



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.

PORTLAND, OREGON, SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1897.

No. 3

The Disinherited.

They cluster at every corner;
They wearily pace the land;
Their starving eyes devour each loaf:
They stretch the begging hand.

They are hungry and sick and tired;
Their bleeding foot-steps lag,
My brothers—and none to help them!
Their nakedness mocked with a rag.

They bake, and others have eaten:
They burn, but others are warm;
They build, but others are unsheltered,
And bare to the pitiless storm.

They till, but the crop goes from them;
They reap, but the "Harvest Home"
Means to them that their product is stolen;
They brew, and taste but the foam.

Ah God! how sadly they call Thee;
If Thou wert Thou couldst not withstand;
But always the wicked have triumphed;
The cunning and strong rule the land.

The hearts of the mothers are breaking;
The daughters are bedded with shame;
The fathers are brutish with labor:
The thoughts of the sons are aflame.

And hatred, and arson, and murder,
The hand to the sword is outstretching—
Like demons, they beckon and tempt,
Blood! blood!—Oh, can nothing be exempt?

O, Wisdom be instant and help us!
Quick rearing thy radiant crest:
O, brothers, the sword is a traitor!
The calm, thoughtful methods, are best.

The way of the wise is the best,
Which thinkers have pondered and planned;
The Gordian tangles are slipping—
Behold! your release is at hand!

—[J. William Lloyd.

The Post Office in Anarchy.

We are often asked how certain standing organizations, of which the Post is a typical instance, could be maintained or their places effectively filled in a condition of Anarchy. And perhaps a precise answer showing, not only generalities which the very question proves that the questioner's mind fails to see the working application of, but this working application itself, in the direction and on the scale inquired about,—may be the means of helping to a true conception of the nature of Anarchist society and enabling the Anarchist theory to be comprehended and appreciated.

For this reason, and also because the study is not without interest to those who are Anarchists already, I have attempted to work out the idea of a possible postal system in Anarchy; naturally, it is that which I think would be put in operation, but it is as well to warn the reader who may not be an Anarchist as yet, that the realization of Anarchy does not necessarily imply that this will be the working postal system. There may be one worse, or better, or there may be several side by side or in different regions. It does imply, however, that the same principle—not of the mechanical working but of the relation between the persons concerned—will appear in whatever arrangements may be adopted. He needs also to keep in mind that we are considering the arrangements with reference to an Anarchist condition of society, that is to say where peo-

ple in general think, and as a natural consequence act, in an Anarchist way and thereby make it easy and natural for each other to do so also; and that this means a society very different from the present. It is a condition of society where nobody is bound to do, or yet not to do anything; where nobody is bound to submit to or tolerate anything, nor yet the contrary; where consequently there is no rule of so-called "right" which anyone can shelter himself behind in order to hamper, plunder or oppress another, or which creates a temptation to do so, and therefore nobody can be forced on the other hand to disregard his neighbor's welfare in order to preserve his own and the rule at the same time; where there is therefore no privilege of any kind whether "exclusive" or "intrusive"—no property whether private, or collective, or common, but simple free people in a world unowned, having to concern themselves with nothing but to provide for their welfare as harmoniously as possible, to satisfy their human sympathies, and to associate their efforts at their own will and pleasure for the purpose of accomplishing these ends by their living actions—the only real way to accomplish them—and helping each other to do so. Still, I do not mean to say that what I am about to put forward could not be applied successfully even in the present environment. All the essential mechanism is operated already, only the persons concerned are in wrong conditions; and the Anarchist principle operates already also, to a partial extent, though not as the principle of society. It is worked on even in connection with this very matter, and I should scarcely hesitate to affirm that a complete postal system on Anarchist-Communist line could exist and work successfully even in the midst of present society.

Let us begin with the post in its most elementary form. This is simply a place of call, for the exchange of correspondence, etc., between residents of the same general locality. A person who writes a letter, or sends a book or a paper, takes it there or gets some one else to do so, in the expectation that either the addressee will at some sufficiently near time call there and find it, or some other person coming there and learning of its existence will take it along to its destination.

This we have already, on purely Anarchist lines, and in spite of the hateful isolation in which most persons are from each other through existing social conditions (and which in turn constitutes those conditions),—I believe it affects about half of all purely "local" correspondence. The members of trades unions and friendly societies who leave communications for each other at the society rooms operate post offices in this sense. Every newspaper office is a post office where readers correspond with casual or regular contributors, these with each other and some times the public with advertisers. Every Anarchist or Socialist reading room, or book-stall even, is a "poste restante," and indeed there is hardly a prominent place of any sort which people frequent that is not so for those who are aware of each others' visits. And indeed, so far as the

receipt and delivery of postal matter is concerned, and not seldom the immediate stage of transportation also, are not large numbers of official post offices in the small country settlements on exactly the same footing, all the local work being voluntary and free of commercial considerations?

In these cases, there is a person who takes charge of the letters, or on the contrary they are confided to the visiting public by being deposited in a box or on a rack, to which everyone has access. This last is the plan necessarily adopted at some uninhabited places where ship letters are posted; and generally for convenience wherever more than a few people (and these few mutually acquainted) make use of premises where many are coming and going—being precisely the reverse order of fact to what authoritarian and commercialist suspicion would prompt to. Yet it is very rare for any abuse of this confidence to take place. Often, with all the supposed inviolability of the State post, letters and often other parcels are destroyed by the basketful to get rid of them, and correspondence is tampered with or withheld for political and class reasons, whilst hundreds of letters and packets are appropriated for private reasons of the officials, notwithstanding that (or perhaps because) in the principal offices they work under the constant supervision of detectives. On the voluntary system everyone who is willing to carry a letter further being free to do so, and the doing so not being a task imposed, the first of these evils is secured against; the third loses its impelling motive with the disappearance of the property system, as, even if the book or article sent might be desirable to some one other than the addressee, that person could easily be supplied without his inconveniencing the one for whom it was meant, in a social condition of freedom and mutual helpfulness where the sole aim of both production and distribution would be the satisfaction of the needs that existed for the particular things produced. As to the second evil, it is sufficiently evident that in the absence of authoritarian control over the correspondence it could only be interfered with privately, whether for party or personal reasons, and it would be a very simple matter to take precautions if risk were suspected, because anyone who did not want his letters brought away by anyone but himself would only have to fit up a private box, or ask the person who took charge of letters—if there was one doing so and he had confidence in— to keep them for personal delivery, or give notice asking his own correspondents to refrain from leaving letters for him where he thought they were unsafe, and informing them of any other arrangement he had made.

This public confidence principle would enable a great development to be made at once on these primitive lines. Thus, without as yet considering the cases in which it might be desirable to arrange specially for some persons to make rounds of collection and delivery at regular periods, we could have a large outwork of letter boxes all around the centre, with collections and deliveries at all times

through the day. It would only be necessary that these boxes should be unlocked, and that the contents should be visible, but to make the best of the idea let us say each box should contain three compartments, one for letters deposited for delivery, another for those going to the centre, and the third for those to go in the opposite direction; and that each compartment should be fitted with a semaphore or flag, to be raised by the first person putting a letter in after the box has been empty, and lowered by whoever takes the last letter out; the people in the neighborhood being thus apprised the moment a letter is brought, and those passing in either direction being signalled and invited to pick up the outgoing mail from the moment there is a letter to go—the like arrangement being maintained on as multiplied a scale as necessary at branch roads and at the common centre. This system would reticulate the country parts with daily or more than daily collections and deliveries where now they have to put up with a mail each way once or twice a week and only one place to send from or receive at—which is only due to their failing to thus communistically associate, as there are always travellers in all directions. Evidently what applies between centre and outposts applies also between neighboring centres. There would be absolute economy of labor here, as well as of time, as the collection, transport, and delivery all over a connected district would be effected by the same journeys which would be made in any case for other purposes, and with scarcely perceptible trouble. Now, in these respects we may consider the whole problem settled, as ninety-nine hundredths of the transport from post office to post office, large or small, is already effected by journeys undertaken for other purposes, so that in adding collection and delivery we are actually only breaking down the bounds set by commercialism and social isolation to the essential arrangements already and always relied on. In the cases where special journeys were necessary or desirable, they would be established by some concerted arrangements between the parties most affected, or between them and other comrades, in the same way as any other matter of social habit founded on friendly solidarity. In what way is it arranged now that someone or other in the house goes to the post office at a certain time, or goes down to the store every day for the city daily paper, when there are no rounds of delivery to where you live? And what is the difference between going to the nearest post office on behalf of a household and going to one further away on behalf of a number of households? or to them from the post?

Well, now let us come to the more central arrangements, such as sorting. I have already shown that the greater part of the preliminary sorting would or could be performed by the persons who deposited the letters—which is simply an extension of what is practiced at all large central post offices—and the reader will hardly fail to see that the central work would be much lightened, besides, by the fact of many letters being carried direct between intermediate places without going through the local centres at all. The outward sorting would in the main be performed automatically, and as persons who got in the habit of carrying mails would certainly provide themselves, or be provided by comrades, with proper conveniences for keeping them together, the making up would be in many cases a mere matter of emptying each collection box into a separate receptacle; the inward mails from distant places, however, would certainly require sorting in order to be radiated out from the local centre.

But even here there is absolutely no difficulty. There would always be some people at hand with whom it would be a matter of pleasure to sort the mails, to satisfy themselves the sooner as to what there might be for them or, in the case of young persons, for the sheer pleasure of the exercise. As a boy I should, I know, have been delighted, and there are plenty of other matters in which what is

in itself indifferent or even tedious to the older person is recreation to the younger. One way and another there would certainly be no lack of volunteers for all the sorting required, and if the work was specially heavy at any place, such as, say, Chicago, in consequence of a concentrated population, there would be all the more helpers—or, at least, there would be a certainty of finding people who would be willing to make a speciality of working in this branch of the satisfaction of the general needs.

However, I see no real reason for any more specialized working in the largest city than in the ordinary country township. If a thousand tons of mail matter came into the city in the course of a day—apart from that which was automatically sorted and transmitted along the streets and railways from one part or suburb to another—the greater part of this mass could certainly be divided at once according to the districts from which it came. Thus, the people who habitually expected correspondence, in Melbourne and suburbs, from Bendigo, would form a postal club; those who generally had it from Ballarat, another, and so on, and the mail bags from the chief district centres would thus go direct to the combination of those for whom the bulk of that correspondence would probably prove to be. They would have their own volunteers for sorting and all the special arrangements they chose for swift distribution, and the letters which were not so got rid of to people in waiting would meanwhile be placed in the order of locality and made up into bundles, to go out to the remaining places by the ordinary means of transport. Thus, it appears to me, by carrying this division of mails according to source to the degree of fineness that the addressees themselves found convenient and perhaps subdividing the clubs themselves into more special local source letter expecters (for instance, here there might be a club to take in hand all inward correspondence from outside Australia, or one for British, and another for elsewhere, whilst the "British" club might be subdivided into special "English letter," "Scotch letter," "Welsh letter" and "Irish letter" groups) the sorting and distribution would be effected at least as rapidly as at present, probably more so, without any centralised, single, postal organization whatever existing. The clubs or groups mentioned, would consist of course in the free association of persons to take particular matters in hand, and not in the "incorporation" of persons as "members" of any formal body.

Equally, there might be several postal clubs for the same letter source; supposing there were two, one might arrange to have the mails sent in a specially numbered or colored bag, the persons directly connected requesting their correspondents in the district to mark letters, say "Per Red Bag." Then, of course, the letters gathered in from the district outposts would be divided into one more parcel at or on the way to the district centre, at the time of being sorted, and there would be one more receiving box there, to facilitate the automatic sorting by letter posters. But however many such clubs might exist in and about Melbourne for receiving and distributing letters from Bendigo, it is almost certain that the Bendigo people would not have to make up anything like the number of separate mails that would be required in order to decentralize the Melbourne arrangements in the only other way apparently possible, that is by sending the mails down in lots for each separate suburb or part of a suburb or of the main city, separately consigned. This clubbing system then, in large centres of population and travel, appears much superior in every way to the familiar official system, because the work is done by separate parties, who are, or at least are closely connected with the actual addressees of the main part of the mails they handle; it is done without any central congestion or strain, and without avoiding that as alone it can be partly avoided in the present system, viz. by throwing exactly as much congestion and strain on every place outside.

It will be observed that in the whole of this postal system which I have been expounding, there is not a single postage stamp, and no Postal Depart-

ment, salaries, contracts or regulations. It is purely voluntary and based upon the enlightened self interest and fraternity combined, or solidarity, of the people. This is what constitutes its Anarchist-Communist character whether applied in a reformed society or now. The other elements are mechanical, and might be applied in connection with the present postal system, but—especially as regards the collection and delivery extension—really require to be worked in the Anarchist way, and in order to yield properly satisfactory results all around should be operated in an Anarchist condition of general society.

J. A. ANDREWS.

P. S. If free men cannot trust free men their comrades, the sharers of their good and ill, for these friendly services, how can people whose own hands are tied trust as they do to strangers who are distinctly isolated from them by the present social system, who are merely mercenary slaves doing task work, and amenable to the terrorism and corruption of their "superiors"? I have sent and received letters, covering hundreds or even thousands of miles of distance, through perfect strangers, quite outside the State postal system and equally clear of all commercial considerations—and this, too, in the most casual manner, without the advantage of any such habitual or concerted arrangements as I have just outlined.

J. A. A.

Wealth and Its Uses.

THERE was a clashing of many tongues in New York pulpits Sunday over the propriety of the Bradley Martin ball. In synagogue and in church, from Baptist and from Reformed pulpits, there proceeded a grand and eloquent chorus of which the dominant note was denunciation of the rich for talking their pleasure magnificently.

But the clergy regard the question at issue from the wrong point of view. The legal right of a man to do what he will with his own, provided it be not harmful to any one, is not to be doubted. The ethical right is scarcely to be questioned except by those who accept literally Christ's command, "Sell all that thou hast and give to the poor," and we fear that the apostles of that creed are neither numerous nor influential to-day.

Attack on the participants in this much discussed festivity borders upon impertinence, but not attack upon a social and industrial system which creates such contrasts as, to quote Rev. Cortlandt Myers, "250,000 people in want of food and coal and \$250,000 squandered in a single society ball." Yet the clergy with one accord ignore the causes which lead to the concentration of wealth and the dissemination of poverty.

Perhaps the falsity of the pulpit's point of view is most clearly shown by the Rev. Madison C. Peters's applauding as a philanthropist Mr. John D. Rockefeller, and contrasting his employment of wealth with that of the Bradley Martins vastly to the latter's depreciation. In thirty years Mr. Rockefeller has, it is true, risen from the position of a bookkeeper to the eminence of the richest man in New York. His charities are said to be enormous—so great, indeed, that according to report, he pays a man \$10,000 a year to supervise them for him. His benefactions to the University of Chicago are unparalleled. Is he therefore to be lauded in the pulpit as a philanthropist—a lover of mankind? Was Robin Hood deserving the applause of the church because a part of his spoil went to the poor?

The millions which this eminent philanthropist disburses—and the vastly greater sums he keeps—are the profits, the spoils of monopoly. The great Standard Oil Company, of which he is the head, and for every act of which he must accept at least moral responsibility, has attained its present impregnable position by nothing short of criminal methods. Against its agents judicial proof of conspiracy, bribery, arson, riot, fraud and burglary has been offered in open court or before legislative committees. It has made and unmade United States Senators, Judges and Legislatures and used them for its profit. It has spread ruin on every side of it, and the thirty years' "business" campaign which ends by making Rockefeller a capitalist has left the men against whom he waged industrial war ruined. If the Church shall not take cognizance of these things, who shall?

It may well be doubted whether expenditure of ill-gotten money in philanthropies and educational endowments is not more insidiously harmful to the social well being than lavish disbursements, in times of de-

titution, of honestly obtained wealth, even though it be spent only in ostentatious and extravagant pleasure seeking.—[New York Journal.]

How near, and yet how far the editor that penned the above is from a solution of the question involved in what he has written. The clergy cannot be expected to see things in their true light, nor to go to the root of any evil. They are not paid for doing anything of the sort. The Journal editor seems to know that, even though he does not say so. The arraignment of Mr. Rockefeller's methods is good, but it is the history on a large scale of every successful business enterprise of recent date, and what good can it do for the Church to "take cognizance of these things?" Success demands the employment of such methods, and "nothing succeeds like success, you know."

There can be no "lavish disbursements, in times of destitution, of honestly obtained wealth," for the simply reason that lavish wealth is of necessity the result of spoliation. There is where the editor misses the solution a long way, although he comes very near it when he attacks philanthropy as the disbursement of the result of robbery. Let the Journal editor learn that all wealth is the product of labor, and that the laborers will enjoy the wealth they create, and not one need charity when the robbery of labor ceases. H. A.

Echoes from Foreign Countries.

GERMANY. Rosa Bareis, the responsible lady manager of the "Socialist" and the "Poor Comrade" who was arrested before Christmas, was released lately, but the prosecution is going on just the same on account of the outrages perpetrated against the German government. G. Landauer is now under arrest because he wanted to leave Germany. Both he and his partner, Friedrich, are accused of libeling the police and inciting the population to open rebellion.

GREECE. About four months ago a strike broke out in the box and basket factories at Patras. Somebody went to the largest establishment and exploded a bomb. The authorities went straight to the headquarters of the "Forward," a local Anarchist periodical. The editors were arrested and are yet kept in jail, but the workmen obtained what they asked for.

FRANCE There are large meetings organized to protest against the cruelties committed in Spain and the colonies. There was a very large meeting at Paris, three weeks ago, at which it was decided to go to see the Spanish Ambassador at midnight. From the place of the meeting, Tivoli Vandhall, to the residence of the Spanish Ambassador is a walk of five miles. In spite of the prevailing cold there was more than 2,000 people present at the demonstration about 1:30 in the morning. They marched all along the "Grand Boulevards" to the Boulevard Courcelles yelling, "Down with the Canovas! down with the inquisition! Hurrah for free Cuba and the Philippines!" The crowd did not disperse until 2 o'clock in the morning.

Two weeks ago there was another large meeting in the "Frianon" Montmartre, Paris attended by over 3,000 people, where it was also decided to go to "see" the Ambassador, but by this time all the "City and Republican" guards were there to prevent the march, and beside that, there was all the diabolical police force scattered along the Boulevards to watch chances to arrest any one that was too "loud" for them. There was a monster Banquet that night at the Ambassade, probably in honor of the Parisian "gold-out journalism." There was fighting reported in several places along the Boulevards, and quite a large number of arrests were made. At Reims, Amiens, Lyons, Chalon sur Laone, Marseilles and other places there were large gatherings to protest against the cowardly attitude of the French government and the Spanish inquisition.

In France the State keeps the monopoly of manufacturing of matches, which are manufactured with red phosphorus. Since many years the workmen are clamoring, begging, and demanding for the use of white phosphorus instead of the red, because this last named is the cause of a terrible sickness which they call necrose, (rot of the respiratory organs.) Some of the directors of the match factory gave an explanation of the subject about three weeks ago in the "Eclair," a semi-official daily. His excuses for the red phosphorus were as follows: "The administration would be obliged to put frictional composition on

the boxes in order to light the matches and the "public" is against such use."

You see how the State administrators are anxious to please the dear "people." What an infernal lie! Why can we use such matches here in America where there is no State monopoly? It is plain to be seen that the management must have some interest, in one way or another, in poisoning thousands of workmen, and this under the protection of the State.

A. KLEMENCIC.

Individual Property.

APPLYING to my occupation as an astronomer the principles so ably developed in The Firebrand by Mr. Byington in relation to his occupation, I reach a still more important conclusion; that the books and instruments needed would not be made at all were it not for individual enterprise and the high prices which those who need them are willing to pay. The masses of the people do not want them, and they would not authorize the diversion of industry from the production of articles which they do appreciate to the production of those which they do not appreciate. It is hardly conceivable that industry directed by the referendum or any similar plan would to this day have given us enough knowledge of astronomy to enable a ship to cross the ocean.

The same principle extends to all the great inventions of modern times. The sewing machine, the reaper, the dynamo, the telegraph, and thousands of other inventions of less importance, were all the results of individual persistent study and experiment, which even now, with all these results before us, it is unlikely that those who direct the work of any community would ever sanction. HENRY M. PARKHURST.

The idea advanced in the above is that all improvement that has been made, all scientific research and advance in knowledge is due to the ability of some men to grow rich as a result of such advancement. Were that the case no one would study astronomy, or other sciences. The truth is that the demand for scientific instruments, coupled with patent laws, and other forms of monopoly, makes it possible for some men to make such instruments and sell them at a high price. The love of gaining knowledge, the desire to investigate, to write books, to make scientific advancements precede patent laws and would exist without them. Should all such manufacture depend on appropriations out of the public treasury, sanctioned or vetoed by a vote of the "electors," it likely would not prosper, but if such manufacture were free from all encumbrance, then it would keep pace with the demand, and all lovers of science could gratify that love, and push their researches further than is possible under present conditions, or any conditions of private property and high prices. H. A.

Mr. Walker's "Short and Easy Method."

"Mr. Tucker sends Samuel P. Putnam into the limbo of oblivion, but the gallant and generous Free-thought President will not stay there; rather, he will not reach the destination assigned him; there are too many staunch friends of liberty, men and women, who knew and loved the man Putnam to permit him to be forgotten in this generation at least. No one is stupid enough to assert that he, any more than any other man, was without flaw, but when his character is fairly balanced it is seen that he was a good man, as men go in this world where none is perfect, a hard worker for what he deemed the right, and a man whose word was a bond. It is unfortunate for Mr. Tucker that of the three men in the ranks of Progress who, up to this time, have assailed Samuel Putnam, he is the only one who could have been expected to do better. Two editors, ex-ministers, have been true to their early training in the school of supernatural moralism, and their animadversions are not in the least surprising. As Mr. Tucker has as strong a feeling of contempt as I have for the moral prosing of Moore and Shaw he should agree with me that he is very unfortunate in being bracketed with them as counsel for the prosecution in the cause of 'History vs. Samuel Porter Putnam.'" —[Truth-Seeker.

"Bracketed" with whom?—with a narrow minded fool as Moore is, and, presumably, Shaw is!

Mr. Walker is neither frank nor fair in his two

paragraphs (Lucifer, No. 643) the last of which I quote in full. Mr. Tucker, Liberty, December No., pens an indictment against S. P. Putnam and also states that he is glad he did not wait until Putnam "was dead to say so."

The indictment is, that the dead Freethinker accepted a letter publicly as a compliment, containing the following charming thought: "There is only one way to deal with those who advocate Anarchy, and those who try to practically carry it out; and that is to make an example of its agitators.

Hang every one of them, and expose their carcasses to view, as a warning to others who are so inclined." Not only this, but that he (Putnam) sought his intimacies among Anarchistic agitators and that his death occurred in the room of one of the most prominent Anarchists in this country.

Not a word, not even a hint does E. C. Walker give to "Lucifer's" readers of all this! The uninformed would gather that Mr. Tucker had abused the dead Freethinker for being a free lover and whisky drinker!

It seems incredible that Mr. Walker could so far forget himself—clear thinker and logical writer as he is. Mr. Walker knows very well it is only Secularists or so-called Freethinkers that have done all the "moral prosing," and neither Mr. Tucker nor any other Anarchist does such work. Mr. Walker has written so well regarding the sad death of both the woman and the man that this "break" of his seems lamentable. Mr. Walker had already expressed his love and honor for the dead Freethinkers,—and no one could fairly criticize him for so doing.

Libertarians will, by sending for "Liberty," Dec. 1896 and "Lucifer" No. 643, be able to form an intelligent opinion of the whole matter.

The best Mr. Walker can do is to content himself with the declaration—prehistoric I believe:—"With all thy faults I love thee still,"—albeit it has a nutty flavor.

In conclusion I send this to The Firebrand feeling sure that "Lucifer" would not print an article showing "an unbecoming spirit for a professed liberal." The verses I close with I sent to and were printed in "Lucifer" many months ago, and although not poetry, contain wise counsel to many of the superstitious Secularists, that, intending to champion the two dead Freethinkers are, the only ones insulting their memory:

Never mind "who did" or didn't; let us have some "don'ts" to-day,
When you think the cause a just one don't turn pal- lid in the fray.

Don't attempt to ride two horses which are running different ways,
It's a darned slow way of traveling; in the long run never pays.

You should uphold every freedom—don't you know unless you do
Your own special little freedom will prove worthless unto you?

CLINTON LOVERIDGE.

LIFE cannot subsist in society but by reciprocal concessions.

A CORPORATION is a very nice arrangement in one way. It allows individuals to combine and do things in its name which their consciences would revolt at were they to take the responsibility personally. When the weight of broken contracts and false promises is divided, each one's share is not so heavy. —Toledo Union.

THERE has been much disquietude among Russian students, especially those of Moscow. They form and spread revolutionary literature, show their sympathy for striking workmen and are ever tireless agitators. It is said 1,114 have been arrested and 662 of them convicted.—[Common Cause.

PAUL LOUIS COURIER, when bitterly assailed by a French professor, quietly remarked: "I fancy he must be vexed. He calls me Jacobin, rebel, plagiarist, thief, prisoner, forger, leper, madman, imposter, calumniator, libel, a horrible, filthy, grinning rag-picker. I gather what he wants to say. He means that he and I are not of the same opinion, and this is his only way of putting it."—Labor Advocate.

THE FIREBRAND

Published Weekly. Communicate in any of the European languages.

SUBSCRIPTION VOLUNTARY.

Address all Communications and make all Money Orders payable to The Firebrand, P. O. Box 94, Portland, Or.

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

Analysis.—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.

CO-OPERATION:

A Reply to Herbert Spencer.

By PETER KROPOTKIN.

HERBERT SPENCER has just brought out the third and last volume of his "Principles of Sociology," and in one of the closing chapters devoted to "Industrial Institutions," he evidently had to touch upon co-operation. So he did, and he came to a proposal concerning the mode of carrying on productive co-operation, which proposal he thought important enough to communicate in advance to the veteran co-operator, Mr. G. J. Holyoake. It was published in the October issue of Labor Co-Partnership.

Coming as it does from the evolutionist philosopher, and representing what Herbert Spencer arrived at after so many years' work in Sociology, it deserves our full attention. It shows where a philosopher—well-meaning, but having spent his life amidst books, and imbued, moreover, with the religion of Wagedom of "reward proportional to merit"—could come to; what his last word of wisdom is.

Fully recognising the importance of labor co-partnerships, which represent a higher form of industrial organization, Herbert Spencer proposes to substitute piece-work for time-wages in these co-partnerships; and to this change, if it only would take place, he attributes grand effects. At the present time, he says, the workers and the employers in industrial co-partnerships have a prejudice against piece-work, and this prejudice is quite natural and justified when the head of the concern is a private employer (which he shows why). But in a co-partnership, where each worker receives a share in the profits, proportionately to his wages, all advantages are in favor of piece-work. Each worker being doubly interested in producing more, the productive power of the concern would be greatly increased, and the control and the administration would be diminished. "Jealousies among the workmen would disappear. A cannot think his remuneration too low as compared with that of B, since each is now paid just as his work brings. Resentment against a foreman who ranks some above others no longer finds any place. Overlooking to check idleness becomes superfluous: the idling almost disappears, and another cause of dissension ceases." And so on.

Then a further development is named: "Where the things are so large and perhaps complex (as in machinery) that an unaided man becomes incapable, work by the piece may be taken by groups of members." The Cornish miners do so. The work "is put up to auction and bid for by different gangs of men, who undertake the work as co-operative piece-work, at so much per fathom."

And then Spencer gives a full column to show the advantages of that sort of work. . . . "The transition from the compulsory co-operation of militancy to the voluntary co-operation of industrialism is completed." . . . The day-wage worker is now coerced, "but under the arrangement described his activity becomes voluntary." . . . More than that—using Henry Maine's expression—"the transition from status (coercive State) to contract reaches its limit; coercion has vanished, and 'the system of contract becomes unqualified.'" . . . "the entire organization is based on contract, and each transaction is based on contract." Reward is proportionate to merit, both adjusting themselves.

The only regret of Herbert Spencer is that mankind has not attained that higher type of nature; that such high-type industrial institutions "are possible only with the best men!" But they will come. A few examples of the sort—and "admission into them would be the goal of the working-class ambition." So far Spencer.

Now, it is always refreshing in our times, when the military utopias of German Socialism have such an ascendancy, to meet with a philosopher who seeks for a solution of the present miseries in free agreement, in each transaction being based on contract. At a time when we are told—and compelled to recognize under the penalty of ostracism—that the ideal of social organ-

ization is an "army" of workers severely "disciplined" and obeying the word of a "dictatorial chief," or of a group of chiefs, it is extremely satisfactory to see Spencer remaining true to the principle of free agreement, which he found to be the moving power of evolution at large, and which he now tries to apply even to the details of social organization.

But Spencer seems not to know that what he advocates as the highest development of co-partnership is already practised, for hundreds of years since, by millions of most ordinary men. More than that. Just because these men know the institution of "co-operative piece-work" from a very long experience, they continually abandon in it the principle of "reward proportionate to merit" within their own co-operations—probably because they have been convinced by experience of the impossibility of carrying this principle through, and find that far from being justice, as Spencer believes, it is a crying injustice.

A few instances, all taken from Russia, where the subject has been best explored, will better explain this idea.

Millions of acres of land are rented in Russia by village-communities. Also meadows. When the community comes to mow a meadow, all men and women come out. It is a village fete. All mowers start in a row, and the ambition of every one of them is to leave the others behind: to do more work than the others. Women rack the cut grass and arrange it in heaps of equal size. In the evening, or next day, lots are cast, and each family takes one heap. The feeling of justice of the peasants does not admit that the tallest and the strongest man should take more hay than the others. All have worked according to their forces—all are equally rewarded.

But a still higher form is also in existence. When scarcity prevails, the division of the produce is made according to the needs. Although all have worked according to their forces, the division of the produce is made according to the number of "eaters" (of mouths) in each family. This form prevailed during the famine, where relief was earned by village-work, or received form outside. And, what was still more remarkable, the debt contracted in this last case had to be repaid by each family according to the number of "workers" (working units) in the family—not of its mouths. A family consisting of two workers and four children, for instance, received six parts of flour, but it had to repay only two parts.

This being the two highest forms of distribution of the produce, all possible and imaginable forms, in thousands of varieties, exist in both the village-communities, and the fishing, wood-cutting, carrying, railway porters and industrial artels, which count hundreds of thousands and cover the whole life of the working part of the Russian nation.

Thus—to take but one instance—a railway and the wooden stations along it have to be built. If the contractor, or sub-contractor, cares in the least to have good work done, he treats, not with individual workers, but with artels (or gangs of from 50 to 250 men) of navvies and of carpenters. The bargain is certainly not so mechanical as an auction, because the qualities of the different bidding "artels" are taken into account. But once the work has been undertaken by a gang the contractor has nothing to do with the distribution of the earnings. They will be distributed in this "artel" in one way, in another artel in a different way—the ill ones always being provided for. The grouping of the "artel" being free, every member knows in advance how the distribution will take place in that gang.

One would spend his life in studying the different types of remuneration—piece work, day work, merit and no merit, in thousands of combinations which no genius could foresee or foresee, but which popular life works out on the spot, in accordance with the conditions of a given work. The same variety exists here as in the working out of animal species, and it is due to the same variety of causes.

And there is not one single branch of popular, agricultural, industrial, and commercial life in which like "artels" should not exist. Peasants form and dissolve them every day—for consumption and distribution. Fishing is done by artels, including sometimes a whole territory (the Ural Cossacks). The domestic trades (and they occupy 7,000,000 workers) are honey-combed

* Those who wish to know more about the subject ought to consult the article "Artels" (Russian name for co-operations) in Meyer's or in Brockhaus' Conversations Lexikon, where they will find the names of an elaborate German work on the subject. Some Russian works dealing with the subject are named in the article "Russia" in Encyclopaedia Britannica.

with such co-operations. Nay, the railway-porters, the privileged dock laborers who have permanent employment, the men who load and unload the goods on the exchanges (a highly privileged class), the carriers, the messengers in towns, and so on, are all organized in artels. In St. Petersburg you call an "arteltechik" of the Town Messengers' Artel, you give him a packet containing £1000, and tell him to carry it to Mr. So and So—and usually no receipt is taken: the messenger belongs to an artel, and that is enough! In all private banks the keys and seals of the cash-boxes are in the hands of a special artel. And so on.

If Spencer knew man, we could take his words relative to the "higher type of institutions" which are "possible only with the best men" as highly complimentary to the Russian nation. But the fact is that the Russian (especially, the Great Russian) worker and peasant are imbued with the spirit and carry on the artel principle into every nook of their lives—not because they are the best men. They do so simply because the village-community has not yet been wrecked by the State, and they carry on into industrial life the spirit of the institution which makes the essence of the agricultural life of the nation.

Why, then, is the working part of the Russian nation, taken as a whole, even more miserable than the working parts of the West European nations?

To this we shall answer in our next number. But we can, already here, indicate our answer in a few words:—"Simply because the distribution of earnings, amongst workers who produce for themselves and not for a capitalist, is the least difficulty in the Social Question. When Wagedom is not imposed from above, the workers find out, and work out, thousand new forms of sharing the earnings, more equitable than piece-wages or time-wages."

Like most middle-class writers who know little of the workers, Herbert Spencer, spite of all the force of his genius, was dragged to inquire into "What is to be done to prevent workers from taking each other by the throat when they come to distribute the fruits of their labor? What is to be done to prevent idleness among them? While the whole of the Social Question lies elsewhere—namely, in "How can the workers become enabled to produce for themselves?" When they will have that, they will find much better means of an equitable sharing of the fruits of their labor than those which any man of genius could find out for them in advance.

II

It was mentioned in the preceding article how widely distributed in Russia are such forms of co-operation and sharing of earnings, as, in Herbert Spencer's opinion, would imply a higher development of human nature. And it hardly need be added that for consumption, similar artels are of everyday occurrence in all branches of popular life. As soon as five, six, ten or twenty peasants come to St. Petersburg, or Moscow, or Odessa, to work in a factory or elsewhere, they hire lodgings in company, take their meals in common, and—if their trade allows it—they try to get work for the artel—not individually. Even the convicts on their way to Siberia, and in hard labor, live in an artel whose elected "elder" is the officially recognized representative of the convict artel in its relations with the authorities, food of the artel, conflicts with the authorities, work, and so on.

That racial characteristics would be of no value to explain these facts that Spencer will see at once, and he will see at once, and he will understand, on the contrary, the importance of the communal institutions which exist in Russia for the maintenance of that spirit. The more so, as we see also in France that the peasants have been permitted to constitute the syndicates agricoles; not only do they largely use that right for a variety of purposes, but facts are known of their treating their individually owned plots of land as common property (for grazing and the like). To use the words of a recent official report, facts multiply of their putting their plots in common in order to redistribute them (remunierements collectifs).

Why, then—it was asked at the end of the last article—do the Russian peasants, workers, artisans and so on, remain in such terrible poverty although they are so willing to associate, and associate in such an excellent way?

I might mention the ruin of the masses by taxation. But this is a very big subject, much neglected by modern economists, which would require many develop-

* Its importance has lately been brought into prominence in the twenty-second Annual Report of the Illinois Labor Bureau.

ments. There is, however, another still more important reason. It is not enough to be imbued with the co-operative spirit; not enough to be capable of working out good forms of co-operation. Men must know what to associate, besides their hands and brains.

Spencer, like all middle-class theorists, sees the chief difficulty for the advent of a better state of affairs in the (presupposed) incapacity of the worker to understand his own interests. He is sure (that is a matter of religious faith with him) that if to-morrow the workers of such a factory, or mine, or railway become owners of that factory, mine or railway, they would quarrel, and the concern would perish in consequence of their incapacity to agree in the sharing of the profits.

Consequently, he cares little to find out such features in the actual life of mankind as would bring him to an opposite conclusion. Just as, in his great anthropological inquest, which has cost him and his contributors and incredible amount of labor and is now utterly valueless, because the real character of the savage and barbarian institutions does not appear from that prearranged inquest, so also he shuts his eyes to the facts of real modern life which would bring him to conclusions different from those just mentioned. *

But the reality of modern life is this: As soon as the workers or the peasants, of any nationality, are brought by any circumstances to the common ownership of anything, and as soon as the State ceases to interfere by creating artificial differences of wealth and power among them, they admirably find out in a relatively short time the ways of managing that common property in the general interest.

Let me mention one or two examples out of thousands. There was in the Urals a royal ironworks, Votkinsk, which it was decided to abandon. The workers proposed to take it, as an artel. The State agreed, and gave to the artel some of those contracts which are given to various private ironworks. The artel prospers for several years since. Or else, in several places in Russia, where petty trades are much developed, the Ministry of War began a few years ago to give some of its contracts—on a pretty large scale—not to sweaters, but to the artisans themselves, if they undertook it as artels. In such cases it made advances of money. A couple of months ago, the Official Messenger published the results—excellent on all accounts. Many County Councils (zemstvos) have done the same, with excellent results.

Under the present conditions of capitalism—the English co-operators know it perfectly well—the chief difficulty is not so much in the organization of production, not so much in finding an equitable way of sharing the earnings, but in the sale of the produce. When it comes to the market, the small concern is unavoidably crushed out of existence; it is killed by underselling and by thousands of wicked tricks of the other dealers. And this is why the English co-operators, who failed with their co-operative production when they had to find buyers in the commercial market, succeed now that they have their own market—more honest than the usual commercial market,—in their thousands of distributive co-operations.

But this is only a small part of the difficulty. The other, much greater part is—what to associate. At the present time, land, capital, knowledge, State and Municipal concessions, even education (how many children work in factories, mines, as newspaper sellers, and so on?)—all these are constituted monopolies in the hands of the rich. And, so long as these monopolies exist, all efforts of the co-operators are bound to remain extremely limited in scope. More than that. All their attempts are bound to remain imbued with a narrow egoistic spirit which stands in direct contradiction to the spirit which Co-operation is intended to develop. Started to counteract the narrow egoistic feeling of capitalism, brought to life with no other purpose but to break down and to crush out of existence that capitalistic spirit,—Co-operation, under the present system of monopolies, becomes itself imbued with that same spirit of capitalist monopoly which it pretends to combat.

This is only normal and natural. And this is so evident, that as soon as a single one of these is done away with, or is only limited in its application, the co-operative spirit grows in proportion. If that spirit, if that capacity for sharing the earnings is so immensely

* Every anthropologist knows how valueless is that immense work produced at Herbert Spencer's expense and at his instigation, and therefore will prefer Waitz's *Anthropologie der Naturvölker*, which was compiled without preconceived ideas, or Post's *African Common Law*, and so on,—to say nothing of the original works, which are still better sources of information.

developed in Russia, or in some French villages, it is only because those Russian or French peasants are—to some extent at least—freed from one of those monopolies, land monopoly. They own land in common, and this alone is sufficient to develop among them the co-operative spirit which Spencer longs for and is ready to consider as a higher ideal to be reached in times to come by the human race. Take one of the monopolies away and the co-operative spirit develops much more than through half a century of practice in individually egoistic "Co-operation."

This is why Spencer would do infinitely more for human progress if, instead of directing his attention to the invention of panaceas for preventing workers from "jealousies" in the sharing of profits, he would inquire into the substance of those institutions which breed jealousies, and of those which diminish them. While what he does now is to endeavor to conciliate two opposite currents of ideas and habits which exclude each other.

As to the still more limited panacea of piece work, which he so warmly advocates and exaggerates in its consequences, it hardly need be criticised here, as the practical commonsense of several correspondents to "Labor Copartnership" has sufficiently shown. The utopian character of that panacea. One of the correspondents puts it especially clearly in its proper light, in this way. A thousand clothiers, he says, are holders of £1 shares, and they start a cloth factory. But, with the present cost of machinery, a capital of £1000 is nothing, a trifle, which will not be enough to give work even to a hundred clothiers. Let us say, nevertheless, that they start a factory for a hundred men. They introduce, on Spencer's advice, piece-work; and by the exercise of much cleverness, ardor in work and so on, the production is increased so much that each of the hundred workers has to be paid £2 or £3 more. What will the shareholders say to that? Surely they will say: "Myself, I can hardly reach 26s. in the factory which I work in. Why should I—employer of these hundred workers—be paid less than they are? They must not have more than 26s." No fine reasoning will induce the capitalistically-reasoning shareholder to pay his worker more than he earns himself. And the utopia, which was going to reform mankind and capitalism, falls to the ground.

We admire Spencer when he comes forward to claim the land of the country for all those who live and work on it. We admire him when he comes forward to claim the power of higher principles in politics. We admire him, also, when he appears as the champion of the Individual against the State (in theory, at least, though not in many of his practical reasonings). But he might leave the workers to find out for themselves how to come to an equitable distribution of what they have produced—when they, themselves, own the necessities for production. Their systems will be more equitable and more practical than whatever may be invented in his study by the evolutionist philosopher.

This, at any rate, he perfectly well knows himself: Great changes in society are not produced by small tricks. Great changes in mankind's moods of thought are not produced by such petty means as "Dutch auctions" and "piece-work wages," which are borrowed from the old mood of thought itself.

Herbert Spencer knows the value of principles.—Need he be reminded of them?—(Freedom, London.

An Ethical Basis.

We think that our friend Mr. Underwood in his excellent article, *Character the Test of Worth*, which appeared in the "Torch" January 28, expressed the sentiments of every true Socialist on the Pacific coast. Yes, our Union should be established on an ethical basis, and because we have had no definite standard we have been the butt of ridicule of societies that have.

Take for example the question mentioned in the editorial of the *Free Thought Magazine* for this month, i. e., the subject of free love. We are of the same opinion as Mr. Green, that free love is one of the most deadly and seductive enemies of the human family. Now the question is, is it for the best interest of our society for those who are so radically opposed to each other as free lovers and those of our opinion, to try to work together? We think not, for if free lovers belong to our organization? Many of our very best citizens who otherwise would gladly put their shoulder to the wheel and be a great power in working for humanity, will

hold themselves aloof and finally our society is nothing but a free love affair. But on the other hand if we adopt a moral code and have some definite guide and the free lovers have their own society, there will be no misunderstanding and when we get a worker he will fully understand his duties and privileges. Our society has suffered very much from this very cause not only on account of what to us is one of the most ruinous doctrines yet devised, free love, but also from other so-called reforms.—(Torch of Reason.

It surely is time that the Secularists began to look for an ethical bases for their work, instead of getting down on their bellies and crawling to the ethics of the priesthood they claim to despise, and calling that "respectability."

They have, for a long time, been calling for "free thought, free speech and free press," and now that there seems to be a slight tendency to think and speak freely they get very scared and yell for an ethical bases, one that will prevent free speech, and oppose free action. In other words they don't want freedom; have no conception of what freedom is, and are only out to fight a doctrine that even the orthodox churches have well-nigh given up. And yet such men come before the Liberals as teachers, editors and leaders. Should the people put their trust in them it would be another case of "blind leaders of the blind." So far as "best people" are concerned someone may differ with Mr. Hosmer as to who the best people are. Our plutocrats here call the wealthiest ones the "best people," does Mr. Hosmer? After all it matters but little who he refers to as "best people," for, after all it is only his opinion, as to who is "best." It already shows this, however, that Mr. Hosmer, in common with a good round number of others who pose as "Liberal," and "Freethought" editors, leaders and teachers, is not in favor of free speech and free action. Bah! what hope is there for the growth of real freedom of thought, speech or action if such men are to be recognized as leaders. True freedom of thought admits of no leaders or directors, only co-workers and fellow investigators. H. A.

Government Illogical.

A RECOGNITION of a necessity for government, implies also the necessity of determining the rights of the governed and the governing classes. If a few govern the many, we call it tyranny, if the many govern the few, it is tyranny also, but in a less intense form. It implies that the governing class has more rights than the governed, which may be, and is disputed by many of the minority governed.

The governed demand, (and it is a reasonable demand,) that an invariable scale be furnished by which rights may be measured. They demand to know just how much less the rights of the governed are than the governing class. The onus of the argument rests upon the governing class to show just how much more rights they have than the governed and why.

Until they do, I as one of the minority governed, shall persist in denying their rights to govern at all.

It is argued that the greater number know more in the aggregate than the few, and that there is no other way of determining right. To which I reply that the small minority of reformers who have suffered martyrdom in the past bears loud testimony in argument that the minority is more frequently in the right than the majority. How was the majority against Bruno, Servetus, Galileo, Columbus, and a host of others I might mention.

The fact is, the greatest and best thinkers are never represented in government and have no voice in making laws by which they are governed. What voice had Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Gerrit Smith, Wm. E. Channing, Wendell Phillips, John Brown and other abolitionists in the government that tolerated and defended slavery? What voice has Henry George, Judge McGuire, Tom L. Johnson, Jerry Simpson and other Single Taxers but to form opinions that may prevail after they have suffered martyrdom at the hands of the ignorant majority?

What voice have the advocates of peace—the opposers of war in a government that taxes them to pay pensions to soldiers by which the brutalities of war is encouraged. What voice has the free thinker in a government that taxes him to support churches and chaplains?

What voice has the free trader in a government that prohibits him from trading where he pleases under penalty? The Declaration of Independence says: "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." Such a statement seems to me to do violence to language by being a contradiction in terms. Consent and government cannot coexist. I have no desire to be governed and will not consent to be, nor do I know of any one who does: however inconsistent he may be by wanting to govern others. All governments are coercive and as Spencer says, "Coercion cannot by any process be made equitable." The consent of the governed would be Mutualism or Communism and not government.

Those who contend for a majority government, will not deny that minorities have some rights, but define those rights to be in accordance with their opinions. If he is an orthodox Christian, he denies a seventh day Adventist or a Jew their right to work on Sunday. He would tax free thinkers to support chaplains and churches. He wants God in the Constitution and Christianity in our laws and taught in our schools. He works to get a majority to enact such laws as favor his notions of religion and politics regardless of the imposition upon dissenters. He would be the first to protest against being taxed to support any other than his own church if it got a majority, and governed others in its favor. The only safe and logical ground for any one to take, sociologically, is to allow every one to do as he pleases, limited only by your own freedom to do the same thing.

Now, I have lived over sixty years as an Anarchist and raised a family of three sons as much respected for their intelligence, integrity and industry as any in the state, and in our family the terms govern, authority, obedience, command, or their synonyms were obsolete. Pure Mutualism or Communism existed. I never owned a fire arm nor any other deadly weapon. I never defended myself from any person, for I never needed to, I never killed anything with a gun, much less a human being. I was never angry enough at any person or people to want to, so I never went to war. I never solicited an office and detest those who do. I never command, and obey only when I must. I pay my taxes to support others under protest. Since I lived a life of Anarchy under hindering environments, I think under a condition of freedom that all could and would. I have lived a life of Anarchy and never knew a proper name for it. In my younger days I called it Christianity or Universalism. Since reading Herbert Spencer's "Social Statics" I called it Spencerian philosophy and sociology. There are many men who live a life of Anarchy who would be shocked to be called Anarchists, who should be won over to an avowal of it openly by gentle means. Teach, preach and practice Anarchy by precept and example until the world seeing our good works may be led to emulate us. The school of Anarchy is a new school, and as soon as the world learns the true meaning of it, after the erroneous conception of it is eliminated, it will be a powerful school. It embraces all that is good. It is "multum in parvo" and simple in philosophy. Its philosophy teaches the ideal of all past great and good people, and that martyrs have died for.

It is encouraging to know that the latest dictionary, for the first time in lexicography, gives a correct definition of Anarchy. I believe in the Spirit of the age. And the spirit of this age, the incoming age is Anarchy. It is in the air. The Prophets have foretold it. The Poets have sung it, and the people are now being imbued with it. It will be the great theme of discussion pro and con, all good people will embrace it, then on to victory. The false conception that only bad people avow it will soon disappear like mist before the morning sun.

As the "Hinglishman" would say, let us "ammer, amme, ammer and keep ammering away" until we drive the idea into the heads of people that we have discovered, the only absolute, unanswerable truth, the acme of the moral law, the eternal verity—Anarchy.
J. C. BARNES.

The Loud Bill requires publishers who are permitted to mail matter of the second class to separate them, before mailing, into mail sacks or bundles by States, cities, towns and counties, thus forcing every publisher to establish in his office a manure post-office.—[Printers Ink.]

*) It would be interesting to know by what means friend Barnes protests against paying taxes, and what effect the means employed have.

Note and Comment.

We are sorry to discontinue Comrade Andrews' "Triumph of Freedom," but the manuscripts of the remainder have not reached us. We regret it as much as any of our readers can, but cannot say how it happened that we failed to receive them.

A LAWYER and politician said to me the other day that it is a fine thing for the State that the pay of the legislators is limited to forty days; that all, from the highest to the lowest—if there be any high or low—act alike, and that even in the U. S. Senate, where people expect dignity, they act like boys at play. He said that a large number of the thoughtful people would not vote, and paid attention to their own private interests only.

If there are more typographical and other errors in this weeks issue than usual it must be excused as we have been extremely busy. We failed in the milk business, owing to the fierce competition and hard times, and so have to seek cheaper rent. Owing to the disturbing of arrangements in the office, and other unavoidable circumstances, the letter-box and receipts were crowded out of last week's issue, and this week we are moving!

We have two reports of the propoganda from Boston. One is that the Anarchist propoganda is dead, nothing being done, the only activity in propoganda being shown by she silverites "who criticise the government mercilessly." The other is from a girl who sells fifty copies of The Firebrand regularly, and sends us the money, every week. She says that well attended meetings are held every Sunday, and that the propoganda is progressing very well. She sold two hundred pamphlets, that we sent her, in a very short time. This last mentioned report is quite encouraging.

"If you Anarchists would be more practical," I am sometimes told, "you would make headway much faster." I always ask how we can be more practical, and declare myself ready to help along anything that will assist the propoganda, or toward the realization of freedom. These advisors do not propose any definite plan of action. It may be, however, that some of the comrades are mere theorists, ignoring all practical efforts to realize greater freedom. If so I deplore it, but see no help for it except the growth of desire for desire for practical efforts on their part. But desire must precede action, and understanding must precede successful effort.

A PLUMBER recently stepped across the street from a house in which he was working, to spend his noon hour viewing the works of art in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, in New York City. He was stopped at the main entrance by custodian Kellogg, who informed him that he could not enter with overalls on, and to get or he'd call a policeman. General di Cesnola, director of the museum, says that during the seventeen years he has been director of the museum "not a single man in overalls has been allowed to look at the pictures." With him workmen in overalls are classed with drunkards, disorderly persons and pickpockets. H. A.

WILLIAM LAUDEN, of Santa Rosa, Cal., came up to Tacoma a couple of months ago in a San Francisco steamer, in the company of a man who died recently with consumption. Lauden was an industrious and attentive waiter at Hotel Chilberg, where he was giving the utmost satisfaction for several weeks. He appeared very healthy, but Saturday, Jan. 9, he got sick and the city physician was called, who left for him some medicine and told him he would come again on Sunday. Lauden grew worse and worse and the doctor was telephoned for, but it was told that he was out of town. The house lady tried to get four other doctors to take charge of the case, but nobody wanted to do it, giving the excuse that they could not take charge of a case which was already taken up by another doctor. The fact of the matter is that Lauden was not well provided with money, and so there was nothing in it for the—profession. This was the reason the city physician did not communicate the case to some of his colleagues. Lauden died Sunday afternoon without any medical assistance. When Dr. Quevli; the city physician, was asked why he did not take the man to the hospital Saturday afternoon, he replied that he knew that Lauden was going to die, so he didn't care to. It is to be remembered that this

very same Dr. Quevli when he delivered a speech among the local populist "stars" scattered in Germania Hall before the election, among other things he said: "It is a duty to humanity to relieve the suffering and pain of unlucky mankind, and even a sick murderer ought to be cured and then hung." Decidely everybody gets "rotten" whoever gets a part of political pie, and the "liberal professions" are only fit to squeeze the bloody dollar. A. KLEMENCIC.

Clippings and Comments.

In all ages men have differed. Those who saw the evils which existed in society, and attempted to apply remedies, were often persecuted by the upholders of existing systems, and habits of thought. Every reform has conquered in the end, but it has often been bathed in blood before final victory was gained —Longshoreman.

CONGRESSMAN LEMUEL E. QUIGG (Republican) of New York, an experienced newspaper man, says of the Loud Bill: "If enacted into law it would not dispense with a single post-master, clerk, railway postal clerk or a single mile of mail service. All of these would remain and continue to increase whether or not the class of matter in question was kept out of the mails."—[Printers Ink.]

THE State cannot make the rich unselfish, but it can make them richer and does, and the appetite of the rich grows with what it feeds on. Governments are capitalist bureaus from which the rich obtain special privileges and permits to plunder the people. The latter furnish the means of operating a machine which the rich use to destroy them.—[Coming Nation.]

The above is correct, but yet the editor of the Coming Nation is an upholder of the State.

A TRUE government would be one that profited by the experience of the past, and gave every opportunity for the free play of the higher activities of man today, and erected no barriers to progress tomorrow. Such a government, however, has never existed. Government has always meant force and fraud, trickery and tinsel, princes and paupers, cant and corruption, tasks and taxes, crowned heads and cormorants, humbug and hunger, "saints" and slaves, robbers and robbed.—[Coming Nation.]

The "true government" above described would be no government at all. Why not be honest, Edwards, and declare against all government?

THE Lincoln, Neb., "Independent" (Pop.), with wonderful introspection, says: "Some men are so generous that they give themselves away at almost every opportunity." And forwith proceeds to furnish an illustration of its own maxim with the following doggerel:

And the heads they are a-dropping,
And you bet there'll be no stopping,
Until every rep shall die;
We will make the dry bones rattle,
We will drive them forth like cattle,
For we surely won the battle,
And we'll surely eat the PIE."

We always thought so, but now we know it, that what the Pop politicians are after, is a transfer of the "pie" from the old to a new set of political hacks. —[The People.]

But of course DeLeon and his gang wouldn't eat any of the "pie"—until they win an election. "Vested with authority all men are alike," says Proudhon.

THAT system of political economy which makes wealth and not man the ultimatum is a based on a monstrous fallacy—on a fallacy so slavish and so detestable that the wonder is how accomplished and personally amible men can be found as its abettors. The fallacy is in taking the rents of the landlord and the profits of the capitalist as the measures of good and evil, instead of taking the condition of the cultivators and of the laborers (the many) as the sure index of the character of a system. Whatever tends to debase man, to make him physically, intellectually or morally a lower being, is bad, however much or little the wealth produced may be. The wealth is not the stable element. It is an accidental, and by no means an important, adjunct. Man is the stable element. His condition is the standard. His improvement is good. His deterioration is an evil. All other conditions are secondary, dependent, subsidiary to the great intention. Man is not useful as he produces wealth, but wealth is useful as it sustains man, ameliorates his condition, improves his capacities, gives opportunities

for his further cultivation and aids his progress in the great scheme of human regeneration.—[A Physician.]

The Armory Board to-day decided that the new Sixty-ninth Regiment armory shall be built at Lexington Ave. and 23d St., the present site of the College of the City of New York. It will take up the entire front of Lexington Ave. between 23d and 24th Sts., including the two houses owned by Mrs. Abram Hewitt.

The property owners in 23d St. and the business men of the locality have made several protests against the selection of this site by the Armory Board, and they appeared in the Mayor's office in force to-day and repeated the objections.

The board, after listening to all the objections, voted unanimously to adopt the report of the Committee on Site. A former report recommending that the armory be built on 3d Ave. between 6th. and 7th. Sts., was recinded.

Charles F. Wingate, of the Social Reform Club, entered a strong protest against the adoption of the College site for an armory.

"In the first place," he said, "these extraordinary fortifications show a lack of faith in the integrity of the people. In the second place, a building now used for educational purposes should not be turned into an armory. Again, on behalf of several labor organizations, I wish to see this college building under the management of a Board of Trustees, who will permit workmen to use it for a meeting place. The workmen of the City of New York want a meeting place that will be away from the influence of saloons and bar-rooms."—[N. Y. Daily News.]

This shows the steady growth of militarism, and preparation of the governing class to meet the outbreaks and bread riots which are unavoidable if "hard times" continue. Property and privilege must be protected and upheld at any cost of life. What is the life of the worker worth, anyhow, in the eyes of military commanders and politicians? But to change all this will be quite easy when workmen grow wise enough to refuse to belong to the militia. What can the bulldog military commanders and the vicious political schemers do if the workers would not obey and uphold them? Nothing. Let unionists and non-unionist alike refuse to work on the construction of armories and who will build them? Comrades, the workers are allpowerful if they will but act wisely. H. A.

Correspondence.

A TOLERANT SOCIALIST.

Through the influence of my friend, sister Alice McNulty of Circleville Texas, I send you 50 cents for your paper. I am a Socialist. Do not understand Anarchy. Will read your literature anyway and will co-operate with you in every way possible to bring about a change. With best wishes I am for right if I can only know what right is. G. B. HARRIS. Bruceville Texas.

WORK IN THEIR OWN WAY.

Your marked copy of The Firebrand was duly noticed, but as I have been on the sick list for three weeks have neglected to reply. However, I will say that all thoughts of benefit from elections have been beaten out of me for a long time. No! A government is of no earthly use, and as Thomas Paine says is the originator of all evils.

As to the book The Old and the New Ideal I would like that as well as several other works on the sex question, but just at present the prosperity that uncle McKinley promised us has not arrived. But I hope in the near future to be able to get a few, also to aid you boys a little. If we were only closer I could, and would gladly aid in the labor of the office for the good of the cause. But as that is out of the question, we are thinking of issuing a small monthly paper. We have a small press and some type, and we have practiced on setting up our articles of agreement, cards, etc.

Of course we do not expect anything, financially, from the paper, but will try and add our mite for the common good.

I have got started on an article for The Firebrand, but as the space has been more ably filled I gave it up, not wishing to intrude on your limited space.

Us boys are doing as well as the common run, have plenty to do fixing our homes etc., and are cutting cord wood for Seattle Market. We are gradually making our improvements and will show people in time that we can better our conditions by labor, without money.

OLIVER A. VERITY.

Propaganda Fund.

C. S. Philadelphia, \$1.00. Darrow, Lee, Fassett, Greenberg, Bohemian Group in Newark, each \$1.00. Lehman, Lacoek, Pardo, Miss Grand, Harris, Tracy, Dumas, each 50c. Ginsburg, Aronberg, each 25c. Parrot, 35c. Jeraned, 10c. Hlavacek, Smirnow, \$1.00 each. Lessman, 60c. Barnes, Devanport, Addis, L., each 50c. Corbin, Kisloff, Hettner, each 25c. Tannenbaum, 10c.

The Letter-Box.

J. P., Newark, N. J.—We sent Vol. 2, but Vol. 1 is exhausted.

J. A., Waterbury, Conn.—Two copies of the "Old and New deal" have been sent, but "Bombs" we ordered from Whittick and will arrive in a few days. The address of T. is changed to New York.

J. L., Chicago.—The book has been sent. Letters like yours are encouraging, and you will have seen by this time that we are trying our best under the circumstances, to keep the propaganda going.

New York City.—Somebody subscribes for The Firebrand, but we neither can decipher the name nor the street. It seems to us the name reads "Stuth." The party will write again and so that we can read.

M. D., Paterson, N. J.—Thanks for your encouraging letter. We are of the same opinion: If the propaganda in the English language is neglected the efforts of the foreign speaking people will have very little effect.

To pretend that a "prudent" marriage generates love, is the same as to sow pumblin seed and wish them to produce mellons—Montegatza.

A small Boy asks his Father some Pertinent Questions.

PA, what place is that?
That is a brickyard, my son.
Whose brickyard is it, pa?
It belongs to me, my son.
Do all those piles of bricks belong to you?
Yes my son, every brick of them.
My! How long did it take you to make them—did you make them all by yourself?
No, my son; those men you see working there made them for me.

Do those men belong to you, pa?
No, my son; these are free men. No man can own another. If he could the other would be a slave.

What is a slave, pa?
A slave is a man who has to work for another all his life for only his board and clothes.

If a slave gets sick who pays for the doctor?
Well, his owner does. He can't afford to lose his property.

Why do these men work so hard, pa—do they like it?
Well, no, I don't suppose they do; but they must work or starve.

Are those men rich, pa?
Not to any great extent, my son.

Do they own houses, pa?
I rather guess not, my son.
Have they any horses and nice clothes, and do they go to the seaside when it's warm, like we do, pa?

Well, hardly. It takes them all their time to earn their living.

What is a living, pa?
Why, a living—well, for them a living is what they eat and wear.

Isn't that board and clothes, pa?
I suppose it is.

Well, are they any better off than slaves?
Of course they are, you foolish boy. Why, they are free; they don't need to work for me if they don't like—they can leave when they choose.

And if they leave, won't they have to work?
Yes, of course they will; they will have to work for some one else.

And will they get any more than a living from him?
No, I suppose not?

Well, then, how are they any better off than slaves?
Why, they have votes; they are free men.

If they get sick do you pay the doctor, pa?
Catch me! What have I to do with it? They must pay for their own doctor.

Can you afford to lose one of the men who work for you, pa?

Of course I can; it don't make any difference to me. I can hire another whenever I like.

Then you ain't so particular about them as if they were your slaves, are you, pa?
No, I suppose not.

Then how is it better for them to be free?
Oh; don't ask foolish questions, boy.
What are bricks made of, pa?

Clay, my son.
Do the bricks belong to the man who makes them?
No, my son, they belong to me.
Why, when they make them, pa?
Because the clay is mine.
Did you make it, pa?
No, God made it, my son.
Did he make it for you, pa?
No, I bought it.

Bought it from God?
No, from a man.
Did the man buy it from God?
No, of course not; he bought it from another man, I suppose.

Did the first man it was bought from buy it from God?
No, I suppose not.
How did he get it, then? How was it his any more than anybody else's?

Oh, I don't know. I suppose he just claimed it.
Then, if these men should claim it now, would it be theirs?

Oh, don't bother asking such foolish questions.
Say, if you didn't own the brickyards and the clay, how would you make your living, pa?

Oh, I don't know; I suppose I would have to work.
Would you make bricks, pa?
Maybe I would.

How would you like to make bricks for your board and clothes, and let the man who claimed the brickyard have everything else?

Nobody'd care how I liked it. Poor people must work for their living.

If these men had brickyards of their own, would they work for you, pa?

Not likely; they'd work for themselves probably.
Isn't it lucky that that man claimed this land first and that you bought it?

Why?
If he hadn't, maybe somebody else would have claimed it, and then maybe one of those men would own it now, and then you'd have to work for your board and clothes.

Maybe you ought to be thankful to Providence for his goodness to you in giving you a father who can support you without working.

Should these men's little boys be thankful to Providence too, pa?

Well, I suppose they should.
What for, pa?
Because their pa's have steady work.

Is steady work a good thing, pa?
Of course it is, my son.

Then, why don't you work, pa? Nobody could keep you from making bricks, could they?

No. I don't want to keep men out of a job. If I worked, there wouldn't be work for another man.

That's kind of you, pa. Do you think, if you was to wheel that man's barrow once, while he rested, that he would be mad about it?

Oh, pshaw! Gentlemen don't wheel barrows.
What's gentlemen, pa?

Why, gentlemen—men who don't need to work—the upper class.
I thought there wasn't any upper class in this country. I heard a man say all men were equal.

The man who said it was a Socialist or Anarchist, or something; or maybe it was at election time, and he was trying to catch votes.

Say, pa, my Sunday-school teacher says we are all God's children. Is she a Socialist, or Anarchist, or is she trying to catch votes?

Oh, no; that's the right thing to say in Sunday-schools and churches.
Well, pa—honest now—are these men God's children just as much as we are?

Why, yes, my son; to be sure they are.
Say, pa, do you remember when you bought that dozen alleys for brother Jim and me, and I grabbed them all and made Jim give me his top before I'd let him play with them, and you called me a greedy little hog and gave me a licking?

Yes my son, I remember.
Well, do you think you did right?

Certainly, my son; a parent does right to correct his children and keep them from acquiring bad principles. I bought the marbles for you both. Jim had as much right to them as you.

Well, pa, if these men are God's children as much as

you, then you and they are brothers; and if you make them give you all the bricks they make for allowing them to use the clay which God made, isn't that the same as me making Jim give me his top for a chance to play with the marbles?

Oh, bother! Don't ask such stupid questions. Say, pa, do you think God thinks you are a greedy little hog, and that he will punish you for grabbing that clay?

Oh, don't talk so much. Say, Mary, put this child to bed—he makes me tired!—[Inland Printer.

Sample Copies.

To all who receive The Firebrand without having ordered it we would say: Your name may have been sent in by a friend, and we will continue to send it to you for a reasonable length of time. Our subscription is voluntary, i. e., all who read it can send in as much or as little toward the support of the paper as their means and conscience will permit. If you wish to read The Firebrand, and can not send anything toward its support let us know, and you will receive the paper just the same. After sending the paper to anyone a reasonable length of time, if we do not hear from them we will discontinue sending it. We want every one to have the paper who desires to read it, but we cannot tell whether you want it or not if you do not let us know.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

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.

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 three 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.

NEW OCCASIONS
A Magazine of Social Progress.
EDITED BY FREDERICK UPHAM ADAMS.
The world is on the threshold of vast social changes. Progress is about to render the chains which have bound it. The next forward step will be just that which the average intelligence of a nation makes possible. Revolution is the pulse-beat of progress. The coming revolution should be one of intelligence; it should be one of peace. In that hope and in that belief NEW OCCASIONS opens its pages to a discussion of these things. It is bound to be new, and desires only to reach nearer to the truth. MONTHLY, 64 PAGES with handsome cover.
ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION \$1.00; SINGLE COPIES 10 CENTS.
Sold by all Progressive Newsdealers.
WANTED: the address of every active reformer. We have thousands of pamphlets on free silver, direct legislation, government banks, etc., for distribution. Sample packages mailed for six cents.
CHARLES H. KERR & CO., Pubs., 56 Fifth Avenue, Chicago.

Mrs. Walsbrooker's Books.

- My Century Plant.....\$1.00
 - The Occult Forces of Sex......50
 - The Fountain of Life......50
 - A Sex Revolution......25
- 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.....\$ 1.0
- One has but to read the above and then be told that the post-department objects to its circulation, to see how much government 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 Sexual Intercourse. By Emil F. Ruedebusch. Paper cover 50c. Nicely bound.....\$1.00
- Diana, a Psycho-Physiological Essay on Sexual Relations. \$1.50
- Talks on Nature. Important Information for both Sexes. A Treatise on the Structure, Functions and passions. Attractions of Men and Women. Nicely bound..... 50

A Splendid Book.

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. No one can afford to miss reading this book. The following subjects are discussed in the order given.

1. Our Freethinkers and Christian Morality.
2. Explanations. 3. Our Children. 4. Our Young Men. 5. The Preventive Check. 6. The Girls.
7. Love. 8. The Value of Marriage and the Free Love Movement. 9. The Happy Marriage of To-day.
10. How long will Love Relations last in a Free Society? 11. Jealousy and Possession. 12. The Old and the New Ideal. 13. Ethical Views on Coition.
14. Love and Friendship in a Free Society. 15. The Ideal Society. 16. The Number of Children in a Free Society. 17. Undesired Children. 18. Licentiousness. 19. The Sense of Shame. 20. Obscenity. 21. Prostitution. 22. Crime and Disease. 23. Ebricity.—An Appeal to the Women. 24. Woman's Emancipation. 25. The Social Question. 26. The

Propaganda.

- Appendix:
1. Introduction. 2. The Criticism of a Leader.
 3. The Charm and Beauty in Exclusiveness. 4. Woman vs. Man. 5. The Weakness of Woman. 6. "Calling Names." 7. Criticisms of Socialists and Anarchists. 8. Tolstoism. 9. A Paradox. 10. My Hopes and Fears.
- The price of this book is: Paper cover 50c. Cloth nicely bound \$1.00.

A fine Present for Friends.

ORDER FROM THE FIREBRAND.

FIREBRAND LIBRARY.

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

- Agriculture. By Peter Kropotkin..... \$ 03
- Anarchism and Violence. By L. S. Bevington..... 03
- Let us be Just. By W. Tcherkessoff. [An open letter to Liebknecht]..... 05
- The Wage System. By Peter Kropotkin..... 05
- Expropriation. By Peter Kropotkin..... 05
- A Talk About Anarchist Communism. By Malatesta..... 05
- Anarchy on Trial. Speeches by Paris Anarchists..... 05
- Common Sense Country. By L. S. Bevington..... 03
- A Plea for Anarchist Communism. By W. H. Duncan..... 03
- Bases of Anarchism: Historical, Philosophical and Economical. By William Holmes..... 05
- God and the State. By Michael Bakounin..... 05
- The Commune of Paris, by Peter Kropotkin, and An Anarchist on Anarchy, by Elise Reclus (one volume)..... 05
- The True Aim of Anarchism. By E. Steiner..... 05
- Anarchist Communism. By Peter Kropotkin..... 05
- Revolution. By S. H. Gordon..... 05
- Social Democracy in Germany. By G. Landauer..... 02
- Liberty Lyrics. By L. S. Bevington..... 05
- Socialism in Danger. By Domela Nieuwenhuis..... 05
- The Why I am..... 05
- Of the Definition of Crime. By H. Hamon..... 05
- Anarchist Morality. By Peter Kropotkin..... 05
- Monopoly, or, How Labor is Robbed. By William Morris. Evolution and Revolution. By Elise Reclus..... 05
- Anarchism in Socialistic Evolution. By Peter Kropotkin..... 05
- Wants and their Gratification. By Henry Adams..... 10
- Useful Work vs. Useless Toil. By William Morris..... 05
- True and false Society. By William Morris..... 05
- The Ballot Box a Farce. By W. K. Hall..... 05
- Anarchism vs. State Socialism. By G. B. Shaw. 100 copies Albert E. Parsons' Book on Anarchism, its Philosophy and Scientific Basis. German and English Editions; handsomely bound in cloth and gilt, 80 cents; paper cover..... 15
- Life of Albert E. Parsons, with a brief History of the Labor Movement in America. Beautifully illustrated and nicely bound; 290 octavo pages..... 75
- The two books last named are slightly damaged, but readable.
- Bombs. The Poetry and Philosophy of Anarchy. By W. A. Whittick. Paper 50 cents. Cloth..... 1.00

THE FIREBRAND'S AGENTS.

- The following named persons will receive and receipt for donations for The Firebrand.
- Chicago, Ill. C. Pfoetzner, 239 Taylor Street.
 - New York City.—J. Rudasch, 60 Rivington Street.
 - Boston, N. Y.—G. Lang, 29 Grape Street.
 - Philadelphia, Pa.—L. Rabotnik, 731 Plover Street. C. Place, 860 N. Fourth St. (No. 2 rear).
 - Baltimore, Md.—B. Morwitz, 1141 East Lombard Street.
 - London, Eng.—Tom Reece, 19 Hild Road, Fulham Road, Sw.
 - Glasgow, Scotland.—Wm. Duff, 5 Nethesda Gardens, Crossmylee.

Kurious Kreatures

- Red Lizard, Mounted on card..... \$.50
 - Porcupine Fish..... 1.00
 - Centipede, Mounted..... 1.00
 - Scorpion, Mounted fine..... 1.00
 - Tarentula 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..... 3.10
 - Alligator 3 feet long..... 5.00
 - Snowy Owl. Large fine Specimen..... 10.00
- E. B. Goss, Taxidermist
Warren Minn.

A Home AND A JOB FOR ONLY \$100.00 IN THE SUNNY SOUTH.

You can get a home in the co operative village of Co-opolis, Miss., and the right to work in the co-operative brick plant for \$100.00. The home consists of a house of two rooms and a lot 150x175. Send stamps for copies of the GRANDER AGE and full particulars. Address, THE GRANDER AGE, CO-OPOLIS, HARRISON CO., MISSISSIPPI.

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.

Poisoning People

because they are sick in going out of fashion, in spite of it being the law. Reason, which is higher than the constitution, demands that they should be cured, not killed. The many one-idea methods, mental and physical, that profess to cure and which sometimes relieve pain, is evidence of this. The Philosophical, Scientific, Psychological & Physiological Method cures after these chance methods have failed even to alleviate. This method is all that its name implies, it cures all forms of disease, of either male or female, from whatever cause arising, including the so called incurables. Free trial. Write now. E. C. Lamont, 68 St. James Place, Brooklyn, N. Y. When writing please mention The Firebrand.

- Anarchist Headquarters in San Francisco, 1232 1/2 Polson 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 Sunday evening at 935 Westminster St., Providence, R. I.
- International Group Free Initiative meets at 64 Washington Square, New York City, every Monday at 8:30 p. m.
- Radical Literature of all kinds, including English periodicals, can be found at the news stand of comrade I Rudasch, Cor. Essex & 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.
- Anarchistische Vorbildungs Gruppe meets every Saturday night at 8 o'clock p. m., 110 Delancy St., New York. Pamphlets in English, Hebrew and German languages can be had at the meeting.
- The Group Proletariat 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.
- Deincke Listy is an eight page Anarchist weekly paper, published in the Bohemian language at New York City, 266 Ave. B by the International Workingmen Association of America. Send for sample copy
- The Alarm is an Anarchist weekly paper for the workers and is published at 98 Judd Street, Euston Road, London, England. The editorial office is Anarchist-Communist, and each issue contains twelve columns of eye opening and thought provoking matter. Two cents weekly, or sent through the post for one dollar a year. With The Firebrand \$1.50.

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, 2519 Olive St., St. Louis, Mo.
Lucifer the Light Bearer, published at 1394 W. Congress St., Chicago, Ill., by M. Harman, makes a specialty of Sexology or Sexologic science, believing this to be the most important of all sciences, because the most intimately connected with the origin or inception of life, when character, for good or ill, for strength or weakness, for happiness or misery, for success or failure, is stamped upon each individual. Weekly, \$1.00 a year