserving, of course, the right to expose crass fallacies. But they dare not take up the offer, as they "fear they will only make propaganda for the Anarchists." In this they are eminently correct. But no Socialist Labor party paper in America dare make the same offer to the Anarchists and honorably fulfill the agreement, as they well know Anarchists will never make propaganda for State Socialist intolerance—hence their fear.

Imagine, if you can, the New York People allowing fair treatment to an opponent! To those who know the tactics of the S. L. P. the thing is unthinkable. It will never happen.

Sunday evening last the meeting referred to above was held and the publisher referred to (a fellow by the name of G. B. Benham), local tin god of the S. L. P., was chairman of the meeting, and availed himself of the opportunity to add the role of insulter of women to his accomplishments as false teacher and slanderer.

The S. L. P. program consists, or purports to consist, of first, answers to any questions that may be asked; second, the speech of the evening; third, five-minute answers, criticisms, etc.; and they never fail to "pass the hat"—sometimes making two or three passes with it. One question asked was "What would you do with a Socialist who turned Populist?" The secretary of the meeting answered it, "I'd rip him up the back," accompanying the words with a gesture signifying a desire to plunge a bowie knife into the bowels of anyone who dared to repudiate his authority.

After the conclusion of the speech of the evening a lady comrade arose and asked the privilege of the floor. The chairman promptly ruled the floor to a man who, to the chagrin of the chair, challenged the S. L. P. to honestly debate State Socialism vs. Anarchy. As soon as he was seated the lady again asked the chair for the floor, but was ignored while the chairman made a lecture on his own hook. This deliberate choking off of questions from a woman brought an elderly lady to her feet (she didn't ask for the floor) to ask what object the chair had in refusing the floor to women. He denied this, saying the lady was mistaken. The comrade acknowledged that she had made a mistake in expecting to be allowed the floor.

Then the smooth-faced, smooth-mannered secretary came to the rescue of his crestfallen chief with much eulogy for the love of the S. L. P. for woman in the abstract and in the concrete. But when the lady again asked the floor, the truthful, honest, gallant, fair-dealing chairman vociferously yelled: "You can't have the floor! Set down!! Set down!!! Will you set down?" The comrade kept her feet as well as her head. The chairman lost his head and kept on bellying and pounding the table till the bulk of all who were not bound by the S. L. P. fled out of the hall in a body, disgusted at such insulting conduct toward a woman.

Here is the question the liberty-and-equality chairman would not allow to be put: "As you claim a Social Democratic government will always treat all equally, the majority will not, as the Anarchists claim, abuse the minority, will you tell me when any government treated all equally?"

While the chairman tried to prevent any question or answer his conduct fully answered the question as to what equality might be expected from the cowardly woman-insulting S. L. P. of San Francisco, which has before this indulged in very similar performances. All we ask is for enough living examples of Statism, such as DeLeon, Plechanoff and the local boss. They are the strongest advocates of freedom by repelling fair-minded people from their own intolerance, bigotry and falsehood. S. L. P. gallantry and decency

was further shown on this occasion by a fellow in the audience, bearing the euphonious title of Brown, who said: "An Anarchist woman ain't a woman; she's only a sexless dog."

Since the above was written the secretary of Columbian branch has accepted the challenge of Comrade Klemencic for a joint debate if FREE SOCIETY will give them "authority." Klemencic is his own authority, capable of handling the subject and his opponents. We are not in the "authority" business.

Prince Kropotkin, known all over the world as an advanced Anarchist, has proved a surprise to New Yorkers, who had expected to find him a loud-mouthed Jonann Most brand. Instead they see a small, benevolent-looking old man of retiring manner and kind eye, preaching brotherly love and deprecating violence.—People's Era, San Marcos, Tex.

Say, Mr. Era Man, stop a minute; I want to talk to you. Did you ever see or hear John Most that you designate him as "loud mouthed?" Didn't you get that idea from the daily press? Is that source to be relied upon where a hated opponent is concerned? With Kropotkin, it's different. He's a prince with a title which he has the sense to appraise at its true value but which the press sycophants place upon a pedestal.

F. A. C.

### EQUAL WAGES IN SOCIETY.

This paper was read before a San Francisco section of the S. L. P. by Geo. Cumming, an individualist, who seems to come as near to Communism as possible without crossing the line.

I am to speak tonight on one phase of the anarchistic doctrine, and one of its fundamental principles. The proposition is, as put by J. P. Proudhon, "that in society all wages are equal." Before I begin the discussion of this subject I wish to make a few preliminary explanations on the much-misunderstood doctrine of Anarchy.

I have been often asked by my Socialist friends what plan has the Anarchists to organize society. My friends, Anarchism has no plan. Anarchism is not constructive; that is not its function; Anarchism only endeavors to discover, and enunciate, and demonstrate the principles or laws which underlie the social science. For if there is a social science then it must be founded on natural laws just as rigid and immutable as those of mathematical and physical sciences, and it is for us to discover those laws and demonstrate them just the same as any other natural law.

The science of geometry, for instance, commences with certain simple, self-evident truths known as axioms, and by a series of reasoning there is based on them one proposition after another, each one after being demonstrated serving as the base for the succeeding one.

So is built up the great science of geometry. The men who discovered those principles were not necessarily constructionists, but they gave to mankind a science that has shown constructors the laws to which their work must conform. If there be any deviation from them, to that extent they will suffer. So it is with the science of mechanics, or chemistry, or any other science.

Now, all the physical sciences in these latter days have made enormous progress, as you all know; why then has the social science lagged so far behind the other sciences? Because, says Proudhon, we study philosophy with the imagination instead of observation and method, because fancy and will are universally regarded as judges in place of arguments and facts.

Now, those social laws exist; they are not made by human enactments, they are like all other natural laws—entirely independent of the human will; all we can do is discover what they are and conform our lives to them, and any infraction of them is sure to incur the penalty due to it, even without any human legislation.

Any proposed system of society, to work in harmony, must be in accord with those social laws or misery will ensue.

How essential it is, then, that we give all our honest efforts to search for those fundamental principles, using the same methods in our investigations that the physical scientists have so successfully used in theirs.

One of those social laws will be the subject of our discussion tonight. I will enunciate it again; it is that in society all wages are equal. One word to my socialist friends: As to the world wages, it must be taken in the sense that Proudhon uses it: as the full product of the laborer, which he receives for his labor, and not in the sense used by the Socialists, known as wage slavery, which is only that which is

left after the laborer has been robbed by the privileged classes.

I have said in society wages are equal. You must now understand that this is not society. Society is founded on truth and honesty, for if you can imagine a community in which every member was so dishonest that they would steal at every opportunity and could not be believed at all, there would be absolutely no society. Now we have some honesty and some truth, and so we have some society, but not a particle more society than we have truth and honesty. The generally accepted doctrine of wages, as you are all well aware, is that he that worketh the most should be rewarded the most, or that the laborer should be rewarded according to his labor and his will.

In fact, we have been long accustomed to regard this proposition as the very essence of justice itself. If you do hear anything to the contrary to this it is generally an appeal to your humanity or your christianity you owe to your brother to share equally with him this world's goods.

Now I propose to demonstrate that this doctrine is false and anti-social, and could not exist in society, and that in society all wages are equal. In doing this I shall not appeal to your sympathies, your passions, or your prejudices; I shall only appeal to justice, and from my premises endeavor to give a logical demonstration of the truth of my proposition, commencing with primeval man, the savage: This being, living comparatively isolated, hunts, fishes, builds his hut, makes his own clothing; he produces for himself and family only; he is his own manufacturer of all his belongings; what he makes he himself consumes. In such a case as this it is correct to say that he is rewarded according to his labor and his skill, but he does not live in society. No matter how much he works he is poor and miserable. He is a savage. But the civilized man does not so live. As man progressed he found division of labor was a necessity and today those divisions and subdivisions are so numerous that the civilized laborer, unlike the savage, consumes but a small fraction of his own immediate and special production. He exchanges his surplus for various other kinds of products of his co-workers.

I will now have to speak of the divisions of labor and enunciate another social law; one that although known to political economists they do not seem to be aware of its great importance, for they did not see it led to equality of wages. It is that in society the divisions of labor must be proportioned to the various products demanded by society.

Suppose that in a given society there are so many shoes required and the requisite number of shoemakers are so employed manufacturing them. Now, suppose in this community, from some disturbing cause, some disarrangement takes place and some of those shoemakers are driven from their special vocation. What can be done with them? The Single Taxer says put them on the land. You have often heard that cry from him, "Back to the land!" Put him on the land to do what; to raise more wheat? Why the requisite proportion of wheat growers sufficient for that community are already employed.

Now suppose those discharged shoemakers are also employed in raising wheat and double the requisite amount is produced. Now, as the various other vocations have not doubled their products only half of the wheat can be exchanged; this is generally called overproduction; it is simply disproportionate production, and a social law has been violated, and the penalty is sure to be exacted, and Mr. George's remedy is neither scientific nor practical.

Now, this surplus wheat has only a potential value; it can only become valuable when other wealth is made to exchange with it. To illustrate this principle Proudhon gives an analogy in chemistry. He says:

Take 80 per cent of nitrogen and 20 per cent of oxygen; those two gases will immediately unite when brought in contact and the result is the common air fit for human consumption. But if you take 80 per cent of nitrogen, same as before, and 40 per cent of oxygen, 20 per cent more than before, and bring them again in contact, then 20 per cent of the oxygen will unite with the 80 per cent of nitrogen as before, forming common air, and reject the extra 20 per cent of oxygen. Now, this extra quantity of oxygen can only be made fit for use by bringing 80 per cent of nitrogen to combine with it.

So that in any civilized community any special product can only become valuable when there are other desirable commodities to exchange with it. I have spoken of exchange; it is a necessary sequence of the division of labor.

Now, says Proudhon, every transaction ending in an exchange of products or services may be designated a



commercial transaction.

Whoever says commerce says exchange of equal values, for if the values are not equal and the injured party perceives it he will not consent to the exchange, and there will be no commerce. Commerce exists only among free men. Transactions may be effected between other people by violence or fraud, but there is no commerce.

Now says this author:

"A freeman is one who enjoys the use of his reason and his faculties; who is neither blinded by passion or hindered or driven by oppression or deceived by erroneous opinions. So in every exchange there is a moral obligation that neither of the contracting parties shall gain at the expense of the other; that is, to be legitimate and true commerce it must be exempt from all inequality; this is the first requisite of commerce. Its second condition is that it be voluntary, that is, that the parties act freely and openly. I define, then, commerce as an act of society."

"The negro who sells his wife for a knife and his children for some bits of glass and, finally, himself for a bottle of brandy is not free; the dealer in human flesh with whom he negotiates is not his associate—he is his enemy."

"The civilized laborer who bakes a loaf that he may eat a slice of bread, who builds a palace that he may sleep in a stable, who weaves rich fabric that he may dress in rags, who produces everything that he may dispense with everything, is not free."

"His employer, not becoming his associate in the exchange of salaries or services which takes place between them, is his enemy."

"The peasant who hires land, the manufacturer who borrows capital, the taxpayer who pays toll duties, patent and license fees, personal and property taxes, and the deputies who vote for them, all act neither intelligently nor freely. Their enemies are the proprietors, the capitalists, the government."

I have given you those quotations from Proudhon so you can see the drift of the argument. For if the civilized laborer depends on the exchange of his special product for the various special products of his co-workers in order to live, and those exchanges are just, that is equal values, then their wages must be equal. But, says some one, are there not grades in society, are there not some of much superior mental and physical capacities to others, and are they not entitled to a much greater reward?

Here, now, we approach the heart of the subject. I will now enunciate another social law. It is that in society there are no degraded functions; that all those divisions of labor necessary to produce all the wants of society are equal. The carpenter is as necessary as the civil engineer, the blacksmith as the miner, the school teacher as the machinist, the farmer as the sailor, and the thousands of others, too numerous to mention, all contributing their equal share of their necessary special products or services to society on equal terms.

I now wish to address a few words to those political economists, those legislators, those christian ministers of the gospel, those professed philanthropists, such as our friend Judge Maguire, who advocate the inequalities of wages and that each should be rewarded according to his labor and his skill, now I ask them this question: What is your final object in all your agitation on social subjects; is it not that you wish to raise all humanity to the highest plane of social existence; that all should be possessed of the highest mental, moral and physical qualifications? You would be obliged to answer in the affirmative. For not one of you now dares to assert the old slaveholder's doctrine that it is necessary that a portion of humanity must remain in a degraded state as mudsills for the rest of the community.

Now, my friends, we will suppose that those legislators and philanthropists have actually succeeded in their object; that everyone in the community is possessed of these high capacities. We will now suppose a certain number (say a million) of these most desirable people are about to establish a community and a division of labor is being arranged. In a society like this what would ensue? As there would be in that community, as in this, certain social tasks that are considered, compared with others, both arduous and disagreeable and not calling for any great mental power, such as sewer cleaning, digging trenches, excavating foundations of houses, cutting and hauling timber, and many others of similar kinds.

Now, suppose the sewer cleaners are appointed (1) from these highly developed individuals of this community and their task assigned to them, and the civil engineer, who plans and superintends the making of this sewer, also has his place in the community. Now, what shall be the relative compensation to these sewer cleaners and the civil engineer, as they are equally intelligent and equally capable? Would not those who

did the most disagreeable and arduous work demand the highest wages; would they accept, as that class does now, \$400 a year while the engineer gets \$4,000? They would say: "We are just as capable of doing your work as you are, and if we do this kind of work assigned to us we must be rewarded according to the amount of repugnance overcome in performing this work," and in a community such as this, all being equal, they certainly would get the highest compensation. In such a community the greatest inequalities would occur, with this difference between our present state and it; that, instead of the idler and those having easy berths, such as bankers, judges, merchants, speculators, etc., getting the higher salaries, and the hewers of wood and drawers of water getting a bare existence, the case would simply be reversed, and the inequalities of wages would be in favor of those having repulsive and arduous tasks. (2)

Now, my friends, such a community as I have just pictured never has existed, and, in all probability, never will. Equality in that sense, or rather similarity, is not desirable. Let us thank God, if there is one, if not, let us praise nature that has made this world, for its infinite variety of landscape, its varieties in fruits, flowers, mountains, rivers, trees and foliage, of animals, birds and fishes. What would this world be without this great variation? And we can be equally grateful that nature has not forgotten to diversify the human race in as great a degree.

I remember listening to the old Socialist, Robert Owen, in a lecture, speaking on this subject. He remarked that he could not imagine a more horrible thing than a state of society where everybody was exactly alike, and this great variety of character, which is the greatest charm of existence, is often made a curse through bigotry compelling everyone to conform to certain prescribed modes of conduct or belief, so that all should be uniform to suit the idea of some despot or ignorant mob.

Now, this great inequality or diversification of humanity is a powerful factor in the regulation or arrangement in the various special divisions of labor in society. Now comes the strange proposition by Proudhon. He says:

"Strange that which has frightened so many minds (that is, the inequality of humanity is not after all an objection to equality of wages); it is the very condition on which equality exists."

"What! natural inequality the condition of equality of fortunes? What a paradox. I repeat my assertion that no one may think I have blundered: Inequality of powers is the sine qua non of equalities of fortunes."

Such is the startling proposition made by Proudhon, 58 years ago, in that remarkable work entitled "What is Property?"

Now, the numerous divisions and subdivisions of labor lead to innumerable specialized vocations extremely diversified and calling for a corresponding diversity of capacity in the functionaries adapted to their several functions.

As humanity is differentiated in the same degree as those functions there can be no difficulty in harmonizing the functionaries to their various functions. Here let me remark that in speaking of the great variety of humanity I do not want any carping critic to think I include as members of society such varieties as robbers, murderers, speculators, landlords, capitalists, politicians and such. They are no part of social economy any more than those parasites that prey on the physical body of man, such as the louse or tape worm, or the numerous broods of microbes; they are all in common the enemies of the human race; they have no legitimate place in the social economy.

Now, all of you have very often seen some of your friends choosing vocations in preference to what seemed to others much more desirable and more remunerative employment. The reason of this is simply those parties so choosing are differently constituted from you who wonder at their choice. Some with robust constitutions would engage in cleaning the forest, cutting down trees; some would engage in agriculture, and take great pride in it; others mine for the metals, and be equally enthusiastic, for when they have done so they could study mineralogy, and so engage their mental qualities in their particular sphere; some, again, as machinists, watchmakers, mathematical instrument makers, and in a thousand other modes of employment, each requiring different special capacities and talents from the others.

Let us now take to exemplify our theory one of those functionaries—the strong, robust engineer and surveyor. He enters the forest, blazes the trees and shows the path to the pioneer and settler, lays off

ground for buildings and mills; he is adapted to that work.

Now, here is another functionary; he is not so strongly constituted; he has a finer organization; he cannot perform the strong and robust engineer's work; his function is to make watches or mathematical instruments, and in doing so he would be able to do a great deal more at his own particular work than others not so well adapted to it, such as this engineer we have spoken of; for this strongly constituted individual if turned into a watchmaker would not be in harmony with the vocation.

Now, here is a young girl who cannot go into the woods to do this arduous work, but she makes garments of various kinds and can make twice as many as this strong man, for she is so constituted. Any quantity of such examples can be given. Bear continuously in mind that each of these special vocations are absolutely necessary to society.

How shall we compensate this watchmaker and this seamstress? Shall we say to them: "You are not so strong and vigorous as this engineer; his calling also calls for the exercise of greater mental exertion than yours; you must accept a great deal less or your services than this man?" Can anyone having the slightest comprehension of justice make such a proposition? Because they make (say) twice as much product at their special vocation as others could do if substituted in their place and because they lack the qualifications to perform other functions that in the social economy will never be required from them, shall they be awarded less compensation? As I said in the beginning, I will appeal only to justice. And I think that from that standpoint you will agree that in society there can be no degraded functions; that in the exchange of products or services all are equal.

Now, I have been asked by an old friend of mine who disagreed with me on those propositions: "Cannot I work," he said, "as hard and as long as I please; cannot I produce as much as I can and sell the product to society and by my superior skill and industry accumulate more wealth than many others."

"My friend," I said, "you can work long and hard at your special vocation and your product may be very great. Work away; no one will stop you; you are free. But when you come to exchange your special products for the special products of others you will be asked this simple question: 'Are you associated?' If you are, then in society your associates have equal rights to yours, and, if justice is done to all equally, you cannot get richer than your co-worker. But if you are not associated you have no rights in that community. They will not assail you; they will leave you severely alone with your accumulated product; they will not exchange with you. Then you will find out how poor you are. You cannot now get rich unless you steal or rob some industrious community either by force or fraud, as government, politician and capitalist do now."

To be honest: everyone must perform his share of the social product. Says Proudhon:

"Suppose, for instance, this social task consists of the ploughing, hoeing or reaping of two square decimeters of land and that the average time required to accomplish it is seven hours. One laborer will finish it in six hours, another will require eight; the majority, however, will work seven. But provided each one furnishes the quantity of labor demanded of him, whatever be the time he employs, they are entitled to equal wages."

"Shall the laborer who is capable of finishing his task in six hours have the right, on the ground of superior strength and activity, to usurp the task of the less skillful laborer and thus rob him of his labor and his bread? Who dare maintain such a proposition?"

"He who finishes before the others may rest if he chooses; he may devote himself to useful exercise and labors for the maintenance of his strength, and the culture of his mind, and the pleasure of his life. This he can do without injury to anyone."

"But let him confine himself to services which affect him solely. Vigor, genius, diligence, and all the personal advantages that result therefrom are the work of nature and, to a certain extent, of the individual. The wage which society pays them is measured not by their power, but by their production. Now, the product of each is limited by the right of all. Whoever finishes his task finds his reward at the end; it is not necessary to get there first."

"If, however, it is true and just that we should reward talent according to its degree, then let us ask how shall we reward such highly talented men as Newton, Herschel, Faraday, Ampere, Watt, and thousands of other such, too numerous to mention? What value were Newton's discoveries to mankind? Something immense. What price did he put on them? Nothing;



all be asked was to be enabled to go on in his glorious path.

"Here psychology comes to the aid of the social science and shows there is no common measure between intelligence and material reward. The only reward for intelligence is intelligence itself."

But, my friends, did you ever hear of any of those great men rising in the bosom of a barbarous or savage people? You never look for a Faraday or a Watt among the Hottentots. These men are just as much the product of the society from which they sprang as the steam engine or the loom. We often hear people tell of self-made men, eulogistic of some one who, by taking advantage of the maladjustments of the economics of society, has managed by his peculiar talents to acquire from the community many thousand days' products of the laborer by unjust exchange or privileges granted to him by governments. Such men did not make themselves; it was corrupt society that made them. But does anyone think that these great men owe nothing to society? Take the men of today, the greatest and most talented. Is all the knowledge they possess due to themselves? No, for thousands of years and millions of men have aided in that accumulated knowledge; each one has added his little stone to the edifice on which we now stand.

The discoveries and inventions made by the great men of today have only been made possible by the discoveries and inventions of their predecessors and the aid of their associates of today.

Let us suppose a society which has resolved to construct an observatory, to view and investigate the stellar universe; to increase their knowledge of planetary movements. Now, the construction of this work involves the employment of numerous and greatly diversified vocations—laborers to excavate the foundations, the stone mason, the draughtsman to plan the machinery, the machinist, the molder, the carpenter, the telescope maker, the glass maker, and hundreds of others, all necessary to its completion. When the whole is finished now comes the operator, the astronomer, and by the aid of this construction he does what the community expects him to do: investigates the heavens to increase our knowledge. Now, remember this is his specialized vocation in society. Now, suppose he makes a discovery. The whole world rings with his fame. He alone gets all the credit for it. I ask, did not those men who, by their labor and their skill, made this great fabric with all its intricate machinery, some of it taking more mental capacity than that necessary to observe the heavens, did they not contribute more toward that discovery than the astronomer himself? I ask why this man who has only done his share of the work should be so much more highly rewarded?

Friends, we have been so accustomed to see labor degraded that the condition seems natural to us that some functions must ever remain so, but anyone must see such condition cannot exist in society. Proudhon says:

"Give men liberty, enlighten their minds that they know the meaning of their contracts, and you will see the most perfect equality in exchanges without regard to superiority of talent and knowledge, and you will admit that in commercial affairs, that is in the sphere of society, the word 'superiority' is void of sense."

We stand full of wonder and admiration of those great geniuses of society and give them deserved praise. But, my friends, we have an immense fountain from which we can draw for genius and talent of all kinds and variety. The brain of the working class of this country is a mine of inexhaustible supply and of bold wealth. But alter their environment. But give them the full product of their labor. Cease to rob them. Give them leisure. In one sentence, "Get off their backs." We then shall have no lack of talent. For in the noble words of Shelly:

That weak from bondage tremble as they tread,  
How many a rustic Milton has passed by  
Stifling the speechless longings of his heart  
In unremitting drudgery and care;  
How many a vulgar Cato has compelled  
His energies no longer tameless there  
To mould a pin or fabric a nail;  
How many a Newton to whose passive ken  
Those mighty spheres that gem infinity  
Were only specks of tinsel fixed in heaven  
To light the midnight of his native town?

Yes, my friends, how many bright minds have perished in the long and grinding slavery of the mine or the factory that would shed luster on science. In the words of Tom Moore:

How many a gem of purest ray serene  
The dark, deep caves of ocean bear;  
How many a flower is born to blush unseen  
And waste its fragrance on the desert air?

Now, my friends, if this philosophy be true, the cause of your misery is because you are not associated. You do not live in society, which means equality, which is a state of justice. If this philosophy be true, what becomes of the single tax? Can you imagine a society so constituted as to allow a portion of their members to take from them a part of their product, for using lands, and then employ police to take from the said members this stolen product and then putting this product in a fund to support this police, which police simply means the government and a lot of parasites? In society the single tax has no place.

Now, my friends, do not think this is any fine-spun theory and speak of these laws as not practicable, and say it is utopian. Those laws, as I have said before, are just as immutable and certain in their action as any other natural law, and in the infringement of them the penalty is sure to follow. You cannot disregard them if you desire social harmony. We have been so long steeped in superstition, so held in bondage by ideas and teachings instilled into us in our childhood by authorities we dared not question that we are not free.

How few there are to whom the superstitions of their childhood do not cling, more or less? Humanity, as far back as history shows, has been afflicted with two gigantic curses—God and the State. Those twin-brothers in iniquity have caused more misery and human carnage than the imagination can conceive.

"Believe, believe," says the priest; "doubt and you are damned; do not reason; it is the will of God; pay your tithes."

"Obey," says the State, "obey the laws made by the legislators; no matter how oppressive or outrageous these laws are; you have no choice; your reasoning on these will not serve you; obey; it is the will of the majority; it is the will of the mightiest."

God has always stood behind the king, the church behind the state, and the two together have so placed the whole world in bondage. King, priest and statesman blast the human flower, even its tenderest bud. Their influence darts, like subtle poison, through the bloodless veins of desolate society. The child, ere he can lip his mother's sacred name, swells with the unnatural pride of crime and lifts his baby sword even in hero's mood. This infant arm becomes the bloodiest scourge of devastated earth, whilst specious names, names learned in soft childhood's hours, serve as the sophisms with which manhood dims bright reason's ray and sanctifies the sword upraised to shed a brother's innocent blood.

Let priest-ed slaves cease to proclaim that man inherits vice and misery when force and falsehood hang even o'er the cradled babe, stifling with rudest grasp all natural good.

#### COMMENTS.

1.—Here appears to be a slip. In society (using Comrade Cumming's definition of society) men might agree to subject themselves to certain regulations terminable at the will of the individual, but the power to appoint would seem to carry with it arbitrary authority, which could not exist under Anarchy.

2.—I do not think that in such case the inequalities of wages would assume the form of greater and lesser amounts, but rather in less hours of labor for the repulsive tasks.

F. A. C.

#### INDIA AND AMERICA.

In front of a group of the grain-sellers, mostly plump, laughing, women, squatted a child, picking up kernels of grain from the dust of the road. The contour of every bone in its body protruded through the hard, lifeless skin. It looked heedfully on this side, then on that, and picked up grain after grain, slowly and yet eagerly. It put each new acquisition into a fold of its girdle. Ten feet away were the overflowing baskets; but the full-fed, laughing bunniah women offered the dying child nothing; the idea of doing so never entered their minds. And what was almost as strange, it never entered the mind of the child either. These Indians (except in the case of blood relations) are totally destitute of all human feeling for one another; they neither feel it nor expect it. Had this child had some coppers with which to buy of the bunniahs, the latter would have taken what advantage they might of its ignorance and helplessness to cheat it out of its fair measure. There is no conception among these three hundred millions of what we understand by humanity; they do not exercise it, they do not ask it, and they cannot comprehend it.

Thus writes Julian Hawthorne, the Cosmopolitan's special commissioner to India, in the September number of that magazine. Righteousness consists in condemning the heathen. And how reprehensible in our

christian eyes is this manifestation by the "Aryan brown" of a very familiar trait of human nature—the ability to bear with equanimity the bad estate of others. Mr. Hawthorne is evidently smitten with a sense—compelling to such indignant expression as may be seemly—of the callousness of those who, plump and merry, think not to share their substance with the lean and miserable. Where in christian lands he has seen tradesman giving away goods to the needy, without a monetary consideration—or even forbearing to exact the customary profit, which is merely limited by the merchant sense, taken collectively, of what the purchaser will stand—he fails to indicate. To be sure, often there is bestowal of good in the name of "charity," by our shrewd business men, because a show of generosity pays in the way of advertisement, and advertising is good "business;" but who will contend that business is conducted for other than monetary consideration? The benighted East Indian is not skilled in this fine art of Christian lands, but we should have forbearance for his lack in this regard, remembering that he did not have the opportunity to become leavened with the leaven of the Pharisees, not having been in the line of that development.

And the native simplicity with which Mr. Hawthorne comments on the lack of brotherly love among "these Indians (except in the case of blood relations)," would lead one to imagine that he went to India from a land where conditions of equity obtain, by virtue of the loving kindness of the inhabitants, and where none revel in luxury while others wallow in misery. As a matter of fact, the fierce contrast between the bunniah women and the starving boy may easily be paralleled any day in any city of the United States. A recently published incident may serve for illustration. A party of gentlemen were dining at a fashionable restaurant in New York. Suddenly the window of the room was thrown open from the outside, and the gaunt, haggard face of a man standing in the alley without appeared. He said, "Last night I pawned my coat to buy a loaf of bread for my wife who is starving." Only this—and disappeared. There was a commotion within, the police were summoned, the window was hastily lowered and secured by the restaurant attendant, and—the banquet proceeded. But one person present had lost his appetite for the dainty fare; and he it was who told the story. The gaunt man did not ask food of the feasters—did not seem to expect it—to do so apparently "did not enter his mind."

To condemn man's inhumanity to man in India may increase the self-satisfaction of the Pharisee in America, but it does not explain just "what we understand by humanity," in view of the fact that thirty thousand persons were destitute in Indiana, while mine operators calmly held out against the demands of men for a bare living wage, and unarmed men were shot down in Pennsylvania for presuming to continue a journey along the public highway against the tyrannical command of a bullying sheriff. When it can appear to the satisfaction of those who administer our laws, that for a band of men to march along the country roads constitutes rioting, it is time to tear in pieces the declaration of independence and burn the constitution of the United States as so much waste paper, and cease talking of "this favored land" and holding up the bad condition of foreign lands to the pitying gaze of "blessed America."

Considering these conditions and the present social state of America, there is exquisite, although we give Mr. Hawthorne the credit of its being wholly unconscious, irony in the closing sentence of the paragraph quoted: "There is no conception among these three hundred millions of what we understand by humanity; they do not exercise it, they do not ask it, and they cannot comprehend it." There is a large and increasing number of thinkers in enlightened America, who find difficulty in comprehending it. But perhaps the cruelty exercised by the possessor of material wealth—which is power in christian America—towards the anxious, toiling millions should not be laid to the charge of inhumanity, and may as readily be explained as the conduct of the Irish constable, would they but condescend as did he, "to render a reason," when after using his weapon unmercifully on the prisoner, he endeavored to vindicate his real tenderness of heart and soothe the wounded feelings of his victim by explaining, "It's not because I hate ye that I bate ye, but because I've the authority to do so."—Eleanor M. Castile, in *Flaming Sword*.

Bakounin's great work, "God and the State," can be obtained of FREE SOCIETY; price, 5 cents.



THE CHOICE OF WORDS.

There is a way without doubt by which the attention of the masses might be more forcibly called to the value of Anarchy. Especially is this the case with reference to words, since words are the weapons we prefer to use. Tammany's slogan, "To Hell with Reform" was rude and smelt of the pavement, but those words were full of meaning to the laboring man who saw no reason why he should be denied his choice of beverages on the Sabbath day. Hence, "To Hell with Reform" with a vengeance was not spoken in vain. The pure, clean and elegant Seth Low party were trod under the heel of the despised Democrat. Another useful combination of words that served a purpose, was Burchard's Rum, Romanism and Rebellion.

Shall the pulpit and the forum have a monopoly of the vile words that arouse the evil passions of men? Nit! More power and devilry to the writers who ardently wish to revolutionize the present state of affairs. It will be necessary to dip the pen more freely into the tank of gall and venom to awaken the millions of toiling, stupid slaves. Sound logic and bitter truth is dry stuff for those who have a taste for swifter thoughts. L. Steink's article "Class War" has the right flavor, also Reb's "Law and Order." Let us have more of them with the same cut, slash and drive. The Firebrand was excellent in some respects, but alas, its most sensational and alarming feature was its startling nom de guerre. Better have a name more discreet and pages more replete with valorous and soul-stirring material. None but men with ample leisure could fathom the depths of its well-meaning arguments. Leaders in the anarchistic movement should adopt theologian tactics. Fire men's souls with enthusiasm first and weigh the solid grains of truth afterward.

Observe the voracious appetite of the mob for intensely yellow literature. That appetite should receive immediate attention by those having the genius to paint phrases in bright and lurid colors. For great skill and piquancy in writing attractive poetry we must yield the palm to Virroqua Daniels. No number is complete without a contribution from that vivacious writer.

It is to be hoped that we may see some of Emma Goldman's speeches in print before long. Her numerous interdicted attempts at speechifying ought to convince her of the value of printing presses as a medium to be heard through uninterrupted.

No doubt an unexpurgated edition of her speeches would give us to understand what effective words to choose and what style of language to employ for propaganda purposes. ST. JONATHAN.

CHURCHIANITY.

"The world used to believe in the divine right of kings. Today we have a substitute—churchianity. Churchianity today believes not much in kings, but it does believe in a golden rule—the rule of gold in the churches as well as in the State.

"It tries to influence the work of God and secures the passage of unjust laws—laws not for good, or freedom, or liberty, but in the interest of injustice, oppression and wrong.

"Professing Christians, guided by a preacher, form a sort of society—a religious club, which they call a church. They become so exclusive that the honest, decent poor are driven by them to humbler channels."—Rev. Father Ducoy.

The New Time claims a circulation of 50,000, and as it is a large monthly dollar-a-year magazine it may have that circulation. But it is a very conservative paper, and we cannot indorse the soundness of its half-way creeds. For those of more timid views, however, it may be "the thing." They offer us a nice clubbing rate, but we don't care to use it very badly, though such as want to take advantage of it may do so by sending \$1.25 for both FREE SOCIETY and the New Time for a year.

The word "Socialism" first came into general use in 1835.

The people have less power here than they have in England or France.

The laws against poverty are severer in the United States than they are in Russia.

Every benefit to mankind has been obtained in spite of the fierce opposition of government.

At the present rate of liquidation it would take 1,095 years to pay off all the debt in this country.

Children in the glass industry begin at 11 years old in Indiana. Statistics show that 7 out of 10 die at 19.

The courts have decided that the Pennsylvania railroad owns its right of way forever. No subsequent generation can legally take it away.

DO YOU SMOKE?

"Free Society" group has added the cigar-making industry to that of publishing the paper bearing its name. This department is under the direct supervision of a comrade who has been engaged in the manufacture of cigars in all the important centers of the industry in the United States and is fully alive to the requirements of the trade in all localities.

The group stands prepared to furnish to the consumers throughout the country a first-class article at a medium price. All its goods bear the Blue Label of the Cigarmakers' International Union, which is everywhere known to be a positive guarantee that the cigars bearing it are made under good sanitary conditions.

Comrades and others who indulge in the "weed" can now enjoy a first-class cigar and at the same time assist in the work of publishing "FREE SOCIETY" by ordering of the group.

In order to introduce our principal brand, "NEW IDEAL," made expressly for lovers of a good cigar, we will send by mail 12 NEW IDEAL (5-inch Spanish Londres) cigars packed in cedar box, postpaid, for one dollar.

These goods are warranted to be long Havana filled and Sumatra wrapped, hand-made cigars with nothing but the finest grades of these tobaccos used in their manufacture.

Address all orders, and make all monies payable to

FREE SOCIETY

LOCK BOX 2538,

SAN FRANCISCO.

141

The number printed or written on the wrapper of your paper shows that your subscription has been paid up to that number.

The publication office of FREE SOCIETY is located at 13 Oak Grove Ave., where comrades will be welcome. Address correspondence to Lock Box 2538.

FREE SOCIETY'S AGENTS.

The following named persons will receive and receipt for donations for Free Society:

Chicago, Ill. C. Pfeustner, 469 Wabash ave. F. Andres, 347 Ward St. W. P. Sorley, Trude Building. Jay Fox, 159 N. Union.

The Old and the New Ideal.

A Solution of that part of the Social Question which pertains to Love, Marriage and Sexual Intercourse.

By Emil F. Kueckbusch.

THE MOST MASTERLY WORK ON THE SEX QUESTION IN PRINT.

It is written in language that anyone can understand, and yet is not offensive to the most refined.

Don't fail to read it. You can't afford to.

PRICE: Paper 50c. Cloth \$1.00.

CONTENTS: Our Freshmen and Christian Morality. Explanations. Our Children. Our Young Men. The Preventive Check. The Girl. Love. The Value of Marriage and the Free Love Movement. The Happy Marriage of Today. How long will Love Relations last in a Free Society? Jealousy and Possession. The Old and the New Ideal. Ethical Views on Coition. Love and Friendship in a Free Society. The Ideal Society. The Number of Children in a Free Society. Undesired Children. Licentiousness. The Sense of Shame. Obscenity. Prostitution. Crime and Disease. Ebrocity—An Appeal to the Women. Woman's Emancipation. The Social Question. The Propaganda.

APPENDIX: Introduction. The Criticism of a Leader. The Charm and Beauty in Exclusiveness. Woman vs. Man. The Weakness of Woman. "Calling Names." Criticisms of Socialists and Anarchists. Tolstolism. A Paradox. My Hopes and Fears.

SEND ORDERS TO FREE SOCIETY.

"A Cityless and Countryless World." AN OUTLINE OF PRACTICAL CO-OPERATIVE INDIVIDUALISM.

Written in the form of a novel this book takes the most advanced stand on the Sex Question, treating of it at length. Its economics are not so clear, however, but are in many respects worthy of close examination.

PRICE, PAPER, 50c.; CLOTH, \$1.00.

DR. FOOTE'S PLAIN HOME TALK

EMBRACING MEDICAL COMMON SENSE.

For the information of those who may be interested, I would call attention to the popular edition of this book, that has been a standard of information, and a source of knowledge to tens of thousands of families for many years. The popular edition has been brought out to meet the ability of the poor to buy, and is sold at the remarkable low price of \$1.50.

Order of Free Society.

LA QUESTIONE SOCIALE has several thousand large-size portraits of

ANGIOLILLO.

the hero of Sta. Agueda, on hand, which will be disposed of at 10c each. Order from La Questione Sociale.

Paterson, N. J.

N. B.—Sympathizing papers please copy.

Delinckie Listy is an eight page Anarchist weekly paper, published in the Bohemian language at New York City, 402 E 71<sup>st</sup> St. by the International Workingmen's Association of America. Send for sample copy.

NEWS STANDS

Where FREE SOCIETY can be obtained:  
SAN FRANCISCO—Paper Covered Book Store, 1203 Market St.  
Boston—Columbia Stationery Store, 965 Washington St.

Free Society Library.

In lots of ten or more, five-cent pamphlets furnished at three cents each.

Agriculture. By Peter Kropotkin. \$ .05  
Anarchism and Violence. By L. Bevington. .05  
Revival of the Inquisition. .05  
Expropriation. By Peter Kropotkin. .05  
Anarchist Morality. By Peter Kropotkin. .05  
Anarchist Communism. By P. Kropotkin. .05  
Anarchism: Its Philosophy and Ideal. By P. Kropotkin. .05  
An Appeal to the Young. By Kropotkin. .05  
The Commune of Paris. By P. Kropotkin, and An Anarchist on Anarchy. By E. Reclus (one volume). .05  
Anarchy. By Enrico Malatesta. .05  
A Talk About Anarchist Communism. By Malatesta. .05  
Anarchist Communism in its Relation to State Socialism. By Agnes Henry. .05  
Anarchy on Trial. Speeches by Paris Anarchists. .05  
Common Sense Country. By Bevington. .05  
A Plea for Anarchist Communism. By W. H. Duncan. .05  
Socialism in Danger. By D. Nieuwenhuis. .05  
On the Definition of Crime. By H. Hamon. .05  
Social Conditions and Character. By "Ireland." .05  
Religion and Labor. Paris I & II. By Fox. .05  
Social Democracy in Germany. By G. Landauer. .05  
Liberty Lyrics. By L. S. Bevington. .05  
Evolution and Revolution. By Elisea Reclus. .05  
Bases of Anarchism: Historical, Philosophical and Economic. By W. Holmes. .05  
God and the State. By Michael Bakounin. .05  
The True Aim of Anarchism. By Steinle. .05  
Revolution. By S. H. Gordon. .05  
Let us be Just. By W. Tcherkessoff. [An open letter to Liebknecht]. .05  
Grandmother's Lessons to Men, Young and Old. By Lois Walsbrooker. .05  
Wants and their Gratification. By H. Addis. .10  
When Love is Liberty and Nature Law. .10  
Albert R. Parsons' Book on Anarchism. Its Philosophy and Scientific Basis. German and English Editions; handsome bound in cloth 30 cents; paper. .15  
The book last named are slightly damaged, but readable.  
My Century Plant. By Lois Walsbrooker. 1.00  
Wherefore Investigating Company, regular price 50c, but while present supply lasts "they go at" .25  
Revival of the Spanish Inquisition (only a few copies of this). .05

The New Dispensation. Corvallis Or., 25 cents a year. Monthly.

International Twin-Vereia meets at 1524 Ave. A, New York City.

The San Francisco Anarchist Club. Headquarters at 1232 1/2 Polson St.

The New Generation. 605 South Third St., Philadelphia Pa., open every evening.

The German Group, Chicago, Ill. meets every Friday, 8 o'clock p.m., at 235 Blue Island av.

Anarchist Headquarters in San Francisco. 1232 1/2 Polson St. Open every evening from 7 till 10 P. M.

The Independent Educational Club meets every Sunday evening, at 7: 30 p.m. at 1927 E St., Tacoma, Wash.

The Peoples Union, a free discussion club, meets every Sunday evening at 935 Westminster St., Providence, R. I.

New York Debating Club meets and delivers lectures every Sunday 7:45 o'clock P. M. at 1524 Avenue A, near 50th. Free discussion.

Radical Literature of all kinds, including English periodicals, can be found at the news stand of comrade I. Rudash, 363 Grant St., New York City.

Pamphlets in English, Hebrew and German languages can be had by out of town stand-keepers and comrades, by addressing A. Levin, 340 Cherry St., New York City.

Group Proletariat meets every Saturday at 8 p.m., 340 Cherry St., New York City. Anarchist lectures and debates given Fridays at 42 Orchard st., and Saturdays at 412 Grand st.

Wendell Phillips Educational Club will meet every Sunday, 3 p.m. at 45 Winter St., Providence, R. I. Pamphlets in English, German, French, Jewish and Russian languages on hand.

Progressive Thought and Dawn of Equity, of Olathe, Kan., is the oldest organ of the Labor Exchange movement. It is full of L. E. news and original articles, gives progressive ideas, co-operative facts and advocates the correct way out of hard times. Send for sample copy.

The Little Freethinker, the only magazine published for the young that is free from superstition. Semi-monthly. Costs a year. On trial, six months, twenty-five cents. "As the twig is bent the tree is inclined." Start the young right, and the work is done. Address Elmina D. Slenker, Snowville, Va.

The Altruist is a monthly paper issued by the Altruist Community, of St. Louis, whose members hold all their property in common, and both men and women have equal rights and decide all their business affairs by majority vote. Twenty-five cents a year; sample copy free. Address, A. Longley, 2319 Olive St., St. Louis, Mo.

Special Offer for Prosperity Times: "When Love is Liberty and Nature Law," 10c; "Ought Women to be Punished for Having too Many Children?" 5c; "Motherhood in Freedom" 5c; "Altruism: Reasons for Pardoning Fielden, Neebe, and Schwab," 10c; "The Prodigal Daughter, or, the Prison of Vice," 5c. Send St. subscription to Lucifer, for one year and receive these pamphlets free; or send 50 cents, 6 months subscription and we will forward your choice of 25 cents' worth of these pamphlets free. Lucifer is weekly, eight pages, the only paper of its kind in the world. This is a rare chance of securing a large supply of excellent literature for missionary work. Address: M. Harman, 1394 W. Congress St., Chicago, Ill.