A Legend.

A man found a fool on an island were cast;
Their ship had gone down in the hurricane's blast.
On the island they met, while hungry and wet,
A wise man who aided them to eat.
They were given a house, with the freedom to roam,
Bound round by no bounds but the wave.

The fool, though destitute, was easily contented
To live in this beautiful land;
But the man was a scholiast (there's plenty more sense,
He thought out a wonderful plan.

Said the man to the fool: "It's plain that some rule
Must govern society here,
Else order will be found in the Anarchist sense—
A government is needed, I fear!"

The fool was demented, and of course he connected,
But the wise man opposed it alone;
His logic was parried, for the measure was carried
Over the minority of one.

Now gone but a fool, or a knife waste futile,
For a wise man knows he's right.
So the knife was elected, for no fool is selected
To sit in judgment, the matter settled.

The knife, as a state, was something quite great,
The fool was God in surprise,
As he looked on awe, for the majesty of law
Quite blinded and dazzled his eyes.

But states are expensive, and the fool was quite prone
When the tax collector called round,
And took all his money, and (it wasn't quite funny)—
As payment for using the ground.

I've long the poor fool, by means of the rule
Of this cunning knife of a state,
Was reduced to a slave and made work for the knife,
From early morning till late.

The wise man foresaw that the knife and his law
Would drive from the island its peace;
He was branded a hellion, a traitor,
For whom toleration should cease.

The soul patriot, and quite shout to—
(Scornfully to the wise man)
Was ready with chains, and the law's legal pains,
To fasten his own despair.

And to kill with a blow, first his enemy's foe,
And his own true defender and friend;
To preserve the knife’s law, which he worshipped in awe
And to the gallows the hero did send.

Why I am an Anarchist.

We find ourselves in a world of conflicting ideas,
And every person who has individually enough
developed to be more, in human life, than a domestic
animal or lifeless machine, must align himself
with others who hold the same opinion, whether
he will or not, and then he is in the view of others,
and perhaps in his own view, labeled with the
name of the idea he holds, so far we find that nearly
every person is labeled, and some persons who have
a number of labels.

Finding that we must be something—must hold
to certain ideas and work for certain ends—if we
work at all, or amount to any more in human life
than an ox, or an ass, it very naturally follows that
we will adopt and work for the prevalence of such
ideas that will bring us the greatest happiness, new
order, or bye and bye. That is why I am an Anarchist.

I am convinced that to work for the realization of
the Anarchist ideal will bring me more satisfaction
than that adherence to, or working for any other
ideal would bring me.

But every one should be able and willing to give
a reason for the "faith that is within him," and I
will try and do so.

I find myself in a world of sunshine and shade;
Of joy and sorrow; of happiness and woe. All
around me I see fellow beings: beings that are con-
stituted very much as I am, have similar desires,
hopes and aspirations. I find that they are con-
stantly trying to gratify these desires, to realize
their hopes and attain to that for which they
aspire. I find further that they can do these things
only by exploiting inorganic nature, and by assist-
ing each other. I find that as things are now,
these beings instead of mutually assisting each other
are constantly striving to injure each other, not
that they take delight in the suffering of a fellow,
but because they see no other way of satisfying
their desires and aspirations. They think this state of
affairs wrong, and are constantly clamoring for a
change, but have not yet learned the great funda-
mental fact of human solidarity—of our interde-
dependence.

Long have the various members of the human
family sought to adjust themselves to environment,
and of late have begun to endeavor to adjust
the environment to suit themselves. All mankind
strive for freedom, but most of the people have
sought to gain freedom by subjugating others, or
by restricting all alike. They have not learned
that they cannot be free while they are holding
others, or while they seek to restrict the freedom
of others. No one desire to be injured, and yet no one
can be secure from injury as long as they
injure others. We all wish to be free from injury,
I crave freedom. I see that others want the same
condition, and I know that my freedom can be
made secure only by the freedom of all others. I
know of no other ideal but Anarchy that if reall-
ized, would secure freedom to me, and to all others.
Therefore I am an Anarchist.

I long for plenty; for a sufficiency of the mate-
rial necessities of life to make it possible for me
to satisfy all my physical cravings, and I know that
all others want the same thing. I see that the
Earth yields abundantly; that it is possible for
human beings to produce all the material necessi-
ties required to satisfy their physical cravings,
and that if they would stop restricting and interfering
with each other and turn their attention to pro-
duction and mutual assistance, they could have
every material comfort they desire. Anarchy is the
only theory that, if put into practice, would secure
this abundance and at the same time secure full
liberty. Consequently, I am an Anarchist.

I love my fellows, some of them at least, and pity
those who suffer. I desire association with my fel-
low humans, and crave their friendship. I have a
horror of violence and of the shedding of blood. I
loved that, as a rule, because the members of the
human family are influenced by the same emotions,
and I see that these emotions are warped and stifled
by the conditions by which we are surrounded. I
realize that Anarchy would be a condition that
would tend to develop these emotions, and to elimi-
nate the emotions of hatred, revenge, jealousy and
envy, by desire: That in Anarchy association
would rest upon mutual attraction, that all such
hindering barriers as class distinction, rank, title
or wealth will not exist, and so I am an Anarchist.

I love the beautiful. It gives me joy to see gorgeous
sunsets, towering mountains, picturesque
scenes. It increases my happiness to see bright
to snows faces, happy people and gay colors. I take
great delight in works of art, in poetry and music.
I do not enjoy these things alone. I wish to share
my joy with others. As things are to-day the abil-
ity to enjoy these things is crowded or crammed out
of most people, and I must have my enjoyment of
them constantly marred by the loneliness I feel
when trying to communicate my joy to those I love,
or with whom I associate. I know that many who
have great artistic power, who could add much to
the worlds store of art, poetry and music are pre-
vented from doing so by the hard necessities that
surround them, and I see that Anarchy would
abolish the stifling conditions that kill the appe-
rition of the beautiful and prevent the develop-
ment of the artistic. I am, for these reasons an
Anarchist.

All this and much more goes to make up the
reasons for my adherence to, and advocacy of An-
archy. HENRY ADDS.

The Paris Commune.

Again the anniversary of the Paris Commune is
approaching. All around the world wherever
modern industrialism has gone, this anniversary
will be celebrated. Much has been written con-
cerning this great popular uprising, most of which
has been of a derogatory character, but some trau-
ful and commendatory. The uprising of the people of Paris against offi-
cial corruption, in time of siege and general distress,
is one of the brightest pages in the history of
France, and has been a source of encouragement to
the oppressed of every country. The lover of liberty,
and the admirer of heroism and devotion may never
weary of contemplating and discussing on the events of the Commune, and the personalities of
those who figured most conspicuous in it. How
great a relief to the sinking and cowardly action of
the rulers of France, was that splendid uprising of
the "commune"—that plan of "hooligan politics," and found themselves
free.

How it shocked the thrones of Europe and extirpated
thrive of hope through the minds of the downtrodden
of every nation. Ah, how near to the realiza-
tion of the dream of all ages it came. Ever had this
people prayed for deliverance from bondage, and
from the domination of oppressors. Always hoped
and prayed for the future would bring them, but they
had watched and waited for deliverance, and now, oh glorious reality, freedom had triumphed in Parisi-
the people of Paris were free. Were they incapable...
of appreciating their freedom? Did they feel like a fish out of water or a bird that longs for its cage? Nay, they enjoyed their freedom; they were happy. They flung themselves into the new form of life with a will and the Faculty of women was in full swing, walking all around at all hours of the day and night, unprotected by police or other

"mimons of the law," and with no fear to beat, no robbery or other acts of violence occurring, was seen for the first time in the history of the city. Strange as it may seem, contradictory as it is to all

authoritarian assertions to the contrary, Paris, during the Commune was absolutely without all those acts which are supposed to be made to maintain public order. Although besieged from without, violence was

unknown within, and no community containing as many persons ever before or since existed that was

as full of happiness and security.

But some men were foolish enough to think that all that was lost must be made "legal." That "admission

was necessary." A "Committee of Public Safety" was elected, and it assumed the right to manage the affairs of the Commune. In other words, a government was established. Then trouble began with the French government as well as with the French people, as a result of an entrance into that city. That was their first great mistake. What need had they of legal sanction or "administration?" Had they not just shaken off the oppression of the old government? Was the idea of thinking that some law was necessary too strong, and while the majority were enjoying their newly gained freedom, the minority were unpreparedly preparing it to a deadfall that would eventually

snatch it away.

How armed the "powers that be," in the other nations were shown by the fact that the Austrian government sent troops over to assist the French Army in re-capturing the city, and the German army that had marched into the French Empire and occupied it from the Rhine to the Pyrenees, was held at bay in readiness to assist the French troops if need be. In fact every indication is that every government in Europe would willingly and freely have rendered the French government aid, if that had been desired, to crush out what at first looked to be the initial step toward the abolishment of political domination of all kinds. But would they have dared? The International Workman's Association had its ramifications

made in '71, in the event that such another opportunity to shake off the shackles of oppression should ever present itself. What governments will do in the name of "law and order" is shown by the unparalleled butchery that accompanied the re-capturing of the city by the government troops. Calling the Communards wolves, they

played the part of byrones, sycophants, of demons. In the name of "order and law." The commanders of the Austrian troops caused the most heinous and bloody tragedy in the annals of history to be enacted, and the woe that they created has lasted even to this day, and it throws a dark shadow over the lives of many who were innocent of all.

Oh, the lesson that is taught by the Paris Commune! Can you not see it? It shows all to clearly to those who can comprehend, that with the passing of government come crime and insecurity, and the attempts at legalisation of society, at legislation, are but playing with a deadly monster. Let all who desire liberty learn a lesson: Reform from legislating; from obeying the command of a military commander; from participating in the decisions of the government, and made sure that the promise of freedom realised, be thwarted by such mistakes as

were made by the Paris Commune.

HENRY ADDIS.

An Answer to Criticisms.

It is a recent number of The Firebrand a correspondent says in regard to my work, "It is certainly true that every New Idealist may be called a "materialist of the extreme type," as he holds that "to be in good faith still to be able to enjoy something is a great complement to his own complex nature he needs a great variety of human beings. How much variety (if any) in sexual enjoyment this would involve is dependent on the personal qualities of the individual, and in many cases, alas, it would probably include sexual intercourse whatever. For some men at least, the highest manifestation of love's joys include many things besides the sexual element. As I am convinced that my critic, in writing the above, thought only to express such a sentiment as the variety of love's joys include many things besides the sexual element. As I am convinced that my critic, in writing the above, thought only to express such a sentiment as the number of people in the world that the majority of the read-

ers understand it, I reject his interpretation as false and misleading and consider it wise to offer an explanation.

I want the abolition of any and all sexual contracts and defy the world to show the least advantage in such a contract. I advocate freedom in love, i.e. real freedom which is in itself so beautiful a contract or "relation," not to such a monstrous absurdity as the prevailing love-ideal. This is the theory in a nutshell! The reader only had to take into consideration all the conditions which could reasonably be expected to result from its general acceptance.

My studies soon convinced me that a natural and inevitable state of society in the sex-life of almost every healthy human being. Hence I had to figure with this and was highly pleased to find that what we are tempted to dismiss that objection to such variety is based upon nothing but

rank superstition, that this conviction is "in, fact, far more charming than if we had to believe that for each of us there was one world but one true soul mate, but one being who could be considered a beautiful complement to our sex-nature." When I had imagined this, I had reached the highest point of intellectual bliss, I felt justified in giving this advice: Be free in love and never barter away in any manner this your most precious, inalienable right! Whatever you may bring to your effort, never fear, you have everything to gain and nothing to lose thereby! I hope that at least the ma-

jority of my readers will be clear-headed enough to understand that this is by no means equivalent to advocating variety in sex-association as a good thing per se. And now I wish to say to my worthy critic: Don't be scared! And now I wish to say to you: I am sure that you obtain from the sex-world a desire for true love, and retain forever the right to say to your partner, friend and foe, to Mrs. Grundy, Church and State, to each and every one of you: "I am too much variety." It is because you are free from being a New-Idealist, even if you should desire to thus label a full, or if your sexual record should bear the names of what you are what you have been.

Another correspondent of The Firebrand thinks that I am "not out of the woods yet," because I believe in an "inviolable contract." The word "inviolable" is badly in order here as it suggests the idea of enforcement by state, society or community by means of brute power, a thing in which I certainly do not believe. Leave out this word, then the only thing guilty. Yet it is not to still be in some binding contracts as long as the present economical conditions prevail. My opponent is perfectly correct in saying that, if we are to say that in a thing having to some extent, but it is equally true that under existing con-

ditions not to enter into such may ensue me still more. To illustrate, one who has obtained a wife through the contract of marriage, without this or a similar contract I would be obliged to steal or beg for my daily bread. In which manner do I gain the greater freedom? Or, suppose a man

no home. At present he cannot gain this except through a binding contract which may ensue him to quite an extent for life,—and yet, every one who enjoys the benefits of a real marriage contract. How many such, to many other lib-

erities (by means of the security which it affords) that even in this case the net result will be a gain in his freedom? The reader frequently as my opponent does that we may some time reach such conditions that we will not be forced again and again to sacrifice one liberty in order to gain another, but book is to offer suggestions for immediate action and that, therefore, I had to reckon with things as they are (economically) and not with what they might be in a moral sense. I believe that it would be a great deal nicer for us men, if the women would offer us the benefits of a beautiful home and the joys, rights, and privileges that a "veritable Idealism" and a real freedom in any way, without asking of us the promise to perform a lot of duties for a term of years or for life, and as things are, I yet feel obliged to advise the women to "believe in" a good solid contract, yes, to make it pretty nearly "inviolable" by an inti-

mate association of interests. This latter forms far stronger and far more reliable ties than the legal law, yet, I would no more blame a woman for adding to her sexual contract than I would blame an Anarchist for making any other business arrangement, a sale or a lease, for instance, a legal bond. Another remark of the correspondent has caused me a good hearty laugh. "That's all rubbish! You can't evade my supervision!"—that's just what Mrs. Grundy and her little friends, the moralists, try to do. They have made a great big fool of herself, and that all her carefully compiled dates and figures which seemed to show the worst vice of all, a real moral sin, turned out in fact absolutely valueless for the "control of the sex relations" of a New-Idealist. As my assertions referring to our position towards the legal law. I will say that my remarks are simply designed to remove one of the points which the author of the book has in mind to get at.

Things As I See Them.

I am much pleased with the way you have defended Samuel P. Putnam against his own people. I have not read the article, but was told by one who had, that its author, Mr. Buffulo's "Dissolution of the Family," has had an editorial speaking very derogatory of Mr. Putnam, saying he was a free lover and a disgrace to the cause of Liberalism.

Mr. Putnam had his faults, but they were those of a lion and not of a ass, and when a living ass attacks a dead lion, the latter he braves the most sensible people stop their ears. I have listened to a great many speakers in my day, but never to one in which the words seemed coming from a soulless shell. I thought it would make little or no effect on our intelligent, of the effect this name Buffalo editor's lecture had upon me, and I found that he was similarly impressed. So much for personalities, and I only brought them in to show what question of the family has been the bone of contention. Until there is Freedom for the holder of the cre-

atory there can be freedom nowhere else.

I regard the family as a great anachronism, and a dead church morality, for so doing they are really the supports of church power.

Sex is the source, or channel, through which all life is led into being—it means all the life that is to come and live there can be no power, it follows that sex is the fountain of all power. As before, I repeat—sex is the fountain of all power. Here we can meet on common ground, for, I regard the fact that in one, two, or a dozen states of existence, whether we believe that "death ends all" or not, science demonstrates two facts: (1) that sex is the fountain of all life, and science further demonstrates that the finer forces are the most powerful, and that there can
be no action without an elimination of some portion of this same act and its sequel, a few simple and bit potent force. Now, please, reader, note every step in this demonstration—I was going to say argument, but I have no use for that—please mark every step and weigh carefully each statement, for I shall show that church power is rooted in sex, consequently those who allow the church and at the same time sustain the concept of church-sexuality are really sustainers of the church.

In order to find why the church opposes the open and apparent violation of this section of the law, we notice first the fact that the church secures its adherents by appealing to the emotions instead of to the reasoning powers. Now, if we can find what relation the emotion contains to the action, we can tell the why of the law that makes it dangerous to investigate sex outside of church theory. A. T. Thompson, a Kentucky Legislator, gives us the key note to the relation of sex to religion in an article to be found in the July Arena for 1895. He says, in arguing what is called "The age of consent law":

"It is not infrequently happens that when the first dawning of sexual appetite make their appearance in this natural desire is, under proper instruction, changed in character and becomes an acquired psychical habit, religions emotion. For it is a fact, and one capable of easy demonstration, that there is a close relation between religious emotion and sexual desire. The natural desire and the acquired emotion taking the places one of another, on occasions unconsciously and without volition, are the means of those in whom the transmission takes place.

What an admission is here! Religious emotion unnatural sexual activity! But this writer continues: The young girl yearning for the sexual union will find nothing wanting to complete a hundred full degrees of satisfaction in religious emotion.

What more can we ask to show that sex is the basis of religion? But remember, please, that whereas there is action there is waste, a something set free that corresponds to the nature of the action or emotion. It follows, then, that when sex desire has been transformed into religious emotion that in the action upon which it is transformed, there is, there must be set free a new element, a new and to the self of the individual recognized by those who control these emotions as to absorb the desire?

But sex in life. Sex aura is life aura, and those who appropriate it grow strong in psychic power. No wonder the priest sways the people! Emotion, transformed sex-desire, in connection with service worship warps the worshiper by weakening his life force, and so long as the men are thus held Freedom is impossible.

I cannot fail to elaborate this question in a newspaper article, but I will be enough to show the importance of the sex question in connection with that of Freedom, and I hold that those who deny the church sex code from the stand point of reason and by their acts and doing to hasten the day of universal freedom than are any other class of people, because they set free creative elements that vitalize life's currents, with the atmosphere with the very essence, or soul of freedom, they create a mental soil in which Freedom can grow.

This is, there can be no question of more importance than the sex question, because all other questions are involved in that, and the so-called church opposition who sneers at "free love" don't know what he is talking.

Note and Comment.

We are in need of two copies of "The Speeches before the Court," to use as "copy," as we wish to get out a new edition of them. We are unable to make them in the way of production, and so there are too few laws now.

The Oregon National Guard (State Militia) has not been called out—except last spring at time of the fisherman's strike—nor used at all, in thirteen or fourteen years, and according to the reports from the organization up. Now that there has been no appropriation made for its benefit what will the captains do? Will they continue to command, without pay, or will they leave the State defenseless, to be ravished by its enemies? The truth is they know that they do not preserve order, and the State would be just as tranquil without them, but it paralyzes their raving to be called a captain, and it suits them very well to live such a life of ease, at good pay.

Morgan J. Swift sends us a circular letter, addressed to the unemployed, calling on them to make themselves conspicuous on inauguration day (March 4th), and for all who can, to be in sight in Washington. Swift is a man of energy and enthusiasm, looking forward to appear in the Firebrand before that date.

The Legislature of South Dakota refuses to make any appropriation for the Oregon Legislature failed to make any such appropriation because of its failure to organize. It remains to be seen how these two stales get through two years without spending a lot of money on military displays.

How many radicals are there who wish to live a life of social work with their ideals? By this I mean how many want to realize a little of the freedom and fraternity we love to talk about now, without waiting for the revolution or the judgment-day.

It is possible, as The Firebrand publishers have demurred, to carry on an undertaking an undertaking a success of it, without constitution, by laws, rules of order or other supporting necessities of association.

It is a perfectly feasible proposition to undertake the carrying out of any object, or purpose, or the accomplishment of any task, or the conduct of an industry on a purely communistic basis. If undertaken by those who are mentally free, and anyway, congregally, there is no better way of life for a person that is more happy than the life of the average person in the ordinary struggle for bread.

When co-operative homes are undertaken it is well to have persons of various occupations connected therewith. A housekeeper, a barber, a tailor, a dressmaker and so on, in such a community will always procure a great advantage even if farming is the chief industry.

Do you want better conditions? Greater freedom? Then what you can do to help it. Nearly wishing for it will do but little to bring it about. Can you awaken the same desire in another, that will do much to hasten its realization.

There is much to do, and much joy to be realized in "bringing the lost sheep into the fold," in setting an example of fearless opposition to established customs; in sowing the seeds of Anarchy, of peace, love and joy.

There are two ways to propaganda, one in opposition to existing conditions because they are hateful: in creating discontent and unrest from an ideal radical. The other is by propagating Anarchy is by pointing out how much more comfortable and happy we could all be in Anarchy. How all our wants can be supplied, our artistic tastes and longing for the peaceful and grand gratifying, and contrasting with that what exists now.

J. Allen Evans, corresponding secretary of the Liberty Co-operative Association, at Hutsberg, Tenn., writes: We now have our own school for the colony children, and a few pupils from the outside attending. Mrs. D. H. Newhouse has been installed as editor. Mr. F. L. Avery, who went away from the colony to visit friends and spend Christmas, has returned and says there is no place like home. Compliments of the season, and a happy New Year to all. P. S.—On account of homesickness, writes he is coming home for keeps, just as soon as he can earn enough money to pay his fare to Hutsberg. He is an honest sick to get back to Liberty as he was to return to the place of his nativity. Any friends of co-operation who feel disposed may lend a helping hand to Liberty co-operators by sending them small contributions. Such favors will be greatly appreciated by them. We want a good blacksmith who is tired of hunting for a boss. A good mechanic of this kind can find a congenial home with the Liberty Co-operators if he can comply with the terms of membership.

Clippings and Comments.

"A man would not be greatly interested by any other name."—Great William assures us. So, a court house ring would act the same, whether called democratic, republican or progressive, regardless of former party affiliation."—Harley Co. News.

Why then, brother News don't you throw the whole mess of political corruption in the path of the popular leaders who may make it impossible to demand freedom? The politicians act in the same office, no matter what parties elect them.

At the banquet given by the Sons of the American Revolution, Mr. W. H. Chapin of this city said: "We do need that spirit of our forefathers—that unfailing devotion to and loyalty for our country's good. The country is running wild. Anarchy and Bolshevism are taking the place of the non-partisan, the non-political, which is the true, the correct, the better. Our Founders and the men who fought them were young men who had that spirit on all sides urge their respectable following to go to the polls early so as to avoid the30 other40 hundreds of characters that take possession later and frighten away the timid citizens who would vote if not too much troubled." This was said in the presence of a number of politicians that were also present at the meeting. The reply to this was nothing, but none of them deny its truthfulness. It is too well known to be denied, and indicates the decay of patriotism. Commercialism know the name of price, and spirit is dominant. Everything is for sale: office, honor, glory, fame, comfort, luxury, love, (?) Consequently the long purge wills. It is time to try to warn our people of the perils of commercialism as to try to turn the course of events backward. Patriotism must disappear, and universal fraternity appear before the evils complained of can be overcome.

The Letter-box.

J. P., Israel, Ind.—We are sorry to say it, but you are only ready to be a man in your town. We hope you'll get us none more.

B. G., New York City.—The books are sent out now and you have seen the reason of the delay in last week's issue.

C. B.—We are receiving many encouraging letters, but that there are not enough to justify a large number of really good pages. If it were not for you and a few other comrades, we would hardly have been able to continue the expenses. We trust, though, that the comrades will appreciate our efforts and assist us as much as possible and not be the greatest burden to relatively few comrades. Many thanks!

R. T., New York City.—We are always willing to argue with individuals that are honest and fair, but when they are intentionally lying and knowingly misrepresent facts, as the editor of your paper is, we are not in the habit of accepting them.

On the other hand, we could not find anything in his paper that would be worth considering. As a matter of fact, the writer has a double-headed tapeworm every week," as one reader of your paper says. The fact is that Mr. Fulton is retrograding steadily.

Notice.

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

We have fed you all a thousand years,
And you still hang as dripping fangs upon our necks.
Though it may cost you a thousand years of your wealth,
But mark the workers dead.
We have given you all that we can give,
And you are on crimson wool,
For blood should be the price of your wealth.
Good God we have paid it in full.
There is never a mine blown skyward now,
But blood instead of ore is poured for you.
There's never a wreck drifted shoreward now,
But we are its ghostly crew.
Communism in the red dust,
And the factories where we spin.
And we're told its our legal share.
But it is the blood of your poor wealth,
Good God we have bought it fair.

The Common Property Bugaboo.

In his piece turned communistic under the caption of "Why I Want Property," Mr. Byington, with views turned communisticward, makes a half-hearted plea for private ownership based upon his individual piety, and as a student and teacher. His attitude strikes the picture of a half converted deist, uttering the praises and extolling the virtues of the system of property, and then pretending that he cannot and should not feel he can no longer serve. That Mr. Byington is already more than half converted to Free Communism, is a fact that proves that people will increase very rapidly under freedom, that we can set no limit to its probable increase, and that "this increase tends and will tend to give us more and more..."

Having assented to this, which is the foundation upon which in my recent article I based the necessity of Free Communism, his further plea for private property in certain books—for, he be remembered, Mr. Byington does not demand private property in all books—even if perfectly valid and not inconsistent with Free Communism, would increase very rapidly under freedom, that we can set no limit to its probable increase, and that "this increase tends and will tend to give us more and more...

My own critic is perfectly honest in his doubts and desires, and I believe that when these are shown to be based upon his imperfect understanding of the requirements of Free Communism he will be ready to acknowledge that his fears were entirely groundless.

Friend Byington's arguments for private ownership center in and about himself; his individual wants, his pursuits as a student and teacher are taken as criteria for his assumption that private property is natural and right. In doing this he is undoubtedly pursuing the proper course. If Free Communism will not satisfy individual desires, if it should prove antagonistic to the individual, he is right. But I do not think a true Free Communist will ever be ready to acknowledge that his fears were entirely groundless.

Mr. Byington offers as a serious objection to Communism in books his pet habit of making marginal notations. But this is mere sophistry that is not necessarily essential to the cult of knowledge, for while it furnishes him valuable references he could equally cultivate the habit of preserving his notes in another and quite as good a place as that of setting them down at the margin. I also note that the best books he read, and have found by experience that my index rerum affords me the names and places of such references and footnotes.

I strongly advise friend Byington to drop the sloppy habit of marking up his books, and to keep to a complete index, with cross references and personal comments.

Another plea put forth by Mr. Byington is his desire to use many books which are not of general interest, and which he therefore presumably would not obtainable in a system of Free Communism. Upon analysis this objection will be found quite as weak as that of the previous one. Unless there be a greater incentive to pursue knowledge, and it would not be long before the demand for rare books would necessitate an ever increasing fund to be expended on them. In this I am sure the influential class would not be so bijou to suppose that a free library under Communism would not be as well regulated as our present public libraries are. If Mr. Byington lived in Chicago he would probably find that the same buck and slippery tactics are used in the sale of rare books duplicated in the public library there; but if not, the library board knows every facility to enable patrons to procure rare books to the extent of purchasing thousands of books annually. Here in Denver many books have been added to the collection in the public library upon the personal request of its patrons. Under Free Communism I would practically be no barrier to the cultivation of the finest tastes, and Mr. Byington would find his every wish in this direction gratified at the expense of the community. Our friend, by his own showing in a poor man, and while he has by great personal sacrifices accomplished so much, he has had it all the while experienced many a vain longing for books which he could not afford to purchase. How foolish, then, for him to raise weak objections to a system which would enable him to gratify his tastes for books without price. I also have a few books which are valuable to me, and in my journeys over the country they are always with me and no expense and inconvenience. I certainly would not take the trouble and expense of packing, carting and railroading these books from town to town if there was any assurance of finding them duplicated in a free library in every place I moved to.

But be not afraid, friend Byington. Even Free Communism makes no distinction of private property in some things, and probably always will. I know of no recognized exponent of Free Communism who would desire the seclusion of a Zulo Dictionary. It is quite certain the members of a free community would not have one a dozen toothbrushes in common, or pairs of trusses, or shoes, or hats, or beds, or undies, or even a single pair of underwear. The only thing that a person could probably own my own nightshirt, a comb and perhaps a pocket knife, and Mr. Byington might possess a watch, or even a bottle of snuff. To say true, he would be at liberty to carve his name or a love token on the watch case I don't believe that terrible bugaboo, the Common Man, would offer any serious objection to this. Why, there should not be our own Zulo Dictionary, and mark it up with hieroglyphics to his heart's content. For my part I see no possible objection to his doing so.

Our difficulties are not serious. The commercialists friends is that they are actually unable to form any but a hazy idea of what is to be and what is not to be common property. As a general rule, any thing that comes through the process of a cheapening of production and a consequent falling off in price, those articles in which the cheapening process is most accelerated will first cease to be considered as common property, because we can produce book —the mechanical part at least—at a very small cost. Suppose some contrivance should be discovered by our manufacturers, the most expensive literary treasure could be produced at a labor cost of say ten minutes, or, measured in money, say 10 cents. There is, as he himself says, "the limit to the probable increase of production."

There are some things, however, which despite their excessive cost, would tend to become common property, because they are of general utility such as seen meeting houses in libraries, railroads, electrical service, etc. etc. There are other things, which because they are proper to the individual, would never become common property until some term is now understood; they would be in the private possession of the individual who required them. Of this class of articles, I would enumerate clothing, necessary household appointments, etc, etc.

I congratulate Mr. Byington upon his clearness in seeing the basic principle upon which Free Communism rests. The chief desire for private property arises in the fear that we may be deprived of it, or may not be able to get it, with the tigre of the few, or the trice of the many. I would suggest to him, he will probably accept the logical conclusions of his own arguments, and accept without reserve the doctrine of Free Communism.

WILLIAM HOLLAND.

"Whipped laws are like cobwebs: the weak and poor are caught in them, the rich break through them."

—Aeschylus.

Must We Lie to Please the Critic?

As my name appears with those of others who have been put to an "ickish, sentimental plaster, in the shape of 'respectability'" to cover up the Futurotarian disaster that has happened to a number of people, I feel I offer a few comments on that subject.

In the course of my life I have been accused of a good many offenses, but I believe this is the first time I have been accused of being a Futurotarian. I am therefore unprepared to answer the charge. I have in connection with the Futurotarian disaster that in the slightest degree involved me; but I do not know the least person, to whom I offer my most sincere condolences. The trouble with the critics—orthodox and radical alike—is simply this: They assume that the futurotarian must be a Futurotarian in the physical sense, and hence neither fact is satisfied with a plain recital of facts, which does not justify the preconception. This, I think, in the long run, will be horrible for persons not married to each other to be lovers, and as they cannot conceive of a man and woman being together without associating, they that is generally given to the most of us about the circumstances are trying to make the best of a bad thing by concealing some of the facts. On the other hand, the radicals are the "far-off," rightly believing that love is not disgraceful, are equally sure that something is being hidden by the radicals who are not "far-off," and that this suppression is inspired by the desire to be thought of as some obscure friend who writes the second paragraph on the subject in the first column of page seven of the "Firebrand!"

January 14, should be truly a day of rejoicing and a wonder for his whole life of sexual reform rests on the assumption that men and women can be together in a bed-room with the door locked without exciting the curiosity of even the mostosaic of our neighbors. It seems not to have occurred to our "far-off" friends that just quite possibly the radicals of Boston know more about sexual relations than others who have been within five hundred or two thousand miles of the scene of the tragedy and that their narrative of events must contain a good deal of information which observation submit contradictory testimony. It is needless to say that persons who had such opportunities all substantially agree in their version of the facts, and denials have been only those who were not on the ground. I submit that this fact is somewhat suggestive, especially in view of the greater credulity of the layman, and that even of the mostosaic of our neighbors, in comparison with that accorded the testimonies of persons residing in parts of the country distant from the other fact, the radicals are "far-off," literally believing that love is not disgraceful, are equally sure that something is being hidden by the radicals who are not "far-off," and that this suppression is inspired by the desire to be thought of as some obscure friend who writes the second paragraph on the subject in the first column of page seven of the "Firebrand!"

I went to Boston to attend the funeral of S. P. Putnam and to get the bottom facts, if I could. From time to time I have recorded in "Lucifer" the results of my investigations. I have held the view, for instance, whether May L. Collins and Samuel Putnam were lovers, or whether they were only friends, and it was some years that the success of other radicals and radicals who are apparently dissatisfied because I did not find them to have died in bed together. But, while their relations were not properly the affair of other persons, it seemed to be necessary to ascertain the facts in regard to the accident, so far as the accident itself was concerned. It was not my fault, nor the fault of those who had earlier been acquainted with the facts, that the victims were both dressed when found, that they were on the floor in different parts of the room, that the gas was flowing from one valve while a jet was burning, that all the indications were that they had fallen to the floor from a standing position, and that Doctor Draper wrote a certificate that has been recently contrary to the testimony of the business of a reporter is to record the facts as he sees them, and I am wholly at a loss to account for the evidence that has been given in favor of the friends of social freedom that Mr. A. H. Simpson, myself, and other radicals have tried to deceive the public in the matter, and that we have done this because we did not dare to tell the truth. But the fact is we should lose our "respectability."

So far as I am concerned, I see nothing incredible in the relations of lovers because they do not happen to be married to each other or happen to be married to other persons, and hence I have no fear of condemning more who than the woman about whom I was informed that the man and woman were dead together than I would have been if they were husband and wife. But I cannot see that this view of love association puts upon me the obligation to try to make it appear that a certain man and a cer-
taint woman died, underrated, in each of those arms when I have no evidence at hand to substantiate such a contention. The facts have been given. One word now as to my personal feelings: I hope our dear comrades were loved; I hold them to have been worthy of each other's love, as they were worthy of the love they drew from others. It is certain that the execution was so prompt that he had not tasted the deepest joys of love and passion is incomparably saddened. Yet such men and women, as they have taken the last step, are surely more at peace. Many are unavoidable, but the strangling of superstitious will prevent the continuance of the whispering and the gnawing of the man who is only a man. Many are unavoidable, but the strangling of superstition will prevent the continuance of the whispering and the gnawing of the man who is only a man. Many are unavoidable, but the strangling of superstition will prevent the continuance of the whispering and the gnawing of the man who is only a man.

|THE FIREBIRD|

If there is a generous heart left who helps along the dependents of the imprisoned and persecuted victims —he is sent to jail himself. If you read or write a paper or don't, it is the same if it is your favorite, or the altar of the religious and royal fetich you also go to prison. In short if you have the gall to think different from the ruling Judaism, you are in the family of the liberty. What say the relatives of the many thousands of imprisoned; the mothers and wives of the young men who are sent off to Cuba and to the Philippines, to die there of hunger and cold and exposure. The judgment, the vampires who are handling “law and order” with the bloody scythe of the poor? The social revolution is in the one simple hope of this: I could and despairing people.

|HUNGRY.|

The coal miners of Ariba, which are employed by “Standards” for the import of the company on account of their “aid and pension funds,” which were controlled until lately by the miners for their mutual benefit. But the avare company could not see any more the independence of the miners in this way, and so the trouble came up; the miners destroyed the offices in order to better conditions and get out of the company. Mr. Putnam and Miss Collins and, among other things said:

“The Truth Seeker vehemently denies that there was anything wrong”—that there was any sex union between them. However that may be, I do not believe that, not being Christians, even by word or by fact. But it is in order. He loved, and expressed his love, it was rather to their credit as well.

Not a word of accusation or imputation, that someone had an out and out conclusion that it was all right if such was the case. The other critic referred to by Conrad Walker said: “Conrade Addis’ article about the Putnam-Collins affair was the only noble and courageous utterance about the affair which appeared in print so far as I know.”

He then goes on to elaborate this idea, by calling attention to the attitude of certain other papers. It is all the attitude of the Truth Seeker and others of the same ilk. He has refused to believe that those who are working for the cause of free love in their periodicals, and they have almost universally arranged themselves against it. Under these circumstances I think the correspondent was justified in his remarks.

|ECHOES FROM FOREIGN COUNTRIES.|

FRANCE. The professor in the State Universities wanted to organize a society for the betterment of their condition, but their right to associate was denied by their glorious government.

The French ladies at Paris held a grand meeting on Monday, July 5. It is noted against the Turkish atrocities. Madame Hurly-Menos was the speaker of the evening, under the auspices of the Anarchist group, the “Social Art.” Madame Hurly-Menos’ principle speech was directed against theIonian sold-out press, whose moral standing is worse than that of a prostitute.

It is not enough, she said, that the French press says nothing about the horrors massacres in Armenia, but they go even so far to show that the Turks were just. It is never justified to say that they did it, for he is only a man in political circles who has really at heart the true liberty for his country people. When the accretion laws were passed, the professor, along with the anarchists, Republicans, Democrats and the State-socialists were laughing at the Anarchists, but today many of their friends have to suffer the results of these laws.

The day at the funeral there were several laurel wreaths deposited on the grave.

A. KLEINERICH.

December 31st, 1916.

I have received a copy of The Firebird which contains a criticism of my books, by Mr. Henry Addis. My self-esteem and combativeness are not overly large, but they are large enough to prompt a desire to answer the ideas given in this letter. So far as typographical and grammatical crudities are concerned I do not wish to defend them, or make excuses for them, however, because I wish as a precaution to avoid a reader or my critic from understanding what I say. Mr. Addis seemed to desire to put me on the defensive, from his standpoint, but I have said would put me there or more. How any unbridled intelligent person can draw the conclusions which he has drawn from what I have said is beyond my comprehension. For instance he says, that the author does not favor freedom is shown by the following: “Many wives are sent to unfortunates graves or insane asylum through no other causes than rough brutality during interrogations.” I ask in all candor what there is in this statement of facts, that can lead anyone to the conclusion that I do not believe in freedom. If Mr. Addis had quoted the remainder of the same sentence he would have done me more justice.

Mr. Addis says, “But the author advocates irresponsible marriage.” Is that so? Where? When? The fundamental principle of my books, and so stated therein, is that all sex relations should result in personal satisfaction, should be the expression of love. How this can be construed to mean that I uphold marriage “laws” or “superstitions” that bind the sex relations, when there is no love, is beyond my comprehension.

Mr. Addis says, “He demonstrates his lack of comprehension of the cause of sexual misery.” What is sexual misery? From what I can learn of Mr. Addis’ views I have concluded that he holds the absence of sex relations to be the cause of sexual misery. He has a right to such conclusions and I do not desire to belittle his comprehension because I believe in personal liberty. His book, “Love and Sex,” persuades me to advocate “sexual misery,” and I do not believe that I am forced to advocate sexual variance in order to advocate freedom. I believe we have past the “variety” stage. I suppose my critic will look at the social evil, does it or look if we had past the variety stage? My answer is, not in practice for some time.

I am aware, however, of the extremely satisfactory results of the sexual relations. It is all for both any one to set themselves up as being the only one able to distinguish slavery. I am aware of the slavery in the excommunication of two loving souls.

As to my ideas on procreation, I have no excuse to consider, because the people who will follow the regulations given in my books, there will be fewer and better children born, receiving better care and education, than the women who make laws useless. I reason from cause to effect. I begin with causes to changes to effects and bring up to effects to lessen or change causes.

Mr. Addis says, “To condemn a young man (the victim of self abuse) and say he is not worth saving because he is a victim of premonial and false teachings, is entirely too erroneous, and too vicious as well as too unscientious and superficial to let go unchallenged.” I am well aware that the young man is in a no man’s land condition, and that it is complex, and attaches itself to many objects, sights and sounds. Not having recognized this fact, he very naturally writes from that point of view. Mr. Addis thinks that I believe that because I love my wife, I can not love my darling boy or the beautiful picture on my wall, or the beautiful number of woman, in a way, but not as I love my wife—my mate. I love my mate, and her only, enough to desire to enter into the very profoundest relation of all relations, and it is so with me.
There are other points that I should like to take up, but at this time. So far as my prices are concerned, I desire to state, that I have no monopoly and no one is forced to buy these books. I shall not come to the conclusion that the public are not as well off as they should be because there are not all fortunate enough to have a thorough literary education, but by persistent practice we overcome many failings.

Emory Birsner, Minneapolis, Minn.

I cannot see that Mr. Biersner brings up a single argument. In commenting on the statement that “many wives are sent to untimely graves or insane asylum through no other cause than their unfortunate position,” he has only pointed out that he would not do it if they were not “bound” together, if the woman was free. He pro- poses that they “practice” continuous intercourse. I was surprised to hear him, as a judge, to injure his wife by rough intercourse, could be induced—he claims her as his—to practice “continuous intercourse!” All through his book Mr. Biersner referred to marriage as though it were a per- nicious institution, never raising his voice against its indissolubility, but proposing ways of making it bearable. He does not propose to bind people together legally or morally, so that they may lawfully do not take in account the fact that human judge- ment is liable to err, but writes as though every young woman and man could unerringly find a mate that would make the marriage bond forever consecrated and it was that attitude I attacked. Of course there is “no slavery in the exclusiveness of two loving souls, unless,” perhaps, there is, for the rights of the human being are comprehensive, and they include another, or a number of others, such exclusiveness, if a woman, must be based on a sense of duty, or on fear, in which event it is slavery. Mr. Biersner admits variety in love in his criticism, and says sexual intercourse should be an expression of love. To be logical he must admit the right and desirability of variety in sexual intercourse.

It does not matter how a large number of married women are unhappy, and may be so, or how little care they receive, as long as the ideas of domination—and the necessity for government—and of the rights of privilege are instilled into them, present conditions will last. To limit offspring would save suffering to many mothers, but would not, could not, of itself, solve the social question. Some write us that the industrial question is all important, and that when it is solved the sex question will settle itself.

Mr. Biersner writes that if we produce fewer and bet- ter children they will solve the social question. I cannot see that he has demonstrated that the solution will come with a broadening of ideas and an exercise of personal liberty.

I did not indicate that some “neighbors daughter became a prostitute” because, as Biersner himself states, and Mr. Biersner advocates identically what I did when he writes, “let him love and secure the love of a woman who has a mind of her own and be friendly and beneficial, and not simply relief brought to him through prostitution.” By all means let him love, and let her love, and let them express their love in such a manner as that love proceeds, by all means let them. It is against the restrictions on love and its expressions that I kick, not on the method Mr. Biersner proposes. The difference between Mr. Biersner that I am afraid to separate the serious from the political situation and the industrial question and essays to solve it independent of them. He, by non-opposition, recognizes and upholds present institutions. I contend that the question of sex and all other affairs of life are so intimately connected that they must all be treated together. The question of sex is not in itself isolated at all. I therefore attack all institutions that seem to hinder this solution.

Social Conditions and Character.

Tax complexion of phrenologists who have been so fortunate as to study our economic conditions (that there are no bad men, no bad women, and even no bad children) is very much the same as that of phrenologists study the human mind would be justified in saying there is nothing as pure as dirt in nature. There is no dark matter, matter in the wrong place, and a purely artificial pail; dirt is dirt; but it is dirt until it gets into its right place, when it be- comes natural and therefore useful. So, there are no bad men, both gloomy, every man-misconstrued, misapplied, ill-used; and therefore ill-treated—in fact, victims to adverse conditions.

But any such useful improvement, he is then, so to speak, matter in the wrong place, or dirt. A man

mentally fitted for some active and laborious employ- ment in the open air is happy and contented when he expends large quantities of his time in the nameless, unremunerative, drudgery. When circumstances make such a man an idle sam- leaker in a large city, with money and spare time, he is dangerous and offensive to society, whether he be convicted or not, one of the criminal classes. The same may be said, in a modified form, of some rich idle gossips.

No one can over estimate the evil effect of poverty on the human mind. A man in search of food or ac- ticles of necessity for himself or those dear to him will commit murder, robbery, and theft, and all kinds of violence, if not well fed; and if he is not similarly organized, phrenologically speaking, would not dream of doing. The fact is, that in times of want, hunger, and deprivation, the man suffers direly in the direc- tion of the energies—those energies which are most actively employed in protecting and providing, such as destructiveness and the executive and aggressive energies. Confusion of the executive energy, nervo- reactivity, the power of reserve or concealing energy, and Acquisitiveness, the providing energy.

This is what people are. In some of the slums districts of every large town there are continual fissions and squabbings, always in proportion to the distance. Drink of course aggravates all this, as the drink is one means of escape, and has more exciting effects on the brain than the body is nourished.

The over-feeling, and enforced idleness of the rich has equally bad effects in more ways than one, the principal being that the brain, being deprived of its climate winds, has no way to circulate too freely in the base of the brain where are the strictly animal faculties. This would account for a good deal. The fact that men do now commit exces- sive in pursuit of animal pleasures is no way prove that in a state of freedom they would do likewise. We are not now living under anything like freedom, hinder all desire of thought of a state monopoly.

Of course there are many which may be called abnormal types—types of head the outcome of our present crimi- nal-making system, which would be a source of danger, perhaps even of the most care. The fact that medical men who possess a sound knowledge of the anatomy and physiology of the human brain, all know that these cases have been brought about by inherited tendency disregard the liberty of others.

It is always the over fed, idle class who victimize the poor. The reverse is impossible. True, we hear of the poor blackmauling the rich, robbing them, breaking- ing into their houses and appropriating their valuables, but this is not a matter of time, but always in search of food, or that which can be readily converted into food and other necessities. To re- turn to the industrial question. It is obvious that har- velous is, not that some of these custom-entered sellers are so bad, but, taking into consideration all the degrading conditions, that they are so good. It only shows what an entrance of evil is, and there is in human nature in spite of adverse circumstance, and the bright hope there is for its future when there is no government, or the rule, active.

It will, then, be seen that human nature is not all earthly, sensual and devisor, as many imitate the clergy, to try to persuade us. Very goodness is the great enemy of the state of things. The reason is that the poor are too good—too submissive, too contented, too docile. Another means of salvation for the rich are the games which they so few have resources to in order to occupy their minds—games of skill, it must be admit- ted, games that in their pursuit require the use of many of the most important faculties of the mind, games of contention and competition. With these they get rid of some of their pent-up energies, and exercise some faculties of their intellects which in their ordi- nary avocations of eating, drinking, novel-reading, entertaining and sightseeing, would not get any exer- cise at all. Without all these games and toys the rich man would be worse than the poor man and see them as an occupation, and even flatter themselves that it is a useful one, and that they earn by means of it a man's respect.

With what earnestness some of these do nothing will talk about their particular games, how they will travel miles in order to go to some particular place, how certain game is to be met and conquered! They will handle their clubs, hats, raquetes and sticks as if they were honor- able instruments, but the innocent young women will enter into conversation with one another on the respective merits and qualifications of their particular toy with all the appearance of earnestness but with the slightest shade of contempt at one another. The fact is, the absurdity of the whole thing has never dawned upon them. Let us look at one of these games, lately occupying much of the attention of the rich, golf. It can only be played on a special ground, such as a public heath or common of irregular formation, or falling land rented over a narrow length, with little hills and dales, ponds and ditches artificially constructed, if necessary, called obstacles, and distinguished by var- ious named points. The players play in a rather large circle. The toy employed in this game are a ball and certain variously named sticks, called generally clubs. The play consists in driving a ball from a given position where the Tee into a hole, or on the centre of a flat grass-plat called a green, these holes being called the first hole, second hole, and so on; the problem is to know the most简便 method to drive the ball from the Tee into the first hole at the least number of strokes winning the hole. The game is to be over the whole course, covering a distance of from two to three miles. Each stroke has its special club, selected in order to get the best advantage in accordance with the position of the hole. The object for the player to make this game of difficult or impossible, it is established with a number of rules and regulations.

The intellectual faculties mostly used are Locality, that of Celtic position, and some power of visualizing and specific gravity; Locality directing the player to stand in the correct position relative to the ball in the direc- tion of its flight when struck with a club, Weight directing the amount of force required to drive the ball the required distance. Such is known game.

True, there are no games of skill, but their excess, when they use their brains so much in business, they need the relaxation of the muscle work these games entail. What they need is more real brain exercises in their business occupation.

Idle rich men have other so-called occupations, stuck between legal and social obligations that are very serious, throws all others into the shade for downright uselessness and silliness, called Hunting Tree; the ancient Briton hunted, the Red Indian hunted, the Spanish Indian hunter and the American Indian hunter, and all, as a personal risk to the hunter. Hunting being meant, pursuing, and killing, and eating the slain, or removing a danger to the community. The rich man's hunting consists simply in following dogs chasing a fox or hare, and the so-called hunter is an idle spectator, the actual intellectual work being left to the dogs and horses, not to speak of the fox. Yet these rich men speak of this rather foolish occupation as if it were some merits and honorable one—Yes,—“the hunts there every seven days.” Yes, the fox and the hounds are good men, but solely for the want of being able to view the world from a proper standpoint, go through their performance. They are the most stupid, necessary, and just. They are really not useful, and therefore cannot be happy in the fullest sense of the word.

What would these rich people do if it were not for all this top-shop occupation, waste of valuable time and muscular exertion? They would be even more visible than they are now, and the pleasure obtainable only from the exercise of these two important faculties intimately connected with repro- duction.

These pleasures were not intended by nature as a kill-time. We cannot depart from nature without injury to ourselves. We shall retain these games, but only as part of the recreation of our own and youth, and as such, they are most useful as a stimulant...
exercise for both brain and muscle.

In the first place, for then there shall be no monopo-

lom of the means of life, adults will have so many

calls on their brains and muscles in the execution of all

that life requires, from the standpoint of a society which

that they will no more think of wasting time in play-

ing such games as they now play, than they would, at

the present time, waste their time in wild and unprof-

able and silly fashion; which latter are, even now, almost

discarded by children for games of a more intellectual

nature.

No, there will be no more useless games, but instead,

the deep sympathies, developed during periods of indi-

vidual and collective danger and strengthened through

the realization of the need for an efficient and united

stirrings, and the application of the new physical and

mental resources, will be the result. Life would

then be of color, and, in a large measure, the result

of the wealth with which nature endows us, we should

allow splendid physique, beauty of character, and pure

intellectual ability, of all kinds to be free and

nurtured, where we know that such beauty Art would be a reality, and the poetry of

nature would be as the wine of life.—"Ireland" in

Liberty, London.

Correspondence.

A Compliment from a Socialist.

I received your bundle of friebreads on Friday, 10 and

to them very much. The work of The Frebreds has

been to many very neglected by parliamentary Soci-

alists, but it is in a nice, respectful, and intel-

lectual manner, in all Christian lands, in which we

should allow splendid physique, beauty of character, and pure

intellectual ability, of all kinds to be free and

nurtured, where we know that such beauty Art would be a reality, and the poetry of

nature would be as the wine of life.—"Ireland" in

Liberty, London.

Montreal, Canada.

T. G. J.

For the Propaganda.

I attended the last meeting of the Bohemian group,
"L. R. K. Pokrak," while among other transactions, I

pointed at the proposed convention. Discussion

followed on that subject. Comrades of that group are

thinking not to hold such, but instead, have a disamina-

tion through our periodicals on all points which should

help the spreading of anarchism among the public.

The audience present at the last convention in

England, they are not so very favorable to such.

They simply say that all actions on these points can be

taken, but not as a convention, but in the shape of a

session lasting three or four days.

Comrades of the above mentioned group are about

of the same mind, i.e., that they can be more profitably

expressed in our papers than any other way, because,

every one gets a chance to explain himself thoroughly

Second. The expense which such a convention would

cost, as fares etc., could be saved, or reduced to one

third or one fourth. That would make also a good

amount to give to our periodicals and for literature.

This is the view of "L. R. K. Pokrak."

A. SCHWEIZER.

New York City.

KELLY’S LETTER BOOK.

Embracing the opportunity of comrade H. M. Ke-

ey’s stay in this city on his way westward bound, we

arranged two meetings at which our friends spoke on

Feb. 14, in Miller’s Hall, on "The Radical Side of the

Labor Movement," and Feb. 21, in The Duquesne

Dancing Academy, "On the development of Traded

Unions; its follies and short-comings."

The audience were not large but made up in earn-

estness of purpose what ever they lacked in numbers.

A good coloring was lent to the meetings by the
two stenographers, Misses H. H. and Miss D. J. H., of

the local Social-Democrat. The debate grew warm and instructive never losing its

friendly and interesting side, and was presented in the

true style of these two indefatigable workers.

In conclusion—we are compelled to repeat that

without any yearning for the true and universal happiness of

man, the people have yet to go through a period of suffer-

ing the most trying and intense that ever was visited

upon mankind. Things must be radically wrong be-

cause things are about being strained to their

breakpoint. Anarchy—this is the word.—"Money

the power—closers his hold on us, on the

"political" power, that is to say, the"Social-Democrat.

Incensed you’ll find five drops of the Golden Remedy

. It won’t cure you. It’s harmful only.

S. D. Thomas.
A Splendid Book. 
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**THE OLD AND THE NEW IDEAL.**
**A Solution of that part of the Social Question which pertains to Marriage and Sexual Intercourse**

By EML F. SEIDELMAN.

The most masterly work on the subject ever in print. It is written in language that anyone can understand 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:


This price of the book is: Paper cover 50c. Cloth bound $1.00.

**A fine Present for Friends.**

**ORDER FROM THE FIREBRAND.**

**FIREBRAND LIBRARY.**

In case of ten or more pamphlets purchased at three cents each.

For New York, N. Y., 171 East 8th Street.

FOR NEW YORK, N. Y., 171 East 8th Street.
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**THE FIREBRAND'S G A N T E R S.**

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

Chicago, Ill.: J. H. New York, N. Y.: Am. 360 Street, 3560 Central.


Dr. FROST'S 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 thousands of families for many years. The popular edition has been so well liked that it has been reprinted in cloth and is sold at the same price.

**ORDER FROM THE FIREBRAND.**
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A Magazine of Social Progress.

By S. E. CHAMBERLAIN.
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