True Wedlock.

We love! spontaneous it flows,
But flashing from eyes that droop not;
Their tale of pure man—manhood
To hide, throbbing in finger tips,
Speaking in touch of lips.—We love!

Nurture fashioned man—women—
No agency to go between
They need to make them two by two;
But in that union, the magnet
Of sex unerringly selects
For love's partner.
She made not Church or State to sit
In judgment, affirm or deny
The wisdom of her provisions.

Ah, no! our Anarchistic love,
Pure and sweet as shadowy eve,
Shall not be marred by thought or word
Of legal sanction—tyrant-born!—
By politicians, Church or State;
Nor yet shall interrupted be
Our union, nonetheless, a state.

That take away our liberty.

True wedlock is that rapture finds
In happy heart. That oath
The potency of life and love;
In little things which conditions are
For social currents that do make
The heart leap and bound with new life;
In touch of lips that, unjointed like
Reluctant part, in thought of offering,
Roses-tinted, bare, as lankness
And birds, from bodyly disease;
And superstition's blighting grief.

J. H. M.

Crime and Punishment.

In a previous number of The Firebrand I showed that the State was the chief cause of crime, and that it was the greatest of all criminals, hence its abolition meant the cessation of nearly all crime.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

HENRY ADAMS.

The Barcelona Martyrs.

In accepting the most careful precautions taken by the “bloody council” to hide their inhuman conduct as bloody butchers, their infamous proceedings are now published by the “Pero Poinard,” “Les Temps Noveraux,” “Ultraterritor” and other revolting papers in Paris.

Most of the “great daily liars” of Spain and France are under the commandments of their respective governments, and the radical French government seems to be in perfect harmony with the Spanish iniquities.

The proofs of this is, that there are two Frenchmen amongst those who were cruelly martyred without any interference by the French Consul reading in Barcelona.

Thiébault and Auber, both succeeded in communicating with the outside world, and the French Consul was fully aware what was going on, and still he did not do anything about it. Oh, but those were only workmen, it’s of no use to come into international troubles over such, and after all they were Anarchists, and ought to be hanged anyhow, and one country is as good for that matter as the other.

Now, in the name of humanity, in the name of solidarity what are we doing, the rest of us, all over the globe? Nothing! Just reading the papers and screaming in the corners, and that is about all it is. It is assumed very hard to do something for us, scattered in small towns over this continent, but the comrades living in New York City, Chicago, Boston, St. Louis, San Francisco, Philadelphia, and cities where there are Spanish Consoles, are there no tricks in the minds of the comrades to attract public attention, by getting a grip over the Spanish governmental representatives, in one way or another? Here are some suggestions of mine.

They are good if you have no better ones in mind, provided you have enough energy to execute them. For instance take a big lump of sulphur and light it at the door of the Consular office. That will poison the whole neighborhood with the stinking smell. One man can do it and not risk much either. If there are more boys they can “mob” the Consul and give him just as good a licking as our comrades got in Paris.

If you don’t want to get into a row, you can go out, take down the Spanish flag and burn it, and do the same with the royal escutcheon. If you don’t want to do that, you can go and gather a number of friends and get some noisy instruments and with the help of a lot of “kids,” make a bell of a parade in front of the Embassadors or Consul’s house or office, get a large crowd for curiosity, and then you have the chance to express yourself and explain the object of your visit.

This would be a very good way to awaken the sympathies of the people and challenge and abuse the Spanish representatives. To test the different
Consuls you can write letters to them polite or measuring just as you are able to do, and act in accordance. We have to go among the masses and agitate in "governing" and put our influence in the balance, and small as it may be, it will show the universal harmony of the pioneers of free society. The above is exactly a repetition of a small amount of mine which was printed in the New York Arbeiterblatt. What are the boys doing there now? I tell you friends in the East, it is high time to quit your hair splitting philosophy in your groups, see a "radical" movement against the Spanish inquisition. I would surely be up to the program. Just read here some extracts from private letters which were written by a jilher from the Monjizqui.

At the session of the Spanish council at Montjuich, Dec. 15, 1896.

At the session of Dec. 15th Nogues declared that all his previous declarations on his own account and against other comrades were false, because he was cruelly tortured in order to force him to make some statements. Collis, Molas and Sayne also declared that they were tortured, and by boisterous conduct forced to make statements. The fact that the torture was done without the presence of the accused, in the hall of the council. The reading was closed at 1:15 p.m. The session was suspended for two hours, at 3 o'clock sharp. The men were then released, as the day had been lost. The session recommenced. The first one taken from the cell was Ascheri; he declared that he had admitted before, that he was the author of the bomb throwing, "but this is a lie," he said, avowedly contrary to the increased pressure of the torture. After he entered Collis. He hardly reached the tribunal before he expressed himself with such energy, that his words stirred all the defendants, with emotion. As soon as judge Marco Moro asked the effect produced on the defendants he opened the door and kicked Collis out of the hall. The butchers quickly took the unfortunate by the neck, and in a short time after, the groaning of pain was to be heard in the cell of the defendants. The attention of the defence the judge ordered the Ballof to bring in another of the accused, but this trick proved to be unsuccessful. Several of the defendants got up to protest with indignation, under the impression left on them by Collis. Corominas was then introduced and told the defense that he would like to know where he had been seen at the supposed secret meetings. Nogues said he was there many times. Ascheri and some others, along the line of Corominas at any meetings.

Corominas then asked permission to be confronted with the president and the jurymen in "teamed court" if ever saw him in any other public meetings. But this demand was rejected, contrary to the most crude notion of justice—to deny an accused the opportunity to defend himself. Molas was the next. His admission made a general exclamation on the defense. He commenced to tell about the atrocious tortures which were inflicted on him. The president tried to stop him speaking, but Molas laughed and went on. Molas declared that a member of the tribunal arose and said "Mister president, the accused wants to speak! And he has a right to!" Marmur of discontent were to be heard from the benches of the public, and Marmur of indignation sat down in his chair in a boiling rage, not knowing what to do. Molas then, gave a sharper vibration to his voice and the whole conversation became infernally his. Molas cried and tortured. His speech made an enormous impression of horror on the defense. Marco all green of anger didn't even dare to move! Molas was manacled with the most hideous tortures if he should dare to move a finger. He was taken to the cell of the prisoners, and there he was placed between the horrors of torture and death. But his countenance was, all through his speech, full of severity, regardless of the tortures which were awaiting him. Immediately after Molas, Nogues entered, crying, he come direct from the torture, which he had endured in the cell. He was tortured with a brutality that he was unable to give account of his general break down, and under the influence of this most horrible suffering he said that he was the author of the explosion, but the judge told him that he didn't want him for that job, but he wanted him for the justification of the other, the accused. He then explained that his whole body was full of wounds for the last four months which were inflicted on him with barbarous cruelties. He showed wounds on his hips, which were burned on him with red-hot irons.

And Nogues was not the last that made such declarations. All of these declarations were the only and the result of the great tortures. All of them told that they did not receive any kind of the first eight days, and they were not allowed to drink water nor to rest; that their fingers and toes nails were torn off, that they were whipped, stuffed in the mouth, and their bodies burned. In short, they had endured all conceivable tortures.

When Nogues left the hall of the war council the muscles on his face went into a grimace in view of other atrocious tortures. But in spite of such a condition he resisted his torturers and enumerated and explained: "You can torture me again with tre, with restlessness, thirst and hunger, you can marco my testicles and make out of me whatever you want. . . . I declare myself innocent and unassailable!" Then he was seized by a hangman who inflicted some tortures on the unfortunate.

Soon after that Mas was pushed into the hall, he entirely lost his consciousness physical condition being in a shape that he hardly could stand on his legs. He was a man of exceptional strength and vigor, and his state proved sufficiently what sufferings he had undergone. He was in suchatical condition that he remained as short a time as possible, before the council. After Mas came Sayne, who told all of his history, with the presence of the exonerable lieutenant Cortas, the boss of the torturers. The intimidation was immense in the presence of such cruel facts. Even some of the gendarmes left the hall, and one or two went even so far as to explain: "Muderers! Murderers!" The son of a privileged "caballero," who had the permission to assist at the protest, left the hall with terror. It seems also that the defendant for Ascher challenged lieutenant Cortas for a duel. Some of the gendarmes protested against such a state of affairs, and came to the conclusion that it is a dishonor to the people who hire gendarmes for such a purpose. They took the culs off their prisoners. In short it was a regular tumult.

But the war council remained a war council, and in spite of the fury of the attorneys for defense proved sufficiently the innocence, and denounced the liberty of their clients, eight of them were sent to death. Forty to twenty years, and in others at least five years hard labor. The case of the other two hundred is not decided yet, and remains within the powers of Marquis de Comillas, representing capital, Canarias state authority, and the Bishop of the Roman Church in Barcelona representing the church. They are the three true instigators of all these horrors. They represent the trinity praying, as we all know, and one of these great men well "educated," well fed, well housed, and well clothed, but with all their education they hire other hangmen to do the job for them. They are too cowards to do it themselves.

Now it remains for us to follow the example of our comrades in France, Belgium, Englan, and other countries, to raise the "boycott" as much as we can, with this we will not allow ourselves to be peaceably butchered as it was already done in Chicago. We must not only express sympathy for those who have already broke a cigar to go to the wall. What is wanted in initiative and action, and not whine on the graves.

J. C. Barnes.

Logic and Justice.

Ten following is a summary of my controversy with the Thrust Seeker on church taxation.

There is a small weekly paper published in Portland, Ore., called "The Firebrand." The editor of it deems himself an "Anarchist," we believe; but despite that and despite the incendiary name, "The Firebrand," as we call it, as it is a "moral" and "social" means well, and would be right if it could. The Thrust Seeker has previously mentioned its web-footed concept, as will be seen from the appended bit of controversy.

Then he gives the controversy that has passed between us. Then follow.

A former subscriber, including the above, writes: "I would to inclined to again become a subscriber, providing you could give me a greater recognition of the fact that seems that Henry Addis has one point against your logic."

J. W. BUS, New York.

In order to please Mr. Addis, I could enlighten him as to the difference between logic and justice. Justice is best defined as impartially reaching the truth. Conscience for compulsory taxation is that, since all property enjoys the protection of government, it should contribu to the support of the government. Exemption of property, with which is attached the right to vote, is partial, and therefore unjust. Logic implies thinking according to a precept, whether the same be true or false. Mr. Addis does not believe in compulsory taxation, and he is logical in defending the exemption of churches. But such
The exception works an injustice to other property by spreading over it the amount of tax dodged by ecclesiastical concern; hence we have said, and must maintain, that it attaches more importance to logic than to justice.

Mr. Parkhurst has, as you know, a task. His objection to compulsory taxation is profoundly fundamental to his philosophy, and the destruction of it would involve a defiance of the State and a violation of everything that is dear to the self-centered, selfish, or influential majority. We hold no brief for taxation, interest, or rent; we are so far opposed to compulsion in the case of a debt to subject the property to be assessed to the pay the proportion of which they justice demands, should be for compulsion to pay out of any source, what was a good starting-point for those who believe in the abolition of all taxes.—The Truth Seeker.

It appears to me that brother McDonald's enlightenment is just the reverse of what he intended. A logical argument directed in time, or in strict accordance with the premises from which it is drawn. Now, if our premises are right; then justice must be legal. If our premises are wrong, then justice is impossible, and that is why justice in taxation is impossible. Be as illogical, or as logical—consistent—as you may in the assessment and collection of taxes, and injustice will be the result. But given the premises of those of you who believe in compulsion, and a logical application and justice is done. Does brother McDonald now see that nothing can be illogical and just at the same time? If the excuse of democracy were that of simple injustice, on anyone it is because of compulsory tax- ation, primarily, and the exemption is only an accessory. It's not the taxors were those who removed the secondary cause could not exist. This is why I advocate the abolition of all taxation, rather than the extension of taxation. To demand that someone else be taxed in order to lessen my taxation is no demand for justice, but for the extension of injustice. I object as strongly as brother McDonald does to the being taxed to protect church property, but if you pay taxes and believe in compulsion, I would think you should see them reduced a little and the general field of taxation extended. I can't see that the extension of taxation is a start toward its abolition.

After.

The Equity of Taxation.

In the latter part of your comments upon my article copied in No. 46, from Lucifer, you have taken up the question of abuses, which I expressly excluded in my statements. That subject did not seem to me essential to consider as preliminary to sociological reform, except in the light in which it is treated in subsequent articles in Lucifer, not yet printed. My purpose was merely to consider a few words the fundamental principle. As I should agree with most of these objections need not occupy your limited space upon this subject. But I ask leave to say that the doctrine of protection of property does not rest upon the "christian theory of total depravity," but upon the history of mankind. I will illustrate from the history of England.

"They shifted easier their habitation, when actuated either by the hopes of plunder or the feard of an enemy." Hum's History of England, page 2.

"The leaders and their military compignons were maintained by the labor of their slaves, or by that of the weaker and less warlike part of the community which they subdued." Davis in his "slave and bond slavery," page 19.

"There was still a large class of non-troopers, whose calling was to plunder dwellings and to drive away whole herds of cattle, the first necessity, wood, and, when necessary, to exact laws as a common property for the prevention of these outrages." Macaulay's History of England, Vol. 1, page 221.

The weight of evidence that before the governments had intervened, plunder was common, and peaceable persons could not hope to escape pillage.

This must be said to be a question of environment.

At present there is nowhere such an environment as prevents the desire for pillage, upon the part of a whole population, until education and industrial advancement would tend to remove those from beyond that environment. Therefore I claim that with development in its present state, some sort of protection, e.g., as government tries to give, is essential. What we most need is such an environment as will make government for this purpose unnecessary. If it becomes unnecessary, it will fall into innumerable disadvantages and cease to exist. There are other purposes, to be considered later, for which it will be longer needed; but as I read the signs of the times, sociological regrouping on an equitable basis will hereafter be more necessary to the development of this government, and it is not at all certain that the name will be retained for the direction of reorganized labor and relations.

I cannot regulate my whole development without passing up from the lower. We cannot reach them by destroying the lower before the higher have been reached. My object is to show what parts of our present environment which are the greatest from which are to be developed the harmonies of the future.—Henry M. Parkhurst.

I contend that I did not take up the question of abuses, but of the fundamental principle of compulsory taxation.

As to the quotations from Hum's they are too meager to prove anything, and Macaulay's History was written from an aristocratic standpoint. Then, too, this was a period of warlike and barbarous chaotic, and of meager production. Industry had not arisen, and modern resources, by which you know no national boundaries, were as yet confined to the few, while ignorance and superstition were universal. To try to prove the necessity of the present or time by the history of the past is to put a base, presuming that people are the same now, and will act the same as they did then, shows an unwarranted reliance to precedent, and a neglect of the influences of the environment. It is to look at effect without enquiring into the causes which produce these effects.

Since governments have accomplished plunder of the producing part of the population has been the rule and none, except the petty of government escape pillage. If the present environment is not such as to prevent the desire for pillage, then let us turn our attention to that environment, and try to destroy it, and create one that will prevent the desire for pillage. That is the only way to control with modern conveniences and methods of production, we need to produce at will there would be no desire for pillage, but that while political and compulsory taxation and non monopolizing tendencies remain, the desire for pillage will remain, as a result of such environment. If protection should prove necessary in a condition of freedom, what a sad state of things, let those who need it pay for it, and rot those who do not want it, by collecting taxes by force.

The last paragraph of Mr. Parkhurst's reminds me of a resolution offered at a meeting of a board of school directors when it had been determined to build a larger school-house. It read thus:

Resolved, that the old building be used in the construction of the new. Resolved, further, that the old building be occupied until the new one is completed.

Henry Addis.

Literature.

SExuality and its functions is the title of a small pamphlet of twenty-two pages just received from the author, Howard Addis, of Minneapolis, Minn., price thirty-five cents. It is the general membership book of the Sexual Science and Purity Club.

The author was arrested and fixed fifty dollars by the postal authorities for sending this pamphlet through the mails, but he continues to send it. The notoriety he gained by his profession brought the pamphlet into uncounted thousands, and he assures me that 15,000 copies have been sold. It is cheaply gotten up, poorly printed on cheap book paper, and abounds in grammatical and typographical errors. If I can get an article on the subject I would advise the editor and proof reader when he starts to bring out another edition. In explaining why he was arrested he lays the foundation of his argument, and demonstrates his lack of comprehension of the causes of sexual misery, or how to remove them. For instance, in referring to prostitution he says:

"Young women who are forced onto the world with no education and no means to escape or struggle for an existence, their parents being too poor to help in a task that might be sacrificed. It was far better, every parent will agree with me, that those young girls whom society good is that every parent will also agree that it is a crime to bring young women into the world to be thus sacrificed. How shall we bring the harem out of the part of the world into the world that they can properly care and educate it, an absolute outcome, an absolute outcome, and we shall see no more prostitution."

This shows his utter lack of comprehension of the hearing of the economic condition of the sex question and its matter. The low limiting the world as long as monoply lasts, and our present marriage system, prostitution will continue. That he does not favor freedom is shown by the following, taken from the same explanation:

"Many wives are sent to untruly grave or insane asylums through no other cause than rough brutality during intercourse."

Were not these women bound to those brutal men, by law and superstition, they would not "be sent to untruly grave," by such methods. But the author advocates indissoluble marriage.

In the introduction he says:

"I have not dealt with the subject in a theoretical manner, nor of reach of humanity as we see it today. That day of individuality that humanity to-day can apply with great benefit."

But my experience has proven to me that he deals with the subject in a theoretical manner, and that it will take careful reading and training of the young to make it applicable to any considerable extent.

Old habits are too strong a hold on the vast majority of those now grown up.

His scheme is what he terms "continuing intercourse," and is the same general plan as that proposed in the pamphlet brought out by him shortly before his death, and now published posthumously and sold by his widow.

He proposes the exchange of magnetism between the sexes, but would restrict it to married and, filed wife, and would allow the currents neutralize each other, and that the ecstasy which he describes, and attributes to magnetic exchange, must warn and disappear if the same two persons exercise it together during "continuing intercourse" is unquestionably desirable in many instances, and it is quite desirable that the plans made in this pamphlet, and to Diana, should be more generally known, but this knowledge, of itself, is not a solution of the sex question.

Under the head of indeterminate procreation, he fell into the same error as before pointed out.

He says:

"Parents should not bring children into the world whom they are unable to take care of in such a manner as to secure their moral, physical, and mental and physical, and, later in the same sentence, is the cause of misery, which is in no way responsible for their being. Let becomes a burden, a curse to such children when they become grown.

Society may not be responsible for the existence of children, but it is responsible for the lack of opportunities to earn an honest living, and while I do not advocate indeterminate procreation, yet I protest that restricted procreation no solution of the economic problem. The economic problem because he is as unreasonable, and unscrupulous—he claims to deal scientifically with the sex question—as any ordinary rancier or pulpit pounder. He says:

"History has not yet shown how or enough to obtain from such doing on knowing their effect do not, for humanity's sake, ask your neighbor's daughter to prostitute herself to save him, he is not worth saving."

In the first place it is not so much a question of 'stability of character as sexual organization. His sentence shows that he does not recognize that girls—"your neighbors' daughters"—have any sex desire, while in reality they have, and if the boys and girls understand their natures, and were not bound down by law and false teaching, masturbation would disappear. To condemn a young man who is not worth saving or young woman scion of parental conditions and false teaching, is entirely too erroneous and too vicious, as well as too unscientific and superficial to get by unchallenged.

This pamphlet was well gotten up, and sold at 5 or 10 cents. I might recommend it, but under the circumstances I cannot.

Henry Addis.


Typographically it is but little better than the other pamphlet, but it is printed on much better paper, and has a better cover, and the title is printed in gilt.

The subject of this pamphlet is on the same matter as the other pamphlet, and also a chapter on child bearing, and one on love and marriage. It starts out with the assumption that child
ing is of necessity a great tax and strain on the mother. It is not point out the case of the strain on the mother, nor does he seem aware of the fact that not many generations ago women bore much larger families than they do now, and were much older. Not that child bearing made them strong, but they were strong and child bearing did not injure them as it does now. Cereals, highly concentrated and almost all fruits, lack of outdoor exercise, all have these in their favor, and do 24,- on the ability of the women to bear children without injury to themselves. Other than the errors he is in, there is one more, what I will call a natural, what he has to say on the subject is fair and good.

In dealing with the question of love and marriage he says that "the more highly refined moral and original forms which characterizes the man, tastes, which cause higher ideals," which is nearly, but not quite true. They have a more complex ideal, and a correspondence to that idea in a number of different persons, hence the necessity of freedom in all love relations. He describes the conventional courtship and marriage, and the too often "inevitable" result, and asks, how can it be avoided? My reply is, by freedom and direct knowledge on sex-matters. One thing the author does not seem to realize is, that love is not one thing, or one thing, and that it is complex, and attaches itself to many objects, sights and sounds. Not having recognized this fact, he very naturally writes from the outside of life, and life itself.

HENRY ADAMS.

Correspondence.

It seems to some of us here that you use too much of your questions about that will have to settle themselves, and be settled by, people living in a state of freedom, and that in a state of freedom would not avoid it.

It seems to me that if we could devote most of our time to an age that could do what long and original forms which characterize the men, tastes, which cause higher ideals, to be able to do that much. Our greetings.

J. L., Chicago, III.-Most certainly the paper will be sent to you. We have said again and again that we will not discuss your question on account of poverty. All we ask is, to let us know whether you want to read in English. A good policy maker should be able to do that much. Much our greetings.

J. H., Cleveland.-Read the answer to J. L., but we would add; to get a paper for your family and friend is your payment for the Free World. There are some friends that have one through their generation assistance-enabled us to issue the paper regularly, and so long as we have such friends, all poverty-stricken friends shall read the paper.

Propaganda Fund.