



VOL. II.

PORTLAND, OREGON, SUNDAY, MAY 3, 1896.

No. 13

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.]

Free Sex Relations.

There are always those who are possessed of a single idea in regard to social philosophy, an inkling of the truth, as it were, and bring forward that idea as a panacea for all social evils. Among these are those who have perceived the ills that follow in the trail of modern marriage and have jumped to the conclusion that if the legality of marriage were abolished humanity would be at the goal of happiness.

Now to my mind these earnest and well-meaning people have overlooked some of the factors in the social problem. The mere fact that the law requires a legal ceremony to sanctify or make decent and respectable the closest association of man and woman is not by any means the primary factor. Back of this lies a cause. That cause is also the fundamental cause of all social ills, because it is the basis of our society. I refer to our property system. I need only point to the laws of inheritance of ancient and modern times to sustain my position.

While the advocates of this may be nearer a solution of the problem than the advocates of any other one idea, because nearer to the principle of non-interference, the fact still remains that with the continuance of the commercial system will continue largely if not wholly the same form of sex relationship. Men and women will continue to be held together in the marital relation by their property interests and by their lack of property, or their fear of want. They will continue to marry for convenience, for support, a house or social position. Commercialism, buying, selling, trafficking, trading, draws the line nowhere; all things are subject to its greed, even that which is counted the most sacred thing in human society—the love of man and woman.

When this is understood it is easy to see that freedom in sex relations must result from better social conditions generally. Woman must be independent of man industrially; property and the incentive to accumulate the same must disappear; opportunities must be free and the fear of want forever banished before the dream of the "free-lover" can be realized.

It is true that a great many superstitions regarding the marriage relation, which though having no foundation in law have all the force thereof in many minds, have grown up in the general mass of ignorance and folly, and if these could be eradicated it would add much to the sum of present hap-

piness and hasten the coming of the social revolution. I know that a mutual understanding of sex powers and functions, a correct appreciation of the equality of the sexes in all matters and a willingness to live up to such knowledge, will work wonder in wedlock. But while much more happiness may thus be extracted from the relation than the evidence indicates is at present realized, it is still true that social conditions and not a mere fiat is at the bottom of marital and other social misery. People may, by understanding, free themselves from the superstition of law to such an extent that it cuts no figure in their sexual relations, but hard facts do not yield so easily.

It has been said by a noted worker for the "emancipation of women" that "if the marriage laws were abolished tomorrow nine-tenths of the married women would free themselves from the marriage ties that bind them." This is an indication, at least, of the sway which superstitious regard for law has over the average mind, and I will agree on the result of the abolition when property laws and a general readjustment are included. It is safe to say that nine-tenths of those women are dependent upon their position as wife for the necessities of life, and if set free tomorrow would not know where to turn to provide for themselves. But this is not an argument against this "emancipation," nor meant to discourage its advocates; it is an effort to lead them to see the importance of the greater liberation that shall include the entire race.

It is agreed, then, that our sexual relations are not what they might and should be, and that they cannot be so under the present social system. The question arises, under what system can the greatest happiness be derived from the association of the sexes?

We have seen that the requirements are independence of woman industrially, the abolition of property and the freeing of opportunities. The society which best secures the conditions is of course the one we seek. Let us examine the claims of Communism.

The fundamental principle of Communism is non-interference. Applied to sex relations this means that every individual shall consult only his or her own tastes and happiness in the matter, and mutual agreement alone constitutes what is now called marriage. The relation may continue for as long or as short a time as is agreeable to the parties concerned. An agreement may be made to associate for life, but if either party repents of his bargain and forsakes the other, society makes no provision for the enforcement of contracts and no interference would take place.

But, says one, that might interfere with the forsaken one's happiness. So it might, but enforced association would surely interfere with the happiness of the other, and it becomes a question as to which has the best right to happiness. But even at this day we hear that the pursuit of happiness is an inalienable right, and the forsaken person is already non-suited. Any way I haven't much respect for the happiness that could be gained from forcing

association upon an unwilling person.

Communism proposes the absolute industrial equality of all human beings. Each may select his or her own line of activity in the pursuit of happiness. Wifehood and motherhood will no longer be preached as the most noble life for woman, but she shall choose for herself what is highest and noblest and live out her own ideal. Motherhood, when chosen, will be no hardship, and bring upon her no added burdens beyond those which in the nature of things follow (and there are no burdens in living one's ideal), because all things necessary for comfort are provided and assured mother and child.

Not only is natural opportunity free, but also the products of labor. All is free to each individual according to his need; and since he is sole judge of his own need a better way to put it is according to his wants or wishes.

Under these conditions property would be as undesirable as impossible. There would be no incentive to the establishing of a princely property and a great family who should, generation after generation, inherit and hand it down. Pride of blood would disappear and jealousies, rivalries and competition would find no soil in which to grow.

How much farther must I go to reach the conclusion that Communism is the ideal society in which to live the ideal life in which the greatest joy of existence may be realized—that of a perfect sex association?

J. H. MORRIS.

CRITICIZES LOVERIDGE.

Now that comrade Loveridge's series of letters on "Christianity and the Church" is finished, I hope one letter of reply may be in order.

In No. 1 he shows up the unfairness of exempting the Church from taxation. Hit'em again, comrade; that's good.

In No. 2 he says "The Protestant Church has for years endeavored to gain admittance for their God in the Constitution of the United States," and gives as the reason the desire to "claim to govern by divine sanction." It is a fact that a few members of the Church keep agitating for this, and that the Protestant Church in general never pays the least attention to them. Why these men want it so I have no personal knowledge; I imagine their motives are largely sentimental, but do not doubt they are mixed of all sorts.

In No. 3 he gives a startling account of the origin of the "books of Moses." On the basis of a ridiculous Jewish legend he makes out that Ezra wrote them, in spite of the internal signs which, in the unanimous judgement of all prominent critics, point to an earlier origin for at least three of the four documents from which these books were compiled, and of the overwhelming external evidence that the book found 150 years earlier (as Loveridge himself tells the story) was our Deuteronomy. Then he explains that there can be no certainty about Hebrew literature anyhow because the vowels were not written, and the consonants by themselves might mean anything. Evidently comrade Loveridge does not practice shorthand. Any stenographer will tell him that a sentence can be correctly read from the consonants alone, if you are only used to such writing. And Hebrew has an advantage over English for such reading, because in Hebrew the same consonants commonly mean

the same thing, or nearly the same, whatever the vowels are. Arabic is like Hebrew in these respects, and is in practical use to day, written with "no vowels, from right to left, no division of words or sentences, an endless string of letters." I have an Arabic copy of the Arabian Nights which exactly fits that description, yet I have read several pages in it, and find it as easy reading as Arabic books printed in Europe with vowels added and spaces between words. By way of illustration comrade Loveridge gives the first word of the Bible, written, he says, with four letters. In fact there are six; one of them may possibly be a later addition to indicate a vowel, but five are certainly as old as the word is.

Then he tries to make out that, because we have no Hebrew manuscripts older than 1000 A. D., we have no evidence of the antiquity of the books beyond that. He might make out the same about any book written before the invention of printing. We do not judge the date of an ancient book by the age of its manuscripts, but by what it says. We know that the 22d book of the Bible is a satire on King Solomon, and that nobody has had any reason for writing satires on him since he died. We judge, therefore, that it was written in Solomon's time—at least till this is opposed by some stronger argument than the fact that the old copies are lost.

In No. 4 he argues that because the correct text of Josephus mentions Christ only once, and gives no details about him, the gospel story is a fiction. Further, Josephus and others do not mention the massacre at Bethlehem, as they ought if 14,000 were killed. Who told comrade Loveridge there were 14,000? there is nothing of that in the Bible. Also, the gospels mention an eclipse (local in the neighborhood of Jerusalem, so far as appears) and an earthquake, of which Pliny seems never to have heard. Therefore we are asked to believe that there is nothing in the history of Jesus. This is pretty bad. As to Jesus' personality, it was not such as gets into histories. What do our ordinary United States histories say about Jonathan Edwards or Ralph Waldo Emerson? As to the massacre of two or three dozen babies in a mountain village, Herod did so many such things that Josephus couldn't be expected to catalog them all; as to the eclipse and earthquake, we cannot expect lists of such things, before the invention of newspapers, to be complete except for the place where the list was kept. It is luck that Josephus mentions Jesus' existence and reputation at all. Socrates, the great Greek philosopher, is not mentioned by any Greek historian of his time except his own pupil Xenophon, and Xenophon barely mentions him in passing, and does not refer to his reputation. Yet Xenophon almost worshiped him, as we know from his book "Recollections of Socrates."

Here we have an important religious movement started by a number of men who all say "These are the teachings of our master Jesus," and give a coherent account of his life. Their bitter enemies, the Jews, accept this story as in the main correct. Now comes some one and tells us there is nothing to the story, because Josephus, a man who wrote the history of kings and wars, gives no details about Jesus! Is this historical science?

In No. 5 he takes two and a half columns to tell us how the story of Adam and Eve is borrowed from the Hindoo story of Adima and Heva; he quotes Ramatsariar as authority. I never heard of Ramatsariar before, but by the quotation he seems to be a modern Hindoo; it is well known that the modern Hindoos can tell you a wonderful lot of things that are not true. On reading this account I went to the best known and most universally accessible authority in our language, the Encyclopaedia Britannica, article "Adam," and found this:

"In Corrodi's *Beitraege* the Indian *Ezour Veda* is quoted, in which the first man is called Adimo. . . . But the *Ezour Veda* (a corrupt pronunciation of *Yajur Veda*) is a spurious *Veda* from the pen of some Jesuit missionary. . . . Genuine Indian mythology recognizes no such name of the first man."

Really, it is time we stopped basing arguments on the pious fraud of a Jesuit missionary, forged to make the heathen accept the Bible more easily by showing them something like it in a *Veda*.

In No. 6 he adds that Jesus' teaching was not new anyhow, and that the Lord's Prayer is in the Talmud. It will be interesting to copy it out of the Talmud.

"Let his great name be magnified and hallowed in the world which he created according to his good pleasure, and let him cause his kingdom to reign. Let his redemption blossom, and the Messiah be at hand and deliver his people. . . . Hallow thy name among

those who hallow thy name, and hallow thy name in thy world."

I have not a full copy of the prayer "Kaddish," but the above are said to be the parts parallel to our "Lord's Prayer." I don't see that they quite fill the bill.

In No. 7 he recommends us to do our own thinking. I recommend it too; but I can't see that comrade Loveridge does his. It seems to me that he takes his facts ready-made from partisan books, without testing them by reference to impartial authorities like the Britannica, or to the work of any of the great scholars who lead the way in science, or to the ancient writers themselves on whom all these historical arguments are founded. At least, all his quotations are from polemical writers of small reputation.

Still, he has nothing as bad as D. Priestley's letter in *THE FIREBRAND* of Mar. 15 in which he charges Jesus with having said nothing about subjects on which he talked much and emphatically, and says Ananias and Sapphira were struck dead for being stingy in contributions—while we were all taught in Sunday-School that they were struck dead for lying, and the Bible story says specially and emphatically that they need not have given any money unless they chose, but when they professed to give anything they should have told the truth.

I have so much faith in the ability of Firebrand readers to do their own thinking that I pass without comment comrade Loveridge's discussions of what is abstractly reasonable or consistent, and take up only his points of historical fact, on which some gathering of evidence is necessary to give material for our thinking.

STEPHEN T. BYINGTON.

Flushing, N. Y.

FREEDOM.

In this "great and glorious country of ours" we hear a great deal about freedom. Where is the patriotic American citizen who does not boast of our free institutions, of the freedom of press and speech, of the freedom to worship God according to the dictates of our conscience? Are we not told by our "great" Fourth of July orators what a grand thing it is to be an American citizen? Are we not told that the stars and the stripes are an emblem of freedom? Are we not worshipers of the famous Declaration of Independence which states that life, liberty and pursuit of happiness are the inalienable rights of every man? Why then should we grumble? Why should we not be happy and bless the gods for the great blessings they bestow upon us? But, my dear patriotic brothers, do we really have much freedom? Is it not a fact that, in spite of your declarations and declamations, we are religious, political and economic slaves? I cheerfully admit that we have the freedom to worship God, but do we have the freedom not to worship? Is it not a fact that the majority of our "liberty-loving" people say to the heretic: "No matter what your private opinions might be; you must not express them in public, if they are contrary to the doctrines of the christian church." Do you tell me that the law does not punish the heretic? Perhaps so, but can a freethinker be elected to a political office? Do not many freethinkers have to conceal their real opinions in order to be able to earn a living? Does not Mrs. Grundy demand piety or at least pretensions of piety? Does she not prefer a hypocritical "Christian" to an honest "infidel"? Ask Cardinal Gibbons, Dr. Talmage and other great lights of the christian Church, and they will tell you the meaning of religious freedom. According to these reverend gentlemen, religious freedom means the freedom to be a christian, and no more.

As to our political and economic freedom, where are they? Do the people have any rights which the politicians are bound to respect? Do the majority of our law-makers care a straw for justice, right and freedom? Is not our whole political machinery an endless fight for the spoils of office? Are your Harrisons, Clevelands et al much better than the despotic European monarchs? Are not your Rockefellerers, Goulds, Vanderbilts and other plutocrats a product of your laws which enable the few to fatten themselves at the expense of the many.

"We have no censorship of press in this country," say the champions of our "free institutions," "our great republic does not muzzle its editors." Can this claim be supported by facts? It is true that our papers have more freedom than the Russian papers have. We have the freedom to abuse Grover Cleveland, while the Russian papers cannot abuse Nicolas the Second, but do we not have a censor in the person of Anthony Comstock whose business it is to watch the "purity" of the press?

Do we not imprison such men as Bennett Haywood, Harman and others? Do the readers of *THE FIREBRAND* know that Moses Harman, a man of whom the world may justly be proud, has for many years been prosecuted and persecuted for the "crime" of having published in *LUCIFER* an indignant protest against a rape committed by a brutal husband upon a sick, helpless wife? Was there anything bad in that article? Why, yes, our immaculate Comstockians have found the article shockingly indecent. Does freedom of press mean the freedom to publish only that which pleases St. Anthony and his minions?

Why should we deceive ourselves? Why should we prattle about freedom when in fact we are slaves? Do the American people love their chains? Is freedom a word without meaning? Will men ever become sensible enough to throw off the yoke of slavery or will they always be proud of obeying the politician and the "boss", and will they always kiss the hands that smites them?

CYRUS W. COOLIDGE.

Oyster Bay, L. I., N. Y.

WHY VOTE?

It is very remarkable, the strong resistance of fashioned thoughts against new conceptions, which are not in accord with the old method of perceiving ideas. The new thoughts seem to be shut out from the comprehension simply because of their unfamiliarity.

In my surrounding there is a lot of friends wishing to see Anarchist-Communism in operation, and do not question the superiority of our ideals and our positive conception of an abundant life of freedom, agree on the uselessness of governing authority, but still continue to vote. They are still so short-sighted that they can not see, that only through voting is it possible to keep up the government, and every government is oppressive because of the special privileges granted to them who are sailing under its flag—with the right to govern others.

They are very enthusiastic in pointing at some "good" man in the Representation and his "eloquent" speeches before the house; and how earnestly they are clamoring for punishment of the men who do not keep their promises.

Let us see if their hopes have any foundation or not. In the first place it is impossible for me to think of the possibility of a government without an "opposition." It is very essential to the security of the government to have the opposition, in order to keep up the ceaseless hope for reforms which never come. The fact of the matter is that they never intend to reorganize our economical system, and this they can not do even if they want to. In the first place because government is an abstraction, and in the second place because government produces nothing and disposes only of what it takes away from the producers by direct, or indirect taxation.

If the masses would stop voting the stump speaker could no more boast about majority rule, because they would be backed up only by politicians, and the politicians are deservedly despised, at least here in Tacoma. The hog would then drown in its own dirt.

All the talk about the "rope" is as ridiculous as it is cruel. Who shall be the authority to supervise our legislators; who shall be the men to decide if they acted right or wrong,—it is impossible for a legislator, whose "job" is to make laws, and every law is a restriction, which is the source of oppression, to suit everybody's notions. It follows as a logical sequence that the legislators are oppressors and as such deserve to be hung. Who would be then foolish enough to be a legislator? Besides this we have our experience that we are practically "run" by the Executive Power, the courts—which are the ones to decide what is right and what is wrong, and how to make us abide by what they call law and order. It follows very logically that we will stay for some time yet to come in the present confusion in Municipal and State affairs, as far as politics are concerned.

I do not propose to sleep, if I don't go to vote, but I want to explain my standpoint in every possible way to be properly understood, publicly as well as privately. The dilemma is simply this: government or Anarchy; if you vote you are sure to keep up the government. If you stop voting and advocate production and distribution on the basis of mutual cooperation without imposing authority, all justice loving people will sympathize with you and gradually evolve to the ideals of a free society, which we are advocating, but it is illogical to wish Anarchy and vote for government.

A. KLEMENCIC

COMMERCIAL CIVILIZATION.

The lie called civilization
Enshrouds us with its bane,
And adds to savage misery
Its wealth of hurt and pain.
It kills our life with sore distress,
Our homes with ill and woe,—
We throw our all into its snare
And still it cries "you owe."

MAURITZ S. LIDEN.

NOTE AND COMMENT.

SERIOUS trouble is reported between the Columbia River Salmon Cannermen and their fishermen, as a result of the recently formed trust organized to control the price paid for new fish as well as the finished product. The fishermen objected to the price offered them and went on a strike. The "featherbed" militia were called out to protect the Cannermen's traps (which catch fish without price), and a story is told that aptly illustrates the feather-bed character of the tin soldiers. They camped at Ilwaco near the residence of one Petit, and duly established guard. In the middle of the night Mr. Petit had occasion to visit the closet, situated on some drift or the beach. He was promptly confronted by the sentinel's musket and made to tell his business out at that hour. It is supposed that while the militia were busy holding up a man who was out on such a harmless and necessary mission the fishermen were busy at the traps for when daylight came the last trap had gone out over the bar!

Comrade Turner of London, England, delivered four lectures in Paterson, commencing Wednesday Apr. 8. His subject was "Anarchist-Communism, what it is." On Friday the 10th his subject was "The Outcome of Unionism." On Saturday the 11th he spoke on "Anarchy, an essential of Socialism," which evoked a warm discussion. On Sunday afternoon he attended the usual meeting of the Socialist Labor Party and as they had their Platform under discussion, he took part, with the result that this Platform was abandoned and the debate turned upon the merits and possibility of Anarchy. The discussion lasted two hours. On Sunday evening he gave his last lecture and pleasing to say this was the best attended of the four, the members of the S. L. P. attending in force to hear more of Anarchism. His subject was "The growth of Anarchist opinion" and again gave rise to a long discussion it being nearly midnight before the meeting broke up.

The result of this propaganda is that there is a good prospect of an American group being formed in Paterson for the purpose of carrying on the English speaking propaganda, several young men have expressed their sympathy with the ideas and their readiness to join.

Comrade Turner does not know just how long he will remain in this country, but hopes to get out west before returning to England.

COMMUNISM VS. COMMERCIALISM.

Mr Byington sees no reason why he should not submit his expense account, nevertheless there is a reason. That reason is that it is not argument and has no bearing on anything I have said in this discussion. As a student of the social problem, he has spent his time, to poor purpose if he has not learned that the non-producer is a parasite, an entirely useless being, and is entitled to no consideration except as to the quickest and easiest method of his extinction. If he can show that his production is equal to his consumption I will acknowledge that I have misplaced him and offer an apology; otherwise he must remain in the category of things that cannot exist in my ideal society. His opinion as to the condition of the twenty-year-old member of Anarchist society and my opinion as to whether there will be college students (in the sense in which the term is today used) under Anarchism amount to but little. But I see no reason why one member of society should be relieved of productive labor in order to devote more time to study, since that must necessarily reduce the time that other members may devote to study; and the right of the twenty-year-old member to leisure for learning is just equal to that of the forty or sixty-year-old member.

The mental qualities of Kropotkin and Morris may be of service in Anarchist propaganda, just as those of Byington may be; but to insist that because they are college-bred, non-producing college professors must always exist, is as if I should insist that the junk-dealer is indispensable to Anarchist society because one of our

most able Portland comrades follows that calling.

I hope that I am not liable to be "led astray" by Tucker or any one else, though I must acknowledge Mr. Byington's compliment in suggesting the idea. I said he was ignorant of Communism and everything he has to say on the subject but indicates the charge. He "thought" Communism was so and so, led astray by a false name. A limited "Communism" is no more possible than liberty with a proviso. So long as some may say what others shall contribute to the support of so-called public institutions, and so long as one may have greater powers than others in their administration, there exists State-Socialism, but not Communism. Control and management as well as use must be common. The prefix "Anarchist" was adopted, not to add to Communism a lacking quality, but to distinguish Communism from State-Socialism under its various names. Liberty and equality are the first requisites of Communism. The distinguishing mark of Commercialism is that these qualities are unknown when it holds sway.

I did say that Anarchism would not interfere with those who wished to practice Commercialism, because non-interference is the principle of liberty; but I also denied the anarchistic principles of the Commercialist, which Mr. Byington seems to have overlooked. This oversight is further apparent when he assumes that I will agree that more good would result from a commercial life under Anarchism than under government, and advises me to point this out to the Commercialist. I tried before to make it plain that such an agreement and such a course was altogether impossible to the Communist. He might as well advise me to make a man a Christian-Atheist as an Anarchist-Commercialist.

J. H. MORRIS.

INDIVIDUAL DEVELOPMENT.

Broad mindedness is the result of growth. Narrow mindedness is a condition of inaction and ignorance. We are creatures of mentality and our sphere of usefulness depends upon the expansion, in all directions, of that mentality. Human beings collect together for various purposes; for protection, for pleasure, and sometimes because they cannot help it.

Minds are of two kinds; negative or passive, and positive or active. If all minds were active in diffusing or giving help, knowledge and pleasure to others, then the need of man-made laws would fade away. This positiveness and self-action is created and accumulated by education and the will power of each individual. Thus the conditions that have placed us where we are to day, have their taproot way back in the past, and the hope of the future is in the newly shooting branches and opening leaves that blossom forth in new theories.

Man must live within his own mental world, his own ideals and mental creations. These are created from his likes and dislikes, his loves and hates. And these ideals largely shape his joys and his sorrows, and his usefulness in life.

Each individual has his own mental field to cultivate, and broadmindedness is the result of carefully sowing, carefully cultivating, and carefully reaping the results thereof. Flower gardens and all that is beautiful and lovely should find a place therein as well as the hard earnest toil of mentality.

As the stream never can rise higher than its source, so our actions will never be more grand or more noble than our ideals; then our education should be such as to form the most perfect ideal of the relation of man to man. Although we do not give expression to them to-day, or in this generation, the seed will be sown to ripen to fruitage in the coming years or possibly the coming ages.

Our present educational system in all of its departments, has a tendency to become weakening to the individual. In the church we are taught to rely upon a Jesus or an outside personal God. In politics we are taught to leave the welfare of our material being to a representative, who is liable to barter away the very conditions that furnish our daily bread. In school we are taught to hold to the conventionalities of the past, and to model after the fixed ideas of the long ago, forgetting that individuality now and here is the highest type of development. The world within should lead and conquer the world that is without. Nature says learn by pleasure if you will, or by pain if you must; and nature—as revealed to us by science—should be the source of our instruction. And when we teach that the greatest satisfaction is found in the development and strength of the individual, and not in weakness and passiveness to outside force, our civilization will

take a stride upward greater than has ever been known before.

T. F. LEE.

Lakeport, Cal.

WHY LABOR CREATES ALL WEALTH.

One man, or several men may possess several thousand acres of land, but land in itself is not wealth, for the possessors could not clothe themselves with it, nor eat it. Land is worthless without labor. Land becomes wealth when used for agricultural or building purposes, that is to say, when labor is applied to it to raise crops, or build houses, or railroads on such land. Without labor, land possessors would be naked savages, and could not be called wealthy, even if they possessed all the fertile land on the globe. The same may be said about all (so called) natural wealth.

Labor makes all kind of clothing, from the shearing of the sheep to the finished clothes. And the machines, by which the weaving of all sorts of clothing is made easy, are made by labor, from the digging of the ore to the finishing touches of the machinists.

An ingenious inventor may make a model of some newly invented machine, tool or other useful article, but such model is of no use unless the machine or tool is made by labor.

A locomotive on paper has no power. One man may design it, but many men are necessary to make it. Both fire and water are necessary to produce steam to give it power to draw thousands of tons of labor's produced wealth (goods) from one city to another, all over the world.

The parasites or their sons could not be doctors, lawyers, professors, etc., without the tradesmen and their helpers. While some are studying in Colleges or Universities, labor attends to the production of all the necessities of life. The working-people enable some to study, and are robbed of their wealth, to be deceived and frightened into submission and work! work! work! to keep in idleness and luxury some rascal. In time of war the working people serve as breast-protections for the rich; In time of peace they kneel in the dust before them for a crust of bread.

How long yet will the working people allow themselves to be used as mere beasts of burden or machines? Supposing we could scare all those legal robbers to an Island not inhabited could they live on air without working?

I think some would become cannibals within a few days; they would not know how to go to work and produce anything, but the working people could be happy, having everything in common that they and their forefathers had produced with common efforts.

T. Smith.

Literature.

"VOLUNTARY SOCIALISM."

We have received a copy of VOLUNTARY SOCIALISM, by F. D. Tandy. It is a neat, pamphlet size book of 228 pages, paper cover, price 50 cents.

In bringing out this book Mr. Tandy essays to supply a long felt want: a want of "some book which will give a brief but lucid outline of voluntarism." The work is affectionately dedicated to Benjamin R. Tucker, whose pupil Mr. Tandy declares himself to be. This very likely accounts for the attitude Mr. Tandy constantly displays toward Communism.

The first four chapters of the book are intensely interesting, dealing as they do with Evolution, Egoism, The State, Equal Freedom.

The first chapter deals with the theory of Evolution, stating quite clearly and concisely that theory as generally accepted among the scientists of the world. One grand error, however, manifests itself in this chapter, as in nearly every chapter in the book. In noting the struggle for existence and the fierce competition among the different species, he concludes that the most intense competition among men is the proper thing. He says: "The foolish philanthropy so prevalent today, which seeks to prevent the procreation of the unfit and which seeks to lessen competition, must be unqualifiedly condemned." This condemnation does not rest on the fact that "such foolish philanthropy" seeks not to establish liberty, but because it seeks to lessen competition. This necessity for competition, which Mr. Tandy so zealously advocates, is a delusion, unjustified by the evidence which he rests it upon.

In the first place the competition among plants and animals is due to their difference in habits, structure, etc., and secondly to the fact that the surface of the earth in the region they inhabit being so fully occupied by themselves, and other species, that there is no possibility of surviving except by a remorseless competition that results in the extermination of the unfit. With man it is different. The greater part of the earth's surface is still untitled, and his ingenuity is such as to make production abundant for all, thus removing the necessity for competition.

The chapter on Egoism is good, showing that the advice "If a man smite thee on the right cheek, turn to him the other also, is a very ennobling and comforting doctrine—for the one doing the smiting," and that the golden rule should be stated negatively.

Chapter three deals with the State, and in it the author traces the growth of the State, and shows how "the State was founded in aggression," and never was the useful and just institution that some claim for it, that has become corrupt. That it can be nothing but an expression of militancy and oppression.

er four is devoted to the subject of Equal Freedom. In it the author shows that equal freedom cannot be maintained by law; that the law is, and necessarily must be, a violation of that principle; that the State is necessarily an invader, for it collects taxes from those who are unwilling to pay. He says: "In spite of our vaunted freedom we are still enslaved by the State. Even the freedom of speech and press, which we hear glorified on every hand are shams," in proof of which he points to the contempt of court method of suppressing free speech and the suppression of papers that deal with the sex question, or advocate suicide, and adds: "The invasive acts of individual transgressors are comparatively insignificant beside those of the State. The power of the individual for harm is at worst limited to a short term of years. But those of the State are organized, systematic, universal and well-nigh eternal."

Chapter five is devoted to the discussion of the Defense of Life and Property, and shows the inefficiency and extreme costliness of the present police and court method of dealing with crime. An idea of the nuisance and expensiveness of the present police system can be formed from a few statistics given in this chapter. In Boston there were, in 1888, 1784 persons arrested on suspicion, only six of whom were held for trial. In 1889, 1890 and 1891 the disparity between the number arrested on suspicion and those held for trial was still greater. The part of this chapter devoted to showing the expensiveness and inefficiency of State protection is good, but that portion devoted to how to protect life and property under Anarchy is a strained effort to answer, or silence, the fears of those who see no protection for themselves except in government. But at the end of the chapter the author admits that: "After all this the question of defence is relatively unimportant," for "all authorities agree that most crimes are directly or indirectly, due to poverty." This being the case the best protection is the abolition of poverty creating monopoly.

But if we admit that crime will still exist in some form, it is evident that spontaneous action of the interested persons would be all sufficient, and not foster the dangerous elements which are necessarily present in organized defensive associations. Look at the association called the "Strangers" of Silverton, Colorado, for example. Originally it was simply a vigilance committee, its only purpose being to "protect life and property," but it soon degraded into a gang of "regulators" who would strangle an enemy to death on slight provocation. Mr. Tandy's proposition of a jury system would hold within itself the potency of a coercive, invasive concern, that in time could become a violator of equal liberty.

In Chapter six the subject of Surplus Value is discussed, and the conclusions of Marx, Proudhon and Josiah Warren as how to prevent the surplus value from going into the hands of a few. Mr. Tandy proposes free competition as the means of gaining this end. He argues that the cost principle will by this means be established, and the surplus value remain in the hands of the producers. But he

shows that no method can be adopted to reach this while government lasts.

Chapter seven deals with Money and Interest. In this chapter the robbery of interest is clearly shown, and the justification of interest shown to be fallacy from beginning to end. It is also shown that making gold or silver or both the basis of all circulating medium, is simply discriminating against all other products, thus enabling the owners of these metals to rob all others by means of interest. Considerable space is spent in speculating about what could be used as a standard, etc. This and much of a purely speculative character in the book is due to the authors strictly commercial way of looking at everything.

Chapter eight is devoted to Mutual Banks of Issue. In this chapter the Bank of Exchange, which P. J. Prondhon proposed is described, as is the Mutual Bank which was proposed by Col. Wm. B. Greene.

The author admits that the Bank of Exchange was to be practically a State institution, while the Mutual Bank was to be chartered by special act of the Massachusetts Legislature. He does not make it clear whether he would have the promoters of free money try to get the ten per cent tax repealed, or the enactment of a special law allowing Mutual Banks, or how he would go about it to get free money.

He gives the law of Colorado that prohibits the issue of notes, bills or checks to be used as money, and the U. S. ten per cent prohibitive tax on such issues, and then leaves his readers to think it out how best to avoid these laws. I would advise Mr. Tandy to put himself in communication with my esteemed friend, Mrs. Albina L. Washburn of Loveland, Colorado, who is doing more, practically, in this line than all the Tuckerites put together.

Chapter nine deals with Free Land, and ably champions use and occupancy as the sole title to land.

This theory is contrasted with the Single Tax and shown to be superior, the Single Tax necessitating compulsion, or some form of government.

Chapter ten contains a discussion on special privileges and is chiefly devoted to showing that patents, copyrights, tariff, etc., are forms of monopoly, violations of equal freedom and detrimental to the general well-being.

Chapter eleven is devoted to a discussion of profit, which is shown to be getting something for nothing, and the author tries very hard to show how profit can be eliminated in a system of Commercialism. Finding that profit in some form would exist under Commercialism he says: "But this could not be prevented by any system other than Communism, which, being a denial of competition, and consequently of Equal Freedom, stands more fundamentally condemned than does this slight deviation from our guiding principle."

Mr. Tandy does not explain how any form of association that is purely voluntary is or can be a violation of Equal Freedom, or how it comes that free people must compete. In chapter ten the author is forced by the logic of his argument to admit the degrading effect on literature of Commercialism, but fails to recognize that it must have a like effect on all forms of human endeavor, and that it logically follows that to obtain the best results in all affairs of life we must be free from the commercial necessity of competing with our fellows in cheapness, the only competition being a rivalry for excellency.

In chapter twelve the question of Transportation is discussed, and the fallacy of government ownership of the means of transportation, communication etc., and like schemes.

Chapter thirteen deals with Methods. After the preceding chapters that have been a compromise between the present society and a condition of liberty, this chapter is quite refreshing. The author divides opposition to the State into three divisions: active resistance, passive resistance and non-resistance. He admits the right of active resistance—violent revolution—but doubts its expediency, and as he makes expediency his only criterion he chooses to use "passive resistance"—education etc.

All in all the book contains much that is to the point, clear and logical, but, starting as he did with out an adequate conception of Anarchist-Commun-

ism, and a preconceived and deep rooted prejudice in favor of Commercialism, much of the book is filled with discussions that are of but little or no importance. It is quite an addition, however, to the Tuckerist literature. It will, undoubtedly, find most of its readers among the commercial and professional classes.

HENRY ADDIS.

RECEIPTS.

Lee, Larkin, each \$1.00. Kleinshmidt, 75c. Press. Yaffe, Miss Berger, Edelstadt, Lang, Shcuetz, Sperber, Bergman, Slotkin, Lang, each 50c. Feinstein, Pomer, Williams, Schweitzer, Carpenter, each 25c. Firebrand Free Distribution fund in Buffalo, \$2.20.

The Rebel, Liberty Library, and The Firebrand have decided to offer the three publications at \$1.00 per year. No subscriptions taken for less than one year. Application may be made to the office of either of the papers.

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.

OMAHA, Nebraska.

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

FIREBRAND LIBRARY.

Bases of Anarchism; Historical, Philosophical and Economical, by Wm. Holmes	5c
God and the State, by Bakounin	5c
The Commune of Paris, by Kropotkin and An	
Anarchist on Anarchy, by Reclus, both in one	5c
The true aim of Anarchism, by E. Steinle	5c
Revolutionary Government, by P. Kropotkin	5c
Anarchist-Communism, "	5c
A Talk about Anarchist-Communism, Malatesta	5c
Anarchy on Trial	5c
Economics of Anarchy; a study of the industrial type, by Dyer D. Lum	
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

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 Bakounine. No. 1 contains 16 pages of solid reading matter and is one of the best pamphlets for missionary work extant. No. 2 contains 44 pages and is the cheapest edition of "God and the State" ever issued. No. 3 contains two important essays: "The Commune of Paris," by Peter Kropotkin, and "An Anarchist on Anarchy," by Elisee Reclus. No. 4 contains The True Aim of Anarchism, by E. Steinle. These numbers contain 16 pages, and are excellent to lend the prejudiced. They are uniform in style, neatly bound, artistic title page, and sold at the remarkably low figure of 5 cents per copy, or 2½ cts. 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, 412 South 13th Str., Omaha, Neb.
I. Rudash, 162 Norfolk street, New York City.
G. Lang, 29 Grape Street, Buffalo, N. Y.