



PORTLAND, OREGON, SUNDAY, MAY 24, 1896.

No. 16

VOL. II.

# THE FIREBRAND

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

Address communications and make money orders payable  
to "The Firebrand", Box 477.

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.

## COMMUNISM AND ANARCHY.

THERE is no such thing as Anarchy (or, at all events, Anarchist Society) without Communism; neither is there any such thing as real Communism without Anarchy. The two are one, so far as the negative principle of Communism is concerned—the denial of property. Property is only authority—that is to say, Society guarantees to the individual that it will blindly follow his will, and back it up without asking any questions, when he chooses to dictate to other people that they are not to use or enjoy something, or that they are only to do so on his terms. Precisely the same as State authority in any form means only that society guarantees blindly to accept the will of some one or more people and to compel any individual who may think otherwise to accept it also.

Communism itself implies Anarchy, because its motto is, "Each according to his needs," and however much material wealth a man may be allowed to enjoy, it is absurd to say that he has according to his needs if he has not perfect liberty of acting upon his own initiative, and responding according to the impulses of his own nature to the various impressions he receives from the world outside of him. It is a lie to say that he has even the material wealth according to his needs; because every restriction imposed on him prevents him from using some material wealth in the way he would do if he were free. I would find it much more practicable to run a weekly paper here, both as to the support it would receive and as to the propaganda to be done, than by confining myself to a monthly publication, which no more people will take even at the same price per copy than would take the weekly, and which people have time to forget between issues. But the law imposes so many requirements and so much nonsense which I cannot comply with, and it would be unduly risking the plant to defy the law, though many papers which are not organs of advanced opinion do so with impunity. In these circumstances if I had the use of all the type and machinery in the world I should not have it according to my needs (neither am I allowed to do on behalf of myself or others according to my capacity.)

Anarchy implies Communism, because what each individual lives for is to satisfy his needs, of whatever sort they may be, and if you say to a man, "Do as you like," that means simply, "Do whatever will bring about the best satisfaction of your needs."

Communism does not impose upon anyone the obligation of ministering to the needs of anyone

else, or of being at any inconvenience to admit of their being satisfied. It means simply this: that Society does not promise in advance to take either my side or yours if a dispute arises as to whether one of us shall have a benefit that the other may think would do harm to him. Everyone would judge the matter from the broad standpoint of all his human feelings and sympathies, in relation to each of us; and not only by one kind of feeling on behalf of only one party. Of course, in a larger sense Communism means more, but this is the foundation, upon which alone that further development is possible. And the further development is even easier to understand. It is the principle, "From each according to his capacity."

Of course, where no property-system existed, this would no longer mean as now, according to an amount of wealth which he has the exclusive privilege of disposing of; it would mean, that we not only regarded goods as existing to satisfy needs, but that we also accepted the principle of acting on behalf of each other's needs, and making our whole behavior conduce to the same end, the fullest possible satisfaction of all the needs of all who were associated together.

All the systems of society ever invented have had for their object to regulate the pursuit of individual needs, so that one person in seeking to satisfy his own should not trespass upon the means required for satisfying someone else's. Now unless people are to have no dealings with each other this difficulty will always be present; and unless we abandon our libertarian ideas and go in for the old policy of trying to solve the problem by restrictions, our only plan is to adopt as a principle of society the intention of doing the best we can in every way to help along the satisfaction of other people's needs as well as our own.

The absurdity of the idea that property is necessary, appears in many ways. First, no amount of restriction and no mechanical system can ever get better results than the spirit of the people would work out freely. The people whose spirit is grab will use any system for grabbing, and indeed the only difference is that if there were no system, they could only grab by their own power, but when they can work a corner under a system they are supported in their robbery by the opinion and will of all the fools who say that the system must not be violated—"damn the men and save the institutions." Whilst if the people have the right spirit they will not have any restrictions or Mother Grundy system, but will treat each other as free and expect each other to conform to the spirit of human brotherhood and not to any "rules of the game."

Secondly, property creates want and insecurity. The benches in a park are in common, and everyone can generally satisfy all the needs he has of using them, but if they were divided up as property between those who have the right to use them nobody would dare to sit down, because his share would not be an inch wide. If again the right of using the benches, instead of the benches themselves, were divided up as property, everyone would

only have the right to sit down for a limited time, and probably only on a particular place on one bench, at a particular hour. Under such conditions people would be driven to try and swindle each other out of their share; of the benches, because everyone would still want to be able to sit down when and where and for as long as he liked; whilst in order to be able to do so, he would have to deprive other people of their right to use the benches at all.

Thirdly, you are not under any compulsion to squeeze your ribs or get up on account of anyone else because the benches are in common; suppose some dude calculated he had need of twice the space that would suit ordinary people, would you feel bound to crowd up to give him that room? On the other hand, very few people but those who were weak or fatigued would ask you to make room for them if the bench was crowded already, they would accommodate themselves some other way. But in favor of a single weak or tired person half a dozen would be glad to get up, so that he might have the whole bench to lie on if he needed it. Your will would be excited in the latter case, and not in the case of the dude. You go out of your way to satisfy the need of someone else that you feel a need to see satisfied. All through, it is a matter to be solved only by the action of the individual wills of those who find themselves concerned one way or another. There is no established regulation, no system to be mechanically conformed to and the conforming to which is taken as the test of righteousness. Even if it came to a fight you are all individually free to go which way you like in the matter.

From the fact of this freedom existing nobody would infer that you have any property-right over the bench, or over the use of it. Therefore it is absurd to say that this freedom of keeping the use of what you are enjoying cannot be had without property. The objection taken to Communism arises from its being confounded with collective property, in which everyone would have, using the bench example, only the right to sit down for a given length of time, which might have to be fixed so as to start from a certain hour; or else with Government property, in which nobody could be sure at any moment that he would not be turned out by authority.

Another thing I want to say is, that the property system applied to sex is prostitution; a woman is either so greeky and filthy that she offers her body to a man for the sake of a present, when she would not have him otherwise, or she is more frequently driven by necessity to this course perhaps with a number of men promiscuously on the same night, when she has absolute need of sexual rest. A free woman only gives the use of her genitals to a man when she herself wishes to satisfy a sexual desire with him. And I say it is just the same with any other part of the body, the arms, for instance, or the intellect. The commercial system means only that a man prostitutes his head and his hands by granting the use of them to somebody else for hire, or price, when he would not do so either from any desire to let off steam by that sort of work, or from any wish to please himself by conferring a benefit upon the other person. It is utterly repugnant to everyone who has any sense of human decency, and it is absurd to suppose that there can ever be a good society based on such abominable lines.

J. A. ANDREWS.  
4 Rule street, Richmond, Victoria, Australia.



## HOW ANARCHY WILL COME.

I do not know, but I have some idea as to how it will not come. It will not be ushered in or won by means of a violent revolution, at least, for several decades to come, although it may come sooner than any of us dare to hope, some other way. The enemy (the State) is too strongly fortified. The money power is the State and the State is the money power, and the church completes the trinity. Church, Calf and State,—place the godheads in any order—it is all one. Fortress-like arsenals are already builded and being builded; cannon and arms and soldiers are prepared to vomit shot and shell and move at a cry to arms from law and order and tens of thousands of the toilers ready to shoot and bayonet charge at the bidding of uplifted hands of priests and clergymen and politicians. Superstition is in the field at the head of a well-armed host ready to fight for the trinity and defend every monopoly. The masses, in a large sense, only ask a little better wages and eight hours of toil or moil in shop, factory or mill.

Anarchy will not come through any political party—by the ballot-box, which would certainly be overridden unless declaring the will of the people by a stupendous, overwhelming majority, and how much likelihood there is of such a declaration is hardly open to conjecture.

Will a great strike usher in Anarchy,—such a strike as William Morris dreamed of in his prose-poem "News from Nowhere"? Possibly, within a decade; probably, a quarter of a century hence such a strike might win. I doubt if it is known how large the "don't care" or "let alone" party is today or how fast that party grows in numbers: that party (if party be a correct name—which it isn't) would not, I think, be arrayed against Humanity.

Any attempts to "set up anarchistic society here or there" must have as, indeed, Mr. Byington admits, a fairly numerous working minority, even to be object-lessons as suppressed experiments. I am not a pessimist, but think it only sane to try and see things as they are, and not through a rose-tinted medium. How long it will take to disprove to a sufficient number the everlasting misrepresentations of press and pulpit regarding Anarchy I would not venture to guess; a continual flow of falsehood can only be counteracted by a constant iteration and re-iteration of the truth. A fairly large minority won over, means the "beginning of the end" insofar as the downfall of monopoly is concerned. Today, propaganda would seem to be our most effective means of warfare.

I think it is nearly certain that any sudden change from present social disorder to communism is both undesirable and, anyhow, impossible.

A social revolution today, even if won (most improbable of impossibilities!) by the proletariat would only result in our enslavement to the crass ignorance, superstition and bigotry which dominate the world today: result in a change of masters, indeed, and for the worse: result in a slavery to priestcraft and demagoguism compared with which our present social disorder gives fair opportunities to work for "better things." On the other hand should the State win (nearly a certainty) progress would, it seems to me, be arrested,—for how long a period it is idle to attempt to guess. The Commune of Paris of 1871, resulted in the butchery of thousands of brave and honest men,—resulted so in my opinion, by reason of the predominance of crass ignorance and old-time, ingrained superstitions of the omnipresent, unnumbered fools. Why would a social revolution called into action today result in freedom? Would not the omnipresent fools be as numerous as ever? Would not such a war, here, today, "blossom thick with such mistakes?" How large a proportion of the people—even know what self-hood, freedom, self-sovereignty mean?

Expediency must not be lost sight of. Liberty-lovers are only a small minority. The State Socialists deny self-hood and equal freedom—at least, State Socialism does so,—and the Populists are in the same boat: no more sense of freedom, quite as much enthralled by governmental superstition and even more saturated with cant and feebleness. The unknown number of the "silent", of the freethinkers, of the all round radicals, would alone even stand neutral in a war today for equal freedom. The priest, demagogue and politician, inspired and directed by the money power, have the ears of the masses today, even as they had them yesterday. This is not to say that Anarchy makes no progress, but the road to "the land of equal freedom" is both rough and long. All-Anarchists claim equal freedom and equality of opportunities and wish to get rid of the state. Individualists and Communists are on

the same ground here. I believe myself that free conditions will lead more and more to voluntary co-operation and Communism in all the necessities of life; anyhow, equality of opportunities will surely abolish poverty, tend to equalize wealth and make happiness on earth a possibility to one and all.

State Socialism would end in failure, as they would only be able to experiment in more or less large communities. Their plan necessitates an autocratic rule, and the intelligent members would soon secede and wander away. Then the orthodox members would quarrel amongst themselves, by reason of the fact that all governmentalists believe that, personally, they need no government, but that everybody else needs a very large measure of it to keep them in the straight and narrow way that leads to "righteousness". The investigating skeptic will find this to be a truism.

I have no hope of "better things" through legislation, as all helpful legislation would be the repeal of unjust laws, of special and class laws. Monopoly cannot be too loudly and constantly execrated.

I would be glad to know just what Mr. Byington means by "expropriation", which he concedes "is possible". I do not think a few coal barons could prevent the miners receiving the full value of their labor, nor would their mining stocks be other than so much waste paper, as the people would never pay more than the cost of production and transportation for their coal in whatever way they paid for it. So would it be with all dividend-paying stocks—all monopolies, of course. Rent and interest could not be collected, and cost of production and delivery would be the price paid under a condition free from all monopoly, so that the vast wealth of individuals would be distributed so widely that it would, it seems to me, be very like expropriation, whatever name be given it. Monopoly of land could not be possible. Whatever we name the abolishment of privilege, to the monopolist it would be marvelously like "expropriation".

If Anarchy is liberty, and I think it is, the most real question is, How can equal freedom, that is to say, equality of opportunity, be brought about?

CLINTON LOVERIDGE.

## Literature.

IRENE; OR, THE ROAD TO FREEDOM, by Sadie Bailey Fowler; H. N. Fowler & Co., Philadelphia; cloth, 50 cents.

This radical novel is interesting as a study in mental development, profound as a discussion of the social question, and but for its defects as a work of art, it could be commended without an adverse criticism.

In Nanie and Irene, two members of "the girl-trinity", we have some good character-delineation, but the other characters are indistinct, and one really wonders what it is in Florella that makes her one of the trinity. As the title suggests, it is woman's freedom in sex relations, primarily, that interests these people, and in the development of the story toward a solution of the problem it is seen that the relations of industrial and sexual life are so intimate that the solution of the one is the solution of the other. But it seems incongruous, if not actually paradoxical, that, in as radical a story as this, Irene, the most conservative spirit among the leading characters, should be presented in the role of heroine. The author could not have intended by this to convey the lesson that the radical element must be counterbalanced by the conservative in order to avert social disaster, because Irene is logically forced to surrender every position that is distinctively her own. Though she is gentle, firm and brave in her convictions, loving and lovable withal, bold, outspoken, radical Nan, who thought necessary sometimes to shock conventional society, and who shares largely in heroic honors, will be the favorite with progressive readers.

The plot is a rapid succession of "mysteries"—there are mysteries of birth and death, mysterious presences and mysterious absences—in fact so prevalent is this element as to be somewhat bewildering.

But if we cannot class the author in the front rank of artists, we can pronounce her work a success so far as the treatment of her chosen subject is concerned. She gives evidence of much study and originality of thought. Hers is the best and most thorough fictional discussion of the social question that I have read. One follows the loves, aspirations and labors of Nan and Irene with deep interest, and the philosophy is as engaging as the fiction.

J. H. M.

## EASTERN AND EUROPEAN PROPAGANDA.

I WAS surprised to learn that you did not know of comrade John Turner's propaganda in this country. I think it very important for the western friends to know how the propaganda is going on in the east.

I cannot say we have an Anarchistic movement of any importance in the east, but I am confident we could work one up if there were people both able and willing to participate in the work. Just what could be done we have seen by Comrades Mowbray and Turner's visits to the States. Mowbray has traveled as far west as St. Louis, holding good meetings all over, not to speak of the success met with in Boston. Thanks to his work, the Anarchists held a May day demonstration on the 3d and the Central Labor union arranged meetings for Comrade Turner—things never before heard of here. We see that if a man is determined and has the ability to make his way he succeeds. It is foolish to say the American workmen have no wish to study Anarchistic ideas. Give them a chance and they will do it. Of course our principles must be propagated in a plain and popular language, such as THE FIREBRAND uses.

Comrade John Turner has left his work in London and come over to the "freest land in the world", though he was aware of the fact that the Americans are a hard lot, to preach Anarchism too. He is a very energetic and earnest fellow, a fine speaker and an excellent debator, and, above all, he is not conceited like many others who know less. We could successfully spread our ideas if he knew the localities and did not have to depend on those comrades who are willing enough to help, but who have not the least experience and understanding as to how to arrange meetings.

Comrade Turner has addressed three meetings in New York City, which have been well attended. Not so those in Newark and Paterson; but certainly Comrade Turner is not to blame for that. On the 30th of April we gave a farewell entertainment to our comrade. The hall was packed. A number of detectives and policemen were present, looking for a job. Comrades Edelman, Mowbray, Turner, Whittington and myself spoke, but we did not seem to gratify the wishes of the officials, as they went away without running any of us in. I am sorry to state that the financial result of the affair was not satisfactory.

We have formed a group, meeting for the present at 50 E. First street. Our work for the summer will be to raise a fund large enough to carry on propaganda next fall and winter. So far, we have issued an Anarchist May day manifesto, of which several thousand were distributed on the 2d at the demonstration of workmen at Union Square.

I can also inform THE FIREBRAND readers that our brave Comrade Alex. Berkmann's case is being pushed. No definite step can be taken until 1897. All we want to do now is to get money, and the more the better, as we will need about \$1000. I beg the comrades of THE FIREBRAND to appeal for aid; if all will help we are sure to liberate him some day.

I have made a trip through different countries on the continent, where I found our ideas marching on wonderfully. In England and Scotland meetings are held several times a week in halls and parks, thousands of workmen and women listening eagerly to the speeches, where leaflets, manifestos and papers are distributed in large quantities. In France the admirable acts of Ravachol, Henry, Vaillant, Cesario and others have done more for the spreading of our principles than ten years of writing and speaking. Les Temps Nouveaux (formerly La Revolte), has increased its circulation from 8000 to 18,000, and La Sociale (formerly Pere Pienard) from 8000 to 20,000. Anarchist publications are springing up in all parts of France. In Austria the comrades have to confine themselves to a clandestine propaganda, as the authorities make daily arrests, imprisoning or expelling everyone who takes any noted part in the movement. The plutocrats are confident now that they have annihilated Anarchistic propaganda, but they will soon find out that imprisonment and suffering cannot stop the tide from flowing on.

Not a grave of the murdered for Freedom but grows seed for Freedom in its turn to bear seed  
Which the winds carry afar and resow and the rains  
And the snows nourish.  
Not a disembodied spirit can the weapons of the  
tyrants let loose  
But it stalks invisible over the world, whispering,  
counseling, cautioning.

—[Walt Whitman.



## TURNER INTERVIEWED.

[From the Boston Herald.]

"I AM here to carry on an Anarchist propaganda throughout the United States, and it is pleasing to find that there is a great deal of Anarchist sentiment among Americans. There is even much of this sentiment among those who would be loth to call themselves Anarchists.

"In the places where I have delivered speeches, the sentiment is so strong that I have been invited to deliver a second speech before returning to England. Not only are Anarchists' ideas gaining ground rapidly in this country, but in England also, which country has been looked upon by Americans as a stronghold of state socialism. In fact, the Socialist movement of England, notwithstanding that it is much stronger and clearer there than in America, is continually furnishing recruits to the Anarchists' movement.

"The more extended the Socialist movement becomes, the less militant it becomes. It started as a revolutionary movement 10 or 15 years ago in England, but just in proportion as it has entered the political arena it has dropped its old interest in the poorest in society, and now caters to the small shop keeping and better off workingmen element in the hope of catching votes at election time.

"My best hopes are centered in the working people of England. The anarchist opinions find acceptance among them. The ideas are comparatively new to them, but the influence is already being felt. The so-called new trade union movement of five or six years ago was mainly political and has already spent its force. In its young strength it carried things by force, and gained many advantages for unskilled labor by the big strikes it carried through successfully. However, carrying the poison of political action as the remedy, it slackened down to politics and impotence.

Influenced by the anarchists' teaching, the workers see that it is only by direct action on their part as against the employing and exploiting class, that any improvement can really be gained. Even more legislation on behalf of the workers was gained at the time of their active hostility to the conditions of industry they were working in. Since these direct efforts ceased, a temporary period of reaction has ensued.

"The legal eight-hour day, the demand for which grew up with the new unionism, does not command as much attention now as it did some years ago. In 1890 and '91 it was estimated that over a million work people paraded to Hyde Park in favor of it. Since then the interest has gradually slackened till this year, when I left England, there was little prospect of any eight-hour demonstration at all. This does not mean that the workers have gone back. On the contrary, new ideas have advanced the workers, until they see that only those who organize and act get anything. The workers see that even if they get an eight hour day it would not seriously alter the conditions of labor.

"They even recognize that they would have to see a six or four hour day to absorb all of the unemployed and make the demand for labor equal to the supply; besides they begin to recognize the vicious circle in which the labor movement is encompassed.

"The first of May is being substituted for the first Sunday in May. The workers are taking a day off instead of parading on Sunday, and the object of this demonstration is revolutionary rather than legal. The revolutionists are demanding the abolition of the capitalists, domination of industry rather than a modification of it, and the Anarchists are playing important part in this movement."

Concerning the condition of the American working men, Mr. Turner said: "I hardly feel justified in giving an opinion. However, so far as I can judge, their wages are better than in England, and the standard of living is higher. On the other hand the work is more intense, the slack seasons more protracted and the profit of the capitalist greater."

## WANTS THE WHOLE TRUTH.

In Comrade Addis' reply to my last letter, speaking of the Georgia Central railroad, he says I mean "another set of parasites—the officials of the state of Georgia are organized parasites and always have been," etc. Again I have to tell him I knew that and didn't need any telling. But he entirely overlooks the patent fact that the road now supports two sets of parasites instead of one. Now it has a set of organized parasites who fleece the people, while

the state parasites are as voracious as ever if not more so. Then he overlooked my question, or felt his inability to answer it: What will you do with those monopolies under Communism? meaning railroads, telegraphs, etc. Both times he has used the tactics of the politician in his reply. When he gets half right he imagines himself able to convince his audience that he has the whole truth and the other fellow all error. That will do for a Republican stalwart spouting his balderdash on a "protective tariff" or a promissory Democrat talking his "tariff for revenue only" popcock, but we reformers want the whole truth.

I said at the beginning that we are not sufficiently educated for co-operation in all things; and I say now that when we are sufficiently educated we will co-operate. The reason people do not co-operate now is because they do not know that it is for their best interests; and the reason they do not know it is because they have been falsely educated. Those false ideas will have to be educated out of them before they are ready for co-operation. Let those who do know it organize co-operative associations and by their example teach others the benefits of it. If the state authorities pass prohibitory laws (which of course they will try), then meet force with force. But be prepared from the start to show who are the aggressors, and the cause of freedom will be strengthened by the contact. What I am after is to get the people to see and work for their own interests instead of working for taskmasters, but how to do it, is the question

JAMES BEESON.

## OPPORTUNISM.

COMRADES:—I am receiving THE FIRREBRAND regularly, and it is splendid.

Mr. Miles article on Socialism has not yet appeared in the "Portersville Enterprise." When it does, if ever, I will send it to you. Mr. Miles has been getting THE FIRREBRAND and said he was pleased with it. He believes in Anarchism, but doesn't think the people are ready for it. He thinks we will have to have State Socialism first. It is a matter of opportunism, with him. Anarchist-Communism is his ideal, but he thinks (as so many do) that as we can't establish Anarchy right away, it is best under the circumstances to vote the Socialist Labor Party (or even the People's Party) into power, believing that government by either of them would be less bad than by the old parties, and fearing that if he refuse to vote, it would help to elect one of the old parties to power.

This thing of opportunism is one of the greatest difficulties with which we have to contend. I would like to see something in THE FIRREBRAND on the subject. I can see the mistake of such opportunism, but many do not. Show the people the danger of direct legislation—how it increases the power of the ignorant and superstitious majority. I don't believe in any kind of government, but I think this direct legislation the most dangerous of all. With the establishment of this popular fad, we may reasonably expect such a revival of Puritanism as has never been known in modern times.

How long do you suppose THE FIRREBRAND would continue to be published if it were left to a vote of all the people,—a majority to decide? I believe that in less than a year after the adoption of direct legislation, all liberal and freethought papers and books would be suppressed, and Comstockism would reign supreme. Even vegetarian and anti-drug-medication publications, would be almost sure to be suppressed before many years, because the bible sanctions meat eating and drug-medication and the opposite view would be considered infidel.

Freethinkers beware of direct legislation! Do you not know that a majority of the people are believers in the bible which sanctions and even commands religious persecution? Under direct legislation they would have far more power than now.

The majority are willing to vote themselves into slavery and the rest of us with them.

W. P. AUSTIN.

## RECEIPTS.

Germinal Italian Group, \$2.00. Work. Educ. Society, Allegheny, Pa., \$2.00. Lee, Wuensch, Loveridge, each \$1.00. Jackson, Lagasse, Schmitz, Brooks, de Jong, Marcus, each 50c. Lewis, Goodrich, Buhr, a Tacoma, Maryson, Task, Yordon, each 25c. Asquith, Leonard, Collins, each 10c. I. Rudash, \$1.65.

## NOTE AND COMMENT.

THE closing paragraph of comrade Andrews' article provokes some thoughts on "the right of contract" and what it is possible for a society to become based thereon. The prostitute, whether sexual, mental or physical (for Comrade Andrews shows that prostitution is not confined to sex), is so by contract, but the contract is forced by conditions the most tyrannical. It is not free contract, neither can such a thing be until opportunities are free, and opportunities cannot be free under any property system. In the absence of property, Communism alone can exist. In no society except the Communistic can contract be free.

THERE has been some call for photographs of THE FIRREBRAND group, but for lack of means we could not furnish them. A comrade in Kansas sent two dollars for the purpose and we now have a few on hand. Those who have a curiosity in this direction and who desire to aid the paper in gratifying that curiosity, will be supplied at 25 cents each.

TEXAS comrades should take the advantage of the favorable attitude of "The Texas State Labor Journal," Dallas. In a late number it had an article on "the minimum of authority," and in a note the editor says:

The following article has been received without date or signature. On account of its merit, and because of the scarcity of arguments on that side of the question, we depart from our usual rule of requiring signatures, and publish the article.

Certainly no paper willing to hear both sides should be allowed to mourn for lack of argument on our side of the question.

A correspondent is surprised that I "think it necessary for a man and woman to live together in order to enjoy love relations". I don't think he will find anything of the sort in anything I have said, and I do not know what has led him to such a conclusion unless it be that I may have said nothing to the contrary. I am aware that there are many essential points to the question which I have not taken up, but hope to do so in the future. In "Anarchy in Marriage", written four years ago and lately reprinted, there are terms which I would not now use, though my ideas have not materially changed. It may be that the unwise choice of words has somewhat obscured my meaning. I may say here, however, that not only do I not think living together necessary or essential to the enjoyment of the love relation, but I am satisfied that constant association as practiced today is the death of love. In a Communistic society conditions would not necessitate such association, but would enable lovers to enjoy each other's society when the desire for association was mutual.

J. H. M.

WHEN Anarchists advise the workingmen to organize, or to unite, they should never forget to explain what they mean by it. We must remember that the two words have different meanings. We know that when people have a common end in view they are united. But the average workingman understands by it that he must accept a certain platform issued by certain parties or unions, and he knows that it is an impossible proposition; he has, when not a clear understanding, at least a presentiment that the platform or constitution is the very thing that makes the uniting impossible.

LOGIC should be expected from a critic, no matter what premise he takes. In last week's issue Comrade Borland quotes a critic of Communism who says he is inclined to the opinion that the failure of Communistic efforts is due to the authority within them, and just how a state of Communism can be maintained without such authority is more than he can understand. Now where is the logic? If the authority is the cause of failure—which is correct—how can it be maintained by authority?

"I BELIEVE the first reform that will come to this country will be direct legislation. It has been introduced into nearly every legislature and has found a respectful hearing," says the "Appeal to Reason". The editor can rely upon it that when any "reform" proposition finds a "respectful hearing" among the oppressors there is "nothing in it". Why should



not our rulers accept the Initiative and Referendum in order to quiet the crying slaves, when they see that it works so smoothly and nicely in favor of the governing classes in Switzerland? A. I.

LAW-WORSHIP AND ITS DOWNFALL

Laws are all that is most arbitrary in the world. They sum up the spirit of a moment, the aspirations of a party, or the average opinion of a nation; but, being made by some men, they are colored with their passions, their defects, their qualities—if those who made them were sincere. They may indeed satisfy those who partake of the way of looking at things of those who fabricated them, but they chafe upon many more. To obtain unanimous approbation a law would have to be of a perfection not of this world; but then it would have no need of being placed on the statute book—its sanction would be in its very justice. One erects into laws only what meets with resistance on the part of a sufficiently important fraction of the population.

Those who make laws or are charged with applying them have reason not to suffer them to be discussed. Based upon the arbitrary, law is like creed—discussion is its ruin. To wish to discuss it is to commit an act of revolt; it is the beginning of insubordination. An order discussed is only half executed. Not a single law would remain capable of being carried into application from the day when each individual should want to reason upon it according to his own conception.

There is no law which does not, by the fact that it is law, wound someone in his individuality, his sentiment or his autonomy. It is to ask for more than worship from those whom it wounds, to ask them to bow before it even though they recognise it for unjust. It is calling for the "Credo quia absurdum" of Saint Augustine—"I believe, because it is absurd!" The weak and the timorous may bend, but the strong and the worthy will always refuse to bow docilely to what their reason reprobates.

Thereupon, all the forces of society have to be made to intervene to assure the sanctity of the laws; which proves we are right in saying that law is only the argument of the stronger.

Certainly, force would not always be sufficient to ensure respect for the law. History gives us numerous examples where it has sufficed for authority to seek to apply some laws, more detested, if not more absurd, than the others, to rouse up public opinion to the point of resistance, and contribute to lay low the power which had enacted them. The succour which force brings to the law can only be temporary, like all that rests upon force; the latter has only a relative value, and if sometimes, nearly always up to the present, it is found on the side of the oppressors, it happens also, intermittently, that the oppressed find it on their side, when they resume the consciousness of their dignity and of their rights.

Therefore, in order to bring about the acceptance of the law, besides brute force it has been necessary to clothe it with a certain moral force which should make the greater number accept it as a social necessity, sometimes painful, but useful to the general well-being; and the skill of rulers was in presenting it as such. That explains to us all the theatrical effects with which it was formerly enveloped, all this stage pomp and masquerade, so ridiculous to-day to the reflecting, but which rulers are careful to conserve, because mummery has always the gift of impressing imbeciles and influencing them.

Formerly, authority was pretended to be an emanation from God. The holders of power were the representatives on earth of the divine majesty; their will was to be respected as equal to decrees of providence. To discuss their orders was a sacrilege. So, in the ages of faith authority was as much respected as feared, without the worst turpitudes that it committed seeming to menace its prestige.

But, slowly, imperceptibly, yet surely, human evolution was accomplishing its work of criticism. Divinity was placed under doubt, and at once the legitimacy of authority, as a divine essence, faded beneath review. The result was the fall of the royalty of right divine, and the accession to power of the middle class, the bourgeoisie.

The latter, on installing themselves in power, brought forward to consolidate it a new theory of authority. The god-entity having lost weight, they created the nation-entity, which had later on to be transformed into the society-entity. Law was no longer the divine will, but the national will. To give to the material force which it had just seized the moral force without which

there is no permanence, the bourgeoisie invoked the "will of all" to coerce the individual will.

While people believed in the legitimacy of majority rule—in the necessities of "society" transcending the necessities of the people as individuals—the laws that the bourgeoisie used or decreed in their own interests were submitted to by the mass. Were they murmured against when they pressed too hard, they were excused by invoking the "general interests".

But the bourgeoisie had dealt authority its death-wound in working to sap its divine origin. From the day the people commenced to discuss its obedience was more apparent than real—respect for authority being wounded in the vitals. The dummied-up that the bourgeoisie effected could not much longer deceive any one.

Physical science teaches us that the fall of a body is accelerated cumulatively in an increasing ratio as it nears the center of the earth. It is the same with the progress of human evolution. The more points of concordance that a brain possesses between its internal faculties and its external relations, the more it is in a condition to acquire new ones and the more quickly is this adaptation of these new conquests effected. It took thousands of years to lay low the authority of the sword and that of divine right, which sustained each other. A century has sufficed to shatter the authority of number, as of riches. At the present time it no longer has respect; even its holders lack belief in it; the swathing-cloth it has willed to wrap around the individual is bursting all over; its dogmas become worthless in the hands of those who attempt to analyze them. At the present time there is no longer anything but brute force that maintains it; and its definite fall is no more than a question of seconds in the chronology of human evolution.—[Jean Grave, in Reason.

The Letter-Box.

C. L., New York.—Thanks. Advice accompanied by a dollar bill is always welcome.

Jos. Lee, Cleveland, O.—You get the Lees mixed up. One Lee was credited with 50 cents in No. 12, but in No. 13 you are credited with \$1.

L. C. G., Reading, Pa.—Your letter is very nice and brotherly, and we appreciate it, but you forgot to say whether or not you want the paper.

R. S., Buffalo, N. Y.—As we had nothing to do with the matter you mention, we feel that any inquiries on our part would be impertinent. Let those interested look into it. We would not advise publicity in such a case unless something definite is known.

A. M., Boston.—You have our sincere thanks. Your help is not so small as you seem to think. From each according to his ability, you know, is all that is expected.

Dr. Lyman Abbott, of the "Outlook", makes this astonishing announcement: "The State is a religious, not a secular, institution." "Its functions," says he, "are distinctly religious." The Standard Dictionary defines religious as "feeling and manifesting religion; devout; pious." According to the same authority, religion is "a belief binding the spiritual nature of man to a supernatural being on which he is conscious that he is dependent." It may be, however, that in Dr. Abbott's vocabulary "religious" does not mean the same that it does in current speech. Otherwise the doctor is out-Heroding the Herods of "national reform".—[American Sentinel.

Among other things which the Iowa state auditor has taken official cognizance of in his account for the past winter is one of prayers offered in the state legislature to the number of one hundred and forty-three. He had decided to allow the preachers who officiated \$5 per prayer. This money, of course, means "value received"; but upon what basis the estimate was made—whether the length of time employed in each instance, or the amount of the divine blessing thought to have been secured, or the degree of respectability imparted to the legislative proceedings—or their value in some other way—we are not told. If the people of the state should demand to be informed on this point—as they have a right to do—the auditor would doubtless find himself in a position of much embarrassment.—[American Sentinel.

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.

A Raffle.

The Labor Educating Society in Allegheny City Pa., has arranged a raffle of a "fine Gold Watch, Lamp, Clock and several other articles," for the benefit of "The Firebrand". Tickets 10c., for sale by A. Frey, 78 Pike street, Allegheny City, Pa.

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.

Agents for THE FIREBRAND.

Charles L. Bodendieck, 1140 Milwaukee Avenue, Chicago, Ill.  
O. C. Schmidt, 412 South 13th St., Omaha, Neb.  
I. Rudash, 162 Norfolk street, New York City.  
G. Lang, 29 Grace Street, Buffalo, N. Y.

OMAHA, Nebraska.

SOCIETY FREEDOM meets every Sunday 3 P. M. at the Labor Temple, 8th floor, SW corner 15th and Forum Sts.

TO THE FRIENDS OF THE FIREBRAND.—For the benefit of this paper I will send instructions for mounting and preserving any sized bird, from a hummer to an Eagle, without skinning, to any one sending 25 cents to THE FIREBRAND and a self-addressed, stamped envelope to Ed. Goss, Warren, Minn.

P. S.—After receiving it, if your conscience troubles you for receiving so much for so little you can remit something to the sender. E. G.

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                                   | 5c  |
| 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        | 25c |
| A Sex Revolution, by Lois Waisbrocker                                       | 5c  |
| Anything More, My Lord?   | 10c |
| Wants and Their Gratification; H. Addis                                     | 15c |
| A Secret and Confidential Address, by Gavroche                              | 5c  |
| 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 Bakounin. 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.

THE "office" of THE FIREBRAND: North Mt. Tabor Car Line, Center Addition North Mount Tabor.