Over-Production.

There's an over-production of cotton, an over-production of corn; too much of everything is grown; too many people born; a surplus yield of wheat and bread; of potatoes, oats and rye; beef and mutton, ham and eggs, and home-made pumpkin pie.

Too much to eat, too much to wear; and cattle on too many hills; too many agricultural tools; too many plows and harrows; there's a surplus now of clothing every grade and kind; too many books and papers, too much thought and mind.

Too many men to do the work that many women do; more daylight than the people need, too much night for sleep; of benefits a surplus; of commodities, a profit; of wine, too many birds and blossoms, more beer than there are lilies.

More patience and more adoration than is needed for the devil; an over-production of grave-stones, more cofins than we sell; an over-production of ignorance; and a little less faith in the world; too many poor, too many rich, and too many fools.

—The Champ.

Bounties of Anarchism.

Before it is worth while trying to explain the philosophy, or describe the beauties of Anarchism, it will be necessary to dispel many of the vague ideas that are now entertained by most persons concerning the intent of Anarchism, and the personology of Anarchists.

There is no word in the English language that has been used so much and understood so little as Anarchism. It has been used as a scare-crow to frighten the ignorant and gullible. It has been—and is to-day—used as synonymous with disorder, bloodshed, violence and war. And yet all this is the antipode, the antithesis of what Anarchism really contemplates.

The funny papers have never wearycd of depicting Anarchists as fierce men with unkept, shaggy beards; with wild and fiery eyes, enormous appetites for beer, and with no idea or hope save that of making explosions and wreaking vengeance on imaginary enemies.

At present much of this has given way to a less vicious but none the more correct idea. During the late campaign Bryan was called an Anarchist, Altgeld was called an Anarchist, and the silver movement was dubbed anarchistic, and the adherents to that cause were dubbed Anarchists. So persistently was this carried on that many who worked for the success of Bryan accepted the title of Anarchist; and have since proclaimed themselves such.

All this occurred for the simple reason that it causes confusion in the minds of many, and prevents an investigation of the claims and proposals of the Anarchists.

In this paper I will try to point out the real meaning and true aims of Anarchism so clearly that the average person will not thereafter confound formulas for revolution with, nor yet the advocacy of the free coinage of silver with Anarchism.

In the fewest words that can be used to define it, Anarchism is defined thus: No authority. This conception carries a condition of society where membership is unknown and legal power is undefined. To many this means horror, for they are so accustomed to look upon the law as some mysterious power that regulates everything and prevents calamity, that they are compelled to pluck to themselves a period of equalities such as is now inconceivable. It is this superstitious reverence for the law; this worshipful attitude of mind for government, and a groundless belief in its necessity that makes it possible for the politician, the editor and the stump-speaker to stuff the public with their misrepresentations of the aims and objects of Anarchist.

What is the law? It is merely the enactment of the will of the majority, the sultan or a legislative body, and is constantly being changed, is never stable and operates more or less haphazardly in proportion as it is rigidly enforced. Of itself it is nothing. Take the jails and prisons, the armed and militarized forces behind it, and it is as powerless as though it did not exist. Thus we see that it is the brute force behind the law and not the law itself that gives it power. Is this elaborate and costly machinery of the law, called government, necessary? Are some men so wise that they can enact rules of action that are calculated to benefit all other persons, and all the others so foolishly wicked that they will not obey these rules unless compelled to by fear of the law, i.e., of the jails and other punishments of torture? In other words, are people so foolish as to constantly wish to hurt and injure themselves, and so find it necessary to choose, some who are wiser and set them to guard and care for the balance? Nonsense! If people are so wicked they do not know how to care for themselves, then they are too foolish to make rules for their own government by direct legislation, or to choose others to make rules of action for them, by the representative system.

Government is force, organized force. It is an elaborate system of repression and compulsion, answering the double purpose of creating and maintaining class distinctions and of despotic the producers of their products. The first proposition is too apparent to need pointing out; but look at the strict rank distinctions in every department of government from the chief mogul at the center of government down to the common soldier in the city police in our large municipalities. The second proposition may not be so apparent to many. But whether the producer sees how it is done or not, he is constantly deploled of his products. This is why producers stay poor while non-producers roll in luxury. This is accomplished through the operation of the law, by means of the power of the government. In the first place the government produces no wealth, and as it constantly expends wealth these expenditures must be met in some manner. Taxation is resorted to, to meet the expenses of government; and so duties are levied on imports. The amount paid out as import duty is added to the price of the goods imported, and so the producer gives none of his products to secure what he needs, than he otherwise would. All kinds of taxes must be paid in money, and our law makers have told us what we may and may not use money; and so the producer must obtain a given amount of that particular commodity—legal tender money—every so often, and finds that in order to do he must give up a much larger portion of his product than he otherwise would have to do. Then again the government has given absolute title to certain portion of the earth's crust to certain individuals. Some of this land they hold out of use, thus creating an abnormal demand for other parts, and so collect high rents. This is charged into the price of goods, services, etc., and is finally taken out of the products of the producer. I might multiply such examples indefinitely, all showing that the final analysis is that the spoliation of labor is traceable to government, and depends wholly upon it for existence.

A condition of Anarchism, then, of no government, would make it possible for every one to retain his or her products, or dispose of them as they might see fit.

Human beings are gregarious. They associate with each other as naturally and irresistibly as do a herd of sheep or a band of horses. Creating human association to be spontaneous it stands to reason that it carries with it a sense of certain requirements. People instinctively know that their own personal safety lies in maintaining the good will of their fellow-men, and the very desire of self preservation, the most fundamental of all human desires, prompts all men to a certain fairness toward, and consideration for others in their intercourse with their fellow-men. It has been illustrated again and again in every newly settled locality in the United States.

We have reached a point in production and distribution where we are absolutely interdependent. No man liveth unto himself nor can be. We all contribute something to the general stock of the world's goods, and partake of the result of the toil of many others. This increases the necessity of good fellowship with each other and reduces the desire for conquest by making the supply of all human wants and needs much easier and safer by peaceful production than by conquest.

With these facts in view the Anarchist boldly and unhesitatingly calls for the abolition of the government with all its costly implements of destruction, its armies of non-producing, parasitic office holders and its defense of self-created privilege. With no government titles to land, use and occupancy would become the sole and only claim to it, and unused lands would be free for anyone wishing to till the soil. No legal tender would be required, no taxes collected, and the interchange of products would be accomplished unhindered by tariffs, license laws, interest and rent paying. Profits would disappear and the toiler would then be enabled to enjoy the full benefit of his labor.

Mutual agreement would be the rule of action.
between all persons in their social and industrial intercourse, and when no one else was directly concerned, everyone would act as he or she saw fit—would seek happiness in such a manner as they chose. Thus, every individual would be thrown on his own resources, and the approval of others and of their own approval would be incentive enough to induce them to refrain from any unwarranted or uncalled for interference with the happiness or welfare of any other. In the same manner, it would be the concern of all, and instead of people putting off all interest in the public welfare, expecting the officers to look after it, each and every one would take a lively interest in everything of a public nature, and voluntarily, by spontaneous effort, full cooperation would provide all necessary public utilities and secure such safeguards as might become necessary to preserve the public health or prevent any public calamity. And all this without the expensive, cumbersome and uncertain machinery of government.

Production and distribution being free, the necessities, the comforts and the luxuries of life would be produced in such abundance that every one could have all they needed or desired. There being no non-productive parasites, government officials, lawyers, soldiers, real estate agents, brokers and bankers—no one producing anything for profit—the government would provide all necessary public utilities and secure such safeguards as might become necessary to preserve the public health or prevent any public calamity. And all this without the expensive, cumbersome and uncertain machinery of government.

Under such conditions, with no fear of want or privation to drive men and women into fierce struggles with each other, art would regain its ancient spirit and purpose. Poets would be praised and decorated by people who are constituted so as to become most perfect in its creation, and poetry would be rescued from the gross commercial spirit that now dominates everything, and would be pure and thrifty with its illuminating descriptions of natural beauty.

The mind of man to-day cannot conceive of the progress that would be made possible by the abolition of government.—Anarchy.

—Henry Adams in Freeman's Labor Journal.

The attitude of the Church.

The attitude of the church on the question of discontent and extravagant ostentation is very aptly put forward by Dr. William S. Rainfords of the General Theological Seminary, New York, when he says, in the New York Journal:

"I believe that the giving of lavish entertainments by the rich is at this time politically, socially and ethically unsafe. I do not wish to be understood as condemning any persons or warning against any particular entertainment. I speak generally, and because I believe that the giving of lavish entertainments is politically and morally unsafe. It is the political influence of New York has been decreased in the last fifteen years, and I think the time has come for something to be done that will arrest the decline."

A large part of the country's population is crying out against existing social conditions, and ostentations display here in the East would only widen the breach between the wealthy and the poor.

Never were the lines between the two classes—those who have wealth and those who envy them—more clearly defined. The rich and the poor are as far apart as are the moon and the sun. Never was a public sentiment against extravagance more intense. A large portion of our people is discontented, and does not hesitate to express its feelings.

Extravagant entertainments do attention to and accentuate existing differences and to the widening chasm between the rich and poor.

With want on every side, contributions to charitable societies decreasing, and applications for aid increasing, it is most unwise now to offer texts to social demagogues and political extremists by ostentations display.

I believe in social entertainments; but there should be a reasonable limit to display and a reasonable time chosen for it. Money is not the root of evil; the root of money is money, and the craving for more against the obvious poor man as well as against the selfish rich man. To gratuitously increase discontent by accentuating the poverty of the poor as well as this is an action greatly to be deplored.

Not one word of condemnation for those who revel in the life of the toiling wealth producing poor, nor for the methods employed to transfer wealth to the few at the expense of the many. Wealth is an asset of the nation.

But advice to be careful not to expose those to view lest the robbed ones see and demand a cessation of the robbery. Such is the attitude of the Church of God toward "His children." And then Christians become the descendents of religion, and the lack of attendance of the people at church. All that grieves me in this matter is that there are yet those who believe that the Church is a friend of the poor.

In commenting on this protest the editor of the Journal says:

"Nowhere in Mr. Rainfords' protest does there appear any sign of the fault of the existing social system under which the widest extremes of wealth and poverty are encouraged as in any degree faulty. On the contrary, all he fears is that such an extravagant display of the wealth of the nation is bad to the economy of that system. Over six million people expressed their disapproval at the polls, he says, and therefore we ought to strive to correct its operations just at present. "It is an inopportune time for such a display of wealth and fashion." "Such a lavish display will serve to widen the chasm between the classes." "The church is on every side, with discontent riding among the lower orders of society, it would seem unwise to offer texts for demagogues and political extremists."

In these three quotations lies the sum and substance of Dr. Rainfords' arrangement of the proposed bill.

The Journal applauds Dr. Rainfords' protest, but questions the propriety of the ground upon which he bases it. He has narrowly missed taking a great, an historic position, but the line, though narrow, is complete. The bitter denunciation and the unexampled luxury of the age are the results of common causes. Whatever calls attention to both at once, vividly, em- phatically, will draw attention to the causes and perhaps aid in the discovery of a remedy. In this way the coming ball may prove of public service, and yet, if Dr. Rainfords' protest is right, he opposes the festivity lest it perform that very service. He does not deplore the social conditions which make it immoral, but fears lest it may call attention to those conditions and give demagogues—i.e., those who hold the future better things in store than the present—a text.

On with the dance! Let joy be unbounded—that is, except to its proper sphere in our best society.

The Journal editor sees that "something is wrong," but speaks of discovering a remedy, thus admitting that he does not know any. Let him read Anarchist literature and learn.

H. A.

Why We Wear Clothes.

The Firebrand has contained several discussions of the reasons why it is considered necessary, for modern society's sake, to wear clothes in public. Having given this subject some special study, I think I can contribute some valuable facts. The recent article entitled "The Cause of This World's Wastefulness" because the author had not studied the customs of savage tribes in this respect. The facts are certainly as follows: Almost every savage tribe in the second world we find it considered disgraceful for the sexes to see each other without more or less clothing. The amount of clothing varies all the way from none in the cold climate, veiled face and all, to the narrowest band or scantiest apron that can serve as a covering; quit it is always required that the organs of sex be covered—that is, of course, in those tribes which require any covering at all. For a tribe to wear anything and leave these parts unclothed is the rarest of exceptions. The only exceptions rule the case to both sexes alike, in a few only to the women, in a few in number, and in very few to the men. In many countries it is disgraceful to expose the parts, and even in the presence of one's own relatives. The extreme case is the Amur woman, who must not undress even when she is alone except in the dark, and the extreme case of the men of her nation need not wear any clothes at all.

In many countries it is considered quite as necessary to be covered behind as in front. In most, I think it is even.

The intensity of feeling on the subject varies greatly, and has no relation to the amount of clothing used. In some countries where clothing is used, and an attempt is made to cover the members of the body, nakedness is considered very disgraceful indeed, and this is as emphatically true where only a narrow bandage is worn as when the whole body is clothed. In many countries there is a difference, and there is a difference in the treatment of curiosities to buy a respectable woman's clothing off her person as to make any other bargain. In certain West African tribes certain amount of cloth must be worn by women, but if a woman is so fat her aprons of the regulation size (one on each side) do not quite meet, but leave the middle of her person exposed. "Hooded" before and behind, she is nevertheless respectfully dressed.

Some tribes which now wear no clothing have customs which seem to show this. There is no observable general difference as to sexual morality between the tribes which use clothing and the tribes which do not. There is as much clothing and as much nudity in the same tribe. There is no difference, indeed, in the amount of clothing and nudity which are sometimes generally accompanies any considerable degree of civilization. As to refinement of feeling there is no difference except what results from the difference of civilization.

In many countries it is customary to punish some form of immorality in a woman by publicly exposing her to the view of the public. Thus, in some Christian churches in Europe in the middle ages. It was also a usage of the ancient Hebrews, recognized as such in some of our laws. Some tribes expose the naked body of a fallen enemy as a disgrace.

To the theory or sentiment on which the idea of the necessity of clothing is based, there are two leading ones. Among primitive peoples (including ancient nations, except possibly the Romans, and modern savages) the theory is that this is a matter of personal dignity and that nakedness is considered an act of the person seen naked, but is no injury to others, nor public morality, except so far as public morality may be injured by any one of the persons who witness the act.

The theory of modern civilization is the opposite. According to this theory, everybody has an equal right to see any other person in maintaining this right the law is an act of the person seen naked, but is no injury to others, nor public morality, except so far as public morality may be injured by any one of the persons who witness the act.

The study of the law is very important in the maintenance of the general dignity of thought. But the sight of the sexual parts of the opposite sex tends to excite unchaste thoughts, and therefore is an injury to the spectator personally and to the public at large.

When the clothed and the unclothed meet and mingle together for some time, the results vary. In general, the clothed man, if he holds the positive theory about the nature of the evil of nakedness, retains his feelings against it; but if he holds the modern theory that nakedness is not an injury to the person seen naked, but is no injury to others, nor public morality, he loses his feelings against the unclothed man, but his senti-ments and the public has an interest in the maintenance of general dignity of thought. But the sight of the sexual parts of the opposite sex tends to excite unchaste thoughts, and therefore is an injury to the spectator personally and to the public at large.

Among clothed races we frequently find a spontaneous feeling of revulsion against the presence of clothing, sometimes sweeping away whole tribes. Among those appearing as the eccentric idea of an individual here.
and there. I do not know where to find a case of even an individual in unadorned cloth: the idea that clothing was needful, without being needful for the individual. But the converse is very true: all together unadorned cloth, the fact that they usually have clothed neighbors, and especially the fact that we never know anything about them till they have been clothed with colored garments, that is, with these—all go to make it impossible to draw any argument from what we don't see them doing.

It is true that no other clothing may exist, however, under the influence of their religion, but without discoverable foreign influence, develop for themselves the demand for a more complete concealment of the body. In the United States, under present conditions, the sight of the unclothed or half-clothed figure does not necessarily excite unadorned thoughts. I do not mean that it excites such thoughts in all men, or that some men would not have plenty in any case, but I mean that in men who are ready to have such thoughts such a spectacle is a cause tending to bring them up. Neither do I mean to assume that those thoughts help to produce all those thoughts that anybody considers bad. I understand, however, that this effect wears off very promptly when one goes to a community where the unclothed figure exists, and do not know that this effect is produced by the sight of the sexual parts more than by the sight of the rest of the body.

American public opinion, among those who are reasonably familiar with the circumstances, does not in general condemn the exposure of the person, in private, or for important purposes. It cannot possibly be served otherwise. Instances, artists' models and consulting a doctor. Where a toil of the body, and does not condemn such things, it is usually traceable to the bias of preconceptions. But the general opinion would condemn such exposure in the presence of the other sex for any purpose except sexual, and that is important purposes. I do not, without it, instance, learning to swim. Japanese opinion is contrary; it allows public exposure of the person for purposes of comfort or convenience, but strongly condemns any such where practical convenience is not the motive,—where there is nothing to do but to be seen. So a man may sit and read on his front porch in summer wearing nothing but his spectacles or coolness; and a woman basking in her house may run out on the city street, without stopping, to look at a horse passing by. They are at our nude art and undressed theatrical exhibitions. It strikes me that it is not improper for any man to go about the street with his body unclothed, but it is not improper for any man, but it is not improper for any man, to show his body unclothed, the fact that its sole purpose is to be seen makes it all right in Mrs. Grundy's eyes. Bear in mind that the Japanese are a highly spiritualized and provincial white people, their care to preserve the person from insult or ridicule. The Japanese government has passed laws to enforce conformity to the white men's standard of clothing, but finds the customs of the people hard to change. These are the notable facts, presented as impartially as I know how, as fully as I can in a small space. My conclusions are as follows: The desire to conceal the person is not an instinct. It is a desire, and it arises from the feeling of this desire is no evidence of refinement or purity; on the contrary, it originated in a morbid indecency of mind, and is itself material to the moral education. Its association with civilization is to be explained not by supposing that civilization tends to weaken this desire, but that it makes us better able to understand the desire. The reason why a man in all respects bear the restrictions of an artificial way of living better than savages.

The concealment of the sexual organs does not help to make the doctrine of thought action. Man is made to have a certain legitimate amount of sexual appetite, and he will have about as much in each instance to the extent that he is accustomed to it. Whether he sees their whole body or any part of it, or only a shapeless veiled figure. Unproper sexual actions or obscene gestures can increase the habitual excitement to an unwholesome extent, but the mere habit of regularly seeing women as nature made them cannot. This is equally true of both sexes. The fact that so-called indecent exposure does among men only, with the same thought is due only to its being unusual, and to its being associated in our minds with bad scenes. Then the custom of wearing clothing, from the same local cause, on many scenes in which indecent thoughts are accidentally or purposely excited, increases the amount of morbid sexual excitement in all men, without reference to malignant morals. Modern society feels the primitive sentiment on this subject to be indefensible, a mere unreasoning savage taboo. So, feeling bound to defend its established usage, it acts on the assumption that the real ground on which that usage was established, at the same time appealing in support of the usage to a supposed "natural" fact: "If clothing does not exist, can be nothing else but the primitive theory. This is in itself a reason for suspecting that the whole thing is untruth. The idea that the Bible commands the use of clothing is an amusing and instructive instance of the universal habit of supposing that the Bible supports whatever is considered orthodox. The Bible, as a primitive document, gives altogether the primitive view, according to which clothing is not a matter of morality at all, but of decorum. And even its necessity for decorum is not expressly stated in the Bible, but is merely referred to as a thing established in public opinion, just as is also the case with the idea that it is not proper for a man to have his beard shaved off (Old Testament) or that it is disgraceful for a woman to have her hair cut (St. Paul). In fact, Paul lays down the latter doctrine, and the necessity of veils for women is, from that, much more positively than any Bible writer lays down the doctrine of clothing. Beyond question Paul believed that we should not go about the streets naked, and as he nowhere states that he will ever permit others to do it, he states that women should wear veils; so that a woman would obey the Bible's precepts regarding this matter, she would have to go out on the street with her face veiled and the rest of her body bare than by appearing with her face unveiled and the rest of her body clothed. And even Paul, who is the greatest stickler for decorum, has said that he had not specified how to be clothed in this matter, the Bible contains no more rules about the covering of the body than it contains about the covering of the head. The notices of clothing is hardly to be explained on the latter theory.

If we reject the current doctrine that the demand for clothing is born in man as an instinct, it is our business to offer, if possible, some hypothesis to account for the existence of so very general a custom. I think I can do so. I believe, in the first place, that the idea of decency clothing is first among those who were already wearing clothes for protection against the weather. They wore clothes the weather, and the whole body of clothing, it seems awkward to leave them all off. There were two main reasons for this. In the first place, man as a maker and user of tools learns to fear that he is not quite himself unless he is provided with labor-producers in which his power lies. But, to one who is accustomed to clothing, the idea of nakedness is an especially vivid one, even the completeness of man without his artificial helps. Thus come people to feel embarrassed at being found naked for the same reason that the Sulu feels embarrassed when he has no weapon. This feeling might get a special application to the male organ of sex from the fact that in naked man this is the most conspicuously unprotected and exposed of all the important parts of the body. In the second place, since clothing is removed for sexual intercourse, those who had the habit of wearing it would see immediate associations with the idea of nakedness that one who appeared naked would seem to be inviting lovers; and one would not wish to be presented to the public as prominently inviting lovers. I think I see traces of minor influence supporting these, but that these must have been the main ones. The reasons for concealing the sexual organs all apply equally well to man; but when the matter once became associated with the thought of chastity, the fact that women are generally expected to be more chaste than men is enough cause for the application of the law to women. The explanation of the last mentioned fact is familiar, but it belongs to the general discussion of emotion. The law itself was once established on other causes would combine to make it harder for women, when she found her clothes un-comfortable, to emancipate herself from them, as men did on social changes.

The view of the author "The Cause of Their Disgrace," that the demand for clothing results from the opposition of Semitic monotheism to phallic worship, has not a leg to stand on. It is contrary to all the facts. A much likelier guess would be that it is a survival of phallic worship itself, the sacred thing being hidden off of reverence, just as the images of gods and goddesses in many remote tribes are supposed to support such a theory, but at least it would harmonize with the fact that the wearing of clothing injures the health in many ways; that even when they must be worn for warmth they do a great deal of harm to make up for their usefulness, and that the custom of wearing clothing is not only for warmth but for reasons injurious to the health of the people as universal filthiness would be.

"Instructing appendices." According to law-books, treating of what constitutes indecent exposure, it is not legally punishable for a man or woman to "run in the public street naked to the waist." This statement is based on court decision a century and a half old, and binding in both England and the United States; the question has never been carried to a high court since. But I doubt whether one would get much comfort out of this law if he tried to act on its license, unless he was ready to carry the case through on appeal to a court of last resort—and not then in same states.

—Stephen T. Tyler.

Words of Wisdom

Labor includes love, which is therefore a secondary virtue, but love does not include the love of a self-centered man, work is not love for others, but love for the self. Work, then, is love for oneself. Love for others is not thus found in work; work is the love of self in love. —Bosch.

We are accustomed to see men derive what they do from motives that are very weak and not fully developed, and we are accustomed to see men sacrifice, because it lies beyond their sympathies. —Goethe.

All voting is a sort of gaming, like checkers or backgammon, with a slight moral tinge to it; a playing with right and wrong—with moral questions—and betting on the result, for nothing is at stake, but you will not leave the right to the mercy of chance nor would you prevail through the power of the majority. —Thoreau.

I make little account of victory—nothing so stupid as to vanquish; the real glory is to convince. —Victor Hugo.

Oliver Wendell Holmes compares the玳ing of a w a tstone to trimming of a tree. After describing all the blind and wriggling creatures which live beneath the stone, he says: "But no sooner is the stone turned and the wholesome light of day let upon this compressed and crowded community of creeping things, then all of them which enjoy the luxury of legs—and some of them have a good many—run about wildly, bustling themselves about in their way, and end in a general stampede for underground retreat from the exploitations poisoned by sunshine. You never ever think you can turn over any old false-bottoms without a terrible squirming and scattering of the horrid little population that dwell under it.

Immigration and Race

In the Jan. 17 issue of The Firesbrand appears a statement, attributed to the royal attorney of Spain, to the effect that Spanish officials in dealing with Anarchists "have to close their eyes to reason." This is a direct attack on anything that seems to originate with the people, and is a direct denial that any such thing exists. It implies that the people with awe which develops into superiority and reverence, particularly for antiquity in any form. Precisely applicable in this case is Buckle's famous definition: "Not only in literature, but also in religion and art, this tendency is supreme. To subjugate the understanding, and exalt the imagination, is the ultimate principle."

Particular point in this case is given by the close connection in Spain between Church and State. Earthquakes and volcanic eruptions are more frequent and more destructive under the Spanish and Portuguese monarchies, than in any other of the great countries; and it is precisely there that superstition is most rife, and the church the most powerful.

—F. A. Coburn.
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Freeman's Call.

"What are you going to do?" in the tone which takes it for granted that you are questioned, but everybody, is as a matter of course going to do something. As yet, indeed, there was in the public mind nothing definite except a sense of necessity for some assertion, with some hope of consequent consciousness that the general condition of affairs was to be altered. As to precisely what was to be done, or what could be done, most people had not the time to consider so intently that they should be prepared to do anything, however serious, and inform each other of their determination to be in readiness for events, and to join in when somebody should happen to commence action in any way that appeared feasible for demonstrating to the Government and the police that they were no longer the weak slaves they had been of old.

In some quarters, however, the case was being considered in more particular fashion, and plots, of various magnitudes and degrees of ambitions, were being discussed and arranged. What one gatherers from published memoirs of different persons who have related their reminiscences of this period, there must have been at least three separate projects of laying the prison in New York as the starting point for a journey back with the prisoners, after the day's proceedings at the Water Police Court, to Darlington (Sail). It was proposed by some in the Social Reform Club and elsewhere to convene public meetings and take such other steps as might be necessary for the purpose of declaring at the least use of lands, buildings, machinery and materials, the incidents of slavery—leaving to the proprietors, for the present, an income in products and services, to be provided by the community collectively; if the Government refused to give this declaration the sanction of law, other steps would have to be taken. To the question, "What in what way should things be conducted afterwards?" the replies were not much to one effect. Lilly, Socialist agitator; Hopper, another; Gulraud, Socialist M. P., (Member of Parliament) leaders of their parties in the Social Reform Club, were for State assumption of everything; the general Labor Party outside would leave industrial matters to the people individually, reserving legislation for special problems that might arise. And State administration of the main roads, lead into post and telegraph services, etc.; a third party would have everything, outside State works, organized machinery; labor was not to be left to see what it could do. The Extreme Right, who refused to sanction any compromise with the "errors of Evolution"—stood aloof from these schemes; except that those of the Socialist Assembly had been formally formed there for the release of the prisoners.

Morning again arrived, and the unrest of the city was more manifest than ever. Hamilton, a close confidant of South's, went to the Water Police Court, but could hardly get in on account of the crowd; another confidant, Greenhill (who was one of the conspirators) arriving later, was unable to reach the building on account of the prisoners being placed [in] Hyde Park, opposite Elizabeth and Market Streets, anxiously awaiting news from the Court. It was feared that on account of the crowd, the case might be called early and removed, in which case the prisoners might be smuggled back to thegoal at once; Wilson and Collier, the originators of the conspiracy, had hurled off with a great noise "in the state moments," the former toward the court, the latter to the Hyde Park waiting place as the most central position to afford communication and the various political consequences. When Raynor, one of the conspirators Wilson, was to come back at once, with the first news that could be gotten on the general appearance of affairs, and whatever incident of public consequence might happen, the sentiments of impatience, Greenhill, who was with Collier's party, went ahead to reconnoiter. He had gone far before he met Raynor running up with the information that troops had been placed against the Court; probably the prisoners would be sent back to the goal. Wilson thought the two had scarcely reached the Park again before the crash of a volley was heard. The crowd rushed the "goal," said Collier "and the crowd tried to get them free. I wish we knew which way the fight is going; we don't know whether to go down there, or whether we shall be absolutely secured and not shot. There was no crowd there," said Raynor, "except what might be inside the Court.

"Yes, by God! if there are," said Greenhill slyly. "Well," said Collier, "We had better go down cautiously. It's no use to wait as long as is possible. Now, whatever it is, it's something not on the programme, and we don't know what we're doing."

They advanced together to the corner of King Street, where they encountered a number of terrified people, who told them that the audience had been driven out of the Court by soldiers, and shot down by others as they reached the street. Directly afterwards, Wilson came up white with excitation.

"What are you doing down this way?" he cried hoarsely. "Come along out of the way; we must do something"

"I don't know how it commenced," he informed them. "The case, I found, had not been reached, directly I came away and directed a crowd to be formed."

What had actually taken place was this. Anticipating a public demonstration outside the Police court, the Government hastened to secrete troops in the Court building, and in the tram yard a little higher up the street, with instructions to reveal themselves and commence firing should there be the slightest tumult in the Court, or should any attempt be made to hold a meeting. The crowd, however, seeing the impossibility of gaining access to the tram yard, immediately proceeded to pass sentence, when something struck him on the face—a crust of bread which had been in the prisoner's pocket. The magistrate, in a fury, sentenced the prisoner to a flogging. Brown, determined to have some satisfaction for his skin, drew off his boot and hurled it at the magistrate's head. This on one occasion, a prisoner, who defended himself with his other boot, using it as a club. The audience rose to their feet, and the magistrate hastily ordered the Court to be cleared. At the same time, a charge of the troops within the building, attracted by the noise, appeared at the Beach door, but was met by one of the officials, who explained that the only disturbance was that made by a disorderly prisoner. The people, however, assumed that they were to be shot down for what had happened—that being strictly connected with the established order of things—and fled panic-stricken into the street.

The troops there had just been drawn up in a diagonal line across the road in front of the Court house, to fire on the crowd that was assembling at the building and the part of the street which was below. The officer in charge, hearing a noise in the building, and seeing several people running toward him, had ordered them to come out or be shot. As they had commenced to riot and were flying from the street with the troops. He gave the order to fire, and a volley rang out. Several of those who were near the building fell. The soldiers, inside, at the sound of the firing, came into the street and cut off the retreat of so many of the people as might have succeeded in crossing the street. The building was then cast aside, and the crowd surged back into the Court, and through to the cells in less time than it took the troops who had fired to reach the building across the street below. The crowd surged back into the Court, and through to the cells in less time than it took the troops who had fired to reach the building across the street below.
The Firebrand.

It seems timeous to go so much into detail but it seems more necessary to do so all the while. Not only voluntary concessions—Anarchist Concessions—Anarchist Concessions in short—is so grossly misrepresented by the press, the clergy and by State Socialists that the tinsome work must be done.

And so, I would grant Comrade Byington not only the private ownership he asks, but much more—enough, certainly, to keep him as poor, cold, hungry, and generally in a condition that might be in any free community of whatever school of thought he might choose to join, or, outside one and all.

Not only equal freemen; not only the death of Mepos is needed; we are not only going to find our own free community in a "world new built." A large measure of Altruism would, it seems to me, have to enter into our daily lives; in other words, a wise selfishness is needed to win the New Day.

The Firebrand is doing good work in the way of education and all its readers (all who can do so) should see it, in order to get to the top of the paper. We may be traveling different roads and working differently by different methods, but I am sure we all desire self-independence and plenty of oil in the lamp—feeling ourselves of every race and clime. Today, it seems only possible to work by propaganda; to tomorrow a sufficiently large minority may win the beginning of the end by means of passive resistance, and the better and more the worth the winning will be all results.

CLINTON LEVERIDGE

The Root of all Evil.

Everyone who is an earnest investigator of our present social system will, or has come to the conclusion that it is rotten to the core. Both Church and State are savage institutions. The Church, because it keeps the toiling class in ignorant fear, submission, or mental slavery. The State, because it protects the privileged class (to which all the government officials, all the government belong). The oppressor in the wild scramble for folk, "Whiff intelligence is light—Ignorance is darkness."

The more man advances in civilization the more irreligious he becomes.

All savages are worshipers; civilized people do not imitate savages. Even the step by step, dancing, ballad-singing, box-ball-dancing, and the most materialistic of the social democrats, are inclined to imitate savages.

As long as we are under the merciless control of leaders we shall be slaves: for each leader has one end, to satisfy the interest of his friend. Every man or woman has his or her likes and dislikes. When one has the power to rule he or she will please his or her friends, but will oppose and hate the enemy; and it is very easy to become an enemy of those rulers. You have but to disobey them, to quarrel with them, speak the naked truth, claim your freedom, or consider them useless parasites.

But I am inclined to believe that all human beings are selfish, which is our root of all evil under authority and compulsion, but when we, the oppressed, will finally have gained absolute freedom—Anarchist freedom it will prove to be the root of harmony and happiness.

FARR.

Should we Marry?

In The Hospersian for April, Lady Cook of London, has an article on "Should the Poor Marry?" She goes on to show what qualities men and women should possess before marryng consummating marriage, in order to be happy, and that the poor ought to marry, in the following language:

"Should poor people marry? As well ask should the course of labor stand still? Should the grass grow in our streets, and the sea dry up? Should the land be unified, and the sea unshelled? Should the shuttle cease, and the spool be silent? In a word, should the toiling toil, and the mind die, dissolution and death away of us all? For all these would happen were the sons and daughters of labor to cease breeding the workers of our industrial lives. Let no one despise marriage, but let us examine it. It is the foundation of all dignity, all goodness, and all true happiness.

It is only idleness that is consummative. And if, in the great battles with and against the forces of nature, thousands, enslaved by fire, or by folly, fall out of the ranks as paupers, the workers must not on that account despair."

This is the philosophy of the parasitic class in good language, and conceivably. If the poor cease to breed slaves, no one will administrate to our wants. Of course the poor must continue to bring children into this world to toil, to produce, to contribute to the luxury of the rich, and if in the struggle they become feeble, fall out of the ranks as paupers or die of starvation in the streets. An abundance of those, who can still work must not complain or despise their lot, but marry and bring some more children into the world to take their place at the bottom of society, to produce wealth, to drop out as paupers and starve in the sight of an abundance which they have helped to create.

Then, how do you like such philosophy? How long will you, by indifference, by the ballot and military force, continue to uphold such conditions? Will you learn that your poverty is due to your own personal wants and not to community as a whole. Will you learn and do the things that will rid you.

H. A.

The Anarchist Barcelona.

The horrors of the Barcelona trial surpass every-thing in the history of human cruelty. It was one of the most brutal acts of the past year. It was almost all other—persecutions since the days of the Holy Inquisition. About 300 Anarchists were arrested, and most of whom will be transported to African islands without trial. Eighteen were executed during last month, and the Government prosecutor demanded the death sentence for not less than twenty-eight of the others.

From a Spanish daily paper we gather that the method resorted to by the prosecution is to make the judges of the members of the club, the "Centro de Carretas," responsible for what could evidently only have been arranged (if so) by a very small number of persons with the consent or not of the leaders of the club, the leaders of this society as well—namely, for the bomb explosion in the Canovas Sevres street, when the trial of the Anarchist assassins took place. The whole accusation is based on the evidence of three men—the chief accused—Thomas Ancier, Antonio Nogues, and Luis Mas; and how this "evidence" was obtained is clear to those who have followed the analogous procedure resorted to in 1894, when after the manifestly individual acts of P. Pallis and Salvador Floro some of their more usual way, in a similar way, were taken and afterwards executed, after having been tortured in the most incredible way (see El Proceso de un gran criminal, summarized in an American newspaper in the summer of 1895). Similar witnesses are coming forward now; so says a letter to Rochefort (published in Intransigent Paris) saying the fortress of Marseilles—where all this takes place—says they were flogged, their nails torn off, their genital parts compressed until the agonies of suffering led these men to sign what the inquiring judge wanted them to say. Among the other methods used are the feeding on salt fish without any water and the privation of sleep, the prisoners being forced for days and nights to walk along their cells; if they drop to sleep they are beaten until they rise again, and after reaching in that way the highest point of physical exhaustion they are ordered to go and perform some task, yet some are said to have resisted these tortures—Jose Moles, F. Franer, J. B. Oliver, and others; many more mutilating declarations have been taken.

There is yet another innovation; this time not even the sentences were made public after the trial finished; only a week afterwards we hear that eight have been sentenced to death; forty to twenty years in penal servitude! One thousand and sixteen years of penal servitude, every day of which means in a hell a day. It is impossible to disbelieve even these accounts I refer to the Parii Gazette of Dec. 19, where an extract from Prince Bismark's (German paper) is reproduced the paper which, of course, has been a propaganda against the Revolution of 1848. The enemy of Socialists and Anarchists, and often recommends measures against which they do not fall very short of torture. It is a communication from Mann, in the Philippine Islands, where, like in Cuba, the inhab-
intimes have risen against Spanish rule, which benefits the landed aristocrats whose concerns lie with the welfare of their hereditary estates. Spain has a long and distant history, with a number of internal conflicts in the early nineteenth century, which led to a period of civil war. The Spanish have a great deal of pride in their country and its history, and are deeply affected by any loss of national identity or territory. The French were among the first to break this cycle of conflict, and in recent years Spain has moved towards a more democratic and stable system of government. The Spanish are a proud and enthusiastic people, and are deeply committed to their country's future. Their strength is in their culture, language, and history, and they are determined to preserve these values for future generations.

And what do we hear from Reuter's telegrams—not from New York, which might seem to be coloured in favor of Cuba, but from elsewhere?—"Manila, December 11th. (see the Daily Chronicle of Dec. 11th): After a skirmish (if not a treacherous ambush), as has since been manifested, the Spanish forces suffered severely, the Jasayakpon, 90 prisoners taken in a black hole, it goes on to say: "The insurgents of torture from the time of the prisoner's capture are still unren. We know that it was reasonable to murder the workmen for assenting to their own rights, and to employ the army for upholding those men who were determined to increase the enmity between labor and capital. Was you so blinded that you could not see the great principles involved in this dispute? Was it necessary for you to complete the work of destruction? Have you any further reason for wishing to become a soldier than simply out of deference to the law?" For the proprietor to say this, and especially because I detest committing murder in obedience to orders. I deliberately refuse to be enrolled as a soldier of the imperial army. If you must therefore trouble to send me uniform or arms, as I am resolved that under no circumstances will I submit to military service. If you 2. J. Van der Weer.

This shows the healthy growth of sentiment, and when a considerable number of men, of all nations act as wisely, the dawn of the day of freedom will be at hand.

H.A.

Note and Comment.

Machines are being placed in Western mines. Each one will do the work of eight men. The machines are a success, and the miners are taking a holiday.

Harrison capitalists imported sixty Chinese coolies to take the places of the striking dockers. When the Chinese found out what they were hired for they quit and joined the strikers.

It now turns out that the Boston street railway strike was started by the orders of the company in order to break the brokerage commission, which was becoming too powerful. The scheme of the bosses worked successfully.

A machine, invented at St. Paul, is creating consterna- tion in the ranks of the coolies. It is a hoop-driving apparatus, a pronounced success. It has a double action. It divides the material and the kids skillful mechanism into the streets, only a few common laborers are being necessary to watch the machine.

MACHINES FORSMASHING.

According to the associated press the strikers of the Anina Mines in Austria, were attacked by gun- carriages and eight of the strikers were shot down. Among the dead are some women who had taken part in the fight. Everywhere the same phenomena: when the provocers ask for bread, the government gives them bullets. When the provokers are enslaved soldiers, called soldiers, learn to turn their guns the other way, instead of shooting down their fellow workers.

The "Buffalo Arbeiter Zeitung" finds fault with the Firebrand for having long and tedious articles on the question: "What will be done with criminals under freedom?" While we have in our country a policy which will settle the question itself in a condition of freedom.

The answer is: the worthy editor seems to forget that those articles were not intended for Anarchists, but for those who have only contempt for theories, and who have a right to question mere assumptions. Or does the editor think that men ought to accept our theories without any question or argument?

A COMMENDABLE LETTER:

"I have just glanced through the book 'The Old and the New Idea.' I should be glad to review it in the Firebrand, but can't say when I can do it. Ruedebusch is not out of the woods yet, I think. He believes in an inviolable contract for the purpose of raising a family. To my mind that is just as silly as a contract to love my wife. I am opposed to any contract. That is the cornerstone of so-called Individualism. If a man makes a contract and conditions or one developed that makes the terms of the contract, his wife, for instance, a slave must continue to be, as for Byington says, that is a part of his works! An inviolable contract is slavery. Ruedebusch also says that by avoiding the law is pure rubbish, too. His challenge to Free-thinkers is fine, as well as many others of his ideas." We would much pleased if the council would review the book more thoroughly.

United we stand, divided we fall," is a good motto for Trades Unions. But the trades unionists deny that the "we" includes the Negro, as well as the brother unknown. Fees and dues of the Union, however, exclude many, and instead of cultivating their friendship and good will, the un- numbed is in the habit of treating the poor fellow as a cluter or a brick bat for the poor fellow who could not pay the fees of the Union. Let all workers learn that they are brothers, that their cause is one: that the success or failure of the union depends on the security of the rank.

A FRIEND OF mine met me on the street the other day and said: "I have read 'The Old and the New Idea,' although the author pitches into my pet idea (continuism). But if he is right about intercoursing being beneficial to health, then it should be for all, and not just for the few. She doubted if people reached a stage of development where abstinence except for procreation would be universal, it would result in the physical wreckage he deprecates. I pointed out that by attained expression, self-torture, it would so result, but it attained by evolution in freedom it would not. She saw the point, and said that the uncompromising demand for freedom was one of the chief charms about the book. That she was delighted with the book was apparent.

COMRADE LUCY PARSONS writes: "The Firebrand-has had a good deal from the men in favor of variety, and I would like to see something, from the women readers in favor of variety showing it is going to reloaded to the happiness of women."

Now we would like some of our readers—our sister who are free—to state their opinions on the question. You need not answer for your own sex, you desire. From personal correspondence I know that some of our readers have enjoyed variety and can tell where it is beneficial. I am an advocate of freedom in freedom, and I cannot object; if it leads others in voluntary monogamy I am contented. Let come what will, but give us freedom.

A CORRESPONDENT writes: "You little damn, as I see it, that the plutocratic press and Church and State are making Anarchists a thousandfold faster than The Firebrand, and all the Anarchist papers and orators in the world, and it seems you would not accept that Anarchism because it is not hard enough for people. Unless you cannot object; it if leads others in voluntary monogamy I am contented. Let come what will, but give us freedom.

Different people in the Firebrand and Church and State, may disgust honest people and drive men to desperation. They never throw the faintest ray of light upon the all important question of how human association can be made more harmonious and desirable. On the other hand they constantly assure all light on that question, and turn attention to questions of no importance, and instil ideas of authority and violence into the minds of the people. It is all that can be done to maintain the present order. No! We cannot accept as Anarchist such "anarchy" as is produced by the plutocratic press and Church and State, for that is based on the theory of domination. But such anarchies are utterly ridiculous, illegal, and unwarranted. In the same leier he claims to be more of an Anarchist than The Firebranders, but
in a letter to the Socialist, a stateless paper published in Boston, he claimed to have been forty years a Socialist, and said that a certain portion of his days as "the only remedy for human poverty and oppression." That shows his clearness on these subjects.

A COMRADE IN BOSTON writes:

I want some extras of every last Firebrand, dated Jan. 24th, and envelopes for same stamps. Should it be necessary, I will post them, like the stamps just the same. I am glad to see some comrade-irresistible applied to the sickish, sentimental plat-ter, in the form of the "selective conscientious objection" which Eugene, George, Morden, Walt, et al., have been trying to get on to cover up the Putnam-Colliers tragedy. To my mind it would have been far better to have been called a comrade, at all events, it was not used so much hysterical effort to try to show that "they were both dressed, etc., etc.

Heavy snow storm to-day. 20 men came at the dinner hour alone to get the job of cleaning off the walk!! As it was snowing fast, I could not employ any of them.

A FRIEND OF THE Firebrand writes among other things:

"Comrade Addis" article about the Putnam-Colliers affair was the only noble and courageous utterance about the affair which appeared in print so far as I know. I would have liked to see Scourby's article of course was simply disgusting in its cowardly creeping before the moral-ity of the priests, even "Ludovici" was extremely careful to remain on "neutral ground" and "Orer Ames" (I have not read "Orer Ames" ad nauseam) with no doubt shocked me with the inexorable action of printing the coarse and vulgar allusion to the tragedy by a comrade (who wishes me of a certain orthodox wasserman of this place) without any con-leying comments of the editor who claims to have stood for them, for the common victims "dear friends" this tragedy would have stood for fine and proper and noble utterance, for thoroughly blessing the priests and their jocks and scum "nec-olatry" which actually demands the proof that there was nothing but cold indifference between the two—a certificate of mutual possession. But no, they prefer to offer a physician's "certificate of purity," to笺无是的 sneers: "Although we are Firebringers, we are just as moral as you are!" (or in other words: "Although we ridicule your lechers, yet we humbly bow down that our projects of Free Love trouble the world find out that those two were very far from hating each other and that it is quite probable that the last moments of the esteemed "Firebrand" comrade—blunt — were the entry of his lover—"and they leave it to the far-off "Fire- brand" which, I believe no reason to feel particu-larly friendly towards the deceased, to print the only words about the affair which are worthy of a Firebringer!!"

Revolution.

One day a savage's fingers ache, as he sat down to rest, after digging for roots. He noticed a stone which was sharp at one end, with a hole in the other: he looked at the stone a long time, then he got up, and broke a stick and fitted it in the stone, then he began to dig with the stone and root; he found this method much easier and more expeditious than using his fingers.

He had discovered a labor-saving device. He got through with his root digging much sooner than former-ly, and had time to think, thus ran his thoughts:

"Suppose sometime in the dim, far-off future, men will become intelligent enough to invent tools, whereby they can tear up the bough of mother earth with them and be able to eke his broad cast-ade.

What a magnificent harvest he will reap and then, too, the knowledge and wisdom of the savage will be transmitted to his children and grandchildren and to all future generations."

The Firebrand
THE FIREBRAND

That is not what they want, they want to be put up as a higher class of men than a worker. They (the capitalists or so-called upper-teeners) will struggle to keep the people ignorant, and we (the propagandists) will struggle to educate the people, and the results are yet to come.

Boys and girls let us help along the cause for which our parents are working, to throw off the crown of slavery. Our contention is to win the four-foot football, trying to break our arms and legs and then giving our parents trouble instead of helping them.

A LITTLE ANARCHIST

Sample Copies.

To all who receive The Firebrand without having ordered it we would respectfully state that they may have been sent by a friend, and we will continue to send it to you for a reasonable length of time. Their names will be kept on a list for the future. To those who want to continue to receive it, we will be glad to have you order a subscription.

EMILY P. RUSSELL

The most eagerly 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. No one can afford to miss reading this book.

The following subjects are discussed in the order given.

2. Our Children.
3. Our Young Men.
5. Love, the Value of Marriage and the New Ideal.
7. Love, the Value of Marriage and the New Ideal.
8. Love, the Value of Marriage and the New Ideal.
9. How to help the Family in a Social Sense.
11. The Old and the New Ideal. 127.
12. Ethical Views on Confinement.
13. Love and Fraternity in a Social Sense. 15.
15. The Propaganda. 25.

Appendix.

1. Introduction.
2. The Criticism of a Leader.
3. The Charming and Beauty in the Woman.
4. Woman in Man.
5. The Weakness of Woman.
7. The Damnation of Socialists and Anarchists.
8. Tolstoy.

The price of this book is: Paper cover 50c. Cloth nicely bound $1.00.

FLOWERS & SHRUBS.

Anyone who will send a donation of ten cents to The Firebrand, or 50 cents subscription and a two-cent stamp to pay postage, will receive a free plant of their choice. Among those are roses, tulips, hollyhock plants, and hardy outdoor plants.

It is also necessary to see some fine flowering plants and help The Firebrand at the same time.

Order of REINHOLD HOFFMAN, Post Office, Marshfield, Oregon.

The Plants will be sent all over the United States.

NEW OCCASIONS

A Magazine of Social Progress.

OFFICIAL ORGAN OF FREE LOVE

Edited by John Humphreys Noyes.

The world is on the threshold of a new social era. It is in the air, and all nations that have been bom, are passing over into the new era. The old religious era is passing over into the new. To many of them, the new era is a sort of rebirth into a new and higher life. The old social era is passing over into the new. To many of them, the new era is a sort of rebirth into a new and higher life. All, therefore, who would participate in the new and higher life should keep closely in touch with the progress of the great movement.

THE IDEAL HOMES ASSOCIATION

The world is on the threshold of a new social era. It is in the air, and all nations that have been bom, are passing over into the new era. The old religious era is passing over into the new. To many of them, the new era is a sort of rebirth into a new and higher life. The old social era is passing over into the new. To many of them, the new era is a sort of rebirth into a new and higher life. All, therefore, who would participate in the new and higher life should keep closely in touch with the progress of the great movement.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION $3.00.

Sold by all Progressive Newsdealers.

WANTED

The Editor of this paper desires to have the names of all people who are interested in the work of the Free Love movement.

Wanted to be in touch with everyone.

Charles N. News & Co., 105 Fifth Avenue, Chicago.

OTHER BOOKS

The Old and the New Ideal. A Solution of that part of the Social Question which pertains to Love, Marriage and Sex.

By EMILY P. RUSSELL.

A Splendid Book.

Kurzus Creatures

A Home and a Job for Only $100.00

In the Sunny South.

You can get a home in the cooperative village of Copo-sipo, Miss., and the right to work in the cooperative brick factories, which consist of a house of two rooms and a lot 10x10x75. Send stamps for copies of the GRANDER AGE and full particulars.
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A Sex Revolution.
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Grandmother’s Lessons to Men. Young and Old, on the Basic Principles of Marriage Happiness.

One has but to read the above and then be told that the postal department objects to the circulation of such, to see how much governmment stands in the way of human happiness.

Send orders to The Firebrand, Box 94, Portland, Or.

Other Books on Sex Relation.

The Old and the New Ideal. A Solution of that part of the Social Question which pertains to Love, Marriage and Sex.

By EMILY P. RUSSELL.

A Splendid Book.

Kurzus Creatures

A Home and a Job for Only $100.00

In the Sunny South.

You can get a home in the cooperative village of Copo-sipo, Miss., and the right to work in the cooperative brick factories, which consist of a house of two rooms and a lot 10x10x75. Send stamps for copies of the GRANDER AGE and full particulars.

Order of the Firebrand.

Mrs. Wadbrook's Books.

My Century Plant.

The Oriental Forms of Sex.

The Procreation of.

A Sex Revolution.

Those who desire to study the Sex Question will find ample food for thought in the above four books.

Grandmother’s Lessons to Men. Young and Old, on the Basic Principles of Marriage Happiness.

One has but to read the above and then be told that the postal department objects to the circulation of such, to see how much governmment stands in the way of human happiness.

Send orders to The Firebrand, Box 94, Portland, Or.

The Firebrand's Agents.

The following names persons will receive and receipt for donations to The Firebrand.

Chicago, Ill.——Miss B. Pullen, 125 W. Madison Street.

New York City——Miss B. Pullen, 125 W. Madison Street.

Boston, R. I.——Miss L. J. Lang, 390 Grove Street.

Cleveland, Ohio——Miss A. H. Scott, 300 Clifton Avenue.

Baltimore, Md.—Miss C. S. Bragg, 350 S. Eutaw Street.

London, Eng.—Mrs. E. E. Jones, 10 Bakers Lane.

Glasgow, Scotland——Miss A. S. S. Black, 350 S. Eutaw Street.

The Firebrand's Agents.

The following names persons will receive and receipt for donations to The Firebrand.

Chicago, Ill.——Miss B. Pullen, 125 W. Madison Street.

New York City——Miss B. Pullen, 125 W. Madison Street.

Boston, R. I.——Miss L. J. Lang, 390 Grove Street.

Cleveland, Ohio——Miss A. H. Scott, 300 Clifton Avenue.

Baltimore, Md.—Miss C. S. Bragg, 350 S. Eutaw Street.

London, Eng.—Mrs. E. E. Jones, 10 Bakers Lane.

Glasgow, Scotland——Miss A. S. S. Black, 350 S. Eutaw Street.