

FREE SOCIETY

ENTERED AT SAN FRANCISCO POSTOFFICE AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER.

-AN ADVOCATE OF COMMUNAL LIFE AND INDIVIDUAL SOVEREIGNTY.

NEW SERIES NO. 9.

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., SUNDAY, JANUARY 9, 1898.

WHOLE NO. 145.

THE SONG OF THE WAGE SLAVE.

The land it is the landlord's,
The trader's is the sea,
The ore the usurer's coffer fills—
But what remains for me?
The engine whirls for master's craft;
The steel shines to defend,
With labor's arms, what labor raised,
For labor's foe to spend.
The camp, the pulpit, and the law
For rich men's sons are free;
Theirs, theirs the learning, art, and arms—
But what remains for me?
The coming hope, the future day,
When wrong to right shall bow,
And hearts that have the courage, man,
To make that future now.

I pay for all their learning,
I toil for all their ease;
They render back, in coin for coin,
Want, ignorance, disease;
Toil, toil—and then a cheerless home,
Where hungry passions cross;
Eternal gain to them that give
To me eternal loss!
The hour of leisured happiness
The rich alone may see;
The playful child, the smiling wife—
But what remains for me?

They render back, those rich men,
A pauper's niggard fee,
Mayhap a prison—then a grave,
And think they're quits with me;
But not a fond wife's heart that breaks,
A poor man's child that dies,
We score not on our hollow cheeks
And in our sunken eyes;
We read it there, where'er we meet,
And as the sum we see,
Each asks, "The rich have got the earth,
And what remains for me?"

We bear the wrong in silence,
We store it in our brain;
They think us dull, they think us dead,
But we shall rise again:
A trumpet through the lands will ring;
A heaving through the mass;
A trampling through their palaces
Until they break like glass;
We'll cease to weep by cherished graves,
From lonely homes we'll flee;
And still, as rolls our million march,
Its watchword brave, shall be—
The coming hope, the future day,
When wrong to right shall bow,
And hearts that have the courage, man,
To make the future now.

—Ernest Jones.

THE MINORITY.

G. E. M. in No. 6 of *FREE SOCIETY*, page 2, has an article captioned "End of Government," wherein he appears to me to show more of an antipathy toward Socialism than common sense and reason. He, in the first place, concluded that a State Socialist gave his case away when he said: "We will permit them (an unwilling minority) to go outside society and do as they please."

It seems to me that was about as liberal as a reasonable being could ask. If one at a time, or a few of a larger number wish to withdraw from an association, and the right is conceded to them, there is "no kick coming."

G. E. M. wants to be antagonistic to Socialism, and in the second paragraph of his article thinks he is giving Socialism a tremendous "belt" when he writes: "Government is an impossibility where it cannot enforce its mandates." This is covered by the concession above set forth, of consent by the majority for the minority to withdraw. As a believer in a socialistic form of association, so much better than the present commercialistic system, I am after a state of society where to use his own words, "government is at an end and authority and oppression cease," and that to me is Socialism—

the Socialism I seek to have displace present day commercialism.

Taking up the third paragraph in his article I wish to say that my conception of Socialism does not allow me to conceive of an "office-holding oligarchy." That is the straw-man that G. E. M. conjures up in his mind and figures out he must fight with all his might and main. Well, it is a monster, and it is right and proper that it should be fought to a finish and beaten to death. It is, however, not a reality; it is simply the picture produced upon paper by the disordered brain of G. E. M. Let me assure him that it will not exist. Every human being in the country will be an office-holder or no one in the country will be an office-holder. You can put it either way—the result is practically the same. The effect is equality—for which I, as a Socialist, seek as earnestly and ardently as G. E. M. or any Anarchist.

In his last paragraph he asserts that Socialism "must be more tyrannical, and enforce its decrees with greater severity than any government that ever existed in the past."

How does that agree with the statement that G. E. M. says a Socialist made to him in the first paragraph of his article? It does not agree at all. In fact it is a flat contradiction. For myself I take it that that Socialist knew what Socialism is, and G. E. M. evidently doesn't.

I infer that G. E. M. is an Anarchist. If this be so he will do well to confine himself to defining the ism he believes in and advocating its adoption. To get in and define an ism he does not like, which conflicts with the definition of the believers in the ism who are likely to know what they believe in, is a useless and unprofitable labor. If Anarchism was as a defender of commercialism might define it—a proposition to do as one pleases without regard to the wishes, feelings or rights of others—G. E. M. would be likely to register an objection, and he would be upheld therein by yours truly,

Exeter, Calif. T. W. B., a Socialist.

COMMENT.

When I was handed the MS of T. W. B.'s article I was told: Here is a criticism of one of your notes by an editor who is a State Socialist. "Ah," thought I then, "now we shall get some facts in support of the Statist's position." But I was not prepared for the unique style of argument used by my critic. After the usual stock arguments of the De Leonites used against those who will not accept their silly twaddle with the faith of a religious devotee—such as "Disordered Brain," "Prejudice," "Man of Straw," "He's a wicked Anarchist," "Let him leave Socialism alone," etc., ad nauseam, he winds up by admitting that Socialism as he understands it means a condition in which "government is at an end and authority and oppression cease," or in other words that he is an Anarchist.

I say amen to that and desire to ask: How can office holding exist under such a regime; how can you have majority rule without authority and oppression or with secession of the unwilling minority; how can you have supervision of men or meddling of man with man?

I will answer for you. They are all impossible—for your premises lead to unrestricted freedom.

The trouble with T. W. B. is that he has come over bag and baggage into the camp of the Anarchists without knowing it—for they believe with all their "might and main" in no government, no authority, no oppression and the right of secession.

If you misrepresent Anarchism in the way you suggest in your last paragraph it would not be farther fetched than your exposition of State Socialism.

You are an Anarchist, comrade, and I'll bet you a big red apple that if I send your article to De Leon he'll say as much. He may like your abuse of the "wicked Anarchists," but your doctrine—never! Drop your abuse; read up our literature and we shall soon have the pleasure of knowing that there is another journal in the service of our cause.

G. E. M.

LABOR EXCHANGE.

F. A. C.: In No. 7 of *FREE SOCIETY* you proposed some questions concerning the Labor Exchange, that give evident proof that you are not as well informed on the subject as the critic of a subject ought to be. (1.)

You suppose a case of a sudden great change or slump in the price of potatoes and think that consequently the provisions of the Labor Exchange would do injustice to some one.

You fail to take into consideration, that the erratic fluctuation in the prices of commodities are mostly due to the heedless somersaults committed on the financial checkerboard by speculators intent on plunder.

Such occurrences, as a rule, do not affect one commodity, but the whole circle of commodities. (2.)

Anyone who has studied prices for a number of years will have discovered that these prices preserve to a large extent a definite proportionality to one another, and whether prices are high or low this proportionality is practically preserved.

The sudden fluctuation in prices, then, are not occasioned by the exigencies of production; they need not occur because of unadvised shipping, because this can be provided against by a proper understanding among shippers; there remains nothing then, but the wayward and willful interference with the flow of money.

Now the Labor Exchange check is a receipt for a deposit of goods made, it is not value in itself. The moves on the financial chessboard cannot alter the nature of our checks or change the character of the goods in our depository. Where then would the loss come in? (3.) Of course, had the member kept his potatoes, he might have pocketed the increased money price, but on the other hand, he would also have had to bear the loss, but if he had kept the potatoes for his own consumption, the change in prices would neither have made him richer nor poorer, because the nutritive value would have remained the same. (4.)

In the Labor Exchange we are trying to combine sufficient people, so that we will neither have to buy or sell, but produce for our own use and enjoyment, and whether our products are quoted in the world's market at high or low prices, what difference can it make to us.

Yes, we believe that in due course of time we can remove all the wrongs committed by legal tender, and all other government money, because the world's history has repeatedly demonstrated that the perfect always displaces the imperfect. The stage coaches and muleteams were taken from the road between San Francisco and Sacramento after the railroad was built. The change in public opinion, brought about by the educational work of the Labor Exchange, will play a mighty part in the coming transformation. I will not intrude further,

because I know you publish FREE SOCIETY for spreading other principles, and I believe in non-invasion and practice it.

CARL GLEESER.

Kansas City, Mo.

COMMENT.

1.—Cannot even a critic ask for information?

2.—Hold on, there, comrade; don't go off half-cocked. It don't matter whether the fluctuation occurs in a day or a year; that don't touch the point I made, which was that a depositor gets a check for so much per bushel for his "spuds," not for so many bushels, as would manifestly be done in fair exchange, unless an allowance were made for storage and handling. I was speaking of society of today, not of an ideal society, for the latter will not, in my opinion, use either money or the L. E. substitute.

3.—In quantity of goods, of real value not artificial, or price value. It might be a gain, instead of a loss, but the principle is the same: You do not evade the speculative feature of the legal tender dollar.

4.—Now you touch my point and your answer proves that your previous conception of the exchange was one of speculative trend. I might add that in fair exchange that is what he would get back from the L. E., and that is what the L. E. does not now attempt to guarantee. F. A. C.

AN IGNORANT MAJORITY.

Said a well-meaning friend of mine to me on one of the recent election days: "Every man should be made to vote, and if he would not, I'd have him put in jail if I had my way."

If only one man in a community were of that way of thinking no harm to liberty would result.

Unfortunately the number of men of like opinion is legion.

It shows conclusively that even in this boasted "land of freedom" men have no conception of liberty.

These men seem incapable of looking for cause and effect. They have been told that liberty is enjoyed in this country because they vote for a president and are ruled by the official elected rather than by the "crowned head."

Presidents, kings, emperors and czars alike exist by and through taxation of the people.

It is astonishing that men can be blinded to their real environment. Yet that such is the case is clearly manifested whenever an election of national, state or municipal officers takes place.

Men devote time, energy and ability in striving to elect an official for what? The answers are as numerous as the sands of the sea, but unless the respondent to the interrogation has some knowledge of Anarchism none of the replies will approach the truth.

Were it not for the power, delegated to our rulers, to levy and collect taxes they would not exist.

Taxes are levied upon the industries and products of the people.

To levy and collect taxes is to restrict in some form the activities of many of the people for the benefit of the people? No! For the support of the rulers and their army of place-holding followers.

The history of governments shows that taxes never grow lower. There is always a seeking for new things to tax. There is always a new list of reasons for increasing the tax budget.

Nor does the evil of government end with the State taxation.

The rich and powerful must ever be placated by the rulers and hence a system of privilege granting to those who can pay for it in some manner or wreak vengeance upon the powers that be. These privileges per se give power and opportunity to their recipients to restrict the industries of the people and collect tribute in the shape of interest, dividends, profits, etc. Now, that all this is true cannot be successfully denied.

Its truth established, what are the people doing when contending that this man or another should

be elected to office? Do they make life easier, more pleasant and more endurable for themselves?

Yes! If they obtain at the hands of the rulers special privileges to control channels of trade, franchises or other forms of tribute exaction.

Yes! If they have opportunity to become the obsequious and pliant tools of the rulers, or their beneficiaries.

No! If they are of the great army of workers. It is upon the backs of the latter that the burdens of taxation and special privileges are supported.

With what results let the army of underpaid, underfed and overworked, or those without employment give answer?

No! No! It is this vast and multitudinous army that sings the praises of the taskmaster and insist that the State shall be maintained, the iniquities of taxation continued, and the special privileges of the few respected and supported.

It is this great and pliant force that renders the ruler and the tax-gatherer possible.

It is this host of men who are, and ever have been, responsible for the execution and incarceration of the few who seeing liberty have sought to maintain her and live within the rays of her life-giving equalities.

It is the many who have discarded liberty and who kiss the hand of the ruler while yet it smites them.

It is the horde of unwitting and willing slaves that make outcast of the man who wants no State, no ruler excepting that which will promote the well being of his fellows in order that he may enjoy greater happiness in the life that is.

So to jail, or to the guillotine with whomsoever questions the State, or refuses to rivet the chains upon his own limbs.

So to hell with the Anarchist! Make him vote! He would destroy our time-honored privilege of rent, interest and profit. His doctrine would obliterate involuntary poverty and luxurious idleness and special privilege; also the power to tax. He would have the people free and happy. Well, damn him! Kill him! Make him a slave, for are we not satisfied with slavery? REB.

Boston, Mass.

NOT AN ANSWER.

The Labor Exchange for \$1 gives a certificate which constitutes a man a life member of the L. E. and he is free to patronize it or not without let or hindrance. There are no dues or assessments, and he is recognized in any L. E. on this earth the same as where he joined.

The price of potatoes is not likely to advance from 50 cents to \$2 in one day, as you suggest, but if they do it helps the branch that much, and his interest in the branch is equal to that of any other member. No member can own more than one share of stock, so the members equally own the branch. They each share alike in the losses as well as the profits. Thus it should be to each one's interest to build up the branch and make it a success. The check system nearly does away with the necessity for legal tender, and with no middle man to gobble the profits they go to build up the branch, which is to the interest of each member equally. It is a free society in a nutshell. I like everything that is of general interest.

Garden Grove, Cal.

T. O. WIGHTMAN.

LABADIE'S VIEWS.

There has been much said of how Miss Goldman came to speak in the People's Tabernacle, and no paper so far has got it right. The Tribune said that Mr. McCowan invited her to speak in his church after he had heard her at Turner hall. Here are the facts: Several days before Miss Goldman came to Detroit, Robert Ogg said to me that Mr. McCowan would like to hear Miss Goldman. When it was learned that she was to speak at Turner hall it was determined that we three go together, expecting that she was to speak in English. On the evening of the first Turner hall meeting—the 16th inst.—we met at the Russell house about 7:30 and walked to the hall. We did not then know in what language she was to speak, but Mr. McCowan said he wanted to see the crowd anyway, see

from what walks of life it was made up, how they acted and to take in the spirit of the whole affair; even though Miss Goldman did speak in German. After we got into seats I noticed some friends in the back end of the hall and went to greet them. While there, Mr. Hacker, president of the Central Labor union, came to me and said Miss Goldman would like to meet me. I went into the side room where she with a number of friends were sitting around a table and was introduced. After a few minutes' conversation Miss Goldman said she would like to have a meeting where she could speak in English. I said, no doubt such a meeting could be had, and that I would speak to some of our friends, get a hall and make arrangements for a meeting. When I returned and took my seat with Mr. McCowan and Mr. Ogg I said Miss Goldman was going to speak in German, but would like to have a place to speak in English. My recollection is that Mr. Ogg spoke and said it "would be kind o' nice if she could speak in the church," meaning the People's church. Mr. Ogg, however, now says that he did not make that remark or any other. Mr. McCowan said yes, that it would be a good thing to have her speak there. It was then agreed that Miss Goldman would speak on Friday evening, and I then went on to the platform, before Miss Goldman had gone on, and announced the fact that she would speak at the People's church, and said all were invited to attend. Miss Goldman then came on to the platform and made her speech in German, which none of us three understood. When the meeting adjourned we went to where Miss Goldman was. I presented Mr. McCowan as the pastor of the church in which she was expected to speak. She expressed some surprise and said jokingly that she would take the opportunity to roast him. He said that would be all right; he could stand it; that she could speak without any restraint.

And that is how Emma Goldman came to speak in the People's Tabernacle.

I happen to know that "Herts" was at none of Emma Goldman's meetings, and therefore could not have known, only by hearsay and the newspaper reports, the unreliability of which no one knows better than "Herts," who she said and whether or not her lectures were "lurid." As a matter of fact, however, Miss Goldman's English talk in the People's church was in every respect very much better than I expected. She did not refer to the marriage question until she was asked, and she had nothing but kindness to say of Christ. It was the hypocrites she denounced. The low, mean, vulgar, dishonest, impudent, dastardly, gutter-snipe way of "roasting" everything a reporter does not agree with or does not understand is a habit this interesting correspondent should not fall into.

* * *

Now, let us see about the truth of "Hert's" statements.

"Her lurid lecture so stirred up her hearers that the resignation of the pastor has been demanded."

As a matter of fact the resignation of the pastor has not been demanded.

"More than half of the trustees and deacons of the church have either sent in their resignations or announced their intention of doing so, if the pastor, whose ill-advised invitation brought Emma into the church, does not resign," says "Herts."

The truth is, only three deacons with their families have left the church, eleven people all told.

"The church, in fact, is split in twain as a result of Emma Goldman's lecture."

The pastor tells me the church is more unified than ever, and that the attendance at services has not fallen off, the prospects being for an increase in membership.

* * *

I myself am not wholly in harmony with Miss Goldman's principles nor methods, but I do not think I lose any of my dignity by being fair and tolerant to her. I was in her company quite a little while she was here and I found her a very interesting person indeed, well-read, generous in the extreme, full of experiences, and doing a work that is much needed to be done. Her frankness is truly refreshing and she is as naive as a child. She is not my ideal woman, but she is one with whom no one can spend an hour without advantage. I am glad she came here. I am glad she spoke in the church with the clearness and unreserve she did, and I am glad she brought some of the bigots out into the open. We know their weakness now.—Joseph A. Labadie, in Detroit Sentinel.

"LAW AND AUTHORITY."

BY PETER KROPOTKIN.

CHAPTER III.

We have seen in the previous chapter how law originated in established usage and custom, and how, from the beginning, it has represented a skillful mixture of social habits, necessary to the preservation of the human race, with other customs, imposed by those who used popular superstition, as well as the right of the strongest, or their own advantage. This double character of law has determined its later development during the growth of political organization. Whilst in the course of ages the nucleus of social custom inscribed in law has been subjected to but slight and gradual modifications, the other portion has been largely developed in directions indicated by the interests of the dominant classes, and to the injury of the classes they oppress. From time to time these dominant classes have allowed a law to be extorted from them which presented, or appeared to present, some guarantee for the disinherited. But then such laws have but repealed a previous law made for the advantage of the ruling caste. "The best laws," says Buckle, "were those which repealed the preceding ones." But what terrible efforts have been needed, what rivers of blood have been spilt, every time there has been a question of the repeal of one of these fundamental enactments serving to hold the people in fetters. Before she could abolish the last vestiges of serfdom and feudal rights, and break up the power of the royal court, France was forced to pass through four years of revolution and 20 years of war. Decades of conflict are needful to repeal the least of the iniquitous laws bequeathed us by the past, and even then they scarcely disappear except in periods of revolution.

The history of the genesis of capital has already been told by Socialists many times. They have described how it was born of war and pillage, of slavery and serfdom, of modern fraud and exploitation. They have shown how it is nourished by the blood of the worker, and how, little by little, it has conquered the whole world. The same story concerning the genesis and development of law has yet to be told. As usual, the popular intelligence has stolen a march upon the men of books. It has already put together the philosophy of this history, and is busy laying down its essential landmarks.

Law, in its quality of guarantee of the results of pillage, slavery and exploitation, has followed the same phases of development as capital; twin brother and sister, they have advanced hand in hand, sustaining one another with the suffering of mankind. In every country in Europe their history is approximately the same. It has differed only in detail; the main facts are alike; and to glance at the development of law in France or Germany is to know its essential traits, its phases of development, in most of the European nations.

In the first instance law was a national pact or contract. Such a contract was agreed upon between legions and people at the Champs de Mars,* a relic of the same period is preserved even yet in the Field of May of the primitive Swiss cantons, despite the alterations effected by the interference of centralizing and middle-class civilization. It is true that this contract was not always freely accepted. Even in those early days the rich and the strong were imposing their will upon the rest. But at all events, they encountered an obstacle to their encroachments in the mass of the people, who often made them feel their power in return.

But as the church on one side, and the nobles on the other, succeeded in enthraling the people, the right of law making escaped from the hands of the nation and passed into those of the privileged orders. Fortified by the wealth accumulating in her coffers, the Church extended her authority; she tampered more and more with private life, and, under the pretext of saving souls, she seized upon the labor of her serfs, she gathered taxes from every class, she increased her jurisdiction, she multiplied penalties, and enriched herself in proportion to the number of offenses committed, for the produce of every fine poured into her coffers. Laws had no longer any connection with the interests of the nation. "They might have been supposed to emanate rather from a council of religious fanatics than from legislators," observes an historian of French law.

* The annual assembly of the early Franks, originally held in March, there the first month of the year.

At the same time, as the baron likewise extended his authority over laborers in the fields and artisans in the towns, he, too, became legislator and judge. The few relics of national law dating from the tenth century are merely agreements regulating service, statute labor, and tribute due from serf and vassals to their lord. The legislators of that period were a handful of brigands, organized for the plunder of a people daily becoming more peaceful as they applied themselves to agricultural pursuits. These robbers exploited the feeling for justice inherent in the people—they posed as the administrators of that justice, made a source of revenue for themselves out of its fundamental principles, and concocted laws to maintain their own domination.

Later on these laws, collected and classified by jurists, formed the foundation of our modern codes. And are we to talk about respecting these codes, the legacy of baron and priest?

The first revolution, the revolt of the townships, was successful in abolishing a portion only of these laws; the charters of enfranchised towns are, for the most part, a mere compromise between baronial or episcopal legislation and the new relations created within the free borough itself. Yet what a difference between these laws and the laws we have now! The town did not take upon itself to imprison and execute citizens for reasons of state; it was content to expel anyone who plotted with the enemies of the city, and to raze his house to the ground. It confined itself to imposing fines for so-called "crimes and misdemeanors;" and in the townships of the twelfth century may even be discerned the just principle, today forgotten, which holds the whole community responsible for the misdoing of each of its members. The societies of that time looked upon crime as an accident or a misfortune; a conception common among the Russian peasantry at this moment. Therefore, they did not admit the principle of personal vengeance, as preached by the bible, but considered that the blame for each misdeed reverted to the whole society. It needed all the influence of the Byzantine church, which imported into the West the refined cruelties of Eastern despotism, to introduce into the manners of Gauls and Germans the penalty of death and the horrible tortures afterward inflicted on those regarded as criminals. Just in the same way it needed all the influence of the Roman code, the product of the corruption of imperial Rome, to introduce the notions as to absolute property in land, which have overthrown the communistic customs of primitive people.

As we know, the free townships were not able to hold their own. Torn by intestine dissensions between rich and poor, burgher and serf, they fell an easy prey to royalty. And, as royalty acquired fresh strength, the right of legislation passed more and more into the hands of a clique of courtiers. Appeal to the nation was made only to sanction the taxes demanded by the king. Parliament summoned at intervals of two centuries, according to the good pleasure or caprice of the court, "council extraordinary," assemblies of notables, ministers, scarce heeding the "grievances of the king's subjects"—these are the legislators of France. Later still, when all power is concentrated in a single man, who can say "I am the State," edicts are concocted in the "secret counsels of the prince," according to the whims of a minister or an imbecile king; and subjects must obey on pain of death. All judicial guarantees are abolished; the nation is the serf of royalty and of a handful of courtiers. And at this period the most horrible penalties startle our gaze—the wheel, the stake, flaying alive, tortures of every description, invented by the sick fancy of monks and madmen, seeking delight in the sufferings of executed criminals.

The great Revolution began the demolition of this framework of law, bequeathed to us by feudalism and royalty. But, after having demolished some portions of the ancient edifice, the Revolution delivered over the power of lawmaking to the bourgeoisie, who, in their turn, began to raise a fresh framework of laws intended to maintain and perpetuate middle-class domination among the masses. Their parliament makes laws right and left, and mountains of law accumulate with frightful rapidity. But what are all these laws at bottom?

The major portion have but one object—to protect private property, i. e. wealth acquired by the exploitation of man by man. Their aim is to open out to capital fresh fields for exploitation, and to sanction the new forms which that exploitation continually assumes, as capital swallows up another branch of hu-

man activity, railways, telegraphs, electric light, chemical industries, the expression of man's thought in literature and science, etc. The object of the rest of these laws is fundamentally the same. They exist to keep up the machinery of government, which serves to secure to capital the exploitation and monopoly of the wealth produced. Magistrature, police, army, public instruction, finance, all serve one God—capital; all have but one object—to facilitate the exploitation of the worker by the capitalist. Analyze all the laws passed for the last 80 years and you will find nothing but this. The protection of the person, which is put forward as the true mission of the law, occupies an imperceptible space among them, for, in existing society, assaults upon the person, directly dictated by hatred and brutality, tend to disappear. Now-a-days if anyone is murdered it is generally for the sake of robbing him; rarely from personal vengeance. But if this class of crimes and misdemeanors is continually diminishing we certainly do not owe the change to legislation. It is due to the growth of humanitarianism in our societies, to our increasingly social habits, rather than to the prescriptions of our laws. Repeal tomorrow every law dealing with the protection of the person, and tomorrow stop all proceedings for assault, and the number of attempts, dictated by personal vengeance and by brutality, would not be augmented by one single instance.

It will, perhaps, be objected that, during the last 50 years, a good many liberal laws have been enacted. But if these laws are analyzed it will be discovered that this liberal legislation consists in the repeal of the laws bequeathed to us by the barbarism of preceding centuries. Every liberal law, every radical program, may be summed up in these words, abolition of laws grown irksome to the middle class itself and return and extension to all citizens of liberties enjoyed by the townships of the twelfth century. The abolition of capital punishment, trial by jury for all "crimes" (there was a more liberal jury in the twelfth century), the election of magistrates, the right of bringing public officials to trial, the abolition of standing armies, free instruction, etc., everything that is pointed out as an invention of modern liberalism, is but a return to the freedom which existed before Church and king had laid hands upon every manifestation of human life.

Thus the protection of exploitation, directly by laws on property, and indirectly by the maintenance of the State, is both the spirit and the substance of our modern codes, and the one function of our costly legislative machinery. But it is time we gave up being satisfied with mere phrases and learned to appreciate their real significance. The law, which on its first appearance presented itself as a compendium of customs useful for the preservation of society, is now perceived to be nothing but an instrument for the maintenance of exploitation and the domination of the toiling masses by rich idlers. At the present day its civilizing mission is nil; it has but one object—to bolster up exploitation.

This is what is told us by history as to the development of law. Is it in virtue of this history that we are called upon to respect it? Certainly not. It has no more title to respect than capital, the fruit of pillage; and the first duty of the revolutionists of the nineteenth century will be to make a bonfire of all existing laws, as they will of all titles to property.

CHAPTER IV.

The millions of laws which exist for the regulation of humanity, appear upon investigation to be divided into three principal categories—protection of property, protection of persons, protection of government. And by analyzing each of these three categories, we arrive at the same logical and necessary conclusion: the uselessness and hurtfulness of law.

Socialists know what is meant by protection of property. Laws on property are not made to guarantee either to the individual or to society the enjoyment of the produce of their own labor. On the contrary, they are made to rob the producer of a part of what he has created, and to secure to certain other people that portion of the produce which they have stolen either from the producer or from society as a whole. When, for example, the law establishes Mr. So-and-So's right to a house, it is not establishing his right to a cottage he has built for himself, or to a house he has erected with the help of some of his friends. In that case no one would have disputed his right. On the contrary,

FREE SOCIETY.

Published Weekly by Free Society Publishing Co.

50 CENTS A YEAR.

Address all Communications and make all Money Orders payable to FREE SOCIETY, 13 Oak Grove Ave., San Francisco, Cal.

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

SPECIAL NOTICE:

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

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

WHO SENT IT?

We got from Station E, New York city, a postoffice money order, dated Dec. 27, with no accompanying letter to show from whom it came. If the sender will identify himself we can properly credit it, but not otherwise.

SOME WHYS.

"EDITOR FREE SOCIETY: Why does an Anarchist hide his individuality? Why don't you put your name in FREE SOCIETY. This system shows our individuality.

"I am with you. In fact I am of you; and for you. But I believe that I can carry the public mind by strategy quicker than by storm. I am for freedom in an absolute sense. It not only is possible but it is the only condition in which life is possible. I will do what I can by noticing your paper to help circulate it.

"But say; make a distinction between churchism and religion. It is the same as between Statism and patriotism. There is a necessity for the religious principle. We can never be materialistic and be 'moral.' Materialism were as bad as monopoly. Think of this. It is the priest we are after and not religion—marriage and not love. Let's make men free—and then leave them alone.

The foregoing letter, by one of the ablest writers in America, comes to us marked "private," but as we do not give the name of the writer or that of his publication, he cannot object to our answering it publicly.

With few exceptions all articles by the publishers are signed at least with the initials of the writer. The exceptions have been made from two reasons: First, inadvertency; second, owing to the numerous articles in an issue bearing the same signature. To sign them all sometimes gives the matter too egotistical an appearance. The regular readers of the paper know who the writer is, usually, at least, and as to the others, what does it matter?

Is not the use of initials a sufficient recognition of individuality? All writers for FREE SOCIETY are free to sign their names if they choose. If they don't see fit to sign for publication, that's their own affair, so long as we know who the writers are.

One thing should be borne in mind: We do not necessarily indorse articles signed by others than the publishers. The paper as a paper does not even have to indorse anything written by any one of the publishers. This is the safest way to recognize the right of free speech. Legally, of course, we have to have an editor who is responsible to the powers that be for every line that appears in the paper, and for that purpose the undersigned plays the role with more or less ability.

The Firebrand got along without an editor, ostensibly, but when three men went to jail instead of one, well, it was deemed advisable to have an editor "for future reference." Now, brother, will this explanation do you or must we go back to the records that are written on the papyrus in order to prove our right to remain with our "light hidden beneath a bushel?"

I might ask my critic why he marks his own letter "private" and thus deprives the world of the knowledge of his own identity. But he tells me that he believes in strategy. Perhaps we also believe in strategy.

As to churchianity and religion, show me a genuine religionist and I'll at least treat him with respect.

On the score of patriotism I will only say that while it has been well defined as "treason to one's country,"

it might have been better put as "treason to one's kind."

Now for your religious belief and my materialistic views, just allow me, not only on your own part, but upon the part of Church and State as well to hold my own beliefs and act upon them and you may remain unmolested by me in the adoration of a hundred gods, and scores of Bibles, Korans and Zend Avestas.

It may be that man cannot be materialistic and be moral according to the christian use of the term "moral." What of that? You admit you are opposed to marriage, yet you cannot oppose marriage and be moral in the eyes of the christians, so why try to come up to the code of the christians? By being "immoral" you do not necessarily become filthy or unclean. You remind me of J. H. Noyes, of Oneida fame, who "invented" a scheme of "male continence" which was to regulate overproduction of unwanted children, but while he devoted pages to extolling its "moral" features he warned the unholy that using his plan as a "safety check" would only make them bestial unless they enjoyed their sexual pleasures with a religious feeling. Don't strain at gnats!

With your final paragraph we can agree, but how will you make men free if you leave their minds in bondage to priestcraft as well as to statecraft.

We send you Bakounin's "God and the State," with the intimation that "investigation is no crime." Read it? Well, read it again—carefully.

F. A. COWELL.

ORDER, NOT LAW.

Well, the "Frisco Anarchists have taken the advice of the Statists and "hired a hall."

They even went further and offered the Statists the privilege of distributing their literature unmolested, but the latter don't do business that way. Possibly they judged the Anarchists by themselves and did not expect fair play, but they got it.

More of it than they wanted.

Their organizer was on hand with the avowed purpose of "seeing that none of his organization took the platform."

That, you know, is on the S. L. P. program every time.

It is their method of illustrating what they mean by the term "liberty."

Well, the meeting had no chairman and it was as orderly as any meeting well could be where Anarchist Communist, Individualist, Labor Exchanger and Independent Socialist took the floor at will when it was unoccupied.

There was one break in the general good will.

One Statist got out of control of his boss and treated the audience to an exhibition that may have been intended to show by practical example that a State Socialist is incapable of living without government. What he said no one knows. It was a jumble of incoherent ravings. Here and there fragments of the words "wild beasts," "animals," etc., escaped him.

No policeman was called in to suppress him. It was not necessary. He did little harm. It was ridiculous, that was all.

An Individualist followed him and remarked "You have just seen what we may expect without order, as the meeting has no chairman, and a wild man has raved and no one knows what about."

With this view I must differ. I expected more turbulent scenes, but found that even men and women brought up under the present system, when placed upon their good behavior, could behave without a boss to enforce obedience.

I concede the exception. It was too glaring to be ignored. But the poor fellow was so unbalanced mentally that the very idea that order could exist without force enraged him and tried to give it the lie. But the policy of his party encourages this, and the party rather than the man is blamable.

Now, if a meeting can today be so conducted without disorder when men meet together whose passions and prejudices have been cultivated and for generations inculcated into their blood, then, given a race of free men, we need anticipate no trouble on this score.

Next week we shall give the address delivered by Comrade Klemencie.

F. A. C.

THINGS AND THOUGHTS.

There's nothing like red tape by which government creates in the minds of its dupes awe for itself. This is illustrated by the fact that when Comrade Miller found the first floor too damp for cigarmaking he con-

cluded to move up to the second floor in the group's headquarters. But here governmental red tapism steps in and declares that such an important step must have the sanction of the U. S. government which must be obtained from Washington and which will probably arrive in due time. And the Statists would have everything run by such officialism as that. Whew!

The shoe stores of this city got to vying with each other as to which should "give away" the most attractive things to their customers, but as it was really a raffle and the city counsel got no "rake off" an ordinance was passed prohibiting the giving of tickets. Then one of the stores put this pathetic notice in its windows:

"The law will not allow us to give away any more watches, so we will sell all we have left at factory prices, to our customers."

If the proprietors of that store will do some hard thinking for a few moments they will feel like putting this question to the first man who comes along:

"What concern is it of the law-making busybodies if we give away our entire store?"

We know nothing about the Mormon church, however, which makes it appear less desirable than others. —Truth Seeker.

And I know this of it which makes it less objectionable than most others: The Mormon creed declares that each one must be accountable for his own sins, and that Adam and Eve must take care of their own. This is decidedly better than that "the sins of the parents shall be visited upon the children even unto the steenth generation."

On account of the scandal and bloodshed stirred up by Brann of the "Iconoclast" the Baptists will remove their headquarters from Waco, Texas.—Ex.

If all the religious organizations which stir up scandal and bloodshed take to moving out of such places there will soon be no religious organizations on earth. "I came not to bring peace but a sword; fall down and worship me or be damned."

"The president signs the bill for the relief of the Yukon miners." Of course he does. Hundreds of thousands of children starving in this country through no fault of their own get not a cent from congress or the president for relief, but a lot of worshipers of yellow metal who have put themselves in a tight place through sheer greed must be helped. Such is civilization today. No, we must not denounce it, oh, no! Just pay your taxes and tariffs meekly and mildly. Help out the greedy gold hunter by paying taxes while your children have to wear rags.

You don't think Anarchy will become popular for a long time, do you? Well, it may not and it may not be probable that such a time will come soon, but it is possible. A few years ago when Populism was on the increase many Populist papers were a trifle socialistic. Today these papers openly advocate State Socialism, but their editors are somewhat progressive, too much so to stick to such a narrow game as the S. L. P., and they now run in an anarchistic article as readily as they did a socialistic one in days of yore. Just give them time to molt—to evolve.

"Might is right?" I was going down the street the other day when I saw a crippled peddler wheeling himself about with a little stock of goods. That infamous phrase struck me quite forcibly just then. What right had the cripple to life? He was only a cripple. The "stern decrees of the survival of the fittest" demanded his extinction, still he lived. According to "Ragnor Redbeard," he was the legitimate prey of anyone who might choose to appropriate his paltry stock in trade. But humanity, low as it is in many respects, has so few degraded as to rob a helpless cripple. On the contrary, as the cripple came to a street crossing a passing bank clerk helped him across with his little wagon. If might is right there are some men who prefer to be in the wrong.

New York publishers have appointed a committee to fight the Loud postal bill which proposes to exclude from the second-class mails all books and sample copies of papers. This would bar Free Society Library from the mails unless we can afford to send it at the

8-cent-a-pound rate. Another feature of the Loud bill is that it prohibits the sending at the pound rate of papers to delinquent subscribers.

The great Dingley bill is prospering the country in great shape. All woollens are going up from 12 to 50 per cent according to the merchants. But there are two very noticeable things in connection with the effect of the bill. For one thing, the laborers' wages have not increased in a ratio corresponding to the increase in price, but no Anarchist was such a chump as to suppose this would happen. But there is even a more significant feature about it than this, and that is that the increased duties fall principally upon the goods of the poor, and not upon those purchased by the rich.

Probably the craziest town on earth is Mankato, Kan. In 1894 it went mad over the whistling of "After the Ball" and in a fit of hilarious madness the town council passed a law making whistling or singing this tune a misdemeanor and punishable by 50 cents fine. Now they propose to place the same legal ban on "A Hot Time in the Old Town Tonight." Some people can't breathe without a law making it legal, but there is no reason why they should force everyone else into the same jacket. F. A. C.

THE MONTHLY.

At last Free Society Library is a fact, not a theory. No. 1 is now ready for delivery. It consists of Kropotkin's excellent "Law and Authority." The price is, per year 50 cents; single copies, 5 cents; \$2 per 100; \$18 per 1,000.

No. 2 of the Library will be Malatesta's great propaganda pamphlet "A Talk About Anarchist Communism."

We want to call the attention of our friends to the fact that the cost of these pamphlets when ordered in quantities depends largely upon the number of them that we print, so that if we have a large supply ordered in advance of publication we may be able to make a much lower rate. We printed 3,000 of No. 1. Could we have been assured of a sale for twice that number we could send them out for \$12 to \$15 per 1,000—at the former price if we get second-class mail rates, but not unless we do. Now send in your orders for Nos. 1 and 2. Don't forget that the yearly subscription is only 50 cents.

REJOINDER.

F. A. C. says he has no desire for a "scrap," but his first comment, and the one in the issue of Jan. 2, would indicate that he is, at least, desirous of sparring for points.

Before any definite idea of what he really means can be formed he must define what he means by monogamy, variety and promiscuity. My understanding of them is: monogamy, living with one person or confining one's sex association to one person at a time; variety, associating with more than one when there is a mutual attraction; promiscuity, unchosen or indifferent association. Now, if F. A. C. will accept my definitions I would be glad to see him admit that he is a varietist, but I do not admit that it is variety for a couple to separate when they "get sick of each other," and seek new mates. That is only a modified form of monogamy.

How can anyone practice promiscuity with "a mate!" "A" means one, and unless there is more than one there is no promiscuity.

An Anarchist would not try to force anyone to practice promiscuity, but he or she might dub monogamists "just like christians" in that respect, and I cannot see why monogamic Anarchists are not as open to criticism as anyone else.

The phrase "not among Anarchists" is simply an implication that the one who dares criticize the actions or theories of certain other Anarchists is no Anarchist.

As to the evidence of "those Anarchists who believe in a monogamic life," I do not have to hunt far to find them. Such Anarchists can be found in San Francisco, Chicago, and if reports are true, in all the cities. The evidence of this assertion is their life and their speech; the exclusive home life and the their readiness to separate, fight or even kill, on account of jealousy. Now, will F. A. C. bring forth as much evidence to support his insinuation that there are some self-styled Anarchists who would force a woman to submit to their desires? Or that I ever advocated promiscuity?

I had not the least desire for a "scrap," but tried to criticize and argue. F. A. C.'s comment implied that I believe in forcing a woman to submit to promiscuity, and that I am advocating promiscuity, and I contend that insinuations are not arguments and therefore it was F. A. C. who was looking for a "scrap."

A. ISAAC.

AND ANOTHER.

I accept your definitions of "variety," and "promiscuity" as nearly enough accurate for the purposes for which they are used, though not so with "monogamy," which is derived from both Latin and Greek, mono, alone or single, and gamy, marriage. So without marriage there can be no monogamy. Your definition of variety requires mutual attraction, and of promiscuity a lack of it. Your previous articles appeared to ignore this distinction and take it for granted that all must practice variety in order to be considered as sexually free. You had no authority for classing any or all who did not do so as monogamists.

I say that no Anarchist will try to force others to practice his ideal, if they only leave him at liberty to practice it. And there is more than one way to force or coerce others. There is ridicule and blackguarding to fall back upon in case consent is not granted.

F. A. C.

CAPITALISTIC CUSSEDNESS.

We give below an article which appeared in the New Charter. We believe in "giving the devil his dues." One thing puzzles us: The article is apparently an editorial, as it is unsigned, yet the editor of the New Charter two short months ago declared in none too polite language that he would not speak from the same platform as a certain invited speaker of the S. L. P. whom he stigmatized as a "damned Anarchist." That speaker has twice since "been on the carpet" before the S. L. P., though not a member of the party, and from the way they have treated him he is not likely to become one, his lessons in State Socialism have been too pointed. But the article quoted would seem to indicate that the local S. L. P. organ has been forced to concede after a few skirmishes with the Free Society group that we are human beings, not cannibals. The editor, however, has not got to the point where he can draw a line between State Socialism and Free Socialism—Anarchist Communism—and yet concede that an Anarchist may also be a Socialist.

Here is the article, and excepting the distinction between Socialisms we can and do heartily indorse it. Concerning Albert Hoff the suspected murderer of Mrs. Clute, the Examiner says:

"As already indicated, Hoff found occasional employment in hundreds of homes. He had won a reputation for honesty and good workmanship. He was employed by people in every part of the city, and all that have been interviewed on the subject give him a good character. He was respectful, kindly and considerate. He made himself friendly with children, and through them found new employment in different homes.

"There is however, another and a blacker side to his character. He was anarchistic in tendency, and was a regular attendant at the meetings of the local society of Anarchists and Socialists."

The above is a fair sample of capitalistic newspaper cussedness. From it we must infer:

First; that however decent, honest, kindly and considerate a man may be, if either a Socialist or an Anarchist he is of necessity a bad man.

Second; that the Socialists and Anarchists are affiliated in the same society.

Third; that Hoff is a Socialist or Anarchist, or both.

What are the facts? Though the Socialists polled 2,000 votes in this city at the last election; and though there have been 25,000 arrests in this city in the past year, only one person making any pretensions to being a Socialist has been in jail, and he was not a member of the party. And we know of no recognized Anarchist who has been in jail in this city during that time.

Second; the Anarchists and Socialists do not affiliate in the same society. You might as well try to mix oil and water. They are squarely opposed on some of their main conclusions, and in tactics they do not agree at all. Yet because the Socialists and Anarchists do not agree it would be wrong to suppose the latter as a class are morally bad. Their supposed character, like that of the Socialists, has been given them by capitalist conspirators who have never scrupled to heap the vilest opprobrium upon whoever is opposed to the established order.

Albert Hoff is not a member of the Socialist Labor Party. Diligent inquiry fails to connect him with either the Socialists or Anarchists. But suppose he were? He is not yet convicted. Wide inquiry by the Examiner gives him a previously good character. The only testimony against him is by a former habitue of an insane asylum. But suppose he were a criminal and a Socialist or Anarchist? Why parade his political relations? Thousand of Republicans and Democrats are jailed every year in this city and no word about their politics. The fact is the capitalist class try to make up in mud-slinging what it lacks in argument; and it is careless whether its mud strikes the guilty or innocent so long as it smirches the cause of whatever is opposed to the infernalism of the present system.

ONTO THE PARSONS.

Two voices, from the church that has, by the aid of their friend, the devil, robbed labor more than any other sect:

Father Ducie was reported as saying in New York, November 21: "As a priest of the Catholic church, I say to you from this pulpit that the present condition of the poor in the United States cannot go on. The Catholic church in these United States must lead in the emancipation of the people from present social and economic slavery; the church must lead as the emancipator of the working classes. The United States and its congress must make laws to protect the people's rights and abrogate laws that have been made by bribery in the interest of fraud.

"The Catholic church's great mission to the inhuman civilization of our times is recognized by all thinking men," were the introductory words of the priest. And then, with uplifted hand, he said: "The church can say, must say, and will say, inhumanity of man to man must end."

"The great mass of the people are in revolt the world over, and unless the church of Christ, directed by the spirit of Jesus Christ, becomes the advocate of the people's cause and rights and forces into public life the truest and best men of the land, who cannot and will not be purchased by trust kings and kings of monopoly—forces into public life men who will pass just laws, based on the ten commandments, the revolt of the people now before the world will swing into a most disastrous revolution."

I wrote him thus November 22:

"Dear Father Ducie: Well done on November 21; study the Labor Exchange (pamphlet enclosed), this is carrying out the revolution peacefully and therefore quietly.

"The Mechanics' Institute have just awarded me the prize for the best essay on, 'How we may dispose of our surplus product, and how we may employ our surplus labor;' on hearing you would like a copy, I will send you one as soon as it is published.

"Archbishop Corrigan is reported to have issued a circular letter to the rectors of the diocese October 15 in which he says: 'The signs of the times show danger signals in the fast-rising flood of Socialism and Anarchism, and thinking men the world over find the greatest bulwark against these dangers in the conservative principle and doctrines of the Catholic church.'

"It would interest me very much to know if his reverence has been correctly quoted. Yours faithfully,
"J. ALFRED KINGHORN-JONES."

It is needless to add, perhaps, that up to date (December 27), no reply has reached me.

No reformer, or body of reformers should listen for a moment to, and much less, invite any parson to address them, on any subject of reform, or on any phase of freedom, until they have first dropped all titles that designate them as being guides to heaven, or protectors from hell, either for cash or on credit; and in addition to this, have taken to making tents, or some other useful occupation for their living; for they are the class that have been most powerful in bringing society into the present state of intensified hell. This is the first class of parasites that society must scratch off their backs before they can hope to enjoy freedom of mind or body.

J. ALFRED KINGHORN-JONES.

The Firebrand case, at the time we close the forms, is still a matter of speculation. Monday, January 3, was the last date set for trial of the case so far as we have heard. Postponements have so far been frequent but the case is probably on trial as we go to press.

the law is establishing his right to a house which is not the product of his labor; first of all, because he had it built for him by others, to whom he has not paid the full value of their work; and next, because that house represents a social value which he could not have produced for himself. The law is establishing his right to what belongs to everybody in general and to nobody in particular. The same house built in the midst of Siberia would not have the value it possesses in a large town, and, as we know, that value arises from the labor of something like fifty generations of men who have built the town, beautified it, supplied it with water and gas, fine promenades, colleges, theaters, shops, railways, and roads leading in all directions. Thus, by recognizing the right of Mr. So-and-So to a particular house in Paris, London or Rouen, the law is unjustly appropriating to him a certain portion of the produce of the labor of mankind in general. And it is precisely because this appropriation and all other forms of property bearing the same character, are a crying injustice, that a whole arsenal of laws, and a whole army of soldiers, policemen and judges are needed to maintain it against the good sense and just feeling inherent in humanity.

Well, half our laws, the civil code in each country, serve no other purpose than to maintain this appropriation, this monopoly for the benefit of certain individuals against the whole of mankind. Three-fourths of the causes decided by the tribunals are nothing but quarrels between monopolists—two robbers disputing over their booty. And a great many of our criminal laws have the same object in view, their end being to keep the workmen in a subordinate position toward his employer, and thus afford security to exploitation.

As for guaranteeing the product of his labor to the producer, there are no laws which even attempt such a thing. It is so simple and natural, so much a part of the manners and customs of mankind, that law has not given it so much as a thought. Open brigandage, sword in hand, is no feature of our age. Neither does one workman ever come and dispute the produce of his labor with another. If they have a misunderstanding they settle it by calling in a third person, without having recourse to law. The only person who exacts from another what that other has produced is the proprietor, who comes in and deducts the lion's share. As for humanity in general, it everywhere respects the right of each to what he has created, without the interposition of any special laws.

As all the laws about property, which make up thick volumes of codes, and are the delight of our lawyers, have no other object than to protect the unjust appropriation of human labor by certain monopolists, there is no reason for their existence, and, on the day of the Revolution, social revolutionists are thoroughly determined to put an end to them. Indeed, a bonfire might be made with perfect justice of all laws bearing upon the so-called "rights of property," all title-deeds, all registers, in a word, of all that is in any way connected with an institution which will soon be looked upon as a blot in the history of humanity, as humiliating as the slavery and serfdom of past ages.

The remarks just made upon laws concerning property are quite as applicable to the second category of laws; those for the maintenance of government, i. e., constitutional law.

It again is a complete arsenal of laws, decrees, ordinances, orders in council, and what not, all serving to protect the diverse forms of representative government, delegated or usurped, beneath which humanity is writhing. We know very well—Anarchists have often enough pointed out in their perpetual criticism of the various forms of government—that the mission of all governments, monarchical, constitutional, or republican, is to protect and maintain by force the privileges of the classes in possession, the aristocracy, clergy, and traders. A good third of our laws—and each country possesses some tens of thousands of them—the fundamental laws on taxes, excise duties, the organization of ministerial departments and their offices, of the army, the police, the church, etc., have no other end than to maintain, patch up, and develop the administrative machine. And this machine in its turn serves almost entirely to protect the privileges of the possessing classes. Analyze all these laws, observe them in action day by day, and you will discover that not one is worth preserving.

About such laws there can be no two opinions. Not only Anarchists, but more or less revolutionary radicals also, are agreed that the only use to be made of

laws concerning the organization of government is to fling them into the fire.

The third category of law still remains to be considered, that relating to the protection of the person and the detection and prevention of "crime." This is the most important, because most prejudices attach to it; because, if law enjoys a certain amount of consideration, it is in consequence of the belief that this species of law is absolutely indispensable to the maintenance of security in our societies. These are laws developed from the nucleus of customs useful to human communities, which have been turned to account by rulers to sanctify their own domination. The authority of the chiefs of tribes, of rich families in towns, and of the king, depended upon their judicial functions, and even down to the present day, whenever the necessity of government is spoken of, its function as supreme judge is the thing implied. "Without a government men would tear one another to pieces," argues the village orator. "The ultimate end of all government is to secure twelve honest jurymen to every accused person," said Burke.

Well, in spite of all the prejudices existing on this subject, it is quite time that Anarchists should boldly declare this category of laws as useless and injurious as the preceding ones.

First of all, as to so-called "crimes"—assaults upon persons—it is well known that two-thirds, and often as many as three-fourths, of such "crimes" are instigated by the desire to obtain possession of someone's wealth. This immense class of so-called "crimes and misdemeanors" will disappear on the day on which private property ceases to exist. "But," it will be said, "there will always be brutes who will attempt the lives of their fellow-citizens, who will lay their hands to a knife in every quarrel, and revenge the slightest offense by murder, if there are no laws to restrain and punishments to withhold them." This refrain is repeated every time the right of society to punish is called in question.

Yet there is one fact upon this head which at the present time is thoroughly established; the severity of punishment does not diminish the amount of crime. Hang, and if you like, quarter murderers, and the number of murders will not decrease by one. On the other hand, abolish the penalty of death, and there will not be one murder more; there will be fewer. Statistics prove it. But if the harvest is good and bread cheap, and the weather fine, the number of murders immediately decreases. This again is proved by statistics. The amount of crime always augments and diminishes in proportion to the price of provisions and the state of the weather. Not that all murders are actuated by hunger. That is not the case. But when the harvest is good, and provisions are at an obtainable price, and when the sun shines, men, lighter hearted and less miserable than usual, do not give way to gloomy passions, do not from trivial motives, plunge a knife into the bosom of a fellow creature.

Moreover, it is also a well-known fact that the fear of punishment has never stopped a single murderer. He who kills his neighbor from revenge or misery does not reason much about consequences; and there have been few murderers who were not firmly convinced that they should escape prosecution.

Without speaking of a society in which a man will receive a better education, in which the development of all his faculties, and the possibility of exercising them, will procure him so many enjoyments, that he will not seek to poison them by remorse—without speaking of the society of the future—even in our society, even with those sad products of misery, whom we see today in the public-houses of great cities—on the day when no punishment is inflicted upon murderers, the number of murders will not augment by a single case; and it is extremely probable that it will be, on the contrary, diminished by all those cases which are due at present to habitual criminals, who have been brutalized in prisons.

We are continually being told of the benefits conferred by law, and the beneficial effect of penalties, but have the speakers ever attempted to strike a balance between the benefits attributed to laws and penalties and the degrading effect of these penalties upon humanity? Only calculate all the evil passions awakened in mankind by the atrocious punishments formerly inflicted in our streets! Man is the cruellest animal upon earth; and who has pampered and developed the cruel instincts unknown even among monkeys, if it is not the king, the judge, and the priest, armed with law, who caused flesh to be torn off in strips, boiling pitch to be poured into wounds, limbs

to be dislocated, bones to be crushed, men to be sawn asunder, to maintain their authority? Only estimate the torrent of depravity let loose in human society by the "informing," which is countenanced by judges, and paid in hard cash by governments, under pretext of assisting in the discovery of "crime." Only go into the jails and study what man becomes when he is deprived of freedom and shut up with other depraved beings, steeped in the vice and corruption which oozes from the very walls of our existing prisons. Only remember that the more these prisons are reformed the more detestable they become; our model modern penitentiaries are a hundred fold more abominable than the dungeons of the middle ages. Finally, consider what corruption, what depravity of mind, is kept up among men by the idea of obedience, the very essence of law; of chastisement; of authority having the right to punish, to judge irrespective of our conscience and the esteem of our friends; of the necessity for executioners, gaolers and informers—in a word, by all the attributes of law and authority. Consider all this, and you will assuredly agree with us in saying that a law inflicting penalties is an abomination which should cease to exist.

Peoples without political organization, and therefore less depraved than ourselves, have perfectly understood that the man who is called "criminal" is simply unfortunate; that the remedy is not to flog him, to chain him up, or to kill him on the scaffold or in prison, but to relieve him by the most brotherly care, by treatment based on equality, by the usages of life among honest men. In the next revolution we hope this cry will go forth:

"Burn the guillotines; demolish the prisons; drive away the judges, policemen, and informers—the impurest race upon the face of the earth; treat as a brother the man who has been led by passion to do ill to his fellow; above all, take from the ignoble products of the middle-class idleness the possibility of displaying their vices in attractive colors; and be sure that but few crimes will mar our society."

The main supports of crime are idleness, law and authority; laws about property, laws about government, laws about penalties and misdemeanors; and authority, which takes upon itself to manufacture these laws and to apply them.

No more laws! No more judges! Liberty, equality and practical human sympathy are the only effectual barriers we can oppose to the anti-social instincts of certain among us.

WOMAN SUPPRESSORS GROWING NERVOUS.

The inclosed letter from Columbian Branch, S. L. P., tends to show that Mr. Hecht and his associates have doubtless come to the conclusion that the program of insulting women has been carried to excess, and in order that the S. L. P. shall escape rebukes on this question in the future we are notified that our attendance is no longer wanted at the Socialist propaganda meetings. They have no doubt discovered that in order to escape the exposition of their insincerity, intolerance and bigotry they find it necessary to exclude Individualists, Anarchists and woman's freedom advocates from their meetings altogether. The following is our invitation to disappear from Columbian Branch, S. L. P., meetings:

SAN FRANCISCO, Dec. 23, 1897.

Mr. John Gillie.

Sir: I have been instructed by Columbian Branch, Socialist Labor party, to inform you and wife that your attendance at our propaganda meetings is no more desired. We have been forced into this step on complaint of our own members and visitors to our meetings, who object to your behavior last Sunday and to your wife's persistent interruptions and interjections. We take this method of informing you so as to spare your feelings in the event of a public reprimand or any other unpleasantness to you, and we hope this will end the matter, though it may not be amiss to state that our society is determined that end it must. Yours, etc., EDEL HECHT,

Secretary Columbian Branch, S. L. P.

We accept the invitation with many sad regrets, and beg to assure the writer that we most highly appreciate his tender consideration for our feelings, knowing that it must be genuine, or it would not have been expressed in the wake of the insolence which makes it policy for him to both apologize and threaten in concluding his communication. We should certainly feel most deeply grieved at a "public reprimand or any other unpleasantness" to which he refers, and we hope that all our anarchistic comrades may take warning from the preceding notice lest at some unlooked-for moment something unpleasant may befall them.

The incident which "forced" the members of Columbian branch "into this step" is as follows:

At a public meeting of the S. L. P. at 909 Market street, Sunday evening, Dec. 19, the question was asked: "What assurance have the friends of woman's emancipation that under Socialism woman will not be exposed to even a more degrading social position than she is at present?" The objection to my "behavior last Sunday," which the secretary refers to, has reference to my answer to that question in which I stated that in all probability, to judge from the present, women would be treated with far less respect than are saloon keepers who supply our Socialists with liquor and tobacco which deprives them of their brains. And though they advocate the equal recognition of both sexes, yet the manner in which their sentiments are expressed indicates that ladies who attend their meetings can be openly insulted, and then denied the "equal recognition" of a hearing in self-defense. Is that impartial justice? Yet such appears to be the glorious equity of Socialism as represented by some of the Socialist saviors of humanity who steep their brains in whisky and tobacco and then feel insulted if the stench becomes unbearable to others. No wonder they "would rather visit a saloon than a church!"

On a previous occasion (Sunday evening, Dec. 12), at a meeting of the same branch, the speaker of the evening mildly hinted that if more of the Socialists would pay as much attention to the ethics of their cause as to the purely economic or industrial questions Socialism would become more popular and advance much more rapidly than it does under the prejudiced policy now pursued by its advocates. He regretted that he found it necessary to visit a saloon to interview the secretary of the S. L. P. on a certain occasion when requested to deliver an address, and thought the Socialists would make a better impression on those who came to their meetings if they did not ignore the question of sobriety and reformation.

At the close of the address Mrs. Gillie was granted five minutes of the usual time extended to opponents, and her remarks were principally applied to the liquor and tobacco question. She remarked, in a jeering manner, that if Socialists would leave their dirty pipes and tobacco at home and discontinue making swill tubs of their stomachs for "sour mash" and beer, and give themselves a cleaning up by scrubbing off the liquor and tobacco stench by taking a bath Sunday morning they would smell a great deal sweeter, and would have less cause for complaining of the lack of interest taken by the ladies in the Socialist labor movement. "I do not take a prominent seat in the front of this hall," she said, "in order to be conspicuous, but to escape the odor of beer and tobacco. For whenever I sit in the audience my clothes become so tainted with tobacco and liquor perfumes that I can smell it afterward for nearly a week."

Then Mr. Hecht took the floor and illustrated the S. L. party's love and respect for women by insulting them in public, and opened up by saying: "I would rather go to a saloon than a church or a magnetic healer's office. And Mrs. Gillie has her sign up, down on Sixth street, as a magnetic healer." The manner in which it was said was undoubtedly intended to convey the impression that a man or woman whose vocation was that of a magnetic healer was more disgraceful and demoralizing than the hell holes and dens of drunkenness and debauchery called "respectable" saloons by some of our Socialists who talk to us so eloquently of the independence, justice and respectability which the Socialist representatives are yearning to extend to woman. And the fact that not a member of the branch disapproved of or protested against publicly insulting women shows conclusively the unsurpassed and loyal regard entertained for woman by the S. L. P. representatives. It is true that one gentleman, who, however, was not a member of the S. L. P., was afterward heard to say that if his wife had been insulted in public by any man he would have been tempted to knock him senseless on the spot, or had it been some other woman, such as he (Mr. Hecht) referred to, he might have been shot dead in his tracks.

But such a course, in our opinion, never improves the matter. Little else could be expected from the brains of a skull-bound Socialist. And the worst reflection falls upon the S. L. P., for when its members openly declare that they would rather visit a saloon than a church, though I know the latter is bad, there is no further explanation necessary on the score of respect for woman.

Yes, Mr. Hecht, Mrs. Gillie, has an office at 120 Sixth street, and she considers her profession just as

honorable as that of the Socialist who preaches justice and humanity and glories in defaming woman's character and reputation. She has taken no exception to the reference made to her business, as the "gentleman" above referred to is trying to believe, but the manner in which it was made. And the man who has so little understanding of the nature of magnetic or mental healing as to class the men and women who follow that vocation on a level or beneath the society of even a "respectable" saloon could not have graduated with higher honors had he made the supreme effort of his life to appear before the public as a brainless idiot or ass. And when the application of the laws of life to the restoration of health is compared with intemperance and debauchery, as insinuated by the manner in which Mr. Hecht has referred to magnetic healers, it is not surprising that he proudly boasts of going to a saloon rather than a church, and when emerging finds his brain in a fit condition to prefer saloon associates to churches or magnetic healers, who regard tobacco, beer and whisky as a pestilence infectious to both decency and self-respect, to say nothing of the cause in the interest of which the Socialists profess to be so earnestly engaged. The S. L. P. boasts of being the only party in the field which favors woman's emancipation, but fails to show her even that respect which they extend to the ministers of the christian churches whose society they consider less desirable than saloons. I remember on a certain occasion that a minister who addressed a Socialist meeting was referred to in uncomplimentary terms, and in less than a moment the entire Socialist audience had become a howling mob, and they were ready to kick that individual out of the hall, notwithstanding that the great majority prefer saloons to churches or "magnetic healers." But then you see that minister was a man, and, of course, of much more importance than a woman.

The influence of liquor and saloon associates will rarely show respect for woman, and if the sentiments expressed by some Socialists are the sentiments of all, then there is no longer any reason to doubt the real position of the S. L. P. on the question of woman's emancipation.

J. A. GILLIE,

Secretary Universal Equity Club.

NEWS FROM EVERYWHERE.

PHILADELPHIA.

I hope you will appreciate hearing from our city of "Brotherly Love" concerning the labor movement at large. To my sorrow I must admit that stupidity still prevails even among organized labor as it used to in bygone days. You'll always notice a horrible row if something is going on among them concerning who should be secretary or chairman of the union, but not a word of protest will be uttered if some capitalistic concern (captains of industry so-called) will in cold blood shoot down peaceful marching workmen, as happened at Hazleton, Pa.; not a word of protest, not a voice was heard; everything was quiet as if nothing had happened, with the exception of the "Ladies' Liberal League," which is more or less inclined to Anarchy, and the Anarchist group, "Knights of Liberty," which has always been the most active on the field of propaganda in this city. Even our "step-brothers" of the old and new creed did not care a rap about the Hazleton affair. It is not wise for such a respectable, law-abiding and scientific-disciplined organization to utter words of sympathy for those killed in the struggle for a living wage. These men are afraid of being considered by the ruling class as Anarchists, that horrifies them very much, you know.

This is my personal opinion, but there may be various reasons for their doing so. A few words in conclusion concerning the definite Anarchist movement of Philadelphia. We have lately had Comrade Kropotkin among us, who lectured before an intelligent audience. The hall was packed with an eager mass of human beings who were anxious to listen to the apostle of the "new era."

The 15th of this month we had our jolly, good-hearted and fearless champion for the rights of labor, Comrade Charles W. Mowbray, who addressed a well-attended meeting under the auspices of the "L. L. L." on the subject "Concentration of Capital." Our comrade proved himself to be the same able exponent of our ideas as he did the last time, before taking a trip to our modern "bastille" called Moyamensing. Thursday evening, Dec. 16, Comrade Mowbray addressed a meeting of the Single Tax society on the subject "Are We Drifting Toward a Revolution?"

His address was in every respect instructive, dealing with the latest occurrences of the present time. He pointed to the fact that the murderous acts of the capitalists as a class have provoked the feeling of discontent and revolt much more effectively than any propagandist could possibly have done. Referring to the Hazleton murder, he asked the audience whether such a brutal and cold-blooded murder could ever be forgiven. He also, by the way, pictured the increasing misery and sufferings of those who toil, and I felt that everyone present at this meeting was heart and soul with Comrade C. W. Mowbray with the exception of Mr. Stevenson, the great mogul of the Single Tax society, (as V. DeCleyre justly calls him). The above named gentleman (?) not being able to contradict Mowbray's statements tried to play the role of a police hireling by stating that the lecturer is of a very dangerous character, thus indirectly encouraging the bluecoats (who are always present on such occasions) to commit an outrage. But fortunately it did not come to that, and the meeting adjourned with this good result—that those who were present will from now on know what a Single Taxer means when he speaks of liberty. To them it means: Follow us or be damned.

L. RABOTNIK.

RUSSIA.

There are two clandestine revolutionary papers published at present in Russia. The name of one is "Rabotchaia Gazeta," in Russian, and "Arbeiterstimme," in Jewish jargon. The place of the publication is unknown as yet to the Russian authorities.

The police discovered a secret Socialist printing office in Moscow. At the time when the police entered the office there were a number of workmen who resisted; three of them were killed and the rest of them were arrested. Besides this raid there were more than a hundred other persons arrested on the nights of Oct. 2-3. All this to keep up God and his partner, the czar.

GREECE.

There are reproaches now, after the war, as to the responsibility of the disaster. The king and his cabinet are showing the responsibility to be on the old Delyanis ministry, and the Delyanis ministry repudiates it back to the king and the people. This only proves that neither the ministry nor the king do any good for the people. Before the war the political stump speakers went abroad and incited the people to patriotism, "the last refuge of the rascals," and they are now blaming the people for being patriotic.

It is proved too clearly that the king and the ministry were gambling heavily on Greek "state obligations." The soldiers who went to war experienced very much hunger and privation all on account of speculation. Our comrade, Panos Macheras, surprised a quarrel between his major and a furnisher of victuals who were disputing with each other as to the lion's share on profits which resulted from their operations in camp. The next day our comrade reproached the officer with the bad condition of his ration, but the officer told him that it was all right and that he had no business to expect any better. At this remonstrance our comrade threw his ration in the face of his officer and disappeared. He is now being pursued by the royal authorities.

FRANCE.

The Captain Dreyfus affair is still discussed in the daily "liars," who are telling a whole lot of truth about the rottenness of the present system which they are defending. Several Anarchist orators left Paris to make propaganda against patriotism in the eastern part of that country.

During October last year there were 20 different strikes, most of which resulted successfully.

SPAIN.

Sempau, who attempted to extinguish the life of Lieutenant Portas, the commander of the Spanish inquisition in Montjuich, is now involved in a process against eight Anarchists who were arrested on account of distributing hand bills inciting the departing soldiers not to quit Spain and not to go to Cuba to kill their fellow men. Sempau proved that he was in Belgium at the time of the distribution of the hand bills, and still the torturers wanted him to avow the contrary, but they did not succeed.

There is a popular agitation on foot that if the government intends to keep up the war in the colonies that every able-bodied Spanish citizen be required to serve in the army. The Spanish soldiers at the present time in the service are mostly poor men who sold themselves for 1,500 to 2,000 pesetas to serve in the army in the place of rich boys, as the rich have the privilege of buying themselves out.

ITALY.

The agitation against the forced domicile has already resulted in freeing several comrades from banishment, but the agitation will not stop there. As long as there is one left in the isolated countries the Italian people are determined to protest. There is now a change in the ministry, but this does not go very far in appeasing the popular discontent. All the relegated are invited to send their names to the "Agitazione" for publication in order to keep the public informed on the conditions of the forced domicile.

A. K.

145

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

FREE SOCIETY'S AGENTS.

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

Chicago, Ill. C. Pfoetzner, 469 Wabash ave. P. Vandree, 347 Ward st. W. F. Sorland, Trade Building. Jay Fox, 159 N. Union.

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

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

Philadelphia, Pa. L. Rabotnik, 731 Plover St.

Allegheny Pa. A. Frey, 138 Madison Ave.

Baltimore, Md. B. Morwitz, 1005 E. Baltimore.

Providence, R. I. S. Bookbinder, 45 Winter St.

St. Louis, Mo. Otto Bink, 3550 Kossuth St.

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

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

PROPAGANDA FUND.

Friends who remit sums of 25 cents or less in stamps will oblige us by using 1 cent stamps instead of larger denominations. Amounts of 50 cents when sent in stamps should be in 2s.

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

Report for week ending Dec. 31, 1897:

Kropotkin lectures, Philadelphia.....	\$32 50
Subs and donation, by Pfoetzner.....	10 00
Meyerson, Lovelidge, 1 each.....	2 00
Pyburn.....	70
Lewis, Cioos, Thomas, Fort, Hicklin, Adams, Pink, Bahr, Notkin, Herman, Evans, Keller, Lutz, Wolpe, Boden, Rubenstein, Ross, Martin, 50c each.....	9 00
Lemmer, Lumbach, 25c each.....	40
Schwartz, Hendryx, 20c each.....	12
Alhans.....	20
Caswell, Sales, 10c each.....	20

This is the first week since the publication of F. S. has begun that receipts have anywhere near equalled expenses.

SAN FRANCISCO LECTURES.

Comrade A. Klemencic, a member of the local Journeymen Tailors' Union, will lecture on the following subjects on the dates given:

1. Labor Unions as They Are and as They Ought to Be. Feb. 4.
2. Labor Unions and the General Strike. Feb. 11.
3. The Place of the Labor Unions in Future Society. Feb. 18.
4. Labor Union Men and Scabs. Feb. 25.

The time and the place will appear later on in the columns of this paper.

TWO THINGS JUST ALIKE.

A spirited discussion took place in a noted Republican resort one evening this week over the question: "Are times any better?" The company of fifteen or twenty were about evenly divided upon the question, and one life-long Republican said that a "gag" which he heard a few nights before illustrated the situation exactly as he saw it.

The "end man" called out: "Say, 8 1/2th, did you ever see two things exactly alike?"

"No, did you?"

"Yes."

"What was it?"

"The Grover Cleveland panic and Bill McKinley boom."—Justice.

WANTS TO START A CROUP.

I am pleased to receive, through Sister Breese, of Talent, Ore., a few copies of FREE SOCIETY. Yes, the human race must evolve into freedom, such as you advocate, and is fermenting and gaining some.

I wish a group of free people would form an association somewhere on the coast so that we could get together and enjoy each other's company. It is a shame that we have not one group on the coast that owns a farm or business of some kind. I am strongly of the opinion that one should practice more of what they believe in and preach. I have no respect for any law of man

which conflicts with any natural law, hence I do not respect very many of them, as they are principally concerning property.

I wish you would send me the address of some live Anarchist who sees the necessity of getting some money with which to start a co-operative home. I believe that I can convince him that with \$500 as a starter we can soon gather in a few thousand and fix ourselves so that we may move some in the reform cause. Without a little money we are like an animal staked out with a rope—we can go but so 'ar.

Please not forget me and my request. Wife and I take Lucifer, Coming Nation, etc., and must add FREE SOCIETY soon, as the Firebrand has gone out it seems.

Fraternally,
F. T. WHEELER.

ON BILLY BRYAN.

Bryan was invited by friends, in a large city where he was visiting, to be one of a party of gentlemen inspecting the 'hospital for insane—a conspicuous public object of the town. While passing through a ward of harmless lunatics a large and rather fine-looking inmate attracted Bryan's attention, and he stopped to speak to him. The inmate could talk glibly as a head-wheeled crank. "My good friend, what is the trouble?" Bryan asked. "I don't know what is the matter with them all," the inmate replied; and continuing, "They know I am the king of Italy, but they have conspired to keep me from my rights by restraining me here. What is the trouble that brings you here?" he asked of Bryan. "Oh," replied Mr. Bryan, jocularly, "I advocate free silver, and they call me crazy." "Pshaw!" ejaculated the appreciative inmate, "they are all wrong. You are just a plain, ordinary, every-day dumphool!" And the would-be king and the would-be president separated amicably.—Ex.

The Letter-Box.

Legatt, London, Eng.—All right, comrade; one comrade in your city writes that he don't want F. S. if we are going to "send it to everybody," as he can do nothing with it; we believe that you can do something with it and find a few people in London to whom we don't send the paper.

"Agitazione," Ancona, Italy.—Prego di scriver a l' Compagno Andrea Klemencic si avete ricevuto la sua lettera raccomandata. Noi abbiamo scritto gia diverse volte ma senza risposta adressate FREE SOCIETY.

Les Temps Nouveaux, Paris.—Changez l'adresse pour la FREE SOCIETY, si il vous plait.

LA QUESTIONE SOCIALE has several thousand large-size portraits of ANGIOLILLO.

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

Paterson, N. J.
N. B.—Sympathising papers please copy.

"WOMAN AND MARRIAGE."

Prof. Bell's lecture on the above subject will be delivered as announced last week, at Vorwärts Turn Hall, 410 O'Farrell street, Jan. 15. The admission fee has been changed to 15 cents in order to meet extra expenses. A liberal lecture may be expected.

THE OLD AND THE NEW IDEAL.

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

BY EMIL F. RUEDERBUSCH.

THE MOST MASTERLY WORK ON THE SEX QUESTION IN PRINT.

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

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

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

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

This book is "held up" by the postal authorities in the publisher's city, though they had accepted his money for its transportation. When we meet a thief on the highway (the U. S. government, for instance,) who demands our purse, and backs up the demand with an army, we prefer to go by some other route; so while the highwayman's gun is leveled at the handlers of this book we will send it by express to any express office in the United States, EXCEPT offices on stage-lines. NONE SENT BY MAIL.

PRICE: Paper cover, 50 cents.

SEND ORDERS TO FREE SOCIETY.

DO YOU SMOKE?

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

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

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

Local comrades who use the weed will save money in buying cigars by the box, and might as well patronize the cause as to buy of a man who hates your belief and would hate you did he know you to be an Anarchist.

Address all orders, and make all monies payable to

FREE SOCIETY
SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.

"A Cityless and Countryless World."

AN OUTLINE OF PRACTICAL CO-OPERATIVE INDIVIDUALISM.

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

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

NEWS STANDS

Where FREE SOCIETY can be obtained:
SAN FRANCISCO—Paper Covered Book Store, 1203 Market st.
BOSTON—Columbia Stationery Store, 665 Washington st.

BOOK LIST.

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

"Agriculture. By Peter Kropotkin.....	\$ 05
Anarchism vs State Socialism. By G. Bernard Shaw; 3 for.....	02
Revival of the Inquisition.....	03
Anarchist Morality. By Peter Kropotkin.....	05
The Commune of Paris, by P. Kropotkin and Anarchist on Anarchy. By E. Reclus (one volume).....	05
Anarchy on Trial. Speeches by Paris Anarchists.....	05
Common Sense Country. By Beverington.....	05
Social Conditions and Character. By "Ireland".....	05
Religion and Labor. Part 1 & 2. By Fox. Liberty Lyrics. By L. S. Beverington.....	05
Basos of Anarchism: Historical, Philosophical and Economical. By W. Holmes.....	05
Law and Authority. By P. Kropotkin.....	05
"God and the State. By M. Bakounin.....	05
The True Aim of Anarchism. By Steinle.....	05
Revolution. By S. H. Gordon.....	05
Grandmother's Lessons to a Son. Young and Old. By Lois Walsbrook.....	05
Wanted and their Gratification. By H. Addis.....	10
When Love is Liberty and Nature Law.....	10
Albert E. Parsons' Boast on Anarchism, Its Philosophy and Scientific Basis. German and English Editions; handsomely bound in cloth 30 cents; paper.....	15
The book last named are slightly damaged, but readable.	
My Century Plant. By Lois Walsbrook. 1.00	
Wherefore Investigating Company, regular price 50c, but while present supply lasts "they go at".....	25

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

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

International Turn-Verein meets at 1624 Ave. A, New York City.

The San Francisco Italian Anarchist Club meets every Saturday night at 111 Trenton st.

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

The German Group, Chicago, Ill. meets every Friday, 8 o'clock p. m., at 835 Blue Island av.

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

Anarchist Headquarters in San Francisco 1225 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 Thursday evening at 8 o'clock.

The Peoples Union, a free discussion club, meets every Sunday evening at 938 Westminster St., Providence, R. I.

Group Proletariat of New York City gives Anarchist lectures Fridays at 45-52 Orchard st., on Saturdays at 21 Suffolk st.

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

New York Debating Club meets and delivers lectures every Sunday 7:45 o'clock P. M., at 1524 Avenue A, near 80th. Free discussion.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Altruist is a monthly paper issued by the Altruist Community, of St. Louis, whose members hold all their property in common, and both men and women have equal rights and decide all their business affairs by majority vote. Twenty-five cents a year; sample copy free. Address, A. Longley, 2819 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. Chandler; "The Sexual Enslavement of Woman"; "Love and the Law"; "Variety vs. Monogamy," by E. C. Walker; "Thomas Jefferson as an Individualist," by Gen. M. M. Trumbull. Address M. Harman, 1394 Congress street, Chicago.