

# FREE SOCIETY

ENTERED AT SAN FRANCISCO POSTOFFICE AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER.

An Exponent of Anarchist-Communism: Holding that Equality of Opportunity alone Constitutes Liberty; that in the Absence of Monopoly Price and Competition Cannot Exist, and that Communism is an Inevitable Consequence.

NEW SERIES NO. 27.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., SUNDAY, MAY 15, 1898.

WHOLE NO. 163.

## VOX POPULI.

"Oh, men of America, let the voice of the people be heard!"  
—Last Words of Albert R. Parsons.

We are coming, we, the people,  
Rising in our conscious power;  
Many ages have we waited,  
Hungered, thirsted, for this hour;  
For the tyrant and oppressor  
In our presence soon shall cower.

We are coming, we, the people,  
We, the outcast and oppressed,  
We, the scorned of all the nations,  
Coming on from east and west,  
North and south, the wide world over,  
Like the sea which knows no rest.

We are coming to our kingdom,  
Pressing on to claim our own;  
We shall rear the "golden city"—  
This our task and ours alone;  
Yes, the stone, so long neglected,  
Shall become its corner stone.

We are coming, coming, coming—  
Hear our legions on their way!  
Rouse ye, sleepers, from your slumbers!  
Make you ready for the fray!  
This the dreaded "dies irae"—  
This the people's judgment-day.

Tremble, tyrants! Pale, ye despots!  
Weep and howl, ye rich and proud!  
For your pow'r at length is shattered—  
See in yonder sky the cloud,  
Soon to burst in retribution,  
O'er your heads in anguish bow'd.

Rocks and mountains may not hide you  
From the people's wakened wrath;  
Like a whirlwind we shall carry  
All before us in our path—  
Earth awaits a new baptism,  
Shall it be a bloody bath?

Not if ye will heed the warning  
Of the voice which speaks today,  
And, for wrongs ye've heaped upon us,  
Make atonement while ye may—  
Make us ample reparation—  
Else in vain for mercy pray.

Ye have lived in ease and splendor—  
Luxury has been your bane;  
Yours the purple and fine linen,  
Ours the sweat, the toil, the pain,  
Ours the crumbs, the rage of Laz'rus,  
Yet must we not e'en complain?

Tho' our toil has recreated  
This fair earth on which we dwell,  
Ye, who toil not, have possessed it,  
While ye banished us to hell;  
To the tenements whose horrors,  
Tongue of mortal scarce may tell.

In those foul and wretched dwellings,  
Void of air, of space, of light,  
Care-crush'd wives bring forth our offspring,  
Doom'd to toil from morn till night;  
Helpless children robbed of childhood—  
Dare men claim that this is right?

In the mansions of our masters  
Childhood blossoms bright and fair;  
While with us 'tis stunted, withered,  
By disease and want and care—  
Tiny forms with aged faces—  
Oh! These things are hard to bear.

Yes, but we have borne them, comrades;  
Silent suffered ev'ry wrong,  
Ev'ry form of foul oppression  
From the mighty and the strong;  
Unto Heaven in vain appealing,  
"God of justice, Oh, how long?"

We have seen our mothers, daughters,  
Seen our sisters, sweethearts, wives,  
Forc'd to barter woman's honor  
To sustain their wretched lives;  
While upon their unpaid labor,  
Capital, the monster, thrives.

Shall we bear these wrongs forever,  
Ever abject and supine?  
Shall that potentate called Mammon,  
Reign for aye by right divine?  
Ha! The gods' great mill grind slowly,  
But they grind exceedingly fine.

Yes, the time has come for action,  
Freedom's voice is heard at last,  
Calling to the sleeping nations—  
Mammon's minions stand aghast—  
And the people's foes shall vanish  
Like dry leaves before the blast.

See! The message we're proclaiming,  
Animates the very stones;  
Lo! Behold a mighty army,  
Where but now were bleaching bones.  
Hear our proclamation echoed,  
In the crash of falling thrones.

As they catch that far-off echo,  
How the hearts of men are stirred;  
How with tears their eyelids glisten,  
(Freedom is a wonderful word)  
And, in joyful acclamation,  
Now the "people's voice" is heard.  
—Sherlie Woodman.

## THE DEVELOPMENT OF TRADE UNIONISM.

A lecture delivered by Peter Kropotkin in the Memorial Hall, on Jan. 24.

A few months ago I was delivering a number of lectures on Socialism and Anarchism in the cities of the Eastern States of America. These were attended to a great extent by American workers belonging to the Trade Unions, especially when delivered in the big industrial centers. That gave the idea to our New York comrades of convening a big meeting in the Cooper Union Hall, and to invite representatives of Trade Unions and as many members of Trade Unions as possible. It was done and we had a splendid meeting on the eve of my departure. At this meeting, Comrade McCraith read a short message from the Trade Unionists of America to be transmitted to their English comrades. It was accepted unanimously and I was requested to convey it.

I was much prouder of carrying it than I would have been of carrying any political message of any importance, which, in fact, I would not have accepted at all.

It would be presumptuous of me, having stayed so short a time in America, to come here to tell you of the movement there. It would have required wider knowledge and more serious study, and moreover a journey to the Western States where Trade Unionism takes quite a different character to the "nibbling" Unionism of the Eastern States. I can only say that it is full of youth and of force, and that happily the differences between "Americans" and the Bohemians, Poles, Hungarians and other "strangers" are gradually fast disappearing. When in the strike at Hazelton such "strangers" were massacred recently it produced such an indignation in New York that the "American" Trade Unionists called a great meeting and told the police who were there present such things as to what would happen if they, the "Americans," were attacked as the poor Bohemians had been, that not one single paper of the middle class cared to report it.

My intention is to speak from a more general standpoint. I have not much to say which you may not know already, but perhaps some general views may not be out of place.

Everyone feels in this country that some change in the present organization, aims and methods of the Trade Unions is absolutely imposed by the union of international capitalism.

For many years in the mediæval towns the workers of all nationalities were united in unions and very often it is said that the guilds of old have given origin to the Trade Unions of today. Per-

haps it is true, but the modern Trade Unions are absolutely different from the old guilds; they cover but a very small part of the field covered by the Unions of old. The workers of the guild considered themselves as the masters of the industry—not as men who were being hired to do the work without any interest in the management of the concern. They did not consider themselves as outsiders to industry: they considered rather the others, the capitalists, as the outside and useless element.

They used to buy all raw material and to sell the produce. They managed the industry entirely; and the cities were nothing but the unions of these unions, the amitas between these unions. When they had to export something, they did not leave it to someone going to find new markets in Africa, nor in China. It was the city which carried on the export, it was the city which was considered the first, the great consumer.

Moreover, the guild was supreme in its own concerns; it was autonomous. If any dispute arose between two workers of the same guild, it was to the arbiters (or judges, if you like), nominated by the guild, it had to be referred; if any dispute arose between two workers of different unions, it was referred to the persons elected by these two unions, who if they disagreed could call in the nominee of a third to decide. It had its own militia; it would join with the others in war if it liked, and such wars were, of course, wars of defence, not of conquest. It was a brotherly organization of production, of distribution, of mutual support, and of the defence of the citizen. What is the modern Trade Union in comparison with this?

What was the result? That in these mediæval cities of the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, such extraordinary progress was made as has never since been equalled.

You know how all this disappeared, how States and kings took possession of the funds of these guilds, how the king conquered the cities and imposed his judges on them and his laws, how the cities were crushed, and how for two centuries, the seventeenth and the eighteenth, all industries in Europe went backwards, were destroyed where they had flourished.

One union, however, was not crushed, that of the men engaged in the pursuit of knowledge, the men who continued to work in their silent studies; who were adding new discoveries to the old ones. In the mediæval universities men had made experiments which led ultimately to the steam engine; chemistry and other new sciences sprang into being; man's force in the long run was increased a hundredfold. If we were to take some books on modern industry, we should be told that the nineteenth century is a beautiful illustration of what can be achieved under capitalist organization. "Look what industry was a hundred years ago, look what it is now! And who has made it? The capitalist." The reality is that it is science which has made it. It was under the influence of the ideas circulating at the end of the last century that man has accomplished the prodigies we see now. Capitalism has not helped, but hindered it. What the capitalists did to promote it we know—helped with a legislation which pauperized the population, which expelled the peasant from the land which he and his ancestors had cultivated; sent their agents travelling all over England stealing children for the factories of Lancashire and Yorkshire. That was what the capitalist invented for the organization of the large industry.

What was the worker to do under such circumstances—legislation in the hands of the monopolizing classes and these workers driven to the factories to compete there with their children. In their small secret societies they fought this Moloch but they could only try to prevent capitalism from crushing them altogether. They were hanged for strikes, they were deported to Australia. All they could imagine at that horrid time was a policy of resistance. Not a constructive policy, not a destructive, simply a policy of conserving only the little they could maintain. This policy has been continued too long. To this policy the Trade Unions continue to adhere although the conditions have changed, and it is time to come forward with new demands of a destructive and constructive order.

Already in the commencement there were men who undertook a greater task, who understood that that would not be enough, that it would be necessary to carry on a policy of active reconstruction. Already in the beginning, Robert Owen, the man to whom we Socialists owe infinitely more than most of us think—a man who really foresaw the future development of Socialism better than many of his successors—had started an international society for discussing these questions, and had constituted "The Great Trades' Union"—the Union of all trades.

You know what the attitude of the government was towards these unionists. They were met with deportation and hard labor, crushed down by prosecution after prosecution, and for a while again they had to return to their little committees, their little councils in secret, to carry on merely a passive resistance.

Then came the great movement on the continent of 1848. But again the workers were crushed down, and again all hope disappeared from the hearts of the workers. In the sixties began a new movement: The International Workingmen's Association. This has now been forgotten, yet it succeeded in bringing together several millions of workmen all over Europe. It put all the great problems into discussion, and gave some solution for each which was not inspired by books but by a knowledge of life and work. In a few years this association seemed to become a tremendous power. The journalists of the capitalist world attended its congresses and hastened to wire from them that things were still quiet, the dreaded revolution was not coming off this time. The International Workingmen's Association, growing constantly in power, finally led the French government to begin that struggle which resulted, alas, again in the crushing of the workers' movement.

The Commune of Paris was an attempt of the working class to try something new, something constructive in Socialism and Communism. It was crushed out in the blood of thirty thousand workers killed in the streets. One hundred thousand were deported. Driven back again, all the workers could do was to fight step by step for the rights of combination and of striking—a fight which has still to be kept up. Men are still condemned for picketing in this country. Look at the money still spent in defending this, the soul of a strike.

Yet gradually an immense work has been done. Progress has been made since these years when almost everything seemed crushed, when the only light we saw gleaming was maintained by the Trade Unionists of this country. At the time of the dockers' strike an attempt was made to create an international union. An eight hour day movement was begun in Chicago, when the five Anarchists were hanged. The May Day movement was started. A great meeting was held in Hyde Park in 1891, and great hopes were awakened all over the world in regard to its success, which could be carried by the workers themselves in their unions. Unhappily it drifted into parliamentary channels; so much was talked about an eight-hour bill, and gradually it faded away. It was a fact of the greatest

importance when the engineers again began this movement. We have had several months of resistance, and you know how it has ended. The capitalists have united all over the world; they went to Germany, France and Austria to get help in crushing the English engineers.

This defeat—for if it is not a victory it is a defeat—what does it show? That it is time to come out of those conditions of forty years ago when the Trade Unionists could do no more than timidly offer a passive resistance, and to enter a new period of constructive activity.

When anything is brought up just now, something to be done for the workers, our ruling classes have but one answer to it. The housing of the poor, for instance—tons of matter have been written about this. When anything is proposed, what do they say? "Wait. Wait a little. Wait a bit. Wait." You have your children educated in the schools. This may be pretty good, but your children go hungry. You are told to wait, wait, wait. You would be pauperized, remember, if they were fed! The problem of the unemployed? The land going out of cultivation? In every direction there is a problem standing, and when you ask for a solution of it, they have no answer for us but "Wait. Wait a little. Wait a bit. Wait. Let us see what the political economists say. Wait."

No; we must not wait. Are the workers of England now less intelligent than in the time of the guilds, that they could not manage industries as their forefathers did? They tell us you could not manage; you could not organize them. I must be very much mistaken if you could not manage them as well as your masters. The capitalists are continually complaining that they cannot manage industries well enough to be productive; they are too poor to pay you a living wage. Well, if they cannot manage industry without exploiting us so, let them go. We don't want them; we can manage better than they have done yet.

I advise everybody to read in this connection a book of Bellamy's, "Equality." Here you will find a brilliant proof of the uneconomical organization of the present day. He does not criticise it from the standpoint of morality, of Christianity, he shows simply that it is the most uneconomical you could imagine, the most wasteful. The idea is growing amongst the workers that it is not for them to be considered outsiders in industry. You are told that you have nothing to say in the management of these things; the present is a good time to begin saying you have, that it is the capitalist who is the outsider and that the organization of industry must be taken into the hands of the workers. This is one movement, in which you have only to be logical, to come to the necessary conclusion imposed upon you by the managers of industry themselves.

Then you see the co-operative movement, since it has organized a market, moving on now toward production; Socialist ideas are penetrating it; many of the people in it are returning to its old conception, that they should combine not for laying aside a few shillings by the end of the year, but for the taking over of all the industries which are now in the hands of the capitalist.

And we see a third movement growing more and more, in the attempt of the cities to organize such things as the tramways, gas, the water supply and so on. It is a childish movement yet, and will remain so as long as it continues in the hands of governing bodies. But bring it to its logical conclusion, let it take its full development, and it will be that the people themselves must take possession of the territory, of the city, of its houses, of all the city contains for the satisfaction of all needs of the population.

Take these three different movements, and let them take their logical development. Imagine a Trade Union movement not only for increasing wages and reducing hours, but inspired by the grander idea of getting rid of the drones and taking possession of the works; imagine the Co-operative movement, inspired, too, by a grander idea, aiming

not only at a small benefit to the members of the society, but at organizing the distribution and production of all the country; imagine the third movement emerging from its present childish phases, growing to become a man—the people—and this man asserting his rights to the territory, the houses, all the necessities for satisfying the needs of the population. Who has made all that is valuable in a city? The inhabitants themselves! And if it be the presence and labor of the people round about it, why should it be the property of a private individual? Why should not the city take into its possession everything that stands upon the ground of the city and the city itself, those values created by its inhabitants, not today or yesterday, but by many centuries of work? Imagine that these three movements, instead of always seeking a governor or even a dictator, instead of stopping half-way, take their entire development, combine amongst themselves, with freedom not for the entire city or union only, but for every separate part of it; imagine these things and we have, not yet the Social Revolution, but the beginning of the Social Revolution.

I appeal to you members of the Trades Unions now. Hitherto you have admitted the right of the employer to consider the factory, the mine, as something which belonged to him alone. You have treated with him, but you have always recognized his right, the right of giving you such or such wages, of producing as he liked, of opening or closing it. The great change in ideas which must be produced is that Trades Unions should no longer recognize that right; they should recognize that that which results from the labor of all cannot belong to any separate individual. What we have all worked for and produced, what everyone has contributed to, no one has a right to take into his own hands. For you, the Trade Unionists of England, it is time to recognize that these changes are not for the twenty-first century but for the immediate future. It is time to combine your efforts in these three directions, and joining hands across frontiers and oceans, to proclaim that at last is arriving the emancipation of the workers.—Freedom, London.

### THE BALLOT A FAILURE.

Manhood suffrage is a failure. I propose to prove it logically and historically, and then let you do as you please. I do not care whether you think as I do or not, as long as you keep your hands from my throat, and leave me in the enjoyment of my own.

The universal ballot has been tried and found wanting. It promised much, but at the end of a hundred years labor is still enslaved. The American republics have demonstrated that the representative form of government is not the pledge of freedom; that mere majorities are powerless to guarantee to men life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

In the beginning of the century we revolted against monarchy. At the end of the century monarchy has no evils which we do not endure. Give the ragged starveling a vote, and the world will be redeemed; let the paupers assemble with the priests and the princes; let us have the Third Estate and all will be well. So said the American and French revolutionists. They gave us what they wished to, and we are still asking to be saved.

How is it that that which promised so much has performed so little?

The question is not hard to answer. The representative democracy violates the very principle upon which it is established. "The community," says John Stuart Mill, "cannot have an interest opposed to its own interest. To say that it could have would be a contradiction in terms. The community within itself, and with respect to itself, can have no sinister interest. One community may intend the evil of another; never its own."

The mistake that Mill makes is in assuming something to exist which does not exist—the community; that is it does not exist in the sense that he means. The community, so-called, is a mere arbitrary arrangement of society for the convenience of business et cetera. Suppose you have a community of one hundred people. The people move away, one by one, and the

community disappears. But there are still one hundred individuals, and their appetites, desires and passions remain the same, whether they live together, or apart.

Again Mill says:

"The reason for which government exists is that one man, if stronger than another, will take from whatever that other possesses and he desires. And if one man will do this so will several. Therefore, if powers are put into the hands of a comparatively small number, called an aristocracy, powers which make them stronger than the rest of the community, they will take from the rest of the community as much as they please of the objects of desire. They will thus defeat the very end for which government was instituted. The unfitness, therefore, of an aristocracy to be entrusted with the powers of government rests on demonstration."

The second mistake that Mill makes is in thinking that one set of men will act differently from another set, under exactly the same circumstances. He ignores the fact that a congress of laborers will have the same motive of corruption that a congress of aristocrats would have. It is true, as he says, that those who are entrusted with power will abuse it, but he forgets that all men were laborers once, and that the same causes, which have made aristocrats of some men and slaves of others, are still in active operation, and that the laborer if given the opportunity will develop into an aristocrat. This is true, or all men are not subject to the same law of development—and that they are subject to it is a self-evident proposition.

In a republic the community, so-called, must delegate power to a few, because a pure democracy is impossible. Mill takes it for granted that the community and the congress have identical interests, if the congressmen are chosen from the ranks of labor; but in fact they have not. The aristocrats, that is the millionaires in this country, have a common interest. The community, or the people who labor, have a common interest, and the congressmen, or people who legislate, have a common interest. The interest of any of them may or may not coincide with the interest of the others. Sometimes they do and sometimes they do not. Thus they have distinct and separate interests.

## II.

Let us suppose a community of one hundred people in which there are twenty-five aristocrats and seventy-five laborers. We will say that the laborers have no voice in public affairs, and are enslaved. A reformer comes along—a Single Taxer, a Socialist or a direct legislation crank. He tells the laborers that every man acts in accordance with his interests. The aristocrats enslave you because it is to their interest to do so, and you have given them the power. Now, if you laborers had a voice in the affairs of government equal to your numbers you would not be enslaved, since you would not do anything against your own interests. I propose to remove the evils you endure by giving you each a vote. The aristocrats have one representative for every five of them, which gives them five representatives or congressmen. According to the same basis you will have fifteen.

The laborers are persuaded that the populist is right. They go into a revolution like France did in 1789. When it is over they elect a congress. There are now twenty-five aristocrats, sixty laborers and twenty office-holders. (An aristocrat, in or out of office is always the same.) A community that formerly had but two classes of people, the aristocrats and laborers, has now three classes—the aristocrats, the people and the office holders, the first of which do not work at all, the second work a little bit and the third work altogether. Each class would like to get on without working, hence the desire of everyone is to become an aristocrat. The laborers will not willingly do anything that makes them work harder, nor will the aristocrats or office holders. But somebody must work, notwithstanding nobody proposes to if he can avoid it.

The congress meets and a law is about to be passed. It cannot favor both the aristocrats and laborers. The question that arises is, how is congress going to vote? First of all it must be admitted that it is going to vote according to its own interest. The five aristocrats will vote for their own welfare, the aristocracy, of which they are still a part; but the fifteen labor representatives are going to try to cast a vote that will not defeat them in the next election by the people, of which they are no longer a part.

The aristocratic interest, the legislative interest and the popular interest are constant variants. The legislative interest vacillates between the two variants.

In a time of peace it allies itself more or less with the aristocratic interest: while in the time of war or revolution it returns to the people to pacify them. It is for the gold standard as long as the people are quietly ignorant; but just as soon as a revolution is imminent it is for free silver, with the exception of the aristocrats and those whom they bribe. And all the time it is simply for itself.

Manhood suffrage is therefore a failure. In our community of one hundred it has done nothing but increase the number of social parasites fifteen. Of course there will be now and then a freak, an Altgeld, a Bryan or a Peffer, among the labor representatives; but they will fail oftener than succeed in whatever they undertake.

## III.

The ideal social system is that in which everyone produces what he eats, or its equivalent. But everyone is willing to eat, whether he produces the equivalent or not; and there are very few who will reduce themselves to the necessity of manual labor if they have a vote to prevent it. Thus the representative plan for the emancipation of labor will fail. If our seventy-five laborers wish to be free they must act for themselves. If they are wise they will delegate authority to no one. To emancipate themselves they must simply refuse to do that which enslaves them. What could the twenty-five aristocrats do in that event? It is thus that by not doing instead of doing that labor may become free.

Self-interest is truly the mainspring of human conduct. But before we can have a harmonious social system we must make the interest of every man identical with the interest of every other man. They must all be either aristocrats, legislators or laborers—all be united into one class, and not divided into many. But all men cannot be aristocrats, nor can they be legislators, hence there is but one hope for freedom, and that lies in making laborers of all mankind.

How is that to be done? Absolutely in no other way than by the refusal of those who labor to support those who do not labor. To effect it manhood suffrage and a representative government are worthless. The laborer must rely upon himself; he must be independent, for it is through him alone that anything will be brought about for his own welfare.

If all laborers will unite in demanding an abolition of the law of contract they will make a step in the right direction. But as long as they follow such rainbow chasers as Debs, Sovereign and Gompers, their condition will not be improved.

The laborers must learn what robbery is, and then unitedly refuse to be robbed. This is their only hope.

Six thousand years of positive government have thoroughly demonstrated its failure. Through all the centuries mankind have been journeying in a circle. The Roman republic began with Romulus and ended with Augustus; the American republic began with Jefferson and ended with Lincoln; and it is time that the laborers were learning that liberty and laws are contraries; that where men are free they are not divided into capitalists and laborers, employers and employees.

Freedom is a sovereign absolute within the realm of human happiness and peace. It is seated high upon a throne of love, whereon, with equality its crown and fraternity its sceptre it reigns forever in universal empery.

## IV.

Let not the reader become offended at what I write. The world has treated me as well as I deserve, and I am pretty well satisfied with things as they are. I am having a better time now than I would have if I lived under an equitable system. I would have to work then, and I am positively adverse to labor. I am therefore simply a cold-blooded reasoner in the discussion of political economy. I am on the unpopular side of the question, but it gives me pleasure to be so. I do not care whether you believe as I do or not. Act and think as you please, so long as you do not try to make me think and act as you do. I have made a study of political economy, the same as I have of grammar, rhetoric and literature. I may be wrong just as I may be a bad writer or a poor grammarian. But I offer you my magazine and my thought—reject them or accept them, and I am still satisfied. I am not going to dynamite anyone, nor suffer for opinion's sake. But I am going to give you my thoughts just as I think them as long as I publish this magazine. My brain is my own, and I am going to use it as I wish to, or not at all.—James Armstrong, in the Autonomist.

## PEPPERY POT.

Be happy! If you can't be, find out the reason for your inability and help us kick. If you haven't brains enough to do so, the lord help you; if you haven't inclination enough to do so, the other fellow take you! There's no sense in your lounging around this planet without making yourself useful. Try Mars.

\* \* \*

To reform means to remodel; to change. To change the form of an evil or even to modify it, does not eradicate it; its essence remains as ever in its modified form and continues to work mischief and to gradually assume the old proportions. To change or modify monopoly or its parent—government—means to alter its form and decrease its severity but to retain its poisonous essence. Anarchists do not wish to change or lessen evils but to abolish them; they are therefore not reformers but abolitionists. Hail the new abolition!

\* \* \*

The cult of mud-slinging is not confined to the Republican and Democratic politicians. It finds ready pupils even in the Socialist Labor party. A certain creature whose loud-mouthings serve as a substitute for the vacancy of his brains had the effrontery to ask at one of Emma Goldman's meetings whether it was true that some Anarchists were sent out by the millionaires as their emissaries to lecture in their behalf? Of course, the proposition is too ridiculous to be considered by sane people and Emma Goldman very promptly told the idiot she was not present to deal with blackmailers. But the S. L. P. would perform a charitable act toward itself as well as to the general public by sending that member to the lunatic asylum.

\* \* \*

The thirst for knowledge and self-improvement is laudable; the desire to impart acquired knowledge to one's fellow beings is commendable; even the ambition to become an orator is excusable. But when a person mounts a public rostrum with the emphatic and poetic introduction: "Well, I never don't know nothings about dem zupshecks you beebles vas dalken about, bot I vant do dalk a liddle bit enevay pecaush dish vos a free blotforms" it is about time for a bald-headed man's hair to stand upon its end.

\* \* \*

"Marx said thus and so;" "Proudhon said thus and so;" "Kropotkin says thus and so;" "Spencer says thus and so," are the favorite expressions heard during discussions between people claiming to be radicals. There is one similarity at least between these good people and those who claim that "Jesus Christ said thus and so" or "the Czar of all the Russias says thus and so," namely they are every one of them authority ridden. Is an error transformed into truth because Marx committed it? Or is a truth any more acceptable because Proudhon uttered it? Society will never be redeemed until there are enough human beings ready to stand upon their own bottoms; to say: "I say thus and so" and proceed to demonstrate and prove their assertions.

\* \* \*

News has reached a comrade of the scandalous, brutal treatment of a woman by her husband, another "Anarchist." No wonder that the State Socialists claim we shout "liberty" without knowing its true meaning. Surely this man does not, for if he did he would realize that liberty includes the perfect independence of the woman in sex relations—free love. But that man is presumably waiting for the social revolution to give his sex-slave the liberty she is too indolent to take now.

\* \* \*

"Unclean" is what some so-called reformers are pleased to term the very discussion of the sex question. Yet the very breath accompanying their ejaculations is polluted by liquor and tobacco. Now, which is the most unclean, the rational and elevating satisfaction of the strongest and most essential natural desire of the sex impulse or of the artificially created and life destroying use of the poisonous alcohol or the filthy tobacco? Oh! what degeneracy of the human mind!

\* \* \*

Ten dollars is the price paid for the use of Scottish Hall for each evening of Emma Goldman's lectures. Does the dull American citizen perceive what that means? Does he realize that rent means a tax levied by robbers from the producer for the use of the earth which should be free to all? Wake up, there!

S. D.

# FREE SOCIETY.

FORMERLY "THE FIREBRAND."

Published Weekly by Free Society Publishing Co.

50 CENTS A YEAR.

Address all Communications and make all Money Orders payable to FREE SOCIETY, 15 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.

## NOTE AND COMMENT.

In a recent lecture, Prof. Vandervelde, of Belgium, Social Democrat and political economist, long a shining light of the Authoritarian Socialists, declared that the Marxian theory that capital tends to concentrate into fewer and fewer hands, is exploded and out of date. True, he did not say that the Anarchists had exploded it, but Kropotkin and Techerkesof will forgive him. But will the Marxians forgive him? True, it is a little painful, and still worse, embarrassing to disavow and denounce a man to-day whom you bragged about yesterday, but when the "theory" is in question, no task is too great for a true "Scientific Socialist." Not even denouncing a man to-day as a fool and traitor, whom yesterday you lauded as a colossus of intellect and a paragon of virtue.

"Socialism is no Anarchism, nor yet is it communism," once said Rev. Heber Newton. This is an error into which many people fall. Socialism is a generic term, and embraces every "ism" that in any way aims to change existing social relations. The abolitionists were socialists, but they were not known as such. Their aim was to change the social relations which then existed between the slave and his master. The word "social" is from the Latin socius, a companion or associate. Anarchism is a branch of socialism, communism is a branch of socialism, social democracy is a branch of socialism. They maintain the same relation to socialism as do the different christian sects to christianity.—Detroit Sentinel.

It has often been said in the radical press that the militia in this country had no other purpose but to display their bravery against striking and defenseless workers, and its attitude toward the war at present proves the claims. Many regiments have declined to go to war and there is nowhere enthusiasm and "patriotism" manifested in these ranks since there is real danger in sight. To prevent their deserting, the various companies are locked up in armories previous to their departure, and that, too, after taking their oath of allegiance; an additional proof of the discount at which god and government are beginning to be.

A reader of Portland, Ore. informs us that he received his paper in a mutilated condition, certain articles being cut out by the postal officials. This convinces us that Comstock's agents are still at work trying to suppress Free Society.

The latest news from Spain are such that fills every rebel with joy. "The Civil guards sympathize with the people. Even the soldiers cannot be trusted." The rebels are tearing down the bread shops, supplying those in need. "Death to the thieves in office!" and "Down with taxes!" is the battle cries of the rebels and is ample proof that they are fully aware of the cause of their misery and are fighting for freedom. Hurrah for the Spanish workers!! I crave to be with them.

Comrade Barnes makes a distinction between egoism and altruism, in last week's issue, and is therefore at sea as to what will be the outcome of a "stable equilibrium of egoism and altruism." The fact is that they are identical and consequently a stable equilibrium can never be reached. What appears to us "good" to-day is considered "bad" tomorrow; when we realize the ideal we hold to-day we will strive for another—a higher ideal, and so on. In short, remove restrictions in our social relations and the terms egoism and altruism will disappear from our vocabulary.

Comrade Emma Goldman delivered three lectures last week before large audiences, and has aroused quite an interest in the principles of Anarchism among the

radicals of this city. Last Tuesday she delivered her farewell address in this city. At present she is lecturing in Los Angeles from whence she will go to Portland, Oregon.

In some future issues we will publish her lectures in full.

Our comrades at San Jose had secured the hall of the S. L. P. for Comrade Emma Goldman to deliver a lecture, and the fact had been announced in one of their own meetings a week before. But, alas, the "bosses" conquered! Before Comrade Emma Goldman arrived the comrades were informed that "it would be impossible for us to make arrangements for Miss Goldman to speak from our platform," and she was compelled to hold an open-air meeting which was attended by about 400 men and women.

The comrades in Tacoma are requested to assist O. A. Verity of Lake Bay in arranging a meeting for comrade Emma Goldman. Comrade Kiefer of Seattle also invites the readers of Free Society to confer with him regarding meetings. His address is 108 Marion street.

The Bohemian group of Baltimore, Md., which sent us \$7.00 a few weeks ago, requests us to state that out of the \$8.50 which were given by the group to Comrade Morwitz, \$1.50 were sent to "Volne Listy," Brooklyn, N. Y.

According to the daily papers Spain and Italy are on the verge of a general uprising and revolt. In many cities the workmen and peasants have seized bread and other necessities of life, and many governmental institutions have been destroyed. Martial law has been declared, but "blood flows in the streets," and "the people are defying the troops." A dispatch says:

"The forces now on the scene are in great danger and may be by this time annihilated, as the miners have large quantities of dynamite and know how to use the explosive. This was shown by their work on the railroad. They completely demolished bridge after bridge and wrecked a tunnel, which it will take weeks, perhaps months, to clear. They also used dynamite in an attack on a jail, bursting in the doors, killing the guards and turning the prisoners loose."

The fact that "all authority is defied" and the cry, "Death to the soldiers" are very encouraging signs, and it is to be hoped that this revolt will result in a Social Revolution which will spread all over the world.

I expect that the internal situation is much more serious than the daily papers admit. People that know how to use dynamite in defying their oppressors will also have intelligence enough to know that the mere change of masters will not better their condition and will strike at the cause of their misery.

Hail the rebels!

Many interesting articles have been crowded out this week for want of space.

A. I.

## ANOTHER OUTRAGE.

The late trial (?) of Leroy Berrier is another judicial outrage added to the already large and rapidly increasing list. The whole affair, called a trial, was a shameless and disgraceful farce. His case was pushed through with all the speed possible by the government, and no adequate opportunity offered for him to defend himself.

Mr. Berrier was not allowed to introduce witnesses to testify to his good character, and the evidence was, as in the trial of Emile Zola, confined to the narrowest limits, the prosecution evidently fearing to allow the introduction of evidence favorable to the "prisoner at the bar," lest the fiendish desire of the government be thwarted.

This is another illustration of the present concerted effort, on the part of the various "limbs of the law," to curtail the freedom of the press, and scare all who wish open discussion so that they will not attempt it.

Mr. Berrier's sentence is as outrageous as were the proceedings in court. To be sentenced to two years at hard labor and pay a fine of five hundred dollars for mailing pamphlets that contained unusual ideas, and a novel theory, is ridiculously outrageous, and shows how vicious the judge must be, and how insecure is the liberty of every one in this boasted "land of the free."

Mr. Berrier, I am informed, had failed to surround himself with an alert "defense committee," or circle of

friends of free press who were ever ready to array themselves against interference, and before his friends could pull themselves together in his behalf his case had been rushed through and he sentenced. This illustrates the necessity of joining ourselves together, and uniting with all who favor the freedom of the press, for the purpose of combatting, by all means, these encroachments, and it also shows the weakness of the argument that it is wasting energy to combat interference with the freedom of the press while government lasts. Had there been no combating of the plans and operations of the officials in The Firebrand Case we might all now be serving a long term in prison.

This administration seems to have started out to curtail or exterminate free press, and it behooves us to put forth every possible effort to thwart that design, and show a solid front, at every opportunity, that we do not propose to meekly submit to such interference.

Give us a free press and we will far sooner knock the stuffing out of the various tyrannous institutions of government.

HENRY ADDIS.

## IS FREEDOM POSSIBLE?

The best argument of the State Socialists against Anarchy is that we are all creatures of circumstances, therefore it is impossible to be free; that the conditions of each age are the inevitable result of past causes, therefore it is of no use trying to change them or of rebelling against them; ergo, State Socialism is inevitable, therefore we should submit gracefully as we cannot be any freer than the prevailing institutions will let us.

It sounds logical and what the Marxian Socialists are very jealous of having called, scientific. But if we yield to it, it proves too much. What is the use of working, hoping, rebelling, struggling, at all? Why not drift with the current, take whatever blind fate gives us—in fact, cease to be propagandists altogether?

We are, it is true, creatures of circumstances. But we are quite important circumstances ourselves. We are what we are, from the environment and conditions, everything that has gone before us, but being what we are, we are a power, a cause which may be felt in a more effective, a wider manner than we dream of. A despot may be the right sort of an outgrowth of a certain age; so is the rebel. And every rebel working out all the powers within him will in time eliminate the despot and the conditions which permit him. The institutions which interfere to regulate my personal relations with another human being, may be consistent with the stage of progress the world has reached. But so am I, a protestant against those arbitrary interferences. The civilization of the present day may have advanced only so far as to create conditions and regulations which allow of little personal freedom; it is natural also that many of the people should consider this situation inevitable, necessary and beneficial to mankind in general. But it is just as natural that I should protest, and dream and work for a time when there shall be no fixed institutions, no arbitrary barriers across my advancement toward full development and happiness.

Freedom of action of all our faculties is the ultimatum. Resolved to its last analysis, every reformer or revolutionist or iconoclast desires this. What else can he possibly be working for? His mind revolts against injustice, inequality of opportunity. The central aim of every human being is happiness. He instinctively feels, even before he reasons, that in order to be happy he must be free to use and exercise all his faculties; and the progressive man realizes that in order to be secure in such freedom all others should be equally as free. The State Socialist is really aiming at this equal freedom or he is aiming at nothing; only he believes that some vague power resting in the collectivity is going to secure it to the individual, instead of trusting to the absence of legal power or authority to leave people free.

A man with feet and legs with the proper development of muscle likes to move about. Shut up in a box, he feels that he ought to be outside of it. He knows there is such a thing as walking about without the restraint of a man-made prison, and he is going to do all he can to get there. It is true of every faculty we possess. We feel in possessing it, that there is such a thing as exercising it freely without restraint, and we are bound to reach that condition. Freedom is not only a possibility but a reality, a condition we must have eventually or the race will die out entirely.

L. M. H.

## SOCIALISM VS. ANARCHISM.

A most interesting discussion of the above subject took place May 4. at the Vorwaerts-Turner Hall of this city. The debaters were Emil Lies, editor of the German San Francisco Tageblatt and Emma Goldman, the Anarchist lecturer. The discussion was conducted in the German language. The house was crowded to overflowing and the audience evinced a deep interest in and a thorough appreciation of the subject discussed.

More than half of the valuable time of the discussion was consumed with citations, statements, contradictions and refutations, etc. of authoritarian versions which was introduced by Lies and had necessarily to be followed by Miss Goldman. Neither space nor inclination permits the recount of these quibbles, hence the following account of the purely philosophical points discussed.

Emil Lies contended that he was as much in favor of liberty as any Anarchist, in fact more so, because he recognized the necessity for liberation even from one's self (ego). Socialists in common with Anarchists, he contended, opposed the State in place of which they advocated the organization of production and distribution with a purely industrial administration. But the State is the product of the existing institution of private property and must fall with its disintegration. The Socialists considered the political arena the place for fighting and settling the struggle for liberty.

Emma Goldman replied that if human beings were to liberate themselves from their ego they must become unconscious first, they must die, which would certainly settle the question so far as they were concerned.

A centralized system of production and distribution was simply another name for a State. Wherever there is centralization there is officialism, and where there is officialism there is power—despotism. She wants individual liberty and recognizes no power on earth restraining the individual in non-invasive acts.

The State was not the effect but the cause of private property, and it is the State that must fall before mankind can breathe again the air of freedom.

The struggle must, however, not be fought by politics. That is a delusion, as a century of unsuccessful experimentation in this country has proven. Correct ideas must precede successful action. Education and agitation are the means. Whenever the people shall have arrived at a knowledge of the true principles governing harmonious social relations they will put them into practice without the ballot box which is simply a method of preferment and elevation into salaried offices of ambitious schemers; a means of corruption; a delusion and a snare.

Lies claimed: the freedom of the individual would be curtailed just as much under a group system of voluntary contracts as proposed by Anarchists, as under a centralized system of production and distribution. For if he were associated with a group and could not agree with it, he would have to seek some other group, and if no group could be found to suit his inclinations he would be left to perish. Individualistic production was unprofitable; the principal governing man was to obtain a maximum amount of comforts with a minimum expenditure of effort which was possible only under a co-operative system upon the largest scale.

Emma Goldman concluded: she did not advocate the contract system or any other special system. She had no hobby to ride and was no system-builder for future generations. It were foolish and shortsighted for us today with the rapid strides of the sciences, inventions and discoveries, with the advance of philosophy and the progressive spirit of the age before us to outline any particular system or arrangement of industrial or social relations. It was true that the largest amount of material comforts can be obtained under operation upon a large scale and no doubt with the present conception large numbers of people would under rational conditions co-operate upon such a plan. But it was not for her nor for Emil Lies or any other human being to dictate or force them into any particular plan or system. Millions of people might want to go into a co-operative system while some isolated few might wish to live upon their own hook in their own fashion. It were irrational and unfair for us to curtail the freedom of even one single individual; that would be the beginning of tyranny. Liberty does not consist in doing what someone else considers rational for us to do, but in the satisfaction of all of our own desires no matter where they may lead us as long as they be non-invasive.

What we want is the liberty of each individual to build his or her own system and heaven upon earth according to their own natural desires and inclination; the same opportunity that the bird has to sing; the plant to grow; the flower to bloom and blossom without restraint.

Let us have that Liberty and the human race will work out its own destiny. S. D.

\*\*\*\*\*

## NATURE AND THE STATE.

In nature, as human beings, we are all in accord; as citizens, in the State, we must enter into agreements. Of course the justification of the State is based upon the possibility of fastening closer the ties of simple nature.

Can it do so? Well, what is the use of such an investigation! There are no papers published outside of States—and within them none would presumably be tolerated—denying the justifiability of the State. And where adverse criticism is denied, what use of any criticism at all.

By the influence of the Church mankind during many centuries received such a training that they did not dare to investigate the doctrines and much less the justification of the Church. This influence from within sufficed for a long time to keep the masses in bounds. Finally outside influences, prohibitory laws, and in cases of their violation the sorest inflictions were resorted to. Equally so does the State still train its victims to a recognition of its institutions and regulations and principally of its own justification.

The more people, however, miss the blessing of the State, the more insufficient will become its moral influence. For the desire for liberty and happiness will forever live in human beings.

Now, there are two means whereby the representatives of the State strive to perpetuate it: the more rational ones by making concessions to human nature; the irrational ones by repression in the shape of brute force. They are imitating the old methods of the Church which, however, the severer they were, hastened the downfall of the Church so much more certainly. The rack and the stake are out of fashion, of course, but jails, exile and economical injuries are still available.

It has been found impossible to bolster up the dignity of the Church by brute force; will it be possible to much longer conserve the dignity of the State by the same means, that is, will the military and police government be able to survive?

The apparent public opinion is that it will, but principally from fear of ostracism and because jails and insane asylums—the result of truthfully expressed opinions—have no particular attraction for anybody.

Thus the State, if its object is the closer organization of human beings and if that proves its justification, certainly accomplishes its object; physical force accomplishes it.

Yes, the State cements our relations, but—to outward appearances only. It builds our relations upon artificial compromises. In order to do that it is obliged to establish an equal foundation for all, to level down everything. Can it accomplish that without jostling against the natural inclinations of human beings? That might be doubted, if doubt were permissible. Yet the State little cares whether any natural inclinations remain besides the outward relations it has forced us into. And it is unable to harmonize natural instincts with its artificial barriers, for nature will not be conquered.

The foundation of nature is absolute liberty; the State wishes to regulate things by external force. But nature is the strongest and frustrates the attempts of the State, so they have no common ground to stand upon.

If the State wishes to compromise with nature—and that is its only plan of self-preservation—then it must clip her wings. Then she cannot fly, but only jump. It cannot capture natural liberty, however, for she dwelleth not in the body alone. Thus liberty is always a thorn in the eyes of the State and it is ready to suppress her upon the slightest expression.

The cause does not bother about our natural or inalienable rights, for they are in conflict with its man-made and artificially established laws. It takes the hands of the citizens, places them into each other and says: Now, children, agree, or I'll take the strap! It does not care how many lives are wrecked by these compulsory regulations and how many of us would be infinitely more happy without them.

Yes, human nature and human interests are supposed to be insufficient to get along without the inter-

ference of the State. Stupid nature has to sit upon the school bench and to learn to behave herself. She is to begin to learn something and the State is to be her schoolteacher!

Will there ever be any human associations based upon elevated and refined natural impulses and promptings and the laws of natural selection instead of the abnormal and degraded conglomerations of human frames based upon and resulting from brutal force and compulsion? That will be the work of education and propaganda and more than all the faith in the superior power and grandeur of the elevating possibilities of liberty.—Johannes Gutzzeit in Chicagoer Arbeiter Zeitung.

\*\*\*\*\*

## GOVERNMENTAL IDIOCY.

The baneful effect of government received a practical illustration in the action of the local authorities the other day.

Two children of one of our comrades in this city were successively taken ill with diphtheria about two weeks ago, but soon became convalescent. To prevent the infection of the three remaining children of that family they were sent to another comrade's house in Berkeley where they remained for four days and enjoyed excellent health. Suddenly upon the fifth day a health officer appears on the scene and orders the children taken back to the city. Being backed by superior brute force—government—of course these orders had to be obeyed, and the children were therefore returned to the city.

Now, what is the inevitable result of such action under the circumstances? Simply this: These three children when taken back to the infected quarters will in all probability be infected and there will possibly be loss of life. Had they been allowed to remain in Berkeley where they had been enjoying better health than they ever knew in the city, even under ordinary conditions, their lives and health would certainly be spared.

This is also a beautiful illustration of the protection monopoly receives at the hands of the government. It was the landlord who reported the case to the health office. The comrades are being mulked by one robber out of a tax upon the few inches of earth that in reason ought to be free for use; and another robber—the government—stands ready to support and protect such robbery. And, to bring the infamy to a climax, the insolent robbers meddle in the private affairs of these comrades.

And that is the lovely piece of machinery our State Socialist friends consider indispensable! S. D.

\*\*\*\*\*

## CORRECT MENTAL VISION.

W. J. Colville in "The Humanitarian" says: "We need to see things in their true relations before we can deal with any great question intelligently, and it is for want of correctly-adjusted mental vision that so many well-intended works result in futility. The temperance question, the social purity movement, and many others are largely handicapped through failure on the part of some of their staunchest advocates to see the need which exists for appealing to the better and higher side of human nature, instead of insisting so much, as is often done, upon repressive or prohibitory measures. The nineteenth century has been largely characterized by the amount of force expended in work of an iconoclastic character: the Twentieth Century may see work done on constructive lines exclusively."

The "image of liberty" must be broken (iconoclasm); we must have liberty herself! "We need to see things in their true relations," which is, wage slavery, caused, and being daily intensified by the legal tender fraud—the only power that maintains Church and State. "The better and higher side of human nature" is a vapory aphorism so long as health and life are being crushed out of labor by the robbery of monopoly, and monopoly is only possible through the medium which forbids equitable exchange.

Anarchy objects to "repressive or prohibitory measures;" in this we agree with Colville, and no doubt still further: that temperance and social purity will not be brought about by man-made law, but by absolute individual liberty; therefore, to "deal with the question intelligently," we must trace the cause of all the evils from which humanity is suffering and abolish the cause—government. Government is nothing but brute force; to abolish this, the money power must be destroyed; then government would cease. Surely all reformers can see that as soon as equity in exchange is possible, the handicapping business will be one of the lost arts. It is just the want of "correctly adjusted mental vision" as to the cause and effect of government, that all "well-intended works result in futility," and it ever will be so. Do you think the Cubans are to be freed? No, they will only pay \$250,000,000 a year to Americans, instead of \$200,000,000 annually to Spain.

J. ALFRED KINGHORN-JONES.

## SELECTIONS FROM THE WRITINGS OF HENRY ADDIS.

### Why I am an Anarchist.

We find ourselves in a world of conflicting ideas, and every person who has individuality enough developed to be more, in human life, than a domestic animal or lifeless machine, must align himself with others who hold the same opinion, whether he will or not, and then he is in the view of others, and perhaps in his own view, labeled with the name of the idea he holds. So we find that nearly every person is labeled, and some persons have a number of labels.

Finding that we must be something—must hold to certain ideas and work for certain ends—if we work at all, or amount to any more in human life than an ox, or an ass, it very naturally follows that we will adopt and work for the prevalence of such ideas as will bring us the greatest happiness, now or by and bye. That is why I am an Anarchist. I am convinced that to work for the realization of the Anarchist ideal will bring me more satisfaction than an adherence to, or working for, any other ideal would bring me.

But every one should be able and willing to give a reason for the 'faith that is within him,' and I will try and do so.

I find myself in a world of sunshine and shade; of joy and sorrow; of happiness and woe. All around me I see fellow beings; beings that are constituted very much as I am, have similar desires, hopes and aspirations. I find that they are constantly trying to gratify these desires; to realize their hopes and attain to that for which they aspire. I find further that they can do these things only by exploiting inorganic nature, and by assisting each other. I find that as things are now, these beings instead of mutually assisting each other are constantly striving to injure each other, not because they take delight in the suffering of a fellow, but because they see no other way of satisfying their desires and aspirations. They think this state of affairs wrong, and are constantly clamoring for a change, but have not yet learned the great fundamental fact of human solidarity—of our interdependence.

Long have the various members of the human family sought to adjust themselves to environment, and of late have begun to endeavor to adjust the environment to suit themselves. All mankind craves for freedom, but most of the people have sought to gain freedom by subjugating others, or by restricting all alike. They have not learned that they cannot be free while they are holding others, or while they seek to restrict the freedom of others. No one desires to be injured, and yet no one can be secure from injury as long as he injures others. We all wish to be free from injury. I crave for freedom. I see that others want the same condition, and I know that my freedom can be made secure only by the freedom of all others. I know of no other ideal but Anarchy that, if realized, would secure freedom to me and to all others, therefore I am an Anarchist.

I long for plenty; for a sufficiency of the material necessities of life to make it possible for me to satisfy all my physical cravings, and I know that all others want the same thing. I see that the Earth yields abundantly; that it is possible for human beings to produce all the material necessities required to satisfy their physical cravings, and that if they would stop restricting and interfering with each other and turn their attention to production and mutual assistance, they could have every material comfort they desire. Anarchy is the only theory that, if put into practice, would secure this abundance and at the same time secure full liberty. Consequently I am an Anarchist.

I love my fellows, some of them at least, and pity those who suffer. I desire association with my fellow humans, and crave their friendship. I have a horror of violence and of the shedding of blood. I find that, as a rule, the other members of the human family are influenced by the same emotions, and I see that these emotions are warped and stifled by the conditions by which we are surrounded. I realize that Anarchy would be a condition that would tend to develop these emotions, and to eliminate the emotions of hatred, revenge, jealousy and envy, by disease: That in Anarchy association would rest upon mutual attraction, that all such hindering barriers as class distinction, rank, title or wealth will not exist, and so I am an Anarchist.

I love the beautiful. It gives me joy to see gorgeous sunsets, towering mountains, picturesque scenes. It increases my happiness to see bright cheerful faces, happy people and comfort. I take great delight in works of art, in poetry and music. I do not enjoy these things alone. I wish to share my joy with others. As things are today the ability to enjoy these things is crowded or crushed out of most people, and I must have my enjoyment of them constantly marred by the loneliness I feel when trying to communicate my joy to those I love, or with whom I associate. I know that many who have great artistic power; who could add much to the world's stock of art, poetry and music, are prevented from so doing by the hard necessities that surround them, and I see that Anarchy would remove the stifling conditions that kill the appreciation of the beautiful and prevent the development of the artistic. I am, for these reasons, an Anarchist.

All this and much more goes to make up the reasons for my adherence to, and advocacy of Anarchy.

### The Tyranny of Majority Rule.

It does not take much reasoning to show that majority rule is not just, wise or best, and that it is absolutely lacking in that element of justice which it has previously been supposed to embody. But few have stopped to calmly consider the tyranny of majority rule. Tyranny has been supposed to be confined to the rule of one or a few, but in reality the rule of the majority has been and ever must be as tyrannous as the rule of a single despot.

Compulsion, whether it takes the form of incentive to action, or of restraint from action, except in cases of necessary defense against aggression, is tyranny. Where a vote is taken on any proposition and a majority votes in one way, and compels the minority to abide by their decision, it is tyranny. A majority may

vote to prohibit the use of beer, and by enforcing that decision tyrannize over the minority who wish to drink beer. On the other hand the majority might vote that every one should drink so much beer every day. That would be tyranny to those who do not like beer, but it would be no more tyranny than to prohibit those from drinking beer who desire to do so.

Every attempt to regulate "public affairs," or to control the conduct of others, must be done by appeals to superior brute force, direct, or to "majority rule." The former is generally recognized as tyranny, and the latter is, logically, equally so. A few, for instance, do not wish to go to church on Sunday, but prefer to spend the day, or part of the day, in the woods, in a park, on a river, at a theatre or at a ball game. The majority do not want to spend their Sunday that way, and by right of their power, as the majority, prevent the minority from following their desires. It may be that out-door exercise is necessary to the health of some of the members of the minority, but by the decision of the majority they must go to church or stay at home, and this may be as galling and tyrannous as if the majority compelled every one to go out-doors and stay away from church and from home.

The majority may think that a certain form of association is "right and proper," and by the means of compulsion at hand force all to conform thereto, but that form of association may be very obnoxious to the minority and its enforcement extremely tyrannous.

In groups or societies formed for special purposes the principle works the same. If the majority rules, then the minority may feel tyrannized over, and as much restricted as can well be. The minority may want to work in a certain manner, or at certain occupations, but if the majority says they shall not, but must work in a certain way, and occupy their time in certain employment, then they must do it, and it becomes tyranny. Even in secret orders, and voluntary societies the rule of the majority often becomes very disagreeable to the minority, but the minority has no rights that the majority is bound to respect, so they must submit, or withdraw and lose what they have in the institution, and in some instances be persecuted unbearably for so doing.

So we see that everywhere majority rule breeds tyranny, is tyranny, and can be nothing else. If all agree there is no rule in the matter, but if one disagrees then the compulsion begins, and the tyranny of majority rule manifests itself. In essence there is no difference between a minority composed of one individual and a minority composed of one half minus one individual. If the lone individual has any rights in the matter, his rights are equal to the right of each other one, or of all the others together. If he has no rights in the matter then one half of the people minus one have no rights in the matter.

The philosopher may think out a better plan for carrying on a certain work, or the scientist may make discoveries that do not accord with accepted notions. A few will be found to give each of them a hearing and to adopt the new method or accept the newly discovered fact, but the majority will be a long time in doing either. If it were put to vote to determine whether the new method should be adopted, or the newly discovered fact be accepted, in nearly every instance the majority would vote "no." If the will of majority, in this instance, becomes the rule of action then it would become tyranny.

Thus we could elaborate indefinitely, and in every instance it will be found that majority rule is tyranny. It is always the expression of the thought and will of those who lag behind; of the conservative ones.

It is evident, then, that all argument in favor of majority rule is only an argument in favor of one form of tyranny, and all our "reform" friends who call so loudly for true majority rule, are calling merely for a change in the form of what they complain of—tyranny—and not its abolition. Why not stop demanding another form of tyranny and demand the abolition of all tyranny—all rule?

### The War Spirit.

The war spirit has been extolled as the noblest quality of man. It has been made the subject of essays and philosophical dissertations. It has been one of the great themes of the poet and the noblest, and has been constantly shown on the stage. All of these great moulders of public opinion have for ages tried to impress upon their devotees the idea that the war spirit is the great moving and ennobling power that raised humanity above the brutes. The horrors of war have been described by some men of genius, but their voices have been drowned by the roll of the drum and the shouts of adoration raised to the conquering warrior. Military commanders have been given places in institutions of instruction; they have been petted and feasted in society as some sort of superior beings. They have been put into positions of trust and influence, and the young taught to look upon them as worthy of unusual honor. So widespread is the war spirit that even religious bodies, going forth to spread a gospel of "peace on earth and good will toward men," as they have claimed, have adopted the organization and discipline of armies on a war footing. Everywhere this spirit of domination, of aggression, of rule or ruin, or "do as I say or I'll kill you," has warped the minds of men and turned energies that otherwise would have been turned to a better purpose. It has been the mainstay of all forms of authority, and an ever ready safety valve to draw off the unrest of the people when the privileges of the parasites have been threatened.

In looking back over the history of the past we find all its pages stained with human blood. Everywhere the people have been taught to fight as a duty, and everywhere the ruling classes have caused the poor, deluded, honest, wealth producing people to slaughter each other on the field of battle. Rivers of blood have flowed; millions of widows and orphans have mourned; the tenderest ties have been broken and the most endearing conditions of life destroyed because the war spirit dominated the minds of men, and they, poor fools, flung themselves into the heat of battle at the command of some potentate—some pompous parasite. All this blood has been wasted: this loss of life was of no good to those who bled or to their dear ones.

In our own day the war spirit is inculcated as much as possible, at school and in church, by the press and from the rostrum. War scares are numerous, and military organizations are spread from one end of Christendom to the other. Not

only the school children, but also the attendants at some of the Sunday schools are drilled in military tactics, and squads of boys, too young to realize the awful gravity of what they are doing, go marching down the streets of our great cities, dressed in military uniforms, bearing guns, and stepping to the time of a snare drum. Long articles are written by eminent men to prove that the war spirit should be cultivated in the young. The ruling class begins to fear that the poor will quit fighting their battles for them. The idea is gaining ground that if kings and congresses want war they may do the fighting.

Workingmen begin to see that the militia is used against them in their struggles with their employers, and much has been written and said concerning what can be done to correct this evil. Some have proposed that the working men join the militia, but in New York city members of Trades Unions are debarred from joining by officers of the militia. In some places entire companies of militia, composed entirely of trades unionists, have been proposed. But oh, how few have seen that no matter how many trades unionists are members of the militia, they will be flung against their fellow unionists in case of strike or lockout. Pretty sight! Beautiful sight! Men who have met in the union and called each other brother, brought out, gun in hand, at the command of a braggart bully, liable at any moment to be given the order "fire" at their brothers, perhaps of the same local. When will the Trades Unions and all their members refuse to belong to any military organization? When will working men see that military organizations are to keep them in subjection, and secure their robbery for the benefit of the parasites? When will people learn that war only brings anguish, destruction and death, and that all the desirable things of life come as a consequence of industry, never as a consequence of war?

When we have grown wise enough to banish the war spirit from amongst us: when all persons will refuse to use force against their fellows, then the power of the oppressor will be gone. No more could proud wealth rob patient industry and laugh in its face. Never again could the efforts of strikers be crushed by the militia. The power of the State would be gone, and the producers be able to maintain possession of their products. Then those who toil and create the wealth of the world could assert their power, and by combining their efforts raise themselves beyond all danger of want or privation, and forever place themselves in position to enjoy all the comforts, the luxuries, the arts and sciences. But as long as the war spirit sways men as it does today; as long as men will take up arms against their fellow men; will march and drill, and obey the command of a "superior," just so long will the parasitic class continue to fatten on the industry of labor, and uphold their privileges by inciting one section of working men against another section, and arousing the war spirit within them.

Wealth producers! refuse to longer allow the foul fiend of war to urge you on to self-destruction: to cause you to slaughter one another in the interest of your common enemy. Refuse to fight!

### Crime and Punishment.

The fear of crime and the question of punishment are two bugbears that stand in the pathway of a good many individuals, when they contemplate the proposition of setting men free from State interference. The same bugbear frightened the conservatives when skepticism began to question the correctness of christian dogmas. Not longer than twenty years ago men stood in the pulpit and boldly asserted that without the fear of hell to restrain them men would rush head-long into all manner of crime and vice, and pitiable indeed would be the world. Today such assertions are received by all intelligent persons with a smile of derision. It is now known that the fear of hell is but a poor preventative of crime. But true, by the history of mental evolution, most minds have transferred their faith in the fear of hell as a preventative of crime, to the fear of punishment here and now. One is as foundationless as the other.

Minds beclouded by ignorance and besotted by superstition may be so terrified by vivid descriptions of eternal tortures as to quake at the thought of committing crime, or may be restrained from some acts by fear of punishment, but as knowledge sheds its light abroad all restraint by fear vanishes. Bright minds are not horrified by threats of hell, and are always ready to take chances on evading the law, and thus escape punishment if they desire to do that which the law prohibits.

To deal with the question of crime, with any hope of solving the problem, it is necessary to inquire into the cause of crime. Those who depend on the fear of hell believe in the depravity of the human race; in the myth of "the fall of man," by the sin of Adam. The upholders of the State, of punishment to prevent crime, may deny a belief in this fallacy, but their attitude shows that the idea still dominates their thoughts. They never inquire why men commit crime, in fact they seldom even stop to enquire what crime is, or what effect punishment has on the one punished. All they want is to retaliate, to practice revenge, and to set an example to other erring ones hoping thereby to deter them from committing crime.

But let us inquire into the cause of crime and the right of punishment.

Has any one the right to punish another? If so, where do they get the right? If individuals have no right to punish others, what right has the State? If the State has the right to punish, from whence comes that right? I deny the right of the State, or of an association of individuals to punish anyone. I call for any argument that can be brought forward to substantiate the right of punishment, and know of none save the "might makes right" argument.

Many acts are called crimes, and defined as such by law that I will not admit are crimes. I deny that it is criminal for anyone to take possession of any unused natural opportunity and use it. I cannot call it a crime for anyone to take that which they need for their own use, or the use of those dependent upon them, when such taking is necessary to support the life of the one doing the taking or those dependent upon him or her. There are many other things commonly called crimes, that I will not admit are crimes, but that I will not stop to discuss.

Let us inquire for a few minutes what is the cause of crime. Most crimes at the present time, that is most all acts classed as criminal, are violations of what is termed property rights. Most of the remainder are the outgrowth of jealousy, which in turn is due to legal marriage, and superstitious beliefs in regard to sex matters. Children are badly born because their parents have not had opportu-

nities to develop what was in them, nor to gain the requisite knowledge to become the parents of healthy and intelligent children. Then, too, heredity is not the only factor to be considered. All persons act as their surroundings impel them to. When opportunities are restricted and persons find it difficult to provide the necessities and comforts of life, they have but little time to cultivate the artistic, to foster fraternity, and to enjoy the society of their fellows. All this has a degrading and stultifying effect upon the people. All around they see others, human beings like themselves, who have not only the comforts they crave for and are denied, but also such luxuries as they have never dared to dream of possessing. Is it any wonder that so many say to themselves: "It don't matter how you get it, the only thing to live for is to get money!"

Nothing can be plainer than that the present economic system, the outgrowth of monopoly, which in turn depends on the State for existence is the chief, if not the only, breeder of crime. Having driven persons to the commission of crime the State immediately becomes a still greater criminal by punishing its victims for doing that which it has forced them to do. The State denies equality of opportunity, fosters privileged classes, creates monopolies, and commits innumerable crimes against individuals; forces them into crimes and vices of all kinds, and then builds jails, prisons, and erects gallows and electric chairs in order, so it is said, to suppress the very crimes and vices of which it is the direct cause.

With all these facts in view it is the height of absurdity to pretend to fear freedom, lest crime should go unpunished and increase beyond human endurance.

### II.

In the above article I showed that the State was the chief cause of crime, and that it was the greatest of all criminals, hence its abolition meant the cessation of nearly all crime.

Now, in the event that crime is committed, after the State has ceased to exist, what is to be done about it? That is the question that seems to bother a large number of persons. At least they will ask that question and look troubled. I will endeavor to point out what crimes might occur, and what would be done about it.

In the first place, the incentive to crime will be reduced to the minimum, and we can reasonably expect that crime would be of rare occurrence. Most crimes today are crimes against property. The reason for that is plain enough. The resources of the earth are monopolized. This prevents the majority from using natural opportunities, thus forcing them to work for wages, or not at all, if no one who owns these opportunities cares to hire them. This immediately creates a distinction between different individuals, creating enmity, jealousy, envy, hatred and all forms of discord. Not only that, but it makes the struggle for existence so fierce amongst the propertyless, or poor, that they are forced to resort to various "questionable means" in order to provide themselves with the means of subsistence, or a few of life's comforts. That easily leads to the commission of "crime against property." Then, too, others are driven to the commission of "crimes against property," by hunger, or the sight of suffering.

Some crimes are the outgrowth of envy, jealousy and hatred, we are told, and I admit it. But it is easy enough to see that all these are the direct outgrowth of the distinctions that grow out of privileges granted by the State. Once these evil frames of mind are engendered, and the conditions that produce them continue, they grow upon themselves, destroy the ability of those possessing them to view life fairly, or on the bright side, and cause them to look upon every one else with suspicion, or with evil intent. This frame of mind is fostered by political aspirants and trades union agitators, and labor fakirs generally, who hope by setting race against race, nationality against nationality, or unionist against scab, to lift themselves into office, or some position of trust and emolument. This, you see, is in turn due to the existence of government and monopoly, and will vanish when these two causes are removed. So we need apprehend no crime as a result of such things, in a condition of freedom.

Jealousy will continue, we are told, and love will cause men to kill each other then as now. But is this true? Much of the trouble that now occurs between the sexes is due to bad industrial conditions, while a great deal of the jealousy that now exists is attributable directly to the frame of mind created and upheld by marriage laws. "This is my wife," is the excuse of many men who act criminally toward the women so designated, or some person for whom she may have formed a tender regard. The idea of woman's right to control her actions, and to determine for herself with whom she will associate sexually, is growing with, and is inseparable from the thought of freedom from State interference. When men and women have learned to respect the rights of all others, including their associate, the one they claim to love, then crimes as a result of jealousy will disappear.

Thus we see that in a condition of freedom crimes of all kinds would become scarce, to say the least.

"But if crime should occur, what would you do?" is a query that is constantly forced onto the advocates of freedom. In the first place, it is impossible to state what will be done, in any case, until the crime has occurred and the surrounding circumstances are determined. For this reason it is nonsense to demand an explanation of what will be done with criminals in supposed cases. In the event of the commission of a crime, it would be of no use to punish the criminal, for in so doing it only draws those into the commission of crime who administer the punishment. If a man becomes insane and undertakes to "pick off everybody on the street with his revolver," as some authoritarians claim, would happen, then there is no question but that very sudden and effective means would be taken to stop him—not as a matter of punishment, but as a matter of protection.

It is not punishment that prevents crime, or can prevent crime, and it is worse than useless to try to cure crime by punishment. Protection is always in order, and there is no question in my mind but that means, adequate to the end, will never be lacking.

Pietro Accirito, the Anarchist who, on April 22, 1897, attempted to stab King Humbert while the latter was on his way to the races, was sentenced at Rome to the galleys for life. On hearing his sentence Accirito, who had been quiet all through the trial, said: "Today it is my turn; tomorrow it is the turn of the bourgeois government. Long live the revolution; long live Anarchy."—Advocate.

## 163

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 and subscriptions for FREE SOCIETY:

Chicago, Ill. C. Piusner, 469 Wabash Ave.  
W. P. Borland, 504 Trade Bldg.  
New York City. I. Rudash, 363 Grand St.  
A. Levin, 340 Cherry St.  
Buffalo, N. Y. G. Lang, 514 Hickory St.  
Philadelphia, Pa. L. Rabotnik, 526 Washing-  
ton Ave.  
Allegheny, Pa. A. Frey, 138 Madison Ave.  
H. Bauer, 78 Spring Garden Ave.  
Baltimore, Md. B. Morvitz, 1005 E. Baltimore.  
Providence, R. I. Bookbinder, 31 Robinson St.  
J. H. Cook, 40 Hanover St.  
St. Louis, Mo. Otto Hinkle, 3859 Koenigs St.  
R. H. Schneider, 324 Calif. Ave.  
London, Eng. F. Goulding, 89 Meredith St.,  
[Paislow, London E.]  
Glasgow, Scotland. Wm. Duff, 9 Carpin St.,  
Gowan Hill.

## PROPAGANDA FUND.

Please do not use private checks nor bank checks if you can avoid it.

The safest and most acceptable manner of re-  
mitting is by postoffice or express money order.

Week ending May 8.

Bohemian Group, Baltimore, Md., \$2.00.  
Les Affamees, Spring Valley, \$2.50.  
Levin, Fox, Carnot, each \$1.00.  
Bachman, Morlan, Neebe, Schoolman, Robin-  
son, Rathbun, Rudash, Bernborg, Komarsky,  
each 50c.  
Heyman, Simkins, Austin, McGill, Glasgow,  
Dalhandy, each 25c.

## The Letter-Box.

I. R., New York. — You will have  
found the reception of the amount ac-  
knowledgeed by this time.

S. C., Philadelphia, Pa. — You seem to  
be very sensitive in regard to the mis-  
take we made, but insensible about pay-  
ing your subscription which expired  
seventeen weeks ago. Selah!

Alhaza. — Received your letter but no  
stamps or money in it. The paper will  
be sent to the given address anyway.  
If the women would be permitted to  
take an active part in political cam-  
paigns they would certainly take more  
interest in the social movement, but I  
don't think they would accomplish any  
more through the ballot than the men  
have; it would only make them more  
corrupt than they now are.

T. R., City. — That Gori has joined the  
ranks of Socialists is not true. You evi-  
dently mean Merlino, but even the latter  
has not repudiated Anarchism as the  
Socialists claim. He simply proposes  
the use of the ballot as a matter of tac-  
tics and expediency, and there is a very  
interesting discussion going on at pre-  
sent between Merlino and Malatesta con-  
cerning the ballot.

## ATTENTION.

In spite of the past failures in attempt-  
ing to put our ideas into practice, there  
are yet many Anarchists who deem it  
necessary to get rid of wage-slavery and  
conventionalities as far as possible.

We have lately received several letters  
proposing to establish an Anarchist col-  
ony if possible near a city. This cannot  
be realized without having a list of those  
who are anxious to take part in such an  
attempt and knowing what means they  
possess.

All those that are interested in this  
proposition are requested to communi-  
cate with Free Society.

Anarchist papers please copy.

## Notice.

All parties in New York City or  
Brooklyn N. Y. wishing to subscribe and  
pay for Free Society and other Anarch-  
ist literature are requested to leave or

send in their orders and moneys to 50  
First st., or to Comrade Masel, 163 Henry  
st., New York or to my address.

A. LEVIN,  
555 Stone Ave. (26 Ward)  
Brooklyn, N. Y.

Addresses of Anarchist  
Lecturers.

Emma Goldman, 50 First street, New  
York City.  
Henry Addis, Gen'l Del., Portland,  
Oregon.  
H. Weinberg, 50 South Second street,  
Philadelphia, Pa.  
Lucy E. Parsons, 1777 N. Troy street,  
Chicago, Ill.

## Free Society Library.

These pamphlets are issued monthly  
at 5 cents each or 50 cents a year:

No. 1, "Law and Authority," by P.  
Kropotkin.  
No. 2, "A Talk About Anarchist Com-  
munism," by Enrico Malatesta.  
No. 3, "Emancipation of Society from  
Government," by Dallen Doyle.  
No. 4, "Anarchist Morality" by P.  
Kropotkin.  
No. 5, "Mating or Marrying, Which?"  
"A Lesson from History" and "The  
Problem of Criminality," by W. H. Van  
Ornum.

|                 | IN QUANTITIES. |         |       |
|-----------------|----------------|---------|-------|
|                 | 10             | 100     | 1,000 |
| No. 1, 25 cents | \$1.75         | \$15.00 |       |
| No. 2, 25 cents | 1.50           | 12.00   |       |
| No. 3, 25 cents | 1.50           | 12.00   |       |
| No. 4, 25 cents | 1.75           | 15.00   |       |
| No. 5, 25 cents | 1.50           | 12.00   |       |

A PHYSICIAN  
IN THE HOUSE.A NEW  
Family Medical Work.

IT IS THE BEST MEDICAL BOOK FOR  
THE HOME YET PRODUCED.

BY  
DR. J. H. GREER.

It has 16 colored plates showing  
different parts of the human  
body.

This book is up to date in every particular.  
It will save you doctor bills. It tells you how  
to cure yourself by simple and harmless  
home remedies. The book recommends No  
Poisonous or Dangerous Drugs. It teaches  
simple Common Sense Methods in accordance  
with Nature's laws. It does not endorse dan-  
gerous experiments with the surgeon's knife.  
It teaches how to save Health and Life by safe  
methods. It is entirely free from technical  
rubbish. It teaches Prevention—that it is  
better to know how to live and Avoid disease  
than to take any medicine as a cure.

It teaches how Typhoid and other Fevers  
can be both Prevented and Cured. It gives  
the best known treatment for La Grippe,  
Diphtheria, Catarrh, Consumption, Appendicitis  
and every other disease. This book is Not an  
Advertisement and has No Medicine to sell.  
It tells you how to live that you may Prolong  
life. It Opposes medical fads of all kinds and  
makes uncompromising War on Vaccination  
and the use of anti-toxins. It has hundreds of  
excellent recipes for the cure of the various  
diseases. The chapter on Painless Midwifery  
is worth its weight in Gold to women. It has  
a large number of valuable illustrations. The  
"Care of Children" is something every mother  
ought to read. It teaches the value of Air  
Sunshine and Water as medicines. This  
book cannot fail to please you. If you are  
looking for Health by the safest and easiest  
means, do not Delay Getting The Book.

This book is printed in clear type on  
good book paper, beautifully bound in  
cloth with gold letters. It has 800 Octa-  
violet pages.

PRICE \$2.75.

Send Orders To FREE SOCIETY

WHEREFORE INVESTI-  
GATING COMPANY.

BY  
LOIS WAISBROOKER.

An interesting book, written in story  
form, showing the inevitable and bad  
results which arise from monopoly in  
land. A splendid missionary book of  
313 pages.

"LEND A COPY TO YOUR CONSERVATIVE  
NEIGHBOR."

"THE HOMELESS MILLIONS OF THE WORLD CRY  
LOUDLY FOR"—THE LAND.

This Book is Printed in Large Clear  
Type, and on Good Book Paper.

Regular Price, 50 CENTS.

OUR PRICE, 25 CENTS.

## Radical Exchanges.

L'agitazione, an Italian Anarchist weekly.  
Address: Claidini No. 10, Ancona, Italy.

Libertaire, a French Anarchist weekly.  
Address: 26 Rue Salute, Marseille, France.

Der Sozialist, a German Anarchist weekly.  
Address: Elisabethstrasse 66, Berlin N., Ger-  
many.

Freedom, an Anarchist monthly, 36c. per  
year. Address: 7 Lamb Conduit St, London  
W. C., England.

Freiheit, a German Anarchist weekly, price  
\$2.00 a year. Address: 317 Genesee Street, Buf-  
falo, New York.

L'Avvenire, a Spanish Anarchist-Communi-  
st paper. Address: G. Consorti, Calle Uruguay  
782, Buenos Aires, Argentine.

Volne Listy, a Bohemian Anarchist monthly,  
published at 50 cents a year. Address: Franta  
Leinr, 43 Johnson Ave., Brooklyn N. Y.

The Adult, the journal of sex. Office:—  
16 John Street, Bedford Row, London W. C.  
England. 8d. Monthly. 4d. Post Free.

Solidarity, an International Review of an  
archist-Communism. A semi-monthly, 50 cents  
a year. Address: J. H. Edelman, 50 First St.,  
New York City.

Sturm und Drang, 50 First st., New York City,  
an Anarchist-Communist paper printed in  
German, semi-monthly; 80 cents per year.

Der Arme Teufel, a radical and literary  
German weekly. Price \$2.50 per year. Address:  
R. Ketzler, 675 McDougall Ave., Detroit, Mich.

Le Temps Nouveau, a French Anarchist  
weekly. Address: 140 Rue Mouffetard, Paris,  
France.

Le Pere Peinard, a French Anarchist week-  
ly. Address: 15 Rue Lavieville, Montmartre  
Paris, France.

La Tribune Libre, a French Anarchist  
weekly. Price \$1.00 a year. Address: Charlevoix,  
Pennsylvania.

Germinal, a Spanish Anarchist weekly.  
Address: B. Salbas, Casilla Correo 1034 Buenos  
Aires, Argentine Republic.

Miscarea Sociala, a Roumanian Anarchist  
weekly. Address: Matasariu 22, Bucharest,  
Roumania.

Sozialistische Monatshefte, a radical month-  
ly magazine. Address: Marien St. 27, Berlin  
N. W., Germany.

Deutsche Listy is an eight page Anarchist  
weekly paper, published in the Bohemian lan-  
guage at New York City, 402 E 71<sup>st</sup> St. by the  
International Workmen's Association of Amer-  
ica. Send for sample copy.

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 major-  
ity vote. Twenty-five cents a year; sample co-  
py free. Address: A. Longley, 2319 Olive St.  
St. Louis, Mo.

WANTED: Light on the Sex Question. This  
is humanity's greatest need. Read Lucifer, the  
Light Bearer, the only paper of its kind in the  
world. Weekly, eight pages, \$1 per year. Send  
25 cents now and receive Lucifer three months  
on trial and these five thought stirring essays,  
which are worth an equal sum, as premium:  
"Subsistence and Justice," by Lucinda B. Chan-  
dler; "The Sexual Enslavement of Woman,"  
"Love and the Law," "Variety vs. Monogamy,"  
by E. C. Walker; "Thomas Jefferson as an Indi-  
vidualist," by Gen. M. M. Trumbull. Address  
M. Harman, 1394 Congress street, Chicago.

## NEWS STANDS

Where FREE SOCIETY can be obtained:

SAN FRANCISCO—Paper Covered Book  
Store, 1203 Market St. Anarchist and  
Freethought literature also on sale.

Boston—Columbia Stationery Store,  
935 Washington St.  
Brigham's Restaurant, Washington St.

New York.—A. Tannen, care of Uf-  
ner, 309 E. 9th St. Also has for sale  
Freedom, the English Anarchist paper,  
at 3c a copy, and Anarchist pamphlets.

A. Levin, 340 Cherry St. Has also  
pamphlets in the English, Hebrew and  
German languages, which out of town  
news stands and comrades can get by  
addressing him.

I. Rudash, 363 Grand St. Radical liter-  
ature of all kinds, including English  
periodicals on hand.

## BOOK LIST.

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

\*Appeal to the Young. By P. Kropotkin. \$ 05  
Anarchism: Its Philosophy and Ideas.  
By P. Kropotkin. 05  
Anarchist Communism, its Basis and  
Principles. By P. Kropotkin. 05  
Law and Authority. By P. Kropotkin. 05  
Expropriation. By Peter Kropotkin. 05  
Anarchist Morality. By Peter Kropotkin. 05  
The Commune of Paris. By P. Kropotkin.  
and An Anarchist on Anarchy. By E.  
Reclus (one volume). 05  
Anarchism vs State Socialism. By G. Ber-  
nard Shaw; 3 for. 02  
A Talk About Anarchist Communism.  
By Malatesta. 02  
Anarchist Communism in its Relation to  
State Socialism. By Agnes Henry. 05  
Let us be Just. By W. Tchericoff. [An  
open letter to Liebknecht] 05  
Social Democracy in Germany. By  
G. Landauer. 02  
Socialism in Danger. By E. Nieuwenhuis.  
Social Conditions and Character. By  
"Ireland." 03  
Bases of Anarchism: Historical Philoso-  
phical and Economical. By W. Holmes.  
God and the State. By M. Bakounin. 05  
The True Aim of Anarchism. By Steine  
Anarchism and Violence. By Bevington  
Speech of August Spies in Court. 05  
The Emancipation of Society from Govern-  
ment. By Dallen Doyle. 1.00  
Wants and their Gratification. By E. Addie  
My Century Plant. By Lois Waisbrooker.  
Wherefore Investigating Company, regu-  
lar price 50c, but while present supply  
lasts "they go at" 25

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

## Public Meetings.

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 ev-  
ery Friday, 8 o'clock P. M., at 535 Blue Island Av.

Anarchist Headquarters of San Francisco  
1274 Folsom 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 Friday  
evening at 8 o'clock.

The People's Union, a free discussion club,  
meets every Sunday evening at 925 Westminster  
St., Providence, R. I.

Social Science Club, Leor's Hall, 61 E. 4th  
St., New York City. Free lectures and discus-  
sion every Wednesday evening at 8 o'clock.

International Workmen Association, of  
Buffalo, N. Y., meets every Sunday morning at  
10 o'clock A. M. at Blume's Schweizer Hall,  
483 Broadway.

The International Group, Chicago, meets  
every Thursday 8 P. M. at 400 Halstead St.  
The object of the group is to spread FREE  
SOCIETY and other radical literature.

Wendell Phillips Educational Club will  
meet every Saturday 8 P. M. at 31 Robinson St.,  
Providence, R. I. Pamphlets in English, Ger-  
man, French, Jewish and Russian languages  
on hand.

The Equity Club meets every Monday 8 P. M.  
at 117 Turk St., San Francisco Cal. for the  
purpose of discussing any question that may  
arise; especially the sex question. Free plat-  
form for everybody.

## DR. FOOTE'S PLAIN HOME TALK

EMBRACING

## MEDICAL COMMON SENSE.

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

Order of Free Society.