

THE FIREBRAND

For the Burning Away of the Cobwebs of Ignorance and Superstition.

VOL. I.

PORTLAND, OREGON, SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 1895.

NO. 33.

THE FIREBRAND

Published Weekly by FIREBRAND PUBLISHING COMMITTEE.
50 CENTS A YEAR.

Communications received in any of the European languages.

Admitted as second-class matter at the Portland,
Or. Post Office, Feb. 23, 1895.

Address: THE FIREBRAND, P. O. Box 477
Portland, Oregon.

ON THE SHORE OF LIFE.

Before me rolls the endless sea of life:—
A field of carnage and of brother-strife.
Tho' thief, the scoundrel and the foul succeed,
The good are vanquished, and the honest bleed.

The flash of Fortune, and the blast of Fate
Congeal the soul and teach the mind to hate.
The school Existence breeds the meanest
knaves,
And makes the world a mart of sottish slaves.

Hail, Poverty, inclement goddess, hail!
Beneath thy sable wings through life I sail;
And may thy pointed beak devour my heart,
I'll drop and sink, and—save my nobler part,
J. Bowser.

SHALL CHILDREN BE OWNED.

"The material with which the sociologist deals may be divided into two classes—owners and owned. Now, under this classification the child presents a difficulty; for while unquestionably belonging in the category of the owned, he differs from all other parts of that category in the fact that there is steadily developing within him the power of self-emancipation, which at a certain point enables him to become an owner instead of remaining a part of the owned. . . . The only question is, who shall own him, the parent or the community? . . . If we are State Socialists, we shall decide in favor of the community. If we are Anarchists, we shall decide in favor of the parents."

When the above, written by an Individualist-Anarchist, met my eye it made me blink very hard. I mentally added another sentence: If we are Anarchist-Communists we shall decide that the child shall go FREE!

Child ownership is child slavery, and is, in my opinion, quite as undesirable a feature of human association as slavery of adults.

In our present social organization, legitimate children are the chattels of the father;

illegitimate children are owned by the mother. Shall we carry forward to the next social grouping, the curse of property rights in children?

What are the natural rights of a child? To be conceived in love. To be desired, or at least to be welcome. To be the recipient of loving care while an infant by the person or persons drawn to it by the strongest affection. As soon as a child is old enough to choose its associates, and a bright child begins at an early age to show its preferences, it has as much right to do so as a full grown man or woman. When older grown and the child's interest is aroused in the matters of food, play, dress, knowledge and work, he has an inalienable right to determine what is best for himself. He has a right to affection, but none to applied brute force, except, possibly, as defense against his intentions upon other people's rights.

Society, even if it eliminate love from its organism and cling only to pride for its achievements, if it desired to perpetuate itself, would see the advisability of instructing the young in its discoveries and its application of them. With love or good will as one of the main features of the combination, the dissemination of learning would be the more eagerly practiced. The child has a right to choose his instructors. While a child is owned his rights are bound to be more or less abrogated. The superior judgment, wisdom, etc., etc., is taken as a matter of course. The child's will and choice must give way to his owner's inclination.

In a free society if parents wish the association and companionship of their child they must make themselves agreeable to him. I do not mean that they should pander to his momentary whims or be slavish in their adoration—even a child feels contempt for a slave; but they must treat him as a person and an equal, not as a nonentity or inferior.

The companions of a child, and the rightful claims of parents can go no further than claims as companions, naturally teach him of things that are of interest to them, but they have no right to restrict his researches in whatsoever direction he may desire to investigate. Many individuals consider force necessary in the training of children. If they are not beaten occasionally there is

no "living with them."

Notice the teaching, beginning in babyhood, of the generality of children. Scarcely any attention is paid to their likes or dislikes. Lovers of babies usually look upon them as "cute little things," to be fondled or teased. The "darling" is scolded for nothing "in mischief" to see if he is "sensitive" or is inclined to "fight." When he begins to prattle he is talked to saucily "to hear what he will say." If ready with an answer, he is picked at or praised for his smartness by everyone who comes along until he becomes so accustomed to that manner of address and retort that his marvelous "impudence" is, in time, resented by his legion of instructors.

The first plaything given a baby is a rattle, and, strange to say, he soon "drives one frantic" with his "noise"! Children are continuously taught to do "cunning" deeds, and as they often lack sufficient discrimination, and power to break off habits, to cease these antics at the moment they change to annoying actions, the "natural meanness" of the child strikes everyone very forcibly.

How often is it explained to children that they must be considerate of others if they wish consideration shown them? How is the child taught to be useful. "Do thus and so." "What for?" "Because I told you to."

To you, reader, who insist that a child must be owned and, also, that force is indispensable if a child is to be properly "raised," to you I would say, observe closely and critically for one week the management of children in the average household. Could not the discipline(?) be greatly improved upon? Is not a large proportion of the child's unbearable direct outcome of his "governing"?

A portion of the quotation that instigated these remarks reads: "He—the child—differs from all other parts of the category—of the owned—in the fact that there is steadily developing within him the power of self-emancipation." I contend that his "power of self-emancipation" depends for its development upon the course pursued by the child's master. If the master be exceptionally "strict," a model governor, there is simply no opportunity for the development of independence in the child, and self-emancipation

cipation is impossible. He is a mere machine, dependent for creditable(?) work upon his master's bidding. The greater the degree of freedom permitted him, coupled with candid elucidation of supposed or known truths, the more likely his chances of all round growth and emancipation. Restricted or stunted faculties are weaklings, and the surety of their final sturdiness or perfect emancipation is not to be relied on.

VIROQUA DANIELS.

SOMETHING FOR NOTHING.

IN No. 12 of THE FIREBRAND there is an advertisement, copied from a daily paper reading thus: Wanted—a copiest, must write a neat legible hand, accurate and rapid; hours 8 a. m. till 6 p. m.; wages \$10 per month. Chamber of Commerce. THE FIREBRAND headed that advertisement with, Wanted—Something for nothing, and followed it by a thorough exposing of the means by which a woman is driven to sell herself for the bare necessities of life. Immediately beneath this comes an advertisement, "Wanted—A workingman desires a young woman as companion. Intelligence and good looks the only requisites, etc." I think THE FIREBRAND might have added Wanted—Something for nothing. Not one word as to the qualities of the man; enough for her to know that he is a member of the male sex. But to be an applicant for his favors SHE must be intelligent and good-looking. I cannot see where any woman would answer such an advertisement only the hopeless ones, driven so by the conditions created by advertisement No. 1, and glad of the poor refuge of advertisement No. 2. If MUTUAL companionship was desired it seems to me he took the poorest way to obtain it. When a woman advertises for a companion she wants a person pleasing to her, the employer. The employer knows she is expected to please her employer, and for this she receives a compensation. If Anarchists feel this is the ground for sweethearts, or mutual companions to meet on, it seems to me woman's condition is to be lower than at present. It seems to me men and women will always find mutual companionship without advertising for it.

E. Slabs, in No. 30 of THE FIREBRAND, says, had he received an answer from a woman desiring to live a "free life" they would have exchanged ideas. It seems to me the exchange would have been a poor one, the employer would have told his thoughts, the "companion" would have tried to conform; that's about the exchange that would have occurred. A woman who is self respecting knows her own worth too well to answer advertisements. She knows the value of owning herself too well to answer the advertisement of a man she knows nothing about, as a companion to him. She would wait until her affections had centered on some special entity, and no advertising medium would be necessary to affect a companionship.

Are there no intelligent, good looking girls in Portland, or is it the men who are lacking in these qualifications? The people of the "effete east" do not find any difficulty in finding sweethearts. After all the effete east is a good place to be.

"AN ORTHODOX WOMAN."

A SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY RUN AGROUND.

IN another column Viroqua Daniels quotes from Benj. R. Tucker, the great light of Individualist-Anarchism, on the relationship of parent and child under his proposed social order. State Socialism and Individualist-Anarchism agree that children shall be owned—the former claiming that they properly belong to the State, the latter insisting that the parents are the rightful owners. And Viroqua Daniels properly states the Communist position in the matter.

The Individualist-Anarchist is nothing if not logical. With all the faith of the Christian in his god, he starts out on the premise that property (which is acknowledged the basis of the present society) is right. If logic runs him aground, aground he lies without a murmur. If property leads to slavery, why, slavery goes, and no question. But where is Anarchy and Liberty, which he claims is the paramount issue, in the meantime?

Anarchism is advocated as a means of simplifying and harmonizing human relations. But how does the so-called Individualist, or Philosophical, brand succeed? They propose, as at present, juries, trials, prisons and punishments; then, as now, property in natural opportunity and in the products of labor; then, not as at present, property in children—that is, human slavery. I say we have not property in children now, because property is taxable and saleable, which children are not. We have parental control of children to a certain limit; but society claims the right to interfere when the life of the child is endangered or permanent injury threatened. This right Tucker denies, showing that by ownership of children he means the same sort of ownership that would exist in the case of a horse or inanimate object.

He says:

I am asked by a correspondent if I would [under Anarchism] passively see a woman throw her baby into the fire as a man throws his newspaper. . . . I answer that it is highly probable that I would personally interfere in such a case. But it is as probable, and perhaps more so, that I would personally interfere to prevent the owner of a masterpiece by Titian from applying the torch to the canvas. My interference in the former case no more invalidates the mother's property right in her child than my interference in the latter case would invalidate the property right of the owner of the painting. If I interfere in either case I am an invader, acting in obedience to my injured feelings. As such I deserve to be punished. I consider that it would be the duty of a policeman in the service of the defense association to arrest me for assault. On my arraignment I should plead guilty, and it would be the duty of the jury to impose a penalty upon me.

So, under Individualist-Anarchism parental control is to extend to murder, without question from any source, unless possibly from the often mentioned, all-regulating "Anarchist" jury. In which case the jury may do what it may punish the individual for doing; if not, then the property right is superior to the right to life; and in either case I fail to see how or why such a social philosophy is entitled to the name of Individualism. Of course the jury which punished Tucker for interfering in a murder case—not on account of the child's equality of right with all others to life, but in obedience to his injured feelings—would have no feelings to injure. All such useless, and troublesome, appendages to the man are eliminated in his

becoming a cog in the wheel of "justice" called a jury. Or perhaps Mr. Tucker's feelings are more highly developed than those of other people, and for that reason, possibly, he suggests that if such invasions were persisted in the jury should impose penalties sufficiently severe to (presumably, induce him to bring his feelings sufficiently under control to be able to look in cold blooded indifference upon the burning of children) put a stop to them.

What slavery could be more absolute? Contrast the Communist ideal with such a picture:

To the Communist, a child is a person, with equal rights to life and liberty with all other persons; and such an act as is described in the quotation above would be an invasive act and public opinion would commend any individual who should interfere, and certain it is that there would be no policeman to arrest nor jury to punish him. The child's associations are of his own choice. Of course it is supposed that up to the time of his expressing a choice the mother will care for him. If, however, she does not choose to do so, she will then, as often occurs now, cast him off. But that will not be a calamity to the child, for he is entitled to all that is necessary to life, health and comfort; and while a loveless mother could be no benefit to him, even this lack can be made up by women who have a natural love for children. Today we have enforced family relations, and I have yet to come in contact with any form of human association that furnishes so much of inharmony and misery. While so-called Individualism proposes to retain this forced association, Communism insists that human association, in order to be harmonious and happy, must depend upon mutual choice and pleasure.

But why property in children? Can we get to the bottom of this question? Property in the means of living is the foundation. If, out of his accumulated property, the parent feeds and clothes the child when a helpless infant and up to the time when he is supposed to be able to hold his own in a property-grasping world, is the parent not entitled to some compensation—the services of the child for a certain number of years? But if we do away with property in land and its products, do away with the property idea, and the child can care for himself as soon as old enough to manifest an intelligent choice, is there any incentive to ownership or even control of children?

But, says Tucker, the child differs from other property in that "there is steadily developing within him the power of self-emancipation." Then does the "Individualist" brand of Anarchism propose only the liberty of those who have the power of "self-emancipation"? Are the weak to be enslaved by the strong? Are children to be free only when they develop the power to resist parental authority? But, as Viroqua Daniels observes, that tyranny may be so employed as to prevent such development of power. Whether so intended or not, the exercise of authority always retards the development of the governed class. If authority is an established principle of human association in any one particular, what adequate influence can there be to negate its inherent aggressive tendency? Can liberty exist on any other basis than human equality and brotherhood?

If the emancipation of the child depends on his reaching a certain age, instead of his physi-

cal ability to "wallop" his owner, that is emancipation by law, written or unwritten; and if a jury is to decide when he is fitted for freedom, we have performed but another State function; and in either case I cannot see why the State (let's call it by its right name) is not as surely an invader of the parent's property right as Mr. Tucker would be in preventing the cremation of a living babe. But the fundamental assumption—and the fundamental error—of Democracy is that a number of persons may interfere and where the individual may not, and from this error "Individualism" seems not to be free. Now trial and punishment implies the existence of authority, which means no more nor less than that in some form the State has been established. Anarchy means no State; anti, or without, government. Liberty is no respecter of persons. Freedom with an exception clause is spelled L-I-C-E-N-S-E.

J. H. MORRIS.

CHRISTIANITY.

BY ITS FRUITS MAY YE KNOW IT.

CHRISTIANITY is plausible and fair-spoken today, although it occasionally emits a flash of its primitive spirit, the spirit which has stained with blood the pages of history. Its advocates are no longer able to crush opposition. They must either answer the arguments advanced by their adversaries or at least make a show of defending their doctrines. Feeling that the tendency of modern thought is to know and not believe; feeling that every scientific research is undermining the religious humbug; and seeing how insignificant their creed is when handled from a scientific standpoint, they are afraid to resist, and prefer to bend rather than fight. "Their only object being to weather the storm at any cost, even by sacrificing large quantities of their freightage."

I do not believe Christianity can weather the storm; in my opinion it is doomed. The works of Charles Darwin shows the Bible to have been written by the ignorant. He has destroyed the foundation of orthodox Christianity and I am quite certain that after such a blow it cannot re-instate itself. Nevertheless, as an earnest truthseeker whose sole object is to replace faith by reason, I feel that it is my duty to assist in the destruction of religious as well as political superstitions. Since all humbugs die of being found out, I am anxious that Christianity should be seen in its true light. I am desirous of having Christianity judged, not by its present promises, but by its past performances. Let it be seen in its evil days of supremacy, when opportunity matched inclination, and it acted according to the laws of its nature, unchecked by science, freethought and humanity.

"Adversity tries a man, says the proverb. But nothing like prosperity. No man is really known until he has power, and the same may be said of religions. They should be tested, not by what they pretend in their weakness, but by what they do in their strength."

Today the greatness of Christianity is praised and glorified by its hired advocates and we are, more or less, at liberty to dissent from it. Today the Christian himself, when pressed, admits that he is above the old superstitions and pretends to believe in what is reasonable. But

in the past, century after century, they have replied to criticism with imprisonment, and to scepticism with the dungeon and the stake. This was the means by which they induced the people to allow its pretensions without inquiry and its beneficence without proof.

Not content with their doctrines which filled the future with fear; not content with the eternal torture which they promised to thinkers; they took everything into their own hands and instead of waiting for their God to take his own part, they inflicted the most severe punishment upon anyone who dared to disagree with their creed.

"For eighteen hundred years the church has had its field and for most of the time has held the sword and purse of the world. For many centuries it has controlled colleges, universities and schools. "It had within its gift wealth and honor. It held the keys, so far as this world is concerned, of heaven and hell—of prosperity and misfortune. It pursued its enemies even unto the grave. It reddened the scaffold with the best blood and kept the sword of persecution wet for centuries. Thousands and thousands have died in its dungeons. It has made millions of widows and orphans, not only ruled this world, but has also estranged friends, has placed a division between man and wife, and destroyed every trace of ancient civilization."

All our civilization today exists in spite of Christianity. Christianity has for many centuries done its best to destroy science, literature and art. A few fragments of ancient literature have escaped the fury of the Christian maniacs and they became the seeds of modern literature. A few statutes were buried in order to escape the bloody hands of savage Christians and they are today the models for all the world.

As bad as religions may have been they were never bad enough to destroy all the goodness of man, and whatever Christianity has failed to destroy is now the jewel of mankind. Christianity has taught the world a mighty good lesson of slavery, savagery and bigotry, and today if man is possessed of love, human solidarity and all other sympathies of man towards man it is in spite of Christianity, in spite of the church.

It is not true that "the church has established human brotherhood." Human brotherhood has been established in spite of the teachings and examples of the church.

"The Church has banished the Jews from Spain; it has driven out the Moors; it has established and maintained the tortures and inquisitions; it has butchered the covenanters of Scotland; it has burned Bruno and Servetus; it has persecuted the Irish; it has whipped and hanged the Quakers of New England; it has established the slave trade, and waged hundreds of wars in the name of Christ." And surely this is not the kind of morality that can maintain human solidarity, human brotherhood. So that for our good moral qualities we are not indebted to Christianity, but we have them in spite of the Church. Had the Church succeeded, we should have been savages, maniacs and bigots up to date. We should have still kept hoping that Jehova will sacrifice the innocent for the guilty.

H. A. KOCH.

Comrades, agitate for THE FIREBRAND!

A SAMPLE.

THE necessity for government supervision of land holding—the giving of legal title, or supervising by means of committee—is one which our authoritarian friends can not see their way around.

Those who believe in individual holdings can conceive of no security except through the possession of a deed, recognized and secured by the state or nation. The nationalists want the nation to own all the land and allow it worked under the direction of a committee. The single taxer wants the nation to regulate the use of land by means of collecting an annual rental, or tax, which collection will necessitate a knowledge of all lands possessing value in the state. All of them insist on the necessity of some kind of governmental supervision, interference or guarantee.

There is not a portion of the United States, except the original colonies, where, at some time, there was absolutely no governmental interference of any kind in land holding, use being the recognized title. This time is referred to by the old men as the "good old days when nobody suffered from want." In some localities this condition has lingered until the present day, but one by one the localities are becoming the prey of legal interference and the miseries which always attend a "high state of civilization" are thereby introduced.

On Shoal Water Bay, Washington, live a large number of persons who make their living by raising oysters. Years ago they settled there and took possession of the tide flats, which are very wide, and began the raising of oysters. No title could be obtained to the flats, so the people simply staked off such portion as they severally wanted for their own use. The fact of occupancy and use was recognized as title enough and so all lived and worked on these terms of equality.

The State of Washington has a legislature, vested with all the powers and privileges of other state legislatures. Through the manipulation of this legislature the treasury of the state has been depleted again and again until taxation has reached a point beyond which it is dangerous to venture; indeed, some of the farmers of eastern Washington have systematically refused to pay their taxes. The politicians must have money. "You oyster growers should be protected in your rights," is first whispered, then spoken and then proclaimed from the stump in Pacific county. The result is the state claims the tide lands on Shoal Water Bay, provides for its surveying and "secures" the oyster grower when he has paid the surveying and one dollar and twenty-five cents per acre for his tide flat. If he does not come up with his money by a certain time anyone else may buy the land.

The Morgan Oyster Company will keep an agent and a bank account in Olympia, and many a poor oyster grower will find the agent of the Morgan Oyster Company a few hours or a day ahead of him at the Land Office and will be "without visible means of support"—a vagrant.

This is one example of the necessity of government. Left to themselves the oyster growers of Shoal Water Bay found it quite easy to arrange matters satisfactorily to themselves

and live and associate together witho utpaying for the privilege. Once the state took cognizance of their existence, the necessity for tribute paying began, the opportunity for making a living narrowed and the old, old story is repeated.

Government never has been anything but robbery and murder.

HENRY ADDIS.

NOTES AND CRITICISMS.

Of the gentleman who orders the discontinuance of his copy of *THE FIREBRAND* because we do not include Tucker's "Liberty" in our list of Anarchistic journals and because H E Fulton spoke of this paper as the only exposition of true freedom in the United States, we want to ask since Liberty advocates property in human beings, as is clearly shown in this issue, isn't Liberty's exclusion and the *THE FIREBRAND*'s distinction merited?

THE article in the Socialist, San Francisco, criticized last week as misrepresenting Anarchism and Communism, is republished complete in last week's issue of that paper— without, however, complying with our request to produce the writing or mentioning the name of an Anarchist who had advocated the measures they accuse us of. The Socialist editor evidently knows a "good thing" when he sees it; but until the evidence is produced we are compelled to look upon both *The Socialist* and the "prominent Socialist" as guilty of intentional misrepresentation.

WE have received from our friend and comrade Jean Grave a copy of his latest work, the *Future Society*. My knowledge of the French is not adequate to do justice to such a work as this is and I handed it to a French comrade to study, and a longer review will appear later on. For the present I take from the publishers preface the following:

"Among the criticisms of the first book of Jean Grave, *The Dying Society* and *Anarchy*, was one characterizing the work as "A book criticizing the actual society, but we are not made acquainted with the form in which the Anarchists see the coming society."

With his second work, *The Future Society*, which will appear in the Sociological Library of "Tresse et Shock," Jean Grave answers all the critics of his book.

We hope that *The Future Society* will not bring to the author two years of prison, like his first work, *The Dying Society*. I hope that an English translation of this much needed work will appear as soon as possible. People to a great extent are aware of the faults of the present society. They desire lucid, logical explanation of human association, where individual freedom and the absence of poverty are guaranteed to all.

E. Slabs.

NOTICE.

COMRADE C. W. MOWBRAY will be in Chicago from Sept. 21st to Oct. 4th. All groups wishing his services on his return trip should correspond with Alu Edlestat, 149 Jane St., Chicago. Write immediately if you wish him to visit your town.

The Letter-Box.

O. L., ST. LOUIS, MO.—You and many others will excuse us for not having answered your letter in time, because "THE FIREBRAND outfit" had to go hop picking in order to provide for the winter, and therefore many letters have not been answered, and so have many requested sample copies not been sent. Caesar's defense will appear as soon as we are "fixed" again.

J. F., MYSTIC, IOWA.—We will send you three copies regularly, and if you can dispose of more just tell us.

W. S., ALLEN, MASS.—We will send you some of the London papers which we have at hand at present.

A. L. B., CLEVELAND, O.—We are glad to send you 10 copies every week. Our cause needs workers like you everywhere. Portland has about 80,000 inhabitants.

J. F., CHICAGO, ILL.—All subscriptions can be paid to comrade Chas. Bodenick, 1140 Milwaukee Ave. Our best greetings.

V. D. LAKE CITY, CAL.—THE FIREBRAND will be gladly sent to the addresses you sent without curtailing the number sent to you. Do not be too modest, comrade.

F., NATLOW, LONDON.—The requested copies of *THE FIREBRAND* will be sent, but we cannot send the *Solidarity*.

M. F. J., MILFORD, MASS.—We will send you the paper as long as you enjoy reading it. The lack of money shall not rob us of a friend of liberty.

ACCORDING to a private correspondence to the *Temps Nouveaux* the Anarchist Colony, Cicilia, well known to all the readers of *Solidarity*, has ceased to exist. Various reasons are given for the dissolution, but they can be summed up in the one, that the element of compulsion was not lacking, it existed in the necessity to work and associate with a certain set of people in order to enjoy the benefits of co-operative labor.

If every man and woman would work four hours a day at something useful, want and misery would soon vanish from the world, and the remaining portion of the day might be leisure and pleasure.—[Franklin]

MOWBRAY'S PROPAGANDA TOUR.

C. W. Mowbray is now making a propaganda tour of the various cities of the country. He wishes to visit all the more important cities. All groups and comrades everywhere who wish him to visit their city should address,

H. A. KOCH, Secretary,
16 Hanover St., Boston, Mass.

NOTICE!

THE receipt of copies of *THE FIREBRAND* when you have not ordered it, is an invitation to subscribe. If you want the paper and can send us 5 or 10 cents, or more, we will be glad. If you can not send us any money, but want the paper, let us know and you shall have it just the same. All we ask is that you try to get us a subscriber or two. If you do not want it, and will not hand it to some one who does, please inform us; we cannot afford to send it where it is not wanted.

FIREBRAND'S LIBRARY.

Sex Revolution	Waisbroker	25c
Anything More My Lord	"	10c
Anarchy at the Bar	Nichol	05c
A Talk about Anarchist-Communism	Malatesta	05c
An Anarchist on Anarchy	Reclus	05c
Ideal and Youth	"	05c
True and False Society	Morris	05c
Useful Work vs Useless Toil	"	05c
Monopoly, or how Labor is robbed	Morris	05c
Commune of Paris	Kropotkine	05c
Anarchist Morality	"	05c
Revolutionary Government	"	05c
Expropriation	"	05c
Anarchist-Communism	"	05c
Appeal to the Young	"	05c
A Secret and Confidential Address	Gavroche	25c
Anarchist Manifesto		05c
Anarchism and Outrage		05c
Wants and Their Gratification		10c

ANARCHIST JOURNALS.

THE TORCH, 127, Ossulton St., London, N. W.

FREEDOM, 7, Lamb's Conduit Street, London, W.C.

LIBERTY, 7, Beadon Road, Hammersmith London, W.

THE ANARCHIST, D. J. Nicoll, Broomhall Sheffield.

All of England at 50 cts. a year.

LES TEMPS NOUVEAUX, J. Grave, 140 Rue Mouffetard, Paris.

LA SOCIALE.—E. Pouget, 23, Rue des trois Freres, Paris. France.

LA VERDAD, T. Carlo, Correo num. 228, Rosario de Santa Fe, Argentina, S. A.; subscription voluntary.

EL PERSEGUIDO, B. Salbans, Casilla de cerros num. 1120. Buenos Aires, Argentina. S. A. Subscription voluntary.

L'AMI DES OUVRIERS, Hastings, Pa.

EL ESCLAVO, TAMPA, FLORIDA, weekly, subscription voluntary.

EL DESPERTAR, 51 POPLAR PL.—BROOKLYN, N. Y. \$1.50 a year.

LA QUESTION SOCIALE, 325 Straight St. Paterson, N. J.; \$1.00 per year.

FREIHEIT, John Mueller, P. O. Box No. 346 New York City.

DER ANARCHIST, Nic. Mauer, 174 E. Third St., New York City.

FREIE WACHT, 522 Berk St., Philadelphia, Pa.

DER ARME TEUFEL, No. 6 Champlain Street, Detroit, Mich.

DIE FACKEL OF VORBORE, both No. 28-30 S. Market St., Chicago, Ill.

DIE ZUKUNFT. Semi-monthly, 75cts. per year. Send subscriptions to Wenzel Kubesh, IV, Shoenburgstrasse 5, 3. Stock, Vienna, Austria. Exchanges and publications to Alfred Sanfleben, Zurich, Oberstruss, Stupferstr. 1. Switzerland.

NOTICE.

Charles L. Badendick, of 1140 Milwaukee Av., Chicago, Ill., is agent for *THE FIREBRAND*, and authorized to collect and receipt for the same.