Not Settled Yet.

However, the battle is ended,
Though proudly the victor comes
With rattling drum and blazing page,
And echoing rolling drums.

Still Truth proclaims this motto
In letters of living light—
No question is ever settled
Until it is settled right.

Though be the heel of the strong oppressor
May grind the weak in dust,
And the veil of shame, with scorn acclaim,
May call him great and just.

Let those who applaud, take warning,
As to the gospel of the light:
No question is ever settled
Until it is settled right.

Let those who have failed take courage,
Though the enemy seems to have won,
Their hosts are strong. If he be in the wrong
The battle is not yet done.

For sure as the morning follows
The darkest hour of the night,
No question is ever settled
Until it is settled right.

O man bowed down with labor!
O woman young, yet old,
O heart oppressed in the corner's breast
And crushed by the power of gold!

Keep on with your weary battle,
Against the triumphant might;
No question is ever settled
Until it is settled right.

—Ella Wheeler Wilcox.

Free Communism.

BY WILLIAM HOLLIER.

Conclusion.

This great truth of economic science—viz., that the productive capacity of society is far superior to its consumptive capacity—is, strange to say, denied by some of our Free Communist friends. It is insisted that there would be no limit to consumption under freedom; but the fact is overlooked or ignored that however true this might be under a system of free consumption—or in other words of Free Communism—it could not happen under a system of commercialism where consumption would be limited by the consumer's ability to purchase. But in spite of the denial, the truth remains a truism still. And it is easy to show that even under existing conditions this is so. Take, for instance, the manufacture of pins and lead pencils. A few factories in the Eastern States turn out all the pins used in the nation. Will anyone say that the production of pins is limited?—Only by the demand. And there will be no greater demand because every one, no matter how poor he may be, has pins in plenty and to spare. The cost of manufacturing pins has been reduced to such an extent that even after paying a profit to the manufacturer, to the numerous dealers and handlers, and transportation freight rates to public carriers, the price to the consumer is so small that they are poor indeed who cannot afford to have an abundance.

So only in a little less degree with lead pencils. A few manufacturers supply the civilized world, and as production increases, the price per doz. is reduced to the point where, while the capacity for producing them is practically unlimited, it is unnecessary, and would be far nearer to making and space to present further arguments or illustrations in support of an economic fact so obvi- ously plain to every unbiased mind. If there is such a tendency under present conditions for produc- tion to outrun consumption, we may be sure that it would not be less if both production and consumption were freed from the blighting influence of monopoly. Why should there be any limit to production as long as a single human want remained unsatisfied? Tens of thousands of people now engaged in harmful and useless occupations would become actual wealth creators. Even with our present comparatively crude methods the hours of labor would be reduced to an enormous extent. Only one of two things could happen: either production would be brought to a standstill by some artificial process, as limiting the hours of labor, or by unnatural maintenance of the private property system and its necessary spandages, price and value. But it is safe to say that as long as our material wants remain unsatisfied there would be no artificial limit to labor time, and as it has been quite clearly shown that the constant tendency would be to cheapen production and therefore to reduce price and value, we may infer that a time would certainly come when both would disappear altogether. And as the function of com- petition is simply to enhance production and reduce price, which is according to the theory of the Free Communist philosophers when the form of the house has reached such a stage that grand pianos become so plentiful and cheap that every family desiring one can afford one, and price has practically disappeared, what necessity will there then be for further competition?

There will be none, and the mode of holding property will become one of simple utility. The necessity for private property will disappear, and with it will disappear desire. I contend that the desire to own private property arises mainly from the fear of want; from the fear that there will not be enough of the world's goods to give every one a sufficiency. Our Free Communist friends are horrid at the idea of one person enjoying as much as another, hence their antipathy to Communism. But if they will stop to think, the unreasonableess of their opposition should become apparent to them. Let me put the matter in the form of a simple illustration: here is a table laden with food; every needful article is supplied in profusion, and there is still an abundance to replenish empty dishes, with every facility at hand to procure more for future occasions. The guests assemble; the feast is free. But stay! here is a Communist who grumbles and sulks over his dinner because his next neighbor, a Communist, who is not as good a worker as he, shares equally with him in the delsices of the table! How absurd! As if one would grumble, provided he be hungry for himself, that his neighbor should have enough also. And yet this is the base of the imagined desire for private property, and there can be no others. I am only imagined property, for I hold that with the disappearance of want and the fear of want the desire for property would dis- appear also. If a wheelbarrow represented less value than ten minutes of my labor time; if there were a million wheelbarrows, my opportunity to labor were unrestricted it is absurd that I could have any anxiety to claim a wheelbarrow as my private property. I think not. And in a community where every family who has one for a wheelbarrow would have another, just as it would be before property, for I hold that with the disappearance of want and the fear of want the desire for property would disappear also. Even under the present system we find there is a tendency for certain articles to become monopolized, as in some of the Swiss set- tlements, where private ownership of agricultural implements has been lost sight of and forgotten in the changes that have taken place among the people.

In free society property would cease to have any value aside from use. In a literal sense money things would cease to have an owner; the possessor would be at the free service of anyone who might choose to use them. For some time a mode of depositing and exchanging products similar to that adopted by the Labor Exchange would probably be adopted, but the tendency would ever be to simplify all functions; co-operation, both in production and distribu- tion would merge into closer and closer fellow- ship, Communism in one kind of product would be followed by Communism in another. Free, universal Communism would come to bless the world with peace, plenty and happiness.

Free Communists may say they do not want Communism; will not have it. Very well, how are they going to escape it? How prevent it? And why will they insist upon private property and individual enterprises? To restrict production? Unquestionably, since there could be no other reason for maintaining them. At least that would be the idea. Last I remember, however, of a proposition to this effect. Restrict the purchasing power ever so little, and production would be correspondingly restricted. To maintain private property, with competition and the wage system, would undoubtedly restrict or limit the purchasing power of the people. People could have what they could buy and pay for; nothing more, if we except what they would have given them and what they could have bought. In this way I think it good to place any restrictions upon production short of the full satisfaction of the people's needs. Who will have the hardihood to answer yes, and at
tions and distribution would be speedily learned and put into operation. The capacity for production being practically without diminution of product itself would only be checked after the wants of every individual would be supplied. Free consumption would then become the basis of the fall town and joy; and finally practically disappear. Value, except in a few rare articles, would follow suit. What necessity then would there be for a continuance of the principle of the state, which at present consumes so much time and labor? None whatever. They would rapidly fall into disease, and, obeying a natural impulse to satisfy their desires with the least possible effort and trouble, drift easily and naturally into Communism: "Not a form of Communism which would subjugate the individual to the will of a majority, as a despot, but that which would leave the individual to do his own, free, to do whatever he wills at his own cost.

This is what I mean by Free Communism. In the contemplation of such a grand scheme as this, questions of administrative detail cut no figure. Nor can they. As a writer on Socialism truly said, we are not architects; we are naturalists. Free Communists cannot tell what the length or breadth of back yards will be, or whether they will need backyards. They do not venture upon the assertion that each member of a group will own a private cat, or that there will be a common tooth-brush. Such a question as "How much white cloth will be asked by friend Fulton is positively puerile, while Cohen's query as to what they would do with murder is only less so in degree. It is presumed that a community of intangiibles and intangible intelli-gences to achieve liberty would be able to carry out administrative details in such a way as to preserve it. We posit certain principles and draw therefrom certain conclusions;究竟是何其重, yet to be proved, that these conclusions are mistaken; nor is the evidence against us sufficiently strong to make out a prima facie case. We leave open the insatiable cuisines which call them forth. Confused of the error of our position, as a firm in our conviction of truth, we await the outcome with calmness.

But a few words more of explanation. The above is not a complete article. I have not covered or attempted to cover all the points. I have not given all the arguments which suggested themselves to me. Possibly there are some which I have not yet learned. Other writers will perhaps supply the deficiencies. Moreover, the composition may be faulty, and the style deserving of criticism from a literary point of view. I have attempted to put down my ideas in very plain, easily understood language, and perhaps in my desire to make myself thoroughly understood I have been guilty of free repentence. But I am, however, gained, which is an elucidation of my own ideas of Anarchist or Free Communism.

Sex Ethics.

Since the above was written last year, I wrote an article in which I asked some questions that I considered pertinent to the subject. I advanced nothing but the right of every one to act in accordance with their best judgement, but so completely at variance with accepted theories did the ideas advanced prove to be that some of the readers who were constantly talking politics found it difficult to believe. Such is the case, and no advocate of freedom ever dreams of denying every one the opportunity to go through the formalities. And we will ask is that those who do not wish to go through any ceremonies shall not be compelled to do so.

"But if that were the case people would stick to the level of the common level is equivalent to saying that ceremonies and formalities make people different from themselves". The truth is that licenses for the police force, a magistrate, or enquire serve to fetter ministerial, judicial, or parliamentary, give opportunity for scandals and divorce court proceedings thus fees some more parables. Than you see that all the way round it is a scheme to compel the people. But you can do it to yourself. That they have a natural and unquestionable right to do.

Instead of peopleinking to a lower level were they free to choose in they would in sex matters, the self-reliance which always comes with the sense of freedom and responsibility will become as active in the correction of many of the abuses which are now so threatening.

These objections to freedom in sex relations are a slur on womanhood, for almost invariably the objections are raised by men of degraded moral character and with the best provocation in the world. They talk of the insecurity of women under a free love regime. And right here let me interject a word concerning women's virtue. We have discarded the double standard, and ceased to think that virtue consists in abstinence, the question of "women's virtue" will not be so seriously considered for two reasons. One, that the question between "women's virtue" and "one's virtue" will be obsolete, and because woman will then be considered as an equal and determining for them- selves in sex matters.

The idea that all objections on the grounds of "women's virtue" are based on, is the same one that man's use of women is overdone. No woman can be as tyrannical, degrading idea that a man's wife is his property, and that she must be guarded in order to prevent injury, and to maintain her purity. Her desires in the matter is not taken into consideration, and she is expected to render all obedience to her husband and be "true" to him, to remain pure and be "faithful", wife, no more. And that his life is from the highest standpoint as this idea holds sway in a man's head will be found prating about "women's virtue", and seen opposing freedom in sex relations.

"Conformity to custom harms no one, and all that is necessary is that the contracting parties be careful and cautious. If the parties wish to marry, I shall not reply I would say, if conformity does no harm it does no good, and being an expense, and a public show, there can be no justice in compelling it. So far as making love is concerned, conformity is considered

Infallible, and for them to find it difficult and costly to correct an error, to discern a union in that unhappy and unloved union, is, in my view, a purely dogmatic standpoint. "If it was so easy to get apart," says our objector, "they would rush into all manner of excess and indecent actions." This slander on manhood and womanhood especially on womanhood, for no matter how prone men may be, owing to false education, to run to excess, it takes two to make a breach of a breach, and every breach of chastity is, as a matter of fact, as to turn into a wild seeking after indiscriminate sex gratification where there is no legal prohibition to such excesses, and to the other hand, what desire in sex relations the person with whom each woman will gratify her sexual desire will be a matter of choice, and, being free from the restrictions of law and arti- ficial sex love, the sexual passion will become natural and orderly in its manifestations, and the excesses and disgusting orgies now so prevalent will disappear.

There are many abuses of sex now common, and many plans proposed to correct these abuses. Many of these proposed plans are unquestionable good as far as they go, but to my mind the first and essential step in the establishment of a correct and adequate code of sex ethics is the recognition of the right of every woman to the complete control of her person; the right of perfect freedom in sex relations for each and every one alike.

One can call anyone who may think differently to show, that they can be the same fine individuals, choosing sex partners that there is inchoating business partners.

Henry Adams.

An open Letter to the Comrades in America.

Laura Michelle must have written to you already that a relapse of my sickness, on account of which I had to go to the hospital, where I am still detained, from going to the United States until after next spring, if I am finally cured.

After that sad comedy of the International Congress London, I would have liked, once more, to tell the published and ignored labors of the American Women's Christian Workers, their death from the fact and still worse to the hypocrisy, all the politicians (even the bourgeois to the Liberal Democrats) that for their entire freedom, the people must get rid
What is Justice?

I have endeavored to fill a place of usefulness for the readers of The Freeholder, by outlining the meaning of the phrase ‘meaning of Life’. Now, I answer and outline the meaning of justice.

What is justice? Is the same question as, What is Righteousness? and this, is the same question as, What is Right? and the whole of the questions, is the same as: What state of human society can and will teach? ‘Peace on earth and good will to men.’

Men have found the meaning of justice, just as they found the meaning of liberty, by centuries of tortuous and blind experimentation. It is interesting to see how the word ‘justice’ has come to mean the thing to which it was once meaningless.

Now, remember, justice is nothing in itself, only a mere name of acts performed by men for men and through men; that is, a conduct of man to man. In society is just, is right, is righteous; or, it is, unjust, and wrong or unrighteous.

Question: How can I tell what act is right and what is wrong? Can I tell when I act justly or unjustly? which is the same question as, when is my conduct righteous and when unrighteous?

It is seen at once that to know the meaning of justice is to know the meaning of righteousness, and to practice justice in its arts and teachings is to be just and righteous.

Another fact, in the human constitution there exists a "monitor" which approves and upholds the spirit, whether what has been done or said is right, just, or, wrong, unjust.

Some teachers, especially religious, teach that this "monitor" is the criterion, the means of knowing what is just, or right, or what is wrong; this is a fallacy; for, man is biding his way to be right or wrong, that if the conduct did not accord, the monitor came into action.

The question to notice is that the monitor, for I know not what else to term it, exists, but it does not determine what is right or what is wrong; again, this "monitor" never gives the shame, the downcast head and eyes, only where one has been educated, informed, as to what is just, right, or what is unjust, wrong.

Then of what use is this "monitor"? It performs the office of a reminder, and gives pain, which frequently is health and saves from wrong doing. It is the voice of God in the soul of all highly developed races of people, I do not wish to offend by using the term God. I want the one who told the dollar, to ask me how is your conscience determined; since law does not give it, or determine it, nor the inward "monitor" know it. I have answered, men determine what is just, what is right, what is wrong, by the effects produced on men in society conduct just as the physician observes the beneficial or injurious effects of his drugs upon the patient by the symptoms exhibited in the patient’s life force. If society is without order, without welfare for the whole of its units: if society is filled with crime, with disease, with poverty, ignorance and degradation; if society is bankrupt, it is seen that one part embalmed, the other part privileged; if society exists one part performing all its labors, the other part lifted above toil and drudgery; if society exists, for the benefit of a few, for those in power, for the rich and the poor, the other part having all wants supplied and wealth, without any laborious efforts, you may

rest assured that justice is not practiced in such a state of society.

Justice is an equation when operated on society, all the parts of society, all the classes of society, exist and an equation of inequality exists in society conduct and life.

Justice is nowhere practiced on the face of the globe, among civilized (?) people, if this be true, it follows that no people on earth are righteous, notwithstanding Christian teachings, precepts and practices; none are righteous, not righteous, none in all ages, why not, why do men not possess justice or righteousness?

Men do not possess liberty; men are forced to sleep the "monitor", and teach what they know to be absolutely unjust, unrighteous, till custom and habit destroy the "voice of God in the soul" then men are lost to right and justice. Why do men not pass through the "monitor", and be just? Laws are enacted which are checks, barriers, hindrances, which push men on to deeds of unrighteousness in their struggle against the world, for power, for profit and escamotement from toll, debt and debauchment. Don’t you know toll carried to the drudgery point always debases and deteriorates human beings? Don’t you know that poverty does the same thing? and don’t you know that unjust acts, unrighteous conduct, no matter if custom, habit and law say they are just; also, debase, deteriorate and destroy the souls of men and women too.

Let me specify briefly, unjust conduct, acts and human relations, now sanctioned as legal, right, righteous and not:

The ownership by enactment, giving the power to buy or sell any part of the earth, or what is in or on it, that God created, is unjust, is unjustified, is wrong? Why? It deprives all men of their birthright to buy, of a place on which to exist, and this deprivation is unrighteous; it forces all people who own no land to support those who do, this is unjust, it is wrong and for existence for the great classes, as population increases and as the ownership of land falls into fewer legal title holders’ hands, this is unjust; it finally destroys the land holding and the master relations, all this exerts the unrighteous relation men hold to the land and all that is on it; and by excluding and disseminating the poor who cannot become owners of land and its natural wealth.

The taking of what is called rent, though sanctioned by common usage, and protected by law, is unjust and unrighteous. It forms an unjust equation, which destroys equal opportunity, it forms a class of people in society, who are enabled to shift the burden of supporting a government entirely on those who till and pay rent; this creates gults of inequality between a rich and soulless landlord and a poor laboring tenant class; it engenders the most cruel and heartless conduct through which would-be honest home goods, are all cast into the streets in midwinter, in all our large cities; it damns the souls of all who engage in the business of landlordism, as well as in labor, refining by rental the wages of the wage-earner; it causes the wageslave to pay, not only rent, but taxes and interest, consequently, poverty abounds with the landlords, producers, and increasing wealth and increase of landlordism in every country of the globe termed civilized; for these reasons, I absolutely know that to take rent is unrighteous, that is, unjust.

The charging and appropriating of money called interest, for the use of money, though sanctioned by centuries of usage and upheld by custom and law, is unjust, unrighteous and wrong. It is clear to the just spirit that no one can claim something for nothing since no labor or service has been given by the money lord for the interest paid, and get back what he has paid or gotten more. Then, he has no just claim for more, yet this claim is legally upheld and long usage has made right that which is wrong. It, like rent, for if there are not classes of parasites who feed and thrive from the sweat of the blood of the balance of society; it burdens all wealth producers, because it reduces the money they earn and the wealth they consume and must, and does pay every dollar of interest that is ever paid; this is society toppers in huge sahmp and annihilation, this is poverty increased and the hands of the poor few, and this is why wealth concentrates, by means of rent, interest, profit and large salaries to non-producers of wealth; for these reasons, rent is unjust, of robbery, of murder, of misery, of poverty, of crime, of disease, of pain, of suffering, of the poor, of the suffering, and the suffering of all.
THE FIREFRONT'S AGENTS.

The following named persons will receive and account for the: of the
Chicago, III.—Charlotte E. Boland, 136 Milwaukee Avenue.
New York City.—E. Roberts, 4625 Broadway.
Boston, Mass.—A. C. Phillips, 263 Hanover Street.
London, Eng.—James Smith, 10 Bond Street, Parkman Road, Sw.

Taxidermy.

To the Friends of the Firefront—For the benefit of this self-sacrificing society, I will send a fine python for 50 cents, and preserving by skilled hand, from a hamster to entire without mistake. Every one involved is greatly happy for the excellence of the python, and will make a quick sale. I can supply an ample variety of:—lizards, snakes, tarantulas, scorpions, and the like. F. R.—After receiving it, if your dances trouble you, I will easily make it ready to send.

Address, 108 Gore, Warren, Minn.

FIREFRONT LIBRARY.

In lieu of ten or more, five-cent pamphlets are furnished at no cost.

The Ware System, by Peter Kropotkin. 
Exemption, by Peter Kropotkin. 
A Anarchist Co-operative Union, by Malatesta. 
Bakunin, by Malatesta. 
Commune, by Kropotkin. 
Commune's Country, by E. Revolt. 
A Book for Anarchists, by W. H. Dickson. 
Basis of Anarchism, Historical, Philosophical and Com- mercial, by William Holman. 
The God and the State, by Michael Bakunin. 
The True Aim of Anarchism, by E. Malati. 
Anarchist Communism, by Peter Kropotkin. 
Revolution, by H. B. Gordon. 
Socialism in Germany, by G. W. Landauer. 
The Bond of Liberty, by E. Revolt. 
Socialism in Italy, by Dalia. 
Anarchist Authority, by Peter Kropotkin. 
Anarchist Propaganda, by H. R. Horsman. 
How Labour is Robbed, by William Morris. 
The Spanish Anarchists, by H. R. Horsman. 
The Anarchists of the Paris Commune, by H. R. Horsman. 
Wants and their Gratification, by Henry Adams. 
A Brief History of Anarchism, by Albert E. Parsons. 
Anarchism, by H. E. B. Gordon. 
Social Democracy and Nationalism, by M. Bakunin. 
Women's Activities in the Anarchist Movement, by Albert E. Parsons. 
Anarchism and Philosophy, and Social German and the Russian Anarchists, by Albert E. Parsons. 

In San Francisco the comrades have established headquarters at 1222 Folson Street, where they gather every night from 7 to 10 P.M.

CLIPPINGS AND COMMENTS.

A France journal describes a new and promising substitute for gold. It is produced by alloying nineteen parts of copper with six of antimony, the copper being first melted and the antimony afterward added. To this a quantity of magnesia carbonate is added to increase its specific gravity. The alloy is capable of being drawn out, refined, and sold, just as gold is, and is said to take and retain as fine a polish as gold. Its cost is a quarter dollar a pound.—Ed.

All that is necessary now is to monopolize the invention and the composition will be as valuable as pure gold is to-day. Only the monopolist would pocket the difference and become millionaires.

In the telegraph lines tied up the Canadian Pacific from end to end in a few days one of the grandest victories ever achieved by working men. Organizers did it.—International.

Hedden was not "organization" alone that "did it." Mr. Editor. It was the recognition of their claim that was just, and that they only could accomplish the end in view by united efforts that "did it."

THE LETTER BOX.

C. S., PHILADELPHIA.—We have reenced the bonds from Mrs. Parsons, and hope you have them now.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

Anarchist Headquarters in San Francisco, 2529 Folson St., Open every evening from 7 till 10 P.M.

The Life of Harvey Levene, a young workingman who lost his life in the strike, will be given away every Monday evening at 8 p.m. in the town meeting hall, Providence, R. I.

International Group Free Initiative meets at 6 Washington Street, New York City, next Thursday evening at 8 o'clock.

Radical Literature of all kinds, including English periodicals, books, pamphlets, and music, is now on hand, ready for use by the public, at the Free Historical Room, New York City.

Memorial Theatre, for which the organization is very thoroughly prepared, will be opened in Schomburg Hall, 200 Washington Avenue, New York City. Details will be given in next week's issue.

What you mean, My Lord? My Lute Writebacker's.