



VOL. II.

PORTLAND, OREGON, SUNDAY, APRIL 12, 1896.

No. 10

## THE FIREBRAND

Published Weekly. Communicate in any of the European languages.  
**50 CENTS A YEAR.**

Address all communications, and make money orders payable to, THE FIREBRAND, Box 477, Portland, Oregon.

Admitted as second-class matter at Portland, Oregon.

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

### SURVIVAL OF THE FITTEST. \*)

Walking along the country road  
 While yet the morning air was damp,  
 As unreflecting on I strode,  
 I marked approach the frequent tramp.

The haggard, ragged, careworn man  
 Accosted me in plaintive tone:  
 "I must have food," he straight began;  
 "Vile miscreant," I cried, "begone!"

"'Tis contrary to every rule  
 That I my fellows should assist;  
 I'm of the scientific school—  
 Political economist.

"Dost thou not know, deluded one,  
 That Adam Smith has clearly proved  
 That 'tis self-interest alone  
 By which the wheels of life are moved?"

"That competition is the law  
 By which we either live or die?  
 I've no demand thy labor for,  
 Why, then, should I thy wants supply?"

"And Herbert Spencer's active brain  
 Shows how the social struggle ends:  
 The weak die out—the strong remain;  
 'Tis this that nature's plan intends.

"Now, really 'tis absurd of you  
 To think I'd interfere at all;  
 Just grasp the scientific view—  
 The weakest must go to the wall."

My words impressed his dormant thought.  
 "How wise," he said, "is nature's plan!  
 Henceforth I'll practice what you've taught  
 And be a scientific man.

"We are alone—no others near,  
 Or even within hasting distance;  
 I've a good club, and now right here  
 We'll have a struggle for existence.

The weak must die, the strong survive  
 Let's see who'll prove the hardest hitter!  
 So, if you wish to keep alive, behold me strike!  
 Prepare to prove yourself the fitter.

"If you decline the test to make  
 Doubting your chances of survival?  
 Your watch and pocketbook I'll take  
 As competition strips a rival."

What could I do but yield the point,  
 Though conscious of no logic blunder?  
 And as I quaked in every joint,  
 The tramp departed with his plunder.

It is but too common, my countrymen, to observe a material difference between the candidates for place of power and trust before and after obtaining them. They solicit them in one manner and execute them in another. They set out with a great appearance of activity, humility, and moderation, and they quickly fall in to sloth, pride and avarice. —(CAESAR MARXUS.)

\*) Reprinted by request.

### COMMUNISM.

There is one subject about which there is much confusion of thought; one which is much misunderstood, or which is unknown to the majority. That subject is Communism.

The most general conception of Communism is that of the small states, or societies in which the tools, land, buildings and products of the society are the common property of the members, or of the government of the society. Usually in these societies, or states, a common kitchen is maintained; the vegetables are all raised together in a common garden by the united effort of those assigned to that work by the management of the society; individual preference is supposed to give way to the preference of the majority, and a regulation of activities carried on by the central authority. This is the old fashioned authoritarian Communism, which still prevails to a limited extent. This is the kind of Communism which most persons picture in their minds when the word is mentioned.

While this kind of Communism has many advantages, such as united effort and the increased productive power incident thereto, the saving incident to the abolition of all the unnecessary weighing, measuring, accounting, book-keeping, etc., yet it is objectionable on account of its authoritarianism.

It is from this kind of effort that most persons draw their conception of Communism. Many who oppose Communism base their opposition on the assumption that these little socialistic states are the true models of Communism, and their antipathy to such arrangements.

Fun is poked at the "community toothbrush, towel, bed", etc., by those who answer argument by ridicule. No one believes that there would then be any greater communism in these things than now exists, if he will stop and think a minute. In every hotel and boarding house these tools of cleanliness are used by thousands of different people. In every city there are toilet Supply Companies who furnish a combination towel rack, looking-glass, comb and brush holder, and take the dirty towels away leaving clean ones every morning. In this way tens of thousands of hands and faces are wiped on the same towels in the run of a year. But the present "promiscuity" in the use of articles of various kinds is too apparent to need elaboration. Yet this is warmly championed by the ridiculers of the "community towel".

Many imagine that all persons would live in big houses where the meals would be served in a common kitchen. This is another unfounded supposition. For that matter see the milliope who do eat in common dining rooms, each getting his roast beef, macaroni and cheese or ham and eggs, cooked in the same vessels, by the same cooks, cut from the same roast or ham. All these things occur, not because of the communistic genius of present institutions, but because of the opposite tendency. The desire to supply our needs or wants cheaply gives birth to such arrangements and customs. The one who can combine the efforts of a number of persons,

in his given line, judiciously can supply our wants more cheaply than can be done otherwise.

So we see that the principle objections brought against Communism are invalid. The first, the charge of authoritarianism, cannot apply to true Communism but only to the miniature State Socialism, usually called Communism; that of promiscuity can be brought with terrible force against the present methods, or any other methods that propose cheapness as the guide to preference. Neither one can be laid at the door of Communism, as I propose to show.

In the first place the Communism proposed as a social and economic arrangement by the Anarchists who no longer love the fierce struggle of competition, and the wasteful methods of commercialism, is a condition of affairs where all exercise of authority is absent. In such a condition association according to taste would be the rule. All the resources of the earth being then common to all, that is to say, free for all to use but not to monopolize, there would be no necessity to associate with others in productive work, or in social matters, when such association was not pleasant. Persons who because of similarity of taste desired to work in the same kind of undertakings would then associate in their occupations of production or distribution because it would give them pleasure to do so. In social matters the likes and dislikes, attractions and repulsions which wield such an important influence in society today would have full play, and association of a social character would be pleasant because desired by all persons concerned. Under these conditions crime, vice, and contentions of an unpleasant character would be reduced to the minimum, for all these things as they exist today are the direct outgrowth of the restriction of liberty, the strained and unpleasant association and relations resulting therefrom.

The common house, towel etc., would be matters for each one to decide for himself or herself. If any number of persons wished to unite their domestic affairs and live in one common home, using the same dishes, spoons, towels etc., they could do so. Those who wished to live the most exclusive lives, having their own houses, towels, dishes, linen etc., made expressly for him or her, and never used by or for anyone else would be equally free to do so. Those who saw fit to go to neither extreme, but desired to retain much of our present method in these arrangements could go on with their domestic relations as they are today.

Wherein then, you may ask, is the communism? Simply in this: Production would be carried on, as before stated, by those who voluntarily associated themselves together for that purpose, each according to his or her desire. The land and tools of production, buildings necessary for production and exchange, the means of transportation, communication and distribution, and the products of united effort would all be held in common, and the right of everyone to use to the full extent of their needs and desires would be recognized. It is a well known fact that if all able bodied persons were oc-



occupied in production for a very few hours per day, an abundance of everything desirable could be produced. If all were assured of plenty then no one would have any incentive to take more than they could use and enjoy.

In Communism there being no money, or other representative of value, there would be no opportunity to hoard for the man who would carry home a hundred hats, or fifty umbrellas, or twenty suits of clothes, when the store was well supplied all the time and free for him to help himself, would be ridiculed and laughed at so much that he would surely refrain from any further exhibition of the hoarding proclivity. The sense of security which would prevail would be a sufficient safeguard against anyone taking too much.

Cheapness would never be thought of. Utility and beauty would always be the objects sought to be attained in all lines of production. Shoddy would be unknown. No thought of adulteration of food would ever enter the head of anyone, and only the best of everything would be sought for. Buildings would be erected with the greatest care, and substantial enough to last many generations. Roads would be made level, straight, wide and with substantial foundations; their surface would be kept constantly in repair.

All the necessary and useful occupations of every description would be carried on by voluntary groups, each group doing that particular work for which it was formed. When any work has been accomplished the group doing it would dissolve into its component parts, the various individuals that had composed it uniting with others in other groups for other and different purposes, as the necessities or expediencies of the times called for united action.

Thus the most infinite variety of combinations for specific purposes, either of utility or pleasure could be formed, accomplish their purpose and go out of existence, and all the necessities and luxuries of life could be provided without curtailing the liberty of any, and the highest individuality now conceivable be attained.

In this condition, above all others that have ever been proposed would the true equality of the sexes be attained. No woman would feel dependent upon any man for her support, even during her inability to provide for herself at the period of childbearing. Full knowing that she need never suffer from want, she would scorn the thought of submitting herself to the sex embrace of any except the man she loved. Nor would she bring unwelcome children into the world. Love alone would draw men and women into the intimate relation that results in parentage, and the loathsome institutions of today (prostitution and marriage) with their attendant female complaints, and venereal diseases, would be but dim memories of the past.

Natural selection in sexual relations, as well as in all the varied affairs of life, would have full and unobstructed play, and would as surely work out the betterment of the human race as it now perpetuates and improves many species whose natural surroundings are more hostile than ours.

HENRY ADDIS.

#### ANOTHER ATTEMPT TO SET OUR CRITICS ON THE RIGHT TRACK.

It can justly be said that there is perhaps no idea worth naming which has been so much misunderstood and so little understood as the idea of Anarchy. Assuming the word Archy to be synonymous with order, most of those who hear about Anarchy leap to the conclusion that An-Archy—no government, is Synonymous with disorder, chaos, etc. Those, however, who make it a practice to make Anarchism hideous at any cost, are not very scrupulous about employing the most wicked and cowardly methods to gain some sort of a plausible justification for their misdeeds. Unable to find faults with Anarchism for what it is, they switch off and try to find fault with Anarchism for what it is not. If true Anarchism does not answer the purpose of our malignant critics, they set up another Anarchism which is certain to appear hideous even in the eyes of the most enthusiastic Anarchist. Indeed so far from the mark by their shots that had it not been called Anar-

chism, we could hardly tell what they are depicting in such hideous colors. In short, they open fire on Anarchists without inquiring where we stand.

The most common attacks on Anarchism consist in occasional outbursts full of venom and falsehoods attributed either to Anarchism in general or Anarchists in particular. "Under Anarchy," they say, "man would kill each other, that is to say there would be perpetual war of individual against individual and even the most desperate of all criminals would go unpunished." These attackers though directed against Anarchists fight us where we are not to be found evidently for fear of meeting us square face to face. Says a leading statesman: "Where crime exists there must be resistance" as though Anarchists deny it. As though Anarchism would imply a revival of "non-resistance". As though we would let "robbery, rape and murder go on without raising a finger to stop its bloody work." But in reality we are made of sterner metal. Though there are non-resistants among us, we are, as a rule, a very rebellious people, so we offer some very uncompromising resistance to those who destroy our homes, our families, our happiness and our life. (It's a pity there are not more of us, for this set of political thieves would find it a hard job to carry on its misrule.) We are the sternest enemies of invasion, in whatever shape or form it may appear, and, although we are busily engaged in destroying the causes thereof, we would, nevertheless, not hesitate to use whatever means wisdom might dictate, to do away with crime, even if it were necessary to use force for that purpose. "That we would choose better ways of doing away with crime than that of 'a blow for a blow' is true; it is also time that we look forward to a time when the necessity of force for the purpose of repressing crime will totally disappear; but this does not say that we will offer no resistance to crime even after the abolition of government. In declaring war against the state, we are not only not non-resistant, but we make war upon the chief criminal, as well as the maker of all the crime and misery that exists, and we are not very scrupulous about those heroic attempts to abolish government which were so numerous in Russia, France, Italy, etc. Inasmuch as the state is the most gigantic criminal of all and the cause of the grinding monopolies, the horrible social conditions which fill our towns and our cities with prisons and provide an abundance of criminals wherewith to fill them, we apply all our energy, all our power, all our ingenuity to hasten its downfall. And those who come forward to attack Anarchists because Anarchists declare war upon the state, come to plead a case which has no moral justification in the opinion of those whose minds have not been totally darkened by political superstition. The excuse for the infamous existence of the state, is the necessity of repressing crime which it manufactures much quicker than it punishes, a thing too absurd to be compared with anything.

But this excuse is not new. During the good old days of anti-slavery, the abolitionists were often met with the argument that slavery was necessary to keep the ignorant slave out of doing mischief. They were told that if the slaves would have their freedom the blacks would kill each other. But the abolitionists in those days knew better. They defied such infamous and baseless excuses and proclaimed the injustice of forcing men, women and children to work all their life time and then pay them with lashes over their naked bodies. They saw that it was the institution of slavery that kept the negroes in ignorance and could not justify the institution of slavery on the ground of the ignorance of the slaves. It was one of the abolitionists of the good old days, Horace Greely, who, in answer to such a petty attempt to justify the existence of chattel slavery, said: "If you wish the slave to show the virtues of a free man, you must first make him free."

The same kind of argument is to be found between the abolitionists and the upholders of the church. When science has so destroyed the foundation of faith that even the church minister no longer believes in the inspiration of the scriptures, and will privately admit the absurdity of this black art practiced by the church for so many centuries. It is argued that the church is necessary to keep the superstition-ridden masses in order, because their

release from mental slavery would cause a multiplication of rape and murder, the inevitable result of which would be the ultimate ruin of mankind. But, the Atheists know better. They know that it is the church that chloroforms the minds of the people and makes knaves, puppets and maniacs of them, and to justify the existence of so ignominious an institution on the ground of their ignorance and superstition of the people, is to put a man into a dungeon away from the rays of the sun till he no longer can look at it and then keep him there in the dark because he cannot bear the light of the sun.

Now the inner and outer manipulations of the State have been gradually coming to light. Every day adds so much to the abolition of the State. People gradually begin to see things as they are and the absurdity of "murder by the State is laudable, while murder by an individual is a serious offence against the person robbed and also against public welfare," casts a fearful doubt upon the omnipotence of the State. We Anarchists utilize every opportunity to drive the political superstition out of the people's mind, thus undermining the existence of government. And we are met with a cry, equal to the cry of the slave owners and the priestcraft, that the abolition of the State is the establishment of chaos. We are told that the existence of the State is necessary to keep criminals in subjection, and, were it not for the State, we should all be garroted in the streets and have our throats cut in our beds. But we know better. We know that the State creates conditions which give birth to all sorts of criminals and to justify the existence of the State on the ground of the existence of crime is an excuse every whit as absurd as those used to justify the existence of chattel slavery, and the existence of the church. We see that the State upholds the monopolies of land and the implements of production under the pressure of which the laboringman is forced to part with the product of his toil to support a set of good for nothings; we see that poverty is directly or indirectly the chief cause of crime; and we hold that with the abolition of the State, monopolies and other poverty creating functions will vanish, and this will lead to the disappearance of crime—the realization of Anarchy.

Once for all, then, we are very anxious to exterminate crime, and we do all in our power to abolish the State which is the chief cause of all crime. But if after the disappearance of the State there shall be some criminals left, though there might be some who would not care to punish them, on the whole however, we would not object to the punishment of criminals. Anarchists, therefore, find no fault with punishing murderers they only find fault with manufacturing them.\*

This is what we claim; and this is just where we stand. Right here must we be attacked, if we are attacked at all. We invite our critics to find fault with Anarchism for what it is and not for what it is not. We invite our adversaries to meet us face to face and whip us if they can. This is a fair challenge!

H. A. KOCH.

#### A COWARDICE.

According to LES TEMPS NOUVEAUX the well known scientist and philosopher Peter Kropotkin was arrested at Dieppe at the moment of his landing on his trip to Paris. He intended to deliver two lectures on the following subjects: "Anarchy, its Philosophy and its Ideal," and "The State and its historical role."

A semi-official parisian Daily proclaimed on behalf of his radical, almost socialistic ministerial bosses:

"The government could not act otherwise than it did. At the hour when the President of the Republic is entertaining the brother of the czar at Nice, it was impossible for the President to allow him to be violently attacked in Paris. Now then, it is known that Prince Kropotkin, before everything else, is the unpitiful enemy of Russian Autocracy, and never missed any occasion to tell what he thinks about the Sovereign

\* Would comrade Koch give us his definition of the word "crime"? How can Society "punish" without authority to do so? Punishment necessitates aggression. We claim the right to defend ourselves from all manner of aggression at all times, but that is not punishment. There is a vast difference between punishment and defense.



allied to France. The Minister of the Interior would have shown a rare awkwardness if he would have allowed a single person in the world on such an occasion, to deliver a lecture that would be obnoxious to the interests of the Russian Nation and the French Fatherland."

When Kropotkin had come out of prison in 1886 he lectured several times in Paris, and so he did in 1887 under the opportunist (republican) government.

But alas, since that time have changed. To day there is a radical (populistic-socialist) government and we see the cynicism of the so-called free government in its full splendor against the freedom loving speakers.

Our comrades will print the two intended lectures just the same, and propagate the sublime ideas of a future society among all the workers which are tired of the present system of knavery and starvation.

O ye men who administer law and order, if you could only know how small your efforts are to stop the tidal wave of economical independence, you would save many a bitter spite against yourself.

A. KLEMENCIC.

### USELESSNESS OF GOVERNMENT.

So far as the observation, experience and research of the wise men in all ages have gone in their explorations of the great ocean of truth, finding a small island here and there, the consensus of them all has been that they have found a great continent of truth and named it the "Law of equal freedom." A continent large enough to contain the whole race in luxury and happiness. It is not bounded nor limited by any other law. All force is banished by unanimous consent.

It has been discovered that equal freedom is the only absolute good. That evil is only the infringement of the equal freedom of an individual or a people. People formerly thought that evil could be cast out by evil. Notwithstanding the penalties for crimes are being mitigated, as in all civilized countries but two crimes are punishable with death, murder and treason, where a hundred years ago 20 were, and the tendency is toward a repeal of all penalties for crime which will obtain when we will have nothing but the form of government without the substance. There are some who insist upon more stringent laws. But our best thinkers and truest men have now by observation found that when a people rid themselves of an evil by law, which implies force, other evils as great or greater spring up unforeseen to take its place.

Government implies force. Government is a violation of the law of equal freedom. Government implies obedience to commands, and commands imply a superiority of the commander with abject submission of the commanded. Behind every command is hid in ambush, if you don't I'll make you. Government implies inequality of privileges. The strong always determine who shall govern. Government in its very nature pertains to physical force and is entirely foreign to the realm of morals. In all governments, the question arises as to who shall govern, and is determined by physical force or intrigue, and in its very nature is adverse to christian ethics, for it abrogates all force but the force of love. It says, "love your enemies" etc. Christianity implies mutualism or Communist-Anarchy. \*) Government is the root of all evil. Money is only a brace root. The love of money is prompted by a love of distinction. Men who cannot distinguish themselves in useful work like Edison, Tesla, Darwin, Huxley, Spencer, Shakespeare, or any of the poets, philosophers or scientists, may by chicanery or cunning accumulate wealth through money as a means, knowing that wealth is power and commands respect and distinction.

Under the law of equal freedom no one could distinguish himself in any other way than by doing good. There would be no temptation to do otherwise. Under freedom, which implies Anarchy or Mutualism, a man who would infringe upon the right of another would be considered a case of activism and treated as an unfortunate at an asylum. The function of government is to protect wealth in the hands of a few, and the few perpetuate it. The older a government becomes, the more despotic and restrictive of the liberties of the people governed it becomes in the very nature of it, for the more wealth is concentrated in a few hands and the poorer the masses, whose privileges must be restricted by the wealthy through their government. The masses are too easily hypnotized by the prestige of power and the "grandeur" of government. The more abject the poverty and ignorance of the masses, the easier they are controlled. Especially is it so in a republican government where the poor are hypnotized to believe they govern them-

selves. A tyranny over the poor by the rich may and is likely to be greater in a Republic than in a Monarchy where it would not be tolerated for the reason above stated.

A propaganda among the poor, of the gospel of equal freedom, showing the great advantage of Communism that would immediately result if government was abolished, it seems to me can be easily promoted. Show them that less than two hours of labor per work day by every able bodied person would produce double the useful wealth now produced, and that every person would get all he wanted of necessities and useful luxuries he desired. Show the enormous waste of labor by friction under our present competitive system. To illustrate the waste under competition: One street in Boston has 20 piano stores—each sells a different make of piano, each piano has an excellence that neither of the others have. One store pays \$60,000 a year for clerk hire and advertising.

Under mutualism one manufactory would make one piano possessing all the good qualities of all the others, and one store would dispose of them without advertising. So with nearly every thing made and sold now. Mutualism would give us more and better goods with a great saving of labor. Under Anarchy no time would be spent producing a thing for one man better than the humblest could have and enjoy. No \$5,000,000, residences nor \$1,000,000 stables would be built. Only for public uses would very expensive buildings be erected. Consider the vast number of men and women now employed in vocations that under Anarchy would be useless, in addition to the predatory rich who would be turned into producers instead of, as now, very extravagant consumers. I estimated roughly that 4,000,000 laborers now useless would be turned into productive channels.

If there was no government, there would be no money, the love of which is said to be the root of all evil. There would be no individual wealth to scheme, lie and cheat for. There would be no courts in which witnesses could be bribed to perjure themselves. There would be no occasion to lie, cheat and steal. There could be no wars. People would prefer to live rather than die for their country. There would be no compulsory labor in vocations which the laborer has no taste for, nor any adaptation. All labor would be voluntary and a labor of love. I am now 60 years old and have been a student of human nature and sociology ever since I was a small child, and I do not believe there is one person in 1000 who would not with alacrity perform two hours labor every day if allowed freedom to choose his vocation. I never saw a so-called criminal, that I could not trace his misfortune directly or indirectly to government.

Gov. Seymour of New York at a conference where prison reform was discussed, said in substance: "I, as Governor of New York have been petitioned and tempted to pardon many criminals, for I have thought, that if I had been educated and envired as they have been, I should have done just what they did." Our own good Governor of Illinois takes much the same view of criminals I think.

Those who oppose Anarchy do not know what it is, many of them, and do not estimate the real goodness there is in the human heart. They think Anarchy would bring a perfect pandemonium. They admit that my ideal of mutualism would be a grand consummation, if possible, but doubt its practicability. They are like the old lady who was very desirous her son Johnnie should learn to swim, but warned him to not go near the water until he did learn. They say Anarchy would work if all were perfect, or if all were christians. They never consider that it is their environment that makes men otherwise than good.

Freedom has never been tried. People are nearly all conventional. They never analyze a proposition philosophically to see whether it be true or not, but go with the popular thought. They were born and reared under government at home and abroad, and it never occurs to them that any other condition could be possible. They speak in laudatory terms of our glorious country. They are as proud of it as a southern slave used to be of his master because he owned more "niggers" than any other man in the country. They are like the frog that was rained down into a well when he was a tadpole. He grew up and lived to an old age when another frog hopped into the well and made his acquaintance. Where did you come from said frog No. 1. I came from the sea, said No. 2. Oh the sea? Is it as big a place as this? Oh yes much larger, infinitely larger. No it can't be, said No. 1, for this is certainly the biggest place in the world. People live in their little wells,

church or political party, and never dream of the great ocean of truth lying outside of their narrow horizon.

I know that Anarchy will work right, for I have lived it almost perfectly for 50 years amid hindering environments. I never struck any one in my life, I've ne killed any thing with a gun in my life, I never sued nor was sued in court, though I have collected on my own account over \$200,000. I never solicited an office but have held offices of trust when solicited by my neighbors to do so. I never went to war for I never was angry enough at any one to want to kill him. I never was a partisan in politics nor a sectarian in religion. I never was patriotic enough to want to die for any country. I prefer to live for the world. I don't want to be governed at all; much less risk my life for a governing machine. Like the ancient Persian Noble. "I neither command nor obey." I allow every one to do as he pleases so long as he infringes not my own equal freedom.

The recital of an episode in my early married life may not be out of place here, and serve to illustrate my ideal of Anarchy or freedom.

In 1863, I and companion were honored by a visit in our little log house in Southern Indiana, from the sage and matron of the neighborhood, Esq. Lee and wife. My good wife according to custom and propriety prepared for dinner all the rare delicacies, in addition to the substantial of a meal, that our humble home could afford. When dinner was announced, the honored guests were bade to be seated at our little square table made for four. Being a little embarrassed by the presence of dignity, but four chairs were placed at table where Elmer our two years old son had always had a place since he could remember. Oblivious of the little high arm chair in the corner of the room and of the little man who had invariably occupied it whenever meals were served, all were seated but the one whose presence had been so ignominiously ignored as he thought. He approached me with flushed face too full for utterance in words. I arose and invited him into the kitchen for an interview. I said: "Elmer, you can see there is no room at table for more than four. Your ma must wait on the guests and I am expected to entertain them. But I am so sorry for you, since you have waited so patiently and are doubtless more hungry than I am; I had much rather wait than have you wait. You may go and eat and I will wait if you say so." My son had perfect confidence in what I said, for I never dissimulated nor exercised any secret evasion of mind whatever toward him but was always absolutely truthful with my children. He looked up through his tears wiping them from his cheeks and said: "Pa, you go and eat. I will wait." I wiped my own eyes, took a seat at table and all went well, for all were happy.

J. C. BARNES.

### A REVIEW.

Comrades of THE FIREBRAND,—Allow me to review in part your issue of March 15. "Friend Addis leads with a clear exposition of natural selection showing that society is wholly the result of an artificial selection. Our political economist prates a good deal about "natural law," "free trade" and the "survival of the fittest." His government should merely protect capital and preserve law and order. But as a matter of fact we know that his protected capital, and his law and order, has perverted nature. His government is an abnormal growth, a blemish in the path of civilization; a leech upon the body of society, and the sufferings of society will continue just so long as this "body politic" absorbs its richest blood. The only consistent advocate of natural law, natural order and natural justice is the Anarchist, for wherever man or men are elected, or appointed, to rule over their fellows, natural conditions must give way to an artificial state. Our State Socialist would improve upon the method of the economist. He would inaugurate "natural law" and "natural justice," by establishing a compulsory co-operation instead of the present political economy. In place of "government" he would have a "social organism." Now there may be a very great difference in the mechanism of

\*) Before we can agree with comrade Barnes that christianity is Anarchist-Communism he will have to show christianity to be a vastly different thing from what it has ever been represented to be by the Church, or any advocate who has ever gained public notoriety. In the days when the apostles formed communes and ignored governments they were looking for the immediate coming of the Lord, and instead of producing were simply consuming what they had amongst themselves, apparently thinking that it would last till the "Great Day."

H. A.



these two concerns, as well as in the results of their operations. But as near as I can find out in both cases, certain individuals are to be given exclusive power to run the machines. In which case, I contend, we shall not have a survival of the fittest as nature would inaugurate, but an artificial arrangement still.

In what respect do they differ? The political economist has created monopoly; the State Socialist would perpetuate it by making it the cornerstone of the "social organism." The economist makes it the power behind the throne; the State Socialist would make it the power of the throne itself. The Anarchist, on the other hand, denounces it as unnatural and inhuman, and would destroy it by removing the props which sustain its special privileges. Brother Hesse puts forth his plea for a peaceful revolution by means of the Single Tax. But this is a trick of political economy. The "end" would not be Anarchy, but government still. Brother Hesse was well answered. I imagine he begins to appreciate the difference in the methods of Anarchy and political economy. Agitate, educate and co-operate; these are the roads which will lead to Anarchy.

Politics and politicians will ever lead us into the labyrinths of law; the pitfalls of politics. Let us boycott the whole business and determinedly set our faces towards the rights of man, life liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

I don't want to interfere in the discussion between comrades Byington and A. I. But as an Anarchist believing in equal freedom, I cannot see wherein weight and measure, and "a money standard for compensation therefor", can be inconsistent with freedom or justice. I am willing to go as far as who goes farthest in denouncing "the spirit of exaction, the spirit of a Shylock demanding his pound of flesh", the methods of "business" generally. The fact is Commercialism like competition has been brought into disrepute because it is not practiced "with out let or hindrance; the absence of interference;" in other words it is not free. When the sun of liberty shall have arisen and all men shall have come into a knowledge of the truth as it abides in Anarchy, man, trade, commerce and competition will be free. The Communist will probably organize his commune and enjoy all things in common; while the individualist will go it alone, or associate himself with other free individuals to accomplish selfish ends. I have no quarrel with any ideal proposed under liberty. Give me liberty and I'll accept what follows with the best grace possible. Why cannot we work together on lines leading to liberty, agreeing to disagree in regard to the various methods proposed, yet tolerant and helpful, ever ready to hail Comrades All.

A. L. BALLOU.

Porterville, N. Y.

### Comment.

Commercialism is "inconsistent with freedom or justice" because it is absolutely impossible to give a just equivalent for a certain performance of labor.

The opportunity and incentive to cheat and exploit our fellowmen is left, and that is why Commercialism is incompatible with freedom and independence. If men cannot get rid of the spirit of Commercialism, they will never rid themselves of the superstition of government. The so-called Individualists are a good example of my assertion. They are aware of the fact that Commercialism necessitates protection, and therefore propose Protective Associations—a substitute for government. Instead of leading us to freedom, it would lead us back to dependence—slavery, even if government was repudiated. A Protective Association without any given power—laws—is simply ridiculous.

Let us compare the situation of an artist in a condition of Commercialism and Communism, and we will see that the first implies dependence and the latter individual freedom.

If a painter cannot sell his pictures unless he paints "per order" or has to take the taste of the public into consideration, he necessarily must suppress his individuality. Basil Dahl, the young poet in New York, is another good illustration. The prostituted papers and magazines have no use for the tendency of his poetry; the radical papers and magazines are unable to pay for his poems, and he consequently must suffer. Tucker, the editor of "Liberty" gave him a lecture for refusing a "job" that did not suit him, and I—as a Communist—admired him for it, as that shows him to be a real Individualist.

In a condition of Communism, the painter and the poet, and all others for that matter, could follow their individuality and inclinations, and enjoy life according to desire. Neither would they ask, nor be asked for compensation.

By the way I challenge the so called Individualists to criticize Communism—if they can. Their conception of Communism is nothing but that of State Socialism.

### CLOTHES.

In Carlyle's "Sartor Resartus (The Tailor Patched)" it is remarked that up to the time of Prof. Teufelsdröckh "nothing of a fundamental character, whether in the way of Philosophy or History, had been written on the subject of clothes. Carlyle remarks, to begin with, that "it has been strangely forgotten that man is by nature a naked animal."

That is where he bases his whole philosophy upon a mistake. If he had said that man is by nature a thief and robber he would have come nearer the naked truth. Man was by nature clothed with fur like other animals, but in trying to adjust himself to all sorts of climates, he took a notion to increase his own fur covering by stealing the skins of other animals. Ultimately he came to rely entirely upon artificial covering, and his own natural covering became aborted and finally mostly disappeared. The Ainus of Japan still retain their covering of natural hair. In some of the northern islands, where bears are plenty, these Ainus catch cubs and raise them, fatten and kill them for food. While these cubs are young and playful and comparatively harmless, they are permitted to run with the children, and one species of animal is about as hairy as the other.

Man would, and probably did, adjust himself to different climatic conditions by means of his own natural covering, but all the distinctive characteristics of man are artificial. He liked to have a covering which he could put on and take off at pleasure. Hence the clothes. The elephants in tropical countries are nearly destitute of hair; but their covering is not pretty to look at. So of the rhinoceros. In northern latitudes there once flourished the woolly rhinoceros and an elephant with a short coat of wool, and a coat of hair from six inches to a foot long.

The natives along the south coast of South America, who go naked in a cold climate, and swim around in cold water, develop a thick layer of fat under their skin, which protects them from the cold, as blubber does the whale and walrus under similar conditions. The thin, delicate, semi-transparent skin of the so-called white races is a product of clothes. The clothes are artificial and the nudity is the result of artificiality.

By covering up his body man has caused the muscles under his skin, by which other animals twitch their skins to drive off insects, to become dormant, except in the face which has been left uncovered. The face, too, by being alone exposed, has become infinitely more expressive; capable, in fact, of manifesting, visibly, almost all the passions, thoughts and emotions of the mind. Hence those blushes in the face when caught unclothed. Clothes being a necessity, a luxury, a convenience, and a protection from the rude gaze of those who will be gawking where they have no business, it was only reasonable to try and make them beautiful. (1)

There is a story told of Andrew Jackson that when he was President, an old farmer came to see him, and the President thought he would surprise him by taking him to an (un)dress ball—and he did. After the ancient agriculturist had looked around for a time, the President asked him if he ever had seen the like? "No," he gasped, "not since I was weaned." (2)

D. PRIESTLEY.

### REPLY.

I.—In this covert manner bro. Priestley attempts to "get back" at some of the ideas advanced by me in "Nudity" in a recent issue. The fallacy of his assertion is apparent on the face of it. Remove the thought that nudity is indecent and there will be no blushes as a result of being seen in a nude condition. Another remarkable proof of this is that only certain parts are hid from view, or attempted to be hid in case of surprise when in a condition of nudity, showing that it is the false idea that sex organs and sex functions are indecent, that causes people to blush at being seen naked.

Clothes are a necessity, to protect us from the weather, but not from the "gaze of those who will be gawking where they have no business" for that gaze is the result of the curiosity, "which every one has, to find out mysteries and see unusual sights, coupled with the degrading idea that sex organs, being "nasty" should always be kept out of sight.

Clothes should be worn for comfort. Artistic taste has room for display here as elsewhere, but looks should always be secondary to comfort.

2.—Now, if the women whose breasts were showing are subject to the same rule as others why didn't they blush when the old farmer "gawked"?

The reason is clear: it is not counted immodest for the women to expose their breasts at these gatherings, hence no blushes. H. A.

### RECEIPTS.

Roustchouk, Bulgaria, M. \$1.24; Brant, \$1.50. Barnes, Group of Waterbury, Group of New Bedford, Augstein, each \$1.00. Mason, Theo. S., Joe Burg, Jacob Burg, Wohlleben, Novak, each 50c. Karl, Lane, Kiss, Knapp, Uici, Turthelbauf, Walecka, Goodheart, each 25c. Slocum, Leise, Shillman, Reisinger Bauer, each 20c. Luce, 10c.

### SAMPLE COPIES.

We sent out large numbers of sample copies, and if you are receiving the paper without ordering it, it is an invitation to investigate our principles. If you want the paper, let us know and you shall have it, and you may send in such amount on your subscription as you can afford. If you can't pay for it and want to read it, you shall have it anyhow. If you get the paper and don't want it, please be kind enough to have it stopped. If you have been getting the paper without paying for it, and can afford to send us some money, please do so, as we are sadly in need of it.

Labor Exchange Certificates, "Labor Tender" or other paper that will procure the necessities of life, will be received in payment for subscription. We also accept all kinds of farm products.

### FIREBRAND LIBRARY.

Bases of Anarchism; Historical, Philosophical and Economical, by Wm. Holmes 5c  
God and the State, by Bakunin 5c  
The Commune of Paris, by Kropotkin and Anarchist on Anarchy, by Reclus, both in one Revolutionary Government, by P. Kropotkin 5c  
Anarchist-Communism, 5c  
A Talk about Anarchist-Communism, Malatesta 5c  
Anarchy on Trial 5c  
Economies of Anarchy; a study of the industrial type, by Dyer D. Lum 20c  
A Sex Revolution, by Lois Waisbrocker 25c  
Anything More, My Lord? 5c  
Wants and Their Gratification, H. Addis 10c  
A Secret and Confidential Address, by Gavroche 15c  
Revolution, a lecture by S. H. Gordon 5c

### OMAHA, Nebraska.

SOCIETY FREEDOM meets every Sunday 3 P. M. at the Labor Temple, 6th floor, SW corner 15th and Forum Sts.

## LIBERTY LIBRARY

### MONTHLY

E. H. FULTON PUBLISHER

Columbus Junction, Iowa.

SUBSCRIPTION 50 CTS. PER YEAR.

In this Library Mr. Fulton brings out one or more volumes of anarchist literature every month. It is printed on fine book paper, in new clear type, and is a model of neatness and artistic skill. No. 1 contains Wm. Holmes' Bases of Anarchy: Historical, Philosophical and Economical. No. 2 contains "God and the State," by Michael Bakunin. No. 3 contains 16 pages of solid reading matter and is one of the best pamphlets for missionary work extant. No. 4 contains 44 pages and is the cheapest edition of "God and the State" ever issued. No. 5 contains two important essays: "The Commune of Paris," by Peter Kropotkin; and "An Anarchist on Anarchy," by Elisee Reclus. This number contains 16 pages, and is excellent to lend to the prejudiced. They are uniform in style, neatly bound, artistic type page, and sold at the remarkably low figure of 5 cents per copy, or 24 cents each in lots of ten or more; 100 copies or more at 2 cents each. No better means of propaganda is to be found. Orders received at this office.

### Agents for THE FIREBRAND

Charles L. Bodendieck, 1140 Milwaukee Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. C. Schmidt, 472 South 13th St., Omaha, Neb.

I. Rudash, 162 Norfolk Street, New York City.

G. Lang, 197 E. North Street, Buffalo, N. Y.

THE OFFICE OF THE FIREBRAND, North Mt. Tabor, Car Line, Center Addition North Mount Tabor.