Eternal Justice.

Tie man is thought a knife or fool,
Or bigot, plotting crime.
Who, for the advancement of his kind
In wiser than his time.
For him the helmboot shall distill;
For him the axe be bared;
For him the gibbet shall be built:
For him the stake prepared:
Him shall the scorn and wrath of men
Pursue with deadly aim;
And maids, envy, spite and lies,
All shall degrade his name,
But truth shall conquer at the last.

—Chas. McKay.

A Criticism of Mrs. Lucy E. Parsons' Objections to Variety in Love.

Waves of time has prevented me from occupying myself sooner with the extremely emotional philippica published by Mr. Parsons in the Firebrand of September 27th against love-variety as advocated by me in an essay entitled: "The sexes and love in freedom."

Before proceeding to a refutation of Mrs. Parsons' attitude toward my ideas on the sex-relations, I wish to say a few words in general on the tone and spirit in which she gave expression to her adverse position. I was simply surprised at the rude style of her writing and her indulgence in uncalled personal abuses.

As regards the latter they are to me a lamentable sign of extreme lack of natural and social tact. It is always bad policy for a speaker or writer to try to make up by personal denunciations for the want of facts and logical arguments. But this of course is a matter of taste and: "de gustibus non est disputandum". The only remedy for it is to give a good example and it shall be a pleasure for me as much from personal preference as in the interest of the cause I represent to observe as a variantist to wards Mrs. Parsons that "deference and respect" for the lady in her, which according to her statement she always teaches to her son, but which she so sadly lacked herself toward a gentleman with whom she voluntarily chose to make a literary acquaintance.

As to the substance of Mrs. Parsons' opposition to variety it rests partly on erroneous conceptions of the variantist standpoint, the consequence of the very superficial study she evidently has devoted to the many facts and abstractions with the subject and partly on her innate prejudices, which are the results of her monomaniac nature. The latter makes it hard for her to grasp the subject of variety philosophically and prevents her from qualifying herself for a scientific discussion of it.

Being myself an Anarchist I admit, as a matter of course, and from principle of a variety of personal opinions and consequently of conduct in all the many spheres of social life including the arrangement of the relation of the sexes.

For this reason I find no fault whatever with the innate preference of Mrs. Parsons for sexual exclusivism. I know very well myself that not every woman is willing or able to be a disciple of Aspasia or Leotonia, but I know equally well that women do exist who are of the type of these two immortal representatives of free and enlightened womanhood of ancient Greece. I shall therefore not try to impose on my own and my sex and women sympathisers' views upon Mrs. Parsons. It shall be only my effort as a propagandist for variety to correct her totally wrong notions and her misrepresentations of variety in love, and to prove the fallacy and absurdity of her conclusions, at which she could not help to arrive on account of starting from false premises.

Her main objections to variety rest on the following assumptions, the truth of which she has not taken the least trouble to prove:

1.—Variety in love is not a natural, but a morbid phenomenon in human nature.
2.—Variety is destructive of the functions and purpose of family life by disregarding the provision for mothers and children.
3.—Variety is incompatible with lady or gentleman like conduct in the social intercourse of the sexes.

In reference to the first assumption I would like to call Mrs. Parsons' attention to the innumerable instances of actual variety in love occurring daily in all classes of society, and the whole of our repressive—statute laws regulating the relation of the sexes, in spite of traditional social customs and moral notions, and the danger of social estrangement. The daily papers are full of records of offenses against law-established monogamy. The evidence for the secret practice of polygamy and polyandry among all monomaniac races and nations, so-called, are so overwhelming for the unprejudiced student of sociology, that for instance the philosopher Arthur Schopenhauer referred to them when he boldly declared himself in favor of polygamy as the more natural arrangement of the sex-relations. He also attributed the astonishing success of the Mormons in the face of a christian population to their abolition of the artificial institution of monomaniac marriage. The cases of spontaneous variety, which come to public notice, are of course only a very small percentage of the many secret violations of our official code of sex-morality, that escape detection and molestation. This fact of almost universal secret practice of variety in love out of mere desire and opportunity, alone ought to convince any unprejudiced mind, that the desire for variety is not an exceptional and morbid propensity or confined to the age "past middle life," as Mrs. Parsons strangely believes, but that it is preeminently natural and normal.

To say, as monomaniacs from temperament as a rule do, that a person could not in the full and ideal sense love more than one person at the same time, or that every new love sentiment must inevitably obliterate a former attachment, is just as illogical as to assert, a person could not delight in the beauty of scenery of Spain without at the same time losing all memory and appreciation for that of other lands. I believe as a woman and a being genuinely revelling while traveling through that country. Must a lover of literature become indifferent to the poetry of Goethe because he soon finds delight in the poetry of Kahlil Gibran? Must a woman's taste and knowledge selected by a florist, resemble each other so closely in perfection of beauty and scent, that it would be almost impossible not to be charmed by all alike? Why then should it not be possible for a person, if he or she be fortunate enough, to meet two, three or more sexual partners whom he or she may realise in each of his or her perfect or ideal complement of love? Is it only to his name, that he is afraid to believe, that some being there should exist in all the world only one person of the opposite sex, who was worthy of his or her best love. If this were true, second or third marriages would, without exception, have to be classified as loveless unions, an assertion, which no sound mind will have the audacity to make. If then a man or woman can love different persons at different periods of time, why not contemporaneously? Can the same persons happen to come in contact at the proper moment?

A few years ago a man committed suicide in New York City because he was deeply in love with two women and could not decide which one he should love. It is true that "Love" is a noble and moral sentiment, then logic as well as actual life have but one answer, that contemporaneous plural loves are natural and that they are to the same degree moral and desirable, as they contribute to the happiness of all concerned. The moral objection to variety rests mainly on the unconscious working in most people, even in many otherwise radical persons, of the sacrosanct sex-morality of Christianity.

Now as to the second objection. Varietism is of course incompatible with "Monomaniac family life" or so-called "Sanctity of marriage" but not in the least with an ideal "Home and child life." Many happy families live in pairs and its natural as a rule happy and lasting. The characteristic of this variantist home is harmony and happiness through absolute mutual personal liberty, unreserved, matured and perfect love, which is the most honorably and unselfishly worked out for the best foundation possible for permanency, because satisfying all emotional, intellectual and physical needs of the human nature. Can the same be said—exception admitted—about the average monomaniac home? 'He who does not know, that the latter, is in too many cases the source of discord, of never ending and estranging petty quarrels and tyrannies, mutual hypocrisy and openly or concealed dissatisfaction, has studied the inside of conventional conjugal life very little indeed.

I am an uncompromising enemy to monomaniac family life because I cannot conceive of a dignified woman life without perfect freedom for everyone and
being, a concept which can be exercised as every moment of existence and which embraces all human needs and activities, be they physical, psychic or mental in their nature. I recognize no other restriction but that of voluntary self-control and the equal liberty of others. So long as the individual and its family life is directly or indirectly forestalled upon men and women by the state, church, society or the as-yet very great power of Christian-moralistic prohibition of sexual activity, serious social ostracism—leading often to material damage—every man or woman who has the moral courage to walk openly outside the "Golden Path". So many would, I fear, sooner be found in a life of bondage. So long there will exist that dual state of sex-normality—practically freedom for man and on the whole sexual slavery for woman—then, no other single issue is so closely related to social conditions, to which every thorough going and genuine lover of freedom, equality and justice, must object. Contrary to Mrs. Parsons' vision, the abolition of marriage and with it the extensive and privileged reign of monogamy has an integral connection with the struggle for economic freedom.

Marriage, property institution, which had its origin in the capture, sale or giving away of women by her male relatives in barbaric and half civilized ages. With the abolition of private property in the natural conditions of production, of which women are and will be the bearers, marriage will become economically free. Marriage will no longer be for her the necessary evil of an institution for her support in compensation for economic necessity forced sexual favors.

The desire for mutual sexual ownership in the person along side with the secret indulgence in one-sided freedom, which has grown out of artificially established and upheld monogamy, will under economic freedom disappear quicker than it yields to intellectual libertarian propaganda alone. With economic freedom will come the reign of sex-freedom, the right of private judgement in the association of the sexes. The latter is all the various demands from society, not the suppression of voluntary chosen monogamy, a policy, which the monogamist ever tries to practice on the varietist. If there are as yet many women, who have no appreciation or desire for sex-freedom, they have no right to deny it to the progressive minority of their sex. It is the only way to a perfect personal freedom including their sex desires.

Mrs. Parsons and society need not worry about desertions of mothers and children on the part of varietists of the present day. The varietist man loves his home and its companionship because he loves her. To provide for a person or persons we love is a natural desire, may even a pleasure and the varietist does it without making his house companions his sexual slave. Does Parsons really think that it is the respect for the law and consequent fear of punishment, that most men, whether happily or unhappily married, provide for their wives and children? I think, they do it to satisfy their own conscience, from natural affection, from self-respect and the feeling of moral personal responsibility. The same motives and impulses activate the varietist man. He has as much right to find a sexual companion in the person of another man or the other. In no other sphere is law and government so powerless for good as in that of sex, home and child life. In no other sphere is its application such a farce, such a contradiction as in this.

Mrs. Parsons betrays her superficial knowledge of true varietism, when she believes, a varietist man cannot necessarily be the father of the fathers of her children. Varietists—men as well as women—believe in rational propagation or prevention of undesired motherhood for the sake of the progress, what of the children. For the reasons of financial circumstances, the health of mothers and so on.

The varietist woman selects the father or fathers of her children, if she chooses, with the same knowledge and thought as in love for gratification only and such for love and parenthood. In reference to the third objection of Mrs. Parsons to varietism, I hold, that sexual respect and social courtesy will necessarily reach their highest possible development among men and women, who make, as the varietists do, the sovereignty of the individual their very principle and ideal in their sex-association. Following the trend of the times, it is a voluntary and mutual agreement between lovers and contains all such elements of the true morality and good conduct. One common aversion against the varietal ideal—what with which is not in accordance with the spirit of libertinism or primitivism—are the christian moralistic bigotism can find fault with the ethical of true varietism.

Does God exist?

Surely, yes—if the right condition be present, the most favorable condition being that of ignorance, as religion and ignorance are the parents of all that is false. In the mind of every believer in a god, animate or inanimate, that god exists, because a creation of the fancy of the god-worshipper. Does a madman believe himself a king possessed of a jeweled crown, a king is, and that crown rests upon his brow. Threaten, argue, calumet if you will, but you cannot shake his kingdom from the dun of the litter of jewels: to him they are real, and reality they remain, till reason again penetrates the disordered brain and, like the true iconoclast she is, shatters the delusive throne. Then in the madman's king, no longer a madman, is also no longer a king.

So with the god-worshipper. But I do not classify under that term the vast majority of so-called christians, as I have found the people of any creeds and races. There are, however, some christians, honest and sincere, who, on all points save religion, are perfectly sane. For this reason, they would fight with pity, for I know that out of the one and the void beyond the other they have created a god which to them is real.

While I do not believe in a personal god, it is evident that there is a moral power that controls a universe of which we have some slight knowledge, and perhaps a greater universe of which we have no knowledge. But, because the moral power is behind all this, must I bow in submissive submission before a terror monster of my own creation, crowned with fear—miscalled reverence?

I do not call this unseen power "God." I choose to call it Nature. Do I choose to worship at her shrine in not-through-fear, but from admiration. She performs her work with an undaunting hand as the ages roll away, sometimes with peace and quiet, again 'mid the crash of 'heaven's artillery' and the upbursting surface of our puny sphere. Yet her work is in full accord with the unchanging law. Does it not make a memorable time ago.

These she never revokes nor deviates from to gratify some jealous or egotistical whim, or hatred, as the god of the little and say-no thing.

Some say that animals, insects and plants, dangerous to the happiness and even to the existence of man are allowed to thrive; that because hurricanes, storms of lightning and thunder are prevented from occurring, the universe is run on a go-as-you-please plan. Such is not the case. To accept that theory we must admit the accuracy of the christians contention that the rest of the universe was created to serve as a lightning-bug for the speck of dirt we live upon, and the whole for the beneft of man. What is man when compared to all creation? When a shaft of lightning strikes down a mouse, what matters it to Nature that a man was not killed instead? Nothing. Both human and rodent are but atoms primarily evolved from earth and air, and upon death returned to the primal elements of earthly life and motion.

And now, what is Nature? Our power we know know little. Noy to us, by fixed laws that never change, as changes the God of the bible—when ever the minds of the god-worshipers change.

I am prone to think that the chief seat of the earth is the fundamental element of the universe, and of nature herself. And that element is electrical power—F. A. L. in Telegraph World Advocate.

A Defense.

In No. 40 of The Firebrand Clinton Loveridge criticizes Moses Harman, the editor of Lucifer, in what seems to me to be a direct attempt to make out a little better than an imbecile. He also gives a little screeching at men in a general way, by assuming that the readers of Lucifer will, while not acceptable to men, nor to his (Clinton's) ideal 'new woman.'

The gist of the matter seems to be (judging from a former issue of The Firebrand), that Moses for some reason failed to publish an article of Clinton's in which he (no doubt severely) criticized Moses' report of a recent congress meeting. Finally it is avowed that what is actuated by a petty malice unbecoming a profession liberal, undertakes to show Moses up as a weak, incompetent person, ignoring the years of service he has done to a cause that should be dear to the heart of every true liberal.

Now what of it, if Moses is a spirit uplifter, and I am not a varietist Loveridge is not, and I do not need to say. If I concede his right to differ from me. Personally, I much prefer to have Lucifer's space occupied with the discussion of subjects we can all understand. But should not consider an injudicious and unhappily criticizing an occasional divergence from my favorite line of work, especially as many of Lucifer's readers do not understand and enjoy articles; the works of our liberalism, it seems to me, demands more toleration, less fierce denunciation or sarcastic belittling of others, and more brotherly love.

It is scarcely probable that the "new woman" will talk exactly as Moses thinks. But yet there are many good suggestions in that same article. No, Moses is not without several "good-nancies" in liking his own article. Mr. Loveridge evidently likes his! We all are apt to like our own. And why not? If we give our best efforts, and say what we really mean, of course we like our articles. But let us remember that we write for different ideas more than persons. And if we can do it kindly, if we are not so acid in our natures that friendly criticism is impossible, let us refrain from unnecessary harshness.

ELEANOR LUCILE WILCOX.

The Outlook for Propaganda.

Now that the election is over and the wild excitement attending it has subsided, it is evident that conditions are favorable for propaganda. That the "good times", the religiosity, the lawless, and the propitious come is a fact that does not need any discussing. Propagandists can prophesy hard conditions, intimating that they have no sympathy with the electorate, but the whole of the war effort, which has been state control of the workers to better their condition without any fear of prophecying falsely. They can point out the rest of the world and the future of the United States, they can criticize the doings of their masters will, and ask those who claim that more money is needed why they waited for years and years to get a little more money coined, when by voluntary association they can dispense with the need of legal tender, except for taxpaying, and destroy the power of the banks, which they decry so loudly, simply by refusing to use their money. For them to say that they want a money system that is good all over the United States is very much like the other fellow saying that he wants a money that is good all over the world. If they want a money system that is good for them, let them propose it to the people of the United States, and let the Electrole-Money Association do as much as it can in the way of publicizing this fact. If the Electrole-Money Association does not have the money for circulating as much as they think it should, it can distribute all that it can, and if the Association may deem most expedient.

Voluntary association for productive purposes, social and religious, is the idea of the age, and the fraternal spirit alone can be depended upon to bring many of the essentials as well as the luxuries and enjoyments of life in the conditions which are so dear to enthrall us as day follows night. Comrade Boden-dyke's Club House plan, Comrade Washburn's Cooperative Exchange, the Labor Exchange, Cooperative Wholesale Markets, Co-operative stores, workshops and kitchens, and other forms of mutual help can be encouraged and will in all probability be tried more and more.

There is another side to the question which must not be overlooked. The general government will become more and more openly the alien and defender of capitalism. This is a fact, which can be pointed out to point out this fact so that it can be seen in all its ugliness than has previously. Conflict between public employees and the government in the future may make the workingmen will find that Bismarck's theory of blood and iron is the most effective method of dealing with malcontents that is in full swing. This will show the workers that they can look to their government for nothing but suppression, imprisonment and execution, that it has become open what it has long been secretly—t total enemy.

Thus it appears that the outlook for propaganda is good, and let us hope that all propagandists will take courage and work with a vigor proportionate to the task at hand, and that they will show the result. Haste and anxiety for immediate results, should be avoided. Mushrooms grow in a night but
The Old, Old Story.

As Anthropod once asked a Crow (Crow believes in the after-life):
To seek the Fates and let him know
When times would come, to cheat the so and so.
The answer came, (the bird was slow)
"For four years more your cake is dough."
The Crow went off to his tall
But wage instead a disease-pall
And Uncle Sam now brings the mail,
Gentle shoots that fed a tale.
Of high old time, plus cake and ale.
In years more, come mud and sull.
(A gray-haired yarn, but not now taw.)
The Crow is dead,—the Fates are dumb,
No more their visions,—or life or drum.
No funeral pyre,—no wake,
What odds, while antiquaries still burn
Of loco to lend and time to burn,
In four years more, or so, to come.

SAM PHOEBE.

Wrong Brand of Socialism.

In a recent issue of the Coming Nation appear several reprints in this connection by "Pilgrim." He states in the last
"Socialism is the name for government ownership, simply that and nothing else.
I deny that, flatly; Ideal Socialism will be a Socialism wholly without government as the term is here used. No government, no government ownership.
This is the case with every country.

The "hot potato" says, "The best of everything we have is in the church. The church is the only place where we have a full list of the wonders of everything. We have it, but I think the other fellow has it, and we can't have it both ways. We can't have our cake and eat it besides. And the other fellow got them too? Not exactly, but he has something mighty close to that.
My friend then says without Socialism if we wanted to use the rivers we could pay rental on it.

We could, if we were foolish enough. But without government who could collect the rent?
How does it work now under anarchy?
I'll tell you briefly: In New York the use of the New and East rivers is free—burning a few licence fees, etc., but to use on our plenty you must have a landing place—wharfage. New York City owns some of it.
Can you get it free? Not by several thousand dollars a year.
In a free society property is to be wanting on every few miles ofilk kept road. Again, I say we could, but we wouldn't have to. In many parts of his country the same thing is happening; they are paying a tax, pay toll on roads—or keep off of them, go to jail.

T. A. CWOEL.

Rou, Not and Comment.

The Bohemian Group "Neodivisia Muzumradni Omimilida" of Chicago, informs us that they will send a delegation to the Convention to be held in New York City, Jan. 1st, 97.

All our friends who have been selling tickets for our rail, take note that the drawing will occur December 15th, and we would like to have all returns up to that time. The unused tickets they will kindly return or inform us what numbers are not sold.

Many of our readers are anxious to know what we mean by the little propaganda in our city, and why we don't say anything about the Free Firebrand. The fact is that we are doing very little propaganda in Portland on account of lack of time. We do our best to follow up on every occasion we happen to meet a man that is interested in the social question; we also hunt for new subscribers when opportunity presents itself, but we have not a group out here, nor can we be in all the meetings we would like to attend, The Firebrand and the rustling for subsc.

and to exploit the common people. Give up your charitable schemes and speculations and start to drill into the so-called "productive labor" which is the only regenerator of a free society.

Tucker made you understand that you cannot bring:

To seek the Fates and let him know
When times would come, to cheat the so and so.
The answer came, (the bird was slow)
"For four years more your cake is dough."
The Crow went off to his tall
But wage instead a disease-pall
And Uncle Sam now brings the mail,
Gentle shoots that fed a tale.
Of high old time, plus cake and ale.
In years more, come mud and sull.
(A gray-haired yarn, but not now taw.)
The Crow is dead,—the Fates are dumb,
No more their visions,—or life or drum.
No funeral pyre,—no wake,
What odds, while antiquaries still burn
Of loco to lend and time to burn,
In four years more, or so, to come.

SAM PHOEBE.

Clippings and Comments.

"I am persuaded that until property is taken away there can be no equitable or just distribution of things, nor can the world be happily governed; for so long as that is maintained all the rest is immaterial and the best part of mankind will be still oppressed with a load of cares and anxieties."—[Sir Thomas More.

"Hitherto it is questionable if all the mechanical inventions yet made have lightened the day's toil of any human being. They enabled a greater population to live the same life of drudgery and improvement, and increased the number of middlemen and others to make large fortunes."—[J. S. Miller.

HENRY ADAMS writes to the "Firebrand" that he was once in favor of taxing church property, but that he had come to the conclusion that no taxation and, consequently, no limiting the taxation of church property, was an individual. Adam's opinion, which there are Still some which would call us an "fixed stars," etc.

The Result of Statescraft.

Tuesday, November 10, a sad disaster took place in Tacoma, the city in which the great "daily labor" would not publish, and therefore we apply to the Firebrand to unveil the truth.

Tucker, an honest laboring man, a paper-hanger by occupation, has been the victim of several local workmen, as to his good moral and mental standing in society. He was a hard workingman and struggling for his daily bread, and the rich and starved, as any one of us, living in a poor shank on Jefferson Ave.

Through some business transaction, probably work done, transfer of estate, disposal of personal property, Dr. Wintemute owed Tucker some money quite a while.

Dr. Wintemute was one of the "leading citizens" among the local citizens. We had, we appointed one of the members of the board of regents of the State Medical Society. He was a Past Chancellor in the order of the Knights of Pythias, wore fine clothes, lived in a comfortable home and at a tasty served table in company with his gentle wife. But his pecuniary was not to pay any debts, provided he could avoid it by some means, to avoid a look, a regular parasite on the back of the social body.

Through the daily experiences in matters referred to, Tucker knew that it was not to apply to another list of parasites for justice, or to bring Wintemute to term by law, and so he resolved to take the law in his own hands and settle things.

Tuesday morning he met the doctor and a 10 minutes long altercation took place. One of Tucker's friends heard him ask the doctor for at least two dollars, as he had nothing to eat, but the doctor refused the reques...

Tucker, then, drew a revolver out of his pocket and gave him a bullet for exchange, after which the doctor and said he was shoked through his body and after making a few steps towards a step he dropped on the sidewalk fatally wounded. Tucker watched his watch until he was shoked through his shot and as soon as he was satisfied, he deliberately raised his hand and blew out his own brains.

It is useless now for me to reason with Dr. Wintemute about our one man's individualism. He paid for his experience with his own life, which should be an example for the rest of the advocates of our beaked Utopianism.

The tyranny of our laws and customs are inseparable on account of our arrogant hypocrisy; you can not see—-you have to see it, deadly wound, the imparity of our pretenses on "superior abilities" and the "survival of the fittest."

Now you sellshoekeng genty, I want to make you a proposition how you can help our own life and in the same time become a friend of mine.

Call around to our meetings; investigation the essence of an anarchistic society, which shall make friends out of enemies, in giving up your vanity and desir to rule to
Chips.

As long as you recognize the ballet you will be paired to recognize the bullet in consequence.

It is impossible to practice a conflict when you express your desires at the ballet-box against the desire of some one else at the same place, unless one submits to the other. Minority subsists to majority.

Our present commercial-political and political commercial prohibit a citizen from doing that which benefits him and hurts nobody.

Governmental interference makes me dependent upon the action taken by my fellow citizens.

Government forces me, the governed to wait until somebody takes on my behalf, it demands of me to pray to a somebody to take action on my behalf and this somebody, as a matter of course, will do no action on my behalf unless it is also his behalf.

Between the half billion silver monopoly backing up Jayson and the squatting of the earth-swelling gold monopoly backing up Mr. Kilady, the producers of all the wealth stand a good chance of amounting to nothing more than a millers object, being dust.

It is a capitalistic see-saw that, if you tend to your business, business will tend to you! Don’t you think this an equally good maxim for reformers, that if you work on the advancement of human workmen, then your fellow worker will tend to you.

Hold on Mr. critic, I see your smile while ridiculing the reformer, but that only proves that your education has been neglected.

There is nothing so ridiculous as a free-born citizen writing about his choice at the ballot box, when he is obliged to work for somebody else for a market price, with somebody else’s tools, at somebody else’s behest.

Bendytree.

Correspondence.

In Memoriam.

At the 11th of November celebration in Chicago, the speakers, Mr. Colvin, Mr. Parsons, and John Most were well received. They spoke about his choice at the ballot box, in German, when he is obliged to work for somebody else for a market price, with somebody else’s tools, at somebody else’s behest.

Mr. Colvin spoke well, giving also the definition of Anarchism, taken from Vol. 10 of the Americanized Encyclopedia. Mr. Parsons spoke so well, that the police, present in a large number, grabbed him by the arm and led him off the stage. It developed in the shape of a hideous contradiction of the manum and his associates, with the unfurling nationalism of the victims. Being forbidden at the last minute demonstration at the same place to mention the names of, Gary, Grinnell, Schloss, Robiette, and John Most, she was this year, by daring to mention these men, hustled off the stage, under protest, from the auditors. But the people soon quieted down, as every one recognized the fact, that the result of this provocation might be the slaughter of civilians in the hall. She was not arrested.

John Most spoke in a very satirical way about the authorities provoking most of the applause, and leaving the stage unmolested by the thugs of law.

And right here, I wish to say that, as long as our German friends insist upon using our mother tongue in propaganda work to any extent, they will amount to nothing just as much as a man in England, do not consider it worth while to interfere.

When the proceedings are carried on in the language of the country at the time then the authorities become interested.

Bendytree.

A Pleading Response.

I have just received a few sample copies of your page and want to say that I am a member of a group of Philanthropic Anarchists, that is to say ever since I came to the States in 1891. I am a heretic by birth, and the word tolerance is another translation of my mother country as an advocate of Socialism (not Party or State Socialism). At last I had to leave my country in order to escape several years imprisonment, for advocating passive resistance against King and government laws of the country. I have also spent two different terms in state prisons in Sweden and the same offens papers were published.

My journey from Sweden to the United States I stopped in Copenhagen, Denmark, one month and in London, England, three months. In both those places and especially in London I got acquainted with the anarchistic ideas. I had the pleasure of meeting Kropp, Millard, Malatesta, Fratila, Gundersen, and many others. I saw all, I met all, known pioneers of personal Freedom. Not being able to speak or read the English language at that time, I could do but little more than make acquaintances.

Since I came back to (to my horror) met but few people with such advanced ideas as ours. I have spent five years in Minneapolis, Minn., but since I could not get any opportunities I lived for myself and family any longer, I had to go, and I went in the wild woods of Minnesota to battle with nature, like so many others for support.

I am a Communist, I am an Individualist, but since The Firebrand freely discusses this question, as well as all others relating to personal liberty, I will be glad to have you send The Firebrand. I am sorry to say that I am not able to send you the small sum of 20c just now; but it will come later on.

My heartiest and most sincere wishes is that The Firebrand may live, burn, and spark, lightning the way to liberty for all.

O. P. VICTORIAL.

Hillman, Minn.

Firebrand Library.

In lots of ten or more, 25c each.

Comrade Country; by G. H. Kunz. [25c]
A Fine Art for Anarchist Communism; by W. L. Dunlop. [25c]
The Anarchist Propaganda; by C. E. B. [25c]
Anarchism; by William Holme. [25c]
The Communist: by W. L. Dunlop. [25c]
The Communist: by C. E. B. [25c]
Anarchism; by Ida Joynson (one volume). [25c]
Anarchist Books; by E. Kropotkin. [25c]
Anarchist Utopias; by Peter Kropotkin. [25c]
Anarchism and Social Revolution. By H. B. Gordon. [25c]
The Anarchist: by W. L. Dunlop. [75c]
Socialism in Danger. By Dorothy Kishneewa. [25c]
The Anarchist: by W. L. Dunlop. [25c]
The Anarchist: by C. E. B. [25c]
Watts and their Guilds. By Henry Addi. [25c]
Diana, a Psychical-Physiological Essay on Sexual Relations. By W. L. Dunlop. [Anarchism]. [25c]
Philosophy and Optimism; by H. B. Gordon. [25c]
Some Boundless Boundaries in Art. By J. A. Michan. [25c]

The two books last named are slightly damaged, but readable.

Mrs. Walshbrooke’s Books.

My Century Plant. [25c]
The Dietetic Forces of Sea. [25c]
A Sex Revelation. [25c]
Three who Feed, the American Woman will find sample food for thought in the above four books.

Basic Principles of Marriage Happiness. [25c]
100 Ways to Help Yourself to be the best in your profession and department to others in your community, to see how much govern.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

International Group Free Initiative meets at 6 4 Washington Square, New York City, every Monday at 4:30 p.m.

Newspaper Theater Tedesko Machek, will be opened in Rhinow, 2441 11th Street, N.W., Washington D.C. and tickets will be issued by Otto Wilcke von Marbick, 3238 S.E.

Relate Lake is an eight page anarchist weekly paper, published in the English language at New York City, 200 Ave. 5 by the International Workingman’s Association fund for sample copy.

Progressive Throats is the official organ of the Labor Exchange. A sample copy may interest you, and a year’s subscription cost you but cost you if you are interested. Published at Omaha, Neb.

Armenian is a magazine for the Armenian People, published by the Amer. Armenian Publishing Co., 60 East 9th Street, New York, N.Y.

The Alarm is an Anarchist weekly paper for the workers and is published at 211 16th Street, Washington, D.C. and contains monthly two columns of news and thought providing for the present week, or two weeks through the post.

The three above mentioned papers can be obtained by the following amounts.

The Alarm, $1.00 a year.

The Firebrand’s Agents.

In the following cities subscriptions are taken for The Firebrand.

Chicag, Ill., 1229 7th Street and 723 Wilson Avenue.
N. Trencher, by Taylor Street.
San Francisco, 700 Market Street.
St. Louis, 1227 7th Street.
Philadelphia, 721 Market Street.
New York, 721 Market Street.

Sample Copies.

We send out each week large numbers of sample copies, and are now offering them to teachers and others of probable liberality for the purpose of being distributed. The reception of a sample copy has no other obligation than the hope of insuring you one a year. If you are not satisfied with the sample copy within ninety one year, though it is reality it is voluntary, for you are then at liberty to return the same and re-serve the sample copy to any one else you wish, as it is not possible for us at a single of all that who desire it, even if they were able to pay for a few cents or nothing at all. We do not wish to have any one who desire it, so that we hesitate to accept it and send it, as it would be sent to you.

The FIREBRAND’s AGENTS.


Taxidermy.

TO THE FRIENDS OF THE FIREBRAND.—For the benefit of this publication, we shall be able to accept small gifts, any small bird, from a hummingbird to an eagle, without skinning, as long as it is a free shot, and especially if self-addressed, stamped envelope, to me.

I shall do my best to send you, in return, a fine specimen, of a bird of your choice, if you shall trouble you for receiving so much for so little you can not think about sending.

Address: E. J. BAHR, 217 S.E. 4th Street, WARCH, Mo.