



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

VOL. III. No. 17.

PORTLAND, OREGON, SUNDAY, MAY 30, 1897.

WHOLE No. 121.

Constructive Anarchy.

III.

BY J. A. ANDREWS.

WE are now fairly at the land question. Already it is obvious that our economic system is incompatible with the system of land ownership, or at least with such ownership being practically recognized and exercised. It will not concur with the exercise of private ownership, neither will it concur with collective or joint-stock ownership as ordinarily understood in commercial partnerships, where the individual has no liberty of use, but only a "definite claim on the proceeds of action taken collectively," nor, of course, with the political "collective ownership" in which the individual has not even that claim, but his interests are wholly at the discretion of the governing body. Neither will it concur with ownership in common, in the legal and strict sense of the words, whereby anyone is privileged to intrude himself anywhere and other people are bound to accommodate themselves to him if they wish to remain there.

If the lands which we are assuming to be at present the legal property of Anarchist comrades were placed on the footing of common property to all the world, then evidently outsiders who had no sympathy with our principles would be entitled to rush it, thereby reducing the resources available for comrades, whilst holding all outer resources firmly locked up. On the other hand if the common property extended only to the persons accepting our ideas, or at least something approaching to our ideas, the same thing would still hold in principle; everyone who was a participator in the common property would be strictly entitled to crowd into any particular locality, and a number of comrades who were cultivating the soil might for instance find themselves at any moment deprived of it by the mere whim of a number of others to go and build houses all over it. Consequently "common property" would entail some authority as a logical offset to that implied by itself; and dangerous as all authority is we may accept the general instinct of humanity as well founded, that the authority of institutions qualified by some regulative authority is, or at least may be less dangerous than the authority of institutions left absolute, by just as much as it is certainly more dangerous if the two authorities happen to fall into the same hands. Besides, common property limited to within the movement would be class property.

What we wish to do in effect is not to expropriate ourselves in favor of a collectivity or of a governing body, nor yet to endow others, in common, with our property claim. What we want is to renounce the exercise of our property privileges, and to do so not as a mere favor granted to others by virtue of those privileges, but because we renounce and repudiate the privileges themselves—without thereby calling into existence a new set of privileges. In short, we wish to annihilate our ownership, not to transfer it; not to make room

for a new ownership in any form; but to leave the land absolutely unowned.

This we could do while we remained the legal owners, by simply treating our legal ownership as a farce, and with the development of society on the new lines legal ownership would no doubt in time become obsolete and forgotten. However, monarchy would still be dangerous if a king, being king, declined to rule; there remaining always, during the interval of time needed for the crown to become irrecoverably extinct in the estimation of the outer world, the possibility that either he will change his mind, or somebody else differently minded will inherit or otherwise acquire his title to sovereignty. Therefore we should wish to make some plain and unmistakable declaration to prove that in intention at all events, whether outer law will recognize it or not, we are not undertaking an act of clemency as owners, but putting off our ownership—not to invest any others with it, or to create a vacuum for some other ownership to fill, but to annihilate it and supersede it by a different principle. At any rate some of the comrades would prefer to make such a declaration, and especially in case there were some present resources in money which it was desired to put together and exchange for land now held outside of the movement, the question of making all this plain would arise with the proposal for its acquisition.

The position has an educational value in exhibiting the exact nature of the change to be effected—perhaps more so now than when it would be actually arrived at. Let people understand what it is that we should require to express and define in contradistinction to established "rights."

First, then, we require to show that our intention is to cancel our ownership of the land, and that we consider it cancelled.

Second, that we do not cancel our liberty of using it.

Thirdly, that we do not establish the privilege of anybody—exclusive or in common—to occupy it.

Fourthly, that we renounce land ownership, not as an isolated thing, but in conjunction with proprietorship in general besides that of land; that we renounce it, not simply to create a vacuum in proprietorship, but in favor of a new principle of the use, production and distribution of natural and made wealth; and that this principle is what abolishes the ownership.

The declaratory renunciation might therefore be pronounced, for present purposes, by embodying a memorandum sufficiently explaining the nature of our Anarchist economic system, and the design of the present land owner to recognize it, in the title deeds as an incumbrance upon the title.

This memorandum at once raises another point which I have had in view all along in working up on the assumption that there might be such a document. It might seem as if we had now got into the position of creating an Anarchist "constitution," or making a code of "Anarchist laws."

As beyond doubt in many combinations formed in a perfectly revolutionized society, it would be

necessary, or at least expedient, to have some written or printed statement of the purposes of association, the contemplated general methods, etc.; and as the essential difference between an Anarchist document and one creating or expressing some sort of legalism, is most effectively shown in taking for a point of departure the existing system, this supposed memorandum appears to me eminently suitable as an illustration.

Supposing that a number of persons were intent on establishing a kind of liberal State Socialism by voluntary action without waiting for the conversion of the political State; it is easy to imagine what sort of document they would produce.

"Whereas it is desirable, etc., we the undersigned agree and contract with each other that we will do such and such things, that we will not do such and such other things, that any lands and other resources possessed by any of us shall be held and used for certain purposes and not for certain other purposes, that they shall be available to certain persons on certain conditions, etc., that the breach of certain conditions shall disqualify persons," and so on in more or less detail.

And I believe that in most attempts at forming Anarchist communities something in this style has been set forth, owing to force of habit and imitation.

The Anarchist memorandum as it might be drawn up would not be, nor appear to be a contract but the simple expression of individual act and attitude. For instance:—

"I desire to respect and help the needs and purposes of each of my fellow beings, compatibly with the regard that I have for those of the rest of them and for mine, clear of all artificial and arbitrary interest and so-called rights and wrongs arising from, or expressed by, rules, privileges and limitation (such as ownership); and that they should so act toward each other and toward me. For in my opinion the object of the social state is the welfare of the individuals composing society, by the means of their personal regard for each others' needs and wishes; and I hold that in the absence of this personal regard any rule, etc., can only serve as an instrument of oppression, whilst if the social feeling exists and is attached to these institutions instead of to real living humanity—if the satisfaction of the moral sense is sought in the observance of forms which cannot possibly always coincide with the realities of human needs and interests which are alone the concern of true morality—the result can only be the production or conservation of false conceptions issuing in an irrational attitude and conduct of man to his fellows, and consequently in depravity and misery.

"I believe that the form and state of society is the direct product of the conceptions and resulting conduct of the individuals; and that the attitude of each individual towards every other has necessarily a large influence in determining the attitude of the others not only towards him, but towards one another. For which reasons I conceive that in using towards others the attitude conformable to

my belief, I shall encourage them to adopt it towards me, and that they will also tend to adopt it towards others than me, and so bring about the transformation of the social habits and ideas of the people generally.

"A number of persons entertain the same opinions and desires, and we have arrived at the intention in common of putting the principle into operation so far as it rests with us. We shall reorganize our affairs so as to associate more intimately and effectively, and thus reap the benefit of each others' advanced conceptions in practice. We shall deal with other persons, as friends or as foes, in the same spirit; and, as far as they please, on the same lines of practice.

"This being so, I declare for general information that as to all things and matters of which I would be considered according to law the owner or as to which I would be considered according to law possessed of any privilege, whether in the nature of a monopoly or otherwise—

"All doings of myself or any one else in relation to such things and matters I view and invite the rest of the world to view, in the light of the principle herein before sought to be expressed, and not in the light of any privilege which the law would attribute to me.

"For instance, anyone who may, quite apart from any consideration of ownership or other privilege, sympathize more with my desire to retain possession of something than with that of someone else—in the circumstances of the case—to obtain the use of it, I invite to support me; but anyone who, in the circumstances, finds his sympathies against me, I invite to oppose me, without regard in either case to the law in my favor.

"I renounce in favor of this principle all effect of law and declare that for my part all privileges created or expressed by law in my favor are non-existent and that therefore I cannot reasonably or morally claim to act by virtue of them or purport to delegate or transmit them; nor can any person truthfully claim to have them by delegation or transmission in any way from or through me, I having renounced them in principle and not merely the exercise of them. I have done so in good faith, from sincere conviction, and also in consideration of others doing similarly and of the benefit arising from the possibility of reorganizing our affairs on lines consistent only with our severally effecting this renunciation."

Of course, it might be expressed in many other ways, but the object in view is attained, namely to provide an explanatory memorandum serving to convey a solemn declaration and pledge of faith without constituting a code. It might contain, for that matter, a detailed description of the working principles of organization already set forth in the earlier part of the article; it might contain innumerable descriptions of ways of adjusting differences, ways of arriving at understandings, ways of forming a judgment, and circumstances in which they would be applicable; it might elaborately expound a variety of possible fraternal relations and combinations with people not wholly agreeing with our ideas and methods; it might appear as the platform of a League instead of the separate manifesto of an individual, who would "adhere to it" instead of independently declaring. Then, it would be distinctly set forth that the words and clauses were merely approximate expressions of current intention, to be taken in the spirit rather than the letter, and always as a mere interpretation of thought, not at all as promulgating any rules.

A Manifesto.

WORKINGMEN,

The market for candidates is once more opened; and you who from year's end to year's end starve and sweat for the profit of greedy masters, and are exposed to all kinds of vexations in your daily lives, you receive the hypocritical homage and listen to the lying promises of those people who rob you systematically of the products of your labor and despise you into the

bargain.

We who are of the people, like you; who toil and suffer like you, and who put every hope, not in an elevation over the heads of others, but in the emancipation of all, we wish to say a candid word to you.

What do your masters and their agents want from you? What are their promises worth?

Too long already you have allowed yourselves to be deceived, and stupidly, meanly you lick the stick with which you are beaten. Think at last over your fate; raise your heads and be men.

You suffer because you have not the means to work and to produce, nor the freedom to live as you would and ought to live. The owners of the land, of the means and instruments of production, of the big cities; who hold the markets and regulate the distribution and the price of all merchandise, these force you to work for their profit how and when it suits them; and they appropriate the product of your labor, leaving to you a mere pittance that keeps you from starving. And government, ever hungry for taxes, diminishes even this little left by your masters—in whose interest, as we well know, the taxes will be spent.

To be free, you must conquer the right to enjoy the product of your labor and to organize and to live as befits the dignity of human beings.

These gentlemen who seek your votes may call themselves Conservatives or Progressives, Liberals or Democrats, Anarchists or Republicans, but they all desire that property should remain in the hands of those who do no work and that the workers should continue to fatten the others and to be led like feeble sheep to be shorn and slaughtered. They all live upon your labor, and would like this state of things to last forever.

Today they are divided among themselves and fight for power—goaded by their vanity for domination, and quarrelling over the division of the spoil wrung from you. But you will find them an united and compact body against you the day when you seriously resolve to emancipate yourselves; and today, even, you see them sink their political differences and unite against you every time you claim a slight improvement, every time they feel, in whatever degree, their money-bags are threatened.

Why should you vote for them? Why should you take part in a struggle in which all the combatants are your enemies?

If you have the least consciousness of your misery, if you feel the least dignity of a man and a worker, if you have the slightest wish to be free you will refuse to sanction your servitude by your vote.

Let those who have a personal interest in it, or those who want to remain humble and down-trodden slaves go to the poll. You who are workers conscious of your rights, go into your associations and defend your interests there; struggle to better your conditions, prepare for the future.

The emancipation of the workers must be the result of the efforts of the workers themselves.

But today, besides the middle classes, who are your enemies and oppressors, though disguised for this occasion as your friends and protectors, others are demanding your votes who call themselves Socialists and are really, at least in great part, your sincere friends. They agree with us that the bourgeois are all enemies of the people, and that it would be stupid and unworthy of workers to help to elect them to power. But they argue that as the bourgeois use the power in favor of the bourgeoisie, so you need only elect workingmen who will use it in the interests of the working-classes. And in this way, just as you are gaining class-consciousness, just when you are beginning to see that you are slaves and are wishing to be free a political ambush is laid for you which throws you back into moral subjection, tears you away from the direct struggle for the conquest of your rights and indicating an easy and flowery path, induces you to leave the rough road of struggle and self-reliance which alone can lead you to happiness and freedom. Against this fraud, which, whilst it may be perpetrated in good faith, is all the same detrimental to your cause, we have come to warn you.

The parliamentarian Socialists only tell you one half of the truth. The government defends property, not only because it consists of property-owners, but also because it is the government. When you put men in a position which enables them to impose their own will upon others, they become by this fact a privileged class and must necessarily defend privilege. The worker who becomes a ruler ceases to belong to

your class and to have the same interests as you have—in the same way as it is the case with the worker who becomes an employer.

Do not of your own will create for yourselves new masters; you are already under the sway of too many. Do not establish by your votes a class which, tomorrow, would take the place of the governing classes of today, and which would oppress you tomorrow as you are oppressed today. The question is not whether we shall be governed by those who have been our fellow-workers, but why we should be governed at all. If free, we should be able to arrange things amongst ourselves in conformity with our ideas and interests, and to provide for our needs as it seems best to us.

Why should we raise from our midst comrades to send them to learn how the people are governed and kept in subjection? For what purpose do governments serve, if not that of fleecing us and defending those who fleece us!—if not to impose upon all the ideas of a few and to force down to a dead level the infinite variety of temperaments, conditions and interests?

To organize the production and distribution of wealth, to provide for all public needs, to establish harmony between the interests and passions of one and all, to obtain the most fruitful result from the unity of the supreme principles of individual liberty and social solidarity,—these are the things which a real society should strive for. Yet the present society is one in which a few "fortunate" ones bleed, oppress, crush the immense majority of mankind and, even then, they (the few) do not succeed in living contented and peaceful among themselves. But no government can provide for those wants which are essential to society. No government could do this, even were it composed of men of genius, wisdom and goodwill, and having at command a legion of geniuses.

The organization of economic life can only spring from an agreement between the producers; the harmony of interest must be intended and promoted by those interested, themselves; and the sense of social solidarity must be rooted in the minds of men. A government cannot take the place of the people and can only divert the activity of the people in favor of a class or a party and take social solidarity as a pretext for oppression.

FELLOW WORKERS, DO NOT VOTE!

If you vote for the bourgeois, you back up those who starve you and thereby show yourselves worthy of the whip that lashes you.

If you vote for workingmen, you prepare yourselves new masters elected from your own ranks; and you think you are able to liberate yourselves from present oppression by forging new chains for yourselves.

Voting, besides preparing the masters of tomorrow, can only help to perpetuate the conditions and inertia of today. Those who tell you that it is a means of agitation and propaganda, that by it you might influence legislation and make it less hostile to you, that by it you may further your interests and the cause of Socialism, deceive themselves or deceive you.

If you want to agitate and to propagate the ideas of emancipation—and your own interests should impel you to do so—you must do it yourselves, each one with untiring and constant work. If you want to influence legislation, to defend and ameliorate your interests, you must unite, agitate, organize, formulate your demands and exact respect for them. If you want freedom, it rests with yourselves to win it.

The few liberties that exist, the small progress realized have been conquered by the people, by the fear with which they inspired their masters; and they are lost the moment the people cease to be their jealous guardians and trust their defence to their so-called representatives.

Parliaments would never have conceded any reform if it had not become part of the public conscience and would have become a fact in spite of the law,—if Parliament had not hastened to legalize it to evade greater disaster. And if, by accident, some law is made that could have been useful to the people, it remains a dead letter unless the people energetically demand that it shall be enforced.

DO NOT VOTE. But your abstention must not be the effect of scepticism and indifference. If you abstain from voting from sheer apathy the elected will exploit your indifference without meeting any resistance, and you will be even more responsible for the wrong that will be done than those who have placed their faith in the ballot-box. We repeat: Unite, Organize, Agitate!

We are accused of being dreamers. It is said that we want too much, that the people do not understand us, that progress is made little by little.

Well, are you contented with little when you need so much? But let that pass. If you only begin to march, the wish to take all will surely follow. Still, however little you demand, demand it in earnest and use the proper means to obtain it.

If, for example, you want freedom of association; form associations and, if the government dissolves them, associate yourselves all the same. If you want the Eight-Hour Day; organize and refuse to work more than eight hours. If you truly want it, if you are disposed to struggle and suffer for your cause, you will obtain what you require.

But if you expect that the bourgeois make you concessions because you succeed in sending some workmen into Parliament, you will obtain nothing. And you will show yourselves scarcely more capable of conquering liberty and well-being if you vote for a Socialist than if you vote for a capitalist or a lord.

(The above is the text of a manifesto published by the Agitazione, of Ancona, on the occasion of the recent Italian elections.)—[Freedom, London.

Things and Thoughts.

A CHURCH in Chicago was "dedicated to God" the other day. Great scheme that, it saves the owners of the church from paying taxes, as the tax collector can't find God. Now if the Anarchists could only work some such graft, but come to think of it, they don't "stand in" with the State while the church does, and that makes a difference.

"PECOOLAR" as was Artemus Ward, he seems to have possessed a pretty clear idea of the kind of religious liberty the churchites believe in. In a "Punch" article, in writing of his genealogy, he said: "I believe we are descended from the Puritans, who nobly fled from a land of despotism to a land of freedom, where they could not only enjoy their own religion, but prevent everybody else from enjoying 'his.'" Some "Anarchists" are built on the same plan.

AND here's another remark of Artemus' which contains more good sense than good orthography: "Traters, I will here remark, are a confortin' class of people. If they wasn't they wouldn't be traters. They conspire to bust up a country—they fail, and they are traters. They bust her, and they become statesmen and heroes."

I WAS looking over Bret Harte's writings the other day and noticed his comment on some cartoons of "The Dissolute Miner," which traced his career "through successive planes of dirt, drunkenness, disease and death." Bret gives a miner's rough but kindly criticism of the cartoons as follows: "Yer see, it ain't no square game. They've just put up the keeder on that chap from the start." That is a terse summing up of the situation of numberless proletarians wherever "civilization" curses the earth. Yet the Individualists want everyone to play a lone hand, even if the cards are stacked against many of them from the start.

WHAT is patriotism? Well suppose two children are born, one in the United States within ten yards of the Canadian boundary, the other on the Canadian side within ten yards of American territory. One must lift his hat to a corrupt president and the other must praise the queen, else they are full of treason. That is patriotism, but it is not common sense. Does a difference of ten yards in latitude make any radical difference in natural laws, or in the methods required to properly direct the social organism most wisely and efficiently?

"In America men became free before they understood what freedom meant."—N. Casson.

Yes, so long before they knew, that their first movement was to give themselves back into slavery. It seems the common impulse of men brought up to believe in government to follow in the footsteps of their sires merely because they fear to trust themselves in paths which they have never trod. They of revolutionary times knew the evils of government, but no sooner was it thrown off than they again adopted it, vainly supposing that by changing the name, and to some small degree the form, they had changed the nature of the animal. But we now know full well

that cropping its ears does not dull its claws nor pull its teeth. They gave the tiger a less "royal" appearance—that was all.

Yet somehow the word Liberty was very popular in those days and is still profusely used in American histories. But now that 120 years have passed, the people, while still parroting the word do not know its meaning, and even men who have come to hate the government that is, cannot see that any government they could conceive of or put into operation could not be other than oppressive, for were it otherwise it would no longer be government.

How the bare idea of true liberty repels the liberty-shouters by its nudity. They do not want Liberty in a natural condition. She must be veiled and swaddled till her own children won't know her, else she shall not appear in public, nor yet in private save for a few who are the first to protest against others seeing her. Poor old Liberty, the meanest slaves treat her as a strumpet! But she can bide her time and when the slaves are dead can smile pityingly down upon their tombstones.

We who would enjoy her society will have to be content with a fleeting glance, a smile that promises hope for the future, spiced perhaps with a stolen caress now and then.

In looking over "Instead of a book" I came across Tucker's criticism of Parsons, in which he says Parsons was not an Anarchist and does not even attempt to give a reason for the assertion save that he had fixed a standard and Parsons did not fit it. What puzzled me was, what authority did he possess for arbitrary erecting a standard and who gave him the authority?

TUCKER repeatedly asserts that our Chicago comrades were not Anarchists, yet he knows that they were tried and murdered solely because they were Anarchists. Why blacken the names (or rather try to do so) of men who gave their lives for their beliefs?

AGAIN Tucker asserts that the Chicago comrades incited to confiscation of property for "a general dividing up." And the "plumb-liners" will not allow that anyone can possibly be an Anarchist unless he first "kisses the book" and swears to uphold the authoritative code promulgated by Benjamin Tucker! What impudence!

WHEN I hear of a "plumb-liner" who gives up his life or even skips a good dinner for the cause he advocates I'll begin to think he actually believes what he teaches, till then excuse me if I can't help thinking he is after the dollars without any regard whatever for humanity.

ZADNAK THE DREAMER.

Variety.

THE opponents of variety attribute to it a great share of the trouble and heartaches that afflict humanity, but this is a mistake. It is not variety in love—that is loving more than one at the same time—that makes trouble, but the lack of it. The impossibility of loving more than one at a time is what causes heart aches and tears. Neglect of love number one almost inevitably follows the advent of love number two, and the main thing is how to get rid of the first. Separations follow and new relations are found. Many changes take place, great confusion exists, there may be a variety of associations but it is not variety in love. It will only be when men and women are much wiser, greater, more sensible and nearer equal in all things than they are now that variety in love will be possible, and then lifelong affections and partnerships will be much more common than now.

It is very rare that the love of two people is so perfectly balanced that each will find every want and desire satisfied by the other. If any one ever does find himself perfectly satisfied he may rest assured that he does not fully satisfy in return, or will not for very long, and especially if he expects or demands exclusiveness.

When people learn how to treat each other and how to love, there will be a freer intermingling and associations of all, and fewer broken homes and scattered families than now.

In a society of free people who have outgrown jealousy and ideas of ownership, there might be some couples who live entirely with and for each other, others who would find it impossible to live together for a

lifetime or even many years, but the people who have "paired off" when loving each other as well as they commonly do, will not separate and break up well arranged domestic relations if they have learned how to treat each other, and they will not cease to love each other on account of new loves and experiences.

In that kind of a society a pair from different households might be lovers of music and find reader response and greater enjoyment in that line together than with any one else. They would enjoy concerts and musicales together, while their domestic or "economic partner" as Ruedebusch, or "central lovers" as Lloyd would say, could be following their tastes in some other directions. Suppose that Mrs. A and Mr. B. take a holiday together at the seaside; that Mr. A and Mrs. B gratify their artistic tastes by a trip through the forests and fields making sketches from nature. Others might enjoy a course of lectures, others read a favorite book together, others attend a party or merry making; each and all living out the faculty of mind with the one most congenial in that line; all enjoying life and love and happiness with varied and congenial elements, and all blessed and benefitted. And all preferring to retain the home arrangements that were originally established.

I have no right to object to the bargain made by the exclusiveists who say to each other: "You have a right to love some one else if you want to, but it must put an end to your loving me, and our living together," but the chances of happiness are greater for the woman who says to her lover, or vice versa: "Do whatever you wish to do that makes you happy and works no one else an injury." You will never lose my love or respect by any act that is prompted by love. Be just and kind in every relation with your fellow-beings. Keep yourself clean and temperate and in good health. Always keep your own self-respect, and so far as your conduct is concerned my love will remain unchanged." This arrangement would tend to strengthen the home and preserve the family rather than to destroy them. That is left for the legally married and the exclusiveists, to do, and quite successfully it is accomplished by them.

LILLIE D. WHITE.

The Letter-Box.

G. L., Phelps.—Letters addressed to Henry Adgls. A. J. Pope, A. Isaak, Box 94, Portland, Ore. or Bellwood, Ore. will reach us.

C. L., Brooklyn, N. J.—B. could not receive the paper as it was ordered to No. 201 and we see now that 123 is the proper number.

Z. A., Fall River, Mass.—The book and pamphlets are sent, except "True and False Society," which we have not on hand at present. We hope you enjoy reading Anarchist literature.

J. J. F., Saulton Hill.—Don't get disheartened friend. Certainly we can't tell if we "middle aged comrades" ever will see freedom, but it gives us great pleasure and satisfaction to defy custom and loyalty even at present, and the spread of our principles is very encouraging.

A. McD., Montana.—Viroqua Daniels is unable to write for The Firebrand, or any other paper, owing to the necessity of her not over exerting or exciting herself. As explained in a note, we have done the best we can for Comrade Wellenbrook—not being a resident here he had no claim on the country.

E. C., Newark Valley, N. Y.—Thanks for the names. "Why the government doesn't stop the paper?" Why should it? Aint we living in "a free country?" The "law abiding citizens" tell us that we can speak and write anything in this country—or is that a lie? But then we are not in the least anxious to be "stopped."

N. L., St. Paul, Minn.—We believe you will soon agree with us, as we too, want "a complete overthrow of the present system," and that such a revolution will not be brought about peacefully is beyond doubt. Many Socialists are getting disgusted with the Socialist Labor Party, the leaders of which are as eager "after an office" as any politician of the old parties. Our best greetings.

I. M., New York City.—"I would like to know where Comrade Morris is, and what the matter is with him that he does not write for The Firebrand any more?" you ask. Similar questions have been asked and the following information will suffice for all. Last fall Comrade Morris thought he was rather a burden to the "Firebrand family" as the money was coming in slowly, and so he went fishing oysters and made a contract which lasts till June the 15th. This keeps him so busy that he hardly has time to answer private letters, and as the work is very tiring and exhausting he don't feel like writing articles for The Firebrand.

Literature.

No. 1 of Vol. 1 of "The Philosopher," a monthly magazine for progressive people designed to contain philosophical comment, reviews of books that help social progress, and miscellaneous reading both original and selected, is on my table. It is published and edited by Albert Chavannes, at 308 Fourth Ave. Knoxville, Tenn. H. A.

THE FIREBRAND

Published Weekly. Communicate in any of the European languages.

50 CENTS A YEAR.

Address all Communications and make all Money Orders payable to Box 94 Portland, Ore. or Sellwood, Or.

Admitted as second-class matter at the Portland, Ore., postoffice

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

"Government of the many by the few we call tyranny. But government of the few by the many is tyranny also, only in a less intense form."

We have governments of all grades, from a despotism like Russia, where one man's will is law, to a Republic like the United States, where about one in six votes and where about one in twelve consents to the government. Take one hundred people in the United States, promiscuously among men women and children, and not more than fifteen are allowed a vote for men who govern the hundred, and eight of them are counted, the other seven being in the minority, have no volition in selecting the men who make laws to govern them. How much does our republic differ from a despotism? It is eleven twelfth despotism and one twelfth democratic. It is true that one sixth of the people are allowed to vote and have a voice in choosing their rulers, but after the election they have no more voice in making laws than if they lived in Russia. The females, and males under twenty one years of age, never have a voice. It is true the older males vote in the interest of their wives, sisters, daughters and minor sons, but so does the Czar of Russia work for the interest of all his subjects as he sees it. I am speaking of facts in government. But the majority in a republic endorse the government under which we live. So may, and probably do a majority of the subjects of the Czar of Russia; but the intelligent class, largely in the minority, are bitterly opposed to an absolute monarchy. So are a very intelligent small minority in this country bitterly opposed to the government under which we live. The intelligent minority have no voice in the government in Russia, neither has the intelligent minority here. The purest, most intelligent, humanitarian and intellectual men and women of America never had a say so in any laws ever made in America. The men who make our laws are men who sought the offices—not the good of the people.

It is said, "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." Then why should not women and children have a vote by which to express their consent? Even if all had a vote and a bare majority or plurality governs, a large minority would be governed against their consent, then a just government, if such an anomaly could exist, should receive the consent of all. A government of however small a minority, cannot be scientifically and logically defended. When it is considered that with all the changes in governments from despotisms to republics, and the adding to and repealing of laws, no stable, scientific form of government has ever been discovered, it bids us pause to enquire if any government can be stable, just and equitable.

Upon those who defend the least tyrannical government, rests the burden to show just how much more rights a majority has than a minority, however great the disparity between them. Even if it be proven—which I deny—that a majority has more and superior faculties to gratify, it is equivalent to saying the minority shall not exercise the few faculties they have.

I am sure history will bear me out in asserting that the greatest minds that have ever lived never had a voice in any government, and suffered at the hands of the majority. It is not necessary to enumerate the many martyrs to truth and justice who were vindicated after their death. What voice had Wm. E. Channing, Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Garret Smith, John Brown and other Abolitionists in the laws of their day? Some like Geo. W. Julian, Wendel Phillips and Horace Greely may survive the odium of their early life and see their principles vindicated, but why should they suffer at all for their advanced avowels of a new truth? Take a hundred men of advanced intelligence; one other man may know a very little more than any one of them and yet more than all of them combined on some subject. Should they rule and he be ignored? Such is republican majority rule. Majorities are

conservative as well as tyrannical. Progress is retarded as much by a republican government as by a monarchy.

Any government not consented to by all governed is a tyrannous government. The only scientific settlement of the question of government is, to abolish it altogether, or enact no law without the consent of all. When such settlement of the question is attained and not until then, can the most exalted minds have an influence in bettering the condition of the race. If all were consulted in government, the best men and women would come to the front to suggest good laws or veto bad ones. The best people then would rule. Otherwise as always in the past, bad men will rule. No good man can or desired to govern except in rare cases as H. Greely desires to be President for the sole purpose of promoting a reconciliation between the North and South—to make some amends for the cruel injustice done the South during its rebellion. He could not have been elected. No good man can, if the ruling rascals know him.

When it is considered that the man elected to govern us by one person in twelve is usually an office seeker who uses every unfair means to get elected, and is often influenced by mercenary motives after elected, can we expect a better government than one man, a king, an emperor or a Czar, who is above mercenary influences, would give us?

A man was recently inaugurated with great eclat as President of the United States, put there by less than one twelfth of the people to reign over and govern seventy million people. How much better government, again I ask, can we expect from him, even though no unfair means had been used to elect him, than could be expected from the Emperor of a limited monarchy, like Germany, or even from an absolute monarch who is above any mercenary or sordid motive as they necessarily must be?

"But," replies the conservative defender of present institutions, "a majority or very near a majority of the whole people indorse the election and the policy of the President elect, even though but one twelfth of the people voted for him, and only a few 'strong minded women' and a few 'smart Alic boys' have any desire to vote." Very true. So do the subjects of the Emperors of Germany and Russia sanction the government under which they live. They cannot conceive of a better government. There are a few discontented thinkers in all countries who would revolt if opportunity presented. But the thinking, intelligent few have as little volition in monarchical governments as in this.

The question I raise, is not whether the subjects of this or any other country sanction the administration of the affairs of their country, but do the people govern, and have they an equal right to govern, provided government is right in itself? I think I have shown that eleven-twelfths of the people are virtually disfranchised so far as a voice in the laws governing them is concerned and I need only allude to a few facts to prove that a republic cannot in the very nature of it, be better than a monarchy, and are both despotic, governing the people without their consent.

A monarch is usually, if not always, in a condition which places him above all mercenary temptation to favor one class of his subjects more than another. He has been educated and trained amid the most favorable environment to fit him for his position. [??? the type-setter.] His humanitarian sympathies have been cultivated by precept and travel. The president of a republic, reared and educated to regard the accumulation of wealth as a virtue, partaking of the conventional ideas of the common people, his moral perception in keeping with envying influences, which regards the distinction of wealth as an honorable distinction, that success in politics, however obtained, combined with riches is the pinnacle of fame and distinction, he is easily made a pliant tool of those whose interest it is to elect him. He has personal friends who assisted pecuniarily to promote him, to whom he cannot be recreant. He may be selected by the wealthy plutocrat for the very reason that his conscience is elastic and his moral integrity weak and pliable.

Is it not true, as a republic becomes old and wealth concentrated in a few hands, that it is impossible to elect our best men to office? Is it not true also that our best men refuse to compete for an office for the reason that they must, if successful, buy their seat of office? Then, I ask, how much better for the people is a republic where a plutocratic oligarchy rules than a monarchy? I am far from advocating a return to a monarchy as some do. From a monarchy to a repub-

lic is a long step towards freedom, albeit a groping in the dark. The sense of freedom, the feeling or belief that one has volition in government, is a valuable incentive or precursor to ultimate freedom. So soon as people find that freedom is a term expressive of a condition never heretofore realized, they will strike out in earnest to find it. The aspirations for freedom are inherent in the constitution of man, which is a prophesy of a realization of it.

I have more than intimated that women and children have the same right to a voice in government that men over twenty-one years of age have. I affirm that they have, and postulate my affirmation upon the self evident fact "that all men are born equal, and are endowed with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." Another reason for my hypothesis of equal rights (which implies equal freedom) is that there has never been offered a reason why women and children should not vote or have an equal voice in government. The onus probandi (burden of proof) rests on those who deny their equal rights. They should be able to show a scale by which to measure rights and show just how much less women's and children's rights are than man's. They should show just how much less a man's right is the day before, than the day after he is twenty one years of age. Is it because age gives wisdom and wisdom measures rights? That would be equivalent to saying the young shall not exercise the weak faculties they have. Then there are some children not yet in their adolescent age who are wiser than men of middle or more advanced age. If wisdom should govern rights, many men as well as children should be excluded from exercising their weak faculties. We may say the same if size, physical strength, mental endowment or any other quality is taken as a test. The same argument for women's equal rights may be applied, and it will be found that the restriction of equal freedom to vote or exercise any other right is entirely arbitrary and without reason. The restriction of the franchise would be amusing if not so serious. To propose to determine a question by ballot and then for the strong to say who should vote, is the acme of absurdity.

The next most absurd and puerile proposition, beneath the dignity and magnanimity of manhood, is that a majority has a right to rule a minority. Even if the whole seventy million people of the United States should vote and thirty-six million should say I should pay a tax to support soldiers who fought in a certain war when I did not employ them to go, would be just as tyrannous as though the Czar of Russia should compel me to pay it. Tyranny is tyranny—let it be exercised by many or few.

As I have more than intimated, majorities are no criterion of right. One man may know more, and be a better man, than a thousand others. As I have shown, the best men and women are never represented in government. It is a great misfortune that they are not. We cannot afford to ignore them. The only way the best, the most intelligent, the most humanitarian, the most kindly and altruistic men and women can be represented in government, is, to enact no law that does not receive the sanction of all; men, women and children. "But," interposes a defender of things as they are, "we could enact no laws then. No law could be proposed but some one would veto it by an adverse ballot." Well, so it might be: if facts and logic applied to government ends in reducing it to an absurdity, I cannot help it.

The French philosopher, Fourier, was certainly one of the most remarkable men of his age. He calls himself, and in many things truly, a discoverer, and claims to be an interpreter of nature. Among the prominent of what he terms the universal laws of nature, is that of "Attraction proportioned to Destiny." He means by it that there is a law of attraction that draws all beings toward their appointed destiny—the end for which they were made. It appears in the instincts of the beast which guide him with unerring certainty to the proper mode of life, and the destiny appointed him by nature. It binds the fish to the water and the bird to the air. It attracts the dog to man and the lion to the jungle. Rising above the brute creation this law of attraction is an index to man's destiny of freedom. "The higher the destiny the more potent the attraction." Man has implanted inherently in his nature a desire for freedom. This inherent desire is universal and a sure prophecy of his ultimate destiny.

The tendency toward freedom and the elimination of government may be seen by observing the mitigation

of penalties for violated law; the elimination of laws by repeal, and the paralysis of some laws still on the statutes as dead letters, unenforced. Formerly, it was thought that society could not exist without the assistance of government to direct the minutest details of every business in every day life. The cut of the garments the people wore, the size, length and make of a pin head, the size of a penny loaf and every little detail of life was prescribed by statute. Men have learned that society can exist without, better than with the prescriptions, and prosecutions of laws. Formerly, over a hundred offenses were punishable by death as a penalty. Laws become a dead letter as their enforcement is ignored, and becomes impossible by the evolution of society towards freedom. As society approaches ultimate freedom, its movement is accelerated in a geometrical ratio. When we consider the wonderful mitigation of penalties from death to a small fine, or imprisonment in jail for a few days, for a small theft, and the growing sentiment in favor of reform schools in place of penal institutions, we may with hope anticipate in the near future when all punishment will be abolished, and nothing but the bare shell of government be left, which can easily be crushed, or will sink into innocuous desuetude. Still we have a great deal to regret before restrictions are relinquished.

The triple tragedy of Pearl Bryan and her slayers, Scott Jackson and Alonzo Walling, all the result of the unnatural law and conventionalism of society, with the unnatural arbitrary penalty of the former threatening the boys, and the unnatural conventional odium threatening the girl for a natural act, drove them to the crime of murder and her to the crime of submitting to an unnatural act to rid herself of the fruits of their previously natural coalition and the odium attached to it by a perverted moral sense. No one has ever been able to offer one good reason why the command of Nature to "multiply and replenish the earth" is not as fully complied with, and the offspring of coalitions outside of and in defiance of statute law, begotten in love, are not superior to those begotten under the compulsions and restraint of laws binding incongenial, incompatible and inharmonious parties of opposite sexes together in a marriage bond for life. It cannot be shown that under free conditions, with no legal restraint of sex relations, with perfect freedom of motherhood, that women and men would not be more chaste and respectful towards each other. It is an irrefutable fact that many of the most affectionate women, who would be prolific and affectionate mothers are driven by law and the conventional sentiment fostered by the law, to infanticide and prostitution. There is no reason why there should not be more conjugal felicity with less dissimulation, less secretive double dealing under freedom than at present. No reason can be offered why unions would not be more harmonious, their children more cheerful, and of a superior moral and intellectual character under freedom than under the restraints now, of laws binding incongenial, incompatible parents together who beget children in hatred, which must result in criminals. It is an established fact that prenatal influences, especially on the mother during pregnancy, has very much to do with the after character of the child. Under freedom of the mother, she would as she has a right to do as builder of the race, choose who should be the father of her children. Free mothers must precede free men. In the Pearl Bryan and Wood alliance, no one's rights were infringed upon. It was no one's business but their own, in justice, but society took upon itself and exercised the unjust power of affixing a penalty for a natural act; to interfere and mar and meddle with natural law. Man's marriage laws are arbitrary and mar and transgress Natural law.

J. C. BARNES.

Hindsboro, Ill.

An Objector.

It is seldom that one sees if an Anarchistic sheet a word in favor of maintaining government. To the average Anarchist "Government" conveys all that is evil in this world. "For upon it depends the continuance of our social sins."

Though for many years a reader of economic literature, I have yet to meet with an article from the pen of an Anarchist, which sets forth how society could exist without government. You may call attention to the shortcomings of "Governments" (though the Anarchist is ever careful not to speak of any of its numerous benefits to the individual—including him-

self), but by so doing you do not prove the benefits that would follow because of its removal.

Given human beings with so many different tastes, hopes and aspirations, because of which their separate interests must conflict, or rather their seeking of happiness on so many lines, must result in clashes and differences and the necessity for government, order, if you please, arises.

This has called forth at different periods of the race's life, governments which best suited or answered its wants and needs. As these changed and change so have changed and change governments. But at no time did the needs of any race or country demand the cessation of all governments. Why? Because it is as necessary to life and happiness as so many acquired habits of the civilized man, viz, apparel, housing, etc. And yet we hear and read of "political superstitions," applied to men and women by the Anarchists because struck with the force of character and intellect of certain people, who perhaps are life long students of Economics, who realize the naturalness of government, and whose position the Anarchist cannot grasp, lacking in light, for he applies the torch to cobwebs instead of to his own mind—that it may illumine his befogged intellect, or, instead of taking hold of brooms wherewith to sweep out the lingering fossils and parasites, which he beholds pestering and threatening society—by sticking to the Government, our Anarchist critics see these, they manage to train their eyes to see naught else, their senses to perceive of naught else, hence their delusion—of trying to pull down the whole structure of the body politic because its sores have affected their minds by constantly dwelling and reflecting upon the same thing year in and year out: Poor creatures—to them the only remedy remaining, is to remove from their sight not the diseased or affected parts of the body politic—Government—but destroying or making away with it in its entirety. Like the poor blind Samson of old—they invariably go down with the object of their design. Death and destruction follow the application of their remedy—wherever practiced, viz, propaganda of deed. I shall undoubtedly be shown up in these columns as one not knowing of the beauties of Anarchism.

Subsequently if the editor shall grant the space—I shall take up your various schools of Anarchism—and try to show the fallacies upon which they all rest and their great underlying truths, likewise. In conclusion permit me to ask the Anarchist-Communist the following questions:

(1) How will you carry on foreign commerce (or exchange of products) under Communism? (2) What will take the place of the tool of trade and value denominator? (3) Should you be threatened by invasion from some migrating hordes—similar to the Huns when entering Europe, would not organization into military groups with discipline—Military Despot at the head—governing of all factions and reducing freedom to a minimum—be the result? In other words would not Government to all intents and purposes become a necessity?

VICTOR.

The first sentence of the above sounds rather peculiar, to an Anarchist, but it shows very clearly that the author is not very well acquainted with Anarchist literature, or he would not expect to find anything favoring the maintenance of government advocated, as all such literature is for the especial purpose showing the absurdity, folly and harmfulness of government.

The next sentence is equally indicative of his lack of acquaintance with Anarchist literature, for there is lots of Anarchist literature showing how society could exist without government, in fact, how much better everything would be were men willing to allow all others to live their own lives in their own way. So far as showing the benefits of government to the individual is concerned, there are none.

Given human beings with a variety of "tastes, hopes, and aspiration," and you cannot make laws that will allow all to gratify their tastes and seek a realization of their hopes and aspirations, consequently government must create distinctions and prompt to strife and war. Given these same individuals in a condition of freedom, and the mutual dependence of each on the other, and the necessity of their commingling, will guide them into a condition of social order. Government then means war, Anarchy, peace.

The assertion that government is a necessity is no proof, and, until some evidence is deduced I refrain

from taking it into account. So far as death and destruction is concerned in connection with "propaganda by deed" I would like to call attention to the fact that all this violence of which so much is said is traceable, in every instance, to the interference of government, directly or indirectly, and is not an atom in comparison with the violence, death, destruction, torture and horrors unspeakable that have, and do, and must ever accompany government.

In answer to the questions propounded I will say:

1. Foreign commerce—exchange of products between different sections of country—would be affected practically the same as between individuals, —not nations—that would do the transporting and exchanging.

2. As the present idea of value will not then exist no "tool of trade and value demonstrator" will be needed, consequently none will be used.

3. As hordes—like the Huns—do not now exist we need have no fear of such invasion. As the world today is so intimately interlocked it is not probable that Anarchy will prevail here and not in Europe at the same time, so we need apprehend no invasion from there. Should the improbable occur, and resistance to invasion become necessary a better method than submission to military despotism would be employed, and no government would become necessary.

H. A.

An Inquirer.

Through the courtesy of A. J. P. The Firebrand comes to our home, and I have been very much interested in reading its contents. While this is so I am compelled to say, that I cannot agree with the ideas expressed through its columns in relation to law and government. I would like to ask one or more questions, and if you are as you say in favor of liberty for every man, woman and child, and also desirous of propagating your work, I trust you will give me the desired information.

1. You say you are opposed to law, then what would you do with a man who would walk up the street of a city, (or village,) knock down one pedestrian after another, rifle the pockets of each, and if there was any resistance take the life of all such?

2. You say that the teachings of Anarchist are misrepresented by those who call them "bomb throwers" "assassins", etc. yet in your issue of May 2nd, you republish an article from "Anarchy on Trial" justifying the killing of Carnot by Caserio. Would not any reader of that article be justified in saying that the publishers of The Firebrand, not only upheld that dastardly act, but advocated its repetition in all similar instances?

3. Can you give any reliable instance, where a considerable number of people lived in a community, communistic or otherwise, without "law," and yet succeeding even in a comparative degree in being free from a violation of human rights?

Trusting that these queries may be received in the spirit in which they are sent I am yours for genuine liberty.

HENRY ALBERTI.

Lexington, Neb.

1. What would you do with a wild animal running through the streets and tearing down one pedestrian after another? Would you look up the law in order to find out what to do with the animal? Law does not prevent any action, but only steps in after the action has taken place. But I see our friend reasons from the standpoint that we intend to abolish government without changing conditions and relations of men in general. Such is not the case. There is no effect without a cause, and therefore we propose to remove the causes of certain phenomena which are disagreeable to mankind. What causes men to steal or "rifle pockets?" Poverty, hunger, want or the fear of want. Therefore we propose to abolish money, make production and consumption free, consequently there would be no chance or incentive to rifle pockets, and stealing would be ridiculous when men women and children could satisfy all their wants according to desire. The statisticians of to day, who are not Anarchists, tell us that nearly all so-called crimes are committed against private property (monopoly) and in love affairs. Then, if you abolish private property and the idea of property in women, you have, according to the statisticians, removed the incentive for nearly all crimes, and I cannot conceive

that there would any so-called crimes committed.

Governments have never prevented crimes, but adds crime to those already committed and calls it punishment or "exercising justice." Society makes criminals and then goes ahead and punishes the criminal. Just as if I would create a child and then punish it for coming into existence. That would be just as justifiable.

2. We have never advocated "bomb-throwing," but I always rejoice when it occurs as it shows that there are still men who cannot look indifferently at the sufferings of people and rather die by striking at some of the oppressors, and I cannot find fault with such acts for they simply are the natural result of the present system of society. If Cesario was a criminal, then every man who fought in the war of Independence was a criminal also. Cesario recognized the fact that the government had no right to interfere with his beliefs as long as he was not invasive, and as the government not only imprisoned him and thousands of others for being Anarchists, but also prevented him from getting employment, and he protested against such outrages as he thought best. And why is the killing of a president such a "dastardly act?" Cesario was neither mean nor a coward. But I think it "dastardly" when the French government exiled hundreds of Anarchists to Cayenne, where they were tortured and abused in a most cruel manner simple because those men and women believed in a better society. Or is a president of more importance than those millions of men, women and children who are dying from want of food, shelter and proper care and are nothing but victims of our infernal system? I say he is not, and everyone who upholds a system which produces such phenomena is upholding murder.

3. I was born and raised in a community of men and women in Russia. These people settled in South Russia after the land had been taken by conquest from the Turks and obtained the privilege from the Russian government to manage their own affairs, and as their religion was against civil laws they lived for about 70 years without laws or officers. (I must mention here that these people had been persecuted, executed, burned at the stake, etc. in western Europe and were considered as the lawless, just as the Anarchists are to-day.) There were no beggars, tramps nor thieves among them, and there was never a murder committed, although there were far over 100,000. There were no drunkards yet they had a distillery in their midst and everybody had access to the "brand." There was a so-called magistrate elected by the communities "to look after the conduct and welfare of the communities," as the government expresses it, but in the eyes of the members he was nothing but a mediator between them and the government. These people were all prosperous and happy as long as commercialism did not effect these communities. They formerly had only produced for their own use as neither cereals nor cattle were saleable. But when wheat raising became profitable, accumulation began; then some invested their money in factories and the "rich and the poor" became distinct—government stepped in, and to-day there are beggars, thieves and drunkards among them, but I have not heard of a murder yet.

Of this country historians tell us that immediately preceding the war of Independence in West Virginia "was actually no code but public opinion, no administration but the mob," and still the people were happier then ever afterwards. Herbert Spencer, in his "Great Political Superstition" points out numerous people in various parts of the world, that lived peaceful without laws. In short, government does not prevent crimes, but causes them. Abolish government, private property in the means of production and distribution, and your jails and prisons will be empty. I challenge friend Alberti to mention any kind of a crime and I will trace it back to government.

A. I.

Bull Fights and Anarchists.

Your comments, writes Joseph Perry, on the revival of the Inquisition in Spain, and suggestion for an immediate protest, leads me to believe the following information will be of interest to your readers. In June, 1896, the time of the explosion at the Calle

Cambios Nuevos, a thoroughfare in Barcelona, for which explosion these men have been tortured and are now awaiting execution, by way of protest against the inhumanism of Anarchists (who were the alleged perpetrators, without the faintest evidence of complicity), the local "sympathetic" bourgeoisie organized a bull fight for the purpose of raising funds to support the families of victims to the explosion. At the said fight the bull—with "artistic delicacy," so indicative of true humane feelings—was speared to death "midst frantic enthusiasm of the onlookers. A pretty humanism this that strips the mask of sympathy from the face of its wearers, and shows a brutal callousness only worthy of complete blindness. One can easily understand the use of indiscriminate violence by Spaniards when the above-mentioned farce and tragedy represent an exhibition of "sympathy." In Spain the Anarchists are recognized as the standing opponents to this form of sport—so much so that their (the Anarchists') unpopularity is more intense where the bull-fight is most popular. In the south of Spain, where the bull-fight fanaticism is at its highest, there it is a recognized custom among Anarchist groups that when a member of any one group is known to have attended a fight he is no longer regarded as a fit member or associate to the group, and the members generally refuse to identify themselves with him as a comrade. The Anarchist groups in Spain are in this wise as the Humanitarian League here. They are also a great force in the industrial world, there being few groups (out of the many hundreds in Spain) that are not at the same time unions of trades. It is these men that are being tortured alive for no actual other reason than holding advanced opinions, which they have fearlessly expressed. Where is the man that will not uplift his voice against the outrageous infamy of the alleged treatment on such persons? Your protest is timely and necessary, the only hope of which—if largely extended and made evident—can be to prevent the execution of these unhappy men.—[Keir Hardies Labor Leader.

The Science of Sex-Attraction.

I AM delighted with the position taken by L. Emerick in The Firebrand of May 2d, to-wit, that the law of sex-relationship belongs to the occult; that it must be solved by the scientist.* This is the position taken in an article of mine in the Banner of Light, of Boston, in the spring, if I remember rightly, of '78, after it had lain in their office eighteen months. Before that, my articles had always been promptly published, and I had given this up when it at last appeared. I took the ground we had only the standard of personal authority in sex matters. Only, "Thus saith the Lord," or thus saith the law, said that nature and science must give us the true standard, and to that end all classes must not only be permitted but induced to give their experiences, without fear or favor. I remember well having occasion to refer to this article when Moses Hull's letter in Woodhull & Claflin's Weekly made such a stir. I was publishing a paper at that time at Battle Creek, Mich., and I was blamed for refusing to publish articles condemning him. I replied, I have called for experiences, said they were needed; Moses is simply on the witness stand, and I will not permit you to brow-beat him through my columns.

This is precisely the position taken by Mrs. Woodhull, to-wit, that it was not a question to be regulated by statute law any more than religion was—she asked the same freedom that is accorded to religious bodies, and the minds of the people were and are so debased that she was accused of advocating promiscuity. She declared her ideal but she advocated no particular theory of sex-relationship, only that all should be free to live their own idea. Those who interpreted her, naturally understood her from their own status, but did not see that it was themselves and not her that they were interpreting. They practically said: "If I was free, if no law stood in the way, I would run riot and of course everybody else would."

* I do not care for the "law" of "occult," but would like to know what the scientist has to solve for us? When we are once free, everybody will solve "the law of sex relationship" for her or himself.

A. I.

Several years ago I said, in a meeting where this question was up: "You remind me of a company of people who have been half starved and who imagine that if they had free access to food they would eat all the time. Now, in such case you would only eat what you wanted, and you will have that now if you can steal it." I was heartily cheered. The next morning a gentleman said to me:

"How did you manage, Lois, to make that audience cheer you when you practically told them you would have what you wanted and they might help themselves?" when the fact was I was not thinking of myself at all, but of the nature of the people generally.

We have been taught that we are the keepers of our brothers and sisters till we imagine that if we do not tie them up by the law they will all go to the devil. But I have wandered from the point.

No, sex-relations cannot be regulated by government, neither is it a question of economics, as such, for no amount of the material comforts of life can make or unmake natural attraction, nor perpetuate an attraction when its laws are violated, but poverty, government and social law stand across the path of honest investigation, therefore must, perforce be a part of the question to be considered.

LOIS WAISBROOKER.

Note and Comment.

A BOX-FACTORY in Everett, Wash., is importing Japs to work. It will make it easier on the patriots.

THE comrades in Philadelphia are preparing for a demonstration in protestation against the torturings of comrades in Spain.

UNDER the head of Various Voices we are printing a few of the letters that we receive. These letters show the growth of the propaganda, and the influence of The Firebrand. Let those who are inclined to be pessimistic read the Voices each week and see if we have not good grounds for continued effort.

FROM Washinton a friend writes: "I would like Mrs. Parsons to explain how she can be an Anarchist and not a free lover. Love under freedom may not be variety, but to be a consistent Anarchist we must let it take its own course. If it is to be regulated, who is to enforce the regulations?"

Clippings and Comments.

"FREEDOM for ourselves is merely happiness; it becomes virtue when we seek to enable others to enjoy it."—[Thomas Paine.

AN exchange says "No marriage is complete so long as either contracting party feels constrained by the presence of the other." That's just where marriage is complete.—[A. L. W.

"WE have a criminal jury system which is superior to any in the world, and its efficiency is only marred by the difficulty of finding twelve men every day who don't know anything and can't read."—[Mark Twain.

OPEN COURT says, "Liberty can admit no libel except on persons. That some abuse freedom of the press by coarse publications is no more reason for the suppression of that freedom than suicide is a reason for suppressing razors."

"A NATURAL sexual desire or passion is not of itself impure or unclean but is a part of the full and complete human being. A necessary, useful, beautiful and admirable part. A well controlled highly endowed sexuality makes a man or a woman better, nobler, kinder, more loving and more beloved."—[Elmina. Slenker.

In Chicago, a week ago, little Delia Owsley, seven years old, was working in a laundry, tending an unguarded ironing machine. "Her hand caught between the rollers, and the limb was drawn in to the elbow. Besides being frightfully crushed the flesh was burned to a crisp." Only another tot sacrificed. In the northwestern mills they mangle them by the score.—[Ex.

Could not occur in freedom.

"THE L. E. checks facilitate exchange, start the wheels of industry, break the dead locks that so often occur in the commercial world, put new life into the

hearts of the listless and despairing, and do all this without wronging a single individual. They meet the requirements of modern civilized life while preserving all the good that existed in the old method of barter." Labor Exchange Guide, Denver Colo.

It is a fact that in every large town or city in the United States, we have one official to every nine voters. It costs \$7.50 per capita to run our national government, and the per capita tax is growing continually larger for both state and national expenditures.—(Coming Nation.

It is the natural and inevitable growth of government, and to avoid this taxation it will be necessary to abolish the thing.

W. H. Harvey, author of "Coin's Financial School," has taken quite a job on his hands. He is at the head of an organization which has for its object the purification of the democratic party. This is a big job and we predict it will require forty gallons of soap to get the slime off of him when he quits the job.—Texas Independent.

Right you are brother Independent, but is that not true of any man who tries to purify any political party—even the people's party?

In the tariff discussion the other day Jerry Simpson got in a home thrust when he remarked: "If the foreigner pays the tax why not make the taxes so high that they will support us and make every day Sunday over here?"—[Pittsburg Kansan.

If the government can create value why not do nothing but legislate and have Sunday all the time for everybody but the legislators? The foreigners do not pay the tax, and the government cannot create value.

An unmarried woman in Melbourne, who had been found with her three weeks' old child lying on the floor of the house in which there was no furniture, was summoned for making a false statement of birth to hide her shame and get one week's goal. She was then trial committed for not notifying the registrar in writing. She and her child were in the last stage of starvation, and the child has since died. At the same court several bakers were fined \$d. per ounce for selling short-weight-bread.—[Troy Advocate, Australia.

All this, mind you, in the "happy land" of State Socialism, government railroads, telegraph, etc.

Various Voices.

F. S. North Fairfield, Me. I received The Firebrand and am much obliged. Please continue to send it to me. I will send six months subscription soon. I am a radical Populist and Socialist. I am sick of Plate rule and believer in throwing the Yoke off, by peaceful means if we can, if not, fight.

S. Press, Stoughton, Mass. —Enclosed you will find a money order for \$8.00. This is the result of a raffle I arranged to aid The Firebrand, the full amount of which I cannot state as yet; but I think to collect about \$8.00 more. Comrades, do not fear the threatening of some so-called radicals to withdraw their support. Keep to your "attitude" and every true radical will support you.

F. C. K. Lacon, Ill. Some time ago I received a number of copies of The Firebrand, I am pleased with the principles it advocates and desire to become a subscriber, but am always short of money. If you will allow me to pay for it in my own way, sending 25 cents or whatever I have, I will be very much obliged to you. A friend of mine liked the paper very much also, and you may send him a few sample copies.

Florence Webb, Payson Utah—I have sent you a list of names of progressive people, who, I am sure, will be interested in The Firebrand and the splendid books you advertise. I would gladly be without butter on my bread to be able to send for some of them for myself, but I have the babies to think of and times are hard here too. I take pains to send all the reform literature I get to friends, it is about all I can do. You are doing a grand work and you must succeed. I cannot tell you how much I enjoy your articles in The Firebrand. It is only within the last year that I have ever seen any thing like The Firebrand. I get a great deal of reform literature lately through friends in the East and I generally read awhile, then cry awhile, and then want to fight awhile. I did not realize how much injustice and wrong there is in this

world, nor how many brave earnest noble workers for humanity there are. Enclosed find 50 cts. for my subscription to The Firebrand for one year and I hope I will be able to send you many more.

Kate Austin, Caplingers Mills, Mo.—Of the Publication of Cesarios "Explanation before the court," in the issue of May 2nd, leads me to inquire, why this explanation was not published at the time of Cesarios execution? Was it a brave deed in the radical reform papers of the U. S. to silently allow the paid attorneys of government to flaunt a hideous distorted picture in the eyes of humanity of a man that was presented to his fellows as the emblem of all that is vile and degraded, as one who killed for the love of killing? Was this a brave thing to do, and then prate of "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity," and leave one who had lived those words to the utmost, to die alone? How long will the distorted visions of humanities martyrs be on exhibition to a gaping credulous world, an exhibition that often causes radicals to show the "white feather?"

But I am glad that in the year of '97 we have one paper brave enough to turn the light on, and show us the warm living heart of Cesario.

His judge thought to coadern him to eternal silence as well as death, but from the ashes of the dead martyr The Firebrand has raked a living ember; one that will long glow in the hearts of all who are not ashamed to be known as kin to Cesario.

H. Cohen, Denver, Colo. —A. I.'s answer to a correspondent amused me. He makes the astounding discovery that I uphold wage-slavery and am therefore not an Anarchist. The very question under debate is whether the wage-system is necessarily one of slavery. Suppose a man has been listening to a debate between a Deist and an Atheist whether god exists, what would be thought of his reasoning if he said at the finish, "It is no use arguing with a man like that Atheist because he does not believe in god."

We are both deriving amusement by coming in conflict with each other, Mr. Cohen. It amuses me to show that the reasoning faculties of the so-called Individualists are somewhat deranged. If one of us was a governmentalist your instance given would have fitted the case, but as we both claim to be Anarchists your comparison is not applicable at all. On the other hand I did not make the discovery that you are upholding wage slavery. You are making the statement yourself again. A man who advocates a wage system is not for freedom, and consequently is not an Anarchist—at least he does not know what freedom is. When a man has to work for wages he is a slave, no matter what the compensation may be, and if you have not learned that much yet I would advise you to begin with the a b c of sociology.

A. I.

Youth's Department.

ABOUT ANTS.

THERE used to be oak trees in our yard, away back in the old time; and, in the late summer, caterpillars would come. They were ringed, streaked and striped, ungainly creatures, and fed upon the oak leaves. Not unfrequently one fell to the ground. There were a number of ant-hills in the yard. A caterpillar falling to the ground might sustain the shock, collect his wits in a few moments and then strike a bee line for the stem of the tree from which it fell. And this is what the well-regulated caterpillar nearly always does. But before it reaches the root of the tree a busy little ant is nearly always encountered. Then the business season opens. The worm is too much for his little adversary. The ant is small, alert, active. It stings and bites the adversary a hundred times as big as itself. But the caterpillar turns, tosses, twists and ant rolls over him. After a while the ant gives up the unequal fight, runs off and seems to have changed its mind. Presently it bumps up against another ant of its colony. They rub against each other, mix their antennae and seem to be conferring confidentially. In a moment, both pursue a backward path, toward home. Every ant they meet is accented. A message seems to be conveyed. All hands turn back toward the parent ant-hill. Every comrade outward bound is halted. He seems to learn something of importance and joins the squad setting footsteps homeward. After a while a whole lot of messengers reach the family

home. There seems to be a council of war. First one then another stands on end. Is he addressing the crowd? Has he a language we cannot overhear? Be this as it may, you soon see an army of ants setting out in the same direction. They are steering toward the spot where that caterpillar hit the ground when he fell from the branches of the oak tree. There is a phalanx of them. They go straight for the spot where the caterpillar fell. Reaching it, they find that the prey is gone, for the worm is well advanced on its journey toward the root of the tree. There is a confused council for a moment. Meantime an alert, wary ant makes a small circuit round about. He returns to the crowd, mounts himself upon his back legs and seems to say something. Then the whole posse take the trail of the caterpillar, overhaul him, bite him to death and then drag him by their united force toward home.

Did you ever see anything like this? If not you have not got a watchful eye upon your little neighbors.—[E. Edwards, in Independent Pulpit.

Can you see the difference between the ants and the people? The ants wage war upon caterpillars for food, and the people war upon each other on a quarrel, usually about property. As long as the caterpillars last the ants will ALL eat, but among people the slaves do the fighting and starve while the masters are sitting at home and ready to bust from eating too much.

Do you know what would happen if the workingmen had as much sense as the ants? I think I do. They would do the eating and let those starve that now are getting too fat from doing nothing; they would get rid of their masters—abolish government. A LITTLE ANARCHIST.

Propaganda Fund.

8. Press, Stoughton, Mass \$8.00. Radicals' Arbeiter Bund, New York City, 45 03. Headquarters, San Francisco, \$5.00. Bucher, Webb, Kiefer, Langman, Smirnow, Thompson, Lange, each 50c. Pollock, Keimath, each 25c. Tannen, 15c. Spence, Seltzer, Borland, each 10c.

Wellenbrock's Relief Fund.

Previously acknowledged.....	\$ 8.25
Anonymous of Haledon, N. J.....	2.00
M Spahn.....	1.00
J. Heritage.....	.25
J. C. Barnes.....	.20

Special Announcement:

THE publication of The Firebrand is carried on by a few individuals, aided by a number of radicals everywhere, for the purpose of spreading radical ideas. We have no organization, no constitution, by-laws, rules, officers or dues. Each works at what he or she is most competent to do. The Firebrand has no editor in the ordinary sense, and we invite everyone who has anything to say to send in their "copy."

Those engaged in the work of getting the paper out have no other means of support than the receipts for the paper, as it keeps them busy to do the work necessary to its publication, and most of the contributors to its support are poor, therefore we appeal to all who can to contribute what they can to the propaganda fund, thus helping to increase the circulation of The Firebrand, by making it possible for us to distribute a larger number of free copies. All donations and subscriptions are accounted for in the propaganda fund.

We accept anything we can use in payment for subscription. Any one wanting the paper can have it sent to them regularly by writing for it. If you can pay nothing now, we will credit you. If you are disabled, or otherwise prevented from paying for the paper you can have it free. We gladly accept any contribution to the propaganda fund, from a 1 cent stamp up, or anything to eat or wear.

The receipt of sample copies is an invitation to read, and to state that you like the paper. If you want it you need not fear to take it from the post office, as you will never be dunned to pay for it.

Notice.

To find the HOME OF THE FIREBRAND take the Oregon City car at cor. First & Alder Sts., and ride out to Sellwood. Get off at Spokane Ave. Walk two blocks toward the river, then turn to the right and walk one block.

121.

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

A Few Squibs.

SELECTED.

THE love of power grows with the use of power.

THE man of generous soul commands not nor obeys.

TYRANNY and slavery flourish in the same soil and grow from the same elements in character.

THE truly noble soul feels itself humiliated rather than elated when placed in command over others.

A PHYSICIAN of Kansas City, while looking for an insane patient, found himself serving on a jury in the circuit court.

THE only man who can be absolutely trusted with power over others is the man who will not accept such trust.

"FREEDOM is the first wish of our heart; freedom is the first blessing of our nature; and unless we bind ourselves with the voluntary chains of interest or passion, we advance in freedom as we advance in years."—Edward Gibbon.

The Firebrand Library.

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

- Expropriation. By Peter Kropotkin..... 06
Anarchist Morality. By Peter Kropotkin..... 05
Anarchist Communism. By P. Kropotkin..... 05
Anarchism: its Philosophy and Ideal. By P. Kropotkin..... 05
The Commune of Paris, by P. Kropotkin, and An Anarchist on Anarchy, by Elisée Reclus (one volume)..... 06
Anarchy. By Enrico Malatesta..... 05
A Talk About Anarchist Communism. By Malatesta..... 05
Anarchist Communism in its Relation to State Socialism. By Agnes Henry..... 05
Anarchy on Trial. Speeches by Paris Anarchists..... 05
Common Sense Country. By Bevington A Plea for Anarchist Communism. By W. H. Duncan..... 05
Socialism in Danger. By D. Nieuwenhuis on the Definition of Crime. By H. Hamon Social Conditions and Character. By "Ireland."..... 05
Religion and Labor. Parts I & II by Fox..... 05
Social Democracy in Germany. By G. Landauer..... 02
Liberty Lyrics. By L. S. Bevington..... 05
Evolution and Revolution. By Elisée Reclus..... 05
Bases of Anarchism: Historical, Philosophical and Economical. By W. Holmes God and the State. By Michael Bakounin The True Aim of Anarchism. By Steintie Revolution. By S. H. Gordon..... 05
Let us be Just. By W. Tcherkesoff. [An open letter to Liebknecht]..... 05
Grandmother's Lessons to Men, Young and Old, By Lois Waisbrooker..... 05
Wants and their Gratification. By H. Addis Albert R. Parsons' Book on Anarchism, its Philosophy and Scientific Basis. German and English Editions; handsome bound in cloth 30 cents; paper..... 15
Life of Albert R. Parsons, with a brief History of the Labor Movement in America. Beautifully illustrated and nicely bound 250 octavo pages..... 75
The two books last named are slightly damaged, but readable.
My Century Plant By Lois Waisbrooker..... 1.00
The Triumph of Death. By Gabriel D'Annunzio. Cloth..... 1.50

The God Idea of the Ancients.

Or, Sex in Religion.

By ELIZA BURT GAMBLE, Author of "The Evolution of Woman" OCTAVO, 339 PAGES.

Beautifully printed. Bound in Cloth. PRICE \$2.25

A Work for every Freethinker and Radical.

Contents:

Preface. Introduction. Sex the Foundation of the God-Idea. Tree, Flant, and Fruit Worship. Sun Worship: Female and Male Energies in the Sun. The Dual God of the Ancients a Trinity also. Separation of the Female and Male Elements in the Deity. Civilization of an Ancient Race Concealment of the Early Doctrines. The Original God Idea of the Israelites. The Phœnician and Hebrew God Set or Seth. Ancient Speculations Concerning Creation. Fire and Phallic Worship. An Attempt to Purify the Sensualized Faiths. Christianity a Continuation of Paganism. Christianity in Ireland. Stones or Columns as the Deity. Sacrifices. The Cross and a Dying Savior. Index

ORDER OF THE FIREBRAND.

DR. FOOTE'S PLAIN HOME TALK

EMBRACING MEDICAL COMMON SENSE.

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

Order from The Firebrand.

Kuriosus Kreatures

- Red Lizard, Mounted on card..... \$ 50
Porcupine Fish..... 1.00
Scorpion, Mounted..... 1.00
Centipede, Mounted..... 1.00
Tarantula Spider, finely Mounted..... 1.00
Trap door Spider, finely Mounted..... 1.00
Trap door Spider Nest..... .75
Horned Toad, fine Mounted..... 1.50
Alligator 1 foot long..... 3.50
Alligator 3 feet long..... 5.00
Snowy Owl. Large fine Specimen..... 10.00

Warren Minn. Ed. GORE, Taxidermist

The Wherefore Investigating Company.

By LOIS WAISBROOKER.

A THRILLING and deeply interesting story, intending to show the wrong, and the inevitable bad results of monopoly in land. It is one of Mrs. Waisbrooker's best and most powerful works. A Splendid missionary book of 313 pages.

LEND A COPY TO YOUR CONSERVATIVE NEIGHBOR.

Regular Price 50 cents.

Our Price 25 Cents.

ALL READERS ARE REQUESTED TO MENTION THE FIREBRAND WHEN Answering Advertisements.

FLOWERS & SHRUBS.

ANYONE who will send a donation of ten cents to The Firebrand, or a 50 cents subscription and a two cent stamp to pay postage, I will send four packages of seed, selected from my catalogue, which I send free on application, or four nice plants. Among them are roses, bulbs, house plants, and hardy outdoor plants.

This is a splendid opportunity to get some nice flowering plants and help The Firebrand at the same time.

Order of REINHOLD HOFFMAN, 768 Glisan St., Portland, Oregon.

The Plants will be sent all over the United States.

THE FIREBRAND'S AGENTS.

The following named persons will receive and receipt for donations for The Firebrand.

- Chicago, Ill. C. Puetzner, 239 W. Taylor St. P. Vandee, 302 Garfield Ave.
New York City. I. Rudash, 90 Stanton Street. A. Levin, 340 Cherry St.
Buffalo, N. Y. F. Kohlbeck, 622 Jefferson St.
Philadelphia, Pa. L. R. Botink, 731 Plover St.
Baltimore, Md. B. Morwitz, 1141 E. Lombard St
Providence, R. I. J. H. Cook, 45 Winter St.
London, Eng. E. Leggat, 23 Eve Rd. London E.
Glasgow, Scotland. Wm. Duff, 5 Nethsdale Gardens, Crossmuloof.
Th. Cantwell, Freedom Office 17 Ouseston St., Euston Road., N. W.

50 YEARS' EXPERIENCE. PATENTS TRADE MARKS, DESIGNS, COPYRIGHTS &c. Anyone sending a sketch and description may quickly ascertain, free, whether an invention is probably patentable. Communications strictly confidential. Oldest agency for securing patents in America. We have a Washington office. Patents taken through Munn & Co. receive special notice in the

SCIENTIFIC AMERICAN, Beautifully illustrated, largest circulation of any scientific journal, weekly, terms \$3.00 a year; \$5.00 six months. Spectacular copies and HAND BOOK ON PATENTS sent free. MUNN & CO., 361 Broadway, New York.

The Old and the New Ideal.

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

By Emil F. Ruedebusch.

THE MOST MASTERLY WORK ON THE SEX QUESTION IN PRINT.

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

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

PRICE: Paper \$.50 Cloth \$1.00.

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

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

SEND ORDERS TO THE FIREBRAND.

HELPING THE FIREBRAND

WM. WHITTICK has kindly donated to us ten copies in paper of his splendid book "Bombs," and five copies in cloth. Anyone sending us fifty cents will receive a copy in paper, or for seventy-five cents a copy in cloth. It is a very appropriate present for friends who love to read. It will also be a great help to The Firebrand.

The German Group, Chicago, Ill meets every Friday, 8 o'clock P. M., at 535 Blue Island Ave.

Anarchist Headquarters in San Francisco 1232 1/2 Folsom St. Open every evening from 7 till 10 P. M.

The Independent Educational Club meets every Sunday evening, at 7: 30 p. m. at 1927 E St., Tacoma, Wash.

The Peoples Union, a free discussion club, meets every Su day evening at 935 Westminster St., Providence, R. I.

International Group Free Initiative meets at 144 West 28th St., New York, on Thursdays and Saturdays at 8:30 p. m.

Radical literature of all kinds, including English periodicals, can be found at the news stand of comrade I Rudash, Cor. Essex a Division Streets, New York City.

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

The New Era, an advocate of the principles of Anarchy, or absolute freedom of the individual in all things. A four page monthly, 10 cents per year. Address: Lake Bay, Wash.

Group New Generation meets every Saturday at 56 Orchard St., New York City. Lecture at 8 o'clock p. m. pamphlets in English, Hebrew and German languages can be had at the meeting.

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

The Group Proletarian meets and delivers lectures every Friday night at 8 o'clock in the New-Prospect Hall, 48 Orchard St., New York. Pamphlets in English, German and Hebrew languages can be had at the meetings.

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

The San Francisco Anarchist Club. Headquarters at 1232 1/2 Folsom St. will hold regular weekly agitation meetings every Saturday evening at 8 o'clock in the Universal Hall, 812 Pacific St. Free Discussion.

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

The Altruist is a monthly paper issued by the Altruist Community, of St. Louis, whose members hold all their property in common, and both men and women have equal rights and decide all their business affairs by majority vote. Twenty-five cents a year; sample copy free. Address, A. Longley, 2319 Olive St., St. Louis, Mo.

The Equitist advocates a condition in which each person has equal freedom with every other, in which each has neither more nor less freedom than any other. If you want to know how to establish that condition, subscribe for The Equitist, an international fortnightly \$1.00 a year. Foreign countries, \$1.25 Sample copies free to readers of The Firebrand. Estela Bachman Brokaw, Publisher, Haskell Flats, N. Y. U. S. A.

Special Offer for Prosperity Times; "When Love is Liberty and Nature Law," 10c; "Ought Women to be Punished for Having too Many Children?" 5c; "Motherhood in Freedom," 5c; "Altgeld's Reasons for Pardoning Fielden, Nebee, and Schwab," 10c; "The Prodigal Daughter, or, the Price of Virtue," 25c. Send \$1, subscription to Lucifer, for one year and receive these pamphlets free; or send 70 cents, 6 months subscription and we will forward your choice of 25 cents' worth of these pamphlets free. Lucifer is weekly, eight pages, the only paper of its kind in the world. This is a rare chance of securing a large supply of excellent literature for missionary work. Address M. Harman, 1394 W. Congress St., Chicago, Ill.

MANGLES FOR FAMILY AND HOTEL USE. An ordinary family ironing can be done on the "RACINE" Mangle in twenty minutes, without heat or fuel. NO FUEL. NO HEAT. NO SCORCHING. Prices within the means of every family. Made in six styles and ten sizes, for Families, Hotels, etc. Every Mangle Guaranteed. Send 2c stamp for our well illustrated Catalogue, with prices. THE RACINE MANGLE CO., Racine, Wis.