

FREE SOCIETY

ENTERED AT SAN FRANCISCO POSTOFFICE AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER.

AN ADVOCATE OF COMMUNAL LIFE AND INDIVIDUAL SOVEREIGNTY.

NEW SERIES NO. 8.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., SUNDAY, JANUARY 2, 1898.

WHOLE NO. 144.

FREEDOM.

Toil and pray! The world cries cold;
Speed thy prayer, for the time is gold,
At thy door Need's subtle tread;
Pray in haste! for time is bread.

And thou plow'st and thou hew'st
And thou rivet'st and sewest,
And thou harvestest in vain;
Speak! O, man; what is thy gain?

Fly'st the shuttle day and night,
Heav'st the oars of earth to light,
Fill'st with treasures plenty's horn;
Brim'st it o'er with wine and corn.

But who hath thy meal prepared;
Festive garments with thee shared;
And where is thy cheerful hearth,
Thy good shield in battle dearth?

Thy creations round thee see
All thy work, but naught for thee!
Yea, of all the chains alone thy hand forged;
These are thine own.

Chains that round the body cling,
Chains that lame the spirit's wing,
Chains that infant's feet, indeed
Clog! O, workman! Lo! thy meed.

What you rear and bring to light,
Profits by the idle wight,
What ye weave of diverse hue,
'Tis a curse—your only due.

What ye build, no room insures,
Not a sheltering roof to yours,
And by haughty ones are trod—
Ye, whose toil their feet hath shod.

Human bees! Has nature's thrift
Given thee naught but honey's gift?
See! the drones are on the wing,
Have you lost the will to sting?

Man of labor, up, arise!
Know the might that in thee lies,
Wheel and shaft are set at rest
At thy powerful arm's behest.

Thine oppressor's hand recoils
When thou, weary of thy toil,
Shun'st thy plow thy task begun,
When thou speak'st: Enough is done.

Break this two-fold yoke in twain;
Break thy want's enslaving chain;
Break thy slavery want and dread;
Bread is freedom, freedom bread.

—George Heinig.

THE LATEST OUTRAGE.

To my Friends and Correspondents:

During the last few weeks a number of persons sent the complaint that they had not received the copies of "The Old and the New Ideal" mailed by me, and it now seems that every copy of this book delivered to the Mayville postoffice since Nov. 15, was retained by the postoffice department. I demanded an explanation from our postmaster, who answered that he did not know and that all mail was promptly forwarded from this office. On Friday, December 10, a man introducing himself as a United States postoffice inspector visited me and explained as follows:

Some time ago he received a complaint (from New York) against the mailing of "The Old and the New Ideal." Thereupon he ordered a copy from me and, having no time to read it himself, forwarded it to the United States district attorney, who declared it to be unmailable. He further informed me that I might expect an indictment by the grand jury meeting next January.

My book unmailable! That would mean that it is lewd, lascivious or obscene! It has been abused in a great many ways, but this is a new and surprising claim against it, which appears simply absurd to me.

Well, I certainly do not want to act contrary to the postal law or any other obscenity law, and the sale of "The Old and the New Ideal" will be suspended entirely until I have proved to the satisfaction of judge and jury that I have the uninvadable

right to use the United States mails for the transportation of this book. EMIL F. RUEDEBUSCH.
Mayville, Wis., Dec. 14, 1897.

Thus are the beauties of government exemplified. Comrade Ruedebush in order to get the use of the mails for the transportation of his book had to pay to a swindling government 8 cents a pound. An ordinary business man who took that 8 cents a pound for transmitting matter would soon transact no business unless he fulfilled the contract.

But the glorious postoffice system, pride of the Statists, is something different. It has a monopoly and punishes by a heavy penalty any attempt at opposition. This brings all grist to the mill of the biggest thief in America—the United States government.

An ordinary business man who indulged in the game of forcing payment for a contract which he refused to fill would have to refund the money so taken or go to jail—or buy a judge. But government can do no wrong.

Government is a "capper." It creates business for its henchmen, the sycophantic, parasitical lawyer, judge and juror.

God, Government and Grundy the great trinity of fraud, force and filth, are monopolists of the rankest kind.

"Thou shalt have no other god before me," says God.

"You shall not despise my rule, you may not govern yourself," says Government.

"You must wear my besmudged straight-jacket, you shall not be clean," says Grundy.

And this trinity enforces its decrees with fear of hell, prison and ostracism. These failing to terrify men and women who dare think, who dare investigate, the sword and the cannon are brought into requisition, the butcher turned loose and streams of blood soak into the bosom of mother earth that "law and order" may be upheld; that monopoly and brigandage may run riot; that Pluto may loll, and Manhood may labor.

Screaming prudes lift their hands in horror at the mention of nature, while parsons have a fit at the thought of truth and honor.

Politician, priest and prude unite in denouncing all that is best for the simple reason that, like vultures, their food is carrion. Cleanliness is foreign to their natures, so away with it; label it filthy and send it to jail!

On top of this, well-meaning friends who would really like to allow liberty but think they can be better served by having unwilling co-workers, ask us, as does Mrs. Whitehead, "Who would do the business if the government did not do it?"

To all such inquirers I want to call attention to the following statement, which appeared years ago in Liberty:

"Some years ago when letter postage was still 3 cents, Wells, Fargo & Co. were doing a large business in carrying letters throughout the Pacific States and Territories. Their rate was 5 cents, more than three of which they expended, as the legal monopoly required, in purchasing of the United States a stamped envelope in which to carry the letter intrusted to their care. That is to say, on every letter which they carried they had to pay a tax of more than 3 cents. Exclusive of this tax, Wells, Fargo & Co. got less than 2 cents for each letter which they carried, while the government got 3 cents for each letter which it carried itself, and more than 3 cents for each letter which Wells,

Fargo & Co. carried. On the other hand it cost every individual 5 cents to send by Wells, Fargo & Co., and only 3 to send by the government. Moreover, the area covered was one in which immensity of distance, sparseness of population, and irregularities of surface made out-of-the-way points unusually difficult of access. Still, in spite of all these advantages on the side of the government, its patronage steadily dwindled, while that of Wells, Fargo & Co. as steadily grew. Peculiarly this, of course, was a benefit to the government. But for this very reason such a condition of affairs was all the more mortifying. Hence the postmaster-general sent a special commissioner to investigate the matter. He fulfilled his duty and reported to his superior that Wells, Fargo & Co. were complying with the law in every particular, and were taking away the business of the government by furnishing a prompter and securer mail service, not alone to principal points, but to more points and remoter points than were included in the government list of postoffices."

Now will our objecting friends do some real hard thinking?

How long would the Wells, Fargo, or any other company do business under freedom, without any monopoly, if they charged 8 cents a pound for carrying goods if they not only did not carry out the contract after taking pay, but went farther and STOLE THE GOODS as the United States government has done in this and similar cases?

Would the country under freedom tolerate a carrying concern which agreed to carry papers at a certain price and then when, after years of labor, a publisher had built up a business deliberately crush it out without trial? The government reserves the right to do that now.

Another thing: Should Comrade Ruedebush's defense cost him his last dollar, and should he then be acquitted, how much of that expense will the thief government make good? Not a cent! If it returns the stolen property that is all the plucked victim may hope for.

As to the sample copy which our critic got, we can, if need be dispense with a few of the benefits of the system rather than have a despotic government rob us on other points.

Why did not the critic mention the thousands of tons of "free" matter carried for privileged characters by the postoffice system? That is even more perfect than a one-cent-a-pound rate. But we don't all get it, though "loyal" country papers get it, as this keeps them contented with any measure which may be adopted against others—hence they don't protest against the infamous Loud bill.

Less hysterics about our cursed postoffice system and more cool analysis would be in order about now. Suppose our Statist friends try it awhile.

F. A. C.

A PIOUS PAGAN.

"I think that all the Anarchists are insane, Emma Goldman among the rest. So, I think that they should be treated as we treat the crazy. Put these Anarchists in asylums, get their nerves in good working order and the probability is that many could be cured. Every Anarchist that is executed becomes a martyr and all the insane Anarchists regard him as a hero, but if he had been declared insane and shut up he would not be a leader. Let this course be pursued and the Anarchists would soon die out. Of course, Emma Goldman did not hurt the church she spoke in. I do not regard brick and mortar and boards sacred because they

are put together in a church. That is nonsense. I also think that the Rev. McCowan is a generous man—not afraid. However it is not commendable for a crazy man or woman to be invited to talk before any public assemblage.

"The people who heard Miss Goldman now know just how mistaken she is, and just how idiotic what is called Anarchy is."

Such was Bob Ingersoll's profound criticism of Emma Goldman's Detroit speech. And here is a criticism of the critic, as delivered by the Detroit Sentinel, or a part of it rather, and the Sentinel is not an Anarchist paper either, though its editor is not a fool:

"There is Bob Ingersoll for example, the great anti-religious crank and economic bigot. He's always fighting spooks. But when it comes to fighting devils on earth, old Ingersoll is orthodox and he ain't in the fight. His mercenary interests are not in that direction. He talks very glibly, very eloquently, very profoundly of the liberty of man, woman and child, but has not a word to say against the things that deny them liberty.

"Of course, everybody who does not agree with Ingersoll is insane and should be put in an insane asylum. It may be imagined that many Christians think old Bob is insane, and it is possible for them to prove it as easily as Bob can prove the Anarchists insane. Now they may be insane, but does it not take more than Infidel Bob's say-so to make it so?"

And Bob is worried because Comrade Goldman don't believe in the Christian marriage system. That is Bob's connecting link with Christianity and he has neither the courage nor the progressiveness to let go of it. You see it would not pay him to be too radical. If there were money in it Bob might be the "reddest of the red."

Bob does well to characterize as insane those who have studied a question which he has shunned, and perhaps shunned because of its poverty of wealth, not of justice.

What a brilliant criticism from a Republican who is a Republican because "in the 60's he fought Democrats on the battle field," and that is what Bob gives as his "reason" for being a Republican. Such a bigot must be an intelligent critic, very!

Kropotkin was welcomed recently by college professors, LL.D.'s and men of science as a man of great learning, but Bob hadn't then informed them that all Anarchists are insane or they would have put Comrade Kropotkin in a straight jacket—or possibly Bob might have got the jacket. But a prince may be sane though an Anarchist, but not common mortals.

And Bob don't believe in abolishing marriage—female slavery. A woman who won't sell herself for a home, or for a title, or for some other consideration, is insane!

If she obeys natural laws without feeling priest or politician she is insane.

If she yields only to love what another yields to fear of God, Government and Grundy she is insane!

But, Bob, whisper it softly: She does not prostitute herself, and when you use your talents for the obtaining of gold regardless of principles you do prostitute yourself.

And you prostitute yourself when you pander to the plaudits of the multitude, Bob; and to the doing of these two things your life is principally devoted.

F. A. C.

THE OTHER SIDE.

The article in the last edition of FREE SOCIETY (Dec. 12) headed "Wants Us to Desist," signed by S. A. P., filled me with disappointment. I think there are few who have the welfare and life of FREE SOCIETY more at heart than yours truly. And I would very much like to see the discussions carried on. They were one of the leading features of our extinguished Firebrand, and I had hoped to see them revived in FREE SOCIETY.

True, Lucifer is doing a grand work, but there are many of us who would enjoy reading some articles along that line who cannot afford to pay \$1 for Lucifer, but are able to pay 50 cents for FREE SOCIETY and really prefer to as it advocates Commun-

ism. Why not discuss the sex question; also, if it is right why should we fear it?

Most Anarchists admit it is of at least as much importance as the economic question, and many of them say we will never obtain economic freedom until we have sexual freedom. Then if it is so let us have the free discussion of it. Let us not be ashamed of our gospel, and don't try to load all the responsibility off onto Lucifer. I am not much of a talker and a poor writer, but I try to carry out my ideas the best I can. It is not a very flowery road here in this little conservative town, but I believe it is right, it pleases me, and I say "a fig for public opinion."

Let us hear from some of the woman comrades and readers of FREE SOCIETY. Yours for perfect freedom.

M. L. K.

Lowell, Wash.

ILL WINDS.

I'm very glad the poor are growing poorer. I will tell you why pretty soon. I'm very glad Republican protection results in a cut in their wages. I'm glad it so happens there are some intelligent men among the poor and that they also have had their wages cut. If they feel the cut they will make good wailers (Weylers). There are Weylers and Weylers. Some are butchers and some are sluggers. I shall be glad when the last straw has not quite broken their laborious backs, but just simply served the purpose of a stinging goad. Just a few more lashes, however, will be very appropriate as a preliminary to the grand smashup which the French revolutionists called un debacle. I shall rejoice at the increase in the number of unruly and fractions. The success of any radical movement is owing largely to that obnoxious element, as history plainly shows. Where would the Jesuits, A. P. A's, Catholics, Turks, Puritans and Prohibs have been today had it not been for their bigotry? Hail! hail, therefore, ye unruly sons of America! May your fiery, restless tribe increase.

Let your motto, "Arrogant Authority come off your perch," ring through the portals with no uncertain sound. Only by the noise you make shall we know of your presence. Only by your actions will you give your threshers to understand that threshing is a game two can play at. The Cubans, for example, know a thing or two about guerrilla warfare, though the odds may be against them.

ST. JONATHAN.

AN EXAMPLE IN STATISM.

The revolutionary movement is growing rapidly in this city. Discontents from the two political Socialist camps, weary and disgusted with the dogmatism of their creeds and in rebellion against the dictatorial methods of their leaders, are joining the ranks of the free statistists, where no censorship is exercised over actions or utterances, no censuring or expelling for disagreement with leaders—there being no leaders as such—every person being his own leader and responsible to no one for his conduct.

In such a fraternity the feeling of solidarity is much stronger and far more widespread than can ever hope to be in iron-clad, rule-sticking organizations like the S. L. P. and Social Democracy.

It is remarkable how soon the spirit of authority and bitterness against independent thought and expression develops in these "parties." Debs' organization, yet an infant, is a striking example of this fact. No czar ever ruled with a more despotic sway than do the schemers of this puny organization. DeLeon never dictated the policy of the S. L. P. with more brazenness than do the "upper council" prescribe the actions of the local branches. An instance of their methods of discipline is shown by their recent action in depriving a branch of the right to select its own speakers for their weekly meetings, and now the "council" supplies the talent (?) for branch 1 that nothing but the unadulterated may reach the ears of its members. To further insure them against false doctrines, and that their education would be strictly in accordance with the requirements of the council—that of disciplined loyalty to it—it was decided that the rule of free discussion should be so amended that

Anarchists' opposition could be prevented, arguing that their criticisms could not be answered by any other method. The safest way to meet the arguments of a superior opponent is to avoid them. Having sadly experienced the force of this logic the Social Democrats would proceed to cram their doctrines down the throats of deluded workers and collect their dollars without avoidable Anarchist molestation.

But why, I ask, do they fear criticism? Are they seeking the truth? Or have they got the truth? And if so, surely no argument an Anarchist can propound will effect it, for the truth is invulnerable, and the most effective way to expose the absurdity of anyone's position is to let him oppose it. Thus the mightiest weapon to wield in defense of truth is the truth itself. Then why this sacred guardianship? The truth needs no protection from laws or national councils, only that which is not the truth requires such shelter, and the Social Democracy in seeking to evade an open discussion of their propositions make a plain, open confession of the weakness of their position.

Not only are they trying to avoid an open discussion of Socialism with the Anarchists, but have, in their mad desperation to injure the propaganda of free Socialism, resorted to the most vile method known to depravity—that of personal slander. The defamation of character is the most cowardly and pernicious of the many crimes known to mankind. Take my life and I immediately become unconscious of the injury you have done me, destroy my good name and you condemn me to a living death. But so devoted are they to the tenets of their creed—self-aggrandizement—so great is their longing for the time when they will sit upon the thrones now occupied by the other tyrants, having appointed themselves presidents, governors, ministers of law and order, directors (?) of labor, prefects of police, etc., so rooted are their eyes upon this beautiful picture of high place, glory, power, rule and dictatorships that seems so near their grasp, and so intense is their desire to attain to them, that they have lost all sense of honor and have descended into the depths of infamy to accomplish their ends.

When I state that they selected as the victim for their venomous tongues one of the ablest men in the revolutionary movement in this country, a man who, for the last 20 years, has fearlessly advocated the cause of freedom, being for years a prominent leader in the famous radical District Assembly 49, K. of L., in New York city, and one of the first to lead the attack on the now infamous traitor Powderly, the vileness of their purpose is all the more plain.

Comrade T. P. Quinn is the man whose character and influence they tried to destroy by circulating a pernicious story of his being a police spy. Having attached this venomous poison to his good name they left it to do its murderous work without showing any disposition to prove it until R. M. Goodwin, a director of the S. D., feeling the grave injustice of the proceeding, resigned his position and began an investigation, and traced the origin of the story to one Fanny Kavanaugh, president of a local S. D. branch, and openly accused her at one of its public meetings. Knowing no escape from the consequences of her own vile tongue she confessed her guilt, but said she got it from another person, whose name, for reasons best known to herself, she refused to give, but whose veracity she did not question.

Quinn was out of the city at the time, and had no knowledge of what was going on. His wife was present, however, and, in defense of her husband's honor, approached the once-dignified, but then much-perplexed, president and gave her a sound thrashing with a whip she had concealed in the folds of her dress. She then departed in triumph, leaving the meeting in the greatest confusion. "Fanny," more scared than hurt, and more humiliated than both, was immediately taken under the paternal wing of the "national council," who, being mostly responsible for her trouble, felt themselves in duty bound to at least protect her from further harm. To this end they hired a big, burly ex-railroad man, who, armed to the teeth, set himself to watch and guard the timid creature against the perilous possibility of another attack from the devoted wife of her victim.

And herein we have a noble deed of knightly valor unexampled since the days of chivalry. To what dangers won't men expose themselves in this dire struggle for bread. Where would the poor foolhard be now, had Mrs. Quinn not thought her injury sufficiently redressed? Alas! too horrible to contemplate. And yet they say the heroes belong to the past.

But he has done the cause of humanity a great serv-

ice, besides doing some practical social democratic Pinkertonism, and it is to be hoped a place worthy of his services, and in line with his late achievement, will be created for him under the new regime.

Seriously, we have in this case a fair example of what may be expected under Social Bureaucracy, where the services of the thug will be as necessary to the safety of the official as they have ever been, and for precisely the same reasons—that of protecting them from the consequences of their own despotic rule.

* * *

According to his own "organ," Debs, at a meeting recently in St. Louis, proudly bore aloft the American flag. If "Gene" is serious in his Socialism he will leave that rag, the emblem of capitalistic spoliation that is dyed in the blood of humanity's noblest heroes, to McKinley; it has no place in the hands of a Socialist. But Debs, like McKinley, is looking for votes.

Chicago, Dec. 17, '97.

JAY FOX.

TWO DROMIOS.

I wish, through your columns, to "sorter" "right up" Bro. Greene and also to show Bro. Ingersoll where he's at. In the December number of Free Thought magazine, pp. 729 and 730, is a report of Bro. Ingersoll being interviewed as to the propriety of the Rev. H. I. McCowan allowing Miss Emma Goldman to lecture in his church. Ingersoll commends Rev. McCowan's liberality, and says Emma "couldn't do any harm any how; that all Anarchists and free lovers are crazy and should be treated as we treat our insane; it's a mistake to hang them, for we thereby make martyrs of them, but shut them up in insane asylums, and thereby stop their breeding and run the race out." And Editor Greene indorses Ingersoll in all this. How handy and nice! This course saves argument. This is free thought orthodoxy. When one can't meet an opponent's argument, don't kill him, don't torture him to death (because we live in a better day), but shut him up, if not in prison a la Bennett and Haywood and Foote, if not in prison, in an insane asylum, then they'll stop their breeding and they'll run out after awhile.

If you get hold of a fellow that's more than a match for you in advanced thought, and you can't convict him under the law as a criminal or as insane and shut him up, then boycott him socially and politically, make life so unbearable that he'll keep his mouth shut.

It seems we have orthodox freethinkers as well as orthodox christians. Both are governed by or adopt the same tactics. I've long looked upon Ingersoll as a back number in the Free Thought ranks. He has been on all sides of the liquor question, on all sides of the labor question, on all sides of the money question. After all his eloquent words in behalf of the poor, down-trodden laboring masses we now find him in the same eloquent strains, advocating Shylock's robber and gold-standard system that has caused more misery, sorrow, suffering and death than war, pestilence and plague. Through the influence of popularity, prestige and love of woman Ingersoll is fast nearing the end of his usefulness in the cause of free thought. Ingersoll and the Free Thought Journal would have such men as Tolstoi, Jefferson and Lincoln incarcerated in an insane asylum—yes, indeed, the most advanced writers on political economy and ethical culture.

The fact is Ingersoll is out for the "stuff," like our priests and preachers; take away their salaries and there will not be a soul saved, they'll all be left to go to hell.

Editor Greene has "Aunt Elmina" as a front-piece in the December number, and says some kind words of her, although she belongs to the insane class, is a free lover as well as an Anarchist, and, according to Greene's and Ingersoll's logic, should be incarcerated in an insane asylum. Fraternally, Newark Valley, N. Y. E. W. COUNCILMAN.

P. S.—I am more than glad to see the ——— re-issued under the name of FREE SOCIETY. It's a fine paper and doing lots of good. It furnishes an avenue whereby men and women of advanced radical views can reach the public. Success to FREE SOCIETY; long may it wave. I hope the time is not far distant when the comrades in Oregon will all be out of one of Ingersoll's and Greene's prisons and breathe the pure air of liberty, fraternity and love. C.

Every noble effort is at first impossible.—Carlyle.

"LAW AND AUTHORITY."

BY PIERRE KROPOTKIN.

CHAPTER I.

"When ignorance reigns in society, and disorder in the minds of men, laws are multiplied, legislation is expected to do everything, and each fresh law being a fresh miscalculation men are continually led to demand from it what can proceed only from themselves, from their own education and their own morality." It is no revolutionist who says this, nor even a reformer. It is the jurist, Dalloy, author of the collection of French law known as "Repertoire de la Legislation." And yet, though these lines were written by a man who was himself a maker and admirer of law, they perfectly represent the abnormal condition of our society.

In existing states a fresh law is looked upon as a remedy for evil. Instead of themselves altering what is bad, people begin by demanding a law to alter it. If the road between two villages is impassable, the peasant says: "There should be a law about parish roads." If a park keeper takes advantage of the want of spirit in those who follow him with servile observance and insults one of them, the insulted man says: "There should be a law to enjoin more politeness upon park keepers." If there is stagnation in agriculture or commerce, the husbandman, cattle breeder, or corn speculator argues: "It is protective legislation that we require." Down to the old clothesman there is not one who does not demand a law to protect his own little trade. If the employer lowers wages, or increases the hours of labor, the politician in embryo exclaims, "We must have a law to put all that to rights!" instead of telling the workers that there are other, and much more effectual, means of settling these things straight; namely, recovering from the employer the wealth of which he has been despoiling the workmen for generations. In short, a law everywhere and for everything! A law about fashions, a law about mad dogs, a law about virtue, a law to put a stop to all the vices and all the evils which result from human indolence and cowardice.

We are so perverted by an education which from infancy seeks to kill in us the spirit of revolt, and to develop that of submission to authority; we are so perverted by this existence under the ferule of a law, which regulates every event in life—our birth, our education, our development, our love, our friendship—that, if this state of things continues, we shall lose all initiative, all habit of thinking for ourselves. Our society seems no longer able to understand that it is possible to exist otherwise than under the reign of law, elaborated by a representative government and administered by a handful of rulers; and even when it has gone so far as to emancipate itself from the thralldom its first care has been to reconstitute it immediately. "The Year 1, of Liberty" has never lasted more than a day, for, after proclaiming it, men put themselves the very next morning under the yoke of law and authority.

Indeed, for some thousands of years, those who govern us have done nothing but ring the changes upon "Respect for law, obedience to authority." This is the moral atmosphere in which parents bring up their children, and school only serves to confirm the impression. Cleverly assorted scraps of apocryphal science are inculcated upon the children to prove necessity of law; obedience to the law is made a religion; moral goodness and the law of the masters are fused into one and the same divinity. The historical hero of the schoolroom is the man who obeys the law and defends it against rebels.

Later, when we enter upon public life, society and literature, impressing us day by day and hour by hour, as the water drop hollows the stone, continue to inculcate the same prejudice. Books of history, of political science, of social economy are stuffed with this respect for law; even the physical sciences have been pressed into the service by introducing artificial modes of expression, borrowed from theology and arbitrary power, into knowledge which is purely the result of observation. Thus our intelligence is successfully befogged, and always to maintain our respect for law. The same work is done by newspapers. They have not an article which does not preach respect for law, even where the third page proves every day to demonstrate the imbecility of that law, and shows how it is dragged through every variety of mud and filth by those charged with its administration. Servility before the law has become a virtue, and I doubt if there

was ever even a revolutionist who did not begin in his youth as the defender of law against what are generally called "abuses," although these last are inevitable consequences of the law itself.

Art pipes in unison with would-be science. The hero of the sculptor, the painter, the musician shields law beneath his buckler, and, with flashing eyes and distended nostrils, stands ever ready to strike down the man who would lay hands upon her. Temples are raised to her; revolutionists themselves hesitate to touch the high priests consecrated to her service, and, when revolution is about to sweep away some ancient institution, it is still by law that it endeavors to sanctify the deed.

The confused mass of rules of conduct called law, which has been bequeathed to us by slavery, serfdom, feudalism and royalty, has taken the place of those stone monsters before whom human victims used to be immolated, and whom slavish savages dared not even touch lest they should be slain by the thunder bolts of heaven.

This new worship has been established with especial success since the rise to supreme power of the middle class—since the great French revolution. Under the ancient regime men spoke little of laws; unless, indeed, it were with Montesquieu, Rousseau and Voltaire, to oppose them to royal caprice; obedience to the good pleasure of the king and his lackeys was compulsory on pain of hanging or imprisonment. But during and after the revolution, when the lawyers rose to power, they did their best to strengthen the principle upon which their ascendancy depended. The middle class at once accepted it as a dike to dam up the popular torrent. The priestly crew hastened to sanctify it, to save their bark from foundering amid the breakers. Finally, the people received it as an improvement upon the arbitrary authority and violence of the past.

To understand this we must transport ourselves in imagination into the eighteenth century. Our hearts must have ached at the story of the atrocities committed by the all-powerful nobles of that time upon the men and women of the people before we can understand what must have been the magic influence upon the peasant's mind of the words "Equality before the law, obedience to the law without distinction of birth or fortune." He who, until then, had been treated more cruelly than a beast, he who had never had any rights, he who had never obtained justice against the most revolting actions on the part of a noble, unless in revenge he killed him and was hanged—he saw himself recognized by this maxim, at least in theory, at least with regard to his personal rights, as the equal of his lord. Whatever this law might be, it promised to affect lord and peasant alike; it proclaimed the equality of the rich and poor before the judge. The promise was a lie, and today we know it; but at that period it was an advance, an homage to justice, as hypocrisy is an homage rendered to truth. This is the reason that when the saviors of the menaced middle class (the Robespierres and the Dantons) took their stand upon the writings of the Rousseaus and the Voltaires, and proclaimed "Respect for law, the same for every man," the people accepted the compromise, for their revolutionary impetus had already spent its force in the contest with a foe whose ranks drew closer day by day. They bowed the neck beneath the yoke of law to save themselves from the arbitrary power of their lords.

The middle class has ever since continued to make the most of this maxim, which, with another principle, that of representative government, sums up the whole philosophy of the bourgeois age, the XIXth century. It has preached this doctrine in its schools, it has propagated it in its writings, it has molded its art and science to the same purpose, it has thrust its beliefs into every hole and corner—like a pious English woman who slips tracts under the door—and it has done all this so successfully that today we behold the issue in the detestable fact that, at the very moment when the spirit of turbulent criticism is reawakening, men who long for freedom begin the attempt to obtain it by entreating their masters to be kind enough to protect them by modifying the laws which these masters themselves have created!

But times and tempers are changed since a hundred years ago. Rebels are everywhere to be found who no longer wish to obey the law without knowing whence it comes, what are its uses, and whither arises the obligation to submit to it, and the reverence with which it is encompassed. The rebels of our day are

Continued on page 6.

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, 13 Oak Grove Ave., 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.

SPECIAL NOTICE!

EXCHANGES, correspondents and subscribers will please address all mail for this paper to address given below. With the new year we discontinue the use of a postoffice box and will receive mail addressed to

FREE SOCIETY, 13 Oak Grove Ave.,
San Francisco, Calif.

NEW YEAR SUGGESTION.

FREE SOCIETY makes this New Year suggestion:

If we are assured of at least \$20 per week of outside receipts on propaganda fund we can keep the paper up to its present size and, with the assistance of the comrades, make it replete with news of the movement as well as propaganda matter, we propose that all who can use bundles of five or more copies per week for distribution subscribe for as many copies each week at 1 cent each as they can use, sending in the money at least once each month if possible. We already send out nearly or quite 1,000 in bundles, some of which are more than paid for and some of which do not produce cash returns.

Now it will certainly be an easy matter for the comrades to not only keep the paper at its present size and increase its circulation to not less than 5,000, but also to insure the publication of pamphlets.

Give us 2,000 copies paid for each week at 1 cent each aside from subscription receipts and we will do the rest.

You might get clubs in your neighborhood, each individual "chipping in" as much as they feel disposed and thus take and use a large bundle to good advantage. These can be sent in smaller bundles if desired. A number of Boston comrades are working on this plan now, each of them gets 10 copies each week, contributing a dime to a chosen comrade who sends in the full amount.

Next week we will publish in pamphlet form Kropotkin's "Law and Authority" at 5 cents each or \$2 per hundred (possibly less, in which case \$2 will pay for more than 100). Send in your orders AT ONCE so we will know how many to print. This will be No. 1 of FREE SOCIETY LIBRARY. FREE SOCIETY GROUP.

While we have no intention of dunning those who are unable to pay for their paper but desire to read it, there are hundreds on our list who are away behind and could doubtless easily pay up. Rather than continue sending it to those who desire to take undue advantage of the policy of this paper not to demand payment from those unable to pay we would send the papers now sent to the too-clever ones to new names each week. Of course many of those who are behind doubtless are unintentionally so. But we desire to state that all who are not up to date in their accounts should drop us a line if they cannot pay and wish the paper continued to their addresses, else we will be justified in the presumption that they are dead or have removed themselves in some other manner, and in either case don't want the paper, and we shall promptly act in accord therewith.

FREE SOCIETY.

SAN FRANCISCO MEETING.

On Thursday evening, Dec. 30, 1897, A. Klemencic will speak on Anarchist Communism, at Friendship hall, Pythian Castle, 909 Market street. As Comrade Klemencic has tired of trying to get the soapy State Socialists to make arrangements to meet him in joint debate he takes this means of forcing them to show their hands. Any Statist who wants to debate will be given an opportunity to do so, and he won't be asked to produce a DeLeon certificate of character—all that will be asked of him will be that he shall produce a logical argument, failing in this all the S. L. P. certificates of Socialism won't save him from annihilation.

Everybody welcome, and the Statists may carpet the hall with copies of their papers and no police will be called in.

Women won't be insulted by an officious chairman and sappy secretary, so they need not fear to come, as this will not be a State Socialist camp meeting.

Don't forget to come and bring your Statist neighbor to Pythian Castle, Dec. 30, 1897. The meeting will begin promptly at 8 o'clock.

INSOLENT IGNORANCE.

I had occasion recently to call attention to the woman-insulting tactics of the S. L. P. on a recent occasion. On the Sunday night following that meeting another woman was given similar treatment.

The speaker of the evening was a Single Taxer, and said that the Socialists should aim to be elevating instead of debasing, whereas in order to find the Socialist secretary he had to go into a saloon.

Mrs. Gillie, a magnetic healer, complimented the speaker upon his remarks, whereupon the smooth-faced secretary arose and said, substantially, "I'd rather be found in a saloon than in a church where the Single Taxers hold their meetings, and I'd rather go into a saloon than into the parlors of a magnetic healer, and Mrs. Gillie has out a sign on Sixth street 'Magnetic Healer.'"

For the benefit of the ignorant youth who helps push the S. L. P. along, I will state two facts. First a church building is from a moral standpoint just as fit a place in which to hold a meeting as any other place. Because superstitious people of one brand use it for their superstitious practices does not give us a license to be equally as superstitious in fancying that the building itself is responsible for what occurs inside of it. Were this so, as all vagaries occur on the earth, to avoid responsibility for them we would have to get off the earth.

Secondly, as to the magnetic healing, aside from the question of deliberately insulting a woman, the young fellow in question carries a heavy load of dense ignorance and old-time prejudice and superstition. The animosity against magnetic healing shows this. Dr. E. B. Foote, one of the best-known medical practitioners on earth, in his "Plain Home Talk," has this to say about magnetic healing:

"Animal magnetism is a humbug!" No, reader, you believe in it. Your reason, perhaps, is not convinced, and you may think you do not. Then, why should I know better than you do what you have faith in? Let me tell you. The other day you came in collision with a chair and bruised your shin. Instinctively you bent over and rubbed the contused limb with your hand. The baby fell from your lap upon the floor; you picked it up hastily and rubbed its little head till it stopped crying. One night you were attacked with cramps in the stomach, and the hand flew there immediately; you pressed and manipulated the region where the suffering was felt until you were relieved. But a few days ago your wife had the headache, and as she reclined on the sofa, you sat beside her and passed your hand gently over her feverish temples. Now all these instinctive, and I may almost say involuntary applications of the hand, in cases of physical distress, show that with all your professed scepticism, you, practically, believe in the efficacy of animal magnetism, and it is your experience and mine, and my observation as a medical man, that leads me to place animal magnetism prominently among what are denominated in this chapter Common Sense Remedies.

"My theory of mesmeric power is quite essential to support many of my views as given in this work, and hence I was pleased to find, many years ago, that the experiments of Mr. William Crooks as reported in a work entitled 'Spiritualism Answered by Science,' by Edward W. Cox, served to confirm it. Mr. Cox was a member of the London Dialectical Society's investigating committee, and was present at the experiments of Mr. Crooks. The object of his pamphlet was to show that the so-called spiritual manifestations were produced by something he called psychic force. He says, 'this force is generated in certain persons of peculiar nervous organization in sufficient power to operate beyond bodily contact,' and, he continues, 'there can be little doubt that the force is possessed by every human being—that it is a necessary condition of the living nerve, if, indeed, it be not the vital force itself,' and that it is possessed by psychics in extra-

ordinary degree. Mr. Crooks, he adds, 'has recently constructed an instrument of extreme delicacy, which seems to indicate the existence of the psychic force more or less in every person with whom he has made trial of it. The existence of such a force is asserted by Dr. Richardson, in a recent article in the Popular Science Review, in which he contends that there is nerve fluid (or ether), with which the nerves are enveloped, and by whose help it is that the motion of their molecules communicates sensations and transmits the commands of the will. This nerve-ether is, he thinks, no other than the vital force. It extends with all of us somewhat beyond the extremities of the nerve-structure, and even beyond the surface of the body, encompassing us wholly with an envelope of nerve-atmosphere, which varies in its depths and intensity in various persons. This, he contends, will solve many difficult problems in psychology, and throw a new light on many obscurities in psychology and mental philosophy.'

Now the psychic force referred to by Mr. Cox, and the nerve-ether so-called by Dr. Richardson, are manifestly only other names for what Mesmer and his followers call mesmeric force, all of which so-called forces are one and the same as animal magnetism. The same writer speaks of 'nerve-ether or nerve-atmosphere,' which emanates from every animal body. It may as well be called magnetic atmosphere. So long as we recognize its existence it matters little what name we give to it."

MIGHT IS RIGHT?

Dr. Redbeard contends that fitness to survive must be tested by the clash of armies, all other tests being fraudulent. Victors in war are naturally entitled to dominate, and the "defeated"—that is the runaways who feared to die—are equally entitled to servitude. "Right" and "wrong" are decided not by the meek, but by the mighty, who, consequently, may write laws, creeds, constitutions, title deeds, and rewrite them at pleasure. Equality ideals are mere millennial illusions, for all life is strife—a combat to the death.

As long as the struggle for existence is "moralized," or limited by governments and gods, the unfit and base, instead of being trampled down (as nature intended) are stupidly permitted to set up imperial injunction seats and deal out death, bondage and ruin to highest types.

Thus, by demanding his credentials, Darwinism is fatal to the tyrant. It rings him round with menace and destruction. It hurls against him 10,000 trained rivals.

So runs part of an advertisement which appears elsewhere in this issue to accommodate a friend—not the advertiser.

It will be seen that the U. of C., which stands for University of C—, is decidedly indefinite, and Ragnar Redbeard appears to be as unreal. I do not wonder that the author desires to conceal his identity.

His test of fitness to survive is a relic of barbarism, one which few of the world's greatest men could have survived in conflict with a muscular gorilla, i. e., according to his logic, the gorilla is the fittest to survive. "Victors in war are naturally entitled to dominate; and the 'defeated'—that is the runaways who feared to die—are equally entitled to servitude." There's wisdom and logic for you; don't dare deny it, now!

If 10,000 men surround 1,000, and by sheer force of numbers capture 500 of them after losing 5,000 of their own men, the 5,000 survivors prove their superior fitness and the small band of 500 prove their unfitness. Talk about logic! But who expects logic of an Individualist?

Might is right (and Tucker also believe this) therefore the victorious 5,000 are right. The most despotic government in existence is right. McKinleyism is right. Bryanism would have been right had Bryan won in the last political campaign. The colonies won the war for independence from England because they were right, and Rothschild has shackled America to England because he is right. Hooray! Just as easy to figure this out as to roll off a log! And when the writer sets himself up as an oracle of nature's intentions he only makes an ass of himself. He is like, very like, the God worshiper who tells us what God intended.

And that tyrant! If might makes right the most powerful would gather around him the great bulk of the throat cutters of the universe because that would be more profitable for them, and require less dangerous fighting. Thus would the "10,000 rivals" remain quiescent and tyranny end—yes end in the absolute omnipotence of the tyrant.

Some men write for money. Others to do what they deem good, i. e., spread their beliefs.

Others write to enunciate a theory just to cultivate their powers without any regard to the pernicious effect of their writing, and these sometimes couple this with the money-acquiring desire. Such would appear to be "Ragnar Redbeard." F. A. C.

S. L. P. DODGES.

Next week we shall publish a letter sent by the Columbian branch, S. L. P. to a friend whose arguments proved troublesome to them. The letter itself is a document well worthy of perusal by all who think that the S. L. P. will bring about an order of Liberty, Fraternity and Equality.

FREE SOCIETY received this week an anonymous communication from one of the local bosses of the S. L. P., though it was written evidently by a woman. It was returned with a request that he sign it, and secure its publication. But it looks as though our ability to spot the writer of the anonymous slur was too much for his courage, for he has not yet returned it with his signature. F. A. C.

COMMUNISM AND STATISM.

A comrade sends a clipping from a third-rate economic-question paper called the "People" of which he says "it is full of lies, but very little truth." After reading the article I am inclined to think that the writer didn't intend to lie, but like the average Statist he was not at all anxious to discover the truth, but would rather foster old follies.

Here are a few excerpts from the article mentioned, written by one Wm. Edlin:

"Socialism and Communism are two terms often used by opponents in a way which would indicate that they mean one and the same thing. Mostly all of the bourgeois writers on Socialism confound the two terms that way. To them Socialism is synonymous with Communism. This is a great error.

Your opponents then are much better posted than you, Mr. Edlin. By looking up the definition of Socialism in the Encyclopedic dictionary you will find that Socialism embraces Communism. So even the lexicographers are better sociologists than you are. But perhaps that one definition won't do you. Then go to Stormouth, Worcester, Encyclopedia Britannica, Blackie's Modern Cyclopaedia, Lalor's Cyclopaedia of Political Science, Century Dictionary, Littré's Dictionary of the French Language.

The real trouble seems to be the Statist desire to monopolize or copyright the term Socialism—and then apply it to Despotism.

"Communism would not leave anything to the individual, and it would make the community the sole owner of all the wealth. While Socialism has for its maxim—to each according to his deeds; Communism has for its maxim—to each according to his needs."

If Communism "would leave nothing to the individual" how would each receive "according to his needs?" State Socialist logic that. As a matter of fact, Communism would leave liberty to the individual, and that one thing is more than all that a slavish Statist can conceive of.

"The forming of small 'communes' seems to be an essential feature of Communism, and therein Communism is a back number in the world's history, because the modern and requisite method of production, necessary to produce abundantly, demands nations for its basis. The 'commune' is too small a basis. Communism ignores this economic and social fact; Socialism recognizes it."

Yes the "commune is too small a basis." You know all about it. You have tried the work of herding vast groups in a bunch and know it will work. I guess you haven't! The Commune will be just as large as it can be and maintain harmony—and no larger. Under these circumstances the larger it is the better, but under other circumstances the smaller it is the better it will be. Economy will demand co-operative effort on the largest scale possible, but liberty-enjoying people won't be such fools as to sacrifice their happiness just to get a saving of a few minutes' labor a day when they have leisure time "to burn." F. A. C.

ONCE WAS ENOUGH.

Cigarmaker's Union No. 97, of Boston, one of the strongest and most influential locals in the United States, has just held its regular semi-annual election of officers. The contest is a significant one for it was fought to determine whether or no State Socialism and its peculiar political policy should continue in power. Six months ago the union was three-fourths socialistic and was officered entirely by DeLeonites. The officiousness and despotism of the Statists caused a revulsion

of feeling with the result that out of 24 offices the Statists secured only one. Only six short months ago DeLeon's "People" heralded to the gaze of the wondering multitude the "significant victory of the Socialists in this union and prophesied the good that would accrue to these Boston cigarmakers. But DeLeon is a poor prophet and his henchmen are poorer managers. It is only necessary to give them a little rope and they'll all hang themselves. G. E. M.

THINGS AND THOUGHTS.

A prominent Statist, or "Socialist" as he labels himself, handed me a pamphlet the other day which bears the title "Socialism and Anarchism; Antagonistic Opposites." But the author was prudent enough to conceal his name, possibly because aware of his inability to handle this subject.

"Socialists and Anarchists as such are enemies. They pursue contrary aims, and the success of the former will destroy forever the fanatical hopes of the latter," says the author in the beginning of his pamphlet. If he had said that the Statists and Anarchists as such are enemies nobody would dispute his assertion, but I deny that Socialists and Anarchists are enemies. Even the self confessed State Socialist declares that he aims at the best conceivable state of society in which the laborer shall receive his full product and secure liberty to the individual. The aim of the Anarchists is the same, consequently we are not "enemies as such," but simply differ in our premises as to what will construct such a state of society, and the essential difference is this: The Statist contends that people will never co-operate harmoniously unless they are taken by the neck and forced into it, while we Anarchists insist that people will never co-operate harmoniously until they are freed from all arbitrary methods and authority, and that, as a friend of mine expresses it, "you can force people into submission, but not into harmony."

But I agree with the author when he says that "the success of the [State] Socialists will destroy forever the fanatical hopes of the latter." The persecution of the Anarchists by the capitalists today would be nothing in comparison to what would be done with us if the State Socialists could succeed in controlling society all over the world.

Now let us see how logical our "antagonist" is in his deductions. In the beginning he tells his readers that the Anarchists want to destroy "State and church, property and laws, of course, foremost." * * * * * "Our readers will, of course, call the above ideas an utopia and utterly impractical." Anarchy is, "of course," "unpractical," and "an utopia," and on the very next page he tells his "intelligent" readers that we are living under Anarchy today. The writer must surely be well acquainted with the dunes of Social Democracy or else he would not dare to exhibit such rot. Telling his readers first that the Anarchists want to destroy "State and church, property and laws, of course, foremost," and then to say that our present society, with State and church, property and laws, is Anarchy is more than a common mortal is able to digest. A. I.

SOCIALISM OR LIBERTY?

In the issue of Nov. 28, the comments upon the extract from Prescott's "Conquest of Peru" are illogical in so far as they apply to the principles of modern Socialism.

The government of the Incas was a monarchy, and necessarily included many of the evils which arise from a government which exists for the purpose of maintaining a social state of inequality and partial slavery. Socialism contemplates absolute equality of conditions, and that highest form of liberty which only is consistent with happiness—equal liberty; (1) fraternal liberty; liberty which recognizes that society has rights, as well as the individual.

That Socialism is to provide men with "soft snaps" under "the government" is a very common, but none the less erroneous idea. High positions under the socialistic organization will mean neither greater power nor greater wage than is possessed by those who are for the time in what are now deemed humbler stations. Socialistic officials will be simply agents of society; and with the abolition of commercial profit, it is difficult to conceive of any motive which would lead to deliberate maladministration. (2) Honor will replace gain as the incentive, and the disgusting debaucheries of modern politics will consequently disappear forever.

The laws of the Incas related almost wholly to criminal matters, and the commentator of FREE SOCIETY observes: "How does this historical fact correspond with the unsupported assertion of many Statists that under State Socialism criminal laws will become obsolete?" Two more questions, equally logical, appear applicable. How does the historical fact that every Peruvian was obliged to marry at a certain age, correspond with the assertion of many Socialists that under Socialism, woman may, if she desires, be economically independent, and therefore not forced, as now, to look to some man for the support of herself and her children, becoming in return his property? (3) How does the historical fact that blasphemy against the sun was a capital crime among the Peruvians correspond with the assertion that most of the Socialists are infidels, and advocate Socialism, among other reasons, because it will curb the power of the church as an organization, and secure perfect religious and non-religious liberty of thought and action? (4) Again, the "benefits of Communism" (5) under the Incas are referred to. It is a poor rule that will not work both ways, so I will ask the reader to again read the three questions above, replacing "Socialists" by "Communists," and "Socialism" by "Communism," wherever the words occur. The query of the commentator appears to be a boomerang. It is clear that if the evils and crudities of the Peruvian monarchy and civilization are to be borne by Socialism because the industrial organization of the Incas was socialistic in its tendencies, then whatever was communistic among them may with equal propriety (impropriety) be burdened likewise. (6)

The gist of the matter is this: Socialism is primarily an industrial and economic organization to promote the happiness of the race by giving to every man the results of his toil, the enhancement of his labor which comes from co-operation, and equal liberty in all things. It is possible, however, to approximate the industrial benefits of Socialism in a condition of practical slavery, and consequently a semi-Socialism might be maintained in either a kingdom, a monarchy, as that of the Incas, or a republic—but in every instance the essential element of freedom would be lacking—in the republic not less than in a monarchy. Socialism under these conditions may appropriately be called State Socialism. We do not hear much of the term State Competition—and yet that is our present condition. As between State Competition and State Socialism—State chaos and State system in industrial affairs—there is simply the choice between slavery with economic insecurity, and slavery with economic security—with all which that choice implies.

My ideal is not State Socialism—I am not a Statist—but as against State competition I shall defend State Socialism, while against State Socialism I shall defend Socialism without the State—true Socialism—free Socialism—ideal Socialism.

Let it be remembered that government has always been a machine for the extraction of profit—commercial profit or its equivalent—from the governed. (7) Socialism by abolishing profit will remove the incentive for governing upon the part of those who would otherwise desire to govern. Power is always exercised for gain (8)—abolish gain and the exercise of power is abolished. ALEX. E. WRIGHT.

Wellesley Hills, Mass.

COMMENT.

1.—What other kind of liberty do you know of?

2 and 8.—A desire to rule over others has in the past proved a strong factor in the use of government by governmentalists. From this we may fairly infer that with the opportunity to do so they will in the future do as in the past.

3.—But under government if some fool faddist got it into his or her head, as some of them now do, that all should be married, what figure would a woman's economic emancipation cut if these faddists got a majority on their hobby.

4.—That is pure guess work. If a State can regulate what we shall eat, drink or wear it can as logically and as legally say what we shall profess to believe.

5 and 6.—My reference to "such benefits of Communism" as was enjoyed might perhaps have been better put as "benefits of co-operation" as the Communism was one of class, there being various grades, and between the different grades there could of course be no Communism. I do not deny the efficacy of even State Socialism to provide for the animal comforts of the citizen. But I contend that liberty means more than well-fed slaves ever dreamed of.

7.—But with the abolition of gain (in profit) what

guarantee would we have that government would forget its greed for something? If it had not profit as an incentive, we have had all too many illustrations of love of power over others. Plainly, as this point is speculation, I hardly think it worth wasting space upon.

F. A. C.

LIBERTY OF PRESS.

I do not know nor have I time to learn the particulars of the Firebrand case; but I am always in sympathy with any protest against suppression of free speech, and do not see how even obscene publications could be shut out of the mails without violating that part of the Constitution which declares "that congress shall make no law * * * abridging the freedom * * * of the press."

It is much to be regretted that some persons have taken advantage of "our glorious postoffice system" and sent through the mails matter calculated to foster impurity even in the minds of the young. (1.) Nevertheless I believe in our postoffice system and I also believe that the cure for these evils is not to be found in a censorship of what goes through the mails.

I do not ask it as a question that cannot be answered but as one for which I do not know the answer—If it were not for our postoffice system who would have brought the sample copy of FREE SOCIETY from you in San Francisco to me in New York! Or would it not need to be brought? (2)

Please accept thanks for sample copy of FREE SOCIETY. Yours for Freedom and Truth.

N. Y. City, Dec. 10, 1897. CELIA B. WHITEHEAD.
ANSWERS.

1.—I do not know whether or no Mrs. Whitehead refers to the Firebrand, but will suppose that she does and make this comment:

If children are properly taught the uses of all parts of their anatomy on a proper basis of instruction, no "obscene" publication will make them impure. If society has adopted a false system and under this system evil ensues from the teaching of physical truths, it is time for that system to be "altered or abolished," and if such action be not taken those who would instruct should certainly not be held wrong in that they tell unwelcome truths.

2.—See article elsewhere in this issue "The Latest Outrage."

A CHALLENGE TO F. A. C.

Since you seem unable to argue the question of monogamy vs. variety (1) I will ask the following: Are there "Anarchists (?) who seem to think that liberty means the license to force any woman for whom they may take a fancy to submit to their desires, even though the woman may have no responsive desires?" (2) If any such so-called Anarchists exist, will F. A. C. please call their names and give the evidence of their holding such opinion? (3)

Until such evidence is forthcoming I will have to treat such statements as I do when they come from ministers and plutocratic editors.

A. ISAAK.

COMMENT.

1.—I have no desire to enter into any such argument, and certainly shall not take a position in which I do not believe (as A. I. evidently desires) just to accommodate a desire for a profitless "scrap." I decline to stultify myself like a lawyer or professional controversialist. I do not believe in monogamy and don't pretend to. I do believe in variety. Also that if anyone wants to practice promiscuity and can find a mate they should be allowed to do so. But what I tried to impress upon A. I. was that no Anarchist will try to force anyone to practice promiscuity or dub them "just like christians" simply because they don't. Since my language was not understood (though I think the misunderstanding was deliberate) I only regret that I afforded imaginary ground for contention.

2.—A close reading of the article will show a phrase, "not among Anarchists," which is plain enough. If A. I. did not mean what I replied to his language was poorly chosen, to say the least.

3.—I am under no obligation to do so—at least not till A. I. tells who he referred to by "those Anarchists who believe in and lead a monogamic life"—though I don't know even if he can name them how he knows what they believe in.

F. A. C.

Did the mass of men know the actual selfishness and injustice of their rulers not a government would stand a year; the world would ferment with revolution.—Theodore Parker.

LAW AND AUTHORITY—CONTINUED FROM PAGE 3.

criticizing the very foundations of society, which have hitherto been held sacred, and first and foremost amongst them that fetish, law. Just for this reason the upheaval which is at hand is no mere insurrection, it is a revolution.

The critics analyze the sources of law, and find there either a god, product of the terrors of the savage, and stupid, paltry and malicious as the priests who vouch for its supernatural origin, or else bloodshed, conquest by fire and sword. They study the characteristics of law, and instead of perpetual growth corresponding to that of the human race, they find its distinctive trait to be immobility, a tendency to crystallize what should be modified and developed day by day. They ask how law has been maintained, and in its service they see the atrocities of Byzantinism, the cruelties of the inquisition, the tortures of the middle ages, living flesh torn by the lash of the executioner, chains, clubs, axes, the gloomy dungeons of prisons, agony, curses and tears. In our own days they see, as before, the ax, the cord, the rifle, the prison; on the one hand, the brutalized prisoner, reduced to the condition of a caged beast by the debasement of his whole moral being, and on the other, the judge, stripped of every feeling which does honor to human nature, living like a visionary in a world of legal fictions, reveling in the infliction of imprisonment and death, without even suspecting, in the cold malignity of his madness, the abyss of degradation into which he has himself fallen before the eyes of those whom he condemns.

They see a race of law makers legislating without knowing what their laws are about; today voting a law on the sanitation of towns, without the faintest notion of hygiene, tomorrow making regulations for the arming of troops, without so much as understanding a gun; making laws about teaching and education without ever having given a lesson of any sort, or even an honest education to their own children; legislating at random in all directions, but never forgetting the penalties to be meted out to ragmuffins, the prison and the galleys, which are to be the portion of men a thousand times less immoral than these legislators themselves.

Finally, they see the gaoler on the way to lose all human feeling, the detective trained as a blood hound, the police spy despising himself; "informing" metamorphosed into a virtue; corruption erected into a system; all the vices, all the evil qualities of mankind, countenanced and cultivated to insure the triumph of law.

All this we see, and, therefore, instead of inane repeating the old formula, "Respect the law," we say, "Despise law and all its attributes!" In place of the cowardly phrase "Obey the law," our cry is "Revolt against all laws!"

Only compare the misdeeds accomplished in the name of each law with the good it has been able to effect, and weigh carefully both good and evil, and you will see if we are right.

CHAPTER II.

Relatively speaking, law is a product of modern times. For ages and ages mankind lived without any written law, even that graven in symbols upon the entrance stone of a temple. During that period human relations were simply regulated by customs, habits and usages, made sacred by constant repetition, and acquired by each person in childhood, exactly as he learned how to obtain his food by hunting, cattle rearing or agriculture.

All human societies have passed through this primitive phase, and to this day a large proportion of mankind have no written law. Every tribe has its own manners and customs; customary law, as the jurists say. It has social habits, and that suffices to maintain cordial relations between the inhabitants of the village, the members of the tribe or community. Even among ourselves—the "civilized" nations—when we leave large towns, and go into the country, we see that there the mutual relations of the inhabitants are still regulated according to ancient and generally accepted custom, and not according to the written law of the legislators. The peasants of Russia, Italy and Spain, and even a large part of France and England, have no conception of written law. It only meddles with their lives to regulate their relations with the State. As to relations between themselves, though these are sometimes very complex, they are simply regulated according to ancient custom. Formerly, this was the case with mankind in general.

Two distinctly marked currents of custom are revealed by analysis of the usages of primitive people.

As man does not live in a solitary state, habits and feelings develop within him which are useful for the preservation of society and the propagation of the race. Without social feelings and usages life in common would have been absolutely impossible. It is not law which has established them; they are anterior to all law. Neither is it religion which has ordained them; they are anterior to all religions. They are found among all animals living in society. They are spontaneously developed by the very nature of things, like those habits in animals which men call instinct. They spring from a process of evolution, which is useful, and, indeed, necessary, to keep society together in the struggle it is forced to maintain for existence. Savages end by no longer eating one another, because they find it in the long run more advantageous to devote themselves to some sort of cultivation than to enjoy the pleasure of feasting upon the flesh of an aged relative once a year. Many travelers have depicted the manners of absolutely independent tribes, where laws and chiefs are unknown, but where the members of the tribe have given up stabbing one another in every dispute, because the habit of living in society has ended by developing certain feelings of fraternity and oneness of interest, and they prefer appealing to a third person to settle their differences. The hospitality of primitive peoples, respect for human life, the sense of reciprocal obligation, compassion for the weak, courage extending even to the sacrifice of self for others, which is first learnt for the sake of children and friends, and later for that of members of the same community—all these qualities are developed in man anterior to all law, independently of all religion, as in the case of the social animals. Such feelings and practices are the inevitable results of social life. Without being, as say priests and metaphysicians, inherent in man, such qualities are the consequence of life in common.

But side by side with these customs, necessary to the life of societies and the preservation of the race, other desires, other passions, and therefore other habits and customs, are evolved in human associations. The desire to dominate others and impose one's will upon them; the desire to seize upon the products of the labor of a neighboring tribe; the desire to surround oneself with comforts, without producing anything, whilst slaves provide their master with the means of procuring every sort of pleasure and luxury—these selfish, personal desires give rise to another current of habits and customs. The priest and the warrior, the charlatan who makes a profit out of superstition, and, after freeing himself from the fear of the devil, cultivates it in others; and the bully who procures the invasion and pillage of his neighbors that he may return laden with booty and followed by slaves; these two, hand in hand, have succeeded in imposing upon primitive society customs advantageous to both of them, but tending to perpetuate their domination of the masses. Profit begun by the indolence, the fears, the inertia of the crowd, and thanks to the continual repetition of the same acts, they have permanently established customs which have become a solid basis for their own domination.

For this purpose they have made use, in the first place, of that tendency to run in a groove, so highly developed in mankind. In children and all savages it attains striking proportions, and it may also be observed in animals. Man, when he is at all superstitious, is always afraid to introduce any sort of change into existing conditions; he generally venerates what is ancient. "Our fathers did so and so; they got on pretty well; they brought you up; they were not unhappy; do the same!" the old say to the young every time the latter wish to alter things. The unknown frightens them, they prefer to cling to the past, even when that past represents poverty, oppression and slavery. It may even be said that the more miserable a man is the more he dreads every sort of change, lest it may make him more wretched still. Some ray of hope, a few scraps of comfort, must penetrate his gloomy abode before he can begin to desire better things, to criticize the old ways of living, and prepare to imperil them or the sake of bringing about a change. So long as he is not imbued with hope, so long as he is not freed from the tutelage of those who utilize his superstition and his fears, he prefers remaining in his former position. If the young desire any change the old raise a cry of alarm against the innovators. Some savages would rather die than transgress the customs of their country, because they

have been told from childhood that the least infraction of established routine would bring ill luck and ruin the whole tribe. Even in the present day what numbers of politicians, economists and would-be revolutionists act under the same impression and cling to a vanishing past. How many care only to seek for precedents. How many fiery innovators are mere copyists of bygone revolutions.

This spirit of routine, originating in superstition, indolence and cowardice, has in all times been the mainstay of oppression. In primitive human societies it was cleverly turned to account by priests and military chiefs. They perpetuated customs useful only to themselves, and succeeded in imposing them on the whole tribe. So long as this conservative spirit could be exploited so as to assure the chief in his encroachment upon individual liberty, so long as the only inequalities between men were the work of nature, and these were not increased a hundred-fold by the concentration of power and wealth, there was no need for law and the formidable paraphernalia of tribunals and ever-augmenting penalties to enforce it.

But as society became more and more divided into two hostile classes, one seeking to establish its domination, the other struggling to escape, the strife began. Now as the conqueror was in a hurry to secure the results of his actions in a permanent form, he tried to place them beyond question, to make them holy and venerable by every means in his power. Law made its appearance under the sanction of the priest, and the warrior's club was placed at its service. Its office was to render immutable such customs as were to the advantage of the dominant minority. Military authority undertook to insure obedience. This new function was a fresh guarantee to the power of the warrior; now he had not only mere brute force at his service; he was the defender of law.

If law, however, presented nothing but a collection of prescriptions serviceable to rulers, it would find some difficulty in insuring acceptance and obedience. Well, the legislators confounded in one code the two currents of custom, of which we have just been speaking, the maxims which represent principles of morality and social union wrought out as a result of life in common, and the mandates, which are meant to insure eternal existence to inequality. Customs, absolutely essential to the very being of society, are, in the code, cleverly intermingled with usages imposed by the ruling caste, and both claim equal respect from the crowd. "Do not kill," says the code, and hastens to add, "And pay tithes to the priest." "Do not steal," says the code, and immediately after, "He who refuses to pay taxes shall have his hand struck off."

Such was law; and it has maintained its two-fold character to this day. Its origin is the desire of the ruling class to give permanence to customs imposed by themselves for their own advantage. Its character is the skillful co-mingling of customs useful to society, customs which have no need of law to insure respect, with other customs useful only to rulers, injurious to the mass of the people, and maintained only by the fear of punishment.

Like individual capital, which born of fraud and violence, and developed under the auspices of authority, law has no title to the respect of men. Born of violence and superstition, and established in the interests of consumer, priest and rich exploiter, it must be utterly destroyed on the day when the people desire to break their chains.

We shall be still better convinced of this, when, in the next chapter, we have analyzed the ulterior development of law, under the auspices of religion, authority and the existing parliamentary system.

BIBLE TEACHING UP TO DATE.

"All their lifetime subject to bondage."

All who sell their labor for legal tender currency based on a scarce metal are in bondage; and further they are robbed of their labor as well as of their freedom.

The unjust medium of exchange was devised by scheming wretches for no other purpose but to enable their class to live in lazy luxury on the toil of others—Henry George in his posthumous book, "The Science of Political Economy," says: "For in such social conditions much that passes for wealth must really be only legalized robbery, and nothing can be more offensive to those enjoying the profit of robbery, than to call it by its true name."

Ethical honesty is impossible with dishonest money; our present system will not allow anyone to

work for himself until he has first satisfied the claims of one or more landlord, and the city or county, or both, according to his place of habitation; seeing this, it follows that the very first step to take for freedom, must be, for those who do any useful work, either by brain or brawn, to agree to use a medium of exchange that cannot be used for any other purpose but that of exchange, this and nothing else is the true foundation for perfect liberty—now by far the greater number of children are born slaves, because the mothers have not borne them in freedom; this fact should not require further elucidation to any real searcher for truth.

It is most surprising how the superstitious faith in church and ballot holds such vast numbers in bondage, keeping church members in hell here, with fear of an intensified sheol for their future state of existence, they being gifted with powerful imaginations to be able to picture a worse state than the present for anyone striving to live according to truth; keeping citizens who vote hopping from frying pan to fire, and fire to frying pan. The employees of the city, all "free Americans by birth or swearing," are in bondage to the "boss" who pitchforked them into office, as payment for their independent vote, and to bleed them—many whose salaries are entered on the books as \$150 a month receive actual coin to the extent of about \$45, and have the constant dread of dismissal; we know how many of the schools are officered; and we know that none of these iniquities could exist with an honest medium of exchange—all government is brute force operated by the money power.

Can any force be more comical than the importance attached to citizenship, no one being consulted as to the place of his birth?

Socialists, Single Taxers, reformers of all grades and shades will never gain their object of freedom from bondage by means of government—gold. The only plan that is slowly but surely working for perfect freedom is "The Labor Exchange;" there are over 300 branches in this republic; every dollar they are putting into circulation by means of "labor checks" is doubling the medium of exchange to the extent of the amount of the currency, and what is of still more importance they are thus reducing the power of gold to that extent; this is a most important factor in the battle for freedom, for as their power increases they lessen the power of the money monopoly, at even a greater ratio than that of their accession.

With a scientific medium of exchange such as "The Labor Exchange" system, no charters, State laws or constitution would be necessary; there is no other plan now before the people to free us from bondage.

San Francisco.

J. ALFRED KINGHORN-JONES.

BOSTON NOTES.

It is only a short while before election day for mayor of Boston and it is very lively in the political arena now.

Large halls, are kept packed for hours in different parts of the city, with audiences so eager to learn the market price of votes this year, and listen to the phrases that are donated to them by the different political orators, who, in many cases, picture so ably the misery and degradation of the working people and tell them that things can all be settled now, God forbid the need to strike, they need not fight, they need not struggle and need not suffer, the matter lies in their own hands, they need only mark a cross against that particular name and everything will be settled.

It is the cross that clergy and politician recommend to the people and no wonder they are so often crucified. But it is not only the Republican and Democratic politicians who are so hungry for authority and rulership. The Socialist politicians are in no way better. The thirst for ruling authority is so developed among them that it has become a part of their nature; the best proof that this is true is the recent split that took place in their party which separated them into two antagonistic organizations. I refer to the old S. L. P. and the new Social Democracy of America. Anyone who knows anything of them knows that there is no difference between them—except Debs' Colonization plan which is only a side issue and tends more to attract public attention than anything else—the first wishes to vote the capitalist class out of power and the second want the very same thing. Yet there is a struggle among them: such a bitter struggle that the Republicans and Democrats are nothing compared with them.

Somebody once said, if you want to find out how a

certain people live and think find out what kind of a government they have, and who are their leaders. The present struggle among the political Socialists, gives us an exact idea of what the party that makes such a noise is composed of.

One need not be a philosopher to see at once the cause and real basis of their unfounded but characteristic fight. It is rule and authority that they are struggling for. It is true that some of the papers on each side were trying to show each other how inconsistent they are in their principles, as though they really had any different ones, but anybody who thinks knows that it was only the fire that covered their retreat after some senseless conflicts, and in the middle of their flight we already begin to notice symptoms of a struggle that will without the shadow of a doubt prove that it is only a question of who shall rule the forces that brought about the fight among them and nothing else. We can see very plainly that each of them want to capture the little government that they have already established in their ranks and that is all. To capture it each side is using all the means they can possibly get. We see that the very people who suggested that religion is a private affair, that it has nothing to do with the movement; that it melts away by itself if we only don't touch it; these very people are trying to utilize the religious prejudice as a weapon against the envying antagonists.

Prof. DeLeon (read the lie-on), the same that made to his disgrace the famous remark about Angiolillo, "swine rend swine," lectured in Boston. His subject was "Plain Talk." He proved to be such a very plain talker that nobody could be mistaken about what he meant.

He bitterly complained against the people that want to rob him of his rule and said, that his party, of which he is the boss, is the only party with competent leaders at its front, and anyone who don't belong to his machine has no right to call himself a Socialist nor even speak about Socialism. And, when he noticed that his eloquence did not have the desired effect upon his audience he became desperate and brought race hatred into play. He attacked the Jews in such a first-class anti-Semitic manner, that such a speech would be a great achievement for Stecker or Halvert; and the opposition of New York and Boston, which is led almost by the Jews did not desire any better, because they know that prejudice is a very effective weapon and they utilize it against their supposed antagonists, embodied in "DeLeon," who is the hope and soul of the S. L. P. Would it not be funny if it were not so ridiculous? S. C. B.

December 3, 1897.

THE GOSPEL OF CHICAGO.

Mr. Frederick Harrison, president of the English positivist committee, in the course of a lecture on "Heroes in Modern History" said nothing was more important to a nation than the ideals it admired and sought to imitate. We are now told that morality had no place whatever in the great problem of our national aims and objects. We had been told, on the authority of Frederick Greenwood and John Morley, that the "law of the beasts" is supreme in all questions of national activity and existence. This idea was being carried out now further than he ever remembered it to have been carried in his time.

There was sent to that hall the other day from Chicago, America, a short work of some 200 pages which expressed this idea in a more naked form than it had probably ever appeared in print before.

The author of this book, a philosopher from the University of Chicago, looked with supreme disdain on right and wrong, on good and evil. "Might," he said, "is right," that being the title of the book. One of his maxims was "Do others or they will do you." Then he burst into poetry thus:

There is no law in heaven or earth
That man must needs obey,
Take what you can, and all you can,
And take it while you may.

This earth is no Nirvana,
Where joy "forever" flows,
It is a gruesome butcher's shop,
Where dead "lambs" hang in rows.

The author of this disgusting dictum was, if serious, very like a madman. He (Mr. Harrison) merely quoted from this book as expressive of the high-water mark to which this kind of Rob Roy doctrine was being carried in our age.—London Clarion.

144

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

FREE SOCIETY'S AGENTS.

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

Chicago, Ill. C. Puetzner, 469 Wabash ave. P. Vandorf, 347 Ward St. W. P. Borland, Trade Building, Jay Fox, 159 N. Union.

New York City. J. Rudash, 363 Grand St. A. Levin, 340 Cherry St.

Buffalo, N. Y. F. Kohlbeck, 622 Jefferson St.

Philadelphia, Pa. L. Rabotnik, 781 Plover St.

Allegheny Pa. A. Frey, 138 Madison Ave.

Baltimore, Md. B. Morwitz, 1007 E. Baltimore.

Providence, R. I. S. Bookbinder, 45 Winter St. J. H. Cook, 40 Hanover St.

St. Louis, Mo. Otto Rinke, 3859 Kosciusko St.

London, Eng. E. Leggett, 23 E. Rd. London E. Th. Cantwell, Freedom Office, 127 Ossington St. Euston Road, N. W.

Glasgow, Scotland. Wm. Duff, 9 Carpin St. Gowan Hill.

PROPAGANDA FUND.

Report for week ending Dec. 24, 1897:

Ruedebusch.....	\$2 50
Rochester meeting, by E. Goldman.....	2 00
Subscriptions, by P. Puetzner.....	2 00
Subscriptions, by Rinko.....	2 00
Hulling, Snellenberg, \$1 each.....	2 00
Sinz, Jensen, Welpert, Himmel, Isaacson, Radich, Chauvet, Burda, Holop, Kinghorn-Jones, De Maupassant, Havacek, Frenzel, Coffin, Schultz, Hempel, Novaksky, 50c each.....	8 50
Burnin, Jorgensen, Hopkinson, 25c each.....	7 50
La Putra.....	25
Allen.....	22
Schwartz, Williams, 20c each.....	40
Benham.....	10
	\$20 75

ENTERTAINMENT AND LECTURE.

At Vorwärts Turn Halle, 410 O'Farrell street, San Francisco, Prof. W. S. Bell will lecture Jan. 15 on "Woman and Marriage," from a libertarian standpoint. After the lecture an entertainment will be given, which will include dancing. Admission 10 cents.

POLICEMAN DEBS.

Debs is favorably commended by the Chicago newspaper trust for issuing injunctions against the wicked but logical Anarchists, as will be seen by the following from the Times-Herald:

Some hysterical people and newspapers are calling for police interference to prevent free speech by the anarchistic blatherers who disturbed a recent Sunday by their wild utterances. No such interference is needed, at least not under present circumstances.

The action of the recognized officers of the Social Democracy—in a single branch of which the incendiary utterances occurred—has been much more effective in suppressing similar utterances in the future than any course that the police could pursue. The best disciplinary proceedings that could have been taken originated in their own ranks, among their chief officers.

A dozen such meetings as that of Sunday a week ago might be held without danger to the peace. The wild talk of half-insane men is not a public danger. The extravagance of the words of the would-be incendiaries is a cure for all the bad effects that might be produced.

Mr. Debs is doing better police duty in repressing dangerous speech among his injudicious followers than could be done by any member or all the members of the department over which Chief Kiple presides.

If Mr. Debs was the elected president of a Socialist government and a body of malcontents opposed him and his plans for "the salvation of man"—what would Mr. Debs do? Would he not act the policeman? Issue an injunction and call out the army, to "put down" "the disturbers of the peace"?

Now that everybody is going into hysterics over Henry George, it would be wise to remember that he wrote in his "standard" in favor of hanging the Chicago martyrs in 1887. Let this not be forgotten. His "sympathy" for them was expressed thus: "Hang them." Q.

WHERE HE'S AT.

I am a member of a Socialist organization but am slowly coming to the conclusion that too much government may establish a tyranny worse than even the one which we are living under at present. Without liberty to do as I please, life would be a one long-drawn-out dishonor and disgrace.

LIBERTY, JUSTICE and VOLUNTARY co-operation are my ideas. But I am willing to study your theories and therefore subscribe for your paper.

MICHAEL LEMMER.

Roseberg, Ore.

By the time Comrade Lemmer has read a few more copies of our paper he will find that we are working for the very condition he describes as his own ideal. If he holds such views he belongs to no organization now in existence. He belongs among the ranks of the free lances of Anarchist Communism.

F. A. C.

LINE OF LEAST RESISTANCE.

I have been receiving a paper called FREE SOCIETY from your city for the last four or five weeks. I will enclose 25 cents in stamps for a six-months' trial. So far I like it very much as it reflects my sentiments entirely, for I am an Anarchist out and out and no doubt shall always remain one in the future. In fact, I believe that Anarchism and co-operation constitute the last analysis of all human effort for human association. Justice, liberty, equity, humanitarianism and happiness, and when we have all these things we shall have all the human heart will or can desire for human unfoldment, welfare and happiness. Now everything that prevents or impedes this final consummation of human effort to its ultimate, must be removed, and this of course is a herculean task in which all must help, but the line to be pursued to the accomplishment of that end is the life line of every human being, for it is the self-unfoldment of all, and when we once understand ourselves we shall all move to that goal as enervating as the needle points to the pole, for it is the line of least resistance, and it is also the line by which to attain the highest happiness that any human being can conceive of. R. E. LAFETRA.

Soldiers Home, Cal.

A PLUTE VIEW.

An anarchical state, of course, is an impossibility, for the Anarchists do not believe in government. An Anarchist community is scarcely less unthinkable. The proposition that the several governments of the world shall deport Anarchists who become troublesome within their borders to some island or group of islands in the Pacific may not be seriously considered, but it is interesting in its suggestiveness.

The Anarchists proclaim a desire for liberty and happiness. But they declare that these are impossible where government, law and religion exist. At present a vast majority of human beings prefer to live under governments and cherish some form of religious belief. Manifestly, therefore, if these queer people who want to get rid of those institutions are to have their way they must find some place where they can be left to carry out their ideas to suit their several notions.—Rochester Democrat.

DANGEROUS.

It is your so-called respectable people who are the most dangerous. Their cloak of eminent respectability hides them, and people will not believe you when you show them up, especially when they are church members and wear long faces.—Gov. Pingree.

DO YOU SMOKE?

Then if you want a good 10-cent cigar, made under good sanitary conditions, warranted long Havana filled, Sumatra wrapped (5-inch Spanish Londres) and bearing the label of the Cigarmakers' International Union, send \$1 for a box of 12 of them, postpaid, and you'll get them.

Dealers, especially on the Pacific coast, should get rates by the 1,000 on our New Ideal, 10 cents; and "F. S.", 5 cents.

By ordering of us you patronize our group and aid in publishing FREE SOCIETY, for these cigars are of our own make, being under the supervision of a comrade who has had plenty of experience to enable him to send out only first-grade goods at a fair price.

Address all orders, and make all monies payable to

FREE SOCIETY

BOX 2538. SAN FRANCISCO.

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.

"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. FOOE'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 \$1.40.

Order of Free Society.

MIGHT IS RIGHT.

OR THE SURVIVAL OF THE FITTEST.

NEW BOOK BY RAGNOR REDBEARD, LL.D., U. OF C.; 178 PP.; CLOTH, GILT, \$1.50; PAPER, 50c. POSTPAID.

This is no ordinary book. Undeniedly it is the most remarkable publication that has appeared in Christendom for fifteen centuries. Its philosophy is that of a scientific Satan, a real-life anarchist. Upon the grim and fanatical it assails the first principles of moral codes, religions, politics and law; affirming that modern civilization is a horrible hypocrite, a caricature of the terrorism and gloom of the Dark Ages. It also marshals an overwhelming array of facts to prove that the man of today is a physical and mental dwindling, a coward, a weakling, slave. Upon biologic Spencerian principles it attacks the Golden Rule, the Sermon on the Mount, the Jewish Decalogue, statute books, written constitutions and representative institutions, affirming that they are all without higher sanction or authority than organized duplicity or armed power. Therefore if man is ever to be free, these artificial and dominating "Thou Shalts" must be entirely swept aside.

Dr. Redbeard contends that fitness to survive must be tested by the clash of armies: all other tests being fraudulent. Victors in war are naturally entitled to dominate; and the "defeated"—that is the runaways who feared to die—are equally entitled to servitude. Throughout all argue the life of the chief selective agent in combat. Women admire warriors above all other kinds of men. Communities of cowards (and their descendants) are rightfully plundered, taxed, enslaved.

"Right" and "Wrong" are decided not by the Meek but by the Mighty, who, consequently may write laws, creeds, constitutions, title deeds—and so write them at pleasure. Equality ideas are mere millennial illusions, for all life is strife—a combat to the death.

As long as the struggle for existence is "moralized" or limited by Governments and Gods, the unit and base, instead of being trampled down (as nature intended) are stupidly permitted to seek up Imperial Injunction seats and deal out death, bondage and ruin to Highest Types.

Thus, by demanding his credentials, Darwinism is fatal to the tyrant. It rings him round with menace and destruction. It huris against him ten thousand trained rivals. It proclaims to all men "Nothing is true; nothing is sacred: all things are open to you; blessed be the Vanquishers!" Address

ADOLPH MUELLER (sole agent), 108 S. Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.

Advertisement.

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 vs State Socialism. By G. Bernard Shaw; 8 for.....	02
Revival of the Inquisition. By.....	03
Anarchist Morality. By Peter Kropotkin	05
The Commune of Paris, by P. Kropotkin, and An Anarchist on Anarchy. By E. Reclus (one volume).....	05
Anarchy on Trial. Speeches by Paris Anarchists.....	05
Common Sense Country. By Bevington	03
Conditions and Character. By "Ireland".....	03
Religion and Labor, Parts I & II. By Fox	05
Liberty Lyrics. By L. S. Bevington.....	05
Bases of Anarchism: Historical, Philosophical and Economical. By W. Holmes	05
*Law and Authority. By P. Kropotkin.....	05
*God and the State. By M. Bakounin.....	05
The True Aim of Anarchism. By Steinle	05
Revolution. By S. H. Gordon.....	05
Grandmother's Lessons to Men, Young and Old. By Lois Waisbrooker.....	05
Wants and their Gratification. By H. Addis	05
When Love is Liberty and Nature Law.....	10
Albert R. Parsons' Book on Anarchism, its Philosophy and Scientific Basis. German and English Editions; handsomely bound in cloth 30 cents; paper.....	10
The book last named are slightly damaged, but readable.....	
My Century Plant. By Lois Waisbrooker. 1.00	
Wherefore Investigating Company, regular price 50c, but while present supply lasts "they go at".....	25

*The 3-cent rate does not apply to those marked with a *.

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

International Turn-Verein meets at 1524 Ave. A, New York City.

The San Francisco Italian Anarchist Club meets every Saturday night at 111 Trenton 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 535 Blue Island av.

Flaming Sword, "Social Theocracy and Equitable Commerce," 6308 Wentworth av., Chicago, Ill.

Anarchist Headquarters in San Francisco 1224 1/2 Folson 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.

Independent Debating Club, St. Louis, 410 1/2 Market St., Room 7, meets every Thursday evening at 8 o'clock.

The Peoples Union, a free discussion club, meets every Sunday evening at 955 Westminster St., Providence, R. I.

Group Proletariat of New York City gives Anarchist lectures Friday at 45-52 Orchard and Saturdays at 21 Suffolk St.

Sutmyogel, 50 First St., New York City, is an Anarchist Communist paper printed in German, semi-monthly; 50 cents per year.

New York Debating Club meets and delivers lectures every Sunday 7-45 o'clock P. M. at 1524 Avenue C, New York City.

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

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

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.

Delnicka Listy is an eight page Anarchist weekly paper, published in the Bohemian language at New York City, 42 E 71" St. by the International Workmen's Association of America. Send for sample copy.

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. Fifty cents 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 Kimina 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, 2819 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; "Altruist's Reasons for Pardoning Fielden, Neebe, and Schwab," 10c; "The Prodigal Daughter, or, the Price of Vice," 10c. Send \$1. subscription to Lucifer, for one year and receive these pamphlets free; or send 60 cents, 6 months subscription and we will forward your choice of 65 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 or missionary work. Address M. Harwan, 1394 W. Congress St., Chicago, Ill.